

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND SOCIAL SCIENCE
IN STATE UNIVERSITIES

by
Russell M. Ross

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Political Science in the Graduate College of the State University of Iowa

January, 1948

ProQuest Number: 10836657

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10836657

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

T1948
R825
cop. 2

Gen.

"The scope of our knowledge has been so widened, and we have so many "departments" of knowledge zealously guarded by their respective specialists that we have come to a stage of human culture in which we have compartments of knowledge, but not knowledge itself; specialization but no integration, specialists but no philosophers of human wisdom."

- Lin Yutang

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
Preface and Introduction	v
I General Education in the State Universities	1
II Social Science Disciplines	18
III Political Science	30
IV Introductory Social Science Courses	41
V Instructional Procedures in Introductory Social Science Courses	53
VI Texts in Introductory Social Science Courses	68
References	89
Bibliography	97

TABLE OF TABLES

	Page
Table A State Universities with General Education Programs and an Introductory Social Science Course . . .	16
Table B The Status of General Education Programs in State Universities	17
Table C Classification of Students Enrolled in Introductory Social Science Courses	29
Table D Departments Administering Introductory Social Science Courses	40
Table E Titles of Introductory Social Science Courses in State Universities	52
Table F Hours of Credit Given for Introductory Social Science Courses	66
Table G Instructional Techniques Used in Introductory Social Science Courses	67
Table H Number of Texts Used in Introductory Social Science Courses	86
Table I List of Texts Used in Introductory Social Science Courses	87

Preface and Introduction

Every business firm periodically takes an inventory of its equipment and resources. This is merely a sound business principle. It is a procedure that should be practiced by the educational world. The purpose of this dissertation has been to segregate one portion of the educational field in order to study and analyze its position. Special attention has been given to some of the factors which have influenced this particular part of education in the past and which will probably continue to do so in the future.

In brief, the problem to be considered deals with the position and status of introductory social science courses in higher education, particularly with reference to the role of political science. The first question to be considered was what institutions of higher learning should be included in the survey? The universities selected were the state universities. Of the forty-eight states, all but New York, New Jersey, and Rhode Island maintain a state university. In this study the forty-five state universities and Rutgers in New Jersey, Rhode Island State, and New York University were surveyed. The selection of these forty-eight state institutions established certain natural limits for the work. The state universities provided diversified enrollments. Enrollments ranged from nineteen hundred students at the University of South Dakota to more than forty thousand registered at the various branches of the University of California. Another factor considered in selecting the state univer-

sities as logical subjects for study was that while they have not always been the leaders in every educational movement, at least they have, as a group, maintained an excellent position in educational circles. They represent a cross section of the American educational pattern in higher education. The universities maintained by the states have always assumed the responsibility of preparing their students for citizenship, as well as for a professional career. Since social science has been a division of education particularly called upon to assume the task of preparing the student for his position in society, it seems reasonable that the state universities should be studied in order to ascertain the status of social science.

A second question that had to be answered was: what were to be the primary objectives of the survey? The first and most important objective was to determine the status of the general introductory social science course. This involved answering a number of questions. 1. What schools offer a course of this nature? 2. What methodologies and instructional techniques are used? 3. How is the course administered? 4. What is the nature of the course, its general content and approach? 5. What texts are used in the course?

The corollary objective of determining the status of social science included evaluating the role of political science in the social science programs of the state universities. This necessitated a study of the contributions that political science has made to general introductory social science courses. The major question was: what has political science contributed to the introductory social science course offered in

each university in regard to personnel, subject matter and reading material?

Because it is believed to be essential to visualize the whole before a small portion may be seen in proper perspective, the first chapter is devoted to the present day educational movement known as general education, with a consideration of its meaning, influence and the extent of its development. This plan was used as it was felt that the discussion of social science and political science has more meaning and reality against this broad canvass.

The sources of information used were the administration and instructional staffs of the state universities. Every state university was contacted at least two times and as many as five letters were exchanged with members of the staffs of the schools which offer general social science courses. The co-operation of the presidents, the deans, and the instructional staffs was most helpful.

A great number of people have given generously of their time and counsel during the preparation of this work. To Professor Jack T. Johnson I owe thanks for valuable critical advice and innumerable helpful criticisms. Dean Earl J. McGrath also gave aid in the preparation of the manuscript as did Professor John H. Haefner. To Professor Kirk H. Porter, Head of the Political Science Department, I owe thanks for making the writing of this dissertation possible. Any errors in evaluation or interpretation in any part of the work are my own.

Chapter I

GENERAL EDUCATION IN THE STATE UNIVERSITIES

New ideas and programs on all levels of education are constantly commanding the attention of the general public as well as professional educators. World War II has precipitated an avalanche of words concerned primarily with higher education. The recent books and articles on the subject have been so numerous and so similar as to evidence a trend - a trend usually termed "the general education movement." Some writers and educators believe that the movement could appropriately be called "the liberal education movement" for the two have much in common. Probably President J. B. Conant of Harvard University is as responsible as any one man for the widespread use of the term "general education."¹

The movement, whatever it is called, is certain to have an affect upon social science and its specialized disciplines. That it is simultaneous with the advent of the general social science course is refuted by the fact that twenty state universities offer general introductory courses in this latter area but only ten of this group relate them to a concrete general education program. It should be noted, however, that the general social science courses in several of the state universities have served as the genesis for a general education curriculum.

It is not to be concluded that general education always follows the offering of a general social science course or that a revamping of the curriculum is the only form that the movement may take. At the Okla-

homa Agricultural and Mechanical College, general education does not consist of offering new courses or old courses under new titles, but rather proceeds from a testing program through which the students are directed into areas in which the examinations show they have insufficient knowledge.*

The examination is called the Sophomore General examination and is similar to the Graduate Record Examination in that it reveals the student's strength and weaknesses in eight different general areas. The test must be taken and passed before a student is advanced from the Lower Division of the college to the Upper Division. The extent of the examination is indicated by the fact that it requires more than nine hours to administer.²

No complete agreement exists as to what general education is or how widespread its effects will ultimately be. Definitions of general education are almost as numerous as the writers in the field.

Norman Foerster defines general education as, implying not a superficial training which runs parallel with expert training, but a genuine reconciliation of breadth and thoroughness. He believes that it means a reasonable degree of thoroughness within a reasonable degree of breadth. Therein is implied a mellowness and matureness, rather than speed and efficiency - assimilation and not mere item gathering, reflection, penetration and recognition of relationships. Principles should dominate facts.³

*Bulletin - Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1946-1947.
pp. 19, 100.

W. W. Charters expresses a similar opinion when he comments that general education is concerned with the mastery of those cultured tools which are of most importance for the common man.⁴

Many people will complain that these definitions are vague and intangible. This group finds support in the Harvard Report, General Education in a Free Society, for this scholarly document raised the question that the term is vague and lacks color. A definition of the movement to avoid criticism, therefore, must include some conception of what general education attempts to achieve. It should include both the goals and the objectives of the movement.

The aims of general education can not be easily summed up. The Harvard Report defines the goal of the movement as an attempt "to provide a broad critical sense by which to recognize competence in any field."⁵ One of the major objectives of general education is to create intelligent citizens. General education is needed in a democracy probably more than in any other form of government. In addition, the universities which are pioneering in the field of general education are striving to attain A. J. Brumbaugh's objectives for an instructional program. His idea centers around the theory that the concomitant of general education, if not its major purpose, is the development of an aesthetic over-tone to life as a whole.⁶ Some educators believe that a school which wants to do justice to what is called general education must aim to develop four prime abilities in the students. These are identical to the four goals of general education as conceived in General Education for a Free Society. First, to develop the student's ability to think effectively; second,

to advance his ability to communicate either through the written or the spoken word; third, to increase his ability to make relevant judgments; and fourth, to augment the student's ability to discriminate values.⁷

The fact that general education is not concerned with highly specialized knowledge has been recognized for many years. President James M. Wood at Stephens College accepted and utilized many of the ideals and principles of general education before 1920. President Wood made a sharp distinction between the specialized scholarship which may be appropriate in the graduate school and the breadth of knowledge and functional experience vital to a liberal arts college.⁸

A negative characteristic of the general education movement is its opposition to vocationalism. This would seem to be only natural since it demands that specialization, so often associated with vocationalism, be separated from the general education curriculum.

Another trend in higher education, in ways distinct from general education, is a movement to organize the curriculum into larger units rather than separate subjects. This calls for better integration of the subject matter than under the older type of organization. The exponents of this integration believe that it will result in more closely relating the courses to vital needs and problems.⁹ The defect in the single subject matter unit pointed out by the critics of this type of organization is its failure to realize that the life of the individual is affected by all of the subject matter areas simultaneously, not first by one and then by another.

Howard Mumford Jones charges that departments which inevitably

accompany the single subject matter unit are one of the greatest evils in our educational system. He asserts that departments are the products of specialization which in turn nourish departments and thereby establish an unending circle. The ethnocentrism developed within departments has become one of the barriers for the ideas of general education to overcome. It can not be denied that specialization and departments, if they are unduly emphasized, are at war with many sound concepts of education and the theories of general education.¹⁰

Educators are frequently asked, "Where is the impetus for the general education movement?" The Harvard Report asserts that some of the stimulus comes from the enlightened specialists and declares that this is no small part of the argument in favor of general education. Many professional educators, however, believe Howard Mumford Jones is correct when he says, "The place and the future of the (general education) movement is squarely in the hands of the college and university presidents and the deans of the liberal arts colleges."¹¹

The deans of the Liberal Arts Colleges in the State Universities differ in their conception of general education and its relationship to other areas of the curriculum. Some of the administrators have made no move to join the general education movement. For example, the University of North Dakota has thus far remained aloof from the trend. The administrators of this state university assert that they have not been able to do much in the area of general education. Being a small institution, with less than twenty-five hundred students, and with limited financial support, the officials of the school have decided it is unnecessary to change

the liberal arts program.¹² A similar attitude is expressed by the Liberal Arts Dean of the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College. There the subject of general education has been given attention, because the possibilities of introducing courses of a more general nature in several fields have been discussed. However, the administrative staff has not been sufficiently convinced of their value to make any move in the direction of general education courses and in view of the attitude prevailing at the University there seems to be little likelihood that there will be any changes in their curriculum in the near future.¹³

The officials of the state universities that at present believe that their schools will remain above the ebb and flow of the general education tide are few. These schools at which not even lip service is being given to the ideas of general education are for the most part the state universities with small enrollments, and limited finances.

A second category of state universities includes those schools which are investigating, considering, and contemplating changes in their curriculum to make it conform with the general education trend. However, at the beginning of the 1947-48 academic year, none of the schools in this group had gone beyond the discussion stage. The University of Washington typifies this group. There, the university committee composed of deans and members of the faculty has prepared a report on general education and will submit its observations to the entire faculty for consideration.¹⁴ A similar situation exists at the University of Maine. While no general education courses have been instituted, the faculty and the members of

the administration have been interested in the reports of other schools on the development of such courses.¹⁵ At the University of Utah a study of general education is being made by the members of the university committee which was appointed to "look-into" the movement. The report of the Utah committee, when it is completed and if adopted, would probably materially affect the curriculum of the university.¹⁶

The University of Alabama is another of the state universities in the process of drawing up blue prints for a general education program. During the summer of 1947, the faculty of the Alabama College of Arts and Sciences began a series of studies which are concerned with the general education area. One committee was appointed to consider the general education movement, while a second group was named to investigate the desirability of a general course in social science.¹⁷

In this second group of thirty-two state universities, the concrete general education program has as yet to be adopted, but all of these schools are conducting studies concerned with the general education movement. The administrators and faculties of these state-maintained universities appear to feel that careful consideration of general education is warranted, but hesitate to commit their institutions to curricular changes until the situation has crystalized and the trend more fully developed.

Algo D. Henderson, President of Antioch College, has summarized the conditions that are present in some of the state universities in his book Vitalizing Liberal Education. He states "In spite of evidences of new thinking about liberal or general education, by and large the colleges seem satisfied to follow the traditions of the past. They remind one of

the bronze founder who is proud of having through years of hard apprenticeship learned how to cast statues in bronze exactly as Cellini cast them four hundred years ago. In the pride of his ancient art, he refuses to see the tremendous developments in science and in training methods which have taken place during the Industrial Revolution. Similarly, the liberal arts college refuses to recognize the radical changes in educational philosophy and method which has been produced by the era of science.¹⁸

The third classification of state universities in regard to the status of general education is a relatively small group, which has adopted the philosophy of general education. An attempt is made in these schools to co-ordinate the basic and relevant knowledge of the disciplines of related fields into a single conceptual framework. These universities are: the Universities of Kansas, Minnesota, North Carolina, Louisiana, New Hampshire, Oregon, Mississippi, Arizona, Florida and Iowa.

The University of Minnesota, the largest of this group in terms of student enrollment, has during recent years developed courses in many departments designed fundamentally on a general education basis. According to Dean Russell Cooper several interdepartmental offerings have also proved particularly successful. The Minnesota work differs somewhat from that of the other state universities in that the general education program is organized within a General College.¹⁹

The University of Oregon is another state university which has made provision for general education, especially in the lower division. The aim has been to compel a wide work distribution for the students in the lower division through the fulfillment of group requirements. The

establishment of courses more broad in scope than the restricted offerings of any one department has been instituted. Collaboration of departments at the University of Oregon has been widespread and as a result the department boundaries have been frequently transcended.²⁰

For over twelve years the University of Florida has been working in the field of general education. This broad experience places the school in a leading position among the state universities. In practically all of the general education courses at the University of Florida the responsibility has been assumed by those faculty members with the greatest length of experience. These educators are convinced that the teacher of the comprehensive courses, the courses that disregard departmental boundaries, require more information, more insight, and more real wisdom than is required in the average upper division course. The directors of the Florida plan have discovered that men who like to philosophize about general education and to write about teaching goals, instructional objectives and classroom techniques, too often do not know how to apply their theories to actual teaching conditions.²¹

Of the New England state universities in this third group, the University of New Hampshire has recently revised the program of its college of liberal arts and has given emphasis to general education. According to Dean Elswett the General Liberal Arts Curriculum is intended to give the student a broad, liberal program, a general education leading to the B.A. or B.S. degree. Provision, however, is made for vocational education in the New Hampshire plan which is called the Prescribed Curriculum. This latter program provides for considerable intensive specialization

which Dean Blewett believes "conserves the breadth and general culture of the students" enrolling in the Prescribed Curriculum. The courses in the general education area of the University of New Hampshire have been in operation in "one form or another for several years."²²

There are many difficulties and problems involved in a general education program. Some of these have already been touched upon. However, the comprehensive problem, irrespective of administration, is the adaptation of the general education program to the needs and interests of different groups. This includes "selling" the student the philosophy, the aims, the goals and objectives of the program. This should not be an unsurmountable task, but it is one that must be given proper attention by the administrators and the instructors of the general education courses. The difficulty mentioned most frequently by deans and administrators is the recruitment of personnel who are not only qualified to perform in the all-inclusive fields but who are interested enough to devote their talents and energies to this endeavor.

President Virgil M. Hancher of the State University of Iowa in his article in The Journal of General Education entitled, "The Components of General Education," states some unobtained objectives for general education. The first of these objectives is the recognition of the inadequate amount of time allotted to general education. The problem may be more than this, however, for the question is how to best utilize whatever time is devoted to general education. The second objective and problem is one of making the program valuable preparation for graduate study and research. While it should be kept in mind that great numbers of students never begin

graduate study, it is still important that those who do find the general education program useful. The final objective - that of creating an ethical attitude toward the uses to which a student may apply his knowledge and his skill is a question to which there is no apodictic answer.²⁵

The corollary problem raised by President Manchester leads to a very interesting and perplexing question that confronts general education. It is simply this: Can general education properly prepare a student to pursue regular departmental courses? Stated more concretely, does a course such as an introductory course in social science give the student the necessary background for taking advanced courses in the various social science disciplines? Does an introductory course in social science constitute a solid foundation for a student who later takes a course in public administration, cultural anthropology, foreign trade, or juvenile delinquency?

Again there seems to be no all inclusive answer - indeed there would appear to be little agreement among educators on any of the fundamental aspects of this problem. This lack of uniformity of belief as to the value of the general introductory courses is evident from the replies expressed by three department heads at the University of Mississippi when asked if they believed an introductory course in social science would adequately prepare a student for more advanced work in the specialized divisions of social science. Dean Horace B. Brown of the School of Commerce and Business Administration, had the following comment to make, "While I am quite sure a course in Introduction to the Social Sciences in many respects may be quite good, I do not consider it to be a pre-

requisite, in any sense, to a study of economics, political science, or sociology. This being true, I would really prefer to have a student study some other subject at this level or begin a more specialized course in political science, economics or sociology." An almost directly opposite view is expressed by Dr. Morton King, Jr., Professor of Sociology. Professor King says, "I am convinced that some work on the freshman level is necessary to prepare our high school graduates for the introductory sophomore courses in economics, political science and sociology. What the students lack in particular is the perspective that comes from knowledge of our society as a functioning whole. This is why I believe that an interdepartmental course is better preparation than freshman work offered by the departments separately." Dr. Robert B. Highsaw, of the University of Mississippi Department of Political Science, has a conception of the value of the introductory course that parallels that claimed by Professor King. Mr. Highsaw states, "It is my opinion that this type of course offers very great possibilities as a means of orientating the student to the basic concepts of the social science fields such as political science, economics, sociology and psychology. It has been my observation that very often students come to the advanced courses in each of these fields without sound knowledge of basic concepts. In fields such as political science, where the sophomore course is usually a course in national government, an introductory course in the social sciences is almost indispensable. It seems to me, also, that the student majoring in one of the fields covered by the courses is often aided by the general knowledge of related fields which can not be picked up on a hit and miss

basis."²⁴

The members of the University of South Dakota staff question the value of general introductory courses as preparation for advanced work. Dean Pardee reports that his faculty is unanimous in its belief that such a course as an introduction to social science would not properly prepare students to take more advanced courses in political science, economics, and sociology. He asserts that the members of his physical science faculty do not believe a general introductory science course to be sufficient as a prerequisite for the advanced courses.²⁵ The faculty of the social studies at the University of Kentucky is in agreement with the South Dakota staff as they do not have faith in an introductory social science course as preparation for advanced work in the various social science disciplines.²⁶

An interesting analysis of the sentiment concerning the value of introductory general education courses is presented by Dean Edward H. Lauer of the University of Washington. While Dean Lauer firmly believes that such courses can be the best ones to prepare a student for more advanced work, he admits that he is unable to point to any courses which are doing the job. The Dean of the University of Washington Liberal Arts College believes that most faculties have not developed general introductory courses because few of the key men in the departments are convinced that it is possible.²⁷

Malville J. Herskovits, Professor of Anthropology at Northwestern University, shares Dean Lauer's opinion that the general course is the best course to prepare a student for more advanced work. He

believes the students at Northwestern University are being given the best possible foundation for more advanced work through the Northwestern general introductory courses.²⁸

Francis O. Wilcox, a member of the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress, has found a growing feeling in many quarters that such a course as a broad social science offering gives a more effective introduction for advanced work. <In some institutions such as the University of Chicago, the general social science course has replaced the traditional introductory courses given by each of the disciplines.> At other universities the students are required to take the general introductory course before registering for the usual first course in each subject matter area.

There are at least three plans concerning the role a general introductory course may assume in the curriculum. The Chicago plan has the general area course replace the usual introductory offering. The Iowa plan differs from this in that the general introductory course is used in the general education program as all students except those majoring in a discipline included in the general introductory course must take general area courses. This means that a student majoring in political science would not be required to enroll for a general introductory course in social Science. The third plan makes use of the general introductory course as a basic foundation for specialized work in any discipline in the area. This middle-of-the-road idea of using the general introductory course as a supplement to the departmental offerings would seem to have some definite advantages. The biggest problem that this procedure

presents is it probably would make necessary extensive revision of many of the upper division courses. For instance in the field of political science, it would probably necessitate a revamping of the American government courses. If the students have a good foundation in such areas as public opinion, propaganda and pressure groups, it would seem proper to base the American government course on a different level than is necessary when the students have no background in this general area. The same would be true of the other specialized disciplines. Possibly this is another of the problems facing the growth and expansion of the general education movement. Inertia among members of a college faculty is a powerful force, which, if coupled with the desire to protect vested interests, can form a formidable opposition to any new trend. H. Frederick Willkie emphasizes this difficulty facing general education, when he declares that faculties are often not free agents and are restricted to their beliefs. He stresses that the general education movement is handicapped by the heavy hand of tradition and conservatism which often controls department heads, deans, and college presidents.⁵⁰

TABLE A

State Universities with General Education Programs
and an Introductory Social Science Course

State Universities with General Introductory Course in Social Science (With a General Education Program)	State Universities with General Introductory Course in Social Science (But No Program in General Education)
1. Arizona	1. Illinois
2. Florida	2. Maine
3. Iowa	3. Mississippi
4. Kansas	4. Missouri
5. Louisiana	5. Montana
6. Minnesota	6. Nebraska
7. New Hampshire	7. Rutgers (N.J.)
8. New Mexico	8. South Carolina
9. North Carolina	9. West Virginia
10. Oregon	10. Wyoming

TABLE B

The Status of General Education Programs
in State Universities

State Universities With Programs In Operation	State Universities That Are Considering New Plans	State Universities Not Participating
1. Arizona	1. Alabama	1. Arkansas
2. Florida	2. Colorado	2. Nevada
3. Iowa	3. California	3. North Dakota
4. Kansas	4. Connecticut	4. Rhode Island State
5. Louisiana	5. Georgia	5. South Dakota
6. Minnesota	6. Delaware	6. Tennessee
7. New Hampshire	7. Idaho	
8. New Mexico	8. Illinois	
9. North Carolina	9. Indiana	
10. Oregon	10. Kentucky	
	11. Maine	
	12. Maryland	
	13. Massachusetts	
	14. Michigan	
	15. Mississippi	
	16. Missouri	
	17. Montana	
	18. Nebraska	
	19. New York	
	20. Ohio State	
	21. Oklahoma	
	22. Pennsylvania	
	23. Rutgers (N.J.)	
	24. South Carolina	
	25. Texas	
	26. Utah	
	27. Vermont	
	28. Virginia	
	29. Washington	
	30. West Virginia	
	31. Wisconsin	
	32. Wyoming	

Chapter II

SOCIAL SCIENCE DISCIPLINES

Before a profitable discussion can be undertaken of the problems and the status of the social science disciplines, some understanding of just what constitutes these sciences must be determined. As Elbridge Sibley phrases the problem, "Any intelligent discussion of social science must unfortunately begin with a definition." One of the leading authorities in this field, Edwin R. A. Seligman, has defined the social sciences as "those mental or cultural sciences which deal with the activities of the individual as a member of a group." Using his outline as a guide, it is found that one of the earliest, if not the first of the social sciences, is that field of study known generally as political science. Economics is another of these fundamental sciences and since the Greeks studied politics first and then economics, it has retained along with its primary aspect, a secondary residuum. Third of this group is the study of history as it inquires into the genesis and development of both political and economic institutions. Last of the older group is the off-shoot of political science, jurisprudence or the science of law. According to Seligman, the four "newer" social sciences are anthropology, penology, criminology, and the social science "par excellence" sociology.⁵¹ However, there are other disciplines that are closely enough related to this general area to be mentioned in any exhaustive study. Ethics, education, philosophy, psychology, biology, the arts, linguistics, and geography

may be considered as related to the social science disciplines already mentioned.

Charles A. Beard's answer to "What are the social sciences?" is of sufficient value to warrant consideration. Dr. Beard first defends the customary usage "science" as being correct since it may mean a body of knowledge and thought, usually to be found in books and papers. "Social science", he asserts, "is such a body of knowledge and thought pertaining to human affairs as distinguished from sticks, stones, stars, and physical objects." Professor Beard completes his admittedly "bewildering" definition by stating, "the social sciences are scattered widely - in millions of books and papers and in the minds of millions of persons." More concrete is Mr. Beard's list of the social science disciplines in which are included: (1) Geography, (2) Economics, (3) Cultural Sociology, (4) Political Science, (5) History, (6) Anthropology.³²

A very general definition of social science is presented by Elbridge Sibley as the application of the scientific method to the study of social structures and behavior.³³ However, it would seem that a concise or limited definition is impossible. Robert Lynd does not define the term social science but prefers to call it an organized part of culture which exists to aid man in understanding and in rebuilding his culture.³⁴

All attempts at definition of social science agree that the general subject matter is man in his relationship to society. Each of the social sciences embrace a body of knowledge and thought pertaining to the relation of human beings, both to one another and to the physical environment in which they live. Possibly there would be no social science if

there were no problems nor perplexities in group life. In a special sense, the social sciences prepare the individual for participation in social life. Especially do they lead the way in civic education. Charles E. Merriam has stated that the social sciences unlock the door to political and social advance.³⁵ <The social sciences attempt to reach a comprehensive interpretation of human life, with the position of man in society as the focal point around which all courses revolve.>

There is considerable agreement that the principles and practices of social sciences are less definitely verified than are the natural sciences. The social scientist deals with the activities of man, which are comparatively unpredictable, while the natural sciences study nature and predictable problems.³⁶

In the social sciences multiple causation must be taken into consideration in every study. The possibilities of controlling all but one of the causes of social phenomena are usually remote. An almost infinite number of variables and factors of human will and choice, with both vertical and lateral relationships complicate all studies of social problems. There is no implication in this that the work of the social scientist is less important than that of the chemist, physicist, or geologist, but rather serves to emphasize that the task of the social scientist is possibly even more difficult to perform than that of the physical scientist.

The social scientist is often asked to explain his role and function in society. Robert Lynd has an answer to this inquiry. It is his assertion that "it is the role of social science to be troublesome, to disconcert the habitual arrangements by which we live and to demonstrate

the possibility of change in more adequate directions."⁵⁷ If the social scientist gives an adequate reply to the question of what his role in society is, he will embark into the realm of his responsibilities. These responsibilities appear to consist of answering two questions. How do the institutions that we have in operation today function and how do they affect our social behavior? How can these factors which cause trials and tribulations for man in society be removed or altered?

The duty of social science and the social scientist is to encourage people to understand how they think rather than to tell them what to think. The task is not to continue to compile more and more data but to contribute to a better world based upon a better understanding of man and society. There is reason to believe that social scientists are realizing now that the individual, his motives, his desires, natural or acquired, coupled with his institutions, social, political, and economic, are the tools that he must employ in his study. It is both the man and the institutions with their constant interrelations which form the foundations for social science.

According to B. L. Johnson, the first general introductory courses in the social sciences were inaugurated at the same time as the first experiments in general education. The first attempt in America to cut across departmental boundaries on the higher education level and present a general course in the social sciences was made in 1918-19 at Princeton University. This course entitled "Historical Introduction to Politics and Economics" was started in the same year that Dartmouth began a survey course in the natural sciences. The following year Missouri

presented a survey course in the social sciences, as did Stanford. Dartmouth, in 1919-20, installed a social science course organized in much the same fashion as its natural science survey.³⁸ The first complete pattern was established by the University of Chicago between the years 1923 and 1925, when it introduced four courses entitled, "Man in Society," "The Nature of the World," "Introduction to Reflective Thinking," and "The Meaning and the Value of the Arts."³⁹ In 1923 a second state university, Minnesota, began experimental work in this area with courses similar to those offered by the University of Chicago.⁴⁰

It is significant that of the early courses which attempted to cut across departmental boundaries, four of the five were in social science, the fifth being a natural science. By the year 1935, W. H. Cowley estimated that approximately one hundred and twenty-four survey courses were being offered.⁴¹ Of this number more than one-third were introductory social science courses.⁴² A year later B. L. Johnson estimated that approximately one hundred and twenty-one survey courses in social sciences were being given.⁴³

The state universities, represented by Missouri and Minnesota in the early 1920's, have been moving cautiously in the direction of offering general social science courses. By the spring of 1947, of the forty-eight state universities, twenty were presenting general social science courses. The twenty state universities led by the University of Missouri and the University of Minnesota are as follows: The universities of Illinois, Iowa, North Carolina, Florida, Maine, Kansas, Rutgers University (New Jersey), Mississippi, New Hampshire, South Carolina, Wyoming, West

Virginia, Louisiana State and Agricultural and Mechanical College, New Mexico, Arizona, Montana, Oregon, and Nebraska.

In the other twenty-eight state universities, no offering was being given in the academic year 1946-47 that could be labeled as a general introduction social science course. As has been pointed out, several of the universities indicate they are "contemplating" the organization of such a course and others indicated that they have committees appointed to investigate the "feasibility and possibilities".

The present twenty state universities having an introductory general social science course form an interesting geographic pattern. Six are located on the Atlantic Coast: Maine, New Hampshire, Rutgers, Florida, North Carolina, and South Carolina, while West Virginia is the only Appalachian state with a course in this area. The southern states interested in the general social science introduction are Mississippi and Louisiana. The west coast states have not joined the movement, with only Oregon offering a social science introduction. Arizona and New Mexico of the southwest and Montana and Wyoming of the Rocky Mountain states are the only other schools in addition to a group of mid-western state universities that have developed courses in the field. The impetus reached the middle west only a year after its origin in the east. Missouri, Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska, Illinois, and Iowa form a mid-western bloc that has shown interest in the general social science courses.

Another factor that warrants consideration, and one that may be of greater importance than geographic location of the state universities with general social science courses, is the size of those schools. The two

largest are Minnesota, with 31,355 students and Illinois with a total of 29,934. The Universities of Louisiana, Nebraska, and Iowa with approximately 11,000 students each, during the 1946-47 school year, are among the largest schools in this group. The University of Florida, with approximately 9,000 students is the average sized state university with a general social science course, the exact number being 9,424. Smallest of the twenty state universities with general social science course offering was the University of Montana with 2,909 students. Wyoming with 3,835, Mississippi with 3,447, New Mexico, 4,247, and Maine with 4,702 were the other schools with less than 5,000 enrolled. The average enrollment of the forty eight state universities was 9,785 students, with the twenty-eight schools not participating in the general social science program averaging 10,403 students per school, giving them an edge over the 9,424 figure as averaged by the twenty schools presenting a general social science course.⁴⁴

Statistics reveal that 11,875 students were enrolled in the twenty-two general introductory social science courses offered by the state universities.⁴⁵ The bulk of this enrollment was found in the state universities where the course was a part of the requirements for graduation, or admission to the senior college, as at the University of Minnesota. Seven schools require the student to receive credit for the course before the requirements for a degree are satisfied. These seven state universities are Florida, Iowa, Louisiana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, and Minnesota, which have a total enrollment for their general introductory social science courses of 8,420. The largest enrollment in a general social science course is at the University of Florida, which has 3,000

students registered for their offering. Iowa is second with approximately 1,650 students in three social science classes. The University of North Carolina numbers of 1,300 in its course, while Louisiana and New Hampshire each has 800, Minnesota enrolls 400, and New Mexico lists 470.

In contrast to these enrollments is the number of students registered for the introductory social science course in the state universities where the course is optional. The average enrollment in this group is only 284. The State Universities of Arizona, Missouri, Illinois, West Virginia, and Wyoming all have fewer than one hundred students in their general social science courses, while the University of Kansas enrolls exactly one-hundred, Mississippi, 115, and South Carolina has 135. Schools not requiring the course for graduation, but who have sizeable enrollments in their introductory courses are Oregon with 275, Maine, 450, Nebraska, 500, Montana, 700, and Rutgers with 930.

The introductory social science course at four of the state universities is limited to freshmen. At the Universities of Missouri and South Carolina, the regulation is rigidly enforced, while at the Universities of Mississippi and Nebraska a few exceptions to the rule are permitted. The Universities of Maine, Montana, and New Hampshire have only freshmen and sophomores enrolled in the introductory social science course, but the remaining thirteen state universities with a general social science course permit any undergraduate to enroll.

Allowing all undergraduate students to register for the introductory social science course would seemingly produce one of the more serious difficulties encountered in the development of general introduc-

tory courses.

Among the barriers to the organization of social science courses at the state universities is the lack of trained personnel capable of working in this broad area. However, Francis O. Wilcox, a member of the Library of Congress staff, takes the view that finding teachers with proper background in the various social science disciplines is not really a difficult problem.⁴⁶ But on the other hand, William G. Carleton reiterates the difficulty of securing competent instructors in his report on the University of Florida's social science program. The administrators at the University of Florida found that the instructors usually were well-qualified in one specialized area, but often had little background and no experience in any of the other disciplines of the social sciences. Another difficulty encountered was the securing of men who were equally familiar with factual and interpretative material. The best instructors, the Florida administrators believe, are those with a sensitivity to social and political movements, and an inherent feeling for the trends of the times. Frequently instructors will tend to emphasize concepts and trends to such an extent that they become pat and even doctrinaire.⁴⁷

An internal difficulty that confronts social science is concerned with the subject matter of the discipline itself. In dealing with economics, politics, and the other areas of the field, the social scientist deals with vested interests, prejudices, and human emotions. Under the best conditions these would offer difficulties but with no common word usage, the situation becomes even more complex, more confused and unwieldy. Lack of common terminology among the disciplines of social

science makes the teaching of the general course in the area an exceedingly difficult task. S. I. Hayakawa in his book, "Language in Action," has pointed out the difficulties encountered when there is no uniformity of meaning applied to the same word by the different academic areas.⁴⁸ Besides standardization of the terminology, clarity of expression and common sense language is needed. This urgent need is keenly felt when the general social science introductory course is attempted, particularly when subject matter specialists deliver the lectures.

There are still numerous other fears and barriers that stand in the way of orderly development of a general social science course. Some social scientists have acquired a fear of being unscientific, yet they have not developed fully the use of the scientific method.⁴⁹ Probably one of the hopes for the future of the social science course lies in a more complete utilization of the scientific method. Some critics believe that it is an impossibility.

Another problem in the development of social science courses is that of suitable reading material. As will be seen in chapter six when the texts used in the social science courses at the state universities are examined, there does not appear to be any single book that presents the problems of social science in a way that is suited to the taste of all instructors.

Another difficulty is that of finding some way to present the material in the social science course so that the over-all picture, the complete panoramic view, may be achieved. There appears to be an almost unanimous verdict that the position of the social science courses is

unsatisfactory. As a result, there is a demand for a new alignment and closer correlation between the materials of social science and the methods that are employed.⁵⁰

The barriers listed are only a few of the ones which social science must face. It would probably be impossible to list all the difficulties since what might be a crisis in one university, may never create a problem in another.

TABLE C

Classification of Students Enrolled in Introductory
Social Science Courses

Limited to Freshmen	Limited to Freshmen and Sophomores	Open to All Liberal Arts Students
1. Mississippi*	1. Maine	1. Arizona
2. Nebraska*	2. Montana	2. Florida
3. South Carolina	3. New Hampshire	3. Illinois
4. Missouri		4. Iowa
		5. Kansas
		6. Louisiana
		7. Minnesota
		8. New Mexico
		9. North Carolina
		10. Oregon
		11. Rutgers
		12. West Virginia
		13. Wyoming

*A few exceptions
are made.

Chapter III
POLITICAL SCIENCE

A definition of political science can be more easily formulated than a definition of social science. The Greeks developed political science early in their history and defined it in its most simple elements as being the science of the state.⁵¹ The father of political science, the Greek philosopher Aristotle, described politics as "the master science in the highest sense."⁵²

This definition and description of the science may be too brief for exactness as the ramifications of the term are much greater than this. A French writer, Paul Janet, has called political science "that part of social science which treats the foundations of the state and the principles of government."⁵³ Professor James W. Garner, while agreeing fundamentally with the definition given by Mr. Janet, believes that political science is the wrong term as there is no one science dealing with the state but rather there are a group of closely related sciences, each of which is concerned with its own particular aspect of the state.⁵⁴

One of the best analysis of the constituent parts of the political science discipline is presented by Herman Heller in the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, in an article entitled "Political Science". The four principal elements included by Professor Heller are as follows:

1. The process of correlation of power, political, with geographic and

and climatic conditions, with racial peculiarities and other forces of nature. 2. The evolution of the role that political ideas play in both the origins and the evolution of political associations. 3. The third important element is concerned with an analysis of the relations of the organized political powers to the outstanding social forces that are predominating in the social world. 4. The fourth element deals with the state and its position as regards the international powers and its relationship to other states."⁵⁵

A definition of political science probably should explain more fully the functions of the science. One of the principal jobs and to some students the real function of political science, is to provide correct, authentic descriptions, and explanations of the political phenomena which are constantly occurring. In this function the discipline has assumed the more or less incidental task of buttressing, undermining or entrenching the group in power often called the ruling class. The prime function still remains as being to explain and study the political phenomena and institutions.

As was pointed out in Chapter II, Professor Seligman believes political science to be the oldest discipline of the social sciences. However, some writers contend that this is not true for they assert that political science is merely the fruit of history and conversely that history is the root for all political science. Stephen Leacock, like Seligman, denied this contention when he asserted, "Political science has no concern with history in its purely narrative aspects."⁵⁶ Actually the political scientist is not interested in the mere accumulation

of instances as is the historian, nor is he interested in the military, commercial or economic aspects of history as such. Rather the political scientist uses these facts of history only in so far as they bear upon the evolution of social control."

Walter J. Shepherd, writing on political science in The History and Prospectus of the Social Sciences states that he believes that much of the teaching of political science has been by the historical method rather than by the scientific method.⁵⁷ However, with the trend toward studying the functioning of government and away from the study of structure it seems that future progress in the area will be based on a more extensive use of the scientific method rather than continued emphasis upon the historic approach. This would further establish the right of political science to be called a science. Usually a field of academic study is termed a science if it has the qualities attributed to a science; that is, it must be a unified mass of knowledge relating to a single subject, acquired by systematic observation, and deductively organized. The scientific method does exactly this and if political scientists will utilize this method political science can meet all of these qualifications for a science.

Some authorities contend that the scientific method is peculiar to the work of the natural and physical sciences. This is not true as the scientific method is just as adaptable to a social science discipline such as political science. Robert Lynd in his book Knowledge For What? attests that the study of the political phenomena of the state is proper subject for scientific investigation and the scientific method.⁵⁸ It is

true that it is impossible for political science to be an exact science in the sense that exact sciences must be studied in a laboratory with the variables all controlled by the laboratory technician, but the differentiation should be in terms of maturity rather than genus. It must also be admitted that the investigator of political phenomena must work without the assistance of mechanical apparatus; cannot reproduce at will the political facts under investigation or control when the political phenomena will occur; it is also true that the material studied by the political scientist is influenced by the unpredictable actions of individuals and groups. However, the work of the student of politics is an orientation for life, which is one of the distinguishing characteristics usually attributed to a science.

In some state universities the study of the political phenomena is termed simply "government", while in the majority of colleges it is called "political science". Eight of the forty-eight state universities included in this survey, the universities of Connecticut, Indiana, Maryland, Oklahoma, South Dakota, New Mexico, New Hampshire, and Louisiana all call their departments "Government" which administer the study of this area of the social sciences. In the universities of Nevada, Montana, Maine and Rutgers, it is combined with history in a department in each school known as the "History and Political Science Department". At the University of North Dakota an "Economics and Political Science Department" carries out the work, while at the University of Colorado, political science is included in a foursome, "Anthropology, Political Science, Economics, and Sociology".

At the other thirty-four state universities a separate department entitled "Political Science" is maintained. The size of the departments in terms of number of students and staff vary widely. In several instances the staff includes only two men. The University of New Hampshire lists only two men on their "government" staff, while the University of Massachusetts (Massachusetts State College until May of 1947) had only one man in the Political Science Department. The University of Arkansas and Idaho State University, like New Hampshire, have only two instructors in political science. In contrast to these small staffs are the departments at the Universities of Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, California, Ohio State, and Indiana, where the Political Science Department is one of the largest in the university. The University of Iowa's staff seems to be typical in numbers and ranks of these larger state universities with five professors, two associate professors, two assistant professors and the equivalent of four full-time instructors. Staffs of twelve or more are found listed by the Universities of Minnesota, Illinois, Texas, California, North Carolina, Wisconsin, Washington, Ohio State, and Michigan.

There can be no doubt as to the position political science occupies in most of the state universities. Only in the six schools where political science is a part of a combined department is there a lack of departmental standing, and in two of these joint departments the head of the department is a political scientist.

In the twenty-two general social science introductory courses the department of political science is sharing the responsibility of

eight courses, while being exclusively in charge of the social science introduction offered in three instances. At the University of Iowa, where three courses are presented that will satisfy the social science requirement for graduation, the Political Science Department takes part in the administration and instruction of all three courses and has exclusive jurisdiction in two of the offerings. "Man and Society" is under an associate professor of political science assisted by three half-time instructors in the department, while "Political Society", is supervised by a professor of political science, with the teaching being done by an assistant professor and three half-time instructors in the political science department. The third course, "Introduction to Social Science", is operated as a joint enterprise by the Geography and Sociology Departments, however, political science contributes discussion leaders as do the Departments of Economics, Geography, and Sociology. At the State University of Iowa the Political Science Department has played a prominent role in the development of general introductory social science courses.

The Political Science Department at the University of Minnesota has likewise been conspicuous in the formulation of the introductory social science offering. The lecturers in the Minnesota course are professors of political science and four of the six discussion leaders are members of this major department, with the History and Sociology Departments each contributing one discussion instructor.⁵⁹

At Rutgers University the joint History-Political Science Department has had the responsibility for the introductory social science

course since its beginning twenty years ago. This department furnishes the instructors who conduct over thirty different sections. The professor supervising the course is primarily a historian but is heavily assisted by political science members of the History-Political Science staff.⁶⁰

Three state universities have turned the general social science course over to a group of departments, with the political science department included in this group in each instance. At the University of Nebraska, the Economics, Sociology, and Political Science Departments each share an equal portion of the responsibility for the administration and instruction in their introductory course, "Contemporary American Institutions".⁶¹ Likewise at the University of New Mexico, three departments, Government and Citizenship, Sociology, and Economics work together in the presentation of "Introduction to Social Science". Each of the departments contributes all ranks of instructors, from professor to graduate assistant, to the operation of the course. A policy in the New Mexico course that is not in common use is to assign the students who intend to major in one of the three departments taking part in the presentation of the course to a class instructed by some member of the other two departments.⁶²

At the University of Wyoming, "Social Science Sequence" is a cooperative effort of the Political Science and Sociology Departments. The course is divided exactly on departmental lines with the Political Science Department assuming the responsibility for the first semester of the course and the Sociology staff providing the work covered in the

second half.⁶³

The only other state university in which the Political Science Department has a significant part in the production of the general social science course is the University of North Carolina. There while the dominant role is taken by the History Department, the political science staff does participate in the instructional program. The Departments of Economics and Sociology also cooperate in the presentation of "Social Science Survey".

It is difficult to determine how large a part the Departments of Political Science have played in the introductory social science course at the five state universities with a Social Science Department. At the University of Montana the director of the Division of Social Science is also head of political science, with a majority of the social science staff being drawn from that of political science.⁶⁴ Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College completely separates the Department of Social Science from all of the other academic departments with no duplication of staff members.⁶⁵ The University of Kansas also maintains a Social Science Department which administers the "Social Science Survey". The head of this course is a political scientist, however instructors in the Social Science Department are also members of the Economics and Sociology Departments.⁶⁶ A General Studies Department administers the University of Oregon's "Survey of Social Science", but the personnel of this department is largely drawn from the history staff. The Economics and Political Science Departments also contribute a number of instructors that take part in the introductory

course.⁶⁷ The Political Science Department plays a negligible role in the University of Florida's introductory social science course, as the administration is in the hands of the general college which tends to place the specialized departments in the higher division of the university.

The Political Science Departments take little part in the eight other introductory social science offerings given by the state universities. The University of Arizona entrusts "Introduction to Social Science" to the Anthropology Department, while the University of Illinois turns the responsibility for what is called a general social science course over to the Sociology Department. At the University of Maine the combined efforts of the Economics and Sociology Departments are used to present "Modern Society". In the south, Mississippi centers the responsibility in the Sociology Department, with about one fourth of the teaching being done by members of the political science staff.⁶⁸ A pioneer in the field, the University of Missouri gives the administration and instruction of "Introduction to Social Science" to the History Department, as does also the University of New Hampshire. Likewise no connection can be shown between the Political Science Department and the general social science course offered at the University of South Carolina. There the Departments of Anthropology and Sociology assume joint responsibility, while at the University of West Virginia "Social Science I and II" is conducted by members of the Economics Department with no aid from members of the other departments of the social sciences.⁶⁹

In the years immediately ahead political science will probably

play an even more important role in the curriculum of the state universities. During the next years many new conditions will face the political science profession that may easily make profound changes in the very nature of the science. There are at least two major factors which Professor Pendleton Herring believes will have marked influence upon the future of political science. These two are: (1) the relatively greater role that government has already assumed and is continuing to assume in regulating the social order, (2) the more active part the students of government have been taking in public affairs on all levels of government, local, state, national and international.⁷⁰

Political science has been able to play a leading part in the formation of general introductory social science courses for by its very nature it can readily draw upon the sister disciplines in the solutions of problems that cut across departmental boundaries. The social sciences actually draw closer together as their boundaries expand in the attempts to study the behavior of man and society. Since government is a universal phenomena of human society which is called upon to solve practically all contemporary social problems, it is only natural that several of the introductory social science courses concentrate in the general area of political science. However, one of the major questions to be answered is how best to relate the new knowledge and accumulated factual data to the future development of the social sciences. The role of political science in this task will be important and difficult.⁷¹

TABLE D

Departments Administering
Introductory Social Science Courses

Political Science Department	Department of Social Science	Department of General Studies	General College	History Department
Iowa	Kansas	Oregon	Florida	New Hampshire
a. Man & Society	Louisiana			Missouri
b. Political Society	Montana			North Carolina
Minnesota				
Rutgers (History- Pol.Sci.)				

Two Depts. Combine	Three Depts. Combine	Sociology	Anthro- pology	Economics
Iowa (Geography & Sociology) Introduction to Soc. Sci.	Nebraska (Econ. & Pol. Science & Sociology)	Mississippi	Arizona	West Virginia
Maine (Economics & Sociology)	New Mexico (Government, Sociology & Economics)	Illinois		
South Carolina (Anthropology & Sociology)				
Wyoming (Pol. Science & Sociology)				

Chapter IV

INTRODUCTORY SOCIAL SCIENCE COURSES

"Introduction to Social Science" was the title under which seven of the twenty-two general introductory social science courses were offered by state universities during the academic year 1946-47. The course heading used by each of the state universities for its general introductory course in this area is listed in the table at the end of this chapter.

The catalogue descriptions of the introductory social science courses indicate the range of subject matter included in the offerings. Of special interest is a descriptive comparison of the material comprising the seven courses taught under the title, "Introduction to Social Science". The catalogue description of the seven courses are listed below:

University of Minnesota: Introduction to Social Science. (The Nature of Contemporary Society) "An analysis of human interdependency and of economic, political and social institutions. A survey of the problems involved in human inter-relations and the methods used by men to understand and control economic, political and social phenomena."⁷²

University of Iowa: Introduction to Social Science. "This course is designed to give the student a knowledge of economic, social, and political features of modern life. Basic principles of social science are presented in such a way as to afford a comprehension of human nature as expressed in social groups and social institutions."⁷³

University of Mississippi: Introduction to Social Science. "An elementary course designed to develop perspective in the

field of the social sciences and to provide background for intensive specialized training in economics, political science and sociology."⁷⁴

University of Missouri: Introduction to Social Science. (Contemporary Civilization) "A course designed to introduce the student to the social studies through institutions."⁷⁵

University of Montana: Introduction to Social Science. "The background and development of political, social, and economic institutions that influence modern life. Special emphasis given present day problems."⁷⁶

University of New Mexico: Introduction to Social Science. "A study of current social, economic, and political problems with particular reference to the United States."⁷⁷

University of South Carolina: Introduction to Social Science. (Social Science Survey) "An orientation course for freshmen. This course is not credited on a major or minor in a department. Three meetings a week."⁷⁸

While the other fifteen titles differ from that of the seven listed above which are called "Introduction to Social Science", their course descriptions and aims follow the same general pattern. Actually little difference can be detected between the first seven and the fifteen comparative descriptions listed below.

University of West Virginia: Social Science I and II. "The general course in the social sciences is designed primarily for sophomores and is intended to give the student an understanding of the society in which he lives, with some indication of political, social and economic trends which may alter his society in the future."⁷⁹

University of Oregon: Background of Social Sciences. "An orientation in each of the social sciences; study of the method of science and its application to the social studies, an attempt to create in the student the urge to independent thought through wide reading."⁸⁰

University of North Carolina: History of Modern Civilization. "A survey of the chief factors in Western Civilization

designed to throw light on the institutions, ideas, and problems of the present."⁸¹

Rutgers University: Fundamentals of Civilization. "An analytical survey of materials from the social and natural sciences with emphasis upon their relationships. The purpose is to enable the student to understand his own nature, the physical and social environment in which he lives, the elements of the developing culture pattern, and the chief characteristics of contemporary civilization."⁸²

University of New Hampshire: Introduction to Contemporary Civilization. "The course is designed to provide a background of appreciation of the social significance of man's environment, the nature of man, the cultural heritage from the past, recognition of the historical allusions in literature and conservation and knowledge of the general sequence of historic events. Pre-historic and historic evolutions, the historic explanation of modern life and an appreciation of the problems of contemporary society."⁸³

University of Maine: Modern Society. "An introductory course in the social sciences, the main purpose of which is to analyze and integrate the economic, political, and social problems of contemporary society. Specifically the course includes organization of government, business and labor. It is concerned with social problems such as housing, public opinion and race."⁸⁴

University of Kansas: Social Science Survey I and II. "A broad survey of the social sciences designed particularly to orient the student in the fields of economics, political science, and sociology. The course attempts to aid the student in achieving an integrated view of these closely related fields by approaching the problems of society from the stand-point of specialized investigation. Beginning with a brief survey of the background of modern culture, the course proceeds to an analysis of the principal existing institutions and an appraisal of the social, economic, and political forces underlying modern social trends. While the interests of the general student aiming to prepare himself for citizenship and social usefulness are kept foremost, the course endeavors also to equip those expecting to major in one of the social sciences with a unitary outlook useful to later specialization."⁸⁵

University of Louisiana State and Agricultural and Mechanical College: A Survey of the Social Sciences. "A general introductory course in the field of the social sciences. The course endeavors to integrate the social sciences by explaining some of the ways in which men live together; particular emphasis is placed

on the human institutions of the present day societies."⁸⁶

University of Iowa: "Man and Society. The common denominator of the social science disciplines will be the subject matter of this course. Emphasis will be placed upon the inter-relationship of man and his culture. The experiments and viewpoints of contemporary social psychology, anthropology, economics, political science, and sociology will be utilized and integrated. In the analysis of the individual and institutional maladjustments the approach of general semantics will be considered. The course will be adapted to the students needs: The method will range from the tutorial technique for the superior student to a social clinic for the below average student. Reading and writing assignments will be made in accordance with student needs and abilities. The course will seek to accomplish two main objectives: (1) The development of a methodology for appraising social institutions, (2) a dynamic analysis of modern society based upon human motivations and maladjustments."⁸⁷

University of Iowa: Political Society: (Government)
 "A study of government as a universal phenomena of human relations in the areas of civil government, economics, and social institutions are examined. Attention is focused upon contemporary social problems that seek solution through government."⁸⁸

University of Illinois: Community and Society: "The anthropological and sociological aspects of primitive and modern societies are stressed. In the second semester the study is devoted entirely to contemporary societies with materials being drawn from all of the social sciences."⁸⁹

University of Florida: American Institutions (A Social Science Comprehensive). "The course is designed to develop and stimulate the ability to interpret the inter-related problems of the modern social world. The unequal rates of change in economic life, in government, in education, in science and in religion are analyzed and interpreted to show the need for a more effective co-ordination of the factors involved in our social organizations of today. Careful scrutiny is made of the changing functions of social organizations as joint inter-dependent activities so that a consciousness of the significant relationships between the individual and social institutions may be developed, from which a consciousness and a greater degree of social adjustment may be achieved."⁹⁰

University of Arizona: Introductions to the Social Sciences.
 "This course attempts to acquaint the student with the social order in which he lives. The issues, institutional controls influencing the thought and conduct of the individual, and the

constant changes in social organizations are explained."⁹¹

University of Nebraska: Contemporary American Institutions. "This course attempts, first, to give the student some knowledge of the entire social organization of the United States as a "going concern", and, secondly, to develop his ability to think and express himself intelligently concerning the problems affecting that organization and the solutions constantly being proposed. The point of concentration is the twentieth century scene in the United States."⁹²

University of Wyoming: Social Science Sequence. "A course offered jointly by the political science and sociology departments. The course stresses the importance of man developing his ability to clearly analyze and solve social and political questions."⁹³

The goals and objectives of all twenty-two of the general introductory courses to social science possess a degree of uniformity. All attempt to provide the student with an insight into the problems of society and the modes by which they can be, and are being, solved. In practically every one of the courses, the three major types of institutions, political, social and economic are studied in the effort to orient the student with the social science disciplines. While the aims and purposes may be similar, the approaches and methodologies utilized in the courses vary widely.

There are three common types of approaches applied to the social sciences. The oldest, and probably the most universal, is the historical. All other methods contain to varying degrees certain elements of this approach. A more recent, but increasingly popular, mode of study is the institutional. The descriptions of courses cited demonstrate the extent to which the institutional plan of procedure is followed. The third methodology is the modern problem approach. This technique is

used by the University of Florida in its introductory social science course, but has been modified and combined with the historic approach.⁹⁴ This is a common practice, as none of the courses are limited to one approach. Practically all of the offerings use a combination of the three methodologies. The historical approach is emphasized in New Hampshire's, "Introduction to Contemporary Civilization," as it is also in the North Carolina course, "History of Modern Civilization," and in the Rutgers general social science offering, "The Fundamentals of Civilization." The Nebraska course is representative of those combining the institutional and problem approaches to the neglect of the historical method. In their "Contemporary Institutions" the primary subject matter is social institutions and the complex customs that are bound together under such labels as family, government, and business. The social institutions are not examined in isolation but are approached through the natural route of the persistent social problems which combine the professional interests of the political scientist, economist, sociologist and other specialists. The social, political, and economic problems are the points of departure for an examination of the human institutions involved. The University of Nebraska educational authorities believe that this practice not only stimulates interest, but also clarifies the connection of one part of the social organization with another. The problem approach demonstrates the fundamental unity of the whole.⁹⁵

"Man and Society," at the University of Iowa, utilizes all of the three common approaches. The analysis of institutions is extensively employed as is the problem method, while only slight emphasis is placed

is placed upon the historical. However, a fourth methodology, "the persons-in-culture" approach, is the principal point of departure. This means that the study centers upon man and his life in society. It demands that contemporary society be viewed as an integrated unit and not split apart by the traditional social science disciplines.

This methodology is based on Robert Lynd's theory that, "What appears to be needed is a recovery of persons-in-culture by social science." While the price system, the securities market, the tariff, the class structure, the city, and so on are all necessary parts of the social science analysis, the primary emphasis in the "Man and Society" approach is upon the people.⁹⁶

The "Introduction to Social Science," at the University of Iowa, relies primarily upon institutional analysis. The first semester concentrates on the sociological institutions, while the second semester places great emphasis upon the geographic foundations of society and culture and the influence of geography upon labor, law, government, and other social and economic institutions. The historic approach is not emphasized to any extent. "Government" or "Political Society," the third University of Iowa course in the area, utilizes what is called "the sound educational method" that requires the study to begin with familiar institutions. This institutional approach is blended with the historical and problem method. Emphasis is placed on the institution of government, the theory being that government serves as a pivot of orientation for the study of modern society.

The University of Kansas' Social Science Survey is another

introductory course that combines the institutional and problem approach with some historic background. The aim of the course is to integrate important parts of three of the social sciences, economics, political science, and sociology. The Kansas Social Science Department believes that this purpose can best be accomplished by this combination of approaches.⁹⁷

The problem approach has been stressed at the University of Minnesota where the first quarter of its course, "Introduction to Social Science," is devoted to an analysis of the negro problem. This central problem in American life is used to show the contributions which the various disciplines can make to an attack upon such a problem. The central question in the second quarter is the economic problem of unemployment, with the relationship of various agencies to this problem being studied. The third major problem used is that of community planning. It, too, is treated in a similar fashion, with the emphasis upon the essential interdependence of all the social sciences.⁹⁸

It is evident that no single method is considered absolute in itself. Because of the nature of the material studied in a general introductory social science course, no one method should be used to the exclusion of the others. The historical method is the one found used extensively in several courses, New Hampshire, Rutgers, and others, but even then the other approaches must enter in to supplement the historical. The same is true of the problem approach. While Minnesota uses it rather exclusively, it is used more as an integrating factor than as the method. The analysis of institutions has a great deal to offer, but it too is

unable to stand alone. As was pointed out in connection with the "Social Science Survey" course at the University of Nebraska, an analysis of isolated institutions has little value unless it is closely correlated with the problems confronting these social institutions. The methodology that is called the person-in-culture approach in Iowa's "Man and Society" has not been widely used.

The general descriptive and narrative idea that has always been associated with the historical method falls short of meeting the twentieth century demand for dependable analyses of social movements and of social science in general. The charge is made that, first, it lacks precision, and, secondly, that it tends to select and emphasize particular elements and events, which may have powers of attraction for the moment, but are relatively unimportant from the standpoint of later interests. The third criticism frequently associated with the historical method is that it tends to deal with individuals rather than with mass situations and with matters of universal importance. The statistical approach has thrown new light upon social relationships and has as a result given added value to the historical method.⁹⁹

The problem approach has as its objective the selection of the most important problems and the consideration and evaluation of the methods of solution. This approach is based upon the assumption that the student is consciously or unconsciously facing groups of problems for which solutions may or may not have been found. It is assumed that he should be aware of the conflicts, know both sides and learn to arrive at a reasonable solution of his own. The difficulty encountered in

the problem approach is in the selection of the problems. First, the limited time available will force the problems to be relatively few in number and as a result they may not cover adequately the types of problems facing the student. Also the difficult decision must be made as to whether problems are to be selected because of their importance to society or selected because of their interest to the student.¹⁰⁰ The assets claimed for the problem approach are such that they should be placed on record. Since the subject matter of a social science course is man and his relations to the world in which he lives, the problem approach appeals to the student because he cannot help but be impressed by the problems that continually face human relations. The claim is also made in behalf of this approach, that it capitalizes upon the student's taste for anything of a controversial nature. Then, too, it is said that the better student is challenged to organize his thinking and knowledge in his search for a solution, challenged in such a way that he must do something more than merely read books about the problem. The final point to be mentioned in favor of the problem approach is that social, economic, and political problems involve every member of society and whether the individual is aware of it or not, he will be sooner or later involved in the issues and the attempted solutions.¹⁰¹

No matter what methodology is employed, the more the scientific method enters into it, probably the better will be its chances of success. The four step procedure of the scientific method should become a part of the problem approach, of the institutional approach, of the historical approach, and of any other approach that is used. First, answerable

questions should be asked. Second, observations should be made in a calm and unprejudiced manner. Third, generalizations applicable to the solution of the question should be formed. Fourth, verification of the hypotheses and their revision of the light of new evidence must be accomplished, and if possible, a scientific law should be stated.

An error that is present in some of the approaches being used in various introductory social science courses is the failure to compare the culture of the United States today with other cultures, past and present. Unless such a comparison is made, a warped perspective of civilization may result. A study confined to one culture assumes any motive to be "human nature", which will often be discovered to be incorrect by the student versed in more than a single culture.

Again it should be emphasized that no single approach, no single method is probably adequate for the work of the introductory social science course. Each of the methods has its value, each has something to offer, but used singly may prove to be inadequate. Different areas can be best viewed by different approaches - no set rules should be laid down as to what method must be employed. There must exist a flexibility that allows the approach and the method to be adjusted to the study.

Probably the best method for teaching a general introductory social science course is a combination of several of the approaches. The problem approach coupled with the historic method and the scientific method seem to lend themselves to the varied material covered in this type of a course.

TABLE E

Titles of Introductory Social Science Courses
in State Universities

State University	Title of Course Offered
1. Arizona	1. Introduction to the Social Sciences
2. Florida	2. American Institutions - A Social Science Comprehension
3. Iowa	3. a. Man and Society b. Political Society (Government) c. Introduction to Social Science
4. Illinois	4. Community and Society
5. Kansas	5. Social Science Survey
6. Louisiana State and Agricultural and Mechanical College	6. A Survey of the Social Sciences
7. Maine	7. Modern Society
8. Minnesota	8. Introduction to Social Science
9. Mississippi	9. Introduction to Social Science
10. Missouri	10. Introduction to Social Science
11. Montana	11. Introduction to Social Science
12. Nebraska	12. Contemporary American Institutions
13. New Hampshire	13. Introduction to Contemporary Civilization
14. New Mexico	14. Introduction to Social Science
15. North Carolina	15. History of Modern Civilization
16. Oregon	16. Background of Social Science
17. Rutgers (New Jersey)	17. The Fundamentals of Civilization
18. South Carolina	18. Introduction to Social Science
19. West Virginia	19. Social Science, I:II
20. Wyoming	20. Social Science Sequence

Chapter V

INSTRUCTIONAL PROCEDURES IN INTRODUCTORY
SOCIAL SCIENCE COURSES

The instructional techniques used in the general introductory social science courses are diversified. The plan that finds the greatest use is the procedure usually referred to as the informal lecture plan. A definition of this term has to be very flexible as it means one thing on one campus and it may mean something quite different in some other educational institution. The term may even have a different connotation to two instructors working in the same course and both supposedly using the informal lecture technique. In reality little difference exists between the so-called "formal" and "informal" lectures. Any distinction is usually an arbitrary one. However, the informal lecture does imply a procedure in which the lectures and the discussions are conducted together. In this method the instructor has the same personnel to work with at all times and may use the periods either for lectures or for general discussion sessions. The process is a very informal one in which the students feel free to interrupt the lecturer whenever they have a question. This type of organization is used in eight state universities in the introductory social science courses. The Universities of Minnesota, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Rutgers, North Carolina, West Virginia, and Wyoming utilize this combined lecture and discussion method in conjunction with the general social science offering. At the University of Iowa, the

course, "Political Society," has three informal lecture periods a week and a fourth period which is a joint discussion and library study session.

Of the eight courses in which the informal lecture is employed, the University of Mississippi has the largest number of students attending the informal lecture sessions. Approximately one hundred and fifteen students attend three informal lectures a week. It would seem a formidable task to use this technique with such a large group. Serious question arises as to how much student discussion can be accomplished in a group of one hundred and fifteen students. Probably the informal lecture at the University of Mississippi resembles what is usually called a formal lecture. The University of Minnesota has an average of eighty students attending its informal social science lectures. The "Introduction to Social Science" course at Minnesota enrolls approximately four hundred but divides them into five informal lecture groups which meet four times a week. Some educators would question the amount of individual student participation in a class of eighty. There is also some question as to the informality of the lectures presented at the University of Minnesota. Both the University of Wyoming and the University of North Carolina use informal lectures with from sixty to sixty-five students in each class. "Political Society," at the University of Iowa, likewise, has between sixty and seventy in each of its informal lecture sessions. Three other universities utilizing this procedure limit their discussion classes to thirty students. The Universities of Maine, Rutgers, and Missouri are the three schools having only thirty in their informal lec-

ture groups. Statistics reveal the average size of the informal lecture class is about fifty-five. The ratio between discussion and lecture in each of the informal lecture classes depends largely upon the instructor, but with over fifty students in the classroom, the difficulties of conducting discussions are greatly multiplied.

Three of the introductory social science courses are using a plan which includes three lectures and one discussion weekly. "Man and Society" at the University of Iowa, "Social Science Survey," at the University of Nebraska, and Montana's "Introduction to Social Science," are all organized with three lectures and one discussion weekly. The Montana schedule also includes a second discussion period a week during portions of the semester, while Nebraska allows some flexibility in its lectures, having a limited amount of discussion intermingled with the strictly formal lecture.

The University of Illinois and the University of New Hampshire depend upon a strictly lecture technique of presentation in their introductory courses, while the University of Kansas, "Social Science Survey," varies its teaching technique with the portion of the course being conducted. Some areas are covered by formal lectures and other portions are more adaptable to informal discussion groups. The instructors at the University of Kansas are encouraged to use considerable flexibility in their classroom methods, and as a result, generalizations and descriptions of the Kansas procedures are difficult.

Two formal lectures and one discussion weekly is the program for

the introductory courses in social science at the University of Louisiana, University of New Mexico, and the University of Oregon. The New Mexico plan is similar to the Kansas organization as considerable freedom is allowed each instructor. At times the New Mexico classes appear to consist of three informal lectures per week rather than two formal lectures and one discussion. At Oregon, however, the plan of presenting two formal lectures to the entire class of over two hundred and seventy-five followed by one discussion period weekly, is adhered to closely. Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College conducts "A Survey of Social Science" in the same manner. The eight hundred students attend two lectures each week as a unit, but are sectioned into groups of thirty to forty for a weekly discussion period.

This process is reversed at the University of Arizona and at South Carolina's State University, where the students enrolled in the introductory social science course meet as a group for one lecture a week and then are divided into smaller sections for two discussion periods. The University of Florida uses one lecture, followed by three discussion meetings every week. The lecture classes include from three hundred to five hundred students, while the discussion groups number approximately forty. Like most of the other schools working in this area, Florida has tried several different types of organizations. When the course was first attempted in 1935, one discussion was given for every lecture. The committee felt that this resulted in too many "detailed and factual lectures and in insufficient time for discussion."¹⁰² From this procedure, the Florida course moved to complete discussion, but found there, too,

that certain deficiencies were in evidence. The prospectus afforded by good interpretative lectures were missed as well as the clash of personalities and different points of view given by various lecturers. The more or less middle of the road pattern was finally decided upon and is the present method. The University of Iowa's "Introduction to Social Science" is the only course of the twenty-two now utilizing two lecture and two discussion section meetings weekly. Walter H. C. Laves of the University of Chicago supports the plan used in the Iowa "Introduction to Social Science" course by asserting that the two and two plan has accomplished three major objectives. First, it encourages the student to do more reading and encourages him to do it in time for a definite discussion meeting. Second, the two discussions help the student to grasp the character of the course early in the year, and, third, it seems to help the student to make the materials of the course part of his own thinking and understanding.¹⁰³ Undoubtedly, the same advantages could be claimed by the supporters of the three discussion plan.

The arguments pro and con concerning the advantages and disadvantages of the lecture plan as compared with the discussion technique are many. The determining factor seems to be the personnel and time available in the individual situation. Here again generalizations are usually inadequate. The big stumbling block is lack of personnel. Finding people competent to lead discussion sections in a general course is difficult. This has caused some of the schools to resort entirely to lectures. In other instances the value of discussion sections has been seriously questioned. As a rule in the discussion sections a single

problem or topic is selected for consideration. This problem or topic is usually analyzed on the basis of the week's work and of previous materials of the course. A number of devices, such as brief tests, charts, graphs, and maps, are used for motivation in the discussion sections. The readings scheduled for study during the week serve as the focal point for many of the discussion meetings.

It is not the purpose to make any attempt to state which one of the seven types of organizations used by the state universities is "the" superior organization for a general introductory social science course. Very likely there is no one arrangement that is superior to all others. However, it is appropriate to include a few words concerning lectures and integration of material in the general introductory course. In considering the merits of the lecture technique, the word of warning given by William G. Carleton of the University of Florida merits attention: "There is nothing so damaging to morale as a poor lecture."

Two alternatives present themselves as to the personnel who deliver the lectures in the general introductory social science course. First, there is the program whereby the specialist in each area is called upon to give the lecture or lectures in his particular field. The second plan provides that one man present all the lectures for the course. The chief merit claimed for the series of different lectures is that it does give the student the advantage of having expert instruction about single topics. This advantage of the first plan is the primary argument against one man presenting all the lectures. It is difficult, and some critics believe impossible, to find a single individual competent to deliver

lectures in all of the social science fields. This school of thought would expect the immature student to integrate the social sciences but admits that a member of the faculty is not able to accomplish this integration. However, the advantages advanced for the second plan are numerous and concrete. It is said to simplify the administration of the introductory social science course to have all the lectures centered in the hands of one instructor. Likewise it is believed that with a single lecturer the possibilities of achieving real unity and coherence are greatly enhanced, while too often when the lectures are given by various specialists the result is not a new course but an accumulation of disjointed fragments which the student is unable to correlate. As has been cited, Q. Breen of the University of Oregon relates these advantages for one-man control, yet "The Background of Social Science" at Oregon uses the specialist as the author of each chapter in the Oregon text lectures when that particular section of the course is reached.¹⁰⁴

The University of Nebraska feels that the one-man control plan is superior and adheres rigidly to it. The University of Florida, on the other hand, uses experts in the presentation of the weekly lecture. It is claimed that it gives the students a chance to see and hear the best-known and dynamic members of the staff. Similarly it is said to have the questionable value of keeping the discussion leaders on their mettle, more or less in intellectual competition with the lecturers.¹⁰⁵

At the University of New Mexico, a division of responsibility exists. Several members of the social science departments share the duties of presenting the lectures. In the University of Iowa's general

social science course, "Man and Society," one professor is responsible for the presentation of all lectures, while in "Introduction to Social Science," two professors share the lecture duties. Iowa's third course in the area, "Political Society," calls upon each instructor to lecture (informally) to his section on all the areas covered in the course. The University of Montana, likewise, uses the one-man control plan, centralizing responsibility for the lectures on one professor. Again the integration possible with this type of lecture system is the outstanding feature.

The University of Arizona, like the University of Florida, allows each specialist to present the lectures in his area. Twelve different professors are involved in the presentation of a total of twenty-nine lectures. This would seem to be the height of specialization. The integration in the Arizona course is taken care of in the discussion sections where each one is carried throughout the entire year by one instructor.¹⁰⁶

South Carolina employs a system similar to that of Iowa's "Introduction to Social Science," in which the lectures are delivered by two professors from different departments. The Sociology and Geography departments share the course at Iowa, but it is a joint endeavor of the Sociology and Anthropology departments in South Carolina.

At the Universities of New Hampshire and Illinois, where the introductory social science courses are conducted on a formal lecture plan, the instructor having a particular group of students is charged with presenting all of the lectures to his group. Thus the one-man

control is actually in effect. Similarly, at the University of Kansas, a single instructor presents all of the lectures to his group, with no assistance from specialists. In the eight introductory courses, which use the informal lecture technique, the philosophy of one instructor directing the work of each group during the entire course predominates. The statistics of the methods used in the twenty-two general social science courses demonstrate that the trend in this area is toward the utilization of one man control.

The question of how much time should be allotted for an introductory social science course has already been raised. President Virgil M. Hancher, of the State University of Iowa, has declared that it must be understood from the beginning that the time will be insufficient. Certainly Mr. Hancher's statement is verified in two of the southern state universities which are working to a limited extent in the general social science area. At the Universities of Mississippi and South Carolina, the introductory course in social science is only one semester in length. In each of these universities, three hours each week are devoted to an introduction to social science. In neither university is the course required to fulfill a graduation requirement. It is an elective open only to freshmen and sophomores.

Five of the state universities offering work in the area are on the quarter system rather than the semester plan. All five, the Universities of Montana, Minnesota, North Carolina, Oregon, and Wyoming, present a general introductory social science course during three quarters of the academic year. The time devoted each quarter, however, is varied. The

University of North Carolina and the University of Montana have courses which devote five hours each week for three quarters. North Carolina requires the student to take its introductory course for three quarters to fulfill the graduation requirements, while the University of Montana has its course on the optional list. The enthusiasm for the course at Montana is emphasized by the fact that nine hundred of a total of twenty-nine hundred students are enrolled in "Introduction to Social Science." Minnesota has the only general social science course on the quarter system with a four hour weekly schedule. The course at Minnesota is on a three quarters basis and all three quarters are required if the student desires to enter the senior college. Both Oregon and Wyoming operate on the quarter system and present a general social science introduction three hours each week for three quarters.

All three social science offerings at the University of Iowa are two semester, four hour courses. Other state universities on the semester plan, having social science courses, include the State Universities of Florida, Illinois, and Kansas. Of these, only the University of Florida requires all students to enroll for the course.

Each of the other nine state universities gives its introduction to social science course on a two semester basis with three hours each week devoted to the course. Of these, the University of Louisiana State and Agricultural and Mechanical College, the University of New Hampshire, and the University of New Mexico, require the students to take the full year, six semester hours. Three hours a week for two semesters are likewise allocated to the general social science course at the State

Universities of Arizona, Maine, Missouri, Nebraska, West Virginia, and Rutgers. All present the introductory social science course on an optional basis, with only Rutgers admitting that "some pressure is placed on students to enroll."¹⁰⁷

Another question concerning which there is a diversity of opinion is: what is the minimum amount of time that can be devoted to an introductory social science course and still make it of sufficient value to warrant having it in the curriculum? As can be seen from this study, there is no universal agreement among the state universities as to how much time is necessary in which to give an introductory social science course. The Universities of Mississippi and South Carolina see fit to give approximately fifty hours of class-room instruction to their introductory courses, while the State Universities of Montana and North Carolina devote almost one hundred and eighty hours of class time to their social science introductions. The average amount of class hours offered in the twenty-two courses is slightly in excess of one hundred and ten. This may not be sufficient time to give the student a sound course in social science. Some people feel that a "taste" of the social sciences is better than none at all, but it seems doubtful if a one semester introduction to social science is adequate. It is difficult to understand how the stated objectives of social science can be achieved in a three hour course of one semester. Some scholars are doubtful if the entire scene can be adequately covered in even a full year course, with the student devoting as much as four to five hours in the classroom each week. The University of Chicago, while not a state university, has done excellent work in the

social science field. Originally the Chicago plan concentrated the introduction to social science in a one-year course, but after several years it was determined that two full years were necessary to present the material adequately. As a result, the University of Chicago developed a full two year course called Social Science I, and Social Science II, "An Introductory General Course in the Study of Contemporary Society." The class meets two times a week for lectures, given by a panel of three men, and is divided into small discussion groups for one meeting each week. The same organization is used in both Social Sciences I and II.¹⁰⁸ None of the state universities has used a two-year plan for the introduction to social science, but the Montana, North Carolina, and Minnesota organizations approach the two-year plan in number of classroom hours.

The state universities with but one exception have not copied directly the syllabi and plans developed for other courses. Each of the universities, except Missouri, has desired to develop its own course in the general social sciences. The University of Florida administrators assert that their course has been developed by their own staff.¹⁰⁹ The University of Kansas did not pattern its survey course on the Chicago or Columbia plan, but the authorities admit that "Social Science Survey" course at Colgate furnished many ideas for the Kansas offering.¹¹⁰ The University of Missouri's course, "Introduction to the Social Sciences" is the only one which uses a syllabus developed on another campus, as the plans of the Columbia University course, "Contemporary Civilization," are followed.¹¹¹ The University of Nebraska, while not using the Chicago plan as a unit, does follow the general outline and the general procedure

involved in the Chicago course. Rutgers University has developed its own course with no reference to other plans. Similarly, Professor Carl H. Pegg at the University of North Carolina, designed his own course, "History of Modern Civilization," with no reference to other existing programs. At the University of Oregon, Professor Q. Breen and his staff have been organizing their own course with their own text and syllabus.¹¹²

There can be no doubt that the programs of the Universities of Chicago, Colgate, and Columbia have had influence on the courses developed in the twenty state universities. Practically all of the state universities now conducting classes in the general social science area made careful study of these three programs before launching their own. The University of Florida's plan of 1935-36 was also a model studied by several state universities. The University of Montana, before organizing its course in the area, made a complete study of the work being done at the University of Iowa, Northwestern University and Oberlin College.¹¹³ It will probably be a number of years before all the universities and colleges will complete their surveys and make their final decisions as to what direction they will turn in this general social science field. The changes and innovations made in the past twenty years may be dwarfed by the new methods and new developments of the next twenty or thirty years.

TABLE F

Hours of Credit Given for Introductory Social Science Courses

3 s.h. for 2 semesters	4 s.h. for 2 semesters	3 s.h. for 1 semester	5 q.h. for 3 quarters	3 q.h. for 3 quarters	4 q.h. for 3 quarters
1. Arizona	1. Florida*	1. Mississippi	1. Montana	1. Oregon	1. Minnesota*
2. Louisiana*	2. Iowa** a. M & S b. Pol. Soc. c. Int. to Soc. Sci.	2. South Carolina	2. North Carolina*	2. Wyoming	
3. Maine					
4. Missouri					
5. Nebraska	3. Illinois				
6. New Hampshire*	4. Kansas				
7. New Mexico*					
8. Rutgers					
9. West Virginia					

*Course required for graduation

**Any one of three courses required for graduation

TABLE G

Instructional Techniques Used in Introductory Social Science Courses

Lecture	Method	Three Lectures and One Disc.	Two Lectures and One Disc.	Two Lectures and Two Disc.	One Lecture and Two Disc.	One Lecture and Three Disc.
"Formal"	"Informal"	One Disc.	One Disc.	Two Disc.	Two Disc.	Three Disc.
1. Illinois	1. Maine	1. Iowa	1. Louisiana	1. Iowa (Int. to Soc.Sci.)	1. Arizona	1. Florida
		a. M & S				
		b. Pol.Soc.	2. New Mexico		2. South Carolina	
2. Kansas	2. Minn.					
	3. Miss.	2. Montana	3. Oregon			
3. New Hampshire		4. Missouri	5. Nebraska			
	5. North Carolina					
	6. Rutgers					
	7. West Virginia					
	8. Wyoming					

Chapter VI

TEXTS IN INTRODUCTORY SOCIAL SCIENCE COURSES

The texts used in the introductory social science courses offered by the state universities are listed below with the title of the course.

University of Iowa : Introduction to Social Science

1. A Survey of Social Science - M. B. Smith
2. The Geographic Basis of American Economic Life - H. H. McCarty

University of Iowa : Political Society

1. American Government in Action - M. E. & G. O. Dimock
2. The Web of Government - R. M. McIver

University of Kansas : Social Science Survey

1. Men, Groups and the Community - T. H. Robinson and Others

Louisiana State University : A Survey of the Social Sciences

1. A Survey of Social Science - M. B. Smith
2. Economics and Government - J. C. Caldwell & B. L. Norton

University of Maine : Modern Society

1. Introduction to Social Science - Atterberry, Auble and Hunt

University of Minnesota : Introduction to Social Science

1. American Dilemma - B. Myrdal
2. Taxes Without Tears - D. B. Marsh
3. Culture of Cities - H. H. Mumford

University of Mississippi : Introduction to Social Science

1. Men, Groups and the Community - T. H. Robinson and Others

University of Nebraska : Contemporary American
Institutions

1. Fundamentals of Social Science - F. E. Merrill and
Others

University of New Hampshire : Introduction to
Contemporary Civilization

1. Civilization : Past and Present - T. W. Wallbank
and A. M. Taylor

University of New Mexico : Introduction to Social
Science

1. Introduction to Social Science - Atterberry, Auble,
and Hunt

University of North Carolina : History of Modern
Civilization

1. American Society and the Changing World - G. H.
Pegg and Others

Rutgers University : The Fundamentals of Civilization

1. Human Nature and the Fundamentals of Civilization -
H. M. Heald
2. Western Civilizations : Their History and Culture -
R. E. McNall Burns

University of South Carolina : Introduction to Social
Science

1. Introduction to Social Science - Atterberry, Auble,
and Hunt

University of West Virginia : Social Science I and II

1. Introduction to Social Science - R. E. Riegel and
Others

University of Wyoming : Social Science Sequence

1. Introduction to Sociology - J. L. & J. P. Gillin
2. Toward A Democratic New Order - D. Bryn-Jones

University of Arizona : Introduction to Social Science
Selected Readings

University of Florida : American Institutions
Selected Readings

University of Iowa : Man and Society
Selected Readings

University of Illinois : Community and Society
Selected Readings

University of Missouri : Introduction to Social Science
Selected Readings

University of Montana : Introduction to Social Science
Selected Readings

The following are brief statements concerning each of the books used in their entirety in the introductory social science courses surveyed.

The Survey of Social Science is edited by Quirinus Breen of the University of Oregon. Following a brief introduction by the editor, eleven specialists have presented their field of the social sciences. Included in the Oregon text are separate chapters on geography, biology, psychology, anthropology, political science, economics, sociology, philosophy, history, religion, and fine arts. Dr. Breen makes a rather interesting division of the disciplines, calling geography, "Human Biology;" psychology and anthropology, the "Background Studies;" while political science, economics, and sociology are termed, "Descriptive Studies." The other four disciplines, philosophy, history, religion and fine arts are listed by Breen as, "Interpretative Studies."¹⁴ Only about one tenth of the three hundred pages deals with the political science area.

American Society and the Changing World, edited by C. H. Pegg of the University of North Carolina, employs a similar type of organization with nine specialists contributing to the text. The book gives approximately one-fifth of its five hundred and eighty pages to the study of government, its functions and operations. The emphasis is placed upon the historic approach. The disciplines of sociology, economics, and

geography are not omitted, but are relegated to the background. In the text each writer has prepared a chapter in his own area of concentration. The specialization is, if anything, greater than in the Oregon book.¹¹⁵

The Introduction to Social Science - A Survey of Social Problems has George C. Atterberry of Wilbur Wright Junior College, John L. Auble of Herzl College and Elgin F. Hunt of Woodrow Wilson Junior College as its principal authors, but twelve other writers each contributed at least one chapter. Again the organization is the type known as the tandem method. Four major divisions are presented. I. Basic Factors in Social Problems, II. Social Relations and Social Problems, III. The Competitive System and Social Problems, and IV. Government and Social Problems. The longest and most specialized of the divisions is the one concerned with government and social problems. As a result, over one-third of the two volume work is devoted to the study of political science and its contributions to the solutions of the social problems. The text analyzes the operation and structure of government to a greater degree than other texts which attempt to cover the entire social science area. The integration of a book authored by one man is missing, but the theory is that this is offset by the authenticity rendered by fifteen specialists, each writing in his own field.¹¹⁶

An Introduction to the Social Sciences is a two volume work edited by Robert E. Riegel. Seven professors of Dartmouth College collaborated with the editor in the preparation of the text. Again the technique employed was that of dividing the social sciences into the usual disciplines and assigning each of the specialists to write in his

own area. Professor Riegel, himself an economist, presents in detail the economic problems that face the modern world. However, two political scientists on his staff, Elmer E. Snead and W. L. Eager, present a survey of the political science discipline in the hundred and forty-two pages that were allotted. The approach used throughout the volume is a study of institutions in the light of separate disciplines -- a modification of the true problem approach.¹¹⁷

Fundamentals of Social Science is edited by Francis E. Merrill. The author claims that this one volume edition is a child of the two volume treatise edited by R. E. Riegel, but a child that has grown in some respects, been curtailed in others, and been completely revised. The design of the book is plainly to satisfy the need for a text that can be used in a one semester social science course. The text is divided very much on the same pattern as the book edited by Professor Riegel, with identical subject matter boundaries being employed. The fields of political science and economics dominate this standard social science text.¹¹⁸

Survey of Social Science is written by Marion B. Smith with the editorial collaboration of Carroll Daugherty. The institutional approach is used extensively. Part three of Smith's book is devoted to what he terms social institutions which are divided into eight types: (1) Domestic, (2) Educational, (3) Recreational, (4) Religious, (5) Health, (6) Aesthetic, (7) Economic, and (8) Political. The book does show a unity that can come only from the authorship of one man. However, Smith's book is open to serious criticism as to the validity and adequacy of the treatment given various institutions. One of the faults that some critics find

is that Smith never attempts to point out solutions for the social problems.¹¹⁹ About one-fourth of Professor Smith's text deals with a discussion of the political institutions, which constitutes one of the longer sections.

Men, Groups and the Community, A Survey in the Social Sciences is edited by Thomas H. Robinson with ten other members of the School of Social Sciences, Colgate University, contributing to the volume. The book, dedicated to Freeman H. Allen, who said, "Life is a unit," follows this theme throughout its nine-hundred fifty pages. While the text does show to a small degree a lack of coherence, it is one of the better integrated of the social science texts, due largely to the editing. One of the factors that probably contributed to the unity and balance of the text is the method used in assigning the writing duties. While many books of this type use the principle that each man should write his own chapter or section of the text, the plan in Men, Groups and the Community was to have several men work together on every chapter, thus presenting a fuller view than if only one man wrote each chapter. There is still an element of the tandem method present as the various disciplines are isolated. One-third of the nine hundred and thirty-nine pages are devoted to explaining the functions of government. The fifth section presents a number of the political and social problems that face the modern day world.¹²⁰

Human Nature and the Fundamentals of Civilization is authored by Mark M. Heald of Rutgers University's History Department. In the introduction of the two volume lithographed edition the problem of the synthesis of knowledge is discussed, followed by Part I, which deals

with the "Physical and Psychological Bases of Human Nature." Included in this section is material on basic time sequences, geological eras, biological evolution, laws of physiological inheritance and a few of the psychological aspects of human nature. The second part deals with the social aspects of civilization, and such elements of society as the family, clan, tribe, and state are discussed. While the first volume presents a more or less analytical summary of the aspects of the fundamental elements and conditions of civilization, the second volume brings in historic examples, giving the course its historic approach. Introduced are such elements as critical evaluations of some of the weaknesses and failures of the theoretical ideals. Economic, governmental, ethical, religious, and philosophical aspects of contemporary civilization are included in volume number two. The significant characteristics of modern culture are also outlined in Professor Heald's work. Volume one gives the structural design, while volume two may have greater value as a study of social science.¹²¹

Western Civilizations : Their History and Their Cultures, is authored by Edward N. Burns of the Rutgers University staff. The book, which makes no pretense of being a social science text, presents a survey of man's struggles, achievements, and failures from the earliest days of civilization to the present time. It makes extensive use of the historical method.¹²²

Civilization - Past and Present is a two volume basic history text by T. Walter Wallbank and Alastair M. Taylor. The two volumes emphasize twentieth century history with the essentials of all civilizations

being discussed under six main headings: (1) economic, (2) social life, (3) political organization, (4) religion, (5) education, and (6) aesthetic activities.¹²³

The Web of Government, is authored by Robert M. McIver. Professor McIver, a political scientist and sociologist explains some sociological problems but centers his book on political questions.

American Government in Action is written by M. E. and G. O. Dimock. It makes no pretense of presenting the entire social science picture but is concerned only with the functions of American government.

An Introduction to Sociology is a pure sociology text by John L. Gillin and John P. Gillin. The function that this book is said to serve in the Wyoming introduction to social science course is that of aiding the student in understanding the multifarious complex of experience which may be called social relations. There can be little doubt that the student needs to know the structure of society, the ways in which men organize themselves into groups for the achievement of ends, the changes in institutions and the functions of human inter-relationships. However, it is in order to inquire as to what balance can be given to a social science course in which at least half of the readings in the course deal with the sociology discipline to the exclusion of all others.¹²⁴

Toward A Democratic New Order, by David Bryn-Jones, concentrates on the presentation of political problems. Bryn-Jones' book portrays democratic government as it meets the political problems of the day.

Economics and Government by J. C. Caldwell and B. L. Norton is a unique text. The book presents the basic political and economic

problems facing modern America, with consideration being given to the role of government in business.

The Geographic Basis of American Economic Life is written by Harold H. McCarty of the State University of Iowa's Geography Department. This economic geography text deals with the economic institutions and their relations to geography. The concepts it expounds are derived largely from the field of economics, while its method is largely from the field of geography.

Taxes Without Tears by Donald B. Marsh is concerned with three main issues, (1) Unemployment, (2) Monopoly, and (3) Inequality. It is an attempt through discussion, to keep misleading or irrelevant conventions and rules of thumb from interfering at once with clear thinking and effective action.

Culture of Cities is by Lewis Mumford and devotes its attention to the political aspects of a city as well as the cultural facts. It presents an analysis of many of the problems facing cities and the residents of the metropolitan areas.

American Dilemma by Bryon Myrdal states the problems of the American negro with clarity. Approximately one fifth of the work is concentrated upon the political implications of what the author believes to be the biggest question yet to be solved in America.

A brief survey of the text books used by the twenty state universities in the twenty-two introductory social science courses reveals no more uniformity than has any other aspect of these courses. There is little agreement even as to the number of books needed to properly conduct

this type of course. While a single text is used in ten of the courses, six others are organized with assignments in reading lists. Of the ten universities using one book as the basic reading material for the introductory social science course, three schools, Maine, New Mexico, and South Carolina, agree upon the same book. The University of Kansas and the University of Mississippi also use the same text, but a different one than that used at Maine, New Mexico and South Carolina. All other five courses that are taught with a single text use a different introductory social science book.

Several of the state universities favor the plan wherein the faculty members of the social science staff write their own text. It must be admitted that the first attempt may not be any better than the standard text, but with practice their efforts should improve. One of the advantages claimed for this plan is that it is a step toward integration of the course, as it forces the faculty members to focus attention upon the task of integration as they write their text. The joint writing of the text by several members of the staff is said to bring the realization to the entire staff that it is their responsibility to give the course integration and purpose. The greatest criticism of having a number of writers co-operate in the production of the text is the danger of producing a disjointed manuscript. This shortcoming of a joint enterprise is offset, in Professor Ereen's opinion, by the greater authenticity as to information and organization that can be obtained by the co-operation of several scholars. The University of Oregon educator does not believe that any one man can write a sound chapter on each of the ten or more

subjects that are covered in the usual social science text.¹²⁴

In addition to the University of Iowa, which uses Professor H. H. McCarty's, The Geographic Basis of American Economic Life for one semester of "Introduction to Social Science," and Louisiana, which uses M. B. Smith's, A Survey of Social Science, there are three other universities using books written by members of their faculty especially for their general social science course. Oregon is one of this group with its text entitled, Survey of Social Science, with a sub-title, An Introduction to A Social Society. A similar production at the University of North Carolina called American Society and the Changing World is used in its introductory social science course. The third school where members of the staff have written the text used in the general social science course is Rutgers University. The lithographical two volume work by Mark M. Heald is called Human Nature and the Fundamentals of Civilization, while Associate Professor Edward McNall Burns entitles his book, Western Civilizations - Their History and Their Culture.

The University of Missouri's course, "Introduction to Social Science," is the only one of the twenty-two schools that uses the manual of course books of Columbia's course in "Contemporary Civilization." The other five social science courses which are using selected readings have prepared their own book lists. These reading lists reflect the courses rather vividly. Representative of the books included on the University of Florida's list are the following: Charles A. Beard's, Economic Basis of Politics; A. A. Berle and G. E. Means' Modern Corporation and Private Property; The End of Economic Man by F. A. Drucker; James Burnham's,

The Managerial Revolution; The Road to Serfdom by Frederik Hayek; and Walter Lippmann's Good Society.

Similarly the University of Illinois' book list mirrors the emphasis placed upon sociological problems in its, "Community and Society." Included in the reading assignments are parts of J. F. Cuper's text, Sociology; H. Zarbaugh's Gold Coast and Slum; Jones West's Plainville; Deep South by M. R. and B. E. Gardner and A. Davis; Ralph Linton's The Study of Man and Science of Man in a Crisis; Katherine Way and Dexter Master's One World Or None; The Communist Manifesto; A. A. Brill's Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud; and W. F. Ogburn's Social Change. In addition to these books the students are given supplementary lists of related readings which they are urged to peruse.

Arizona's "Introduction to Social Science" has a reading list of fifteen books. Of the books used in the Arizona course almost all are standard text books in sociology, economics, government and history. Representative of the texts utilized are the following: G. H. Hedges' Introduction to World Civilization; Thomas H. Robinson's Men, Groups and Communities; E. P. Schmidt's Man and Society; Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations; P. W. Paustain and Oopenheimer's Problems of Modern Society; C. G. Haines and B. H. Haines' Principles and Problems of Government; and Andrews and Mardsen's Tomorrow in the Making.

The Montana list is similar in character to that of the University of Arizona, including standard texts in the social science disciplines.

The course, "Man and Society," given at the University of Iowa, uses a different group of books than those already examined. Extensive

use is made of the articles in the Encyclopedia of Social Sciences. Articles entitled "What Are the Social Sciences?", "Communication", "Symbolism", "Propaganda", "Geography" and others are photographed and placed in the library for the students' study. The books used include few of the standard texts ordinarily associated with the general social science courses. H. I. Hayakawa's, Language in Action; Robert Thouless' How To Think Straight; Ruth Benedict's The Pattern of Culture; Ralph Linton's The Cultural Background of Personality; M. R. and B. B. Gardner and A. Davis' Deep South; Albert Elmenthal's Small Town Stuff; Warner Lunt's Yankee City Series; Walter Webb's The Great Plains; and Robert Lynd's Middletown in Transition. Also included in the reading list for students in "Man and Society" are sections of Harry E. Barnes and O. M. Reudi's The American Way of Life; D. W. Brogan's Government of the People; Carl B. Swisher's The Growth of Constitutional Power; Eugene Staley's World Economy in Transition; and Walter A. Dixon's Economic Institutions and Cultural Change.

It is not meant to imply that only the six courses that have reading lists use material other than in the book listed as the basic text.

The University of Florida's reaction to using a text book is typical of the schools using the reading list method rather than a single text. While the standard social science texts are made available, the assignments are usually centered in the type of book already listed as representative of their selected readings. One disadvantage said to accrue in using a variety of texts and reference books is the difficulty involved

in obtaining unity and integration. This method is known to minimize the text as an integrating factor and some professors feel lost without a text upon which to base their course. Miscellaneous assignments, unless very carefully made and followed through in discussion and lecture, can offer a variety of disjointed "readings" that may or may not contribute to the objectives of the course.

In writing a text for a general social science course, the author must at the outset make a major decision concerning the way he approaches the subject. There seem to be two fundamental approaches. The first, and probably the easier of the two, is sometimes called "the tandem method". This is the approach which divides the social science disciplines into their separate fields and devotes a chapter or series of chapters to each subject matter area. The result is that one section of the book is devoted rather exclusively to sociology, another section to political science and its problems, and so on throughout the social science disciplines. If the writer does not choose to use this type of organization for his social science text, then he usually turns to an integrated approach wherein the problems confronting man are considered without regard to label. This type of text is probably more difficult to write. It is usually considered easier to integrate each discipline in itself rather than to attempt to integrate the entire social science area.

In the courses which use either a single text or two books as the foundation for the social science course, political science seems to be the leading center of concentration. The one course that goes farther than any other in this concentration is the University of Iowa's "Political

Society." The two books used in connection with this course devote over three-fourths of their pages to political problems and the functions of government. Three other courses devote approximately one-third of their total readings to the elements of political science. The introductory social science courses at Louisiana University, Wyoming, and Mississippi assign at least a third of the reading material in this area.

Three universities devote approximately one-fourth of their reading assignments to politics and political science material. The Universities of Maine, South Carolina, and New Mexico use the specialized discipline, political science, as the foundation for about twenty-five percent of their general social science courses.

The University of North Carolina uses history as the principal integrating discipline but also uses political science material for at least one-fifth of its reading assignments. Determination of the exact extent to which political science enters into some of the general social science courses is not possible. In the University of Iowa's course, "Man and Society," the elements of political science, economics, geography, sociology, psychology and all the other social science disciplines are treated as they play their roles in the total picture. They are not isolated and treated as special areas but are shown as constantly interacting forces, which do not perform in isolated hemispheres of their own. In a few of the general social science courses the political area is left almost untouched. New Hampshire's course gives only a minimum of time to political issues, problems and trends, as the emphasis is upon history. The same is true in the Rutgers University course. The University of

Illinois directs about the same proportion of its course concentrating on sociological problems as Iowa's "Political Society" devotes to governmental issues. According to the diversified reading lists of the courses given at Florida, Missouri, Arizona, and Montana, it would appear that a fairly equal balance of most of the social sciences is included. Of course the emphasis may easily be changed by the lecturers or discussion leaders.

From the survey made of the social science test books in use at the state universities, a few conclusions are evident. The ideal text book for teaching a general social science course does not appear to have been published - if it is in print, at least the men in charge of the instruction in this area are not aware of it. All of the texts seem to have some general shortcomings. Most of them lack a balanced perspective. The picture that is presented of social science is distorted. Frequently, the picture is not complete - only the sociological side, or in other cases, only the political aspect of man's life is presented. In some of the texts the emphasis appears to be centered in too specialized an area. This probably is due to the specialist writing in his own localized field with an editor who fears to hurt any of the specialists' feelings by omitting any of the material.

None of the texts exhaust the numerous approaches that are available to the social scientist. Usually only the problem approach or the institutional approach is utilized, or as in several instances, the historical method is used to the exclusion of all the others. The scientific method seems to be almost completely overlooked in the writing of

the social science texts and where it is used, it is not followed through to the third and fourth steps which are considered the most important. Where the institutional approach is used, many of the important institutions, and frequently the foundations of these institutions are overlooked and never analyzed.

There appears to be a definite trend in the direction of developing their own syllabus or are already using their own product. One of the oldest of these syllabi is that of the University of Florida for its course, "A Social Science Comprehension." The Rutgers University faculty has been revising and adding to their syllabus for over twenty years. Kansas also has a syllabus that has been used for several years. Oregon's syllabus likewise has gone through most of the experimental stages. Among the schools that are still developing and modifying their syllabi are the Universities of Virginia and Wyoming. Montana also is developing a social science syllabus. A syllabus for the general social science course, "Man and Society," at the University of Iowa is under preparation. "The Introduction to Social Science" course at Iowa has been using the same syllabus for three years. Other schools that employ this teaching technique in their general social science courses are the University of Arizona, the University of Missouri, and the University of North Carolina, which offers another one of the older courses in the field, "History of Modern Civilization."

Ten of the general social science courses are taught without a syllabus. The Universities of Illinois, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi,

Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, and South Carolina do not present their courses through this medium.

TABLE II

Number of Texts Used in Introductory Social Science Courses

<u>Courses Using a Single Text</u>	<u>Courses Using Reading Lists</u>	<u>Courses Using Two Text Books</u>	<u>Courses Using Three Text Books</u>
1. Kansas	1. Arizona	1. Iowa (Political Society)	1. Minnesota
2. Maine	2. Florida		
3. Mississippi	3. Iowa (Man and Society)	2. Iowa (Introduction to Soc.Sci.)	
4. Nebraska			
5. New Hampshire	4. Illinois	3. Louisiana	
6. New Mexico	5. Missouri	4. Rutgers	
7. North Carolina	6. Montana	5. Wyoming	
8. Oregon			
9. South Carolina			
10. West Virginia			

TABLE I

List of Texts Used in Introductory Social Science Courses

1. Introduction to Social Science - Atterberry, Auble and Hunt
 - a. Maine
 - b. New Mexico
 - c. South Carolina
2. Men, Groups and the Community - T. H. Robinson and Others
 - a. Kansas
 - b. Mississippi
3. A Survey of Social Science - M. B. Smith
 - a. Iowa (Introduction to Social Science)
 - b. Louisiana
4. The Geographic Basis of American Economic Life - H. H. McCarty
 - a. Iowa (Introduction to Social Science)
5. Economics and Government - Caldwell and Norton
 - a. Louisiana
6. American Dilemma - B. Myrdal
Taxes Without Tears - D. B. Marsh
Culture of Cities - H. M. Mumford
 - a. Minnesota
7. American Government in Action - M. E. and G. O. Dimock
The Web of Government - R. M. McIver
 - a. Iowa (Political Society)
8. Human Nature and the Fundamentals of Civilization - H. M. Heald
Western Civilizations : Their History & Culture - E. McNall Burns
 - a. Rutgers
9. Introduction to Sociology - J. L. Gillin and J. P. Gillin
Toward A Democratic New Order - D. Bryn-Jones
 - a. Wyoming
10. Introduction to Social Science - R. E. Riegel and Others
 - a. West Virginia
11. Fundamentals of Social Science - F. E. Merrill
 - a. Nebraska

TABLE I
(Continued)

12. Civilization : Past and Present - T. W. Wallbank and A. M. Taylor
 - a. New Hampshire
13. American Society and the Changing World - C. H. Pegg
 - a. North Carolina
14. Survey Of Social Science - Q. E. Breen
 - a. Oregon

REFERENCES

Chapter I

1. The Harvard Report, General Education in a Free Society, p. VIII.
2. The Bulletin, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1946-47, pp. 19, 100.
3. Norman Foerster, The Future of the Liberal College, p. 59.
4. W. W. Charters, "Patterns of Courses in General Education" The Journal of General Education, Vol. 1, No. 1, p. 5.
5. The Harvard Report, General Education in a Free Society, p. 54.
6. John Dale Russell, ed. New Frontiers in Collegiate Instruction, p. 5.
7. Howard Mumford Jones, Education and World Tragedy, p. 73.
8. Roy Ivan Johnson, Explorations in General Education, p. 32.
9. Earl J. McGrath, "The General Education Movement," The Journal of General Education, Vol. 1, No. 1, p. 5.
10. Howard Mumford Jones, Education and World Tragedy, pp. 119, 120.
11. The Harvard Report, General Education in a Free Society, p. 261.
12. Letter from Dean William G. Bek, University of North Dakota, July 17, 1947.
13. Letter from Acting Dean G. V. Kidder, University of Vermont and State Agricultural College, July 23, 1947.
14. Letter from Dean Edward H. Lauer, University of Washington, July 31, 1947.
15. Letter from Dean Joseph M. Murray, University of Maine, July 29, 1947.
16. Letter from O. Meredith Wilson, University of Utah, July 28, 1947.
17. Letter from Dean Ten Hoor, University of Alabama, July 22, 1947.
18. Algo D. Henderson, Vitalizing Liberal Education, p. 7.
19. Letter from Dean Russell Cooper, University of Minnesota, July 28, 1947.

REFERENCES
(Cont'd)

20. Letter from Professor James H. Gilbert, Department of Economics, University of Oregon, July 21, 1947.
21. Congressional Record, 80th Congress, 1st Session, pp. A. 3466, 3467, 3468.
22. Letter from Dean Edward Y. Elewett, University of New Hampshire, July 29, 1947.
23. Virgil M. Hancher, "The Components of General Education," The Journal of General Education, Vol. 1, No. 1, p. 9, 15.
24. Letter from Dean Victor A. Coulter, University of Mississippi, July 22, 1947.
25. Letter from the office of Dean Pardee, University of South Dakota, July 31, 1947.
26. Letter from Dean M. M. White, University of Kentucky, July 19, 1947.
27. Letter from Dean E. H. Lauer, University of Washington, July 31, 1947.
28. Melville J. Herskovits, "The Social Science Units of the Northwestern University Liberal Arts Program," The Journal of General Education, Vol. 1, No. 3, p. 223.
29. Francis O. Wilcox, "The Introductory Course in Government," American Political Science Review, Vol. XLI, No. 3, p. 496.
30. H. Frederick Willkie, "General Education for an Industrial Culture," The Journal of General Education, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 268, 269.

Chapter II

31. Edwin A. Seligman, "What is Social Science?" Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. 1, pp. 3, 5.
32. Charles A. Beard, The Nature of the Social Sciences, pp. 2, 3, 192.
33. Elbridge Sibley, "The Place of Social Science in General Education," The Journal of General Education, Vol. 1, No. 1, p. 52.
34. Robert Lynd, Knowledge For What? p. IX, Introduction.

REFERENCES
(Cont'd)

35. Charles E. Merriam, Civic Education in the United States, p. IX, Introduction.
36. Elbridge Sibley, "The Place of Social Science in General Education," The Journal of General Education, Vol. I, No. 1, p. 53.
37. Robert Lynd, Knowledge For What? p. 181.
38. B. L. Johnson, What About Survey Courses? p. 7.
39. Fitts C. Tabor, and Swift, The Construction of Orientation Courses for College Freshmen, pp. 163, 164.
40. Fitts C. Tabor, and Swift, The Construction of Orientation Courses for College Freshmen, p. 154.
41. B. L. Johnson, What About the Survey Courses? pp. 10, 12.
42. B. L. Johnson, What About the Survey Courses? pp. 8, 9.
43. B. L. Johnson, What About the Survey Courses? pp. 9, 12.
44. All statistics as to State University enrollments were taken from School and Society, Saturday, December 21, 1946, Vol. 64, No. 1669, pp. 429-433.
45. Statistics pertaining to enrollments in general introductory social science courses obtained from questionnaires completed by instructors at all State Universities with such courses.
46. F. O. Wilcox, "The Introductory Course in Government," American Political Science Review, Vol. XLI, No. 3, p. 497.
47. Congressional Record, 80th Congress, 1st Session, p. A. 3468.
48. S. I. Hayakawa, Language in Action, pp. 66, 67.
49. Robert Redfield, "Social Science in the Atomic Age," The Journal of General Education, Vol. I, No. 2, p. 124.
50. J. B. Odum, and Jocher, Development of Social Science, pp. 62, 63.

Chapter III

51. R. G. Cettell, Political Science, p. 3.

REFERENCES
(Cont'd)

52. Aristotle's Ethics, Book I, Chapter II.
53. J. W. Garner, Introduction to Political Science, p. 14.
54. J. W. Garner, Introduction to Political Science, p. 10.
55. Herman Heller, "Political Science," Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol VI, p. 209.
56. Stephen Leacock, Elements of Political Science, p. 7.
57. H. E. Barnes, ed. The History and Prospectus of the Social Sciences, pp. 425, 426.
58. Robert Lynd, Knowledge For What? p. 140.
59. Letter from Professor Arthur Naftlin, Department of Political Science, University of Minnesota, July 23, 1947.
60. Letter from Professor Mark M. Heald, Department of History and Political Science, Rutgers University, July 23, 1947.
61. Letter from Karl M. Arndt, Professor of Economics, University of Nebraska, June 25, 1947.
62. Letter from Jack E. Holmes, Department of Government, University of New Mexico, July 1, 1947.
63. Letter from Forest R. Hall, Administrative Assistant to the President, University of Wyoming, January 13, 1947.
64. University of Montana Bulletin, No. 407, April 1946, p. 52.
65. Letter from Frank W. Girlinghouse, Department of Social Science, University of Louisiana State Agricultural and Mechanical College, June 26, 1947.
66. Letter from Assistant Dean Gilbert Ulmer, University of Kansas, August 1, 1947.
67. Letter from Professor Q. Breen, Department of History, University of Oregon, June 30, 1947.
68. Letter from Professor Morton B. King, Department of Sociology, University of Mississippi, June 23, 1947.

REFERENCES
(Cont'd)

69. Letter from (Mrs.) Virginia Flanigan, Department of Economics, University of West Virginia, July 16, 1947.
70. Pendleton Herring, "Political Science in the Next Decade," American Political Science Review, Vol. XXXIX, No. 4, p. 758.
71. Pendleton Herring, "Political Science in the Next Decade," American Political Science Review, Vol. XXXIX, No. 4, p. 766.

Chapter IV

72. The Bulletin of the University of Minnesota, Vol. XLVIII, No. 21, p. 50.
73. The University of Iowa Publication Catalogue, November, 1946, p. 72.
74. Bulletin of the University of Mississippi, Series XLIV, No. 8, p. 118.
75. The University of Missouri Bulletin, Catalogue Number, Vol. XLVI, No. 10, p. 303.
76. The University of Montana Bulletin, State University Series, No. 407, p. 52.
77. The University of New Mexico Bulletin, 1947-48 Catalogue Issue, Vol. XL, No. 1, p. 113.
78. Bulletin of the University of South Carolina, Vol. 308, p. 96.
79. West Virginia University Bulletin, The Catalogue Issue, Series 44, No. 10, p. 124.
80. Oregon Bulletin, University of Oregon, Catalogue Issue, Number 169, p. 97.
81. The University of North Carolina Record, Number 365, p. 211.
82. Rutgers University Bulletin, College of Arts and Science Series, 22, No. 15, p. 67.
83. Bulletin of the University of New Hampshire, Catalogue Issue, Vol XXXVIII, No. 10, p. 226.

REFERENCES
(Cont'd)

84. Maine Bulletin, Catalogue Number, Vol. XLIX, No. 8, p. 127.
85. Bulletin of the University of Kansas, Catalogue Number, Series 39, No. 5, p. 169.
86. University Bulletin Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Vol. 39, No. 3, p. 322.
87. University of Iowa Publication Summer Session Catalogue, 1947, p. 42, University of Iowa Publication, Catalogue Number 1947-48, p. 75.
88. University of Iowa Publication, Catalogue Number, 1946, p. 73.
89. Letter from Professor R. W. Janes, Department of Sociology, University of Illinois, July 3, 1947.
90. The University Record of the University of Florida, Vol. XXXVIII, No. 7, p. 119.
91. University of Arizona Record, Biennial Catalogue, Vol XXXVIII, No. 4, p. 173.
92. Letter from Professor Karl M. Arndt, Department of Economics, University of Nebraska, June 25, 1947.
93. Letter from Forest R. Hall, Administrative Assistant to the President, University of Wyoming, January 13, 1947.
94. Congressional Record, 80th Congress, 1st Session, p. A 3467.
95. Report on "Contemporary Institutions" made to the University of Nebraska Faculty, June, 1947.
96. Robert Lynd, Knowledge For What? pp. 24, 25.
97. Letter from Assistant Dean Gilbert Ulmer, University of Kansas, August 1, 1947.
98. Letter from Professor Arthur Naftalin, Department of Political Science, University of Minnesota, July 25, 1947.
99. Stuart A. Rice, Statistics in Social Studies, pp. 1, 5.
100. B. L. Johnson, What About the Survey Courses?, p. 40.

REFERENCES
(Cont'd)

101. B. L. Johnson, What About the Survey Courses? p. 275.
102. Congressional Record, 80th Congress, 1st Session, p. A. 3467.
103. J. D. Russell, ed. New Frontiers in Collegiate Instruction, p. 102.
104. Report of the University of Oregon's Department of Social Studies to the Faculty, 1945, by Professor Q. Breen, p. 2.
105. Congressional Record, 80th Congress, 1st Session, p. A. 3467.
106. The University of Arizona's Outline of "Introduction to the Social Sciences," September 20, 1945.
107. Letter from Professor Mark M. Heald, Department of History and Political Science, Rutgers University, July 23, 1947.
108. The University of Chicago's, "Introductory General Course in the Study of Contemporary Society," A Syllabus, Preface, pp. III, IV.
109. Congressional Record, 80th Congress, 1st Session, p. A. 3467.
110. Letter from Assistant Dean Gilbert Ulmer, State University of Kansas, August 1, 1947.
111. Note attached to questionnaire from Professor J. E. Wrench, Department of History, University of Missouri
112. Report of the University of Oregon's Department of Social Studies to the Faculty, 1945, by Professor Q. Breen.
113. Report of the Special Curriculum Committee to the President of Montana State University, September, 1945.
114. Q. Breen, Survey of Social Science, p. V.
115. C. H. Pegg, American Society and the Changing World, p. VII.
116. G. C. Atterberry, J. L. Auble, and E. F. Hunt, Introduction to Social Science, p. VIII.
117. Robert E. Riegel and Others, An Introduction to the Social Sciences, p. V.

REFERENCES
(Cont'd)

118. Francis E. Merrill and Others, Fundamentals of Social Science, p. VI.
119. Marion B. Smith, Survey of Social Science, p. IX.
120. T. H. Robinson and Others, Men, Groups and the Community, p. XVII.
121. Mark M. Heald, Human Nature and the Fundamentals of Civilization, Vol. I, p. V, Vol. II, P. V.
122. Edward M. Burns, Western Civilization, P. VI.
123. T. Walter Wallbank and A. M. Taylor, Civilization : Past and Present, p. VII.
124. J. L. Gillin and J. P. Gillin, An Introduction to Sociology, p. VI.
125. Report of the Department of General Studies to the Faculty of the State University of Oregon, 1945, p. 2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arnold, Thurman, The Symbols of Government, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1935.
- Arneson, Ben. H., A Gateway to the Social Sciences, Ginn and Company, Boston, 1926.
- Arnett, Trevor, Recent Trends in Higher Education, New York General Education Board, New York, 1940.
- Bagley, William C., The Teacher of the Social Studies, Scribner's Sons, New York, 1937.
- Barker, Ernest, The Study of Political Science and its Relation to Cognate Studies, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1928.
- Barnes, H. E., ed. The History and Prospectus of the Social Sciences, A. A. Knopf, New York, 1925.
- Barnes, H. E., ed. The New History and the Social Studies, The Century Company, New York, 1925.
- Beard, Charles A., The Nature of the Social Sciences in Relations to Objectives of Instruction, Scribner's Sons, New York, 1937.
- Bogardus, Emory A., Making Social Studies, J. R. Miller Press, New York, 1925.
- Boucher, Chauncey S., The University of Chicago Plan, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1935.
- Branon, Frederick K., The Teaching of the Social Studies In A Changing World, W. H. Sadlier, Inc., New York, 1942.
- Brookings Institute, Essays on Research in the Social Sciences, Brookings Institute, Washington, D.C., 1931.
- Burgess, John W., The Foundations of Political Science, Columbia University Press, New York, 1935.
- Butts, R. Freeman, The College Charts Its Course, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1939.
- Cairns, Huntington, Law and the Social Sciences, Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1935.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
(Cont'd)

- Chase, Stuart, The Tyranny of Words, Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1938.
- Cole, Stewart Grant, Liberal Education In A Democracy, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1940.
- Committee on Plans, A College Program in Action, Columbia University, Columbia University Press, New York, 1946.
- ✓ Davies, George R., Methods of Statistical Analysis in the Social Sciences, J. Wiley and Sons, New York, 1933.
- Dawson, Edgar, Teaching the Social Studies, The MacMillan Co., New York, 1928.
- Donham, Wallace B., Education for Responsible Living; The Opportunity for Liberal Arts Colleges, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1944.
- Doob, Leonard W., The Plans of Men, Oxford University Press, London, 1940.
- Ellwood, Charles A., Recent Developments in the Social Sciences, J. B. Lippincott Co., New York, 1937.
- Ellwood, Robert S., The Social Studies Curriculum in General Education, McKnight and McKnight, New York, 1941.
- Evans, Daniel L., Essentials of Liberal Education, Ginn and Co., New York, 1942.
- Fairchild, Henry P., Elements of Social Science, The MacMillan Co., New York, 1924.
- Fitts, C. Tabor, The Construction of Orientation Courses for College Freshmen, University of California Press, Berkeley, California, 1928.
- Foerster, Norman, The Future of the Liberal College, D. Appleton-Century Co., New York, 1938.
- Foerster, Norman, The American State University, Its Relations to Democracy, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1937.
- Foster, William T., Administration of College Curriculums, Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, 1911.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
(Cont'd)

Fraser, Mowat G., The College of the Future, Columbia University Press, New York, 1937.

Garner, J. W., Introduction to Political Science, The American Book Co., New York, 1910.

✓ Gee, Wilson, Research in the Social Sciences, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1929.

Gettell, R. G., Political Science, Ginn and Co., Boston, 1910.

Gilchrist, Robert N., Principles of Political Science, Longmans, Green and Co., Bombay, 1921.

✓ Gray, William S., The Preparation and In-Service Training of College Teachers, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1938.

Haddow, Anna, Political Science in American Colleges and Universities, 1836-1900, D. Appleton Century Co., New York, 1939.

Haggerty, Melvin E., The Faculty, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1937.

Harvard Report, General Education in a Free Society, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1945.

Heaton, Kenneth L., and Koopman, G. Robert, A College Curriculum Based on Functional Needs of Students, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1938.

Henderson, Algo D., Vitalizing Liberal Education, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1944.

Henderson, Algo D., Antioch College : Its Design For Liberal Education, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1946.

Hodgson, James G., Trends in University Education, H. W. Wilson Co., New York, 1931.

✓ Hook, Sidney, Education for Modern Man, The Dial Press, New York, 1946.

✓ Hook, Sidney, Reasons, Social Myths and Democracy, John Day Co., New York, 1940.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
(Cont'd)

- Horn, Ernest, Methods of Instruction in Social Studies, C. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1937.
- Hudelson, Earl., Problems of College Education, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1928.
- Hudson, Hoyt H., Educating Liberally, Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, California, 1945.
- Hayakawa, S. I., Language in Action, Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1939.
- Jones, Howard Mumford, Education and World Tragedy, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1946.
- Johnson, B. L., What About Survey Courses?, Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1937.
- Johnson, Roy Ivan, Explorations in General Education, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1947.
- Jordan, David S., The Trend of the American University, Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, California, 1929.
- ✓ Kaufmann, Felix, Methodology of the Social Sciences, Oxford University Press, London, 1944.
- Keller, Albert G., Starting Points in Social Science, Ginn and Company, New York, 1925.
- Kelly, Frederick J., The State and Higher Education, New York City Press, New York, 1935.
- Kent, Raymond A., Higher Education in America, Ginn and Co., Boston, 1930.
- Leacock, Stephen, Elements of Political Science, Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, 1921.
- Milly, William S., First Principles of Political Science, G. P. Putman's Sons, New York, 1899.
- Lynd, Robert, Knowledge For What?, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1946.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
(Cont'd)

- Martz, Charles E., Social Science for Teachers, Houghton-Mifflin Co., New York, 1923.
- Mayer, Joseph, Social Science Principles in the Light of the Scientific Method, Duke University Press, Durham, 1941.
- Meiklejohn, Alexander, Freedom and the College, The Century Co., New York, 1923.
- Meiklejohn, Alexander, The Liberal College, Marshall Jones Co., New York, 1920.
- Merriam, Charles E., Civic Education in the United States, C. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1934.
- Millett, Fred B., The Rebirth of Liberal Education, Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1945.
- Odum, H. W., ed., American Masters of Social Science, Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1927.
- Odum, H. W., and Jocher, K. E., Development of Social Science, Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1930.
- Odum, H. W. and Jocher, K. D., An Introduction to Social Research, Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1929.
- Ogburn, William F., The Social Sciences and Their Interrelations, Houghton-Mifflin, Boston, 1927.
- Ogg, Frederic O., Research in the Humanistic and Social Sciences, The Century Co., New York, 1928.
- Pennsylvania Bicentennial Conference, Studies in Political Science and Sociology, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1941.
- Postan, Michael M., The Historical Method in Social Science, Cambridge Press, London, 1939.
- Reeves, Floyd, W., Instructional Problems in the University, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1933.
- ✓ Rice, Stuart A., Statistics in Social Studies, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1930.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
(Cont'd)

- ✓ Rice, Stuart A., Methods in Social Science, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1931.
- Rugg, Earl U., The Social Studies in Teachers Colleges and Normal Schools, Colorado State Teachers College, Boulder, 1928.
- Russell, John D., New Frontiers in Collegiate Instruction, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1941.
- Schilpp, Paul A., Higher Education Faces the Future, Horace Liveright, Inc., New York, 1930.
- Seeley, Sir J. R., Introduction to Political Science, The MacMillan Co., London, 1902.
- Small, A. W., The Meaning of Social Science, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1910.
- ✓ Spahr, Walter E., Methods and Status of Scientific Research - Social Science, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1930.
- Swathmore College Faculty, An Adventure in Education, The MacMillan Co., New York, 1941.
- Tryon, Rolla M., The Social Sciences As School Subjects, C. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1935.
- Tugwell, Rexford G., Redirecting Education, Columbia University Press, New York, 1935.
- West, Andrew F., American General Education, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1932.
- Wilkins, Ernest H., The College and Society, The Century Co., New York, New York, 1932.
- Williams, James M., The Foundations of Social Science, A. A. Knopf, New York, 1920.
- Wilson, Francis G., The Elements of Modern Politics, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1936.
- White, Leonard D., The New Social Science, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1930.
- Wriston, Henry M., The Nature of a Liberal College, Lawrence College Press, Appleton, Wisconsin, 1937.