



3

Paul Hanna at Teachers College, Columbia University

Paul Hanna arrived in New York in the fall of 1924. His previous education had developed his inquisitive mind and laid the foundation for his future scholarship. His negative experiences with traditional schooling developed his bias toward experiential education, and his studies at Hamline University provided him an intellectual framework into which to place elements of his previous learning. At Teachers College, Columbia University, Hanna's assumptions and abilities were challenged by his interactions with some of the leading thinkers in American education. In his decade there as a graduate student and a faculty member, Hanna embarked on a new career and began his family. He began to formulate his view of the roles of schools in democratic societies and, in the process, rejected traditional schooling. He pioneered work on the curriculum design for which he is best known—the grand scope and sequence that came to be called *expanding communities*—and entered into a life-long relationship with a major textbook publisher, Scott, Foresman and Company, to develop it. At Teachers College, Paul Hanna's

own community expanded to embrace school issues on a national level.

THE EARLY YEARS AT TEACHERS COLLEGE

Hanna's mentor at Hamline University, Gregory Walcott, knew William Heard Kilpatrick of Teachers College. Kilpatrick arranged for Hanna to serve as an assistant to John Dewey while he pursued his Master of Arts degree in philosophy. Professor Dewey was scheduled to return from China for the 1924 fall term, but the Chinese government persuaded him to prolong his stay through the end of the year. Hanna found himself without the mentor for whom he had hoped. Kilpatrick agreed to employ him as an assistant, and the change in plans altered Hanna's life. His focus gradually shifted from Columbia University to Teachers College, and from philosophy to education.

Assisting in Kilpatrick's classes, Hanna met school superintendents who had enrolled in the courses. They expressed surprise at Hanna's ambition to become a professor of philosophy, asking "How are you ever going to earn a living?" (Hanna 1974, 58). Their concerns caused Hanna to worry that, as a philosopher, he might not be able to afford marriage and a family.

Beyond these practical considerations, Hanna found that as he spent time around the educators at Teachers College, he became increasingly intrigued with the problems and promise of the impact of schools on society. Hanna recalled that ". . . by Christmas time the die had pretty well been cast" (ibid., 59). He moved from Columbia to Teachers College and changed the focus of his study to school administration, even though he had never taught in or administered schools.

The Teachers College Hanna found had an enrollment of nearly 7000. By far, most of these students came from Northeastern states, with nine percent from the South, five percent from the West, and

sixteen percent joining Hanna in coming from the Midwest. Students were transient; fifty-seven percent attended only part-time. New York was an expensive city in which to live in those days, as it is now. Fully half of the single men in graduate study had to work to meet expenses, and another forty percent incurred debt to pay for college (Cremin, Shannon, and Townsend 1954, 257–259).

The leading figure in the field of school administration at Teachers College was George Strayer (*ibid.*, 57). Professor Strayer had come to school administration with a background in science. He pioneered the use of scientific school surveys as a tool for administrators, and, over the years, he turned his department at Teachers College into a survey workshop for his students (Burlbaw 1989, 90). Fully half of their program was devoted to the collection and analysis of data for one of Strayer's ongoing school surveys (*ibid.*). He wrote that surveys facilitated the "analysis of a total situation into the many problems which demand solution" (Strayer 1925, 822). Hanna completed a Master of Arts degree in school administration, under Strayer's supervision, in 1925.

Even during this early phase of his studies in education, Hanna began to formulate his view on the roles of schools in society. This view became the underlying motivation for all of his major contributions to education. One student of Hanna's expanding communities curriculum design claimed, "Hanna's design was based on his conception of the proper relationship between education and society" (Gill 1974, 1).

Hanna represented a bridge between two major educational trends of his time. Social efficiency educators viewed the schools as tools for preparing children to fit neatly into their future roles as citizens and workers in an industrial democracy (Kliebard 1986, 28–29). The curriculum of such schools must be based on the needs of society. Some progressive educators, on the other hand, thought that schools should serve the present needs of children exclusively. In their conception, the curriculum derived solely from the interest

children showed in the world around them (ibid., 190). Hanna's involvement in the ideological struggle between these two camps is detailed later in this chapter and in Chapter Six, but an early version of his thinking on the matter appeared in a paper he wrote for his Philosophy of Education class. He wrote, "Democratic education so manages the educative process that each individual, irrespective of social position, will receive that particular education which will be of most profit to himself and to his community" (Hanna 1925). In this paper, Hanna revealed his view that education in a democracy must serve both the needs of society and those of the individual.

These considerations remained central to Paul Hanna's philosophy of education throughout his career and dovetailed with those of key figures at Teachers College. Dean William F. Russell characterized the intention of the founders of the College and their successors as "the improvement of the life of the people, with special emphasis on the underprivileged and the young; the use of education as a means of sectional and national reconstruction . . . and the guarding of the liberties of the people" (Cremin et al., 273). At Teachers College, Hanna found an institution supportive of his investigation of these concerns.

By 1925, Hanna had become deeply immersed in educational issues, but only at a theoretical level. He had no practical experience in the schools, and he realized his deficiency: "I didn't know about curriculum. I didn't know enough about instruction, learning, and teaching. These things I had missed in my Master's degree because I was still interested in philosophy, and I had added the superstructure within administration without anything to really administer" (Hanna 1974, 60).

His thesis advisers knew his deficiency, too. Hanna remembered that "they realized that I had never taught a day. They realized that my experience had not been in professional education and they wanted me to get my feet wet" (ibid., 61). Thus, when George Strayer learned of an opening for a superintendent of schools in West Win-

field, New York, a village of 2000 near Utica, he insisted that Hanna interview for the position. Such was the influence of Strayer, as well as the state of superintendency, in those years that his endorsement of a young, untried candidate with no classroom experience gained Hanna an interview for the position. He must have made a strong impression on the West Winfield Board of Education, because he returned to New York with an offer of the position and a yearly salary of \$2500. At twenty-six years old, Hanna made plans in the spring of 1925 to move upstate and gain practical experience before returning to complete his doctorate at Teachers College (Hanna 1974).

HANNA AT WEST WINFIELD

The condition of the West Winfield schools contributed to Paul Hanna's growing sense of what education should and should not be. Evidently, the previous superintendent had provided little leadership and the schools suffered from neglect (Gill 1974, 22). Hanna recalled his first visit to his new office: "I found a table in the center of the room piled so high with unopened mail that you couldn't put another piece of paper on top without it sliding onto the floor. There had been no attention on his part to curriculum, to staff, to student affairs" (ibid., 101).

The schools displayed a deplorable neglect of student interests. Hanna recalled that "there was not a single athletic team, nothing in publications or forensics. It was a dead school" (ibid.). Hanna understood that although student interest was not an adequate foundation on which to build an entire curriculum, interest was a necessary factor in motivation. He swiftly added cocurricular activities to the school program in an effort to increase its relevance to students.

West Winfield High School became a center of activity. Hanna incorporated his recollections of school activities that had appealed

to him as a youth with Kilpatrick's and Dewey's ideas on experiential learning, which he brought from Teachers College, to enhance the school program. With the help of sympathetic faculty members, Hanna organized athletic teams, debate teams, a school newspaper, and a yearbook and launched school-based community service projects (ibid., 23). The fruits of these efforts appear in a description of some of these activities in the 1927 edition of the high school annual:

In West Winfield high school French, learned in the classroom, becomes the official spoken word in the club known as Le Cercle Francais. Parliamentary procedure studied in the English classes becomes something alive in the Hi-Y Club, Young Farmers' Club, and others. The Young Farmers' Club very practically tests the principles taught in agriculture. English reaches a fuller expression in the debates, plays, and declamation contests held throughout the school year (*The Tournament* 1927, 20).

The West Winfield graduating class of 1926, the first over which Paul Hanna presided, consisted of twenty-one students. Thirteen graduated from the general high school program, and eight more graduated from a teacher certification program that extended one year beyond high school (*The Tournament* 1926, 7). In this small student body, Hanna's personal qualities of enthusiasm and energy became infectious. One student recalled, "One day they've got us doing track for physical education and we couldn't believe it but there was Mr. Hanna high jumping! He jumped higher than any of us could and from that day on we'd try anything he asked us to . . . Such zeal!" (Griffin 1974).

Hanna's willingness to poke fun at himself was a welcome contrast to the aloofness of his predecessor and helped to endear him to the students (ibid.). Page 38 of the 1927 *Tournament*, West Winfield's yearbook, pictured a skinny Paul Hanna and another young man in running shorts over the caption, "Columbia Track Team."

In addition to adding cocurricular activities, Hanna enhanced

the academic program at West Winfield High School. He taught biology, economics, and physics himself, although his college degree was in philosophy. As in taking a superintendent's position without having teaching experience, Hanna's willingness to teach high school classes without formal preparation displays an astonishing level of self-confidence by today's standards. However, the high school faculty consisted of only six teachers, so some of them must have taught subjects for which they were less-than-thoroughly prepared (*The Tournament* 1926, 3). Hanna's innovative methods engaged the students and helped make up for deficiencies in his subject preparation. His physics classes were especially memorable. The 1926 *Tournament* includes in a timeline for the year, "Dec. 8—The queer experiment to determine the velocity of sound was tested . . . Apr. 23—Prof. Hanna shocks the Physics class by means of a small wire on the seats" (ibid., 46–47).

Despite his own efforts, Hanna observed "the inadequacy, the inappropriateness, the lack of match between the curriculum and what these children were interested in or what their lives were like. There was no relevance whatsoever" (Hanna 1974, 103). He organized students to survey community needs, and he sometimes interrupted the regular schedule so that students might take advantage of community events. One student recalled being enlisted to speak before a hastily called assembly of the high school student body about his experiences exhibiting a prize steer around the state. Hanna "turned the whole thing into a discussion of the future for scientific improvement in animal husbandry . . . [he was] always looking for ways to include our own experiences into the curriculum" (Griffin 1974).

Faculty members were perhaps more difficult to charm than were the students, especially considering Hanna's youth and scant teaching experience (Gill 1974, 22). His master's degree from the highly esteemed Teachers College may have impressed some teachers, and his energy and enthusiasm may have impressed others. He

certainly represented a refreshing change from the inactivity of his predecessor. In addition to his teaching duties, Hanna served as principal of the elementary and high schools and school board secretary. He also substituted for teachers who were absent in every grade, kindergarten through high school (Hanna 1974, 101). Through this broad variety of experiences, he gained invaluable insights into the practical world of the classroom.

As principal, Hanna held weekly faculty meetings at which he introduced new curriculum concepts (Gill 1974, 25). These meetings did not always communicate what he intended. For example, one meeting designed for the elementary teachers featured a graduate from New Jersey State Teacher's College who was acclaimed as the college's outstanding student in elementary and primary level art instruction. She was scheduled to demonstrate a model art lesson for third graders as Hanna's teachers observed. Instead of the exciting experience of helping children explore their own creativity that Hanna expected, the teacher set up a factory-style assembly line with the students performing merely mechanical tasks that resulted in thirty identical "works of art." Hanna was embarrassed. He did not want his teachers to imitate what he considered to be dull instructional techniques. He felt that instructional activities requiring little independent, creative thought were unprogressive and undemocratic. Hanna blamed himself for not thoroughly previewing the presentation and never again scheduled a meeting for which he did not know the exact content in advance, even to the point of holding pre-meeting rehearsals (ibid., 25-26).

Despite such minor embarrassments, the students and the school board appreciated Hanna's efforts. His students dedicated the 1926 school yearbook to him with many affectionate comments (*The Tournament* 1926, 2). At the end of the 1925-1926 school year, the West Winfield school board rewarded his work by renewing his contract and increasing his annual salary to \$3000 (Gill 1974, 24). This good fortune enabled him to return to Minnesota in the sum-

mer of 1926 to marry Jean Shuman, his sweetheart from Hamline days.

The young couple returned to West Winfield for the 1926 fall term, and both threw themselves into the work of modernizing the school curriculum. Jean taught high school English and organized a drama club. She also helped students with public speaking and served as an adviser for the 1927 yearbook (*The Tournament 1927*, 40).

The Hannas worked as a team to make the schools more responsive to the students, but roadblocks to change remained. Hanna was disappointed that many teachers did not respond to his attempts to introduce new teaching methods in the schools (Gill 1974, 26). He also lamented the fact that West Winfield certified teachers with so little preparation beyond high school (ibid., 25). By the winter of 1926–1927 the Hannas were weary of their effort. At one point, both suffering from head colds, they met in Paul’s office and decided that the time had come for a change. In February they traveled to New York City and arranged to return to Teachers College for the 1927 fall term, Paul to pursue his doctorate and Jean to pursue a master’s degree in English (Hanna 1974, 105).

In his two years at West Winfield, Paul Hanna gained what he desired and needed. He now possessed some practical experience as a schoolman that would inform his efforts as he wrestled with curriculum questions in the coming years. He also had tasted success as an educational leader and had felt the satisfaction that comes from impacting the lives of individual students. W. F. Griffin, a West Winfield student during Hanna’s superintendency, later chaired the education department at Colgate University. He recalled that “Mr. Hanna was one of the strongest influences in my life, and planted the idea of pursuing a career in education. What a marvelous man” (Griffin 1974).

Perhaps the most important thing Paul Hanna gained from his time at West Winfield was a growing concern about school curric-

ulum. He had rejected the traditional curriculum in favor of one that focused on students' natural interests, but, with practical experience, he perceived problems with that approach to curriculum building as well. The weakness of the traditional approach was its lack of relevance to students and, therefore, its failure to enlist their natural curiosity in the learning process. The weakness of the interest-centered curriculum was that it failed to direct what content should be taught. It seemed that the school could either interest students or inform them, but not both. Hanna decided that he needed to study curriculum. He sensed that if West Winfield was any indication, "curriculum was sadly in need of complete modification" (Hanna 1974, 104). In the summer of 1927, the Hannas moved to New York City to embark on the next phase of their life together.

RETURN TO TEACHERS COLLEGE

Paul Hanna determined to pursue a doctorate with an emphasis in curriculum, but his restless mind could not be so constrained. For his advisers, he chose scholars in supervision, curriculum, and subject matter education. Milo B. Hillegas taught courses in elementary and secondary supervision, James R. McGaughy taught curriculum courses, and Clifford B. Upton and John R. Clark taught courses in mathematics education (Cremin et al., 103). Hanna created a customized degree program. He recalled

taking all I could handle in both [curriculum and elementary education] . . . I realized that it was curriculum focused in the elementary school years I wanted to get a hold on . . . I took a number of courses in elementary school mathematics, curriculum and instruction . . . in the social studies, social sciences, reading . . . I was literally bridging these two fields . . . curriculum and elementary education (ibid., 62).

Despite his academic commitments, Hanna found time to tinker. He invented a mechanical device to help children calculate sums, and he filed a patent application for it on November 26, 1927. The device was designed to relieve children of the tedium of memorizing endless computation tables, so that they could focus on the patterns underlying arithmetic calculations. Nothing ever came of his invention, but it demonstrated Hanna's commitment to educational approaches that stress students' thinking through subject matter concepts rather than simply learning skills.

Hanna's knowledge of elementary education deepened through his work at the Lincoln School, beginning in 1928. Lincoln was the brainchild of Abraham Flexner, as a forum for experimentation (Cremin et al. 1954, 110). The school was organized as a unit of Teachers College in 1917, with twenty-five teachers and 116 students in grades one through five. A large grant from the General Education Board provided the funding (Rugg 1941, 185). At Lincoln, teachers created their own materials and textbooks and devised their own curricula, often integrating different subjects within one unit of study (ibid., 111). They also developed their own methods of assessing student achievement (Reich 1996, 33). One instructor characterized the faculty's approach as, "Try anything once and see if it works" (ibid.). By the late 1920s, Lincoln was a beacon of child-centered progressive education.

In 1928, Teachers College employed Jesse Newlon, one of the most prominent school superintendents of the time, to replace Otis Caldwell as head of Lincoln School (Cremin et al. 1954, 113). Newlon represented a tradition of superintendents as curriculum makers. As superintendent of the Denver Public Schools in 1922, he had pioneered an innovative curriculum development project that directly involved Denver's teachers. Up to that time, curriculum development primarily had been the domain of *experts*.

Upon his arrival at Lincoln, Newlon realized that he needed an assistant. Through the good offices of Strayer and Nickolaus En-

gelhardt, Hanna gained an interview with Newlon. In Hanna's words, ". . . it was love at first sight . . . he was a great 'father figure' and we were just like father and son" (Hanna 1974, 62). Hanna became Newlon's executive assistant on December 5, 1928, the beginning of a long and fruitful association.

Hanna first worked with Newlon on a reorganization of the administration of the school. The two then launched a study of the school curriculum (Gill 1974, 31). This effort proved to be one of the key events in shaping Hanna's thinking about the purposes of education. Hanna's first impression of the Lincoln School's curriculum was that the concept of basing lessons solely on child interest had run wild there. As he described it, "There was no continuity whatsoever in the curriculum. It was what each of the teachers decided that he or she wanted to do" (ibid., 64). He was not critical of the quality of instruction, however. In fact, Hanna described Lincoln's teachers as "magnificent . . . I would just as soon that my grandchildren . . . be under these stimulating and magnificent people . . ." (ibid.). The problem lay with letting children's immediate interests shape the curriculum. Hanna feared that "It was quite possible for a child progressing through the grades for thirteen or fourteen years in the Lincoln School and [sic] study nothing, say, but science, or nothing but sculpture . . . There was no general or common core to prepare one for a broad view of life . . ." (Gill 1974, 104-105).

Another member of the Lincoln School staff shared Hanna's reservations about the foundations of its curriculum. Harold Rugg first came to the Lincoln School in 1919 as an educational psychologist specializing in testing (Rugg 1941, 189). He also served as a professor of curriculum at Teachers College. With each Lincoln teacher assessing student progress in his own manner, there was no standard of comparison. One author claimed that ". . . because Lincoln was Lincoln, its students found themselves guinea pigs for every new testing technique that came down the pike" (Reich 1996,

34). It was to bring some order to this chaos that Rugg was brought to Lincoln.

Rugg shared Hanna's concern about the curriculum at the school. In 1928, he coauthored a book that was critical of the extremes in child-centered progressive education. He complained that the curriculum in schools like Lincoln was fragmented and failed to give students a clear picture of the world. He observed that "We find interesting separate units of work devoted to a study of Holland, China, the desert life of the bedouins. These have been selected, however, largely in the expressed interests of a few children or the personal interest of the teacher. They do not represent integral units in a carefully designed scheme for the curriculum of the whole school" (Rugg and Shumaker 1928, 123).

Out of his concern for a more orderly approach to curriculum development, Rugg developed innovative materials for junior high school social studies instruction. These materials began as pamphlets first distributed to schools through subscription in 1922, and grew into a popular textbook series published by Ginn and Company (Rugg 1941, 206). Rugg's pamphlets pioneered both an integrated approach to presenting social science information and the use of scholarly work in the social science fields to determine content. In these books, Rugg addressed what he saw as the premier educational need in the United States: "an honest and intelligible description of our social order" (*ibid.*, 210).

Hanna admired Rugg's attempts to integrate the previously segregated fields in social science and his efforts to ensure the intellectual integrity of the subject matter (Gill 1974, 37). Rugg's approach to curriculum making seemed more rational than blindly following student interest. Moreover, as he observed Lincoln teachers planning curriculum, Hanna began to question whether or not they were following student interest or creating it. Hanna observed that the same inquiries repeated themselves year after year after year in specific classrooms. Teachers apparently assumed that cer-

tain interests were innate to certain age groups, but Hanna suspected something else was at work. He theorized that the teachers communicated their interest in certain topics to the students and then read it as the children's own (Hanna 1974, 100). This assumption was borne out by his observations of a third grade teacher:

Miss Keeler's youngsters always had culminating experiences in which they invited the kindergartners and 1st and 2nd graders to come and share their marvelous and exciting experiences. The glass showcases in the halls were always filled with the things that Miss Keeler's group were [sic] doing on Manhattan Indians or the Dutch colonial settlement. So there was an expectation on the part of the children. It was Miss Keeler, in her class, who set the interests in the youngsters who came to that 3rd grade. Miss Keeler would never acknowledge this (ibid., 105).

Harold Rugg had observed much the same behavior in Lincoln School teachers (Rugg 1928, viii).

Rugg left the Lincoln School in 1928 and Jesse Newlon employed another curriculum authority to help Hanna in his study of the curriculum (Gill 1974, 33). He was L. Thomas Hopkins, a professor of education at the University of Colorado who had worked with Newlon on the Denver Curriculum Project. In Hanna's view, Hopkins represented the other end of the curriculum spectrum from Lincoln—traditional education. For him, curriculum making was a methodical, scientific process centered on discerning what content students needed to know (ibid., 65). Child interest was not a major concern.

Hanna and Hopkins worked as a team with the faculty to try to find some middle ground between the traditional and child-centered approaches. Just as Hanna had at West Winfield, the two men held weekly faculty meetings and enlisted the help of other members of the Teachers College community (ibid., 105). Hanna worked on this project for three years, but the teachers remained "under the impression that there was something inborn in children . . . intrinsic

. . . and we were never able to get any kind of curriculum consideration” (ibid., 106).

Despite his failure to persuade Lincoln’s teachers to look beyond the child as a basis for curriculum making, Hanna benefited greatly from his work at Lincoln. The experience helped move him further along in his thinking about the purpose of the curriculum and curriculum development processes. Thus far, he had rejected traditional instructional methods as irrelevant to the lives of students, and he was moving closer to rejecting child-centered progressivism as lacking direction. Hanna began to consider other foundations for curriculum making, such as social utility.

An early expression of Hanna’s interest in the social utility of the schools was his involvement with adult classes at the Lincoln School. Convinced that the school could provide greater service to its community, Hanna helped form a Parents’ Recreation Club at Lincoln. Under his supervision, this group surveyed all parents of Lincoln School children about their hobbies and interests. Analysis of the responses prompted the school administration to open the school to the public. Each Tuesday night from 7:30 until 10:00 p.m., adults attended seminars and classes, used the art studios and dramatic facilities, conducted experiments in the science lab, and exercised in the gymnasium and the pool (Hanna and Gucker 1930, 66). This curriculum consisted of “anything that takes their fancy in the realm of modern experimental education” (*World* 14 January 1929). Concepts developed during this work formed a foundation for some of Hanna’s later efforts in the development of community schools here and abroad.

The Lincoln School afforded Hanna some of his first opportunities to publish his ideas. He was reluctant at first, but his mentor, Newlon, urged him, “Boy, you have got to write . . . to get your name in print” (Hanna 1974, 69). Lincoln students compiled stories, myths, and legends of flight that were compiled in a volume entitled *Wonder Flights of Long Ago* (1930). For this collection,

Hanna appeared as the second editor behind Mary Elizabeth Barry. He also was assistant editor of the Lincoln School Curriculum Research Studies, a compilation of lessons prepared by various Lincoln teachers. Hanna authored the promotional brochure for the series. It indicates his understanding of the importance of student interest in motivating learning. He wrote that, "The theory underlying the unit of work curriculum recognizes the dynamic effect on the learner when he engages in a series of related activities in which he personally feels a purpose, an adventure, a meaning" (Hanna 1932a).

INFLUENCES ON HANNA'S THOUGHT
REGARDING THE ROLE OF THE SCHOOL

Paul Hanna completed his Ph.D. degree in 1929 and joined the faculty of Teachers College as an assistant professor. The title of his dissertation was "Arithmetic Problem Solving: A Study of the Relative Effectiveness of Three Methods of Problem Solving." However, Hanna soon focused on broader curriculum questions than the study of specific instructional applications. The Great Depression caused many educators to rethink the role of schools in society. Social reconstructionist educator Henry Harap recalled, "Many people thought that we were on the brink of an economic disaster . . . It was a time of a terrific awakening of the schools to their educational responsibilities" (Harap 1970, 157). It was a unique time in which scholars of curriculum went far beyond advocating certain instructional methods or new subject matter offerings and questioned the basic assumptions upon which their ideas were founded. Hanna found a stimulating environment in which to investigate the proper balance between child interest and social needs in the curriculum of the school.

Discussion of the school's role in society took place in both formal and informal settings at Teachers College. William Heard

Kilpatrick organized a bimonthly dinner and discussion group that met off and on from 1928 through 1938. Joining Kilpatrick as regular attendees were Newlon, Rugg, and Professor George S. Counts, as well as John Dewey, political science professor Rexford Tugwell, Dean William F. Russell, and others (Cremin et al. 1954, 144). These scholars represented a wide variety of disciplines. Harold Rugg described them as, “canvassing informally, without programs planned in advance, the roots of every phase of our culture. In hundreds of hours of friendly argument we dug to the social foundations of education” (Rugg 1941, 155). Hanna’s entree to these meetings was through his association with Newlon and Rugg. As a junior participant, he listened more than he spoke, but he benefited from his observations of these great minds as they, “revolutionized our personal understandings and our theories of society and the culture” (Rugg 1952, 225).

Rugg’s recollections emphasized the harmony of thought reached by discussion group participants (Rugg 1941, 155). Hanna, on the other hand, recalled considerable disagreement (Hanna 1973). Perhaps Hanna’s relative inexperience in academic argument caused him to perceive these discussions as more heated than did other participants. The discussion group considered all means of social change and the school’s role as an agent for change. Some adopted Marxian interpretations of the Great Depression, but most of the social reconstructionists rejected Marx (Cremin et al. 1954, 253). In 1932, George Counts published his landmark *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* In it, he argued that teachers should be the instruments of social change leading to social perfection. Dean Russell took issue with him, arguing that such utopianism plays into the hands of both fascists and communists (Cremin et al., 252).

The dialogue in the Kilpatrick discussion group had a profound influence on Paul Hanna’s thought. He summarized selected writings on methods of social change as a talking paper and distributed

his findings among his colleagues. In the introduction to that work, Hanna eschewed both those who would attempt to halt all social change and those who see it as inevitable, but uncontrollable by human means—those who would simply let it take its course. As an alternative, he advocated planned social change. He wrote that this approach “would direct and control the change so as to move at varying speeds toward selected goals” (Hanna 1932b, 1). He then selected quotations from writings by agents of change classified by their ultimate goal—a classless society or one that retains class distinctions—and by methods advocated for change, including “by education and propaganda.” He concluded by declaring, “Today we need to be students of the methods of social change as at no time since the days of the American Revolution . . . We hope the study of the ‘readings’ presented will be of aid in formulating the method of social change which is undoubtedly crystallizing in the contemporary American scene” (ibid., 8).

Hanna’s study of revolutionary writings led him to another conclusion. He observed that firebrands are often martyred. He thought that working within accepted mechanisms for change was more effective than revolutionary action. He wrote, “If you really want to affect institutions and individuals, you have to work within the framework. You have to support the establishment and work to change the attitudes, understandings, and so forth . . . That is, it is the evolutionary concept, not the revolutionary concept in which I believe” (ibid., 109). Although his association with the Teachers College *radicals* would later turn suspicion on him, Hanna’s insistence on working *within the framework* eventually allowed him to exert great influence on the attitudes and understandings of generations of schoolchildren.

Another literary outgrowth of the discussion group meetings was the Progressive Education Association journal, *Social Frontier*. Hanna served on its board of directors along with Kilpatrick, Counts, Rugg, Newlon, and others (Johnson 1977, 70). They be-

lieved that the schools ill-served the dawning age with their outmoded, individualistic emphases (Cremin et al. 1954, 146). Hanna perceived that “the age of individualism in economy is closing and that an age marked by close integration of social life and by collective planning and control is opening” (*Social Frontier*, 4). The periodical was developed to provide a forum for “the development of the thought of all who are interested in making education discharge its full responsibility in the present age of social transition” (Cremin et al., 146). Hanna’s orderly mind was drawn to the concept of scientific social planning (Johnson 1977, 67). Others in the group became more critical of American education as a result of their discussions (Cremin et al. 1954, 145).

Another significant result of the discussion group’s deliberations was the merger of six departments of Teachers College into one, the Division of Social and Philosophical Foundations (ibid., 145). Until that time, “history, psychology, philosophy, sociology, and economics of education, and comparative education, had been laws unto themselves, each professor teaching what he wanted to teach” (Rugg 1952, 225). Rugg, the great curriculum integrator, described this academic segregation as “the chronic and besetting sin of academic life” (ibid.). Members of the discussion group concluded that separate fields of educational study shared the common mission of providing depth of understanding for teachers and administrators at all levels (Cremin et al. 1954, 145). In 1934, the departments of history of education, educational sociology, educational psychology, educational economics, philosophy of education, and comparative education joined to form the Division of Social and Philosophical Foundations. The introductory Education 200F course, required for all Teachers College master’s degree students, sprang from that union of departments in 1934.

The innovative Education 200F course, a year-long class in the foundations of education, was both a result of debate and a forum for further debate. Each section of the class enrolled nearly 500

students taught by six professors, one of whom chaired the panel (*ibid.*, 152). Hanna, Isaac Kandell, and others took part in course preparation and teaching on the faculty committee chaired by Kilpatrick. Each week, Hanna, Kilpatrick, and the others met to plan, then to teach their class as a panel. These meetings took place in the midst of the vigorous debates within Kilpatrick's discussion group and in the academic journals. For example, Kilpatrick and educational psychologist William C. Bagley sharply opposed each other over the nature of the curriculum. Kilpatrick, representing the progressive social reconstructionist view, wrote that the future was unsettled, uncertain. Therefore, no set subject matter could adequately prepare children for adulthood. The better approach, he argued, was to teach children problem-solving skills through real-life experiences (Kilpatrick 1934). The curriculum that would best prepare them for their roles as citizens in a developing democracy would be drawn primarily from present conditions, not the past.

Bagley opposed many tenets of progressive education (Cremin et al. 1954, 48). He responded by pointing to two fallacies in Kilpatrick's argument. The first was the assumption that more traditional subject matter consisted merely of memorized facts, instead of deeper understandings. The second was the assumption that instrumental knowledge was the only worthwhile knowledge, and he disputed both of these positions (Bagley 1935). Isaac Kandel joined Bagley's side, arguing that rejection of the traditional was anti-intellectual, irrational, and antidemocratic (Kandel 1933).

Cremin described Education 200F as a stimulating experience for students (Cremin et al. 1954, 147). Hanna's recollections confirmed Cremin's description: "We had Kandell who was on the extreme right and we had Kilpatrick who was on the extreme left. All six of us would sit on the platform of Horace Mann School [auditorium] and each of us would have a certain part in lecturing

to the two hour section This was a fascinating experience” (Hanna 1974, 67).

Once each week, all of the 200F faculty panels met together under Rugg’s chairmanship to plan the course. Hanna recalled that a wide range of views was represented. “There were reactionaries, conservatives, there were radicals, there were those who wanted to go communist right now! In that kind of a discussion group you had an exciting exchange” (ibid., 70). Certainly, the topics of discussion were not limited to curriculum and instruction. Hanna recalled his attendance at meetings in which the social problems of the Depression were discussed. “He [Harold Rugg] might take a half-hour to make the key issues of what the Depression was doing to the family, to the neighborhood, and so forth. And then it would be open for discussion” (ibid.). In these wide-ranging discussions the strong views of influential men were reasoned, debated, and defended over and over again, and Hanna’s view of education and its role in the wider society was challenged and refined.

The effect of this rich intellectual ferment on Hanna’s thinking was the realization that the schools, and especially social science instruction, had failed to prepare children for productive lives in a complex, democratic society by failing to provide them with solid, accurate information about the origins and nature of their social, economic, and political worlds (Hanna 1973a, 23). Schools had also failed to guide children in putting their social education to good use. This failure was not just irresponsible, but also dangerous; democratic government in the United States was under attack from both the right and the left. Hanna was concerned that the Depression encouraged “. . . all kinds of wild ideas about how you change society through revolution—through evolution—whether you become technocrats or communists or whatnot” (ibid., 23–24).

Hanna saw some hope in Harold Rugg’s approach. Influenced by Rugg, Hanna believed that adequate social education required instruction in all the social sciences. He thought that “the separate

subjects—history and geography—were inadequate for living in a modern society in which knowledge of economics, political science, sociology, et cetera were just as important as history and geography” (ibid., 4). Moreover, Rugg’s arguments and Hanna’s own experience at West Winfield convinced Hanna that “there was little or no scholarly underpinning in the study of the social sciences in high school curriculum.” Hanna believed that these ideas could be translated to the lower schools, as well. He resolved to restructure the teaching of social science topics in the schools through a new curriculum of integrated social sciences, but he had not yet settled on a design for this new curriculum. He developed that design in his work on the Virginia Curriculum Study.

THE VIRGINIA CURRICULUM STUDY

State and school curriculum reform projects had become a fixture in American education by the early 1930s (Cremin et al. 1954, 81). A rising leader in these efforts in the South was Hollis L. Caswell (Seguel 1966, 147). Caswell had been Hanna’s classmate and friend at Teachers College. In fact, Paul and Jean Hanna had first introduced Hollis and Ruth Caswell to each other, and the four remained close in the years after graduation (Hanna 1973a, 78). Caswell studied educational administration with George Strayer and became thoroughly versed in the theory and practice of school surveys. His graduate studies had prompted his increased concern about the impact on students of a school system that advanced the goals of society without regard to the needs of individual students (Fraley 1981, 96).

In 1929, Caswell joined the faculty of George Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville, Tennessee. He worked on curriculum revisions in Alabama and Florida, but was not pleased with the results. He believed that those revisions had failed to institute changes that would produce true democratic conduct in youth (ibid.,

97). When Sidney B. Hall, a former colleague of Caswell's at Peabody and the new State Superintendent for Public Instruction for Virginia, called him to help in a revision of Virginia's school curriculum, Caswell responded. The project, which began in 1931, required three years to produce a tentative course of study, followed by six years of experimentation to implement it (*ibid.*, 99).

The Virginia Study broke new ground. It was one of the first to involve teachers intimately in the curriculum-making process. Most curriculum projects at the time employed experts in school administration or in the academic subjects to produce courses of study for teachers to follow (Seguel 1966, 149). Caswell believed that teachers were the key to any curriculum reform. He wrote, "The individual classroom teacher is the final arbiter of the curriculum" (Caswell 1977). In order to involve teachers, Caswell distributed to them a brief study guide describing the process of curriculum development, and he invited teachers to attend seminars and discussions at six study centers around the state (Seguel 1966, 148).

The Virginia Study stood alone among curriculum revisions of its time in that it introduced an innovative structure for organizing the curriculum. Caswell was dissatisfied with his previous efforts at curriculum reform and wanted to develop something more appropriate for a democratic society (Fraley 1981, 97). Instead of the traditional subject matter divisions, the Virginia curriculum was organized around a number of basic human activities, functions carried out by all people throughout time and space (Seguel 1966, 153). These activities constituted the scope of study across the grade levels, and the sequence of study was organized around centers of child interest (*ibid.*, 154).

Caswell invited Hanna to work with him in Virginia and the two proved to be a formidable team. At least one history of the Virginia Study attributed development of the scope of study to Caswell and the sequence to Paul Hanna (Seguel 1966). Others portray Hanna as merely a "consultant for social studies" (Burlbaw 1989;

Fraley 1981), if they mention him at all. Paul Hanna's version of events claims for himself much greater involvement in the process of devising the core curriculum for the State of Virginia.

In Hanna's version, he developed a plan to survey the thousands of teachers involved in the activity of the study centers, in order to assess students' natural interests in the social sciences (Hanna 1973a, 5). He planned to have the teachers develop social studies units based on their students' interests, teach them, and then report to him on the results. Once the reports were collected, they were divided by grade levels, with each grade level's reports further divided by topic. Hanna anticipated that once the reports were sorted, one topic would stand out in each grade level, representing the natural interest of school children of that age. Hanna believed that, "If the pupil interest theory of curriculum development were correct, then this procedure should give us some evidence that such natural interest did in fact exist in youngsters and from such evidence we could provide instructional guides for teachers and learning materials for pupils in the social studies" (ibid.).

The reality was quite different. When the reports came in, they revealed no natural pattern of interests.

We had no bell-shaped curve of piles of papers, each pile representing a topic like "the Mailman," or "the Fireman" or "the Aviator." Instead we had piles of reports from the first grade through the elementary school that had no pattern. We found a stack of reports on aviation units in every grade. As many teachers reported units on aviation in the first grade as reported them in any other grade. . . . Indians! We found as many Indian units in the first grade as we found in the fourth or the seventh grades (ibid., 6).

This disturbing result prompted Hanna to jettison innate child interest as the principle around which to organize the curriculum, but he had nothing to take its place. Hanna was at a loss because he had promoted his survey as the tool that would "give us a struc-

ture as to how we could build the curriculum in the social studies” (ibid., 7) and it had failed. He returned to New York in late spring of 1933, desperate to find a framework for the social studies curriculum.

Hanna already had determined that the traditional disciplinary divisions of the social sciences were too artificial to describe for children all of the social, economic, and political interactions in the real world, but his attempts to devise a design for integration had been thwarted. At the time, Hanna was reading a two-volume study that impressed him: “President Hoover’s magnificent reports [*Recent*] *Social Trends* and [*Recent*] *Economic Trends*” (ibid., 131). These documents appealed to him because of their systematic approach to social change. “The great engineer, Herbert Hoover, saw that we had to have national planning and he ought to take broad base studies of what society was at that time—what our objectives and long-range goals were, and then set up an educational system that would move us in the direction of those desirable goals” (ibid.).

Hanna was particularly taken with a chapter that grouped basic human activities into broad categories such as communication, transportation, and health. He decided to adopt those categories as organizing principles for the scope of content for the Virginia curriculum. He employed twenty-three chapter headings from Hoover’s work on a vertical axis and used the various grade levels on the horizontal axis. Hanna recalled, “So I took some 23 chapter headings out of *Recent Economic and Recent Social Trends* [sic] and made them the columns of my big wall chart and made the grades the rows and crossed the grades or levels of schools with these 23 categories of basic human activities” (ibid.). The interaction of these two axes became the scope of the social studies curriculum for Virginia. The centers of student interest, such as home and school life, community life, and pioneering activities comprised the sequence.

The scheme was too complicated, however. Hanna recalled,

“When I went down and presented my huge chart, they [sic] covered a whole side of the library wall of the Department of Education in Virginia. I couldn’t even remember what was on it” (ibid., 8). He had to condense it and make it more useful for teachers. He could simply fall back on the traditional social science categories of economics, political science, and so on, but he feared that it would “scare most teachers not having had anything in these fields.” It would also violate what Hanna had come to believe about the importance of integration. He determined to use more familiar, accessible terms, “like transporting, communicating, education, or recreating” (ibid.) for the vertical axis representing the scope of study.

For the other axis, the sequence of study, Hanna modified a design that had existed since at least the turn of the century. Charles McMurry advocated a plan in his *Special Method in History* (1903) in which children studied first the history and geography of their family and community, then of their state and region, and then of the nation. By the time of the Virginia Study, nearly half of the curriculum guides in use in the schools employed some version of this “widening horizons” design (LeRiche 1987, 148).

Hanna borrowed this pattern. In his plan, the earliest grades would be exposed to how the basic human activities were carried out in the contemporary home and local community. Grades three through nine followed a sequence of study loosely based on the history of man’s conquest of his environment through technological advances. Grades ten and eleven focused on the effects of social change and planning (Fraley 1981, 104–107). Hanna thought “This was a much better sequence for allocating what you would do in grade one to three than had been this [earlier] one” (Hanna 1973a, 8). Although it would undergo considerable refinement in the years to come, the basis for Hanna’s expanding communities curriculum design found its genesis in the Virginia Study.

Hanna’s version of the Virginia Study story has a number of

flaws. In the first place, Hanna seemed to claim that the innovative design of the Virginia curriculum grew out of his search for an appropriate structure for the social studies curriculum. In fact, Caswell himself viewed the traditional curriculum divisions as inadequate for the proper preparation of children for life in a changing industrial democracy. He too was looking for a more comprehensive organizing structure for Virginia (Burlbaw 1989, 242).

The biggest problem with Hanna's version of events in Virginia is that it portrays him as the prime innovator behind the project. In truth, many brilliant scholars and teachers worked together to produce the innovative Virginia curriculum design. Caswell led the project, and Hanna's account of it stands alone in diminishing Caswell's role.

Two reasons may account for the discrepancies in Hanna's story. One is that most of Hanna's accounts of his work on the project were recorded in interviews conducted late in his life. Aside from the normal reconstruction of memory over time, Hanna's version was clouded by a break in his friendship with Caswell. An incident occurred in 1964 in connection with their work together on the World Book Encyclopedia, in which Hanna felt Caswell misrepresented himself and embarrassed Hanna. The friendship that had lasted nearly forty years was severed. Sadly, Hanna reported that "Now Caswells and Hannas exchange Christmas cards only . . . We just don't see each other" (Hanna 1973a, 79). The rift lasted more than ten years. During that period, Hanna omitted Caswell's contributions from the version of the Virginia story he recounted in interviews. Consequently, the interviewer's questions focused on Hanna's, not Caswell's, role in the Virginia Study.

Still another factor may account for the exaggerated role Hanna assigned himself in the development of the Virginia curriculum design. The design fundamentally became the one that he employed in his development of commercial social studies textbooks for forty years following the Virginia Study. His textbooks became so popular

that his name was linked to the design indelibly. Late in life, he may have had a greater interest in underscoring that link than he had in historical precision. Whatever the reasons for the different versions of events in Virginia, the Virginia Curriculum Study represented the genesis of Hanna's best-known contribution to curriculum.

LEAVING TEACHERS COLLEGE

In the summer of 1930, Hanna taught summer courses at Washington State University. Hanna and his wife toured the region during the summer. They were especially intrigued with the easy lifestyle of northern California and the beauty of the Stanford University campus. Paul Hanna recalled, "The campus was such a pleasing contrast to our urban environment of New York City. As we walked about, we dared to think wistfully of some day living on this beautiful campus" (Hanna 1976, 1). Four years later, when an offer came to teach a summer course at Stanford University, they were already favorably disposed toward that part of the country.

Hanna understood that the summer teaching assignment was, in part, a prolonged interview for a permanent position, and he was not an unknown quantity at Stanford. He was acquainted with Stanford president Ray Lyman Wilbur and other faculty members: "[Grayson] Kefauver, who was one of my very good friends and . . . who lived just above us at Columbia, had come out the year before as the new Dean [of Education] to follow Cubberley . . . Harold Hand and I were very close friends" (Hanna 1974, 139–40).

Jean Hanna particularly impressed Jesse B. Sears, one of the "grand old men" in the Stanford School of Education. After chatting with Mrs. Hanna for nearly a half hour at a cocktail party, Sears declared, "I am not sure that I want to invite that radical husband of yours to join the Stanford faculty, but I will tell you one thing, I

am all out for you!” (ibid., 138). The offer of a permanent position to Paul Hanna followed soon after.

In considering the job offer, Paul Hanna followed the sort of deliberate process that characterized major decision making throughout his life. He asked his mentors for their opinions, and thirty-six people in all responded to his requests for advice. His senior colleagues at Teachers College advised him to make the move. They believed that in their shadows at Teachers College he would be too reticent to challenge them and fully develop his own ideas. They told him to “take this Stanford position where you will be confident enough and forced by the circumstances to speak up. To write. To take leadership. You will not do that as long as you remain here” (Hanna 1973a, 69). Hanna recognized the validity of their advice. He accepted Stanford’s invitation and, in the fall of 1935, he joined the Stanford faculty as an associate professor of education.

CONCLUSION

Paul Hanna’s years at Teachers College had crystallized his thinking on the relationship between the school and society. There he formed the foundation for his later production of textbooks and other activities. At Teachers College Hanna developed a rich network of friends and colleagues with whom he learned and grew, debated the great issues of the day, and taught groundbreaking courses. The next stage of his career, his more than three decades at Stanford University, saw his own community of influence expand. From Stanford—through his teaching, writing textbooks, involvement with professional organizations, and consulting work with school districts in the United States and abroad—Hanna’s ideas reached a worldwide audience.