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by
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(ABSTRACT)

Since textbooks are a standard feature of social studies classrooms and frequently are considered the central tools of social studies instruction, their content and manner of presentation are critical issues for the social studies. This study concentrated on identification and analysis of the individual people appearing by name in selected secondary world history textbooks.

The written words and illustrations of twelve secondary world history textbooks were analyzed for their selection of, and the way in which they portray, individual men and women of world history. Content of the textbooks was analyzed to determine which people are included, which receive the greatest amount of space devoted to them, and the general characteristics of these people as attributed to them by the textbooks. Those who have the most space devoted to them, the most significant people of world history, were further analyzed to determine which people are portrayed as possessing characteristics which identify them as heroes or as villains. The selected textbooks were compared to determine the amount of agreement among them.

The study found a large number of individual people identified by name
in the selected textbooks. These people represent every corner of the world, area of endeavor, and time period of history. However, some places, events, and times receive greater emphasis than others in all the textbooks studied. These people of world history textbooks are predominately western European, male, and political leaders who are written of in terms of their actions. The limited number of most significant people share the general characteristics of all who are named, but the greater amount of information provided the basis for analysis of the selection of information and the style of writing. This analysis provided a description of those most significant people who share common characteristics which match the characteristics of heroes and of villains. A few of the people exhibit characteristics of both heroes and villains. The textbooks studied are remarkably similar in these emphases. What is different among the textbooks is the exact people included in them and how much narrative text is used to describe and explain them.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Visit any world history classroom and more than likely you will see textbooks scattered about the room, usually one on every student’s desk. Ask those students about their textbooks --- there might well be groans and cat-calls at the notion that these weighty tomes have to be thoroughly read or even at the idea that they have to be carried throughout the year. Pick up one of these textbooks and glance through it. Very probably that textbook, compared to the one you remember at the same age, is bigger, more colorful, and, if a page at random is examined closely, packed much more fully with all manner of things of interest (or interest to adults, at any rate). These textbooks contain a great many words. From casual observation, they seem to be heavily used in the classroom. What do these textbooks say? What are these students learning about the world they will soon control?

Frequently it is assumed that textbooks provide the student’s major source, sometimes the only source, of ideas, facts, and theories about social studies. If indeed textbooks do play such a central role, their content and manner of presentation become critical issues for the social studies. The inclusion or exclusion of specific content, the portrayal of historic events and
people, the discussion of issues, and the style of writing have all precipitated intense battles among educators, parents, and other groups in past decades. This study analyzes the way in which selected world history textbooks present and portray important individual people. The primary focus is the identification of heroes and villains through their characteristics as presented in the textbooks read and studied by high school students of world history.

*Use of textbooks*

There are numerous references to the extensive use of textbooks in American schools. Comments appear in the media, popular press, professional journals, and research studies. Textbooks are variously labeled as pervasive features of American classrooms, as determining curriculum, and as being the central tool for teaching social studies. Some writers dispute this centrality and dominance of the textbook, maintaining that teachers' lectures rather than textbooks are the primary source of information for students. Others maintain that students use textbooks only as a reference tool to locate specific answers to literal questions. The most common assumption, however, remains that textbooks are central to the study of social studies and that their authority to students is irrefutable.

*Determiners of textbook content*

The factors that directly determine textbook content are many and
varied and their interaction is complex. Three factors are especially important in determining the content of history textbooks. First are the organization and practices of the textbook industry. Decisions about what to put into textbooks are in the hands of a small number of major publishing companies and are seemingly the work of committees. Not unmindful of intellectual integrity and pedagogical essentials, they are dominated by the need to produce a marketable and salable product. A second major influence is the process and criteria used by state and local authorities to select textbooks for use in their schools. The large states that are highly centralized in their adoption procedures are powerful determinants of textbook content. Although professional educators usually dominate the review process, committee makeup and criteria for evaluating content are most frequently specified by state legislatures. Finally, a powerful influence is the external pressure of the special interest groups which monitor and dispute the content and style of textbooks. Attacks are frequently highly personal and politicized and have been remarkably effective in expurgating controversy, debate, and intellectual honesty from textbooks. The politics of selecting textbook content are indeed an integral part of transmitting the myths of American society.

A fourth possible factor is the influence of teachers and students. As users of textbooks, teachers and students should have considerable influence on their content. They have as high a stake as anyone in the outcome of the
learning which takes place when the textbooks are used. Nothing prevents the exercise of such influence. Surprisingly, that influence seems to be largely absent.

In considering the factors that influence the contents of textbooks, it should also be remembered that textbooks and their contents are not the whole of the story of curriculum and of student learning: supplemental materials may provide that which the political arena has omitted from textbooks, teachers may not use textbooks in the way publishers and the reviewers intended, and students may not read the textbook (or for that matter the supplemental materials) or may read only fragments here and there. Thus, the analysis of the contents of textbooks may not reveal the complete picture of either curriculum or learning. However, that analysis may shed some light on our schools and our society.

**Attacks on quality of textbooks**

Although seemingly ubiquitous and authoritative, textbooks have been widely condemned for being poorly written. In 1982, Secretary of Education Terrell Bell used the phrase “dumbed down” to describe problems with textbooks. *Washington Post* headlines in 1988 reported that textbooks were “Themeless, Confusing, or Deadly Dull” (Feinberg, 1988). History textbooks are criticized for treating major topics of United States and world history in
a superficial manner. California Superintendent Bill Honig writes, "Not enough detail is provided to make the subjects interesting or understandable" (Honig, 1991, p. 106), while Paul Gagnon says, "textbooks give us too much and too little. In their unrelenting encyclopedic coverage, they lose the student in thickets of details whose significance is often left unexplained" (Gagnon, 1987, p. 34). Of the five world history texts he studied, "None of the texts defines what history is, how it is written, what its strengths and weaknesses may be, how it relates to the student's life and other studies, or what connection it could have with preparing thoughtful and informed citizens" (p. 43). And, Gilbert Sewall writes that history textbooks are lacking in "incandescent acts of charity and wisdom, triumphs of technology and political genius, the exploits of heroes and villains" (Sewall, 1988, p. 553).

Over the years, interested Americans have voiced many concerns about social studies textbooks. In the 1940s the National Association of Manufacturers opposed social studies textbooks that described "problems" associated with the contemporary American economic system. Minority groups have demanded the inclusion of minority role models and Mel and Norma Gabler's listing of offensive materials is widely circulated and has provided support for challenges to books in Texas and in many other states and local districts. In the 1980s those who upheld the values of classical education brought new attention to the content of textbooks. They advocated increased
rigor and emphasis on American history and traditional Western literature. In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education’s *A Nation at Risk* included problems with textbooks in the list of factors which were contributing to a “rising tide of mediocrity” in American education.

*Why history is important*

History is generally defined as the known and recorded past. It encompasses both the events themselves and the written narrative. Despite the controversies about textbooks, many claim that the knowledge of history is vitally important to the education of the youth of the United States. There is a critical need for students to prepare for life in a world which is increasingly pluralistic and interdependent, a world characterized by more rapid change than ever before imaginable. History provides the background, the collective memory, necessary for dealing with the complexities and uncertainties of this modern world. History provides perspective on the present and enables students to place their own identity and experiences within the larger context of the whole of human experience. Not least, knowledge of past deeds and people enriches the world.

No one can “walk out of history.” If we are deprived of our past, we become overwhelmed by the instant moment and are blind to the world around us. Without history we lose respect for the wisdom of the ages -
-- the views, the successes, and the failures of other people, of other
times, and of other places (Welter, 1990, p. 3).

Why world history?

The story of one nation is only a fraction of what students need to know
and understand. At the edge of the 21st century, nationalistic outlooks are
inadequate --- and widely questioned. Historian William McNeill maintains,
“only an acquaintance with the entire human adventure allows us to
understand the dimension of human reality” (McNeill, 1989, p. 104). World
history alone provides the entirety of human experience necessary to explore
fully the successes and failures of others who have dealt with the pervasive
problems caused by constant change in human affairs. Historian Geoffrey
Barraclough says of the teaching of world history, “It is, particularly at a
pedagogical level, a practical demand. How can we, in the world as constituted
today, safely teach a history nine-tenths of which is devoted to a quarter of
the world’s inhabitants?” (Barraclough, 1978, p. 153).

World history: A problem of definition

The world history course taught in high schools in the United States
poses a problem of definition. The 19th century General History course gave
way in the 1920s to separate courses on ancient, European, English, and
American history as recommended by the Committee of Ten on Secondary
School Subjects. As more subjects competed for school time and space, the three-year European history sequence lost favor and collapsed into a single course. It was called world history but had a clearly western European focus. By the early 1960s, history in schools of the United States was almost universally one year each of United States history and world history, or western civilization as it was increasingly called.

Following Sputnik and the rapid decolonization of the late 1950s, the Eurocentric approach came under attack as critics called for a more global view of history. But as De Bary noted, "we have no convenient and accepted framework in which to present world civilization as a whole" (De Bary, 1961, Intro. x). By the mid-1980s advocates of world history still were condemning existing world history textbooks as parallel regional and national histories, at best, and researchers Douglas Alder and Matthew Downey were saying, "What the world history course needs is an adequate conceptual base." (Alder and Downey, 1985, p. 16) This view was held by many. The College Board, for example, took a position in favor of world history when it changed the name of the European history and world cultures test to "World History" and revised the test to decrease the number of questions on western civilization in favor of an increase in the content range of questions on the non-western world (Dunn, 1990-91). The World History Association has, since its inception in 1982, continued to call for a conceptually integrated and meaningful world
history (Allardyce, 1990). This has not yet been reflected in world history textbooks. They remain basically parallel regional and national histories which are only very loosely integrated. It is tempting, and all too possible, for the world history teacher, severely pressed by time constraints, to skip the separate sections on Asia, Africa, and South America in favor of the sections on western Europe. A commonly accepted and practiced definition of world history does not currently exist although world history courses are offered in most schools in the United States.

**Leaders in world history**

As modern governments and economies have become increasingly centralized and interconnected and as modern communications have made it possible to transmit decisions instantly to every nook and corner of the world, control of events and people has become an actual possibility. Leadership is essential to all modern political and economic life and to every major form of social organization. It can now have a truly pervasive influence on the daily life of entire populations. It is not surprising that there should be a high degree of interest in the individual men and women who wield this power (Hook, 1943). The past can provide a framework for assessment of current leaders. Who are these leaders of the past, what did they value, how did they acquire, and keep, their power? Which are the heroes? Which are the villains?
Heroes and villains

Heroes\(^1\) may appear in many guises and may be defined in many ways. Sometimes hero is synonymous with great leader. Other times heroism is used in a much narrower sense. The hero, for example, is commonly identified with military greatness, with courage, valor, and extraordinary achievements in war. Literature depicts still other heroic types. There are heroes of tragedy, of comedy, and of myth. Great virtue and great patience are described as heroic, as is great genius in intellectual or artistic affairs.

At one extreme of the spectrum of concepts of hero there is the hero as event-maker. The hero not only causes an issue or event to have consequences different than if he had not acted as he did, but his actions are clearly the consequence of outstanding intelligence, will, and character. They are not the consequences of accidental position or conjunction of circumstances. The hero has a role in creating the situation by virtue of the extraordinary qualities he possesses. At the other extreme is the hero as expression of his environment. The hero can act only in accord with the one direction of development permitted by his culture. There are no genuine alternatives from which to choose. A great person cannot influence history until the times are “ripe.” When times are “ripe” a hero will emerge.

\(^1\) Hero will be used throughout in a masculine form and the pronoun “he” will be used, but both will refer to heroes and heroines.
Somewhere in between the extremes rests the view of the hero as releasing agent, one who does not create situations but rather manipulates and controls, releasing the power of events and channelling it into chosen alternatives (Hook, 1943).

A number of assumptions underlies these variations. First is the assumption of inequality. All people are not equal. Some, the few, achieve greatness, perhaps by their own abilities or perhaps as a reflection of their times. Second, the hero may differ from ordinary people in the degree of ability or in the kind of ability. The hero may have more strength of the same order or may have strengths of a higher order. Third, there is evidence of the functioning of powers or abilities which is accompanied by recognition and acclaim. "There would be no heroes," said S. L. A. Marshall, "if there were no one to sing them" (Marshall, 1973, p. 40). Fourth, the hero can achieve nothing alone. Achievements depend upon the consent of followers.

Another type of event-maker is the villain. As with the hero, actions are clearly the consequences of outstanding ability, courage, and will. The villain may not only influence an issue or event to consequences different than if he had not acted as he did, but he may create the situation in which he acts. Or he may be an expression of his environment, always limited by his times and culture and acting only as permitted by that culture. Is the villain, then, but a version of hero? Or, is the villain truly different, and separate?
It is important to remember that almost every great figure in history, from Alexander to Napoleon, from Pericles to Bismarck, and from Catherine to Churchill, has been regarded by some as morally monstrous, the epitome of wickedness and evil intent. No great figure has escaped criticism and ridicule by some historian, defeated opponent, or commentator of a different cultural perspective. Is villainy, then, a matter of perspective?

According to dictionaries, villains are wicked, evil, malevolent, and nefarious, while philosophers debate endlessly the question of the existence of absolutes of goodness or wickedness. In our search for definition of villain this question is significant for it is a necessary condition of villainy. How can we measure this, though, since it might be seen one way by the moral philosopher, another by the politician, another by the economist, and yet another by the man-in-the-street? There are perhaps some commonalities. The person who deliberately inflicts pain and death on large numbers of people who are not directly involved certainly is wicked, as is the person whose actions are motivated solely by personal hatred, greed, lust, or pride. Motivation is, of course, difficult to ascertain. I can think of no other single, absolutely agreed upon characteristic of villainy. There are, however, some possibilities to consider. A villain may be one who destroys or prevents the economic, and thus physical and emotional, well-being of others, either deliberately or through carelessness and neglect. A villain may be characterized as one who
is corrupt, selfish, immoral, or untruthful. Or a villain may be one who destroys or prevents works of art, literature, or music, or who simply is politically incorrect. Since history is written by the winners, there is also the possibility that the villain is the one who loses, or fails to win, the competition for power.

A final point to consider is the underlying cause of villainy. Certainly no one consciously chooses evil for evil’s sake. Many, however, have been deceived into thinking bad is good, believing that circumstances justify a diversion from the values of society in order to gain something for the common good. The common good may demand dramatic, though socially repugnant, action. Individuals thus deceived may also possess great charisma and the ability to convince others to embrace or at least acquiesce to this perversion of values. These are to be feared for their villainy (Fishwick, 1963).

The matter of hero or villain is but a part of a larger question. Heroes are created as a reflection of human beliefs about the way the world is. As has been suggested earlier, there is no absolute agreement about who is good and who is bad. Major figures are praised by some and criticized by others. The heroes and villains do, in fact, exist as humans in the real world but their attributes of complete goodness or badness are the myths of the society.
Schools as transmitters of myth

Myth is defined here, not as fabulous story or untruth, but rather as a society's generally believed statements about the world and how it got to be that way. They are believed to be true and they inform action whenever circumstances suggest or require unity of response. These beliefs, then, direct community activities and provide a sense of purpose and unity. They are the instruments by which experiences are given meaning.

One of the roles of school is to transmit to the young the myths of its society. The school is not the only purveyor of these "truths." They are also conveyed by church, parents, and peers, for example, but school lessons and materials are pervasive transmitters of beliefs, values, and traditions. School history courses strive to make the past intelligible and meaningful as they focus on a few bits of the past which thereby acquire permanence, relevance, and significance for students. History textbooks, major instructional tools in most history courses, thus have a role in developing the myth-sense of a society. School textbooks are not so much myth-makers however, as they are myth transmitters and sustainers.

It is important to note that myths are not static. They are constantly assessed and revised or rejected as necessary to provide the coherence and identity essential for common action. Current textbooks, then, may reflect myths that differ from those of past years, or from those held by individual
groups within the larger group. The human community is divided among an enormous number of different groups, each espousing its own version of truth about itself and about those excluded from the in-group. Textbooks both reflect the myths of the current generation and train the future generation in the beliefs that form the myths. They generally are more trailing than pacesetting however, transmitting to students the myths held by the adult world of teachers, textbook writers, and policy setters rather than the myths of the student's own group or set. Whose beliefs will be included in school textbooks is not infrequently a matter of concern and controversy.

Research focus and specific questions

This study analyzed the content of the eleven world history textbooks currently on the Virginia state textbook adoption list plus one additional textbook for comparison. The books were published for use by tenth grade students in public schools. The contents were analyzed to determine which men and women have been included, which received the greatest amount of space devoted to them, the nature or quality of the coverage, and the characteristics that are attributed to these people.

Some Assumptions

● Textbooks reflect over-all values and beliefs of a society and are used by the society as transmitters of those values. Textbooks reflect
present society and foreshadow future society.

✧ History textbooks are about people as individuals as well as people in the aggregate. The individual is important in history.

✧ The amount and type of coverage of topics is a reflection of the importance perceived by producers of textbooks, endorsed by selection.

✧ If individuals are featured in textbooks, students will learn about them. The greater the exposure the more students will learn.

✧ The heroes have characteristics to be emulated and the villains have characteristics to be avoided.

✧ The uniqueness of an individual person is the product of his/her personal history. To identify an historical character as a person, the student must know something of the person's biography.

✧ Both words and illustrations are significant conveyors of information, attitudes, and beliefs.

The basic research question to be addressed. Who are the most significant people in world history and what qualities characterize their actions and achievements according to secondary world history textbooks? This can be broken into several subsidiary questions:

1. Which people receive what amount of coverage in written words
and illustrations?

2. What are their characteristics in terms of gender, geographic origin, and major field of endeavor?

3. Which people receive the most coverage? Do textbooks agree?

4. What are the characteristics of these individuals who receive major emphasis?

5. Which people are treated as heroes/villains based on the nature of coverage?

6. Is there agreement among textbooks on who the heroes and villains are?
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

Textbooks play a significant role in social studies education. They are instructional resources for students and teachers alike, providing information, ideas, organization, illustrations, and study guides. While students do not generally question the authority of textbooks, they have been widely criticized by almost everyone else. The altercations are intermittently played out at both local and national levels. In recent years textbooks have even been the subject of international debates. These controversies are perhaps not surprising since textbooks are highly visible concrete evidence of the schools' role as transmitters and sustainers of the pervasive beliefs and assumptions of societies. History textbooks bear an especially heavy burden as they portray the major events and peoples of vast segments of past ages. Societies have long considered it important that their young gain knowledge of their past in order to better understand why they have reached the status and condition of the present, and to firmly entrench their identity within that society.
TEXTBOOKS IN SOCIAL STUDIES

Textbook analyses

There are several types of analyses of textbooks of interest to social studies educators. First, there are analyses which deal with textbooks in general, frequently from the point of view of reading analysis (see for example, Chall & Conard, 1991; Crismore, 1984; Elliott & Woodward, 1990). Although they shed some light on the topic of world history textbooks, they are useful primarily for background and general insight into the reading process. A second group deals with social studies textbooks (see for example English, 1985; White, 1988). They are useful for surveying the general field of social studies textbooks. While world history textbooks may have been included in the studies, they are not a focal point and the studies do little to inform us of specifically world history strengths, weaknesses, and problems. A third group deals with themes that cut across two or more of the social studies. There are analyses, for example, of the Korean War (Fleming and Kaufman, 1990), propaganda (Fleming, 1985), geographic regions (Cannon 1990; Wiley 1982), and aging issues (Fleming and McAuley, 1987). World history textbooks were included in the studies and the topics certainly are of global concern, but world history textbooks are not truly the focal point. Conclusions, while helpful in understanding some aspects of world history, are fairly general. The fourth group deals with textbooks for specific social studies courses. There are
analyses of government, economics, United States history, world history, and geography textbooks. They may deal with textbooks across grade levels or with specific grade or age levels. By far the greatest number of analyses deal with United States history textbooks, primarily at the secondary level.

**Analyses of world history textbooks**

Although world history has long been a major social studies topic at the secondary level and publishers have produced many textbooks for those courses, few analyses deal only with secondary world history textbooks. Analyses of the textbook treatment of individual people in world history has been equally meager. Three analyses of world history textbooks have appeared in recent years. Gagnon (1989) surveyed five world history textbooks to find out how they portrayed the development of democracy. Fleming (1989-90), acknowledging the supremely difficult task of world history textbooks, analyzed eight world history textbooks for their treatment of Hammurabi’s Code, Buddhism, the fall of the Bastille, and the Korean War. Hitchens (1990) reviewed a number of world history textbooks for general style and content. One analysis (Brodbelt and Wall, 1985) deals with the way in which textbooks portray the role of individual people in history.

Brodbelt and Wall (1985) studied the way 31 secondary social studies textbooks deal with heroes and heroines but utilized only a limited number of
world history textbooks. Over half of the textbooks included in the study were for United States history courses. The study examined individuals, whom they first identified as heroes or heroines on the basis of heroic actions attributed to them, across five institutional settings for five trait characteristics. The researchers conclude that textbooks generally neither use the terms hero or heroine, nor present leaders in a value-specific framework. “In most cases the concept of hero and heroine is presented infrequently and the full development of the hero/heroine characteristics was the exception rather than the norm” (p. 11). Identified as hero/heroine characteristics were bravery, humanitarianism, entertainment, leadership, and skill,¹ however the authors do not explain what was meant by the “full development of the hero/heroine characteristics.”

It is surprising to find that Brodbelt and Wall discovered no fully developed hero or heroine in any of the four world history textbooks included in the study. Their study, while not especially useful, does pose intriguing questions about the identification and definition of hero. Neither methodology nor criteria are fully enough described, however, to assess the author’s broad conclusions.

Three analyses dealing with textbooks from the point of view of reading

---

¹ Skill was defined as “the mastery of a specific occupation, craft or trade other than politics, athletics, and entertainment as related to a profession or job.” (p. 4)
suggest approaches useful in the analysis of world history textbooks. Crismore (1984, 1988) proposes a system of analysis designed to identify the attitudes of authors toward the content. She poses a categorization of the words, phrases, or clauses by which the author intrudes into the text, signaling to students what they should gain from their reading. Both Selander (1990) and Armbruster and Anderson (1984) suggest ways to analyze the structure of the explanations which are essential to understanding events, actions, and achievements. Although they suggest somewhat different structural forms they both indicate that clearly identified structures of explanation assist student comprehension of the text. A frequent weakness of social studies textbooks is their failure to clearly present the structure of explanation in its entirety, thus leaving students to puzzle out on their own the reasons for events and actions and the implications for future developments (Armbruster and Anderson, 1984).

Use of social studies textbooks

Many writers comment on the prevalence of textbooks in social studies. Tyson and Woodward (1989), for example, say “textbooks are a pervasive feature of American classrooms. Numerous studies report that textbooks structure from 75 to 90 percent of classroom instruction. In most subject areas, textbooks define the scope and sequence of instruction and the accompanying
teacher guides (especially at the elementary school level) provide a road map from which few teachers make major changes” (p. 14). Social studies, then, seem typical, with Superka, Hawke, and Morrissett reporting in 1980, “The findings of recent research studies emphatically point out that certain curriculum materials, especially commercially published textbooks, are the central tool for teaching social studies . . . According to an EPIE study, 90 percent of classroom time is spent using curriculum materials. Most of this time (about two thirds) is spent using printed materials, primarily textbooks. This centrality of the textbooks is confirmed in the NCSS and ASCD interpretive reports” (p.315-316). Frequent reference is made to the dominance of textbooks in general, and in social studies classrooms in particular (for example, Morrissett 1984; Smith and Feathers 1983b; Vocke, 1989; Wade 1983; Woodward 1987).

Some writers, however, dispute this dominance. Alvermann, Dillon, O'Brien, and Smith (1985) comment, for example, “According to reports based on content area classroom observation studies, students depend upon the teacher's lecture, not the text, as their primary source of information” (p. 5). They also concluded that even teachers minimize the text's role as a primary source of information. In their analysis of homework assignments they found that “fewer than 1% of those assignments reflected the expectation that students would develop concepts from reading their textbook” (p. 50). Smith and Feathers (1983b) have taken a leading role in challenging the conventional
wisdom. "The conclusions we have drawn from the teacher and student behaviors in these classes provide a basis for questioning the common assumption that reading is an integral part of content area classes and that students need to read content area texts. . . . for most students reading was neither meaningful nor necessary. " (p. 266). Ratekin, Simpson, Alvermann, and Dishner (1985) echo these findings.

Sosniak and Perlman (1990) studied high school students and their perceptions of the four core academic courses of English, mathematics, history (or related social sciences), and science. A major focus of their study was the use of textbooks since "from the students' point of view the bulk of experiences with academic work is organized around the textbooks available for the class" (p. 428). Students reported that their history or social studies textbooks, in contrast to their English textbooks, served as a source of knowledge, rather than the source of knowledge. Acquisition of knowledge was certainly dominated by the textbook but the knowledge of most worth, and the manner of acquiring it, was not limited to the textbook. Teacher talk and student discussion apparently contributed significantly to student understanding and acquisition of knowledge, a finding surprising to the researchers. Their study, then, suggests that, at least in some instances, social studies textbooks are used as a stepping-stone rather than the source of all course knowledge and understanding.
There may be some question about how much textbooks are in fact used by teachers and students of social studies. Indeed, this is a question that clearly merits further study. There is, however, little question that textbooks are purchased for use in most social studies classrooms and that they are used with a high degree of frequency.

*The authority of textbooks*

Olson (1980) flatly states, "textbooks are the primary educational resource of the school... Nor is the reliance on textbooks waning" (p. 189). Olson maintains that this centrality, and indeed dominance, of textbooks comes from the authority of texts. Textbooks are understood by students and community to be the authorized version of what their society accepts as knowledge. It is the students' responsibility to learn this authorized knowledge, not to disagree with it. Olson suggests that text authority originates with the particular linguistic structures which make texts inaccessible until students master these structures, and that texts appear "above criticism" because the separation of the speaker from the reader makes the works impersonal and provides an impression of objectivity and authority.

Others modify this view, claiming that the social structure of schools significantly impacts on the status and authority of textbooks. For example, "Today... the techniques of curriculum development are evaluation driven,
so that what counts as curricular knowledge is largely a function of how and by what criteria the acquisition of text knowledge is evaluated" (Luke, De Castell, and Luke, 1983, p. 116). It may be the teacher's interpretation of what needs to be learned for the test that defines for students what must be acquired as knowledge. Although printed discourse ideally is more open to criticism than speech because it can more easily be subjected to critical analysis, in most school situations "neither text nor teacher utterance is criticized forcefully, much less critically analyzed. . . . [and the student] assumes an acquiescent, nonauthoritative status in relation to both texts and teacher" (p. 119). The text, then, is filtered through the teacher and, "How and what the student learns from the text is highly dependent on the specific manner in which the text is taught; instructional practices delimit the pragmatic context within which the text is read and interpreted." (p. 117) Perhaps it is the teacher who has the ultimate authority over the textbook.

Aronowitz and Giroux (1991) view textual authority in the wider context of the struggle over the relationship between power and knowledge. Such authority is the ground on which knowledge is produced and legitimatized. They note, "power legitimates a particular view of the world, and privilege legitimates a specific rendering of knowledge" (p. 236). They are critical of Bloom (1987) and Hirsch (1988) who, they maintain, "cling to a notion of textual authority that neither produces critical citizens nor provides the
foundation for a pedagogy in which the conditions of learning might become possible for the vast majority of diverse peoples who live in this society” (p. 238).

If textbooks have such authority as the official version of knowledge accepted by society, then analysis of their content should lead to understanding of what the society considers important to transmit to the next generation. Textbooks can thus provide a window onto the society which produces them.

THE CRITICS

The question of bias and interpretation

Critics claim that social studies textbooks are biased (Anyon. 1979; Clements, 1987; Dance, 1960; Romanisch, 1983). Textbooks are neither objective nor fair. Anyon (1979) expresses the complaint, declaring that textbooks “will most likely not be objective, neutral or without a social point of view. Rather, they may be expected to contain highly positive evaluative statements which justify and protect prevailing social arrangements” (p. 42). Romanish (1983) carries the attack even farther. “To impose on the young a set of beliefs and economic teachings without full opportunity to investigate and understand alternatives is to ape the pedagogical practices of those who are accused of indoctrination” (p. 2). Clements (1987) is even less complimentary. He simply says of textbooks, “they lie” (p.88).
In writing of school textbooks, Dance (1960) refers to the bias of inertia. "We are so accustomed to thinking along well-worn lines that we rarely make the intellectual effort needed to strike out along lines of our own" (p. 47) Textbook publishers and students alike participate in this. It is understandably difficult and time consuming to develop new ways of thinking and doing things. Inertia rather than deliberate decision can and does cause much of the bias in textbooks and in classrooms.

More commonly, textbook analysts comment on bias caused by omission. They identify the picture as incomplete, thus biased or slanted because so much has been left out. Romanish (1983) in his study of secondary economics textbooks says, for example, "The ideological bias in the texts exists in two basic forms. First, they present free enterprise principles to the exclusion of other ideas" (p. 18). Bias thus is a matter of omission of alternative systems. Barger (1990) claims "It may be that pre-college descriptions of the presidency are not so much wrong as incomplete. 'Errors of omission' are fairly common" (p. 68). In a third example Miller and Rose (1983) discovered "faulty analyses and omission of facts concerning the Great Depression" in the American history textbooks they studied (p. 68). They placed blame primarily on problems of marketing but also suggest problems caused by faulty scholarship. Textbook writers simply weren't aware of the most recent scholarly findings. A number of researchers acknowledge space
limitations as the reason for many of the omissions, but also call for hard decisions to be made and priority to be given to the topics of greatest significance (for example, Dance, 1960; Fleming, 1983). Dance says “it is idle for history teachers to pretend that their lessons and their textbooks are too full to take in more. There will be space enough for the weightier matters we neglect at present when we have thrown overboard some of that super-cargo with which we still permit ourselves to be encumbered” (p. 52).

White (1988) takes a somewhat different view, contending “Knowledge in history, (or in political science, economics, anthropology, or sociology) is constructed by specific authors who are not neutral and who are influenced, either positively or negatively, by the ‘accepted cultural and intellectual explanations’ of the day” (p. 117). She maintains that knowledge is always constructed and is thus an act of interpretation. “Even accounts that strive for a detached, impersonal style are still interpretative, as the author must select which events and aspects of events to include in his/her account and which to remain silent about. . . The transformation of events into discourse is an interpretative act and an evaluative one too.” (p. 118)

Critics are perhaps justified in pointing out the bias in textbooks, including those for social studies. Teachers and students bring to the text their own backgrounds, experiences, and beliefs. The challenge is for social studies educators to recognize this phenomenon and to deal with it. Identifying the
way in which beliefs and attitudes are reflected in textbooks may assist educators to achieve this.

*The lack of "substantial knowledge"

Many critics stress the lack of substantial knowledge in textbooks. Their concern focuses on how the text presents content as well as on the content itself. Style and content are, in fact, inextricably intertwined. Often it is not so much what is said, nor the manner in which it is written, as the silences which fail to develop substantial knowledge. A major criticism made by analysts of social studies textbooks is that they are bland, superficial, and vacuous and thus lack the substantial knowledge that gives meaning to school learning. Cheney describes elementary social studies textbooks as superficial because they belabor what is obvious even to six, seven, and eight year olds (Cheney, 1987) and she claims of textbooks in general that many “are so dull that no one would read them voluntarily” (Cheney, 1991, p.7). She further maintains, “We continue to teach history with textbooks that drain all drama out of the past” (Cheney, 1991, p. 7). Larkins, Hawkins, and Gilmore (1987) classify much information they found in primary social studies textbooks as noninformative because it was needlessly redundant, superfluous, or inappropriate. FitzGerald (1979) claims that current texts have achieved an “excess of noninformation” (p. 155).
Some researchers focus on specific aspects of the overall problem. FitzGerald (1979), for example, focuses on the way in which individual people, which she calls characters, are treated in textbooks. The "neglect of character in the schoolbooks is an aesthetic impoverishment. In the days of Muzzey, American history had gentlemen, shysters, hotheads, statesmen, and fools; it now has only cipher people, who say very little and think nothing --- who have no passions and no logic" (p. 154). Graves and Slater's study of the characteristics of a successful text, in which they used passages taken from a popular high school United States history textbook, suggests "attempts directed at enlivening the passages, giving them more verve, making them less impersonal, and providing more human drama --- produced by far the strongest effects. . . Writing first-rate texts . . requires attention to structure, attention to content, and attention to style" (Graves and Slater, 1986, p. 39). Geertz (1978) argues that while social scientists write about big ideas, which he calls "Grand Realities," these big ideas are connected to and grow out of the study of "local truths." It is through elaborated findings produced over a long time that the big ideas are given meaning. He concludes, "The aim is to draw large conclusions from small, but very densely textured facts; to support broad assertions . . by engaging them with complex specifics" (p. 28). White (1988) echoes the thought, saying "In social studies texts the topics must be both significant within a social studies discipline, sufficiently simple so that students
can understand them, yet sufficiently complex so that grasping the concept helps to reorganize the students’ understanding of what they have previously learned” (p. 122). It is exactly this “substantial knowledge” that the critics claim is missing from social studies textbooks.

World history textbooks are not specifically mentioned by the critics but, considering the vast sweep of events and people they must present, it is important to consider the style and kind of knowledge presented. Are students presented with the “densely textured facts” and engaged with the complex specifics essential to reorganize their previously learned knowledge? Cheney certainly implies they are not. What do world history textbooks tell us?

**Depth versus coverage, the "mentioning" problem**

“Mentioning,” a term coined by researcher Dolores Durkin at the University of Illinois (Tyson-Bernstein, 1985), is one of the most pervasive problems of contemporary textbooks. “Books prepared for nearly every grade level and subject matter introduce too many topics and cover them too superficially” says Tyson-Bernstein (1985, p. 26). She goes on to assert that social studies books are particular problem areas. In *Conspiracy of Good Intentions*, she further expounds on the idea. “Books accused of ‘mentioning’ are generally long on facts and terms but short on ideas and explanations. Without the necessary context, readers often fail to see the significance of the
connections between statements” (1988, p. 27). She blames the education community itself, “followed closely by narrow special interest groups and by publishers all too willing to please everyone” (1985, p. 44). To Tyson-Bernstein the solution seems to lie in the realm of leadership. Curriculum leaders need to make realistic assessments of what can be taught during the course or school year and to make distinctions between course content and book content. Interest group leaders need to understand the consequences of their demands and to move away from the extensive checklists which check content for fairness. It is essential for state boards of education, local adoption committees, and special interest groups to work cooperatively to review their criteria in light of evidence about the negative educational effects of mentioning (1985).

Tyson-Bernstein is not alone in her concern about “mentioning.” Woodward (1987) comments that there is a fine line between breadth and depth of coverage. “Unfortunately, publishers and authors tend to sacrifice in-depth presentation for content coverage,” as he reported on his study of social studies textbooks in which he found “truncated and confusing coverage of many topics” (p. 522). Newmann (1988) comments that due to the “addiction to coverage” students spend so little time on each topic that they are able to develop nothing but a superficial understanding of anything. Downey (1988) contends that “a shallow ‘cultural literacy’ approach to concept development
in history is not supported by the research. Instead, studies link cognition to context, and to a framework of experiences rich enough to provide more than surface features of concepts” (p. 340).

Cheney (1991) points out a specific part of the problem. “Another admirable goal that textbook publishers have set in recent years is to include more women and minorities. . . All too often, however, textbooks include individuals from these groups only by ‘mentioning’ them rather than by giving a full account of their lives and contributions” (p. 8). Apple and Christian-Smith (1991) view this as simply one more way dominance is maintained. Selected elements of the knowledge of oppositional cultures are integrated into the dominant tradition, thus bringing them into close association and integrating them into the values of powerful groups. Speaking from the viewpoint of an author of textbooks in history and social studies, King (1985) comments on the space limitations that are part of the cause of the problem.

Space limitations, for instance, prevent any real airing of opposing viewpoints or the reasoning behind them. Every issue is distilled down to a few information-packed sentences. . . Another outcome of the textbook’s space constraints is that the authors have no chance to develop a narrative thread --- a “story line,” biographical sketch, or case study with which the reader can identify. This matter of narrative is critical. It stimulates student interest and enables the reader to
encounter believable people in believable situations. This is the key in helping students become aware of the connections between what is happening “out there” and what goes on in their own lives and communities (p. 66).

Hirsch, (1987) on the other hand, calls for coverage, maintaining that there is a body of historical events and persons that should be known by every “culturally literate” citizen. He avers that this body of essential knowledge has not been fully covered in American history textbooks. “We should,” he says, “teach more surveys that cover large movements of human thought and experience” (p. 132).

The whole question of depth versus coverage is indeed puzzling. How much, or how little, is included in the world history textbook may not be related to how much the student learns, but it seems clear that at least some information is essential. The mention of a person’s name in passing provides the student with little notion or understanding of why that person is important or, indeed, of who the person might have been.

**WHOSE MYTHS? WHOSE KNOWLEDGE?:**

**THE DETERMINERS OF CONTENT**

Studies indicate that textbooks determine in large measure the content of instruction. Textbooks, then, may determine the degree and nature of access
students have to knowledge of history and the related social sciences. Fleming (1992) poses a number of pertinent questions about the priorities which determine the content of social studies textbooks. Should textbooks focus on depth or should they serve as encyclopedic reference works? What is significant knowledge? What bias is reflected in the choice of information to include or exclude from textbooks? Who makes the decisions to omit or retain information? Who should make the decisions? What is the role of curriculum? All are cogent questions if one is to understand why textbooks contain what they do.

**Social class**

Anyon (1981) argues that there are distinct patterns of instruction and materials for students of different social classes and that this is not accidental. In her study of fifth grade classrooms she addresses the question of the role of the textbooks, commenting that the schools in her study used different social studies textbooks and related instructional materials. There were several curriculum similarities among the schools but each school chose its own social studies textbook.

The texts chosen by the fifth-grade teachers in the working-class schools contained less information, fewer inquiry or independent research activities, and more of an emphasis on social studies knowledge as facts to be remembered than the texts used in any other school of this study.
... A striking characteristic of the textbook is the paucity of information (p. 8).

She found the history of powerful groups was emphasized and there was less information on minorities, women's rights, and the working class than in the texts used in the middle, professional, and executive class schools. She concludes that what constitutes school knowledge in the working class schools is “fragmented facts, isolated from context and connection to each other or to wider bodies of meaning, or to activity, or biography of the students” (p. 12).

Other studies (for example, Sosniak and Perlman 1990; Stodolsky 1988) report findings that are not entirely consistent with Anyon's findings, indicating a need for further studies of subject-specific distinctions in different social class settings. While the present study does not deal with the topic of social class settings directly nor does Anyon address secondary world history textbooks, Anyon's study is significant here for the questions it intimates about the content of world history textbooks. For example, do the textbooks agree on the characteristics of hero and villain? Do they deal with the same people or with people in the same fields of endeavor? If there are differences, are the texts used in different social settings? The present study can only identify the differences or similarities. Further studies would be helpful in determining different patterns of textbook content and use in different social settings.
The publishers

Publishing companies certainly play a major role in determining textbook content. Apple (1985) suggests that it is possible to ascertain at least some of those who make decisions about what is to be included in textbooks, "thus what students are to receive as 'official knowledge'" (p. 153). He maintains that decisions are made by predominantly male editors whose background in marketing leads them to focus on financial capital, short-term perspectives, and high profit margins as major goals. Competition among a dwindling number of textbook publishing firms has reduced the willingness to take risks. Publishers increasingly prefer to concentrate their efforts on a smaller selection of textbooks carefully chosen to sell. Apple goes on to point out that "the bottom line" is not the full story however. Although market exigencies limit their behavior, editors and other employees in fact have "relative autonomy." They are at least partly free to respond to the nature of their craft and to the internal needs and practices of the publishing company itself. "The past histories of gender, class, and race relations and the actual 'local' political economy of publishing set the boundaries within which these decisions are made and in large part determine who will make the decisions" (p. 158). Promotion practices within the company, political dynamics, and internal relationships determine the kinds of discourse which dominate meetings and discussions, and thus the decision-making process.
Both Apple (1985) and FitzGerald (1979) comment on the phenomenon of the "managed" or "developed" texts that have become a prominent feature of textbook publishing. Specifications for the manuscript, prose style, reading level, and choice of content to be emphasized may be determined largely by the editor, not by the author. "Ghost-written under conditions of stringent cost controls, geared to what will sell, and not necessarily what is most important to know. . . . the managed text is a significant phenomenon and deserves a good deal of critical attention not only at the college level but in elementary and secondary schools as well" (Apple, 1985, p. 154). There is another aspect to the problem. If a textbook is successful it will be revised and reissued every three or four years in response to selection committee demands for up-to-date texts. Even small revisions can alter the nature of the book. "If you look through the various editions of the very long-lived textbooks," says FitzGerald, "you will see the book changing like a Brunswick stew or a customized stock car" (FitzGerald, 1979, p. 27). What the author's name on the cover signifies, then, is questionable.

Keith (1991) notes that there is practically no information to document publishers' decisions to exclude or include material. Numerous writers call for additional research into the textbook publishing process (for example Cody 1990; Doyle, 1984).
Adoption practices

The system of adoption has a significant impact on the content of textbooks. About half the states practice some form of state-level control on the selection of textbooks (FitzGerald, 1979; Keith, 1991). Practices vary widely among these states. In some, only a few books are adopted in each category. Indeed, a single title may be adopted for the entire state. In others, only a few are weeded out and the decision is left in reality to the local jurisdiction. In the other states, frequently referred to as non-adoption states, school districts have adoption authority and usually rely on committees to examine the publishers' offerings. Practices vary more widely even than in the state-level, or adoption, states. The whole system is dominated by the adoption states and the big-city adoption units, especially the ones that narrow their selections to one or two texts in each category. "The recommendation of a social studies book by the Texas State Textbook Committee can make a difference of hundreds of thousands of dollars to a publisher. Consequently, that committee has traditionally had a strong influence on the content of texts" (FitzGerald, 1979, p. 33). To Texas, Keith (1991) adds Florida and California to make a triumvirate of dominant states. Apple (1985) notes that these influential states are in the southern tier of states and concludes "the political and ideological climate of these primarily southern states often determines the content and form of the purchased curriculum [i.e. the textbook] throughout
the rest of the nation" (p. 156).

Cody (1990) suggests that, while this may be true, the important decisions about textbook adoption continue to be made at the local level where community politics are most intimate and most divisive and where the final decision-making body is a local school board accountable to the community. Mel and Norma Gabler, much publicized textbook critics of the 1970's and 1980's advise their readers that, "We've demonstrated in Texas that changes can be made in textbooks, that better books can be made. You can do it in your schools" (Gabler, 1985, p. 160) and then proceed with a chapter of instructions on "How to get better books into your schools and survive" (title, chapter 11, p. 163). The chapter concludes with the message, "Textbooks didn't become instruments of social change and Humanist propaganda overnight. It will take time to change them. Hang in there. Learn from your bloopers. When knocked down, get up and get back in the fight. You've learned what not to do next time" (p. 173). Local commitment and community ties account for much of the pervasive influence of the external pressure of special interests of citizens’ groups on the content of textbooks.

Pressure groups

Pressures from those concerned about societal and personal values continue to influence the content of social studies textbooks. Controversies
have raged concerning globalism, race, sex roles, affirmative action, religion, patriotism, family relationships, economic systems, and much more. To the Gabler’s (1985) the basic issue is simple. “Which principles will shape the minds of our children? Those which uphold family, morality, freedom, individuality, and free enterprise; or those which advocate atheism, evolution, secularism, and a collectivism in which an elite governs and regulates religion, parenthood, education, property, and the lifestyle of all members of society” (pp. 31-32)? Attacks have come from all directions. Everyone wants to get into the act, except perhaps (as FitzGerald notes), the academic community. “Most scholars do not take secondary school (or even college) textbooks seriously. . . .” (p. 43). Groups have formed seeking to reform society by controlling what students read and, by extension, what they will grow up believing (Cody, 1990). They have pressured state legislators and school boards. They have taken local school boards to court and the ensuing controversies have split communities and erupted into violence. Apple (1991) reminds us that these conflicts over texts signify profound political, economic, and cultural relations and histories. “Conflicts over texts are often proxies for wider questions of power relations” (p. 7). Schools may well be, as both Woodward and FitzGerald suggest, the “lightning rods of American society” (FitzGerald, 1979, p. 42; Woodward and Elliott, 1990, p. 147).

How have these controversies and external pressures influenced the
content of world history textbooks? Are the values expressed either explicitly or implicitly, those of white middle-class, male America, or do they include those of “the militant ethnic and racial groups, atheists, agnostics, church and state separatists, values clarifiers, sex educationists, Zionists, women’s rights and anti-sexist enthusiasts, homosexuals, egalitarians, bilingualists, nuclear disarmers, and many more . . .” (English, 1986, p. 48), who have insisted on content inclusion or exclusion over the past few decades?

In a detailed study of Texas adoption practices through three adoption cycles, Marshall (1991) determined that, despite Mel and Norma Gabler, “protestors” had little apparent effect on textbook selections, and thus had little influence on textbook content. In a three-tiered selection process, the protestors exerted most influence on State Board of Education members, a body which in the Texas adoption process may ask for content changes and may decide to remove some books from the list but may not add books to the list.

Many critics of textbooks (for example, Cheney, 1991; English, 1986; FitzGerald, 1979) have blamed these pressures and controversies for the dull and vapid nature of textbooks as publishers have attempted to produce tomes acceptable to all and offensive to none. “The result is monotony, sameness, blandness, glossiness, a vapid style and an elusive quality that make young readers despise and hate them” (English, 1986, p. 48).
MYTHS AND MYTHMAKING

Definition

Scholars have variously labeled an essentially human phenomenon: McNeill (1986) calls it myth, or sometimes public myth, and created the term mythistory; Marcus (1960) writes of mystique, mystique-sense, values, and myth-events; Finley (1975) and Kammen (1991) write of tradition and myth; Murray (1960) speaks of social myths and modern mythology; Lewis (1975) writes of remembered, recovered, and invented history; and Bruner (1960) writes of mythic image and of mythic confusion. Their definitions and discussions, however, remain remarkably similar, and they are useful as a way of thinking about school history textbooks and their contents. We can assume that no history textbook, and certainly no world history textbook, contains everything of history. Selection of events and people and a way in which to present them is inevitable. The question is, who selects and what are the bases for selection? The myths of the society play a pivotal role in this selection process.

A definition of myth might be useful at this juncture. McNeill (1982) writes, “myths are general statements about the world and its parts, and in particular about nations and other human in-groups, that are believed to be true and then acted on whenever circumstances suggest or require common response” (p. 23). McNeill and Schorer both state quite clearly that they are
not talking about myth in the sense of fabulous story or untruth. "Even a loose
definition does not include, however, the current journalistic sense of
falsehood, nor does it imply anti-intellectualism or any such pejorative" (Schorer, 1960, p. 354). McNeill (1986) points out the "elastic, inexact
cracter of truth, especially of truths about human conduct" (p. 7) and
comments that while myth is based more on faith than on fact, it is perceived
as "true belief" by those who belong to the group even if it may also be
perceived as untruth by those outside the group. Since it is what the group
believes that shapes its action, the question of true or untrue seems irrelevant.
Schorer (1960) says, "Myth is fundamental, the dramatic representation of our
deepest instinctual life, of a primary awareness of man in the universe, capable
of many configurations, upon which all particular opinions and attitudes
depend" (p. 356). Ausband (1983) defines myth as "tales that are accepted, on
the whole, as either true to historical fact or as reinforcing and demonstrating
a society's understanding of the truth about natural phenomena, and which are
treated seriously by most members of the society" (p. 6).

Myths, as used here, will be defined as the beliefs and attitudes
generally accepted by members of a group as explanation of the way their
world is. Myths are accepted by the group as true and proper explanations of
social and natural phenomena and determine much of the behavior of the
group, especially when a situation requires a unified response.
The necessity of myths

Myths are necessary to the individual. Schorer (1960) maintains, "Myths are the instruments by which we continually struggle to make our experience intelligible to ourselves" (p. 355). They give philosophical meaning and organization to the facts of ordinary life. Thomas Mann (1960) suggests that if a person existed merely in the unique and the present he wouldn't know how to conduct himself at all. The "timeless schema" provided by society's myths provide the pattern for behavior. Mythical identification, then, is important in the education of the youth of a society. The child learns about and comes to identify with the mythic heroes who are identified by the adults in his world and seen through the lens of the standards and values peculiar to the society. (Ausband, 1983; Marcus, 1960)

MacIntyre (1967) approaches the necessity of myth from the viewpoint of the society as a whole, suggesting that the function of myth is "to render intellectually and socially tolerable what would otherwise be experienced as incoherence. The myth is a form in which society both understands and misunderstands its own structure" (p. 436). McNeill (1986) expands on this approach, asserting that myths provide the bond between members of the group. Myths are the cement that holds the group together and provides the distinction between "us" and "them." They provide the coherence and rationale for the group and inform members of appropriate action when
common action is called for. Kammen (1991) regards this sense of social cohesion as especially important in the United States where religious, ethnic, and regional diversity are such powerful forces.

Myths change

McNeill (1986) reminds us that myths are not static. Groups constantly assess and revise their myths, rejecting them as necessary to achieve desired results in changing circumstances. Though the myths may change as societies change, the need for myth remains constant. When myths are discredited and rejected and not replaced by new ones, an essentially dangerous situation exists since this “erodes the basis for common action that once bound those who believed into a public body, capable of acting together” (McNeill, 1982, p. 25). Finley (1968) goes so far as to say “so long as the tradition is accepted, it works, and it must work if the society is not to fall apart” (p. 27).

The role of the school

Schools, among others, transmit and sustain society’s beliefs and myths (Finely, 1968; McNeill, 1982). There is a curious lurch here. Even while the student is taught to honor societal beliefs and values, those myths may be discredited and perhaps have already been discarded. Textbooks and curricula are the products of the world of teachers, textbook publishers, and policy setters. They may not reflect the most recent myth changes. We must consider
also that the student's group or "crowd" has its own values and its own myths, peopled with heroes and tales that may be different from those of the adult world of textbook and curriculum. These student myths, too, determine behavior and may, in fact, foreshadow the myths of the next generation of textbook producers and users.

*Myths used to legitimize action*

A final point is a word of caution regarding the role of myth in determining the content of history textbooks. Finley (1968) suggests that group memory may deliberately be created to serve a purpose known only to the one who does so. The objective may be "the enhancement of prestige or the warranty of power or the justification of an institution" (pp. 27, 28). Kammen (1991) warns, "traditions are commonly relied upon by whose who possess the power to achieve an illusion of social consensus. Such people invoke the legitimacy of an artificially constructed past in order to buttress presentist assumptions and the authority of a regime" (pp. 4, 5). Lewis (1975) and McNeill (1982) echo these sentiments, suggesting the potentially directive nature of myths and the possibility that they may be the creation of but a fragment of the over-all group.
OF HEROES AND VILLAINS

Uses

A society's heroes\(^2\) are the embodiment of its myths. The hero's actions and words may be more dramatic and more influential than those of the ordinary man but they just as surely express commonly held beliefs and values (Fishwick, 1954). Heroic acts and personalities may vary from epoch to epoch and from culture to culture. The same actions in another time or place may not be the stuff of which heroes are made. If the particular variations from the norm are not useful at the time, they will be rejected or ignored. If useful, however, their perpetuator will be honored above others (Wecter, 1941, pp. 6-7). "Different ages and cultures vary the heroic personality, but all heroes are true to their age," says Fishwick (1954, p. 3).

School textbooks may be in a strange position here. If they reflect their own time and society, how do they deal with the heroes and villains of other times and other places? Are heroic characteristics those of the time and place of the hero, or the time and place of the textbook?

Since myths are the way we explain or make intelligible our experiences, the hero is useful as a point of entry to understanding ourselves. As Butler (1979) expresses it, "a function of the hero is to portray us to ourselves" (p.

\(^2\) As noted earlier, hero will be used in a masculine form and the pronoun "he" will be used, but both will refer to heroes and heroines.
14). We can identify with a person who expresses our own hopes and fears, our own beliefs about the world and why it is as it is. This seems to be a universal human quality. "The search for heroes is inherent in human nature" Fishwick wrote in 1954 (p. 3), and again in 1983 (p. 9). Wecter (1941) writes of hero worship as "satisfying a hunger of the human heart" (p. 4). The hero is not only explanation but something more. Heroes may be not only useful but essential.

*Where do heroes come from?*

Where do heroes come from? Butler (1979) says the hero "is generated by the needs of ordinary mortals. He is the answer to our prayers and will do those things which we are completely incapable of doing for ourselves" (p. 5). Fishwick (1954) maintains that the hero is created by public recognition but he is careful to note that the reason for the recognition, the merit, is independent of the recognition. He also talks of devotees of heroes "who create a mythical image and a second life for them" (p. 229). Others make statements about the media, or the strong man, creating heroes for their own purposes. Hook (1943), for example, says "Today, more than ever before, belief in 'the hero' is a synthetic product. Whoever controls the microphones and printing presses can make or unmake belief overnight. If greatness be defined in terms of popular acclaim, as some hasty writers have suggested,
then it may be thrust upon the modern dictator. But if it is not thrust upon him, he can easily arrange for it” (p. 10). McNeill (1986) suggests that great public figures, who almost inevitably become the next generation of heroes, emerge when there is enough of a discrepancy between outmoded myths and current realities to be troubling. Butler (1979) echoes this view, saying, “the good guy will appear at a crisis point; a time of stress when the rules of the mundane world are inoperative or unknown” (p. 6).

How do world history textbooks approach the issue? Are heroes portrayed as explanation of human experience, as yardstick for ordinary needs, deeds, and words, as extender of human effort, or as the creation of followers or of the media . . . or of the strong man? If it is possible to determine how textbooks portray the heroes of world history, it might inform us of the qualities or characteristics of the American society that produced those texts.

*Characteristics of heroes*

Wecter (1941) sketches the qualities of heroes chosen by Americans to whom character is more important than intelligence. Heroes are hard-working, brave, honest, and loyal; they are idealists who act with tenacity and firmness. They are self-respecting, honorable, and decent individuals who exhibit a sense of fair play. American heroes stand for the concept of progress. They leave the world a better place than they found it. They are not the scholars, nor the
saints, of life. "An unexpressed American belief holds that wisdom must be practical, that it is best built not upon elaborate philosophies but on a few homely principles of common sense, buttressed with the lore of proverb and fable" (p. 479). Wecter goes on to warn that although the hero must be better and do things better than common folk, his achievements must be comprehensible. The artist, the philosopher, or the pure scientist remains a mystery and is somehow less heroic to Americans than the political leader, the astronaut, or the general. Above all, the American hero is able to translate dream into act. "The supreme leader is he who can hitch the great bandwagon to the star of American idealism" (p. 487).

Fishwick (1954) maintains that the essential qualities of heroes are difficult to identify and isolate since each hero remains unique, but he goes on to make some generalizations notwithstanding. Heroes chosen by Americans are apt to be direct and men of action. They are "solid rather than subtle." They "act while others think" (p. 6). This is perhaps a reflection of American activism and strong sense of individualism. Heroes must have large stores of inner power in order to perform heroically for Americans. They must be able to turn within for solutions. American heroes "must have the inspired ability to do important and dramatic things memorably" (p. 230).

Butler (1979) suggests that one of "the chief characteristics of the hero is his right to establish the laws of Heaven on Earth, and the concurrent right
to break any of these laws, including the most serious injunctions against murder, with impunity” (pp. 8-9).

*The hero: event maker or expression of environment?*

There is some question of whether the society creates the hero or the hero creates the society. Is the hero event-maker or is he expression of his environment? Fishwick (1954) obviously believes the latter, saying “Heroes are not born. They are the products of their time, their insight, and the work of their devotees . . . . Heroes do not make history. They are the products of historic times” (pp. 229-230).

Hook (1943) takes the opposite view. “The hero in history is the individual to whom we can justifiably attribute preponderant influence in determining an issue or event whose consequences would have been profoundly different if he had not acted as he did” (p. 154). He goes on to differentiate between the eventful men in history and the hero as the event-making man. The eventful men in history influence subsequent developments. Their actions force things to take a quite different course than would have been followed if these actions had not been taken. The eventful man, however, is not a hero. It is the event-making man who deserves that distinction, according to Hook. The event-making man is like the eventful man in that his actions influence later developments but his actions are the consequences of outstanding
capacities of intelligence, will, and character rather than of accidents of position. "It is the hero as event-making man who leaves the positive imprint of his personality upon history -- an imprint that is still observable after he has disappeared from the scene" (p. 157).

Hook poses an interesting dilemma when he defines the hero as event-maker. "If the hero is defined as an event-making individual who determines the course of history, it follows at once that a democratic community must be eternally on guard against him" (p. 229). Since participation of the governed is essential to democracy, it is interesting to contemplate whether we, as Americans, should have heroes of our own. Do we, then, look to other times and other places for our heroes? "If we were to list as heroes the event-making men of the past, we should find few of them in the histories of democratic societies. It is in conformity with the genius of democratic society that this should be so" (p. 236). If true, and if school textbooks reflect the myths of their society, then world history textbooks should describe few heroes in democracies. Brodbelt and Wall (1985) argue the point, claiming that "The heroes and heroines of the past as well as the present can become a foundation for selecting, analysing, and promoting a democratic philosophy" (p. 12).
HISTORY

Why study the past?

"Historical knowledge is no more and no less than carefully and critically constructed collective memory. As such it can make us both wiser in our public choices and more richly human in our present lives" (McNeill, 1989, p. 103). According to many scholars it is this collective memory of the past which makes us social (Becker, 1935; Chesneaux, 1978; Commager, 1965; McNeill, 1989). The shared memories of persons and of events provide the common understanding and bonds that enable us to live together in groups. McNeill (1989) explains this phenomenon. "Each such group acts as it does largely because of shared ideas and beliefs about the past and about what the past, as understood and interpreted by the group in question, tells about the present and probable future" (p. 106). Barraclough (1978) concurs, saying, "Only history can provide the insight we need for a full understanding of the working of social processes and social institutions in time" (p. 215).

Although it is of the past we speak, we must also acknowledge that the past is not isolated from the present --- contrary to what is believed by most high school students. It is history that allows us to make sense of the present. "The surviving past's most essential and pervasive benefit," says Lowenthal (1985), "is to render the present familiar. Its traces on the ground and in our minds let us make sense of the present" (p. 39).
History contributes to our self-knowledge (Collingwood, 1946; McNeill, 1989). We can know ourselves only by knowing how we resemble and how we differ from others. The study of the recorded past extends our cognizance of human differences and similarities over time and through space. History is unique in the way it provides an “opportunity for the student to step into another time and place and to experience it whole” (Downey, 1985, p. 11). It is a way to view people and events within the larger context in which they exist. Commager (1965) suggests that the past adds dimension to present places and events. Rome viewed close-up may be little more than a collection of dim buildings and traffic-clogged streets. Rome viewed through the lens of the past is a city of power, beauty, and glory.

The past validates present attitudes and actions of the student and his society as it affirms their resemblance to former ones. Previous usage puts the stamp of approval on what is done now. “Historical precedent legitimizes what exists today; we justify current practice by referring to ‘immutable’ tradition” (Lowenthal, 1985, p. 40), or to the glories of our national heritage.

The past is essential to our sense of identity. “Without this historical knowledge, this memory of things said and done, his today would be aimless and his tomorrow without significance” said Becker (1935, p. 236) of his “Everyman”. Commager (1965) suggests that history informs us that while man may not be master of his own fate, “neither is he the victim of fate.”
Individuals do count. Character does count in the overall scheme of things. This applies quite as much to communal and national identity as to individual identity.

It is commonly claimed that history provides lessons for the present and for the future. McNeill (1989) assures us that “the study of history does not lead to exact predictions for future events. [It may, indeed, foster practical wisdom, but] does not enable one to know exactly what is going to happen in the future” (p. 109). Lowenthal’s position seems especially applicable to students. “If [history] is no longer a model it remains a guide; if it cannot tell us what we should do it tells us what we might do; if it provides no specific precedent it still prefigures the present” (Lowenthal, 1985, p. 47). Chesneaux (1975) maintains that while history may not provide explicit instruction for future events, it does provide examples of the “will to struggle” and pivot points for action (p. 11).

Additionally, the study of history extends our perspective. Kammen declares that understanding the past helps us avoid the tendency to ascribe equal value to all relationships and events and to place ourselves in the center of all events (Kammen in McNeill, Kammen, & Craig, 1989). Commager (1965) points out that as our range of people and ideas are extended across time and space through the study of history, we learn of others who have faced crises, wars, turmoil, and triumph --- and survived. We extend our range of
solutions as well as problems. As we learn of human differences and similarities, we are forced to confront the pervasive belief that what works for one people or one nation at one point in time necessarily works equally well for all others (Craig, in McNeill, Kammen & Craig, 1989). Ballard (1970) relates history to students. “The justification of the study of history at the school level . . . lies in the acquisition of breadth” (p. 6).

Study of history enriches the world around us. Commager (1965) instructs us to read for pleasure and for intellectual excitement. History opens new worlds of the mind in much the way 16th century explorers opened new areas of the world to settlement and trade. Without history life would be poorer and meaner. History provides intellectual and moral experiences which give meaning to life. History enriches life as it “lengthens life’s reach by linking us with events and people prior to ourselves” (Lowenthal, 1985, p. 48). History enables us to enter into the minds and characters of the greatest thinkers and doers of the past with a degree of intimacy denied for people of our own day and our own society (Commager, 1965).

The study of history provides an asylum from the present, an escape from the lock-step work of technology and machines. “The past offers alternatives to an unacceptable present. In yesterday we find what we miss today . . . historical immersion can alleviate contemporary stress,” maintains Lowenthal (1985, p. 49).
Finally, in history we know how events ended, how things turned out. History thus provides a yardstick and a sense of stability. The past is truly over and done with. "The past is appreciated because it is over; what happened in it has ended. Termination gives it a sense of completion, of stability, of permanence lacking in the ongoing present... Completion also makes the past comprehensible; we see things more clearly when their consequences have emerged" (Lowenthal, 1985, p. 62).

**What is world history?**

World history is both the oldest and the newest study of history. Neither historians nor teachers yet fully agree on what world history is (Allardyce, 1990; Hertzberg, 1981). Early church historians identified world history as the portrayal of the universal truth of Christianity, as the story of God's people in the Middle East and in Europe. With the Enlightenment the religious ideas were replaced by moral philosophy and metaphysical abstractions but the idea of a universal history continued. As the practice of history became scientific and professional, however, the practice of world history was looked upon as outmoded and the realm of amateurs by the new historians steeped in specialized and scientific research.

World history was not completely obliterated and the ideal of universal history lingered in some areas. Based on the conviction that lasting world
peace rests on understanding among peoples, the vision of a common history was maintained by many. UNESCO set out to produce a composite world history to fulfill this vision. Each of the six volumes of *History of Mankind: Cultural and Scientific Development* was to be the work of a major historian assisted by a team of consultants and area specialists from around the world. The goal was to provide a vision of humanity as a whole and, ultimately, even a common classroom textbook for schools of all countries.

Gottschalk’s experiences in the UNESCO project were rocky and, in the end, disappointing (Allardyce, 1990). The idea of a common world history as a form of education for international understanding and world peace failed to materialize. What did emerge from Gottschalk’s twelve-year struggle to produce his volume of the six-volume series was his belief in the need to “de-Europeanize” world history. The future of the subject lay in a more pluralistic and universal approach. Europe had been the world for too long. Now it was time to make the world round.

Stavrianos turned to world history as he recognized the limitations of the traditional western civilization survey for Americans involved in larger international commitments after World War II and the Korean war. He called for a higher, unifying vision of the whole human past, a view as “that of an observer perched on the moon, surveying our planet as a whole rather than that of one which is ensconced in London or Paris, or for that matter in
Peking or Delhi” (Stavrianos, 1970, p. 3). Stavrianos was not alone in this concern. After Sputnik in 1957, concern about the need for education about nonwestern cultures became more widely shared in the United States. In 1960 Dance summarized this situation. “There are no world histories in any language which give one-fifth, let alone the just four-fifths, of their space to these great ‘colored’ civilizations, living and dead. Indeed, there are still, in Europe and America, millions of educated people capable of regarding these civilizations as unreal, and their makers as no better than barbarians.” (p. 26). With the 1958 National Defense Education Act, government, universities, and private foundations joined in the realization that instruction in foreign languages, area studies, and international education was in the national defense interests of the United States.

McNeill (1986) decried the whole idea of civilization studies as an outmoded phase in world history. The civilizations approach concentrates study on a defined geographic area, thus dividing historical experience into discrete and unrelated chunks. World history, by contrast, unites it by its emphasis on cross-cultural and global developments. He explains,

As the twentieth century draws towards its close, we live globally in a more intimate and pervasive sense than ever before, thanks to the acceleration and intensification of communication that has occurred in recent centuries. Consequently, the circumstances of our age demand
a global account of how things got to be the way they are. Only so can the world in which we live make sense (p. 90).

As Barraclough (1978) points out, “This means not only . . . a displacement of the much criticized ‘Eurocentric’ view of history . . . this is only one side of the problem: and it must be matched by a similar effort by historians elsewhere to transcend their national and ethnographic limitations, if it is to produce worthwhile results” (p. 95). To Barraclough world history is still in its beginnings.

Because it cuts into the past at a different angle from other types of history, it cuts across the lines they have traced. . . World history in its contemporary connotation is not a synthesis of known fact or a juxtaposition of the histories of different continents or cultures, arranged in some sort of order of relative importance; rather it is a search for the links and connections across political and cultural frontiers. It is concerned not so much with development in time or with the goal and meaning of history . . . as with the perennial problems which have assailed mankind everywhere and with the different responses to them (p. 162).

Development of a world history course in American high schools paralleled the controversies of the university academics and critics. General History evolved from a second-year high school course called Ancient and
Modern History and Chronology. Intended to provide historical background to the study of classical languages, it only gradually expanded to include later centuries. The course mixed biblical history and classical mythology but the direction toward a European emphasis was unmistakable. The organizing idea was clear: history was the story of the “true religion” of Christianity. As this principle of organization waned, the course turned to the secular themes of race and progress, continuing to make Europe the focus (Allardyce, 1990).

As historians became increasingly scientific and professional, high school General History became a target for criticism. The 1899 report of the American Historical Association’s Committee of Seven made the world history course obsolete by recommending one year each of ancient history, European history, English history, and American history and civil government (American Historical Association, 1899). By 1915 only 5% of over seven thousand schools reporting to the United States Commissioners of Education were still teaching the General History course. Schools had shifted to the more specialized sequence of courses (Hertzberg, 1981).

Following the First World War, some educators called for a return to a study of the world, now using the term world history to distinguish it from the older, discredited, General History. When the National Education Association asked the American Historical Association to accommodate a wider conception of history to better prepare citizens for the nation’s new
international involvement, the American Historical Association Council renounced the world history idea in spite of the fact that their own curriculum committee was in agreement with NEA and recommended a clearly world focus.\(^3\)

With subjects clamoring for school time and space, however, many educators saw world history as a way to make room not only for other subjects but also other histories, and world history began to stage a come-back. In 1924 the History Curricula Inquiry, organized by the American Historical Association to examine school curricula, reported that separate courses in ancient, medieval, and English history were shrinking as the three were increasingly being collapsed into a one-year world history course (Dawson, 1924).

The trend continued. More students enrolled in world history and fewer in all other non-American histories. For example, a survey of course offerings for 1934-35 showed that enrollment in the two one-year courses of English history and medieval and modern history had declined dramatically since 1922-23, their traditional two-year study being replaced by a one-year course in world history. The world history course involved only one-half the time but

\(^3\) The AHA Committee on History and Education for Citizenship (sometimes known as the second Committee of Eight and sometimes as the Schafer committee after its chairman, Joseph Schafer) agreed with the NEA emphasis on world history rather than European history, and in general had a world focus. Their report was debated at the AHA’s annual meeting in 1920 and the AHA Council declined to endorse the report of its own curriculum committee. The Schafer Committee full report was later published in *Historical Outlook*, Hertzberg (1981), *Social Studies Reform*, ch. 2.
included about the same proportion of the total enrollment. By the early 1960s, history in American high schools consisted fundamentally of two courses: eleventh-grade United States history, mandated by law in many states and safe-guarded everywhere by civic and patriotic organizations, and tenth-grade world history, generally an elective course (Ostendorf, 1975). Although enrollment was definitely up in world history, many considered it to be a failure. In spite of its name the course, in actual practice, focused almost entirely on western Europe. Despite this narrow focus, too much was crammed into too short a time and students did not seem to be learning much. Analysts were noting (see for example, De Bary, 1961) that there was no accepted framework in which to present world history as a whole.

A few critics called for a broader focus (for example, Ellis, 1934; Hodgson, 1944), but made little headway until the 1957 Sputnik episode led to a demand for a more global perspective in school curricula. Additional urgency was given to this widening vision of history by the rapid advance of the process of decolonization, and attacks on the old Eurocentric approach now became the most familiar criticism of world history courses. Little change was evident in world history classrooms, but as a partial response to changing conditions the 1960s saw the development of interdisciplinary global studies courses. Their aim was to educate students to the idea of global interdependence on a small and endangered planet. "Spaceship Earth" became part of the imagery
of the new movement.

The 1970s brought a back-to-basics movement in education as Americans turned away from international involvement. By 1973, members of the Kettering Foundation commission concluded that dissatisfaction with world history was probably greater than ever before. A 1979 poll by the National School Board Association pointed out that school board members and school superintendents had come to rank high the need for more instruction in basic skills, consumerism, and parenting. They ranked low the need for bilingual studies and world history (Mecklenburger, 1979). As a result, global studies withered and died. World history continued, however, in much the same form as before.

In the 1980s, critics continued to censure the emphasis on a Europeanized version of world history. Sjoquist (1986) was critical of the existing situation. “Students of Western history lack a background in world history and the picture we have painted for ourselves of civilization as a whole is one-sided and segregated. . . . It is more crucial now than ever before that the history of the West be taught within the framework of world history” (p. 240). Sjoquist raised other important issues too when he pointed out that since our classrooms are increasingly multicultural, “We are, in fact depriving some of our students of a chance to discover their cultural heritage by limiting our teaching to Western civilization and culture. Also, our own civilization has
been shaped to some degree by the influence of other civilizations and cultures. Our American cultural roots extend into the world community and are, therefore, global and not uniquely European" (Sjoquist, 1986, p. 241).

Kniep (1989) believes "there is a critical need for schools to prepare young people for life in a world increasingly characterized by pluralism, interdependence, and change" (p. 399). To do this he calls for, among other things, the study of global history "focusing on the evolution of universal and diverse human values, the historical development of contemporary global systems, and the antecedent condition and causes of today's global issues" (p. 399).

In 1985, researchers Alder and Downey reported about the world history course,

From many quarters comes the message that the course is not well taught, is not received well by students, and is confined to the unimaginative presentation of far too much detail. This is as much a problem of course design as poor teaching, the result of collapsing two years of European history into one while adding a great deal of non-European history content. Teachers of such courses are faced with trying to cover too much ground. For world history to play a vital role in the high school curriculum, some solutions must be found to this "coverage" dilemma (p. 12).
Yet, they concluded that preserving this course was the major task for teachers of history, maintaining “What the world history course needs is an adequate conceptual base” (p. 16).

Twenty five years after De Bary noted the problem, Woyach and Remy (1988) were still claiming that no teachable and generally accepted model of world history exists. “Even those models that appear in major textbooks are in reality the parallel regional and national histories of various civilizations. These parallel histories are not conceptually integrated and, as a result, do not add up to world history in any meaningful sense” (p. 484).

The question has not yet been resolved. “International studies receive scant attention, other than in world geography and world history courses, where the emphasis tends to be on geographic areas or regions or, as in the case of world history, a chronology of major events in the western world” (Becker, 1990, p. 69).

The definition of world history remains unsettled. It is commonly taught as a one-year course but that course lacks a clear conceptual base. Textbooks attempt to respond to an unclear concept by covering everything, including the kitchen sink. Designing an appropriate and usable textbook in the face of such lack of clarity and focus may, indeed, be as Fleming posed in 1989, an impossible dream.
SUMMARY

While the precise use of textbooks and the amount and type of history may be in question, both textbooks and the study of history are undeniably important to students. The exact nature and conceptual base of world history as a course of study remains somewhat cloudy but it seems clear that American students do need knowledge and understanding of the peoples of other times and other places. It is surprising, therefore, that world history textbooks have been virtually ignored by textbook analysts. Likewise, the manner in which textbooks portray the role of the individual in history has been little studied. If the myths of our society and the concomitant study of heroes and villains are important, then it is important for educators to know and understand just how they are presented in textbooks.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Social studies textbooks are created for the purpose of transmitting to youth certain information about their own and other societies. Textbooks are reflections of the beliefs and attitudes of those who determine the content, the style, and the writing of textbooks, and who are for the most part outside the school structure. However, the textbooks are also framed by the school to fit institutional needs. They are arranged in chapters which are subdivided into sections and subsections. They are heavily illustrated, and contain things deemed to be of interest to the intended audience. They contain review questions, timelines, atlases, and vocabulary which fulfill the institutional needs of instruction and accountability. Textbooks thus are socially constructed, produced by publishers in response to pressures from certain parts of the society in a form commensurate with the institutional needs of school and classroom. Thus, analysis of the product, textbooks, informs us of some of the beliefs of the society which produces them. Analysis also identifies some difficulties for successful instruction. The number of individual people included in world history textbooks presents difficulties for example. Are students to
learn about and analyze 800 people during the year at anything more than the recognition level? The attitudes and beliefs expressed as characteristic of the most important of these people may also cause instructional difficulties, especially if the beliefs of the teacher and the students do not coincide with the beliefs demonstrated by the textbooks. This study concentrated on identification of the most significant people of world history and the attitudes and beliefs about those people as portrayed by selected secondary world history textbooks.

**Selection of textbooks**

Twelve secondary level world history textbooks were analyzed. They were published in the United States for use by students in grade 10. Eleven of the textbooks comprise the current Virginia state adoption list of world history textbooks. They were selected by a state-wide committee and are used by Virginia students in grades 9 and 10. To complete the full range of world history textbooks I included one additional textbook, *Exploring World History*. Although this is not on the Virginia adoption list, it frequently is used for students who need a world history course but read below grade level. The textbooks are all products of major textbook publishing firms and are used throughout the nation. (See Attachment A for a list of the selected textbooks). The textbooks average about 800 pages in length. In the textbooks almost all
the pages include at least one illustration, chart, or map as well as narrative text, and many also include quotations attributed to the leading figures of world history. All textbooks include reviews, study questions, suggested activities, and other guides for students and teachers, which were not included in this study.

Identification of significant people and degree of significance in world history textbooks

The textbook index served as the entry point and I read each of the world history textbooks to ascertain the inclusion of and the degree of significance allocated to individual people. Indexes are not all-inclusive. Sometimes people are omitted entirely in the indexes or reference is made to pages on which there are no comments about the person. I read each textbook to identify incorrect index references in order to fully reflect what the textbook says to students. Insofar as possible all actual coverage was used rather than merely the references in the indexes.

I created a computer database of all individuals included in each textbook. One form was completed for each person. Basic information was included in the database about all 2190 persons. This included gender, major field of endeavor, geographic region, amount of space devoted to the person, general time period, and number and kind of illustrations. (See Attachment
B for an example of the form). Other information is important, for example race or education, and might have been included but the information is not included in the textbooks for all or most of the people named. The resulting file was used to generate a list of those people considered to be of enough significance to be included in a textbook for a secondary level survey of world history. A list was generated for each textbook and lists were compared for all of the selected textbooks.

The data was analyzed for each element of basic information in the database. I surveyed each textbook and compared the selected textbooks for their choice of individuals on the basis of gender, major field, geographic region, amount of space, and number and kind of illustrations. What is the coverage of females versus males, for example, or do any geographic regions dominate world history textbooks?

These textbooks characteristically include between 600 and 750 names. Several textbooks include over 800 names. Although many individual people do appear in all the textbooks, there is a sizeable group that appears in only one or a few of the textbooks. The 12 textbooks include altogether 2190 individual names with an average of 867 individual people in each textbook. The number of individuals included in the typical world history textbook may seem large to students but is small when compared to the number possible to include. *Webster's New Biographical Dictionary* (1983) contains nearly 30,000
entries and the somewhat more descriptive *Cambridge Biographical Dictionary* (1990) contains approximately 17,000 entries. Even if a person receives little coverage, it must be remembered that, out of the total number of possibilities, to be included at all is a mark of great significance in the opinion of the determiners of textbook content.

Reading the textbooks reveals that many of these persons are mentioned only and very little information or explanation is presented about them. Some sections are little more than lists of names appearing in paragraph fashion. This fact of mentioning was included in the analyses. People who receive one or two sentences, regardless of sentence length, were labeled *mentions*. In some cases, these people actually receive less than one sentence of coverage because several people are included in a single sentence. Each of the less-than-a-full-sentence people was treated as a separate mention.

This first step provided a list of the textbook version of the *significant* people in world history. This included all persons who are considered sufficiently significant to be included in the textbook, no matter how brief the entry. There was also enough basic information about each person to enable a break-down by each category of information. In the analyses, the *mentions* were included as a subset of the significant people of world history. They are the ones who receive the least amount of coverage. They are singled out for special treatment in order to address the criticism of mentioning. There was
no separate label used for people who receive less than one-half page but more than two sentences of narrative text, nor were they included in the analyses as a separate category or subset. They are, however, included in the total of all persons included in the textbooks.

Identification of the most significant people in world history

Those persons who receive the greatest amount of coverage, defined here as those to whom one-half page or more of text has been devoted in six or more of the textbooks, were considered to be the most significant persons in world history. It was anticipated that about two dozen people would emerge as the most significant people in world history. Twenty-one actually emerged. Comments in study or review sections or study questions were not counted in determining whether the half-page criterion has been met for a particular person. Illustrations and quotations were surveyed for all persons but were not counted as part of the one-half page of text. It is these most significant people who were further analyzed for qualities which characterize them as heroes or villains. Presumably the people students read most about and have the richest information about are the people who are considered by the student to be the most important and are the most likely role model, or examples of the characteristics most or least acceptable to the overall society.
Analysis of textbook treatment of the most significant people

Analysis presented some problems, for few models exist and none seems totally appropriate for the analysis of significant people in world history textbooks. For example, existing models of language analysis, while providing much valuable insight, do not reflect the complexities of individual behavior and ideals within the context of world history. It was anticipated that much of the analytical procedure would, of necessity, emerge out of the analysis itself. It was expected that an analytical procedure or approach would emerge that will be useful for the analysis of treatment of people in social studies textbooks for different grade levels and disciplines.

I created a second computer database (hereafter this is referred to as the Composite Database) which included more detailed information about the limited number of persons identified as the most significant people in world history. The Composite Database included all 12 of the textbooks being analyzed. Much of the information is subjective in nature and this second database appears in more narrative form than the first database. (See Attachment C for an example of the database form and Attachment D for an example of a completed form. The separate elements of the form are defined in following pages).

In order to assess whether a textbook presents a person as a hero or as a villain, or more likely, as a combination, it was first necessary to identify the
characteristics and actions attributed to the person. The context in which the person appears in the textbook is a significant factor in the development of a student's perception of the person as hero or villain. Winston Churchill without the backdrop of world war and crisis may appear as less than heroic, but his actions in the context of the Blitz, Dunkirk, and threatened invasion appear in another light. In identifying the characteristics attributed to the most significant people by the selected textbooks, three major areas were considered for each of those persons in each of the selected textbooks and entered into the Composite Database: selection of factual information, style of writing, and selection and nature of illustration.

Selection of information

The first area analyzed was selection of information. It is obviously impossible for authors to include everything known about each of the most significant people in an 800-page textbook. Selection of some information over other information is inevitable. The textbooks were read and the information presented in the textbooks about each of the 21 most significant persons was entered into the Composite Database, which included all 12 of the textbooks. It was then possible to sort the information by the following categories: information about personal life, called biographic information; information about accomplishments and major actions, called achievements; information
about the ideas that prompt a person to action, called *beliefs and goals*; and information about the major conditions and events surrounding the person’s actions, called *context*.

Once the Composite Database was complete I used it to compare treatments between individuals and among textbooks on the following questions: Do individual textbooks select the same kinds of information about each significant person? Do textbooks agree on the types of information presented? Selection of information helps to inform us of the myths of textbook publishers, educators, pressure groups, and perhaps students.

*Style of writing*

The second area that was analyzed was the style of writing about the person. Style of writing refers to the way in which words are selected and arranged in order to convey to secondary level students the information and understandings deemed important by the determiners of the content and presentation of world history textbooks. This rhetorical style may be different from the style used for more mature readers who are vitally interested in the history content.

Three aspects of writing style were considered and entered into the Composite Database for further analysis and comparison: personal traits attributed to the person, indicators of attitudinal discourse, and the structure
of explanation. Segments of the analytical approach were drawn from the writings of Crismore (1984), Armbruster and Anderson (1984), and Selander (1990). The analytical systems proposed by these authors are not for analysis of individual persons nor for world history textbooks. Therefore, no one analytical system was used in its entirety since none directly address the topic of analysis of persons in secondary textbooks. Since only 21 people were analyzed I was able to read and specifically analyze each word or phrase more carefully and at greater length than if there was a cast of thousands.

The first aspect of writing style considered was the personal traits attributed to the person. While I focused primarily on explicitly written statements I also included in the Composite Database directly implied traits wherever possible. Does the text state that the person possesses great wisdom, courage, or a tendency to violence, for example?

To address the second aspect of writing style I included in the Composite Database (See Attachment C) words, phrases, or clauses classified according to Crismore’s categorization of words, phrases, or clauses used by authors as indicators of attitudinal discourse (1984, p. 283). These categories of words, phrases, or clauses are (1) the importance of an idea or fact, called saliency; (2) the degree of certainty of assertion, called emphatics; (3) the degree of uncertainty of assertion, called hedges; and (4) the attitude toward a fact or idea, called evaluation. (p. 283). These indicators provide to students
clues of what the author intends for them to gain from reading the text. The author may, for example, write that one action was “more important” than another, that “of course” it deserves acclaim, that another person or action “perhaps” deserves some attention, or that “unfortunately” a particular action was carried out. Although Crismore found that these indicators or road signs are not always used in social studies textbooks (p. 294), where they do appear, they are powerful indicators of the beliefs and attitudes of the determiners of textbook content. In discussing these categories, Crismore limits her comments to overt author intervention in the text. To be considered an example of saliency, Crismore says that the author must specifically state “this is important.” Although Crismore says that they are not often used in social studies textbooks, they are frequently implied. I expanded the usage to include implied as well as explicit statements of Crismore’s categories of indicators of attitudinal discourse.

The third aspect of style of writing is the structure of the presentation. How are the basic units of knowledge, the facts, combined with explanation? Are the explanations complete or are students left to puzzle out on their own why certain actions were taken and the probable results? If the determiners of textbook content want students to learn certain beliefs, they presumably are explicit and specific in detailing what it is they believe students should know. Both Selander (1990) and Armbruster and Anderson (1984) suggest that social
studies textbooks of necessity explain events, actions, and achievements, as well as describe them. Indeed, the manner in which the description is written may well also be at least a part of the explanation. Armbruster and Anderson postulate that “the better structured the text and the more apparent the structure to the reader, the more likely the reader is to . . . comprehend the text.” (p.182) They go on to describe the explanations as being made up of goal, plan, action, and outcome (p. 183-4).

An example may be helpful here. Stalin’s Five Year Plans may be presented as the plan in the Armbruster and Anderson sense, but what goal is attributed to Stalin by the textbook? Were the Five Year Plans an attempt to prevent foreign invasion of the Soviet Union, as suggested by one textbook, or were they intended to build up the Soviet Union as a base for spreading the beliefs of Communism to other parts of the world, as suggested by another textbook? What was the outcome of implementation of the plans? Does the textbook describe the increases in industrial and agricultural production, or does it describe the dissatisfaction and the deaths of peasants? What do textbook determiners intend for students to learn about Stalin and his Five Year Plans?

The elements of the structure of explanation (Goal/Plan/Action/and Outcome) were identified for each important action by each most significant person in each text and summarized in the Composite Database insofar as
they appear in the textbook. Textbooks may, indeed, spell out the complete structure and thus directly inform students what they are to gain from reading the textbook or may leave it up to students to figure out the significance of actions performed by individual persons. Questions specifically addressed were: is there a consistent structure of explanation within individual textbooks? Is there agreement among textbooks about the elements of the structure of explanation about a single action? Are the structures of explanation generally complete? Are any elements of the structure generally emphasized or generally weak? The way the textbook writes about the actions of people, then, informs us of the attitudes and beliefs of those who determine textbook content and style.

*Selection and style of illustrations*

Illustrations of all of the individually named people were surveyed as indicators of the status and role of these people. Illustrations are defined as non-textual material which in some non-verbal way portray a person who is specifically identified as an actor on the stage of world history. The illustration may be a photograph, a painting, a drawing, an engraving, or an etching, either contemporary with the person or event or a modern reconstruction, or it may be a photograph of an artifact on which the person is portrayed. The person illustrated had to have been specifically identified for the illustration to be
considered for analysis. As with the narrative text, one illustration may be selected over another illustration. One person may be selected to be featured in an illustration, while another is not. While in some cases there are few illustrations to choose from, for most of the most significant people enough examples exist that the selection process may indeed indicate the beliefs and ideas of the selectors. Although the topic of illustration was not fully explored in this study, the general findings provide an additional dimension to the question of the role of individual persons in world history.

In the General Database, illustrations were categorized according to type of medium -- a photograph, a painting of the person, a graphic, or an artifact that portrays the person. Presumably the photograph accurately portrays the appearance of the person at a moment in time, but the other types are the person as portrayed or filtered by other people -- the artists. For much of history, however, the artist's portrayal is all that is available. Thus the medium, while possibly significant, is insufficient for broad conclusions.

The illustrations also were classified in the General Database by the number of people portrayed and the manner in which the person appears. The person alone in an individual portrait, was labeled a *single*; the person plus no more than four others, was labeled a *small group*; and the person plus five or more other people, was labeled a *large group*. Group illustrations were further classified as to whether the significant person is featured, that is, larger, more
vividly colored, or otherwise clearly the focal point of the illustration, and whether the person is in the center of the group but not necessarily further featured. The data was then summarized and compared by type of medium, number of people in the illustration, and mode of presentation.

Additionally, I surveyed all the people in the General Database and reported the number of significant people, as opposed to the most significant people, who receive more than one illustration in any of the textbooks. Considering that all who are included in world history textbooks are significant, it is possible to compare the textual with the illustration presentation. Do the same people receive major coverage in both written word, defined as one-half page or more of text, and in illustrations, defined as one or more illustrations in the same textbook?

Thus, it was possible to discern the myths determining textbook content about the role and character of the person by analyzing the illustrations which accompany the narrative and by comparing the coverage given by the illustrations to that given by the written word.

**Heroes and villains**

Having identified the most significant people and the characteristics of those individuals as portrayed in the selected textbooks, I classified these people as hero, villain, or a combination of both. The characteristics of
hero/villain as described in earlier pages based partially on the writings of Butler (1979), Fishwick (1954, 1983), and Wecter (1941) were used as initial benchmarks and points of comparison. These characteristics may be summarized in the following manner. Heroes are capable, hard-working, brave, honest, loyal, honorable, fair, and they exemplify progress. They are direct men and women whose actions are more dramatic and more influential than those of ordinary people but who are understandable to ordinary folk. Villains, on the other hand, may possess outstanding ability, courage, and will but they may also inflict unnecessary pain and death, be motivated by personal greed, lust, or pride, and/or they squelch progress. They are corrupt, selfish, immoral, untruthful, and possibly politically incorrect and the losers in the competition for power. Do the selected textbooks portray these important people in the manner described by earlier writers about heroes and villains, or is there some other discernable pattern of personal characteristics that may be considered as favorable, (i.e. heroic), or unfavorable, (i.e. villainous)?

Once heroes and villains were identified in each textbook, it then became possible to compare treatments among textbooks. Do the twelve world history textbooks agree in their determination of heroes and villains, for example? It also became possible to compare the characteristics, or identifiers, of hero and villain. Do they have characteristics in common? What makes them different? Are they, indeed, different? This leads us to more complex
definitions of hero and villain.

*Limitations of the study*

This study examined world history textbooks on the Virginia state social studies adoption list (plus one additional book) to determine how individual people are presented or portrayed. There are limitations to what this study can do, how this study was conducted, and to what the study can accomplish.

Only selected books were included in the study. Although the list of those selected does include a large proportion of available world history textbooks, nevertheless it does not include them all. Other textbooks may present quite a different picture of heroes and villains in world history.

As suggested earlier, the selected textbooks include altogether 2190 individual people by name. This is too many people to consider in enough depth to reach other than quite limited conclusions. It was necessary to select out of that number a small group of people on whom to focus. The selection of these people on the basis of one-half page of textual coverage is of necessity arbitrary. Additionally, I did not differentiate between materials scattered over several pages and a half-page or more of cohesive text concentrated in one place. There may indeed be a difference in treatment. Both have been simply considered as one-half page or more of coverage.

It should be noted that although one-half page of coverage has been
selected to differentiate between significant people and most significant people, that one-half page in a secondary level textbook does not include a great deal of description or information. As students must do, I drew conclusions on the basis of very limited information.

The very nature of this study is evaluative. The distinction between positive (the hero) and negative (the villain) is by nature subjective and based partially on historical context. The context is complex and based on multiple factors. Even within the confines of what selected world history textbooks present, there are too many factors to consider everything. Selection of some factors over others must be made and it is acknowledged that such selection is subjective and based at least in part on the experience and beliefs of the researcher.

The textbooks selected represent a specific point in time. They are the books on the current (1992) Virginia state adoption list for world history plus one other book. It is recognized that interpretations of historic events and people often change over time. The heroes of one decade may be the villains of another decade as new materials and information come to light. Additionally, the production of textbooks is a time-consuming process and thus textbooks are slow to incorporate the most recent scholarship. I focus here on
what the textbooks actually present rather than on what scholars write in the field of world history.

Summary

The written words and illustrations of twelve secondary level world history textbooks were analyzed to determine which people, from where, and with what attributes, are presented by the textbooks and thus may be considered the significant people in world history. A limited number of the most significant persons were identified and the textbook treatments of those people were further analyzed to determine which people are treated as heroes and which as villains, their characteristics, and the degree to which the most significant people appear as heroes or villains or a combination. The analysis includes the amount of coverage, the characteristics of heroes and villains in the view of the textbooks, and the amount of agreement among textbooks.
Chapter 4

RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

Secondary level world history textbooks include a great many individual people. They are named, identified, described, and explained by the textbooks for ninth and tenth grade students to read and study about. They are the human elements that make the revolutions, wars, literary movements, religious changes and other events real and alive. Who are these people who are included in world history textbooks and what qualities characterize their actions and achievements?

Twelve world history textbooks were selected to read and analyze in an effort to answer this question. The textbooks, all but one of which are on the current Virginia state adoption list, represent major United States textbook publishing companies and are widely used throughout the nation, as well as the state of Virginia.

The data collected in the search for an answer divides into two major types. A separate section of this report is devoted to each category. The first section deals with all of the individual people named in the 12 textbooks. They are described in terms of how many people are named in each book and the
texts are compared to determine patterns. These significant people are also described and compared in terms of small amounts of information presented about all of them in the textbooks. The analysis is based on the numbers of people appearing in specified categories.

The second section deals only with those most significant people of world history textbooks. A most significant person is defined here as one who receives one half page or more of coverage in six or more of the selected textbooks. These people are analyzed to a much greater extent since significantly greater information about them is presented in the textbooks. The analysis is based on the nature and quality of presentation about these most significant people in world history. It is this latter group of people who will ultimately be analyzed and designated as heroes and villains in an effort to describe the myths of the society which produced these textbooks.

Part I

SIGNIFICANT PEOPLE IN WORLD HISTORY TEXTBOOKS

The people named in the 12 textbooks are a fraction of the people who have played a role in world history. Considering the number of possibilities, to be included in a world history textbook at all is a sign of significance in the opinion of the determiners of textbook content. The 12 textbooks and their treatment of these significant people is described in the following pages.
Overview

The 12 textbooks summarized in Table 1 are similar in number of pages devoted to narrative text and chapter study guides. Indexes, atlases, glossaries, and similar end-of-text summaries are not included in the count. The leanest book contains 665 pages while the stoutest contains 903 pages. While it is interesting to note that the smallest book also contains the fewest individual people (367) and the largest contains the most people (912), this correlation between number of pages and number of people named does not characterize the rest of the books. The 12 textbooks examined contain an average of 782 pages each and name individually an average of 687 people each.

Table 1 also shows variety in the number of individual people named in each of the texts. The range extends from 367 people named in Merrill’s *Human Heritage* (Merrill 2) to 912 named in HBJ’s *World History: People and Nations*. Although a total of 8238 names appear in the 12 textbooks, this

---

**TABLE 1: Pages and People**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total PAGES</th>
<th>no. of PEOPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison Wesley</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Heath</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBJ</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 1</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 2</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 1</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 2</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 1</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 2</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
number includes all people named in each textbook, and therefore includes all of the duplications in various of the texts.

**TABLE 2: Texts and People**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n texts containing same name</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n persons contained in each text</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% total people</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 examines the total number of individual people as opposed to the total number of names appearing in the textbooks. When the duplication is eliminated, 2190 different individual people are named in the textbooks. Ninety seven of these people are named in all 12 textbooks. Thus, a student using any one of the 12 textbooks has an equal chance for introduction to those 97 people through reading about them in the assigned textbook. At the other end of the scale, 949 people are named in only one textbook. A student reading any one of the other 11 textbooks may hear of that person in class activities but will have no textbook reading connection with that person. If the top three and the bottom three are considered, 268 people (or 12% of the total named in the textbooks) appear in 10, 11, or 12 textbooks, and 1423 people (or 64% of the total named in the textbooks) appear in one, two, or three textbooks.

The 2190 people named in the 12 textbooks do not receive equal
coverage. Table 3 (page 94) focuses on two sub-groups of the significant people of world history. It identifies as *Most Significant People (hereafter, MSP)* those people who receive one half page or more of narrative text in any text and as *Mentions* those who are covered by one or two sentences in a particular textbook. Some in the latter category receive less than a full sentence as in the following example,

The representatives of the victorious nations met at Versailles in France. Known as the Big Four, they were Woodrow Wilson of the United States, Georges Clemenceau of France, David Lloyd George of England, and Victorio Orlando of Italy. (This is the sole reference to all but Wilson. Page 585, Prentice Hall 2, *Pageant*).

The remaining people, not included in Table 3, receive one to four or five paragraphs of coverage. Depending on style of writing, this may encompass a great deal of information or little more than that received by the Mentions. There is considerable variation in the number of people receiving substantial coverage (*i.e.* one half page or more) among the 12 textbooks. While Scott Foresman’s *Living World History* (Scott Foresman 1) contains only 20 such people. DC Heath’s *Perspectives on the Past* treats 60 people in that manner and at the same time devotes only one or two sentences to 38% of the total, fewer than the average of 47% of people who are mentioned. The categories of MSP and Mentions together comprise 52% of the total on average. The
TABLE 3: MSP and Mentioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>* MSP</th>
<th>MSP as % of total people in text</th>
<th>** MENTIONS</th>
<th>MENTIONS as % of total people in text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison Wesley</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Heath</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBJ</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MSP (Most Significant People) = ½ page or more of text

** MENTION = 1 or 2 sentences (may be more than 1 person in the sentence)

remaining 48% receive one to four or five paragraphs of coverage and are not included in this table which focuses on the groups receiving the most and the least amount of space.

All of the 12 textbooks examined include illustrations of the people named. Table 4 (page 95) includes both all people named and, in a separate category, the most significant people. Merrill’s Human Heritage (Merrill 2) includes illustrations of 35% of the individual people named in the text. The average is lower, with 16% of the people named being accompanied by an
### TABLE 4: Illustrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PEOPLE</th>
<th>people w/ILLUS</th>
<th>% people w/ILLUS</th>
<th>2+ ILLUS</th>
<th>MSP w/ILLUS</th>
<th>% MSP w/ILLUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison Wesley</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Heath</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBJ</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 1</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 2</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 1</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 2</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 1</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 2</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illustration of the person. The MSP are more frequently illustrated. On average, 65% of the MSP have an illustration to accompany the one half page or more of text describing them and their deeds.

Who are the people included in current World History textbooks? What are their characteristics? With almost all the people named, even the Mentions, there is sufficient information provided by the textbooks to determine geographic region, gender, areas of leadership, and approximate time period.
### GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS

**TABLE 5: Geographic Regions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>AMERICA</th>
<th>AFRICA</th>
<th>ASIA</th>
<th>EUROPE</th>
<th>MID EAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (% )</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison Wesley</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>88 (12)</td>
<td>49 (7)</td>
<td>95 (13)</td>
<td>459 (62)</td>
<td>36 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Heath</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>104 (12)</td>
<td>39 (6)</td>
<td>75 (9)</td>
<td>579 (68)</td>
<td>43 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>62 (14)</td>
<td>24 (5)</td>
<td>66 (15)</td>
<td>255 (58)</td>
<td>32 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBJ</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>143 (16)</td>
<td>54 (6)</td>
<td>87 (10)</td>
<td>579 (63)</td>
<td>32 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>97 (12)</td>
<td>57 (8)</td>
<td>41 (6)</td>
<td>472 (65)</td>
<td>39 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>57 (11)</td>
<td>29 (5)</td>
<td>74 (14)</td>
<td>307 (58)</td>
<td>40 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 1</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>130 (16)</td>
<td>34 (4)</td>
<td>52 (6)</td>
<td>566 (68)</td>
<td>52 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 2</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>44 (12)</td>
<td>18 (5)</td>
<td>22 (6)</td>
<td>243 (66)</td>
<td>58 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 1</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>91 (13)</td>
<td>46 (7)</td>
<td>51 (7)</td>
<td>469 (67)</td>
<td>28 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 2</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>67 (10)</td>
<td>39 (6)</td>
<td>78 (12)</td>
<td>424 (65)</td>
<td>34 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 1</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>75 (11)</td>
<td>46 (6)</td>
<td>59 (8)</td>
<td>469 (66)</td>
<td>42 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 2</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>86 (11)</td>
<td>41 (5)</td>
<td>45 (6)</td>
<td>569 (71)</td>
<td>44 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>column average</td>
<td>85 (12)</td>
<td>40 (6)</td>
<td>62 (9)</td>
<td>449 (65)</td>
<td>41 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = number of people  
% = percentage of total people in textbook

Table 5 illustrates the geographic distribution of people included in the 12 textbooks. The people included in the textbooks are not distributed evenly among the world’s major geographic regions.

America (North America, Central America and South America together) includes an average of 12% of the number of people named in the selected textbooks. However, as shown in Table 5.A (page 97), 64% of the people in the combined category America were North American and 97% of
**TABLE 5.A: America**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total People</th>
<th>N Amer total</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>CAMER</th>
<th>SAMER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison Wesley</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Heath</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>39*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBJ</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 1</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 2</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>35*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 1</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>57*</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 2</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 1</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 2</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average number</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>56*</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total for texts</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total for Amer</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total for N Amer</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*blank field accounts for differences*

those named for North America were from the United States. Canada contributes few, if any, people to these world history accounts. The number of people for each nation in Central and South America was small and scattered with no apparent pattern of distribution so those regions were not further broken down for presentation in this table.

Africa includes 6% of the total number of people contained in the
### TABLE 5.B: Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Total People</th>
<th>Total AFRICA</th>
<th>N. Africa</th>
<th>Sub-Sahara Africa</th>
<th>Ancient Egypt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison Wesley</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Heath</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBJ</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougall Littell</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 1</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 2</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 1</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 2</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 1</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 2</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average for Texts:**
- Total People: 687
- Total AFRICA: 40
- N. Africa: 16
- Sub-Sahara Africa: 24
- Ancient Egypt: 9

**% of Names in All Texts:**
- NA: 6
- NA: 2
- NA: 3
- naive: 1

**% of Names for Africa:**
- NA: NA
- NA: 39
- NA: 61
- naive: 22

Textbooks (see Table 5, page 96). Within Africa, North Africa accounts for 39% and sub-Saharan Africa for 61% of the people included. North Africa was defined as the Mediterranean littoral and includes ancient Egypt and Carthage as well as the generic north Africa and the modern nations of Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco. Sub-Saharan Africa is the rest of Africa. Ancient Egypt accounts for 57% of the North Africa entries, for 22% of the total for Africa and 1% of the total for all periods and places.

Asia shows a similar geographic distribution. Asia accounts for 9% of
### TABLE 5.C: Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total in text</th>
<th>total Asia</th>
<th>East Asia</th>
<th>SE Asia</th>
<th>S Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison Wesley</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Heath</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBJ</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal Littel</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 1</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 2</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 1</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 2</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 1</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 2</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average for texts</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of names all texts</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of names for Asia</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

East Asia: China, Japan, Korea
SE Asia: Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Burma, Philippines, Australia
S Asia: India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Nepal

the total (Table 5, page 96), the East Asian states of China, Japan, and Korea include 54% of the people named for Asia as a whole. Despite covering such a large geographic area and number of nations, the people of South East Asia appear infrequently.

Europe presents yet another picture. Table 5 illustrates that Europe, on average accounts for 65% of the people included in world history textbooks. Within Europe, western Europe predominates, as is shown in Table 5.D (1),

CH. 4, RESULTS
**TABLE 5.D (1): Europe -- West**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>all people</th>
<th>EUROPE</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>WEST</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>OMC</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison Wesley</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>107 73 41 31 60 64</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Heath</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>138 95 46 42 77 87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52 35 28 21 34 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBJ</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>146 95 58 34 67 69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>117 77 37 31 63 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>80 37 21 25 55 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 1</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>123 106 44 39 88 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 2</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61 28 14 19 32 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 1</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>106 86 38 41 62 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 2</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>96 74 28 35 61 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 1</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>123 58 29 38 66 57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 2</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>157 90 52 43 75 66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>109 71 36 33 62 56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% people/Europe</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>24 16 8 7 14 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% people/Weur</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>30 19 10 9 17 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* OMC = Other Modern Countries

Western Europe includes 82% of the people included for all of Europe. Within western Europe it is England and Scotland which predominate, with 30% of the people named for western Europe or 24% of the people named for all of Europe. The category Other Modern Countries (OMC) includes the modern nations of western Europe not listed by individual name. The textbooks include a few people of each of the modern nations of Spain, Portugal, Switzerland, Ireland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, the
Netherlands, and Luxembourg. Even grouped together they comprise only 17% of the entries for western Europe. The category Other includes people who are not confined to the area, even the approximate area, of a modern nation. They are mostly people of historic eras whose empire encompassed a number of modern nations or, in the case of the popes, are not identified in the textbooks as a resident of a specific nation but who are generally located in western Europe. This category includes the ancient Greeks and Romans as well as the Franks, the German tribes, the Holy Roman emperors, and the popes. Taken together, they have only half as many entries as do the Scots and the English.

Eastern Europe is summarized in Table 5.D (2) (page 102). The historic eras of ancient Greece and the Byzantine empire (Other on the table) predominate in the coverage of eastern Europe, comprising 43% of the entries for the region. Russia is a close second with 42% of the entries for eastern Europe. There are only a few people included who are from the other modern countries (OMC on the table) of eastern Europe, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Yugoslavia, Albania, or Serbia.

To round out the picture of geographic distribution, the Middle East accounts for 6% of the total names included in world history textbooks (see Table 5, page 96). Middle East is here defined as the geographic region bounded by the Mediterranean, Red, Arabian, Caspian, and Black Seas and
including Turkey and Iran. It is possible to view this region from the perspective of a cultural region in which case Egypt and North Africa combine with the Middle East. If this perspective were taken, the Arab world would account for 8% of the total. This, however, denies Africa the status of geographic region in the same way other continents are designated. The Middle East does, indeed, pose some problems of identification.
## GENDER

### TABLE 6: The Gender Issue

(part 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>AW</th>
<th>Gl</th>
<th>HBJ</th>
<th>He</th>
<th>HM</th>
<th>ML</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** * = 51

**% F**  = 7%

**% M**  = 93%

(part 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>PH1</th>
<th>PH2</th>
<th>SF1</th>
<th>SF2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** * = 61

**% F**  = 7%

**% M**  = 93%

\[ n = \text{number of females}; \quad * = \text{column total}; \quad ** = \% \text{of total people in texts} \]
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A second area to consider is that of gender. How frequently and to what extent are females portrayed in world history textbooks? In general there is not much variation among the textbooks. (Table 6, page 103). For most textbooks the percentage of females is around 7%. Three books reach 9% and one text includes only 4% females. Other, more complex issues might be considered as well. The largest numbers of females occurs in periods three and four, 1500-1910. This however reflects the greater number of people named in that time period overall and the percentages remain close to the overall average of 7% females in each time period.

Another concern is the relation of gender to geographic region (Table 7, page 105). Does the ratio of females to males change by geographic region? Textbooks include an average of 10% females for Asia and 3% for the Middle East and an average of 8-9% females for the other geographic regions, Europe, America, and Africa. There are much greater variations among textbooks. These variations are not consistent among geographic regions. Prentice Hall’s *Patterns of Civilization* includes 11% female in America (as opposed to an average of 8% for all textbooks) but remains at the overall average of 3% for the Middle East. Houghton Mifflin drops to 3% female for America, below the average of 8%, but climbs to 13% for Asia, above the average of 10%. The overall numbers of females, however, are small -- well below 20 in every geographic region except Europe.
TABLE 7: Gender and Geographic Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AMERICA F</th>
<th>AFRICA F</th>
<th>ASIA F</th>
<th>EUROPE F</th>
<th>MID EAST F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%) for text</td>
<td>N (%) for text</td>
<td>N (%) for text</td>
<td>N (%) for text</td>
<td>N (%) for text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison Wesley</td>
<td>11 (11)</td>
<td>4 (9)</td>
<td>9 (9)</td>
<td>25 (5)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Heath</td>
<td>10 (10)</td>
<td>4 (10)</td>
<td>9 (12)</td>
<td>50 (9)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>3 (5)</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
<td>8 (12)</td>
<td>15 (6)</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBJ</td>
<td>12 (8)</td>
<td>6 (11)</td>
<td>6 (7)</td>
<td>36 (6)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>4 (7)</td>
<td>6 (13)</td>
<td>35 (7)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>5 (7)</td>
<td>19 (6)</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 1</td>
<td>13 (10)</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
<td>4 (8)</td>
<td>39 (6)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 2</td>
<td>4 (8)</td>
<td>2 (11)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>18 (7)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 1</td>
<td>10 (11)</td>
<td>4 (9)</td>
<td>7 (14)</td>
<td>31 (7)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 2</td>
<td>3 (4)</td>
<td>5 (13)</td>
<td>7 (9)</td>
<td>41 (10)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 1</td>
<td>12 (16)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>6 (11)</td>
<td>41 (9)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 2</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>3 (7)</td>
<td>23 (4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL F</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE F</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE M</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet another concern might be considered with regard to the gender issue. Do either females or males have more mentions? In other words, the name is included but in only a cursory manner. Table 8 (page 106) indicates that while the overall average there of mentioning remains very close, 45% for females and 47% for males, once again is some variation among textbooks. In McDougal Littell’s Links Across Time and Place, for example, females are treated with mentions only 36% of the time while males are mentioned a
### TABLE 8: The Gender Issue -- Mentions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n in</td>
<td>n of</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>n in</td>
<td>n of</td>
<td>% of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>text</td>
<td>mentions</td>
<td>mentions</td>
<td>text</td>
<td>mentions</td>
<td>mentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison Wesley</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Heath</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBJ</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>593</strong></td>
<td><strong>266</strong></td>
<td><strong>45%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7543</strong></td>
<td><strong>3566</strong></td>
<td><strong>47%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>average</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>45%</strong></td>
<td><strong>629</strong></td>
<td><strong>297</strong></td>
<td><strong>47%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

somewhat higher 43%. Both are below the overall average. The highest percentage of female mentioning is by Merrill 1 where females are mentioned 70% and males are mentioned 55% of the time. It should be noted that the range among the 12 textbooks for male mentions is relatively small. 37 - 55% of males are mentions. The range for females is greater. 32 - 70% of females are mentions. But on the whole, females, although many fewer in number, are mentioned somewhat, but not significantly, less than males.
LEADERSHIP

A third topic to consider is that of category of leadership. All people were classified according to one or more of the major areas in which they are leaders: political, military, economic, religion, science, technology, the arts, philosophy, social reform, and exploration. Additionally, if the person is identified as the wife of, the daughter of, or the husband of a specific person, that classification was noted under the area of leadership. These last three relationships were noted to address how often women or men are deemed important enough to include in world history textbooks based solely, or in part, on their status as relatives.

A word of explanation is perhaps in order in relation to some leadership categories. Science and technology could be combined into a single category. The thought behind separating them was the possibility that the two categories might change in relation to each other over time. Pure sciences might appear more important or prevalent at some times and applied sciences at others. Exploration was confined to exploration of physical geography and might have been (but was not) combined with science, military, or political leadership. Since the distinction was fuzzy it was placed in a separate category of its own, despite the prediction that it would be closely tied to a single historical period and might not apply across historical periods. The arts and philosophy categories might be combined into a single category. Since textbooks
specifically label people as philosophers, however, it was decided to dedicate a separate category to them. Those leaders in what might be called economic theory caused some problems. Should they be classified under arts for their writing, economics for their economic theories, philosophy for their ideas about the bases of human life and about human interactions, or political for their influence on political ideas and practices? It was decided to classify them as the textbook labeled them for students. Thus, Karl Marx, who is variously described in the textbooks, may have been classified in any one of those major categories depending on how the specific textbook presented and labeled him. An additional point to consider is that human life does not always divide into neat, air-tight compartments. Therefore, any individual person may be classified into multiple categories. No one in fact was classified in more than three categories of leadership. In the tables, there are seeming discrepancies where columns add up to somewhat different amounts, or more, or less, than 100%. This is in part due to multiple listings and in part due to cases where the area of leadership was not clear in the textbooks and thus the category was left blank in the database.

Table 9 (page 110) clearly indicates the prevalence of political leaders in world history textbooks. Overall, 46% of those included in the 12 textbooks are identified as political leaders. Just under half of the people named in the world history textbooks are political and half are spread among the other 12
categories of leadership. The second most prevalent category is the arts, with an overall average of 15% of names included in the 12 textbooks being important in that field. As with other categories there is some variation among textbooks. In Merrill 2 and McDougal Littell, 9% of the people included are in the field of the arts, while in Merrill 1, 26% are famous for their leadership in the arts. To balance this, Merrill 1 also includes the lowest percentage of political leaders.

It is interesting to consider also the areas of leadership in which few people are included. Rivals for the low end of the scale, except for the insignificant categories of daughter of and husband of, are the categories of economics and wife of. These categories includes 1.3% and 1% respectively of the people named in the 12 textbooks.

The issue of mentioning is closely related to area of leadership. Are there categories of leadership, for example, which have a large number of people named but which are not elaborated or supported with a rich base of information? The arts appear to be such a category. Table 9 (page 110) shows the overall average percentage of people in the arts is 15%, second only to political leaders. However, as indicated in Table 10 (page 111), this category is also high in mentioning, with 64% of the people who are named receiving only a sentence or two of coverage compared to the 40% mentions in the political category. There is some variation among textbooks with, for example,
### TABLE 9: Leadership Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>political</th>
<th>military</th>
<th>economic</th>
<th>religion</th>
<th>science</th>
<th>technology</th>
<th>exploration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison Wesley</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Heath</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBJ</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 1</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 2</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 1</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 2</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 1</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 2</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total names</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (part 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>arts</th>
<th>philosophy</th>
<th>social ref</th>
<th>wife of</th>
<th>das of</th>
<th>husband of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison Wesley</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Heath</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBJ</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 1</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 1</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 2</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total names</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 10: Leadership -- Mentions

#### (part 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>political</th>
<th>military</th>
<th>economic</th>
<th>religion</th>
<th>science</th>
<th>technology</th>
<th>exploration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison Wesley</td>
<td>177 (42)</td>
<td>14 (31)</td>
<td>2 (15)</td>
<td>16 (40)</td>
<td>15 (32)</td>
<td>16 (73)</td>
<td>13 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE Heath</td>
<td>142 (32)</td>
<td>14 (21)</td>
<td>10 (43)</td>
<td>22 (34)</td>
<td>23 (45)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>86 (34)</td>
<td>11 (33)</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td>14 (56)</td>
<td>10 (38)</td>
<td>20 (69)</td>
<td>4 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBJ</td>
<td>222 (47)</td>
<td>17 (33)</td>
<td>4 (36)</td>
<td>17 (35)</td>
<td>25 (35)</td>
<td>22 (58)</td>
<td>13 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>146 (38)</td>
<td>20 (27)</td>
<td>1 (7)</td>
<td>14 (37)</td>
<td>18 (36)</td>
<td>22 (71)</td>
<td>11 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>116 (40)</td>
<td>12 (44)</td>
<td>8 (50)</td>
<td>13 (38)</td>
<td>19 (41)</td>
<td>18 (62)</td>
<td>9 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 1</td>
<td>151 (40)</td>
<td>30 (48)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26 (50)</td>
<td>35 (73)</td>
<td>29 (71)</td>
<td>19 (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 2</td>
<td>79 (37)</td>
<td>15 (45)</td>
<td>2 (50)</td>
<td>6 (17)</td>
<td>10 (56)</td>
<td>16 (73)</td>
<td>10 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 1</td>
<td>128 (35)</td>
<td>24 (40)</td>
<td>2 (12)</td>
<td>20 (39)</td>
<td>17 (35)</td>
<td>25 (76)</td>
<td>9 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 2</td>
<td>178 (44)</td>
<td>17 (41)</td>
<td>2 (29)</td>
<td>18 (44)</td>
<td>21 (64)</td>
<td>13 (87)</td>
<td>6 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foreman 1</td>
<td>143 (41)</td>
<td>15 (34)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>24 (57)</td>
<td>39 (61)</td>
<td>25 (81)</td>
<td>15 (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foreman 2</td>
<td>177 (44)</td>
<td>41 (48)</td>
<td>4 (48)</td>
<td>26 (53)</td>
<td>38 (64)</td>
<td>30 (83)</td>
<td>19 (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>aver (% mentions)</strong></td>
<td>145 (40)</td>
<td>19 (37)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>18 (41)</td>
<td>22 (48)</td>
<td>20 (65)</td>
<td>11 (44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (part 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>arts</th>
<th>philosophy</th>
<th>social ref</th>
<th>wife of</th>
<th>dau of</th>
<th>husband of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison Wesley</td>
<td>96 (68)</td>
<td>6 (21)</td>
<td>8 (50)</td>
<td>5 (62)</td>
<td>1 (33)</td>
<td>1 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE Heath</td>
<td>82 (55)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16 (37)</td>
<td>6 (26)</td>
<td>2 (67)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>33 (52)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>5 (62)</td>
<td>3 (50)</td>
<td>1 (33)</td>
<td>1 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBJ</td>
<td>117 (60)</td>
<td>7 (32)</td>
<td>9 (50)</td>
<td>9 (64)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>98 (67)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>11 (48)</td>
<td>9 (64)</td>
<td>1 (100)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>20 (43)</td>
<td>3 (18)</td>
<td>3 (33)</td>
<td>3 (43)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 1</td>
<td>168 (78)</td>
<td>7 (24)</td>
<td>4 (36)</td>
<td>8 (67)</td>
<td>2 (100)</td>
<td>1 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 2</td>
<td>19 (56)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (36)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>1 (25)</td>
<td>1 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 1</td>
<td>62 (49)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>5 (29)</td>
<td>8 (67)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 2</td>
<td>62 (67)</td>
<td>4 (24)</td>
<td>6 (40)</td>
<td>6 (60)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foreman 1</td>
<td>87 (64)</td>
<td>10 (37)</td>
<td>9 (60)</td>
<td>9 (60)</td>
<td>6 (86)</td>
<td>3 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foreman 2</td>
<td>106 (76)</td>
<td>8 (35)</td>
<td>8 (42)</td>
<td>4 (80)</td>
<td>1 (33)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>aver (% mentions)</strong></td>
<td>79 (64)</td>
<td>4 (20)</td>
<td>7 (43)</td>
<td>6 (54)</td>
<td>1 (48)</td>
<td>1 (71)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n = \) number of mentions (% mentions in category)

**Ch. 4, Results**
Merrill 1 mentioning 78% of the people they have named in the arts. It may also be significant that Merrill 1 also includes more people in the arts category than any of the other texts, with 216 people named (see Table 9, page 110). Its closest competitor includes 195 names in the arts but has the average percentage of mentions with 117 (or 60%) of those people receiving a sentence or two of description and explanation. An even higher overall percentage of mentioning (65%) is found in the technology category. The range goes as high as 87% of the people in this field receiving a one or two sentence mention in Prentice Hall 2 to a low of 58% in HBJ. The total number of people included in technology, however, is low. Prentice Hall 2 includes only 15 people, 2% of the book's total (see Table 9, page 110). An overall average of 4% of the people named in the 12 textbooks are important because of their achievements in the field of technology.

Another point to consider with regard to leadership is that of gender. Does the gender ratio vary with leadership area? Table 11 (page 113) indicates that it does, but not much. The leadership area of philosophy is the only one that is 100% male in all textbooks. There are no female philosophers. Exploration is 99% a male domain according to the textbooks. One female, Dutch explorer of Central Africa, Alexandrine Tinne, is mentioned in Prentice Hall's Pageant of World History (p. 553). Technology is likewise represented by a single female who is mentioned in two books. Although in the military
### TABLE 11: Leadership and Gender
(part 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison Wesley</td>
<td>393 (94)</td>
<td>44 (98)</td>
<td>13 (100)</td>
<td>38 (95)</td>
<td>48 (98)</td>
<td>22 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE Heath</td>
<td>406 (91)</td>
<td>65 (98)</td>
<td>24 (100)</td>
<td>61 (95)</td>
<td>50 (98)</td>
<td>34 (94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>235 (91)</td>
<td>32 (97)</td>
<td>8 (100)</td>
<td>26 (96)</td>
<td>25 (95)</td>
<td>29 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBJ</td>
<td>446 (94)</td>
<td>50 (98)</td>
<td>10 (91)</td>
<td>49 (100)</td>
<td>69 (97)</td>
<td>38 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>349 (92)</td>
<td>71 (97)</td>
<td>14 (100)</td>
<td>41 (100)</td>
<td>48 (94)</td>
<td>31 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>270 (92)</td>
<td>26 (96)</td>
<td>15 (94)</td>
<td>31 (91)</td>
<td>43 (93)</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 1</td>
<td>344 (89)</td>
<td>61 (97)</td>
<td>5 (100)</td>
<td>52 (100)</td>
<td>43 (90)</td>
<td>41 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 2</td>
<td>203 (94)</td>
<td>32 (97)</td>
<td>4 (100)</td>
<td>36 (100)</td>
<td>18 (100)</td>
<td>21 (95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 1</td>
<td>339 (92)</td>
<td>56 (93)</td>
<td>17 (100)</td>
<td>51 (100)</td>
<td>48 (100)</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 2</td>
<td>373 (93)</td>
<td>40 (96)</td>
<td>7 (100)</td>
<td>40 (96)</td>
<td>31 (94)</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 1</td>
<td>313 (90)</td>
<td>42 (95)</td>
<td>5 (83)</td>
<td>43 (98)</td>
<td>62 (98)</td>
<td>30 (97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 2</td>
<td>385 (95)</td>
<td>84 (99)</td>
<td>10 (100)</td>
<td>50 (100)</td>
<td>57 (97)</td>
<td>36 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aver (n and % males)</strong></td>
<td>338 (92)</td>
<td>50 (97)</td>
<td>11 (97)</td>
<td>43 (98)</td>
<td>45 (98)</td>
<td>30 (99)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(part 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Exploration</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Social ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison Wesley</td>
<td>25 (100)</td>
<td>131 (92)</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
<td>8 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE Heath</td>
<td>27 (100)</td>
<td>141 (95)</td>
<td>14 (100)</td>
<td>14 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe</td>
<td>13 (100)</td>
<td>59 (92)</td>
<td>11 (100)</td>
<td>7 (88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBJ</td>
<td>26 (100)</td>
<td>185 (95)</td>
<td>22 (100)</td>
<td>9 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
<td>133 (90)</td>
<td>21 (100)</td>
<td>19 (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>20 (100)</td>
<td>43 (93)</td>
<td>17 (100)</td>
<td>7 (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 1</td>
<td>27 (100)</td>
<td>197 (91)</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
<td>8 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill 2</td>
<td>22 (100)</td>
<td>34 (97)</td>
<td>8 (100)</td>
<td>7 (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 1</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
<td>116 (91)</td>
<td>21 (100)</td>
<td>14 (82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice Hall 2</td>
<td>21 (95)</td>
<td>78 (85)</td>
<td>19 (100)</td>
<td>10 (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 1</td>
<td>28 (100)</td>
<td>119 (88)</td>
<td>27 (100)</td>
<td>9 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Foresman 2</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
<td>137 (88)</td>
<td>24 (100)</td>
<td>18 (95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aver (n and % males)</strong></td>
<td>25 (99)</td>
<td>114 (92)</td>
<td>21 (100)</td>
<td>11 (70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = number of males (% of category are male)
category the percentage of males drops to 97% this is largely due to Joan of Arc who is included in every text. There are, however, some other military females mentioned, Zenobia, the Trung sisters, Matilda of England, and a trio of Central American female military leaders -- Carmen Alanis, Romona Flores, and Juana Balen Gutierrez de Mendoza -- mentioned in Prentice Hall's *Patterns of Civilization*. In most areas of leadership, females make up 1-8% of the total. It is only in the field of social reform that the female/male ratio is different. In this one area, males make up 70% of the category on average. In 3 textbooks the ratio nears an average of 50% (Addison Wesley, DC Heath, and HBJ).

Yet another point is geographic region (Table 12, page 115). Does the area of leadership vary from one geographic region to another? In all geographic regions in all textbooks the political category includes the largest percentage of the people named in the textbook. There is, however, considerable variety among geographic regions with 41% being political leaders in Europe, 53% in America, 70% in Africa, 67% in the Middle East, and 72% in Asia. There is a sharp division in the second largest leadership category. For America and Europe the second largest category is the arts with for America and 21% for Europe being in that category. For Africa and Asia the 13%second largest category is military with 9% for Africa and 10% for Asia. The remaining geographic region, the Middle East, has religion as its second
TABLE 12: Leadership and Geographic Region -- All Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>AMERICA</th>
<th>AFRICA</th>
<th>ASIA</th>
<th>EUROPE</th>
<th>MID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>science</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arts</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philosophy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social ref</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explore</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wife of</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daughter of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>husband of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = number of people in category in geographic region, all textbooks
% = % of people in geographic region, all textbooks

largest category with 16% of its total leaders classified as religious leaders.

TIME

A fourth topic to consider is that of time. Do the number and categories of people included in textbooks remain constant over time? If more people are included in some periods for some categories than in others, do either the times or the categories differ from others in any meaningful way?

Table 13 (page 116) describes the relationship between time periods
**TABLE 13: Time and Leadership**

Total, all texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>POL</th>
<th>MIL</th>
<th>ECO</th>
<th>REL</th>
<th>SCI</th>
<th>TEC</th>
<th>ART</th>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>EXP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average, all texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>POL</th>
<th>MIL</th>
<th>ECO</th>
<th>REL</th>
<th>SCI</th>
<th>TEC</th>
<th>ART</th>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>EXP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of category, all texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>POL</th>
<th>MIL</th>
<th>ECO</th>
<th>REL</th>
<th>SCI</th>
<th>TEC</th>
<th>ART</th>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>EXP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-- = less than 1

(see page 103 for time periods code) and categories of leadership. In every time period there are more people listed as political leaders than any other category of leadership. Although period six, 1957 to the present, contains the
largest number of people, that time period does not vary much from the other periods. Each time period includes between 14% and 19% of the total number of people in the political category. The military category remains fairly constant over time also, except for the final period, 1953 to the present, when both the number and the percentage decline. Other categories contain neither as many people nor are as consistent over time. The economic category, one of the more extreme cases, includes 68% of its people in a single time period, 1815-1910. As predicted, most of the people classified as explorers fall within a narrow time range, 75% in period three, 1500-1815. The remaining number appear in the periods immediately before and after but in much small numbers. It seems clear that exploration, as defined by textbook usage, is confined to one period of time, one which does not quite coincide with the periodization used here based on the general breakout used by the authors of the textbooks. Science and technology are similar in including few 20th century people (periods five and six). There is a difference in the earlier periods, however. Science includes 16% of its total people in period one, prior to 600, while technology includes virtually no one from that period. Technology does show a bulge, 71% of its total, in period four, 1815-1910. Both religion and philosophy include almost no people of the 20th century. In the case of religion, just about everybody, 91%, is from the periods prior to 1815.

In contrast, Table 14 (page 118) focuses on the 20th century, time
### TABLE 14: Leadership in the 20th Century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POL</th>
<th>MIL</th>
<th>ECO</th>
<th>REL</th>
<th>SCI</th>
<th>TEC</th>
<th>ART</th>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>EXP</th>
<th>WIF</th>
<th>DAU</th>
<th>HUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AW</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gl</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBJ</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHI1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH2</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF2</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2876</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>2943</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) = total people in category  
(B) = % of total for 20th century  
(C) = total people in category for pre-20th century  
(D) = % of total for pre 20th century

periods five and six. Unlike Table 13, this table compares the number of people in each category with people in other categories in the same time period. Thus, the category of political leadership includes 53% of the people of all categories in the 20th century while the arts, the next largest group, includes 11% of all categories of 20th century people. These percentages vary a little from the earlier periods. For all of the pre-20th century periods, political leaders comprise 45% of the total. Their percentage is higher for the
20th century, an 8% increase over the combined earlier periods. This is the only category showing an increase. All the others show a decrease, including, surprisingly, science and technology.

**SUMMARY**

The textbooks name an average of 687 people each. The 12 texts include a total of 2190 people, of which 949 appear only in a single textbook. In no textbook do all of these people receive equal coverage. An average of 47% of the people named in each text are described by two or fewer sentences, while an average of 5% of the people receive one half page or more of description and explanation in each text. The narrative text is accompanied by illustrations in all of the textbooks. An illustration is included for an average of 16% of the people included in each textbook. All parts of the world are not equally represented in the textbooks. An average of 65% of the people named in each textbook are from Europe and 82% of the people of Europe are from western Europe. The nearest competitor is North, Central, and South America combined and the combination on average accounts for only 12% of the people in each textbook. Males and females are not equally represented in the textbooks. Females make up an average of 7% of the people named in each textbook. This average remains fairly constant across geographic regions and through the major time periods. Males and females, however, are treated
approximately equally in the matter of mentioning. They both receive one to two sentence coverage almost 50% of the time. Political leaders clearly dominate the textbook treatment of world history. An average of 46% of the people included in each textbook are described in political terms. The remaining 54% of the people are divided among 12 other categories of leadership, no one category including more than 15% of the total number of people.

In all cases there is some variation among the textbooks. Although they are close to the same length, the textbooks do not include the same number of people and this makes the number of people in each category seem to be quite different on occasion. When the percentage of the total is compared, however, the variations become much less and the overall picture remains generally close to the average. It is possible to discern areas of emphasis in some of the textbooks but the variations are relatively narrow. What is different among the textbooks is the exact people included and how much text is used to describe and explain them.
Part II

THE MOST SIGNIFICANT PEOPLE IN WORLD HISTORY TEXTBOOKS

The most significant people in world history, as indicated in secondary world history textbooks, are the ones about whom students read the greatest amount. Because of the greater exposure, it is possible that students will consider these people to be perceived by their culture as either heroes or villains and thus are the most likely textbook-presented role models for student behaviors, values and beliefs. The characteristics attributed to these most significant people are therefore of considerable importance and were selected for further analysis.

On the basis of the amount of the coverage they received, 21 people were identified as the most significant people in world history. Those who had one half page or more of narrative text devoted to them in six or more of the textbooks examined were selected for further analysis of their coverage in all 12 textbooks (see Attachment F for complete listing of coverage in all 12 textbooks). Table 15 (page 122) lists 130 people who received one half page or more of narrative in any of the 12 textbooks. Some of these people were included in only one textbook. Others were included in all or most of the them but did not receive one half page or more of coverage in more than five texts.
Table 15: THE MOST SIGNIFICANT PEOPLE IN ANY TEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbas</th>
<th>Henry IV of France</th>
<th>Plato</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akbar</td>
<td>Henry VIII of England</td>
<td>Pushkin, Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander the Great</td>
<td>Henry VII of England</td>
<td>Quaddafi, Muammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander II</td>
<td>Herodotus</td>
<td>Richelieu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristotle</td>
<td>Hitler, Adolph</td>
<td>Roosevelt, Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asoka</td>
<td>Ibn Batuta</td>
<td>Rousseau, Jean Jacques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus (Octavian)</td>
<td>Isabella of Spain</td>
<td>Sarmento, Domingo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurangzeb</td>
<td>Ivan IV of Russia</td>
<td>Selim II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baber</td>
<td>James I of England</td>
<td>Shi Hangdi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bismarck, Otto von</td>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>Smith, Adam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaparte, Napoleon</td>
<td>Joan of Arc</td>
<td>Socrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar, Julius</td>
<td>Johanson, Donald</td>
<td>Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin, John</td>
<td>Justinian</td>
<td>Soren, David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro, Fidel</td>
<td>Kemal, Mustafa</td>
<td>Stalin, Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine II</td>
<td>Kennedy, John F.</td>
<td>Sun Yat-sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavour, Camilio</td>
<td>Kenny, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Thatcher, Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlemagne</td>
<td>Kenyatta, Jomo</td>
<td>Unkagina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles I of England</td>
<td>Khrushchev, Nikita</td>
<td>Victoria of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles V of Spain</td>
<td>Kublai Khan</td>
<td>Voltaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles II of England</td>
<td>L’Ouverture, Toissaint</td>
<td>Walska, Lech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng Ho</td>
<td>Las Casas, Bartholome de</td>
<td>Wesley, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Kai-shek</td>
<td>Lenin, Vladimir</td>
<td>Whitney, Eli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill, Winston</td>
<td>Li Bo</td>
<td>William the Conqueror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colbert, Jean</td>
<td>Louis Napoleon</td>
<td>William II of Prussia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, Christopher</td>
<td>Louis XVI of France</td>
<td>Wilson, Woodrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comnena, Anna</td>
<td>Louis XIV of France</td>
<td>Wu Chao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confucius</td>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>Yaroslav the Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>Machiavelli</td>
<td>Zenobia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortes</td>
<td>Magellan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cromwell, Oliver</td>
<td>Mandela, Nelson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curie, Marie</td>
<td>Mansa Musa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin, Charles</td>
<td>Mao Zedong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DaVinci, Leonardo</td>
<td>Maria Theresa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeGaulle, Charles</td>
<td>Marx, Karl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicretian</td>
<td>Meir, Golda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danant, Henri</td>
<td>Michelangelo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison, Thomas</td>
<td>Mussolini, Benito</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einstein, Albert</td>
<td>Metternich, Klemens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor of Aquitaine</td>
<td>Napoleon III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth I of England</td>
<td>Nasser, Gamel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz Ferdinand of Austria</td>
<td>Nelertiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick William I of Prussia</td>
<td>Nehru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick II of Prussia</td>
<td>Newton, Isaac</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galileo</td>
<td>Nightingale, Florence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandhi, Indira</td>
<td>Nkruma, Kwame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandhi, Mohandas</td>
<td>Nyerere, Julius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautama, Siddhartha</td>
<td>Pankhurst, Emmeline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genghis Khan</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goddard, Robert</td>
<td>Pericles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorbachev, Mikhail</td>
<td>Peter I of Russia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammurabi</td>
<td>Philip II of Spain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannibal</td>
<td>Philip II of Macedonia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry II of England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CH. 4, RESULTS
Table 16 (page 124) lists the 21 people who received this significant amount of coverage in *six or more* textbooks. All but one of the 21 people have some coverage, not necessarily one half page, in all 12 textbooks. Louis XIV is the exception who is included in only 11 of the 12 textbooks.

A profile of the 21 most significant people reveals their common general characteristics (see Table 17, page 125). All 21 are male. Few females (17 of the 130, see Table 15) receive as much as one half page of coverage in any of the textbooks, and none receive that much coverage in six textbooks or more (see Table 16). Political terms are used to describe 13 of the 21 people. Three of the 13 who are described as political leaders are also described as military leaders (Julius Caesar, Charlemagne, and Napoleon Bonaparte). Nearly one quarter, 5 of the 21, are religious or moral leaders; three of these originated new religions which remain major forces in world affairs. The remaining religious leader, Martin Luther, set in motion a major religious movement within Christianity which attained nearly the stature of a separate, new religion. Confucius is most frequently described as a philosopher and teacher or as a moral leader. Christopher Columbus is the sole explorer and Karl Marx receives substantial coverage but is described variously in economic, social reform, and/or political terms.

According to the textbooks, 16 of these 21 most significant people are from Europe. Within Europe, only the three Russians are from other than
Table 16:

THE 21 MOST SIGNIFICANT PEOPLE IN WORLD HISTORY

IN SIX OR MORE TEXTBOOKS

Alexander the Great
Augustus (Octavian)
Bismarck, Otto von
Bonaparte, Napoleon
Caesar, Julius
Charlemagne
Charles I of England
Columbus, Christopher
Confucius
Gandhi, Mohandas
Gautama, Siddhartha (Buddha)
Hitler, Adolph
Jesus
Lenin
Louis XIV of France
Luther, Martin
Marx, Karl
Muhammad
Mussolini, Benito
Peter I of Russia
Stalin, Joseph
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Figures</th>
<th>OSH</th>
<th>CHS</th>
<th>ARS</th>
<th>ECO</th>
<th>EXP</th>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>SCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender M</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Biarack</td>
<td>Biarack</td>
<td>Charlemagne</td>
<td>Charles I</td>
<td>Gandhi</td>
<td>Confucius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caesar</td>
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</table>
western Europe. Of the five remaining most significant people, three are from Asia and two from the Middle East. None are from North, Central, or South America. It should also be noted that four of the five non-Europeans are religious or moral leaders. The fifth, Mohandas Gandhi, although characterized here as a political leader, is described by many texts as providing a political leadership bordering on the religious.

For the 21 people who receive substantial coverage in at least half the textbooks, three categories of presentation to students were analyzed: selection of information, style of writing, and presence of illustrations. No one category is by itself adequate to determine overall characteristics. Each category reveals pertinent information but it is only by considering the whole that a composite picture emerges. Likewise, no one textbook is enough. The comments of a single text certainly can be suggestive but they are not definitive. It is only as a number of texts are considered that patterns begin to emerge. It is the patterns, the composite picture, that provide the window onto the society which produces and uses the texts.

The analysis is concerned not with what one textbook says of an individual person but with the nature of the textbook presentation of people by all 12 of the selected textbooks. Since textbooks are written in different styles and devote different amounts of coverage to even the same individual, exactly the same words or exactly the same number and kinds of things can
not be expected. Thus one book may describe a person as intelligent, another describe the same person as having a quick mind, another as being wise, and perhaps the fourth says nothing directly but describes some events in the person's life which illustrate the person's mental quickness in analyzing a situation. Yet another textbook may choose to devote much less space to that person and to describe only major events, none of which directly display the person's intellectual abilities but which taken together could only be perceived by the student as the actions of an intelligent person. The general pattern may be that of great intelligence but since different terminology has been used in different textbooks and the situation may be unclear anyhow, it is difficult to say more than "most textbooks indicate or suggest extraordinary mental abilities." Table 18 (page 128) illustrates the point by displaying for the selected textbooks the database entries for Charlemagne under the category traits. Table 19 (page 166) demonstrates the combining of all the entries into a single list of traits attributed to Charlemagne by the textbooks in general. This same approach is used for all the categories of entries.

**SELECTION OF INFORMATION**

Since it is not possible for authors to include everything known about each of the 21 most significant people, information must be selected to be presented to students. Information presented by the textbooks was classified
TABLE 18: Charlemagne

- vigorous; steadfast defender of the faith
- courage; wisdom; good Christian; loyal
- energetic; determined; devoted Christian; strong personality
- exceptional leadership ability; powerful
- wise; ambitious; ruthless; use of force; force of personality
- powerful leader; wise; just; appreciated learning; strong and able ruler
- energetic and courageous; effective ruler; well-traveled; forced Saxons to become Christians
- great sportsman; great physical strength and energy; great ability; wise; temper
- religious; intelligent; energetic; capable; personable
- devout Christian; intellectual curiosity; alert; strong
- able general; energetic ruler; forceful; wise

= 1 textbook

as: biographic information, achievements, beliefs and goals, and the context of the times in which the person lived. In all cases, some facts were selected over other facts. Our concern here is which facts were selected to be included in the 12 textbooks (11 textbooks in the case of Louis XIV).

Biographic Information

Only limited biographic information is included in the textbook accounts of the most significant people in world history. Where appearing, it adds to the overall picture of the total person and thus may be a significant contribution to student learning.
Time Frame

A time frame for each individual person is indicated without exception, but it takes many forms. If the person is a monarch or head of state the dates of the reign or term of office are usually indicated. Sometimes this appears as a direct statement, such as, "Charles I, who ruled from 1625 to 1649. . ." (HBJ, p. 399) Sometimes the student is left to figure it out from comments such as "Louis XIV, the third king of the Bourbon Dynasty, inherited the throne of France in 1643 when he was only five years old. He reigned 72 years . . ." (McDougal Littell, p. 479). For other than rulers, dates of birth appear only about half the time but dates of death are usually provided. Generally, however, dates are more conspicuous by their absence than by their presence, the time frame being most frequently suggested by reference to other events or by placement within the textbook.

Social Class

Social class is regularly indicated in the textbooks. Monarchs are clearly of the royal or noble class and others are directly identified. Otto von Bismarck, for example, is specifically labeled as a Junker, a member of the Prussian land owning class, in 9 of the 12 textbooks. The remaining three suggest only that he is of the higher class without being specific. Napoleon Bonaparte is said to be of a poor, aristocratic family or a member of the
minor nobility, but there is no precise description of what this means within the context of the times. Karl Marx and Lenin are identified with the middle class as they are described as the sons of prosperous lawyers. There is not quite so much consistency regarding Martin Luther, although the general picture of peasant background is fairly clear. He is in one place identified as “The son of a wealthy peasant” (Prentice Hall, Patterns, p. 339) and in another as the son of a copper miner (DC Heath, p. 348). Joseph Stalin and Benito Mussolini are frequently identified with the working class. Stalin’s father, where identified at all by the textbooks, is identified as a shoemaker. His mother, when identified by the texts, is called a washerwoman or laundress (see McDougal Littell, p. 690).

Profession or Trade

The only other biographic data that is almost certain to appear is an indication of profession or trade. Thus, Confucius is said to be a teacher and government official, Gandhi a lawyer, Martin Luther a monk and professor, Karl Marx a journalist and newspaper editor, and Muhammad a camel driver, caravan leader or trader.

Education

Where it is known, the kind and amount of education is indicated. This education varies from apprenticeship training to formal education in a school
and includes study with a tutor. The information that Alexander studied with Aristotle is included in every book, as is Napoleon’s education at a French military school. Neither situation is elaborated upon however and the extent and implications of such schooling are not explained. Students generally are informed that Karl Marx and Martin Luther earned degrees from German universities, that Joseph Stalin was a seminary student, that Gandhi, Lenin, and Bismarck studied law, and that Muhammad and Charlemagne had little formal education and probably could not read or write very well. Training on the job for skilled occupations is indicated for Muhammad, Columbus, and Jesus. Jesus also is variously said to have been a “student of the writings of the Jewish prophets” (HBJ, p. 163), to have “studied religion in the synagogue” (Addison Wesley, p. 141), and to have “received a Jewish education” (Merrill, Pageant, page 247). However, there are no descriptions of what this education of Jesus means, either in the context of the times or in modern terms. The texts characteristically label Adolph Hitler as a high school drop-out. One book, Houghton Mifflin’s History of the World, says that he dropped out of school at age 16 (p. 665) but does not acknowledge that this may have been typical of the time and place.

Personal Life

Details of personal life are only occasionally presented and may be
inadequately explained. Whether or not the person was married or had children is infrequently mentioned, for example, and other family connections are rarely included. Students are told that Octavian was the grandnephew and adopted son of Julius Caesar, but this is not accompanied by an explanation. Some of the textbooks do comment on the person’s size. Students are informed, for example, that Napoleon “bundled extraordinary energy into a five-foot-two inch frame” (HBJ, p. 438) and that Charlemagne “stood out in a crowd like a bright flag. Six feet, four inches tall, he towered over most people in his kingdom” (Prentice Hall, Pageant, p. 202). Another exception, and it is not consistent, is to name the father from whom monarchs inherited their throne. Thus, Charles I inherited the throne from his father James I and Charlemagne was the son of Pepin the Short in most textbooks. However, in no book does the name of Peter I’s father appear and the name of Napoleon Bonaparte’s father remains a complete mystery. It is indeed an unusual circumstance when a significant person’s mother is named.

Violent Death

It is interesting to note that six of the 21 people are described as having died violently by murder, suicide, execution, or assassination, and an additional three died unexpectedly from fever, stroke, or food poisoning. All textbooks include this information, except that the food poisoning said to have caused
the death of Gautama is included in only one book. All other people simply died from no apparent cause.

**The Omissions**

There is no mention of likes or dislikes, hobbies, interests, nicknames, homes, childhood, friends, or associates in either official or unofficial capacities. The sole exceptions are DC Heath’s comments that Hitler preferred classical and romantic music and art (p. 656) and that Louis XIV had strong likes and dislikes (p. 410).

**Notable Exceptions**

Individual textbooks provide notable exceptions to the sparse biographic data. McDougal Littell’s *Links Across Time and Place*, for example, tells students that Alexander’s mother was the Illyrian princess Olympias, he grew up in a military environment, governed Macedonia in his father’s absence at 16, helped Philip defeat the Greeks at 18, and that his wife, the Persian princess Roxana, was expecting their first child at the time of his death in June of 323 (pp. 137-138). DC Heath’s, *Perspectives on the Past* describes Charlemagne as tall, having a mustache, loving sports, having many children, and as a great landowner who was much involved in its management (p. 196). These details are omitted in other textbooks.

Biographic information, though limited, does provide a valuable view of
the 21 most significant people in world history. They are placed in time and
the 21 span world history from the ancient world of Alexander the Great to
the mid-20th century. They are of the royal or noble, the middle, the working,
and the peasant classes. Most strikingly though, they are the sons of those who
have achieved stature within their own class. Profession or trade, and level and
nature of educational attainment generally are indicated but details of personal
life are fragmentary and not infrequently omitted altogether. There are, of
course, exceptions to these patterns. Details are given for some people in some
categories. These are informative but are not consistent either for textbook or
for the person. Although the details vary among textbooks, the general picture
remains constant.

Achievements

The 12 textbooks emphasize the achievements of the most significant
people. While not all textbooks include the entire list of achievements for each
of the 21, there is substantial consistency in what they present to students.
Achievements may consist of deeds and results that may or may not be
considered good by textbook users.

Domestic Relations

Let us consider first the matter of domestic changes made by political
leaders. All 13 political leaders of the list of 21 most significant people have
major changes attributed to them by all 12 textbooks (11 in textbooks in the case of Louis XIV). Some revisions are presented as for the good of the people, some to ensure control of the people, and some for personal aggrandizement (but even the last may also increase the pride of the people governed and thus their loyalty to the state.) Some types of change cost money which ultimately means higher taxes though they may also mean steady employment and therefore increased ability to pay taxes.

Domestic changes attributed to these people are public works, legal changes, and restructuring of government organization and services. The public works noted are of two main types: beautification, and improved transportation and communication facilities. “In Rome, Augustus undertook a great building program. Temples, monuments, and other public buildings were erected or restored, many of them with his own money. New materials replaced the brick, wood, and stone of old Rome. ‘I found Rome built of sun-dried bricks,’ Augustus claimed. ‘I leave it clothed in marble’” (Addison Wesley, p. 127). Although Augustus is frequently cited for this, he is also noted for having built roads, for trade and military purposes. Louis XIV built a grand palace at Versailles. All texts comment that this was a way to control nobles and encourage the arts but also suggest it was a matter of personal pride and aggrandizement. The high cost of his building program is also noted. Adolph Hitler presents a special case. None of the texts describe his public
works programs, mentioning neither the monumental buildings nor the super highways.

A second area is that of legal change. A majority, 9 of 13, of the most significant political leaders are said to have consolidated existing laws into a new unified system of law, created new laws, eliminated old laws, or reformed the system of enforcement of laws. The motivation suggested by the textbooks for such action may be to further the good of the people or it may be a matter of control. Control may be social control to bring peace to a chaotic situation or it may be control in order to secure the power of a tyrant or dictator. The results, then, may be good or bad.

Napoleon’s consolidated code of laws is described in all 12 textbooks. “This law code brought together many reforms of the revolution into a unified legal system. It recognized that all men were equal before the law. It guaranteed freedom of religion as well as a person’s right to work in any occupation” (Prentice Hall, Pageant, p. 447). While such positive terms are used in all 12 textbooks, there is also the suggestion that “some laws of the Napoleonic Code worked against equality. Workers were considered inferior to employers. Men received almost complete power over their family property, while women lost some rights” (Houghton Mifflin, p. 447). Charlemagne “established law and order.” The way he accomplished this is not detailed in most texts. however. The most complete account comments simply that
“Charlemagne helped establish uniform laws and appointed local judges to uphold the laws” (Prentice Hall, *Pageant*, p. 163). Augustus is associated with “just laws” but it is not clear if he was responsible for their inception. Only one text chooses to include the fact that he also established professional law schools. Otto von Bismarck is said to have reformed or standardized Germany’s banking laws in connection with the unification of the German states and his program of expanding heavy industry and military strength.

In a somewhat different vein, Charles I is said to have agreed to new laws restricting the power of the monarch in Britain. Despite the fact that he ignored the laws and ultimately was executed, the principle of such limitation was established in preparation for later implementation. Thus, although the laws were not initiated, nor in reality agreed to, by Charles I, he none-the-less is portrayed as being responsible for their presence.

In the accounts of the 20th century there are several examples of profound changes of laws and legal systems. Adolf Hitler’s domestic polices are not a prominent part of textbook accounts but texts do comment that he took over the courts for his own purposes, abolished laws he didn’t like, established new laws prohibiting trade unions, and prompted the passage of restrictive laws which in effect denied citizenship rights and the protection of the law to Jews. Houghton Mifflin, for example, describes “New laws did away with trade unions, set up courts for secret trials, and banned all political
parties except the Nazis” (p. 667). This does not say directly that Hitler did these things, but the implication is so strong as to be unmistakable. “He quickly took steps to turn Germany into a totalitarian state” says the topic sentence of the paragraph and this comment about laws is clearly a description of one of these steps. *Pageant of World History* puts it in a somewhat different perspective. “New laws were passed that made the good of the state more important than individual rights” (Prentice Hall, *Pageant*, p. 683). Mussolini is described as outlawing political parties other than his own, revising laws to restrict voting rights, eliminating strikes by new laws prohibiting them, and suspending trial by jury.

[Mussolini] pushed through parliament a new election law providing that the party receiving the most votes would automatically gain two-thirds of the seats in the Chamber of Deputies, the lower house of parliament. After the Fascists won the election in 1924, the Chamber of Deputies voted to give Mussolini “decree powers” -- which meant that his decrees would have the force of law (HBJ, p. 680).

Stalin did not necessarily create new laws according to the texts but made obvious use of the courts to stage show trials during the purges of the 1930s. In the case of Lenin it is what the accounts do not say that is significant. Although it is clear that he was establishing a new government to replace that of the czarist regime, there are no mentions of the legal system or of laws.
Confucius is the one non-head of state who is said to have had a role, albeit a distant one, in establishing new laws. The principles contained in his teachings and written down by his followers became the basis for Chinese law. “Chinese law was based on Confucian principles” (Prentice Hall, Pageant, p. 148). This may be one step removed from revision of legal systems but it certainly might suggest such a connection to students.

A third area of domestic relations is that of restructuring the government. In the textbooks the political leaders characteristically centralize government, attempting to eliminate rival sources of power. They frequently attempt to eliminate corruption, improve tax collection systems, and increase both services and power. Thus, Augustus “built up his imperial household to take charge of the daily business of government. He chose people because of their talent rather than their birth” (Merrill, Human Heritage, p. 233). Textbooks comment that Charlemagne made government centralized and efficient in the large empire he created and describe how he appointed officials known as counts to administer his empire. To balance the power of the counts, Charles sent agents called missi dominici, or messengers of the lord, throughout his empire. This system of checks and balances enabled the king to rule effectively (McDougal Littell, p. 269).

There are mentions of Louis XIV closely directing government administration
and appointing his top advisors from the middle class rather than the nobility, strengthening his centralization of the government by creating a middle class bureaucracy dependent upon him for their positions.

Louis chose bureaucrats, or officials in the bureaucracy, from the ranks of middle-class business and professional people rather than from the aristocracy. Because these officials owed their position to the king alone, they were more loyal than officials drawn from the aristocracy, who were born into their high place in society (Addison Wesley, p. 382).

Peter I of Russia is described as having not only built a new city on the shores of the Gulf of Finland but also as drastically revising the government. He eliminated all traces of local self government and authority, required all Russians to serve the state, opened the nobility to talented people and made the Church little more than a branch of the government.

*Foreign Relations: Conquests and Conferences*

Other achievements fall in the area of foreign relations, mostly in the form of conquests by six political leaders. Thus, military victories and conquests are attributed to Alexander the Great in Persia, Asia Minor, Egypt, and the Indus Valley. Bismarck is said to have provoked wars with Denmark, Austria, and France which ultimately united the German states under Prussian leadership. Napoleon Bonaparte led French troops to victory against Austrians
in Italy and later brought most of continental Europe under French rule. Julius Caesar conquered Gaul, the northern France and Belgium of modern times, for Rome. Charlemagne defeated the Lombards, Saxons, and Avars to bring most of Europe into his empire. And under Adolph Hitler, Germans occupied Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, France, Greece, and Yugoslavia, utilizing the resources and labor of those countries to further German industrial and political greatness.

Implications of these conquests for the conquered regions are seldom described for students. An exception is the characteristic description of the blending of Greek and Persian cultures in the areas conquered by Alexander the Great and his military forces.

The one area of foreign relations other than conquest that is addressed in the textbooks is that of participation in international conferences during the 1940s. Joseph Stalin’s presence at such conferences is clearly recorded in both narrative text and illustrations, but the conferences themselves are not described in detail and it is difficult to determine his precise role. Prentice Hall’s Patterns of World Civilization devotes one sentence to a description of Stalin’s part in the conference in Yalta. “Stalin agreed to declare war on Japan after Germany surrendered” (p. 714). There is also a photograph of Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin at that conference. Another sentence describes Stalin’s
role at Potsdam. "When [Truman] demanded free elections in accordance with the Yalta agreement, Stalin refused" (p. 714). In both cases the textbook presentation is of Stalin playing a strictly reactive role. Globe makes no mention of the conferences at either Yalta or Potsdam but does include an informal photograph of Stalin with Harry Truman at Potsdam (p. 604).

There are suggestions of meetings between Adolph Hitler and Benito Mussolini and a few illustrations of them together do appear in the textbooks (see for example, HBJ, p. 682 and McDougal Littell, p. 645), but the meetings are suggested or hinted at only and no details are given beyond the implication that the meetings must have taken place.

*Casualties/Deaths Associated with Some Leaders*

An achievement mentioned for some leaders is the number of people arrested, imprisoned, killed, or who died during their regime. This is most frequently connected with domestic relations rather than with conquest of foreign peoples. People killed during foreign military engagements characteristically go unmentioned in world history textbooks. However, the textbooks abound with examples of numbers of people killed. Charles I provides probably the least of these examples, as one textbook recounts the 100,000 who died in battle during the civil war provoked by this English king (DC Heath, p. 400). In the same vein, the text recounts that 15 million
Russians died during the 1918-1920 civil war during which Lenin led the government of Russia (DC Heath, p. 615).

More dramatic are the large numbers of deaths associated by textbooks with 20th century dictators Adolph Hitler and Joseph Stalin. The connection between the leader and the deaths is sometimes not quite clear. Merrill’s *Human Experience* speaks of Hitler’s bitter attacks against Jews but gives no hint of the extent of it in the sections that are indexed under Hitler. In the chapter sub-section labeled “Holocaust” there is some treatment of its extent but the name Hitler is used only once when the statement is made that, “as a part of his plan for world conquest, Hitler had set out to eliminate the Jews” (p. 643). The death of 6 million Jews and 6 million others is attributed to Nazis. Although Hitler is clearly the leader of the Nazi party and his hatred of Jews characteristically is described, the mechanisms by which Hitler’s personal biases were translated into mass arrest and murder are not directly stated. Indeed, one text clearly says “Nazi racial policies were carried out by Heinrich Himmler, a fanatical believer in ‘Aryan superiority’” and in another place “Himmler’s deputy, Reinhard Heydrich, was the chief planner of the Nazi program to wipe out the Jews of Europe -- always one of Hitler’s main goals” (Houghton Mifflin, p. 695). The last phrase is the only place Hitler is mentioned in this textbook in the description of the Holocaust. Perhaps the most direct description of the mechanism appears in Merrill’s *Human Heritage.*
“Hitler felt that Jews were not being killed fast enough. So, he ordered six concentration camps to be equipped with poison gas chambers and cremation ovens, or places to burn dead bodies.” (p. 615) Recognizing that the connection between the leader and death may be tenuous to students, nonetheless, the overall impression of large numbers of people dying must certainly be connected with Hitler in the minds of students. Statements include 500,000 people imprisoned and, in another text, 1,000 killed, including many of his own followers, in an effort to eliminate opposition. Scott Foresman’s *Living World History* speaks of the destruction of 11 million “racially inferior” people while Prentice Hall’s *Pageant of World History* spells it out somewhat more explicitly with its comments on the death of 6 million Jews and of an equal number of Slavs, gypsies, political prisoners, the disabled, and the clergy.

The accounts of Russian deaths during the regime of Joseph Stalin are equally murky. The distinction between party members and non-party members is not always clear. Prentice Hall’s *Patterns of Civilization* says, for example, that “Thousands of party members were purged, or expelled from the party” (p. 676). But later in the same paragraph appears the statement “In the next four years, millions of men and women were arrested. Many of them were tried and executed” (p. 676). Certainly the image of a great many deaths is clear, but it is less clear who they were, the reasons, or the exact number. HBJ speaks of the arrest of nearly 8 million people by Stalin in order to get rid of
opposition and Globe informs students that Stalin used force and terror to silence or eliminate party members who disagreed with him. Many were executed and millions sent into slave labor. Addison Wesley claims that in Stalin’s effort to eliminate all opposition, an estimated 8-10 million people were jailed, exiled, sent to labor camps (many of whom were never heard from again according to Scott Foresman, *History and Life*), or killed. Textbooks also speak of the peasant or rural people who were killed when they protested collectivization. In one text it was “millions of rural people.” In another, it was “thousands of peasants.” Another text speaks of the millions of peasants who died in the famines caused by the sale abroad of the grain needed to feed them. Prentice Hall, *Pageant of World History* attempts to be more precise, saying that Stalin’s collectivization was responsible for the deaths of 5-10 million people.

The question of Stalin’s role in this is never precisely recounted. It is clear that he was the leader of the Communist party and that, whatever his title, he headed the government. But, as with the accounts of Hitler, the mechanisms of the connection between the man and the deaths are far from clear or precise. Unmistakably, however, there is a connection between Joseph Stalin and the deaths of millions of Russians.
Exploration

Non-political leaders are characterized by quite different achievements. Christopher Columbus, as the only explorer, is pretty much one-of-a-kind. By all 12 textbooks he is credited with reaching the islands of the Caribbean, claiming those lands for Spain, and, believing he had reached the East Indies of Asia, labeling the natives Indians. Although some texts may supply slightly different details, the nature of the accomplishments remains the same.

Moral, Philosophical, and Religious Leaders

Confucius and Siddhartha Gautama (Buddha) are portrayed as generally contemporaneous and both are identified with Asia. Jesus and Muhammad are both identified with the Middle East, though some 600 years apart. Three of the four are credited with establishing the principle beliefs of new religions which were popularized and spread by their loyal followers. The textbooks state that, even if one does not adhere to these religious principles, the moral precepts of these men are to be admired. Confucius joins the religious leaders in promulgating a code of moral behavior that strongly influenced a major culture of the world for many hundreds of years. The chief accomplishment is portrayed in all four cases as the establishment of a strong moral code and, in three of the four cases, ultimately a new religious system.
The Others

Finally, three of the 21 most significant people in world history require special mention. Martin Luther, although a devout Christian, challenged existing Christian institutions with his pleas for reform. He did not, of course, establish a new religion but in establishing a new church institution he did disrupt the unity of the western European Christian church and change the course of history.

The textbooks agree that the major achievement of Karl Marx is the writing and publication of the Communist Manifesto and Das Kapital which became the basis for theories of scientific socialism or communism. Few of the texts directly link this to any specific party or nation. Two of the texts additionally say he helped to organize the First International Workingmen’s Association, although they omit the eventual fate of that organization.

The remaining one-of-a-kind on our list of 21 is Mohandas Gandhi, an enigmatic figure of Asian history. He is described as unique in being a political leader but not a head of state. He also is unique in being a moral leader of strong religious faith who was assassinated by one of his co-religionist Hindus because he had gone over to the “other side” in advocating tolerance for Muslims. All 12 textbooks present pretty much the same accomplishments: a skilled lawyer who successfully led his people in a revolution against their European colonial masters. The revolution was far from the non-violent action
promoted by Gandhi, but it did accomplish its goals for India. The principles established by Gandhi were clearly utilized by other peoples in other times and places, none of which is fully developed or described by the 12 textbooks although almost all mention these events.

The achievements attributed to the 21 most significant people in world history cover a wide range of actions. They vary from public works to conquest, from exploration to the writing of philosophical works, and from establishing new religions to major religious reforms. These achievements, which may have results perceived as “good” or “bad,” form a major portion of textbook treatment of the most significant people in world history.

Beliefs and goals

Beliefs and goals are ascribed to all of the 21 most significant people. The assumption is that underlying beliefs prompt people to formulate goals that are commensurate with those beliefs. The textbooks sometimes describe beliefs and other times goals but the two are inextricably intertwined in most instances. Since the distinction is not clear, the two will be considered here together and interchangeably.

The 21 most significant people divide into 2 major groups plus 2 individuals. The major groups are the religious or moral leaders and the political and military leaders. The 2 individuals, who don't seem to fit either
category but who may share beliefs and goals with either or both, are Christopher Columbus and Karl Marx.

Religious/Moral Leaders

The religious/moral leaders (Confucius, Mohandas Gandhi, Siddhartha Gautama, Jesus, Martin Luther, and Muhammad) are presented by these textbooks as advocating for all certain rules of conduct based on respect for other people. These rules, as recounted by the texts, are all based on belief in justice, honesty, and unselfishness. The rules explicitly condemn violence. The partial exception to the rule about violence is Muhammad, who favored wars against unbelievers. Since no such wars are described and no details are given, however, it is possible that students may not make the connection between Muhammad and religious or other wars. Both Jesus and Muhammad are specifically said to believe in one God and by implication Martin Luther, who is described as a devout Christian, must have held the same belief.

One way or another, everyone in this group is described as espousing a goal of progress toward a better life. Confucius is described as believing that most evil would disappear and peace and happiness would be the lot of those who adhere to the prescribed rules for proper and moral conduct. Gandhi proposed a simpler and traditional way of life for an India freed from foreign rule, the caste system, and intolerance. Gautama prophesied that although
sorrow and suffering were a part of life, the cycle could be broken and the peace and happiness of nirvana achieved by those who suppressed their desire for the unattainable by practicing ethical and proper behavior, beliefs, and thoughts. Jesus promised a better life after death based on faith in God, and he emphasized a present life based on love, compassion, brotherhood, equality, and a personal relationship with God. In his goal of a reformed church, Martin Luther reaffirmed the beliefs and goals of Jesus, stressing especially salvation by faith alone and a personal relationship with God through prayer and Bible reading without priests. And, finally there is Muhammad whose beliefs included a day of judgment and a pleasant afterlife for believers who adhered to a strict moral code and performed prescribed religious duties. One textbook describes this paradise as “at the top of a mountain. It has shade, fruit trees, beautiful flower gardens, cold springs, and singing birds” (Merrill, Human Heritage, p. 336).

Differences, though more obscure, are also presented by the textbooks. It is clear that Jesus believed that he was the son of God, but that Muhammad considered Jesus only one among many prophets rather than the son of God, and that he himself (Muhammad) was the last and most important of the prophets. Gandhi is not presented as believing himself a religious leader of any kind although some texts suggest that some of his followers might have perceived him to be so. Scott Foresman’s History and Life, for example,
recounts that “Millions of Indians began to look up to him as a holy man, or
mahatma” (p. 590). It is difficult to discern what beliefs Gautama may have
had because the accounts concentrate almost solely on descriptions of the
ethics and moral code of the “middle way.” Scott Foreman’s History and Life
states that “This simple and humble teacher claimed no godlike powers.” (p.
61). Other texts comment on the split among his followers, one group (the
Mahayana school) considering him to be a god and the other (the Theravada
school) only a great teacher. Confucius is presented more as a teacher and
would-be government practitioner than as a religious figure. There are no
suggestions of his status or relationship to any form of deity.

Christopher Columbus

The only belief or goal attributed to Christopher Columbus is the belief
that it is possible to reach Asia by sailing west across the Atlantic. There
doesn’t even seem to be a goal in mind. Did he want fame and acclaim as the
discoverer of a new trade route to Asia? Did he desire to claim new lands to
enrich and make more famous a Spain which was not his homeland? Did he
have the goal of adding to scientific knowledge? All are possible, but the texts
are silent on the subject.

Karl Marx

Karl Marx is equally difficult to describe. While every text summarizes
the beliefs embedded in Marx's "scientific socialism," they do so in such cursory fashion it is difficult to even guess what students might understand from it beyond the simple fact of conflict between workers and capitalists. It is equally difficult to discern from the textbooks what goals Marx might have had.

**Political and Military Leaders**

The actions of the 13 most important political people featured in the 12 textbooks clearly were prompted by their beliefs about the nature of government. It is apparent that none of these, nor any of the group of 21, embraced democratic principles. It is said of Augustus, for example, "Although he was careful to observe the forms of republican government, he kept the final power in his own hands, largely through his control of the army" (Scott Foresman, *History and Life*, p. 119). HBJ includes similar comments about Julius Caesar's practice of government, saying "Caesar kept the republican form of government, but he was king in everything but name" (HBJ, p. 153). Although the details of how he accomplished this are not supplied, the implication that he held certain beliefs about the nature of government are clear. Addison Wesley makes no secret of Bismarck's views. "Bismarck opposed democratic rule because he had no faith in the ability of the people to govern themselves" (p. 538). HBJ agrees, and goes further. "Bismarck
opposed democracy and the idea of a parliament. . . . He was willing to use
trickery, bribery, or military force to help Prussia fulfill this destiny” (HBJ, p.
578). Charles I, Louis XIV, and Peter I are all described as believers in the
divine right of kings and absolute rule. “Louis believed in the divine right of
kings and had a burning ambition to make his reign a glorious one . . . .
Dignified and regal in his bearing, he fully enjoyed playing the part of God’s
agent on earth” (Scott Foresman, Living World History, p. 358). Addison
Wesley adds, as do most of the textbooks, the archetypal quote of Louis XIV,
“Louis XIV is said to have uttered a phrase which has become the classic
slogan of absolute monarchy: L’etat, c’est moi,” meaning “I am the state” (p.
382). Of Napoleon, Scott Foresman’s History and Life simply says “Napoleon
planned to rule as a dictator” (p. 454).

Although the actions of the twentieth century political leaders are
clearly described in the textbooks, their beliefs about government are seldom
explained in any detail. Not uncommonly, Hitler for example, is said to have
held the belief “that the German people were superior and that Germany
needed a strong government to bring the nation back to its rightful place in
the world” (Addison Wesley, p. 679). Students are left to infer further
elaboration of his beliefs from the pages of description of his actions that
follow. Merrill’s, The Human Experience becomes a bit more explicit about
Mussolini. “Mussolini developed new ideas about government that he called
fascism. Fascism was a political creed that supported the unity of all social
groups under the control of the nation-state . . . Not only did fascism give the
state absolute authority, but it also gave it the right to rule by force” (Merrill,
*Human Experience*, p. 588). While Lenin is said to have the goal of establishing
a marxist, socialist, or communist, state, students are invariably left to thumb
back to the pages describing Karl Marx’s “scientific socialism” for an
explanation of just how that might work.

Mohandas Gandhi is the sole political leader on the list who might have
held other views about the nature of government, since these views are
recouted in none of the 12 textbooks.

A goal of many of these political leaders, according to the 12 textbooks,
was to *restore order* within their own lands, a move perceived to require a
single strong leader. Thus, we find recounted Alexander’s first move upon
assuming the throne was the crushing of a revolt by the Greek city-state of
Thebes. Augustus believed there was a need for a strong ruler to achieve his
goal of restoring order to Rome. Napoleon Bonaparte faced the obvious need
to restore order and stability to France following years of revolution and
disastrous foreign wars. A weak government under the Directory had failed to
do so and now, he believed, it was time for the leadership of a strong
individual. Benito Mussolini and Adolph Hitler became leaders of countries
facing severe economic and social problems calling for a strong leader, an idea
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near and dear to them anyhow. Their beliefs about leadership certainly
directed the ways in which they achieved their goals. In Russia Lenin was
faced first with the chaotic aftermath of two revolutionary overthrows of the
government within a year and then with civil war which threatened still
another overthrow. A strong leader using any means possible was the obvious
solution. Joseph Stalin took over a somewhat more stable, but still hardly
orderly, state. The goal of these leaders was to preserve what they had
somehow acquired and they acted on the belief that what was needed was a
single all-powerful leader.

Although they may have shared over-all goals, the means by which these
strong rulers attained their goal of personal power are not presented as
identical. Twentieth century greats, Mussolini, Hitler, Lenin, and Stalin used
force, terror, propaganda, and perversion of the law according to the
textbooks. Alexander may have been little better, although there is a difference
of scale. Students are told only of a single colony that revolted and Alexander
took drastic action, killing or selling into slavery the entire population.
Augustus on the other hand, although he held supreme power, observed the
form of the republic, including retaining and consulting with the Senate.
Napoleon Bonaparte, while not favoring political liberty or free elections, did
retain and protect many of the reforms of the revolution, including the
equality of men before the law. Charlemagne is said to have encouraged
Christianity and education to strengthen his rule. Addison Wesley’s *Traditions and New Directions* maintains “To strengthen his rule [Charlemagne] needed to spread Christianity, which required educated monks. He also needed officials who could read and write to help govern the large kingdom” (Addison Wesley, p. 209).

The political leaders shared a common goal of creating a powerful state. Otto von Bismarck, for example, is depicted as desiring not only to unite the German states under Prussian leadership, but to create both industrial and military power and alliances to cement German might. Building a fine palace at Versailles was but one manifestation of Louis XIV’s goal of dramatically increasing the glory of France and the monarchy. “To accomplish his goals, he built an enormous palace at Versailles . . . The palace emphasized the grandeur and power of Louis XIV and France” (HBJ, p. 381). Restoring the historic greatness of their states was certainly a major goal of both Hitler and Mussolini. The glories of ancient Rome were powerful memories from which to weave dreams. “Mussolini spoke of bringing back the glory and military strength of ancient Rome” (Houghton Mifflin, p. 663). And as Addison Wesley’s *Traditions and New Directions* maintains, “Hitler’s goals for the Third Reich included returning Germany to the status of great power” (Addison Wesley, p. 681). Stalin is presented as having a somewhat different goal. He is quoted as saying, “We are 50 or 100 years behind the advanced countries.
We must make good this distance in 10 years or they will crush us” (Houghton Mifflin, p. 655).

Yet another goal of these political leaders was that of expanding their rule into new lands. According to the texts, Alexander’s conviction that he was destined to rule the world (see for example, Scott Foresman, History and Life, p. 101) was the underpinning of his goal of unifying and ruling all the civilized world known to the Greeks (plus India and China according to Addison Wesley, p.98). Napoleon Bonaparte, it is variously claimed by textbooks, desired to rule France, all of Europe, or a world-wide French empire. “Not content to be a general --- even a great one --- Napoleon wanted to rule France” (Houghton Mifflin, p. 446). This text goes on to say, “Just as he had become master of France, Napoleon wanted to become master of Europe” (p. 448). Scott Foresman’s History and Life speaks of Napoleon as being “Driven by his ambition to rule all of Europe” (Scott Foresman, History and Life, p. 455). Louis XIV clearly wanted to expand his state as most texts inform students with statements such as, “In foreign policy Louis had a major goal -- to expand France’s territory in Europe. He wanted to extend the country’s boundaries to what he believed were its rightful and natural border -- to the Rhine River in the north and in the east. (Merrill, Human Experience, p. 311). And, Mussolini sought “to solve his country’s economic problems by overseas expansion” (HBJ, p. 712).
Hitler’s dreams about expansion are less clear in the textbooks. Expansion is tangled with racism in both history and textbooks. Merrill’s *Human Experience*, describes the situation as, “In [Mein Kampf] he described the main ideas of nazism. The Germans, he declared, were better than any other people, a ‘master race’ that deserved to rule the world” (p. 592). Houghton Mifflin’s *History of the World* expresses it as, “Claiming that he was following the principle of self determination, Hitler tried to bring all the German-speaking peoples into the Third Reich” (p. 686) and in another place as “Hitler called on Germany to rebuild its strength, to win back lands lost in the Versailles Treaty, and to create a great German empire that would stretch across Europe” (p. 666). Another text says only that he wanted to control Europe. The general outlines are clear enough, it is the details that are not distinct.

Peter’s goal of expansion takes on a somewhat different form in most textbooks. Merrill’s *Human Experience* puts it very simply, “To help fulfill his goals of making Russia a European power, Peter expanded its borders in the south, east, and northwest.“ (Merrill, p. 321). Other texts take a bit more complex view of the situation. “Peter the Great and later Russian rulers had a major goal in foreign affairs, to obtain ‘windows on the West.’ These were seaports on the Black Sea or Baltic Sea that would enable Russia to trade with western Europe by water” (Scott Foresman, *History and Life*, p. 381). HBJ says
much the same thing, but fails to give a reason, "One of Peter’s major goals was to break through Russia’s landlocked position and acquire warm water ports on the Sea of Azov and the Black Sea" (p.384).

Beliefs about the nature of government, social institutions, and human behavior have determined the goals of the 21 most significant people of world history. Actions are informed by beliefs and goals, but that is not the only factor that determines behavior. These people are also influenced by the context of the times in which they live.

Context

Context is defined here as the historical environment out of which a person emerges. This includes the factors which create that person’s knowledge, goals, beliefs, and values and the events and circumstances which enable him to reach the pinnacles of power and acclaim. Each of the 21 most famous people in world history is portrayed as the product of his environment. It cannot be otherwise. The question, however, is not so much of the effect of the environment in creating the person as it is of either the environment providing the opportunity for the person to become one of the most famous people in world history or of the person shaping the environment.

Alexander: Change and Opportunity

Accounts of Alexander, for example, in all 12 textbooks are prefaced
with comments about the rivalry, conflict, and subsequent weakening of the Greek city states, and their recent conquest by Alexander’s father, Philip of Macedonia. Alexander is thus portrayed as inheriting the ascending power of his country in the region, with all the attendant problems of having only recently conquered a major portion of its empire. The formative period of his youth was obviously during the time the Macedonians were engaged in bringing under their control the once brilliant, but now declining, Greek city states. The context, then, is one of change, turmoil, cultural clash, and opportunity.

Alexander is depicted by the textbooks as being enthralled by Greek culture. This may be a one-sided interpretation and there may be other reasons for his trying to spread Greek culture through his empire. Perhaps, for example, there is also an element of intimidation. After all, it was the Greek city states who were famous for their achievements in the arts, political life, philosophy, and virtually every other realm of human achievement. There are also possible pressures on Alexander to excel. If his father has managed such brilliant conquests, then Alexander must indeed do “one better” to make his mark on history. The Persian Empire provides the opportunity. Two textbooks comment, with regard to the Persian empire, that it was in a “disorganized state” at the time of the conquest by Alexander. The implication is that Alexander’s conquest may have been not too difficult after all, given the
weakened state of the Persian empire (Scott Foresman, *History and Life*; Scott Foresman, *Living World History*). The remaining 10 textbooks describe no such implications, and nothing is said by any of them about the condition of either the Persian empire or of the other regions conquered by Alexander. The context, then, in most textbooks is rich in possible explanations for the person and achievements of Alexander.

Textbooks also describe in some detail the new culture that emerged in the wake of Alexander’s conquest. Alexander is said to have dreamed of a united world characterized by brotherhood and a combined culture comprised of Greek and Persian elements. All the textbooks describe the culture which in fact did emerge.

Alexander is a good example of the treatment of an individual and as an example provides a great deal of insight into textbook treatment of individuals in general. But what of the 21 as a whole? Are there discernable patterns regarding the context of the times? Do the textbooks present people as created by the environment, or do they present them as creating the environment?

Characteristically, the textbooks present the 21 people as emerging during times of extreme stress and severe problems, or at times when many people are dissatisfied, possibly fearful, and seeking new directions.
One-man rule: political and economic crisis

Julius Caesar, Augustus, Napoleon Bonaparte, Lenin, Benito Mussolini, and Adolph Hitler all are depicted as emerging during times of political and economic crisis, social unrest, and loss of pride in the state. This is accompanied by a weak government which is blamed for the crisis and demonstrates inability to solve the problems or to maintain law and order. The Rome of Caesar and Augustus, unable to cope with the problems of an expanding empire, had degenerated into civil war, social unrest, and an economic situation bordering on crisis for many citizens. The France of Napoleon had been unable to implement the radical changes of the revolution, to bring the drawn-out foreign wars to a satisfactory conclusion, or indeed, to establish any kind of political or economic stability. The French people were weary, confused, restive under the heavy tax burden, and disillusioned. Lenin returned to a Russia on the verge of collapse. The Provisional Government had inherited the social, economic, and political problems of the czarist regime and seemed unable to solve them. Mussolini is depicted as coming to political power in an Italy disillusioned by the outcome of World War I, fraught with economic depression and bitter with a government unable to solve the post-war problems. Germany, at the time Hitler became chancellor, is described as in a condition of turmoil and uncertainty. The economic system had been all but destroyed by reparations, unemployment was high, and money was virtually
worthless. There was social unrest and widespread anger at the humiliation of defeat in World War I. The Weimar republic was inexperienced, lacked popular support, and was completely unable to make things right again.

*Prophets: Cultural and Social Unrest*

In contrast, Gautama, Jesus, Muhammad, Luther, and Gandhi are depicted by the 12 world history textbooks as living in times not of political chaos but rather of cultural unrest in which existing beliefs and values fail to meet the changing needs of society. Some people are no longer satisfied with prevailing practices and ways of looking at the world, and they search for alternatives. Their proposed “reforms” or “improvements” are perceived as a challenge to the existing authority and power structure.

Textbook accounts are remarkably similar. Gautama’s “enlightenment” is portrayed as reaction to the luxury and security of his own life when compared with the life he saw others living. His contention that any person could achieve nirvana without the assistance of the priestly hierarchy was certainly perceived as a threat to the Brahmans of India. Jesus was condemned to die as a common criminal because, to many in power, his teachings of “his father’s kingdom” and of a direct and personal relationship with God seemed to threaten both the political state and the religious leadership. As times changed in the Arabian peninsula, the old idols of a nomadic desert society
are described as no longer suited to the more settled existence of the coastal traders. Muhammad was thought to be a threat to those whose wealth and positions were dependent on established practices. Although the textbooks are not consistent in their portrayal of why and under what conditions Muhammad left Mecca to resettle in Medina, they all recount that event. Martin Luther’s dissatisfaction with existing religious practices and his demands for reform are depicted as being not uncommon for the times. Others shared his discontent. It was Luther, however, who made the most dramatic picture as he was condemned by both the church and the state. His contention that the ordinary man could and should read and interpret the Bible for himself and should send his prayers directly to God without priestly intervention is described clearly as a threat to the existing hierarchy. Gandhi came to personify the Indian middle class dissatisfaction with the foreign rulers who would not allow them a part in the hierarchy. Gandhi, however, went much farther, appealing also to the lowest caste with his attacks on injustice and his pleas for a return to a simpler and traditional form of Indian life. It was not only the British overlords who felt threatened, as Gandhi’s eventual assassination demonstrated.

Somewhat different details appear in different textbooks with regard to the context of the times out of which the 21 most significant people emerged, but the over-all picture is remarkably alike in every text.
STYLE OF WRITING

The way in which words are selected and arranged conveys a message to the world history student who reads the textbook. This is the way in which the author intervenes directly to guide the student's understanding and interpretation of the most significant people of world history. Three aspects of style of writing were considered: personal traits attributed to the person, indicators of attitudinal discourse, and the structure of explanation.

Personal Traits

The textbooks attribute many different personal traits and characteristics to the 21 most significant people. Sometimes it is a matter of a single word. Gautama, for example, is described in different textbooks as simple, or self-disciplined, or wise. In other cases it is the full phrase that conveys the message. For example, Louis XIV is said to have "ruled with skill and power" but it is the rest of the sentence that conveys the message of the extent of that skill and power, "unmatched by any other ruler in Europe" (Prentice Hall, Patterns, p. 380). Sometimes it is more a matter of the context within which a word or phrase appears that seems to signal the author's intended message. Both Alexander and Stalin are said to be ambitious, for example. In the case of Alexander the ambition is coupled with vision, courage, intelligence, education, and skill as a military commander. In the case of Joseph Stalin it
is insatiable ambition, which is linked with ruthlessness, suspicion, violence, and willingness to use force and terror. The message of “ambition” is quite different.

Table 19 (pages 166-170) is a composite list of the personal traits attributed to the 21 most significant people in world history. Although textbooks do not always use the same term to describe a trait or characteristic, the term that is used in this table summarizes or includes the terms used in different textbooks. Where the author’s intent may not be clear several terms have been included and grouped together in the table. Direct quotes from textbooks have been included as examples in particularly difficult cases, or where they highlight or significantly refine the meaning. Individual traits do not necessarily appear in all textbooks but in all cases they appear either directly or are strongly implied in a majority of the textbooks. The few exceptions are labeled as appearing in one text only (“1 text” in the table). They are included in cases where they provide an unusual perspective on the person.

**TABLE 19: PERSONAL TRAITS AND CHARACTERISTICS**

Alexander the Great:
intelligent, quick mind
courageous (“brave to the point of rashness”, HBJ, p. 125)
daring, a risk taker
had a vision
ambitious
skillful military commander
strong (strong will, strong leader, great physical strength)
educated
Table 19, continued

admired Greek and Persian cultures
impatient (1 text)
may have been depressed (1 text, "withdrew into a lonely life
dominated by suspicious of his soldiers' disloyalty", HBJ, p. 137)

Augustus (Octavian):
creative
courageous (valiant general)
capable politician (clever, astute, able, skillful, shrewd)
popular leader
powerful speaker
ambitious
exemplified traditional virtues (simplicity, sober conduct,
patriotism)

Bismarck, Otto von:
intensely nationalist
conservative
loyal to Prussian monarchy
trusted neither the people nor the system of democracy
didn't care about public opinion or response
no use for democracy or liberals
master of realpolitik (willing to use any means necessary to gain goals)
cunning, unscrupulous, clever, crafty, shrewd, devious, calculating, tough,
opportunistic
brilliant diplomat, bullied and outmaneuvered other politicians
strong willed

Bonaparte, Napoleon:
intelligent (sharp, incisive, quick mind, "remarkable capacity to grasp problems and
make decisions quickly", Scott Foresman 2, p. 414)
educated (well read in history, law, military science; excelled in math and geography)
capable administrator, political leader
skillful military leader (genius to some)
strong-willed
bold, imaginative, unconventional
energetic, hard working
ambitious
vain, domineering, haughty
popular, dazzled people
inspired admiration and loyalty
resourceful
risk taker, gambler
short, stocky, intense eyes, commanding presence

Caesar, Julius:
capable leader, skillful military commander
well educated
strong family alliances
popular, inspired great loyalty
brilliant orator and writer
ambitious
dynamic

Charlemagne:
courageous
wise
energetic, vigorous
devoted Christian
capable leader
ambitious
[Table 19, continued] ruthless, willing to use force just
great physical strength and energy personable
temper (1 text) great sportsman (1 text)
tall

Charles I of England: courageous intelligent proud
"not enough common sense" (Heath, p. 399) tactless
aloof, few friends, isolated

Columbus, Christopher: fearless explorer stubborn
dreamer

Confucius: loved tradition and the past scholarly kind
humorous

Gandhi, Mohandas: just courageous practiced what he preached
honored ancient traditions understanding
shrewd, skillful in working out compromises popular
had a moral vision had integrity
nonviolent, gentle simple dress and life style
small, fragile

Gautama, Siddhartha (Buddha): simple; humble self-disciplined
wise

Hitler, Adolph: extremely nationalistic courageous (WW I, twice decorated for bravery)
fanatical believer in own causes capable organizer and leader
anti-Semitic, fanatical believer in racism intolerant
talented public speaker (emotional, spellbinding, moving, effective) popular, swayed people (often with lies)
broke promises ruthless, willing to use force frustrated, suspicious, self-pitying, resentful impatient

Jesus: gentle
[Table 19, continued]

Lenin:
fanatic revolutionary
willing to use terror
ruthless
shrewd
mild-mannered, nondescript little man
short, balding at time of revolution

Louis XIV of France:
skillful ruler ("ruled with skill and power unmatched by any other ruler in Europe"
Prentice Hall 1, p. 380)
ambitious
ruthless ("no interest in the suffering of those beneath him", Prentice Hall 2, p. 390)
devout Catholic, intolerant
intelligent
hard working ("took the business of being king seriously", HBJ, p. 381)
demanding, strong likes and dislikes
liked ritual and ceremony
fondness for building and war

Luther, Martin:
intensely religious, daily good deeds
hard working, energetic
earnest, steadfast, stubborn
intolerant ("did not listen to ideas different from his own", Scott Foresman 1, p. 372)
bright lecturer
devoted to his work, wrote tirelessly
loved scholarly debate
loved good friends, good food, and music (1 text)

Marx, Karl:
held radical views
revolutionary

Muhammad:
capable leader
wise, thoughtful
eloquent speaker (1 text)
good business sense (1 text)

Mussolini, Benito:
ambitious
extremely nationalistic
ruthless
clever
shifted principles in response to events; opportunist
dazzling orator
modest height, commanding appearance, fiery black eyes, massive jaw

Peter I of Russia:
intelligent (sharp, inquiring mind)
capable ruler
energetic, strong
skillful military leader
fascinated by machines and tools, loved ships and the sea
brutal with those who opposed him ("tortured enemies without mercy", Heath, p. 416)
zealous (forced nobles, compelled Russian nobles, strong determination to work for
Russian progress, intemperate)
had violent temper, capable of great cruelty
physically large, commanding presence
"a towering figure nearly seven feet tall, a mountain of boundless energy and
volcanic emotions" (Merrill I, p. 320)
"Nearly seven feet tall, he had immense physical strength, vitality, and curiosity."
(Houghton Mifflin, p. 404)
"mind of a genius, body of a giant, and the ferocious temper of a bear" (Heath, p. 416)

Stalin, Joseph:
skilled administrator
shrewd politician
insatiably ambitious
cold, hard, impersonal, suspicious of others
untrustworthy (distrusted by Lenin, distrusted by foreign powers, refused to honor
WW II agreements, worked behind the scenes)
murderous tyrant according to Khrushchev
ruthless
hasty
violent
dedicated Communist
demanded complete obedience

Care must be exercised to assess the overall pattern of traits or the
collection within which the traits appear in the textbooks. The traits attributed
to the most significant people can be a memorable guide to student
understanding, or a way to direct student attention to interpretations pre-
selected by textbook publishers, special interest groups, and adoption
committees.

**Indicators of Attitudinal Discourse**

Words, phrases, or clauses used by authors sometimes signal to
students what it is the author intends for them to learn or to understand
about events or people described in the narrative text. These indicators
of attitudinal discourse can be powerful guidelines for students.
Saliency

The textbooks point out to students the importance of people, ideas, and events, their saliency, in a variety of ways. Sometimes students are explicitly informed that an action or person is important, influential, famous, or significant. McDougal Littell says for example, of actions of Napoleon, “One of his important achievements was the establishment of a single code of laws for all of France...” (p. 513). There should be no doubt in the student’s mind, then, that the Napoleonic code is something to be remembered. It is important. In another example, Confucius is described as “the most important thinker in all Chinese history” (Globe, p. 53).

At other times, the textbooks are not so explicit, indicating saliency by informing the student that the person was the first to do something, was the originator of an idea or practice, was the most powerful, or in some way was the model for others. Louis XIV’s importance is explained, “Because other European kings modelled their courts and their nations after Louis, one can learn a great deal about absolutism by studying his reign” (Prentice Hall, Pageant, p. 398). Martin Luther is said to have begun the Reformation as he “ sparked a reform movement that split the Roman Catholic Church” (Prentice Hall, Patterns, 339). Alexander conquered “more of the world than anyone before him” (McDougal Littell, p. 136). “It was Mussolini, however, who was Hitler’s teacher and who first imposed a Fascist dictatorship on the people of
Italy" (Prentice Hall, *Pageant*, p. 603). It is left up to the student to infer from such comments that the person or action is important. The selected textbooks abound with examples of this implied saliency. Every one of the 21 most significant people have such comments made about them, albeit not in every textbook.

The saliency indicators vary in another way as well. Sometimes they refer to the person in a generalized way. One textbook says "The most influential socialist thinker was Karl Marx" (Houghton Mifflin, p. 500) while another focuses on a specific accomplishment, saying that the *Communist Manifesto* became "one of the most important documents of modern history" (Scott Foresman, *History and Life*, p. 469). Some textbooks use both styles, sometimes about the same person. Saliency, then, may be presented as either general or specific, as well as explicit or implied.

Yet another aspect of saliency that emerges from the textbooks is the time element. Some people and events are indicated as salient, either explicitly or implied, either general or specific, in their own times (hereafter called history saliency) or in later, or modern, times (hereafter called contemporary saliency). Thus, under Adolph Hitler, "The Third Reich became the largest nation in area in western Europe" (Scott Foresman, *Living World History*, p. 653) -- direct, general, history saliency -- but of Islam, the religion established by Muhammad, "Today, more people are Muslims . . . than any other religion
in the world except Christianity” (Scott Foresman, *History and Life*, p. 188) --
general, implied, contemporary saliency. “Bismarck gave Germany the world’s
first large-scale welfare program” (DC Heath, p. 572) -- implied, specific,
history saliency --- while it is said of Napoleon that “Over 200,000 books and
many shorter works have been written about him” (Prentice Hall 2, *Pageant*,
p. 466) --- implied, general, and contemporary saliency.

There is another category of saliency which is difficult to clearly define.
It seems almost evaluative in nature and perhaps might be thought of under
evaluation. But, evaluative though the statements may be, they also indicate
saliency. It is said of Napoleon, for example, that the world was dominated by
his personality (Prentice Hall, *Pageant*, p. 466). McDougal Littell informs the
reader about Alexander that “It is seldom that one person changes history.
Alexander the Great was such a hero” (p. 136). And one text says of Stalin,
“During the 1930s Stalin established one of the most brutal dictatorships the
world had ever seen” (Merrill, *Human Experience*, p. 585). These comments
certainly reflect the author’s attitudes toward these people and their actions,
but equally certainly they imply to students the importance of these people.

Saliency is not indicated for every fact attributed to all of the 21 most
significant people in every textbook, but it does occur. Students are informed
that at least some actions are important and that at least some people are
important in world history. Saliency may be presented explicitly or it may be
implied. It may refer either to the person's general importance or it may refer to a particular action. It may refer to the person's importance in his own time or in the contemporary, or current, world. When saliency is pointed out, it is a strong message to students that the author expects them to pay particular attention to the event or person.

**Evaluation**

Evaluative words, phrases, and comments indicating the author's attitude toward the person and his actions appear in the textbooks and serve to direct student perceptions and beliefs. As noted earlier, evaluation and saliency frequently overlap. There may in fact be little to distinguish them since outstanding capabilities or performance are the reason for the person's importance. Evaluation also overlaps with emphatics. Authors use emphatic words and phrases to indicate their attitude. Thus, the comment Charlemagne was a "great leader" rather than merely a leader, is evaluative but, at least in this example, the evaluation is signaled by use of emphatics.

Charlemagne is called the "first outstanding western European monarch" (Merrill, *Human Experience*, p. 161). This may well be saliency (he is the first), emphatic (he is outstanding), or evaluative since it is the author's evaluation of Charlemagne. Others may not agree, especially since there is little attempt to directly support the statement or prove the point in the
narrative which follows the statement.

The authors who say “Alexander proved to be even more remarkable than his father” (HBJ, p. 134), or that his “accomplishments were even greater than those of his father” (McDougal Littell, p. 137) may be on more secure ground. In most texts the account of Alexander and his exploits is immediately preceded by an account of his father’s achievements. Students can make the comparison and readily see that, insofar as the textbook presents the situation, the biggest differences are (1) that Alexander conquered more territory than did Philip and (2) that Alexander introduced Greek culture into the lands he conquered. Thus, we have examples of two levels of author intervention. The direct, “more remarkable” and “greater accomplishments,” and the selection of materials which implies great achievement without ever directly saying so.

Evaluation includes a wide range of comments, from the very complimentary to the very critical. Julius Caesar is characterized as a “fine writer” (Prentice Hall, Patterns), Charlemagne as “an extraordinary figure in medieval history” (Houghton Mifflin, p. 216), Christopher Columbus as “an explorer of exceptional daring” (Globe, p. 302), Confucius as “the most honored and revered man in all Chinese history” (Scott Foresman, Living World History, p. 227), Gandhi as “the most admired of India’s independence leaders” (Houghton Mifflin, 789), and Gautama as having “left some of the most noble and beautiful rules for right conduct” (Scott Foresman, History and
Life, p. 61).

On the other hand, Adolph Hitler is said to have "dreamed of becoming an artist but failed due to lack of talent" (Houghton Mifflin, p. 665), to have "without proof blamed . . . the Communists" (Addison Wesley, p. 680), and was defeated only after "a long and costly war" (Prentice Hall, Pageant, p. 618). Lenin "moved too swiftly . . . and the results were disastrous for Russia" (Prentice Hall, Pageant, p.600). And "the events of history have shown that Marx was a poor prophet" whose "theories suffer from basic weakness in logic" (Scott Foresman, Living World History, p. 498) and who "ironically . . . underestimated the ability of capitalistic society to change for the better" (Addison Wesley, p. 494). Benito Mussolini was a "ruthless dictator" (Prentice Hall, Patterns, p. 678), and of Joseph Stalin a text says, "Lenin was right to distrust Stalin" and that he "became one of the most feared figures in history" (Prentice Hall, Pageant, p. 601)

**Emphatics**

Crismore identifies emphatics as the degree of certainty of assertion and gives as examples statements such as indeed, actually, of course, and in fact (Crismore, 1984, p. 291). Among the very few examples used in the 12 textbooks that come close to this type of author intervention are that Napoleon "certainly was a person who could command the attention of friends
as well as enemies. . .” (Prentice Hall, Patterns, p. 446), “without doubt, Napoleon was a military genius . . .” (DC Heath, p. 465), and that Stalin was “clearly in charge of the Communist party” (Scott Foresman, History and Life, p. 578). The examples of explicit emphatics are so few as to be negligible. There is, however, another category of author intervention that seems closely related and might prove to be more informative about the authors’ attitudes toward people and events. Comments appear that serve to emphasize characteristics or events. For example, Alexander is said to have “fervently admired Hellenic civilization” (Scott Foresman, History and Life, p. 101), “to have promptly pursued his father’s dream of conquest of the Persian empire” (McDougal Littell, p. 138), and to have “swiftly put down revolt” in Thebes (McDougal Littell, p. 138), and Louis XIV is said to be an absolute monarch, to have made France the strongest nation in Europe, to have taxed people heavily, and to have spent huge sums of money (Globe, p. 297). Surely these comments convey a message of certainty and of urgency to students quite the equal of in fact and of course. All 12 of the textbooks include comments such as the latter for at least three of the 21 people.

**Hedges**

Hedges, the degree of uncertainty about a person or event, appear frequently in the 12 world history textbooks and convey a potent message to
students. That Alexander inherited the throne young, “however, he was well prepared to rule” (Prentice Hall, Patterns, p. 94) is more impressive than simply saying he was a capable king. “To a great extent, [Napoleon] managed to gain the approval of every major group in France” (Houghton Mifflin, p. 446) says something quite different than that Napoleon had people’s support. Of Peter I, HBJ says, “It has been said he murdered his son” (p. 385). The message is conveyed to students quite clearly, in spite of (or perhaps because of) the hedges. HBJ says of Martin Luther “Even though [he] had humble beginnings he earned a degree from the University of Erfurt” (p. 334). Confucius is even more hedged. Textbooks say that, “he is believed” to have preserved the literature of China (Scott Foresman, History and Life, p. 77), “Historians believe that Confucius lived from about 551 BC to 478 BC. . . .” (Addison Wesley, p. 165), he “gained a reputation for wisdom,” (Prentice Hall, Patterns, p. 147), and “Great as Confucius was, he may not have been altogether good for China” (Scott Foresman, Living World History, p. 227). The most consistent hedges, however, appear surrounding the religious leaders of the 21. The accounts of Jesus are strongly hedged in all 12 textbooks. Students are informed that “accounts in the Gospels indicate. . . .” (Houghton Mifflin, p. 126), that “according to Christian belief. . . .” (Globe, p. 169), and “historians differ as to exactly what happened next” (Scott Foresman, History and Life, p. 138). This is, of course, after establishing that “his teachings and
the events of his life were preserved by word of mouth. . . ” (Houghton Mifflin, p. 126) and were written down by followers “years after Jesus’ death and there are points on which they seem to disagree.” (Scott Foresman, Living World History, p. 117). Of Gautama, one textbook says that he “apparently grew up in luxury, protected from the world outside his father’s palace” (Prentice Hall, Patterns, p. 138), that he took certain actions “according to tradition” (Addison Wesley, p. 156), that “the legends of his life are probably exaggerated” (DC Heath, p. 73), and that “he felt he understood the truth which formed the basis of life” (HBJ, p. 60). Other texts are less cautious, saying merely that these things took place. Hedges may also take the form of absence of comments. Jesus, for example, has virtually no personal traits or characteristics attributed to him (see Table 21, page 158) and very few achievements are described. All of the religious leaders are treated in this manner.

**Structure of explanation**

In most of the texts the structure of explanation for events and main ideas can be discerned if the text is read carefully and thoughtfully. The explanation is not generally labeled clearly nor is it obvious enough for the casual reader to quickly put together the **goal**, the **plan**, the **action**, and the **outcome**, and to understand the cause and effect relationship of their
connections.

A close look at one example will serve to illustrate this point. The 12 textbooks make it clear that Bismarck’s goal was the unification of the German states under the leadership of Prussia. The plan for how this was to be achieved is much less distinct. Some texts indicate his plan was to eliminate Austria as a major influence and to unify the other German states with Prussia as the dominant force. Houghton Mifflin’s History of the World provides the clearest statement of this plan. “Bismarck’s plan was to drive Austria from the Confederation and bring the other German states under Prussian control” (p. 517). It must be noted, however, that the text fails to indicate just how this is to be accomplished. Some texts imply a more complex plan involving the isolation of Austria and war with France. In other texts no plan is apparent. It is a matter of one event after the other. Bismarck emerges as opportunistic rather than as the master planner. The action is fully described in all textbooks. Even the most casual reader will detect a series of wars that involved Prussia and the German states. The outcome clearly is unification of the German states. What is less clear, and never specifically stated, is just how these wars caused unification. Globe’s Exploring World History provides perhaps the clearest explanation of what happened, but characteristically fails to establish the connection to the wars. “The princes of the German states met in the Hall of Mirrors at the Palace of Versailles, where they proclaimed
Germany a unified nation” (p. 406). The domestic dynamics are omitted altogether. In many texts, the creation of the German Empire seems simply one more isolated event with no apparent connection to what came before. Overall, then, the goal and the action are distinct and should be clear to students. The plan, at best, is only suggested or implied. The outcome is clear enough but the cause and effect relationship to either the action or the plan is weak.

Another goal of Bismarck that is featured in many of the textbooks is his drive to strengthen the monarchy once the German Empire was formed. Here all semblance of clarity and agreement falls apart. The clearest explanation is found in Prentice Hall’s Patterns of Civilization where it is suggested that in order to mesh the separate elements into a single nation, Bismarck planned to create an efficient government and reduce or eliminate opposition. The actions to accomplish this were to reform the legal and monetary systems, to increase economic prosperity through industrial growth, to improve communication and transportation systems, to reduce the power of Catholics, and to establish social insurance for workers. Students are not told of the results, however. The outcome is not specified. The other textbooks are not even this clear, emphasizing the actions in isolation and with no explanation.

Other textbooks describe Bismarck’s actions against Catholics and
socialists as part of his drive to strengthen the monarchy but contain no hint of an underlying goal or plan. The reader is left with the clear impression that Bismarck disliked both groups, but no idea of why. Scott Foresman's *Living History* tries to explain Bismarck's actions against socialists but probably confuses students further with the statement "Many workers became interested in socialism --- a movement which advocated, among other things, state ownership of all means of production and distribution. When they organized a Social Democratic party in 1875, Bismarck became alarmed" (p. 458). The comment that Bismarck was a prominent Junker, a member of Prussia's land owning class, appears nine pages earlier. It is up to students to make the connection with Bismarck's alarm when the Social Democratic party was formed and to discount his desire for a strong centralized government. The action is clearly the laws against socialists and, when that didn't work, the "comprehensive state plan of social insurance covering sickness, accident, and old age" (p. 458). Students are informed of this plan and then that "it did not kill socialism" (p. 458). The ultimate outcome may lie in the comments which follow this failure to kill socialism. "The chancellor quarreled with the new emperor, William II, about antisocialist legislation, which the latter considered too extreme" (p. 458) and that finally Bismarck was forced to retire.

Eleven of the textbooks feature alliances as a major goal of Bismarck's foreign policy as chancellor of the German Empire. They agree that "His chief
goal was to isolate France so it could not take revenge on Germany“ (Prentice Hall, Patterns, p. 624) and that he planned to accomplish this through alliances. The action is clearly the League of the Three Emperors (not named in all textbooks) and the Triple Alliance. Some texts do not specify an outcome and others do not agree or are unclear. Globe is alone in saying that the Triple Alliance “kept Germany in a strong position among other nations and helped prevent a major European war” (p. 407). There are some hints that the alliance may have had a role in establishing a warlike atmosphere in Europe but the statements are vague enough that students may not make the connection. Prentice Hall’s Pageant of World History is quite definite. “This agreement would play a central role in the events leading to World War I” (p. 576), but doesn’t say just how this worked.

The textbooks’ explanation of Bismarck’s actions is representative of how the texts treat all of the 21 most significant people in world history. There is general agreement on goals. They may not always be detailed, nor are they labeled, but they are included and students should be able to identify them most of the time. Some of the most commonly ascribed goals include the desire of:

Alexander to conquer the world and spread Greek culture
Augustus to restore law, order, and power to Rome
Caesar to rule
Charlemagne to spread Christianity and education
Charlemagne to rule
Charles I to establish and retain absolute monarchy
Columbus to reach Asia by sailing west across the Atlantic
Confucius to secure a just and powerful society
Confucius to have strength and happiness for China
Gandhi to gain independence for India, justice for all
Gautama to find truth about life
Gautama to reform Hinduism to correspond to truth
Hitler to establish Europe as a single political and economic system
ruled from Berlin
Hitler to rid Germany of “inferior” peoples
Hitler to rule
Hitler to return German greatness and power
Jesus to spread religious beliefs
Lenin to build a communist state
Louis XIV to establish and retain absolute monarchy
Luther to reform the church
Muhammad to spread religious beliefs
Mussolini to return Italy to the greatness of Rome
Napoleon to rule
Peter I to make Russia a powerful nation
Peter I to establish and retain absolute monarchy
Peter I to westernize Russia
Stalin to survive foreign attack
Stalin to build communism in one state
Stalin to achieve absolute power
Stalin to rule

The textbooks clearly emphasize the actions of the 21 most significant people. Since most of those receiving significant coverage are involved in political life, it is not surprising to find the texts abounding with battles, laws, reforms, alliances, and public occasions. Religious leaders are described as teaching, preaching, and otherwise engaged in developing their beliefs and convincing others of their suitability and rightfulness.

The two weakest portions of the structure of explanation are plans and
outcomes. In some textbooks they are omitted altogether, in other textbooks there is little description, and in some cases the textbooks do not precisely agree. While it may be possible in some cases to figure out the probable plans for achieving a particular goal, it may be equally possible for the student reader to conclude that there was a complete lack of planning and that the most significant people in world history have been content to let fate lead them, grasping whatever opportunities present themselves but doing little to further their own goals. Just as textbooks do not specify plans, neither do they generally specify outcomes as other than additional events. It may be more a matter of the cause and effect relationships not being clear than of outcomes being completely absent. Perhaps the assumption is that students should be able to figure out for themselves the outcomes.

A problem regarding outcomes is that of immediate versus long-range outcomes. Texts sometimes describe one and sometimes the other, but seldom do they distinguish between the two. One textbook, for example, tells students that Napoleon's failed invasion of Russia encouraged others to attack France and then jumps immediately to Napoleon's defeat and exile without making clear either the connections or the differences. It is clear, according to textbooks, that much of the time Adolph Hitler's immediate goals were accomplished. Unemployment was reduced, the military enlarged, much land with German-speaking peoples taken over, and many "inferior" people
eliminated. Infrequently do textbooks explain the precise connection between accomplishment of these immediate goals and the long-range outcome of defeat. Louis XIV is another example. Every textbook describes the sumptuous palace at Versailles, the luxurious life of the court housed there, and the way this became a model for others thus enhancing the power and glory of France. Obviously the immediate goals of Louis XIV had been achieved. However, the textbooks also describe the huge cost of such grandeur and the extent to which the royal treasury was drained. The problems it created for his successors, especially Louis XVI, are surely long-range outcomes and the connections to Louis XIV are not clear.

Summary

The way in which information and words are selected and arranged, the style of writing, is the way textbook authors directly intervene to guide student reading and interpretation of history. The style of writing includes the selection of factual information and the portrayal of information about people through indicators of saliency, emphatics, hedges, and evaluation, and the structure of explanation. Students are directed by the world history textbooks of this study to concentrate on specific bits and pieces of information as the indicators of saliency tell them that some facts, some deeds, some ideas, of some people are, indeed, important. They are are guided to specific interpretations of
people and events as they are told that some people are outstanding, remarkable, or fine writers, and that others are cunning, fanatical, or ruthless. The style of writing of world history textbooks conveys messages to the students who read the textbooks.

ILLUSTRATIONS

Social studies textbooks characteristically convey a great deal of information by words but this is not the only way they do so. Textbooks also convey information and meaning by illustrations. The number of illustrations of all people named in the 12 world history textbooks is analyzed in Table 4 (page 95). The 21 most significant people were examined more fully as an addition to the analysis of selection of information and style of writing. The illustrations portray the most significant person in some non-verbal way and may be presented in a wide variety of media. The person illustrated must be specifically identified for the illustration to have been considered for analysis. The topic of illustration was not fully explored but even so, the general findings provide an additional dimension to the analysis of the role of individual persons in world history. Three aspects of illustrations were categorized and analyzed: the number of illustrations in the textbooks for each individual most significant person, the type of medium portrayed in the illustration, and the size of the group of people represented in the picture.
The Number

There are illustrations of an average of 16% of the people who are named in each textbook (see Table 4, page 88). In contrast, there are illustrations of an average of 59% of the 130 most significant people included in any of the textbooks. (One textbook illustrates 81% of the most significant people and even the one with the fewest most significant people illustrated depicts 43% of them.) All 21 of the most significant people (who receive one half page or more of narrative in six or more textbooks) are illustrated in at least one textbook and two people, Mohandas Gandhi and Adolph Hitler, are illustrated in all 12. This might reflect the use of photography in the modern world, but Martin Luther, Alexander the Great, and Augustus are illustrated in nine textbooks, and Charlemagne, Columbus, and Louis XIV are illustrated in 10 textbooks. Bismarck, Louis XIV, Adolph Hitler, and Joseph Stalin each have three illustrations in at least one textbook. A few people have two illustrations, but most of them have only one illustration in each textbook.

The Medium

The illustrations are characteristically statues, mosaics, or artifacts in ancient history; paintings until about 1900; and photographs after 1900. However, there are some exceptions in the 20th century. Merrill's Human Experience, for example, features Lenin in a painting and a cartoon in addition
to the usual photograph. Joseph Stalin and Adolph Hitler are often featured in cartoons and posters as well as photographs. The message of the illustration clearly may be something other than the appearance of the person. Overall, the medium reflects the technology of the period and, in some cases, may be more of an example of a work of art than a representation of the person depicted.

*Size of Group*

The illustrations were classified according to the number of people included: *single* for one person, *small group* for two to five people in addition to the most significant person, and *large* for a group of more than six people. The 21 most significant people are the single subject of the illustration in 52% of the illustrations, part of a small group in 17%, and part of a large group in 30% of the illustrations. In most illustrations of more than six people, the most significant person is centered or otherwise featured by being larger, wearing clothing that is different in style or color from the others, or otherwise marked as a focal point (for example, marked with a halo or special trappings of office). In a few of the large crowd scenes, for example two of the photographs of Adolph Hitler, the main subject is so small or so distant that it is not possible to distinguish his features although his presence is clearly indicated by position or symbol (*i.e.* the limousine in which Hitler rides). In such
illustrations, the point seems to be that the person was the focal point of an enormous crowd of people.

The illustrations featuring a small group are quite diverse. Sometimes the people with the most significant person are identified in only a general sense, as in McDougal Littell's photograph of Mohandas Gandhi and his grandchildren (p. 699). Sometimes the group is small and they are all prominent people (although not necessarily one of the 21), such as the photograph of Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin that appears in three textbooks (Merrill, *Human Experience*, p. 656; Scott Foresman, *History and Life*, p. 625; Scott Foresman, *Living World History*, p. 685). Sometimes, the photograph is of a pair of the 21, Hitler and Mussolini (see for example, HBJ, p. 682). Most frequently, only the most significant person is identified for students in the picture captions.

Identification of the illustration as a large group, small group, or single may be misleading. Some of the textbook illustrations are selected cuts of larger pictures. For example, there is a large mosaic of the Battle of Issus in the Museo Nazionale in Naples. Addison Wesley illustrates the mosaic in its entirety, while Prentice Hall, *Patterns of Civilization*, and Globe use only a segment of it featuring one man (and his horse) which they identify as Alexander the Great. Yet another textbook (HBJ, p. 124) features a different segment of the mosaic – and says nothing of Alexander.
In summary, illustrations appear consistently in world history textbooks and can be a valuable source of information and understanding for the students using these textbooks. While many of the people included in the textbooks do not have accompanying illustrations (84% of the total group), the most significant people usually are illustrated in the textbooks. The illustrations often feature only one person who is clearly identified as significant. When other people are included in the illustrations, the featured subject is still clear and specifically identified although the other people are infrequently named, as in the photograph of Mohandas Gandhi and his grandchildren. The nature of the medium may distort the actual appearance of an individual person, the cartoons or idealized posters of Adolph Hitler and Joseph Stalin for example, but in those instances the illustrations may have a message to convey to students other than the appearance of the person. Attitudes and opinions of authors, publishers, and society about the person may be the determining factor in the selection and presentation of illustrations in world history textbooks. This may inform us, not so much about the textbooks, as about the society which produces them.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The people who are included in world history textbooks have been selected by publishers at least partly in response to public beliefs, attitudes,
and values, and endorsed by textbook adoption committees in states, school divisions, and schools across the nation. The process of textbooks writing and production is long and arduous. The people who are selected represent, in the opinion of the textbook content decisions-makers, the significant people who span the entire spectrum of world history. Some of these people are only briefly described for students -- a sentence or two, a paragraph, or a few paragraphs. Some are described in greater length -- a full column of text, a page, or perhaps even several pages. At best, the descriptions encompass only a tiny part of what is known of these people and the people selected encompass only a small portion of all the people who have played a role in world history. Selection of some information over other information, of some people over others, and of some illustrations over others is inevitable.

The total number of people named in the 12 world history textbooks selected for analysis is large, 2190 people. The average number appearing in each textbook however, is a smaller number, 687 people. These people represent every corner of the world and every time period of history. Some things, however, receive greater emphasis than others. It matters not whether we look at the group as a whole, or at the few who are selected specifically because the largest amount of space is devoted to them, the overall picture remains constant. These significant people of world history textbooks are predominately western European, male, political leaders who are written of in
terms of their actions. The second largest group of *significant people* lags well behind the first group, both in numbers of people and in amount of narrative text. They are the leaders in the arts and are also predominantly male and western European. The second largest group of the 21 *most significant people* represent a different view of world history. They are also male, but they are the religious and moral leaders who originated in the Middle East and Asia. In style of writing the texts emphasize facts and information about events in which these people participated, and minimize analysis and explanation of those actions. The people vary from textbook to textbook (43% appear in only one book) and the details vary from person to person. The overall picture of the way individual people are treated in world history textbooks, though, is consistent with regard to categories and number of people and the way the most significant people are presented.
Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS

As students view their world history textbooks, they often express dismay at their size and seem to fear being overcome by it all --- there's so much textbook, so much information, so many names to remember. Teachers express much the same sense of being overwhelmed. There's so much of world history and it's all so very important. The school year is simply too short to deal with all of man's history everywhere in the world.

Teachers and students are right. There is much of world history and there are a great many people included in world history textbooks. The people should be interesting. They are, after all, human with all the same fears and fantasies as students. They have done dramatic and memorable things and they have influenced world history. This drama and color should excite students and interest them in these people. Instead, the people all too often are reduced to names on the page for students to memorize, to be tested on, and then forgotten. How does this happen?

Much of the answer rests within the textbooks themselves. They include a great many different people, examine all corners of the world, and span the thousands of years of human achievement in a largely chronological fashion.
with little cohesion and sense of unit. Such vastness condensed into a single textbook leaves little room for the details and explanation of information that makes history personal and memorable.

*Which people receive what amount of coverage in written words and illustrations?*

Depending on the textbook, students can expect to meet between 6 and 7 hundred different individual people in their reading of an assigned world history textbook of between 7 and 8 hundred pages. The people included in these textbooks represent every corner of the world and a wide variety of human experiences. The names are largely unfamiliar to secondary students and include many in languages unknown to students. The most notable of these people may be described and explained in a page or two of narrative text accompanied by perhaps an illustration. More frequently, however, references to the person appear scattered over several pages, or even several chapters. Those people who are deemed to be of lesser importance may be described in several paragraphs or even a sentence, or less.

All of these people are significant in one way or the other, but many of them have little information about them in the textbook. Almost half of the people who are named have one or two sentences about them, just enough to present to students, at best, three or four bits of information. The publishers
can point to the index as proof that just about everybody's favorite person is included. The problem is that this fails to provide the densely textured fact, the detail, the little ideas that build the big ideas, or the depth essential for students to gain anything other than superficial knowledge of people, places, and events. With such limited coverage of so many people there is hardly room for the biographic sketch, for the case study, for the interest and humor that make the person come alive as real and human. Sadly missing are the narrative threads, the story lines that stimulate student interest and involvement with the subject or the learning process. Equally lacking are the structured explanations that help students to make sense of people and events.

The illustrations are helpful, it is true. They are colorful and interesting and they provide a visual image of what the person looked like at some time, but only a small portion of the names are accompanied by an illustration. Few people are illustrated in more than one medium, or at more than one time of their life.

One final point to note is that even those people who have the most space devoted to them in the world history textbooks and who may be illustrated, do not have very much information presented about them. Students are asked to draw conclusions and to remember people on the basis of limited information, at best.
What are their characteristics in terms of geographic region, gender, and major field of endeavor?

Who are these people who are included in world history textbooks, and what are they like? How will the student know who are the most important? Who should be looked up to as role models to be emulated? Who should be read about as examples of behavior which is not valued, and not to be repeated?

The world history presented by these secondary world history textbooks focuses on western Europe. People from other parts of the world are included in the texts, it is true, but they are few in number. Several areas of the world are conspicuously underrepresented. Southeast Asia, for example, provides only 1% of the total of all people named in the textbooks, and Central and South America fare little better with 2% of the total each. Even Africa, with 6% of the total, may be considered to be underrepresented. Over half of the people included in any of the 12 world history textbooks are people of western Europe, and a large proportion of these are British. These people who are emphasized are important, there is no disputing that, but as the United States becomes increasingly multi-cultural, this omits the heritage of large numbers of students, many of whom have roots in Southeast Asia and in Central and South America or Africa. It downplays their worth and value if the world history they study includes primarily the tale of other people. That seems to
say that others than themselves are more significant and more valued by their own society. They are not alone in needing a more balanced treatment of the many cultures that make up the world and its history. All students need to know and to understand the cultural richness of the world if they are to be productive and informed citizens.

What else do we know about these many people of world history? They are mostly male. These textbooks are in agreement that about five to eight percent of the people named should be female and that as much as possible these females should come from all parts of the world and represent a variety of fields of achievement. The student will read of female politicians, scientists, artists, and aviators, but only about a few of them. One might expect more females to appear in the more recent history as opportunities have become more plentiful for women to participate in a wider range of activities. Such is not the case. The proportion of females remains nearly constant through the years. The people in these world history textbooks, then, are mostly men.

Not only is most of world history the domain of men but they are men who are political leaders. Some, especially in the early years of history, were military as well as political leaders. Indeed, the two were probably inseparable at certain times in history. Interestingly, other than these combined political-military leaders, there are not very many military people included in the pages of the world history texts. Artists, scientists, philosophers, and religious leaders
are certainly included in the texts but they are greatly outnumbered by the political leaders. This trend increases in the coverage of 20th century people as political leaders increase in numbers and all other categories decline in numbers in the textbooks. It seems that the determiners of textbook content in the United States value political leaders and political history over all other varieties. It is political information, however shallow, that society deems important to convey to its young people, the leaders of the next generation.

World history is a chronologically told tale in the textbooks. The books begin with earliest man and proceed through the centuries chapter by chapter with the final chapter or two dealing with the post World War II world. Emphasis is on description of specific events told in chronological order spread approximately equally over all the major time periods. The time periods used in this study, based on the textbook periodization, while not equal in number of years included are approximately equal in number of pages of coverage and in number of people included. An exception to the overall chronological pattern is the way some parts of the world are isolated from the mainstream of the chronology and are likely to have a separate chapter which combines several time periods --- Africa and Asia are most frequently treated this way (and thus easily omitted by teachers who believe western European history is more important.)

Thus, the view that students gain from these textbooks represents a
specific definition of world history. It is not the broad-based, integrated history of the world that so many scholars and teachers have called for over the years. The definition of world history according to these secondary world history textbooks, then, might read something like this. World history is the known and recorded account of all the world's people and their achievements throughout the ages. The emphasis is on male Western European political leaders. Other parts of the world and other areas of achievement are included largely as they relate to influence, or are influenced by Western European political events.

*Which people receive the most coverage? Do textbooks agree?*

While these textbooks generally do agree in this definition of history, in the number of pages appropriate for a world history textbook, and in the number of people who ought to be included, they do not agree very well on just who should be included, nor who should receive the greatest emphasis. About half the total number of people included in world history textbooks appear in only one or two of the 12 textbooks studied. There is no assurance that the people a student reads about in one assigned text are the same people a student who has another text is reading about. The same types of people appear but not the same individual people. We might assume that those who appear in only a few books are also the ones about whom there is only a
mention of a sentence or two and that the text would agree on the most
significant people -- the ones they describe and explain most extensively. This
is not the case. Although 130 people receive extensive coverage in one or
another of the 12 textbooks, only 21 receive that amount in six or more texts
of the 12, and only three receive that much in all 12 texts. Complete
agreement is lacking on who should be included and on how much coverage
they are to receive.

One textbook included in the study, *Exploring World History*, is not on
the Virginia state adoption list. This textbook, published by Globe Book
Company, was included as an example of a textbook designed for a specific
group of students, those needing a course in world history but reading below
the reading level of the typical world history textbooks. It was expected that
this book would display some distinct differences from the other textbooks.
Such does not seem to be the case.

It appears that the publishers have made a hard decision in order to
reach the target audience -- to have a small world history textbook which
contains fewer than the usual number of names. But although the Globe text
has fewer than the average number of pages (717 compared to the average of
782), it is not the smallest book of the study. Merrill's *Human Heritage* has 665
pages. The Globe text also has fewer than the average number of people
included (443 compared to the average of 687) but, once again, the Merrill
book, with 367 people named, is smaller. On the surface, then, both Globe and Merrill contain less content than do the other textbooks studied.

However, it is also apparent that the Globe book, although containing fewer people, does not skimp on the information provided. Those people who are included are more likely, than in the typical book, to have a substantial amount of information as fewer than the usual number of people receive only a sentence or two and more than the usual number of people are illustrated. In the categories of geographic region, gender, leadership, and time, Globe is approximately average. An exception to this appears in the 20th century where Globe contains fewer than the average, but not the lowest, number of people in both science and the arts. With 6% of the total people included in the text receiving one-half page or more of narrative text, neither is Globe below average in percentage of most significant people.

Having looked at the general treatment of people in the world history textbooks let us now focus on those individual people who have the most information, description, and explanation presented about them in a majority of the textbooks. In general outline these 21 people reflect the overall picture of the 2190 people treated in these world history textbooks --- only a little more so. They are all male, mostly western European, and mostly political leaders. There are no artists or scientists in the group but there are a larger than the overall average number of religious leaders included. There is one
explorer in the group, one philosopher and teacher, and one social and economic reformer. All time periods are represented by the 21 most significant leaders but the proportion of 20th century leaders is somewhat higher than the overall average. What really sets these people apart is the amount of information and explanation made possible by the greater amount of space devoted to them. It is here, if anywhere, that we find the facts and details which make these men memorable to students.

Who are these men and what are their characteristics? What is it about them that the determiners of textbook content value enough to devote at least half a page of text to them -- and make them memorable for students -- when half of all the people named have so little space and information devoted to them? Let us return to the idea of myth introduced in earlier pages. Myth was defined as that set of shared beliefs, values, and attitudes which inform decisions and actions of the group. Myths are the general statements about the world and how it got to be the way it is. They are the form in which society understands, and misunderstands, its own background and structure. The embodiment of the myths of any society is to be found in its heroes and its villains. It is among the 21 most significant people that we should find the most fully developed examples of heroes and villains, the ones the determiners of textbook content deem important for students to know about, understand, and remember.
Which people are treated as heroes/villains based on the nature of coverage? Is there agreement among textbooks on who the heroes and villains are?

There may be many heroes and many villains included within the pages of any world history textbook. There is, however, very little substantive information about most of them. The student may guess at their character and motives but the text provides sparse information and comment. It is to the most significant people, those to whom one half page or more of text is devoted, that we must look to find the information and author guidance that allows us to determine who are the heroes and who are the villains, according to the selected world history textbooks.

The characteristics of heroes and villains used here are based on the writings of Butler (1979), Fishwick (1954, 1983), and Wecter (1941). They represent a point of view based on western European and democratic traditions.

The Heroes

This study identified three groups of heroes, depending largely on how many of the typical characteristics of heroes are used by the textbooks to described them. Alexander the Great and Charlemagne fit the description of hero most closely. They are described in some detail and are identified as political and military leaders with great interest in education and culture.
second group, Augustus, Julius Caesar, Mohandas Gandhi, Martin Luther, and Muhammad, match the characteristics less well and generally are described in less detail than are Alexander and Charlemagne. They are political, military, and moral leaders. A third group, Jesus, Gautama, and Confucius, while not fully described as people, are described emphatically in terms of some of the characteristics of heroes.

In this study heroes are defined initially as having the following characteristics. They are capable, hard working, brave, honest, loyal, honorable, fair, and they exemplify progress. They are direct men of action who “do important and dramatic things memorably” (Fishwick, 1954, p. 230). Ordinary folks may also possess these characteristics but the hero has them to an extraordinary degree. The assumptions are that there are few heroes and that their powers or abilities are accompanied by recognition and acclaim. Villains may demonstrate some or all of these characteristics but they also have other attributes not shared by the heroes.

Those of the 21 most significant people in world history who seem to fit this description of hero best, although not matching in every detail, are Alexander the Great and Charlemagne. According to the texts they are characterized by courage, wisdom, exceptional leadership ability, admiration for culture and learning, and they are ambitious. Additionally, Charlemagne is presented as a devout Christian and “steadfast defender of the faith” (Scott
Foresman, *Pageant*, p. 117). They are presented as men of vision and action.

Alexander and Charlemagne are both credited with the winning of a sizeable empire and being faced with the challenge of governing it successfully. Charlemagne established law and order and centralized and made more efficient the government of his much expanded empire. His grandsons, less able or perhaps simply living in different times, were unable to hold together this empire and it quickly broke into pieces. Charlemagne’s political successes, although admirable, were not long-lasting. The textbooks provide only hints of how Alexander might have governed the huge empire he conquered had he had a longer period in which to consolidate his spectacular military gains.

The more lasting achievement of both men, according to the textbooks, was to create and cultivate education and culture. Alexander is said to have established a new culture, a blend of the best of the two cultures he so much admired -- the Greek and the Persian. This Hellenistic culture influenced the Mediterranean world for centuries and produced brilliant thinkers, writers, and scientists. It was through Alexander that the Greek heritage was preserved and extended. Charlemagne, whom the textbooks agree could read a bit and write not at all, is said to have revered learning and been instrumental in achieving better education for the clergy and in establishing schools and other scholarly activities in his domain. There is a suggestion in one textbook that he may have had a motive other than love of education. “[Charlemagne’s] most
important reasons for promoting education were political. To strengthen his rule, he needed to spread Christianity, which required educated monks. He also needed officials who could read and write to help govern the large kingdom” (Addison Wesley, p. 209). According to the other texts, though, it was his love of learning and admiration for education which prompted his actions.

Both Alexander and Charlemagne exemplify progress. They are portrayed as extending enlightenment (Greek culture in one case, Christianity and education in the other) into dark and uncivilized areas. They unified and brought the benefits of law and order to the areas they conquered. Alexander is said to have liberated Greek city states from Persian rule. (Prentice Hall, Patterns, p. 92-96) The implication is that Greek rule is superior to Persian rule, but there is no description of what Persian rule means.

Honesty, loyalty, honor, and fairness do not seem to enter the textbook-presented picture insofar as these two men are concerned. One might assume those are characteristics which accompany some of the others, but they do not appear in the textbook accounts.

Both Alexander and Charlemagne are said by the textbooks to be ambitious, a characteristic not often found among descriptors of heroes. In the case of Alexander and of Charlemagne, ambition is linked with wisdom, exceptional leadership ability, and admiration for culture and learning. As
suggested earlier, perhaps it is a matter of what other characteristics ambition is linked with. One who uses ambition wisely and is otherwise heroic, may also be admired for his ambition. Ambition linked with other, less desirable characteristics, may not be so much admired.

In the textbook accounts Charlemagne is credited with more examples of public recognition and acclaim than is Alexander. There are no accounts in the texts that even hint of Alexander receiving acclaim in his own time. He seems much admired in current school textbooks for his achievements of conquering a vast empire and introducing Greek culture to the East, but students are not informed of how he was accepted in his own time. One text tells us he “had become a legend in his lifetime” (Merrill, Human Experience, p. 76) but the comment is not further elaborated. The implication is that it was his military conquests that prompted this. Another text says “After his death, Alexander became a romantic legend. More than 80 versions of his life have been written in more than 20 languages” (Merrill, Human Heritage, p. 198). Recognition, then, came in later generations. Certainly Charlemagne’s crowning by the pope and the accounts of the crowd’s reaction indicate recognition and public acclaim. “The crowd of people in the church . . . shouted, ‘Hail to Charles the Augustus, crowned by God to be the great and peace-giving emperor of the Romans, life and victory’” (DC Heath, p. 197). The tale appears in every textbook but there is complete agreement about
neither the motivation nor the significance of the event. Certainly his title, recounted differently in every text, suggests that at least his political and military superiority were recognized.

The textbooks account are not clear on the issue of whether these two men created events or were created by their times and environment. Certainly both emerged from politically tenuous situations. The two men, then, seem to be the products of environments which created opportunities as well as challenges for them. They are portrayed as emerging out of that environment to go on to win empires for themselves. The textbook accounts lead one to believe they achieved this by themselves. Although the word army is used, students are provided with so few details that it is difficult to believe that either Alexander or Charlemagne had any help to accomplish their actions. The image is one of great men who single-handedly accomplished great deeds.

Neither Alexander nor Charlemagne is associated by the textbooks with any negative actions or results. The implications of their conquests for those who were conquered are simply not disclosed. There is a vague hint that Charlemagne was willing to overlook means in order to achieve his goals in the comments that he forced people, notably the Saxons, to convert to Christianity. Perhaps it is a matter of the goal being of such paramount importance that any means are acceptable.

We have identified two fairly clear-cut heroes among our 21 most
significant people. They are portrayed as men of great wisdom, exceptional leadership ability, outstanding courage, and ambition. They are men of vision and action who exemplify progress and whose greatest achievements stem from their admiration for culture and learning. They evidence some characteristics generally described as typical of heroes but they also exhibit some other characteristics.

A second group fits the general description of heroes but somewhat less well than do Alexander and Charlemagne. They are Augustus, Julius Caesar, Mohandas Gandhi, Martin Luther, and Muhammad. All are robust men of action. They challenge the existing order and in one way or another, win out in the end.

Two characteristics these men share in abundance. They are courageous and they are men others want to follow. Every one of them faced major challenges and dangerous situations with daring and bravery. Every one of them led men well. They are portrayed in the textbooks as clever politicians and/or astute military commanders. Martin Luther was neither a politician nor a military commander but the accounts are consistent in their comments about his quickly gaining a large following both of peasants and of princes. One text (Merrill, Human Heritage, p. 26) specifically describes his triumphal procession to Worms for his meeting with the Diet. All tell of the German prince who offered Luther asylum in his castle when Luther was condemned as an outlaw.
Luther, it seems, was a leader of men in his own way. The textbook accounts agree that these men were all strong leaders who commanded great loyalty among their many followers.

Other heroic characteristics were displayed by these men. They all were capable (the terms skillful and talented appear frequently), Luther was energetic, Muhammad was honest, and Gandhi was just and possessed great integrity. They are presented obviously as men of honor and fairness.

Public recognition is at least suggested for all of this group. They are said to be popular and Julius Caesar, Martin Luther, and Muhammad are singled out as powerful speakers. It is difficult to be sure of Gandhi’s public recognition. Certainly he is said to have many devoted followers but it is not completely clear from the textbook accounts just how much public acclaim he received.

Gandhi may be unique among the group in the challenge he presented to the ways and values of western Europeans. The textbooks make no secret of his agitation against the British but emphasize his espousal of passive resistance and non-violent opposition.

This group is presented as quite clearly the product of the time and the environment. The textbooks portray them as being in the right place at the right time. Julius Caesar and Augustus both faced a Rome plagued by political chaos and civil strife but accompanied by recognition of the need for a strong
leader to restore law and order. Martin Luther was the focal point for much dissatisfaction with existing religious practices and institutions. He provided the leadership to fill a need perceived by many. Muhammad and Gandhi are presented as sharing this trait but with the added element of providing political leadership as well. Luther might have done so too but he is stated to have refused the political role which both peasants and princes tried to thrust upon him.

The members of this second group of heroes are portrayed as courageous leaders of men. They are capable and some are described as energetic, honest, and just. They received public recognition for their achievements and are clearly the products of their times and environment. They are heroes but not on such a grand scale as Alexander and Charlemagne --- nor are they attributed with comparable admiration for culture and learning.

This takes us to another group: Jesus, Gautama, and Confucius. They are all obviously “good” as signaled by indicators of saliency and evaluation. They are portrayed as moral and ethical leaders with many accomplishments to their credit. In each case, at least one great accomplishment was the establishment of a code of ethical conduct. Jesus clearly established a significant new religion and at least some of the followers of Gautama claim the same for him.
Once beyond this, however, it is difficult to detect the characteristics of these men from the textbook accounts. They are so strongly hedged that they fail to emerge as real people or as heroes in the accounts. Students simply are not informed of their traits or characteristics. The hero characteristics are seldom directly recounted with regard to these men.

All of this group are said by the textbooks to have developed groups of followers but in their own times these followers, though strongly loyal, were few in number. The implication is that they were leaders in the field of ideas more than leaders of men. Ideas, however, proved to have long-lasting effects because it was in later generations that large numbers of people became devotees of their ideas, a situation repeatedly stressed by the textbooks. This group more nearly became heroes in later generations than in their own times. Interestingly, in all three cases it was their followers who wrote their ideas and teachings, an experience shared by Muhammad.

Those we have labeled as heroes and who share at least some heroic characteristics are Alexander the Great, Augustus, Charlemagne, Gautama, Jesus, Julius Caesar, Martin Luther, Mohandas Gandhi, and Muhammad. Most of them are portrayed as capable, intelligent, and courageous. They are leaders who generate great loyalty among their followers and who exemplify progress toward better lives for humans. Above all, they are men of action who possess these characteristics to an extraordinary degree. They are products of their
environment and appear on the scene at just the right time to be effective. Some receive acclaim and recognition in their own time, others’ accomplishments are recognized only later.

The heroes, as a whole, are described in terms of momentous achievements. They conquer vast empires and rule them wisely or they devise rules of conduct based on respect for other people which become the bases for grand civilizations. They respect traditional customs and beliefs of their own society and attempt to restore them. They influence people, not only in their own times and lands but for many generations and in many other places. The textbooks agree in their descriptions of these heroes. They may recount different details but the overall message is clearly the same.

*The Villains*

Three pair of villains appear among the 21 most significant people of world history textbooks. Adolph Hitler and Joseph Stalin are clearly villains in all of the textbooks of this study. They are portrayed as men of talent, but as exhibiting characteristics opposite those of heroes, therefore as villains. Benito Mussolini and Lenin are less fully described by the textbooks and appear to be somewhat less villainous in that fewer of the characteristics of villain are attributed to them. Their actions, as described by the textbooks, are neither as dramatic nor as villainous as are those of Hitler and Stalin. Otto
von Bismarck and Karl Marx form the third pair of villains. They are less clearly villainous than are the others. They are, however, described in terms of at least some villainous characteristics.

The villain is also an event-maker whose actions clearly show the possession of outstanding ability, courage, and vigor. Villains are described in dictionaries as wicked, evil, malevolent, and nefarious. It is difficult to know without a doubt what motivates such behavior or, indeed, even to precisely describe the behavior that would indicate such characteristics. The textbooks occasionally use the term hero but never the term villain. We must, then, try to discern such behavior for ourselves. Some possibly common characteristics were suggested earlier. Villains deliberately inflict pain and death on large numbers of people who are not directly involved; are motivated solely by hatred, personal greed, lust, or pride; may be characterized as corrupt, selfish, immoral, or untruthful; may destroy or prevent works of art, literature, or music; and may be losers in the competition for power. It seems that villains are, in many ways, the exact opposites of heroes.

Those who in the textbooks exhibit the greatest number of these characteristics are Adolph Hitler and Joseph Stalin. Both most certainly were major event-makers. World events both during and after their lifetimes were heavily influenced by these men. They both headed nations which included many millions of people whose very lives hung on the decisions of these
There is little question that both men were capable, courageous, and dynamic. Textbooks inform students that Adolph Hitler was twice decorated for bravery when he was a soldier during World War I, was a spell-binding and hypnotic orator, and that he was a highly competent and successful organizer and leader. Joseph Stalin is described as a shrewd politician who worked his way up through the ranks of the Communist party to the highest position in a huge and powerful nation. He was a successful, highly skilled administrator and political leader.

Other traits attributed to Hitler by textbooks include suspicion, resentment, willfulness, intolerance, and fanaticism. He is also spoken of as frustrated, self-pitying, impatient, ruthless, and contemptuous of those he considered inferior. Stalin shares many of these characteristics. He too is portrayed as suspicious, impatient, ruthless, willful, and as a dedicated Communist. Other traits he is said to possess are that he was cold, hard, impersonal, and secretive. Not only did he distrust others, they distrusted him. Lenin labeled him as untrustworthy and dangerous and Khrushchev denounced him as a murderous tyrant. Both Hitler and Stalin are described as extremely nationalistic and as ambitious. These traits appear to be direct opposites of traits attributed to heroes but do they mean these men were evil, malevolent, immoral, or corrupt? It is difficult to decide. Perhaps behavior will provide
insight into inner traits and motivation.

Adolph Hitler is described in textbooks as dropping out of school, dreaming of becoming an artist, drifting through minor jobs in Vienna, and finally, enlisting in the German army in World War I. These may be actions of indecision, failure, and patriotism but they are hardly immoral or corrupt behavior.

It is after the war that his actions are described as taking a different direction. Students are informed that he joined or helped establish a political party which eventually became the Nazi party, was imprisoned for the attempted overthrow of Germany's first republic, and wrote Mein Kampf in which his hatred of Jews and Slavs and his determination to eliminate them was for the first time made public. His hatred and contempt may have been present for some time but it is here that the textbooks indicate the beginning of a transformation from belief to action.

Every textbook indicates that Hitler was invited to head up a new government as chancellor in 1933 -- an entirely legal procedure under the Weimar constitution. It is at this point that his behavior begins to be described in different terms by the textbooks: he abolished the Weimar constitution; took power away from the Reichstag, the legally elected legislature; became dictator by forcing the legislature to give him emergency powers; eliminated opposition; outlawed trade unions; and suppressed or controlled all sources of
information. Hitler immediately began an extensive program of rearmament and military build-up in direct violation of legal and binding treaties signed at the conclusion of World War I. While these actions may not be evil or wicked, they certainly represent behavior something less than trustworthy, loyal, and honest.

In his relations with other countries Hitler is also portrayed as being disloyal and untrustworthy. All textbooks describe the non-aggression pact with Stalin and the subsequent invasion of the Soviet Union in terms surely unmistakable to students. He is also described as using the resources and labor of other nations to enhance German might at the expense of others. His dealings with Chamberlain, Daladier, and Schuschnigg are described by various textbooks in terms of intimidation, lies, and manipulation. The characteristics of disloyalty and untrustworthiness are thus illustrated by behavior.

It is with Hitler’s treatment of those he perceived to be in opposition to him, possible rivals, or simply inferior that the most villainous behavior is portrayed. He is said to have lied to, and about, everyone he wished to control, and to have acted against them in direct and dramatic ways. One text, for example, informs students that he had as many as 500,000 people imprisoned (Addison Wesley, p. 681), and another that he had 1,000 people killed, including many of his own followers (Houghton Mifflin, p. 667) in his efforts to eliminate opposition. Perhaps most villainous of all, however, were
his efforts to eliminate the Jews and other "inferior" people he so detested --- all non-combatants and, insofar as the textbook accounts relate, people who were not actively involved in opposition to him. The textbooks agree that approximately 6 million Jews and 6 million others died as a result of his hatred and his decisions.

Stalin's behavior is portrayed in much the same way. The textbooks describe that once in power Stalin used censorship, propaganda, and terrorism to eliminate opposition, including many of his own party. For example, one textbook tells students of the arrest of nearly 8 million people to get rid of opposition (HBJ, p. 687) and another recounts that thousands of party members were purged, millions were arrested, and many were executed (Prentice Hall, Patterns, p. 676).

It was the agricultural part of his Five Year Plans, however, that resulted in the deaths of millions of peasants. The textbooks do not agree on the numbers, nor do they tell a complete story regarding the causes of death, but it is unmistakable that it was Stalin's decisions about collectivization, sale of grain, and emphasis on heavy industry at the expense of consumer goods that were responsible for the deaths of somewhere between 5 and 10 million Russian peasants.

Stalin's behavior in his dealings with other countries is presented as being little more appealing. Although he appears in a somewhat sympathetic
light in view of the German invasion of his country, that is quickly dispelled by comments about his participation in international conferences at the end of World War II and his actions in the immediate post-war years. Students are presented with his refusal to honor commitments, his refusal to allow free elections, and Soviet take-over of much of eastern Europe at his orders.

Both Hitler and Stalin are portrayed by the textbooks as products of their environment and as having come to power and taken the actions they did because the times were right. Stalin’s early years are presented against the backdrop of the crumbling of czarist Russia, early revolutionary activities, arrest, and exile. He rose through the party apparatus during disastrous foreign wars, a revolution, and civil war. Conditions were little improved when he took control and initiated his Five Year Plans designed to strengthen the nation with no regard for the cost to the individual. World War II invasion and the eventual push for quick recovery after the war provided opportunity for continued dictatorial actions.

Hitler is presented in much the same way, though the details are different. His opportunity to rise to the top came on the heels of a humiliating defeat for Germany in World War I, international disapproval, economic disaster, political instability, and social unrest. All of the textbooks describe this in some detail. Once in power the picture changes. Now it is Hitler’s decisions which set the stage for events. However, it is still existing conditions
which encourage large numbers of people to support or condone his actions and thus make them possible. It is his military build-up, actions against “inferior” peoples, and invasions that set in motion the opposition which culminated, at least in part, in World War II and eventual defeat for Adolph Hitler.

A word of caution must be added here. It is difficult to tell from the textbooks just who is responsible for some of these actions. Textbooks frequently describe actions as being the work of Nazis and Communists or Germans and Soviets rather than specifically the actions of Hitler and Stalin. It is clear that Hitler and Stalin headed both the parties and the governments, but the exact connections between that leadership and the implementation of policies are, in most cases, not very clearly described. The implication is that the man in charge had a major role, however.

Another two of the 21 most significant people fit the general description of villains. Benito Mussolini and Lenin are less extensively written about in the textbooks than are Hitler and Stalin and the descriptions of them are less well developed. The characteristics attributed to them are less likely to be described in terms of ability and courage. Lenin is described as being a shrewd revolutionary in one text. This is the single hint in any of the texts of capabilities. Mussolini fares a little better. He is described as a dazzling orator and as having a commanding presence in one text and as being clever in
another. Both men are said to be ambitious. Both are also said to be ruthless in their use of power and willing to use terror in order to fulfill their ambitions. Lenin is described as a fanatical revolutionary and Mussolini as an extreme nationalist. The picture of them, though fragmentary and not well developed in the texts, suggests men of ability, ambition, and extreme dedication to their own views who are willing to use harsh means to gain their goals.

As described in the texts, their actions confirm the impression given by the description of their characteristics. Both Mussolini and Lenin are said to have restructured their governments, the laws, and the economic systems in accordance with their personal fanatical views and without reference to the people. Lenin and Mussolini both took actions following their coming to power which included eliminating all opposition through the use of secret police, killings, and outlawing of rival parties. There is, however, no indication of the extent of these actions nor the number of people who might have been involved. It is suggested that in the civil war following the revolution which brought Lenin to power, hundreds of thousands (or several millions, the texts do not agree) died of famine, disease, and atrocities but this is linked to Lenin only in that he was the leader of the Communist party during this period. Mussolini is associated only with the ending of personal rights, not with the death of large numbers of people.
In most textbooks Lenin is credited with desiring to promote world revolution, but there are few descriptions of actions he may have taken to make this a reality. Mussolini's foreign policies are described in a little more detail. He is credited with an aggressive foreign policy which included invasion of Ethiopia. In both cases the intent seems more important than the reality of expansion.

Two additional people of the 21 most significant people present a less clear picture but match a number of the characteristics of villains. These are Otto von Bismarck and Karl Marx.

Bismarck is portrayed in the textbooks as a competent diplomat and politician. His goal was unification of the German states under Prussian leadership, and he made it happen. He is variously described as a brilliant diplomat and an astute politician. He is also described as a master of realpolitik and characterized as unscrupulous, crafty, tough, devious, calculating, shrewd, and cunning. While these characteristics may not match precisely any of the previously noted characteristics of villain, they are opposites of what have been proposed as the hero characteristics of honesty and honor. Bismarck is also commonly said to be loyal to the Prussian monarchy and to have "no faith in the ability of the people to govern themselves" (Addison Wesley, p. 538). He is said to be unconcerned about public opinion or response, believing success in achieving goals to be more
important than legality or idealism. The only clues about the motivation for these beliefs and the actions they prompted are the frequent textbook comments that he was conservative and extremely nationalistic.

All of the textbooks recount in some detail the unification of the German states by means of a series of wars. Most textbooks credit Bismarck with planning these wars, the work of a crafty and cunning person. In some texts, however, the picture emerges more of Bismarck seizing opportunities as they present themselves. The texts do not directly state this latter view. It is a matter of implication that students may or may not perceive. The point is that unification did take place and that Bismarck was largely responsible for it. It is difficult to know from the texts whether this unification under Prussian leadership represents progress, especially since another of Bismarck's achievements described in all texts is his dramatic increase of the industrial and military might of the newly unified nation.

Other behaviors of Bismarck related in the texts include his attacks on Catholics and socialists. In neither case did the attacks include arrests or deaths. Rather, they took the form of laws restricting actions. The laws generally proved to be ineffective and Bismarck was forced to turn to other methods to ensure the power of the monarchy. One evidence of progress described in all texts was the comprehensive state program of social insurance enacted by Bismarck. Most texts comment, however, that the motivation was
in reality to lure workers away from socialism rather than to provide security and better health for them. One textbook summarizes the situation as “Whatever their reason, however, the reforms gave German workers one of the most generous social security programs in Europe” (Addison Wesley, p. 540).

Karl Marx presents a similarly cloudy picture. He is not fully developed as a person in any of the texts, making it impossible to determine personal characteristics, motivation, or indeed, even goals. He is presented as responding to the miserable working and living conditions of workers and wanting to see a change. In this sense, then, he is portrayed as at least desiring progress toward a better life. He is also, however, portrayed as being a poor prophet and his theories as being seriously flawed and in error. Although he may have desired changes leading to progress, his ideas failed to achieve the desired results. Ironically it was the capitalist system itself which reformed the worst abuses, and conditions improved, according to the textbooks, without Karl Marx and his theories. Karl Marx seems thus not wicked so much as ineffectual and a loser, although the texts also point out that his ideas attracted many followers and were influential. They do not, however, develop this latter point in much detail.

Those we have labeled as villains and who share at least some characteristics are Adolph Hitler, Joseph Stalin, Benito Mussolini, Lenin, Otto
von Bismarck, and Karl Marx. They are all men of outstanding ability and intelligence. They are courageous, ambitious, and vigorous. They inspire people to follow their lead. They are also harsh men of action, willing to exact a high price in human life and security to enact their ideas, their beliefs, and their goals. To varying degrees, they eliminated opposition, used existing systems of law and government to achieve and retain power, and, in the end, themselves knew terror and defeat.

Karl Marx, the one man of ideas rather than political action, fits the overall pattern less well than the others --- and in the long run may have influenced more people over a longer time. The texts do not present much information or comment on this point.

*The Mixed Hero/Villains*

The remainder of the group of 21 most significant people exhibit a mixture of hero and villain characteristics. They may at some times show evidence of heroic characteristics and at other times of villainous characteristics. In some cases motivation itself appears to be mixed or, more likely has not been transmitted clearly through the years. This group includes Charles I, Christopher Columbus, Louis XIV, Napoleon Bonaparte, and Peter I.

These people are presented to students as being capable, courageous,
and hard-working. Charles I is described in at least one text as possessing great intelligence and all textbooks indicate great courage in the way he faced his execution. One text goes so far as to say that it was this admirable courage which made it possible for his son to eventually succeed to the throne. Christopher Columbus is described as daring and adventurous. Certainly it took great courage to cross uncharted and vast waters in the face of ridicule and fear. Louis XIV is attributed with ability to rule skillfully, of taking seriously the business of being king, and of working hard at fulfilling what he perceived to be kingly duties. Napoleon was said to be a military genius and a capable organizer and administrator. Certainly the texts do not question his courage as he led his men into battle and challenged the great nations of the world. Peter I of Russia is described as a brilliant and able ruler, one who got things done despite grave obstacles of weather, opposition from the boyars, and lack of knowledge and training. These men are all described in textbooks in terms of heroic characteristics matched by their accomplishments.

The accomplishments attributed to these leaders by the textbooks are momentous. They exhibit behavior commensurate with their heroic characteristics. Charles I agreed to a pivotal role in the government for the legislature, a major departure for the times. His motivation may have been self preservation and he may not have actually believed in these limitations on royal power but the fact remains that he did agree and that this provided the
foundation for later implementation of the principles. Christopher Columbus discovered a whole new world for Europeans. Louis XIV provided support and encouragement for many talented artists and created a centralized monarchy which provided a brilliant model for much of the world. Napoleon implemented many reforms which enacted and preserved the goals and ideals of the French revolution. This was a task that others had been unable to accomplish. Peter strengthened government administration and opened the way for many talented people to participate in government, a privilege previously denied to them. The behavior, as well as the personal traits, of these men match the descriptions of heroes.

But, there is another side to the textbook descriptions of these people. They are also described in terms the same as or similar to the terms used to describe villains. Charles I is described as provoking a civil war which was costly in terms of human lives and cost him his throne and his head. Thousands suffered from his arrogance and ill-timed decisions. Readers are told that Christopher Columbus discovered a new world but are not told that the results for those already inhabiting those lands were a large number of deaths, destruction of their civilizations, and for many generations, loss of freedom. This latter impact is not clearly described by the textbooks. Rather, in response to traditional patriotic beliefs they emphasize the glorious discovery of a continent. But the message of death and destruction lurks not
too far behind the innocuous textbook accounts and the controversies about Columbus of recent years will undoubtedly find their way into the next round of world history textbooks. Louis XIV built an elaborate palace and created a brilliant court life at the expense of the common people who did not benefit from it. The costs of such luxury drained the treasury and left major problems for his successors to solve. Napoleon is described as vain, domineering, and as savagely putting down opposition by means of secret police, censorship, and terrorism. He twice left his army to recover from major defeats and make their own way back home. Many thousands of people died or were seriously wounded in the military engagements he promoted. Peter I is described as forcing the aristocrats to behavior which directly violated their traditional religious and social beliefs, sometimes to the point of violence. He is said to have personally murdered the guardsmen who challenged his authority. The building of a new capital at St Petersburg is presented as being costly in terms of human life and further isolating the aristocracy from the people they were supposed to rule. The peasants did not escape the cost either. The point is made in the texts that the cost of Peter’s improvements was high in terms of both money and human lives. Details are not recounted in most cases and numbers are only hinted at but the message of death, destruction, and despair is unmistakable.

This group, then, is mixed in the textbook treatment of heroes and
villains. They may emerge in individual textbooks as a little more of one than of the other but, overall, students are presented with a mixed picture and not much direct textbook guidance in sorting it out.

In summary, the 12 textbooks of this study do agree on the identity of the heroes, the villains, and the mixed hero/villains. There are only slight variations in the events and the details described. The traits, characteristics, beliefs, and achievements may not be labeled with exactly the same words, but the message is remarkably similar. Globe’s *Exploring World History* is designed, as described earlier, for a lower reading level. It describes events in less complex words and more concretely than do the others (with the possible exception of Merrill’s *Human Heritage*). However, it is only a matter of elaboration, not of disagreement. All 12 of the textbooks of the study identify the same heroes, villains, and mixed hero/villains, and describe them in a similar manner.

**THE MYTHS**

What are the myths of our society as revealed by a study of how individual people are treated in 12 secondary level world history textbooks? What are the attitudes, values, and beliefs cherished enough by those who determine textbook content to want them transmitted to new generations?
It's a Political World

If we look carefully at the textbooks, it is apparent that the political world is valued above all else. It is the political leaders who are most numerous and have the most written about them. It is political events that are described and explained in greatest detail. Although the emphasis is political, it is the political world of kings, emperors, pharaohs, and tyrants that is emphasized. For example, among the 21 most significant people there is not one proponent of democratically elected republican government. Law and order are valued, but these conditions are described as the work of single strong leaders. The textbooks emphasize larger-than-life size men who conquer empires single handedly and who introduce their own customs and culture into what they perceive to be less developed or less enlightened areas. One might speculate that this fits the notion that while our roots may be in western Europe, the United States has progressed to better political systems and practices. The political world of the world history textbooks is the old political world that proved to be inadequate.

Importance of Rules of Ethical Conduct

The notable exceptions to the emphasis on the political world are those people we revere as great moral leaders. They may also be men of great religious significance but it is their ethical codes of conduct that are
emphasized by the textbooks. In a sense they parallel the political leaders in many of their actions. They too establish law and order, but it is the law of religion and the order of respect for human life and well-being. They are men who reform existing religious systems. They conquer empires too as their ethical systems gain converts and eventually spread over large areas. They seem, however, to work less alone than do the political leaders. It is their loyal followers who record their beliefs and who carry them afar. Belief in ethical conduct based on respect for human life is apparently of fundamental concern and is a message we want to convey to students, regardless of the precise form their religious practices might assume.

Social History Little Valued

That which is not included in world history textbook may be as informative about the myths of our society as what is included. The world history textbooks include few women, none that fit our definition of most significant person. As long as world history is mostly political history, this is as it should be. In fact, throughout history political affairs have been essentially a male domain. To include women who did not play major roles would not be true to history. The point is not that women are not valued, but that the variety of history in which women have played a larger role has not been valued. The histories of social interactions, of social reform, of domestic
life, and of family life receive no emphasis and, indeed, little mention in current world history textbooks. The message is that these matters are of little importance since they have no role in world history.

*Little Economic History*

In this matter of emphasis it is perhaps significant to note that the economic world and economic leaders are seldom included in world history textbooks. The Industrial Revolution of Europe receives some pages, mostly in the form of listing the major British inventors, and the plight of industrial workers in western Europe is deplored in a page or two. The topics, however, are neither fully explained nor are alternative economic systems explained as anything other than dreams and utopian wishes. The business and banking leaders of industrial development are seldom included and their vision and daring receive, at best, a mention in passing. Economic development of the rest of the world is simply ignored. Economic development apparently is not thought to play an important role in world history.

*Men of Action*

Action is apparently much valued. The textbooks repeatedly describe actions taken by people but only infrequency analyze or explain those actions. The 21 most significant people, for example, are portrayed as direct and men of action whose achievements are obvious and understandable to ordinary folk.
They may be thoughtful and may achieve things in the inner world of ideas and beliefs but what is emphasized is the way they teach and convince others of their beliefs. It is their actions that are made to appear important. The message is that *doing* is somehow more significant and heroic than *thinking*.

*20th Century Villains*

It is interesting to consider the emphasis given to 20th century villains and to the death and destruction that identifies them as villain. Four of the 21 most significant people are 20th century villains all of whom receive extensive coverage in all textbooks. Why should this be so? One might speculate that the underlying purpose is to inform students so they will see these people as villains and thus prevent any recurrence of their deeds. This may indicate an underlying belief about the cyclical nature of history. Events repeat themselves unless prevented by alert and informed members of society. It is also interesting to consider the possibility that this emphasis reflects the decision-making process within the publishing companies more than an underlying belief of our society as a whole. We don’t know much of the decision-making process of the industry, but one might speculate regarding the age of those with whom the ultimate content decisions rest. It is possible that they are mostly of an age to have been heavily influenced by World War II experiences. A third possibility rests with outside pressure groups who in recent years have
been increasingly active in ensuring that the holocaust not be forgotten.

*Eurocentrism*

World history textbooks focus mostly on the histories and people of western European nations and their roots in the eastern Mediterranean region. Some other areas of the world are included, frequently with many factual details and a number of illustrations. Explanations and analyses are notably absent, however, and connections to the rest of world history are weak. They are treated either as isolated pieces of the textbook and of the world, or they are considered primarily in relation to the nations and people of western Europe. They are not dealt with as an integrated part of the whole of world history. Other parts of the world fare even less well. They are omitted entirely. Seldom do textbooks include references, for example, to Canada, Poland, Thailand, Malaysia, or many other places. The apparent belief is that it is important for students in the United States to know about western European people and events as that is the source of the society and practices of the United States. Other parts of the world, other people and achievements, may be interesting but are hardly significant and their famous people, cultures, and traditions are not major factors in world history.

*The Arts*

If the number of people named in the textbooks is an indication of
importance in world history, the arts must be considered to be of great importance by Americans. In all the world history textbooks people involved in the arts are second only to the political leaders in number of people named. However, it must be remembered that they are far fewer in number than the political leaders and that none of them receive enough coverage to be included among the 21 most significant people. Leaders in the arts are, in fact, mentioned a much higher percentage of the time than other categories of leadership. Apparently, the arts are important in quantity. Students must know of a great many, principally European, writers, musicians, painters, and sculptors, but need know very little about them or their work.

**Mentioning**

The topic of mentioning of people, places, and things without providing the substantial knowledge necessary to make them understandable, suggests an apparent valuing of a superficial cultural patina. If we truly expect students to learn from textbooks and if so little information is provided, the logical conclusion is that what we desire to have our young people know is the names of many people and maybe their general category of achievement. The appearance of an educated person evidently is cherished.

**The Heroes**

The heroes who embody these attitudes and beliefs are
exceptionally capable people. They are portrayed as possessing great wisdom, extraordinary leadership ability, and outstanding courage. Their actions epitomize progress, a moving forward, improvement, and development. They may encounter resistance but the hero is ethical, honest, just, moral, and right and so wins out in the end.

The Villains

The villains are also exceptionally capable people. They too are intelligent and courageous leaders who people want to follow. They, however, are portrayed as being motivated by hatred and greed. They inflict unspeakable pain and death on others. They stifle progress even though they may speak of it often. They do not value the individual, and his interests and well being are of less importance than those of the leader and his immediate followers.

IMPLICATIONS

World history presents a unique challenge to social studies educators. As a school subject it covers a longer time period (all of human history) and presents a larger stage (the entire world) than any other course. Additionally, it incorporates the culture of the peoples studied, so teachers must be knowledgeable about art, music, religion, philosophy, literature, and language. World history is perhaps the most complex and sophisticated of all school
subjects. It is currently most frequently taught as a one-year survey course, indeed a daunting challenge.

Curriculum Design

One of the major implications of this study is for curriculum design. What is world history and should it continue to be a one-year survey course? The number of people now included in world history textbooks by itself suggests an already heavy content load. At the same time, however, large areas of the world and its population are underrepresented so still more content is needed. If we add to this the inevitably increasing amount of information, events, and people active in world affairs, the task becomes overwhelming. At the same time, class periods have been reduced in length and the number of courses students engage in has been increased thus leaving less time for the study of the content of a single course. Realistically, there is not enough time in a single school year to accomplish the traditional thorough, full-scale study of all of world history. The answer may be in looking at world history through a different lens. World history textbooks could become more thematic, more integrated, more holistic in approach. They could support the less Eurocentric, less parallel national histories, and the more integrated world history called for by some scholars and teachers for many years. World history could become the organizing framework for a several year history course which incorporates
United States history in its appropriate time-period as recommended by the Curriculum Task Force of the National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools (1989) in Charting a Course: Social Studies for the 21st Century. Those responsible for curriculum design and integration must consider the options and possibilities very carefully. The decisions are difficult to make, and even more difficult to implement. We cannot, however, continue to minimize the achievements, the pain, or the worth of vast segments of the world simply because “there isn’t time” to do it the way “we’ve always done it.”

*Classroom Instruction*

There are implications, too, for classroom instruction. The world history textbooks are generally colorful, heavy with content, and include many aids to effective teaching. They contain much that is valuable and helpful for the student, but they are also characterized by some weaknesses and may not be completely suitable for a specific class, school, or community. In order to make effective use of these materials the teacher must identify the strengths and the deficiencies of the particular textbook and identify the areas that present problems for specific classes and communities. It is on this point that this study focuses, providing both specific information about a portion of the contents of current world history textbooks and a framework for analysis of other history texts.
Having identified the strengths and weaknesses, the biases and the omissions of the assigned world history textbook, it is the teacher who must plan learning activities to correct or counteract these weaknesses and capitalize on the strengths. Identifying the elements in the structure of explanation suggests a wide range of activities. For example, students might identify in the textbook a belief of a political leader, then predict the other elements of the structure of explanation, and read in textbook and other resources to verify or disprove the hypothesis. It is the task of the teacher to tailor textbook use to the needs of the students, the curriculum, and the community.

It is the teacher who must complement unbalanced or fragmentary textbook accounts by supplementing the texts with other appropriate instructional materials. If the textbook fails to provide adequate materials about the history of Southeast Asia, for example, the teacher must provide other books, films, illustrations, or guest speakers. The textbook, no matter how thick it may be, is inadequate as the sole instructional resource for study of world history.

And, above all, it is the teacher who must make hard decisions about what to emphasize, what to connect, what to leave out, and what to summarize in order to achieve a comprehensive and integrated view of world history. The teacher must first, however, know the contents of the textbook. Once the teacher recognizes the inadequacies of the world history textbook, the
traditional "read the textbook and answer the questions at the end of the chapter" will no longer suffice.

*Textbook Adoption Committees*

The implications for textbook adoption committees, at all levels, are equally strong. The high incidence of mentioning in world history textbooks must be noted. Names without richness of information do little to inform students. They simply take up space that could be used to better elaborate and explain a smaller number of people and events. The problem is one of balance. World history is a broad subject and the textbooks probably do need to include many significant people, but including individuals just for the sake of having a name in print should not force textbooks to abandon their purpose of providing richness of information and explanation. Checklists of people, or even categories of people, who must be included are inadequate as a means of assessing world history textbooks. They actually may do more harm than good as textbook publishers see these lists as reasons to add still more people to the overcrowded accounts of world history.

Another question to ponder is that of match of textbook content and style with local objectives and needs. Different world history textbooks do include different people and it ought to be possible to match the people with the local objectives, but this is a difficult task. It takes careful scrutiny to
identify, for example, the world history textbook whose emphasis on the arts matches the local objectives for multidisciplinary study. And, even if a person’s name is present in the index, the amount and nature of information and ideas presented must also be considered. If many artists or writers, for example, are listed in the index but are dismissed with a sentence here and there, what message is conveyed to students about their significance in the world? This may, in fact, do more to harm than to support interdisciplinary studies including history and the arts. Checklists of what ought to be included and cursory looks at the index are simply not enough. A much more detailed study of what is included and how it is written needs to be made before world history textbooks are selected for classroom use.

**Standardized Testing**

There are implications for standardized testing. There are several major areas of concern here. First is the sheer number of people included in the world history textbooks. Selection of some people over others, for both textbook and for standardized test content, is inevitable. The question is, will the same ones be selected? It is also important to remember that just because a person’s name is included in a world history textbook it does not mean there is very much to learn about that person or the concepts embodied in his or her actions. Another problem is the lack of agreement among world history
textbooks about who should be included. The 12 textbooks studied do not include the same people. There are a large number of people, thus events and concepts, in one or two textbooks only. A very small number, indeed, appear in all the world history textbooks studied. The problem is the match between standardized tests and the world history textbooks.

The problem becomes even larger when the role of world history within standardized tests is considered. World history is a broad subject, including as it does, all of the world and all of its people. Standardized tests that include a section on the social studies, of which world history is but a part, cannot hope to do justice to the whole of world history. The conclusions drawn from a mere handful of questions, sometimes only three or four, do little to assess what the student knows of the world.

National Standards

In the same vein, what about the committees currently working to develop national standards for social studies? If the world history textbooks agree, as they do, on general categories and number of people, it seems not only possible but likely that the committees dealing with world history will focus on these things. Are they, however, truly the people, the actions, and the beliefs that we would choose for a national standard of world history if it were not for the textbooks? The world history textbooks do not agree on the details
how many people and exactly which ones. Where does that leave the
committee? If the committee elects simply to describe the world history
currently defined by the textbooks, it seems probable this will further delay the
overhaul of world history and the development of an agreed upon conceptual
base for the course. If the committee strives to take the lead in new directions,
as they have the opportunity to do, textbooks publishers must massively revise
world history textbooks to support their recommendations.

Teacher Preparation

There are implications for teacher preparation as well. Even though
current world history textbooks focus on European political history this does
not release teachers from the obligation to teach about the whole world. An
extremely broad base of knowledge is essential. Teachers of world history
certainly must be informed about western European history, but they must also
be prepared to teach the history of eastern Europe, Asia, Africa, and Central
and South America, and they must be able to incorporate art, music,
literature, and language into their instruction.

Teachers of world history must be cognizant of the skills and techniques
of the discipline of world history. Critical thinking, summarization, analysis,
reading strategies, and synthesis and integration skills are essential to the
teaching and study of world history. Additionally, the teachers must be masters
of the skills of historical research and analysis.

If world history as a secondary school course is to be successfully organized and structured using the current textbooks, teachers must also be knowledgeable of the principles of curriculum design. They must understand where the world history course fits into the overall school curriculum in order to clearly see how all the elements of world history are integrated. To best utilize the textbooks as they have been described in this study, the teachers of secondary world history courses must have a thorough grounding in the use of units, thematic approaches, alternative methods of assessment, and of alternative course organizations.

ilitcultural Education

A final implication of this study relates to multicultural education. There is no way of getting around the fact that world history as currently constituted in world history textbooks is Eurocentric and marginalizes or ignores large portions of the world’s population. This fails to meet the needs of an increasing number of American students. These students are themselves belittled and marginalized by the lack of recounting of their roots, their culture, and their achievements, which, in fact, have played a role in the development of the United States. All students are deprived of the variety and richness of the many cultures of the world throughout its history.
REFLECTIONS ON METHODOLOGY

The methodology described in chapter three was generally usable. As the study proceeded some alterations were made to the analytical procedure in order to refine and make it more suitable for the analysis of world history textbooks. The procedure should be useful for the analysis of the treatment of people in social studies textbooks for other social studies subjects and grade levels but should be revised somewhat for greatest effectiveness.

Minor changes in the categories of indicators of attitudinal discourse would be helpful for analysis. Saliency should be expanded and further subdivided. Evaluation could then be omitted entirely. Since outstanding characteristics and performance are the reasons for a person’s importance, the same things tend to appear in both categories and the overlap is confusing. This could be averted by dividing saliency into the following sub-categories: explicit, implied, general, specific, historic, and contemporary. The sub-categories are further explained and examples are given on pages 160 to 163. See Attachment D for a suggested modified Composite Database form including these revisions.

The structure of explanation likewise would be more usable if it were expanded and made somewhat more specific. Beliefs and goals were presented in the textbooks as distinct and different much of the time. The textbooks sometimes state one and sometimes the other. Seldom are they both explicitly
stated but it is frequently possible to infer one from the other. Including both as separate categories would help to make the analysis clearer and less confusing. *Plan* might be divided into general and specific since many goals involve both long-range (called general) and short-term (called specific) plans to fulfill them. *Actions* need not be expanded, but adequate space must be allotted to them. *Outcomes* should be divided into immediate and long-term outcomes. The textbooks frequently include, or imply, both.

There also needs to be a way to indicate the cause and effect relationships between the different elements of the structure of explanation. The world history textbooks studied did not always indicate the relationship (a major weakness) but when it was provided it was a powerful aid to understanding. This was not included in the original database but was addressed in the narrative text. It would be useful to add this to the database.

In summary, the methodology used was appropriate, but in the process of the study itself, a number of revisions were developed which had the effect of making the analytical process more generally usable for the analysis of the treatment of people in social studies textbooks.

**FURTHER RESEARCH**

This study has focused on one type of social studies instructional material, the ever-present textbook. The contents of selected world history
textbooks were analyzed for both the selection of information and for the manner in which the information is presented to students.

**Elementary Level World History Textbooks**

A continuation of this study using the same analytical procedure with the world history textbooks used in the upper elementary grades would be informative. It is important to know how these elementary level textbooks, which lay the foundations for later study, identify individual people for inclusion, and how they define and who they identify as heroes and villains. The elementary textbooks may reflect the same attitudes about the individual people portrayed in the secondary world history textbooks, but there may be contradictions that students will have to deal with as they move into the study of world history at the secondary level. It would be significant for the overall social studies curriculum to know how the world history textbooks at different levels complement and reinforce each other.

**Use of Textbooks by Teachers**

The assumption, from the beginning, was that teachers assign the textbooks to students to read and that students read the textbooks. This logical, strait-forward assumption is the basis for all textbook content analysis, but is it correct? There is need for research to find out to what extent and in what manner both experienced and inexperienced world history teachers use
the textbooks in real classrooms. There is a need for interviews to ascertain how teachers say they use textbooks, followed by close observation to determine how they, in fact, use them to organize course content, in class activities, and as assigned reading. Further research is needed to determine how much knowledge of the use of reading strategies, critical thinking skills, historical methodology, and other skills essential to the study of world history is held by secondary world history teachers and if and when such strategies are used to assist student learning of the social studies content.

Use of Textbooks by Students

The other side of the coin is equally important, and even more in need of study. How often and in what ways do students use world history textbooks? Any observant teacher can tell you that students use world history textbooks to sit on, prop the window open, weigh down a stack of paper, and a host of other expected, and not-so-expected things. But what really happens when conscientious students open the textbook and settle down to read world history? Teachers assign pages to read, words to define, questions to answer and, occasionally, information to locate on textbook pages. We know little about how, or even if, students actually perform those tasks with world history textbooks. Interviews, observations, surveys, and focus groups could provide much information and insight that might modify our teaching of world history
and purchase of world history textbooks. Students, the primary users of textbooks, are seldom asked for their views about textbook content, organization, writing, and usability. They have much to tell educators and textbook publishers.

*Content Decisions*

There is little information available to educators about how decisions are reached about world history textbook content. The decision makers, the nature of the dialogue that precedes the decisions, the actual writing of text, the decisions about sub-headings and bold type, and the kind of negotiations resulting in the final decisions are all topics that could help us better understand the textbook publishing process and better use it to achieve world history textbooks that are pedagogically sound as well as marketable.

*Effect of Illustrations*

Illustrations form a substantial portion of all current world history textbooks yet few studies have been done of this topic. We urgently need to find out the effect of the colorful and expensive illustrations on the acquisition of social studies knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate for world history. The illustrations are brilliant and frequently beautiful, but do they further social studies objectives? If students do learn from the illustrations in their world history textbooks what they learn and how they learn it would be of
major concern and interest. And most certainly, we need to know how teachers and students view and use the illustrations in world history textbooks and if this is unique to world history.

Relationship of Illustrations to Narrative Text

A closely related topic about which there is little information is the relationship of illustrations to narrative text. One textbook in this study, for example, makes no mention in the narrative of the Yalta conference but prominently features a photograph of Joseph Stalin and Harry Truman at that conference. How much, and what, do students learn from this method of presentation? Some world history textbooks extensively caption illustrations, others include only the briefest of identification. Is one more effective than the other in conveying world history content?

Mentioning

The mentioning that has played such a major role in this study of world history textbooks needs further research. Do students learn the content of a single sentence on a topic when they read it in a world history textbook? What do they learn from such mentions? How much elaboration and how many repetitions of a name, fact, or concept are necessary before a student truly learns something of world history? Is this different for social studies than for other school subjects? Is it reasonable to mention something once and expect
students to connect it to something which is mentioned 10 or 15 pages later? Mentioning is present in all narrative writing but in world history textbooks it is pervasive enough to be of major concern.

*Social-Economic Setting*

There is need for research on the use of world history textbooks in different social-economic settings. There have been some studies of the use of elementary-level social studies textbooks in different social class settings, but none of secondary world history textbooks. This study has identified some of the similarities and some of the differences among world history textbooks. It would be informative to learn if there are patterns among schools or school districts that choose one of the textbooks over the others.

*A FINAL WORD OR TWO*

The world history textbooks of this study aim to relate the entire history of all people in all of the world. Selection of some people from among the many millions that actually have played a role in world history is the task of the textbook publishers, but in actuality the publishers are directed in their choice by their own myths, by the marketplace, by the realities of classroom instruction and current beliefs about curriculum, and by some vocal parts of our society which have targeted world history textbooks as a way to influence the society of tomorrow. Textbooks are socially constructed for the purpose
of transmitting selected information about their own and other societies to the youth of the society

The world history textbooks of this study emphasize political history and minimize economic, social, intellectual, artistic, and other varieties of history. Not surprisingly, then, they also emphasize the deeds and ideas of men. Women are included in the textbooks but they play only a minor role in the saga of world history. The textbooks emphasize the achievements, the sorrows, and the actions of the peoples of western Europe. Most other parts of the world are included, it is true, but they are portrayed as on the margins of the western European world. The history narrated by these world history textbooks is parallel national histories. There is little of the integrated history of the world as a whole.

The textbook critics are largely correct about the lack of substantial knowledge in textbooks. Almost half of the people who are named in these textbooks are described in a sentence or two. The information about them is minimal. There is more information about those who have more space devoted to them, but the amounts of information are still small. Deeds are described but explanations and analyses are almost entirely absent. The critics are not quite so right about the lack of color and drama of history. Alexander marches through the pages, Napoleon is invincible, and Martin Luther challenges existing church institutions in dramatic scenes. The inherent drama of history
is difficult to deny altogether. The textbooks have attempted to highlight some of this drama and excitement, but a page or two here and there does not make up for the chapters of dictionary-like recounting of people's names and deeds.

Confucius, Gautama, Jesus, Marx, Muhammad, and Columbus -- what do they have in common? They are all included in all of these textbooks and all are included among the 21 most significant people. However, there is surprisingly little information or comment about them as people. Few traits are attributed to them, there is little biographical information, and there is little description or analysis of their achievements. The accounts are inoffensive, neutral, and noninformative. These men are controversial and represent sensitive issues.

Religious beliefs are intensely personal and emotional. Since they deal with beliefs about the very basis of life, it is understandable that religious leaders represent sensitive issues. Textbook content is at least in part structured by fear of offending someone, conviction that one's own views are right and proper, missionary zeal, belief in separation of church and state, fear of attack, and fear of loss of sales. The results are clear in the world history textbooks studied. Religious leaders, once largely excluded from school textbooks, are now included, largely as the result of pressure groups. But, the emphasis is on the beliefs and the followers rather than on the person of Jesus, Gautama, or Muhammad. They are so hedged in order to be "politically
correct" that much meaning is lost. The emphasis is on moral codes of living, as interpreted by their followers, rather than on the religious leaders themselves.

With respect to Columbus, publishers are caught between a rock and a hard place. Patriotic traditionalists perceive Columbus as the wonderful, daring, and brave discoverer of America. It is unpatriotic if he is not included and not glorified. But what about native Americans? Columbus opened the door to their exploitation, slavery, destruction, and death. The Columbus controversies of recent years are not yet openly admitted to by the world history textbooks but there is a shadow there. Few traits are attributed to him, his beliefs and goals are absent altogether, his achievements are described in neutral terms, and there is little or no analysis of him. Columbus is treated much as the religious figures are treated --- carefully.

Karl Marx suffers a similar fate. He is hedged, has few traits, is not developed as a person, and few achievements are attributed to him. One wonders what will happen to this reflection of the politically correct view in the next round of textbooks.

The message is, when in doubt, or fearful of attack, include but hedge. Concentrate on beliefs rather than on the person. Admit these significant people influence other people and give them space, but carefully hint that they really aren’t to be admired as heroes. Concentrate on their ideas. Spin out the
admittedly difficult concepts and philosophical ideas.

It is too often forgotten that students bring their own beliefs and experiences into the classroom with them. Everything they read of world history is filtered through their own set of myths and much influenced by school and community climate. And this is as it should be. The myths of a society change quite as much as they preserve continuity and tradition. The myths of tomorrow will be the attitudes, beliefs, and values of the students of today.

World history textbooks have changed in recent years. They aren’t the same books I remember as a tenth grader studying world history. They are more colorful and bigger and they do contain more. But, they are still organized the same way and they are still used for a one-year survey of world history. We will continue to overwhelm students and never get beyond the events of World War II until we accept the challenge to restructure world history as a school subject, and revise the textbooks to reflect this. Until then, we continue to “dream the impossible dream” of all of the world’s history in one year.
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Attachment B (page 2)

TYPO/DESIGN: bold, sub head, ch sub head, box (separate color or otherwise featured)
TYPE (of illustration): painting of (includes drawings, etchings, engravings, woodcuts, etc.), painting
by, statue by, mosaic, graphic (poster or flag), artifact (+type)
GROUP (refers to size of group and placement of significant person in illustration): single (individual
by himself/herself), small (individual + 4 other people), large (individual + 5 or more other
people), featured, center
TYPE (refers to type of material quoted): speech, writing, poem, novel, journal, diary, letter
TIME PERIOD: 1 (--> AD 600), 2 (600-1500), 3 (1500-1815), 4 (1815-1910), 5 (1910-1957),
6 (1957-->)
COUNTRY: names of modern countries or (for historic era) Greek, Roman, Byzantine, Germans,
Franks, pope
COMPOSITE DATABASE

World History Textbooks/ Most Significant People

NAME:                           PAGES:

TEXT:

BIOGRAPHIC:

TRAITS:

ACHIEVEMENTS:

BELIEFS/GOALS:

CONTEXT:

SALIENCY:

EMPHATICS:

HEDGES:

EVAL:

STRUCTURE (GOAL/PLAN/ACTION/OUTCOME):
COMPOSITE DATABASE, An Example -- Charlemagne


BIOGRAPHIC: son of Pepin, brother of Carloman, king of the Franks (279); close friend Roland (280); ruled from Aachen (281); his son Louis the Pious inherited (285)

TRAITS: powerful leader (279); wise, just, appreciated learning (281); strong and able ruler (285)

ACHIEVEMENTS: created a large empire by conquest, crowned Roman emperor by the Pope, reformed laws and courts (281); started school, encouraged the establishment of others by churches and monasteries, arts flourished under his rule (282)

BELIEFS/GOALS: bring all western Europe under his control, all Germanic peoples to become Christians (279); to keep close ties between church and government, Christian Roman Empire to exist in western Europe; his people to be educated (281)

CONTEXT: waged series of wars: Lombards, Saxons, Muslims in Spain (279-80); most people in Empire couldn’t read or write; Byzantines angry when C was crowned Emperor of the Romans (partly a basis of later East/West Christians dispute)

SALIENCY: C was "as important as any Roman emperor" (281)

EMPHATICS:

NAME: Charlemagne  PAGES: 180, 198, 200, 201, 202, 309, 316


BIOGRAPHIC: son of Pepin (198); born 742, reigned 768-814, died 814, appearance, crowned by the pope (200)

TRAITS: strong (201); striking appearance, undisputed leader; devout Christian, intellectual curiosity, alert (202)

ACHIEVEMENTS: built a great empire (189); created Holy Roman Empire (200); advanced learning, stopped violence and disorder (201); conquered western Europe, forced Germans to accept Christianity, revival of learning during his reign which was the foundation for medieval civilization (202)

BELIEFS/GOALS: to unite former Roman Empire (202); thought in terms of empire, not nation (316)

CONTEXT: Byzantines angry when pope crowned C (180); ties w/church gave both Pepin and C political power (198); conquest of most of western Europe (202); crowned by pope (202)

SALIENCY: event (crowning) was important because it meant C accepted pope as spiritual leader (200)

EMPHATICS: they had not, of course [rebuilt the Roman Empire] (200)
**HEDGES:** eventually all Saxons accepted Christianity (280); although they managed to keep their freedom (280)

**EVAL:** most powerful leader in western Europe (281)

**STRUCTURE:** (GOAL/PLAN/ACTION/OUTCOME)
*bring all Europe under his control/ waged series of wars/ Saxons eventually became Christian (279-80)
*Christian Roman empire in Europe/ (?) conquests/ crowned Roman emperor by Pope (281)

**HEDGES:**

**EVAL:** great empire (198); stopped violence and disorder by great strength (201); none of descendants strong enough to keep C's empire together (201); striking appearance, undisputed leader (202)

**STRUCTURE:** (GOAL/PLAN/ACTION/OUTCOME)
*unite former Roman Empire/ (?) conquest, crowned by Pope/ stopped violence and disorder, beginning of endless fights between kings and popes over power
NAME: Charlemagne  PAGES: 215, 216, 217


BIOGRAPHIC: father crowned "King of the Franks" by pope (215); tall, couldn’t write, capital at Aachen, crowned by Pope (216); son Louis inherited empire (217)

TRAITS: energetic, determined, devoted Christian, admired culture of ancient Greece and Rome (216) strong personality (217)

ACHIEVEMENTS: spread Christianity through military conquest, encouraged learning, brought scholars to Aachen, united western Europe for first time since Romans, after terrible wars he forced people to submit to his rule and convert to Christianity, crowned "Emperor of the Romans" by the Pope (216)

BELIEFS/GOALS: expand the empire, encourage education, support the church, he was NOT trying to revive the Roman Empire

CONTEXT: reunites much of western Europe by conquest, new civilization emerges, blend of Germanic customs, Christianity, and Greco-Roman culture, came to characterize Europe in the Middle Ages

SALIENCY: C’s empire represented a new kind of civilization (216)

EMPHATICS: C. greatly encouraged learning (216)

HEDGES:

NAME: Charlemagne  PAGES: 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 175, 307


BIOGRAPHIC: king of the Franks (160); son of Pepin, reigned 768-814, crowned by the Pope, court at Aachen (163); sons and daughters (164); could read but not write

TRAITS: able general, energetic ruler, forceful (163); wise (164)

ACHIEVEMENTS: conquered an empire that reunited large areas of the western Roman Empire, crowned "Emperor of the Romans" by the Pope, established uniform laws, appointed local judges to uphold laws (163); encouraged education, invited scholars to Aachen, issued rules for the education of the clergy (164)

BELIEFS/GOALS: improve government and unify the empire, spread Christianity throughout the empire, firm control over the empire, strengthen central government (163); encourage education (164)

CONTEXT: w Europe in disorder, decay, rich in resources, new political system emerging (161); laws based on custom, turning point for Franks when Christianized (161)

SALIENCY: C’s coronation symbolic of changes taking place in Europe (161)

EMPHATICS: C. so impressed his contemporaries that ... (163)

HEDGES: "however, often only the clergy were educated", C. "supposedly slept with pen, ink, and paper under his pillow" (164)
EVAL: C. was an extraordinary figure in medieval history, after terrible wars he forced people to submit and convert (216)

STRUCTURE: (GOAL/PLAN/ACTION/OUTCOME)
* (?) / spread Christianity/conquest, forced people to convert to Christianity/new culture emerged (combined Christian, Germanic, Greco-Roman) (216)
* expand empire/ (?) / wars of conquest, forced people to submit to his rule/reunited much of western Europe under his rule (216)
* (?) / encouraged education/imported scholars/new writings/preservation of classical writings (216)

EVAL: C. moved forcefully, C. an able general, C. an energetic ruler (163)

STRUCTURE: (GOAL/PLAN/ACTION/OUTCOME)
* (?) / spread Christianity/battled non-Christians, encouraged missionaries, supported Church efforts to provide local priests, required all Christians to pay tithe to the Church/ (?) (160-164)
* firm control over the empire/established laws, appointed royal officials to check on local justice and defense/appointed local judges to carry out laws/ (?) (163)
* (?) / (?) / encouraged scholarship/new European culture begins to emerge (164)
NAME: Charlemagne  PAGES: 207, 208, 209, 232, 262, 374


BIOGRAPHIC: son of Pepin the Short, came to throne in 768 (208); his son Louis the Pious inherited empire in 814, title "Holy Roman Emperor" (209); friendly with the caliph (261)

TRAITS: exceptional leadership ability (208); powerful (209)

ACHIEVEMENTS: established the first large-scale, stable European empire; established important ties with the Church (207); increased the size of the kingdom, conquered much of Europe, helped the Church become more powerful, helped bring literacy to Europe, crowned by Pope (208)

BELIEFS/GOALS: strengthen his rule (209) by encouraging Christianity (208) and encouraging education

CONTEXT: nearly constant peace during his reign; few in kingdom could read and write at the beginning of C's reiga 209)

SALIENCEY: established important ties with Church (207); C's greatest achievement was ... (208); one of the most powerful kings in Europe since Charlemagne ... (208)

EMPHATICS: greatly increased size of kingdom (208)

HEDGES:

NAME: Charlemagne  PAGES: 137, 148, 149, 150


BIOGRAPHIC: son of Pepin the Short (P's rule approved by Pope), brother of Carloman, inherited throne with Carloman 768, became sole ruler in 711, King of the Lombards 774 (148); crowned by the Pope (149); capital at Aachen

TRAITS: established much of western Europe as his empire by conquest, kept law and order, made government centralized and efficient, beautified his capital, encouraged education and a new style of handwriting (149); crowning by the Pope begins conflict between popes and kings over authority (150); completed the blending of political and religious unity (150)

BELIEFS/GOALS:

CONTEXT: nation of the Franks becomes largest empire in Europe (148); crowning by the Pope raises the question of whether popes or kings have higher authority

SALIENCEY: C represented the forces that would reshape western Christendom (137); Most important of all, the crowning of C ... (150); The coronation also illustrated another great theme ... (150)

EMPHATICS:

HEDGES: "Whether the pope planned this action (crowning) with C's knowledge is unknown. However, the crowning proved ..." (150)
EVAL: reign was so successful that ... (207); remarkable king (207); one of the most important rulers (208); greatly increased size of kingdom (208)

STRUCTURE: (GOAL/PLAN/ACTION/OUTCOME)
* strengthen rule/ encourage education and Christianity, efficient administration/ established schools, invited scholars, ordered tithe, established system of checks and balances/ (?) (208-9)
* (?) / (?) / conquer various people, lands/ greatly increased size of kingdom
**NAME:** Charlemagne  **PAGES:** 237, 238, 239, 257, 259


**BIOGRAPHIC:** son of Pepin, king of the Franks 768-814, crowned "Emperor of the Romans", only surviving son, Louis the Pious, capital at Aachen (237)

**TRAITS:** religious, intelligent, retained Frankish custom, interested in education (237); possessed energy, ability, personality (239)

**ACHIEVEMENTS:** gained empire by conquest (Lombards, Saxons, Avars, Muslims), crowned emperor by Pope, united much of Europe, centralized and made efficient govt, est capital at Aachen, founded schools, imported scholars, ordered copying of manuscripts (237)

**BELIEFS/GOALS:** interested in education (237); regarded the church as a branch of the royal govt (259)

**CONTEXT:** C spent much of life at war (237)

**SALIENCY:** "one of the outstanding rulers of history" (237); "the new title was important ..." (237)

**EMPHATICS:** greatly interested in education (237)

**HEDGES:**

---

**NAME:** Charlemagne  **PAGE:** 194-198, 223


**BIOGRAPHIC:** son of Pepin the Short, king in mid 20s, d in early 70s, tall, mustache, great sportsman, capital at Aachen (194); many children, great landowner (196); crowned emperor by the Pope, d 814, son Louis the Pious (196)

**TRAITS:** great sportsman, great physical strength and energy (194); ability (195); wise, had a temper (196)

**ACHIEVEMENTS:** conquered new lands, empire larger than Byzantine empire (195); limited power of nobles, encouraged est. of schools (196); most powerful king in w. Europe (197)

**BELIEFS/GOALS:**

**CONTEXT:** wars of conquest, C led in battle (195); crowning increases hostility between East and West

**SALIENCY:** "It was on the ... eastern frontiers ... where C fought his greatest wars." (195) "Not for nothing did Christian chroniclers call C 'iron Charles" (195)

**EMPHATICS:** In fact, C's reign was a glorious time (194)

**HEDGES:** "Probably C's coronation meant different things to different people." (196)
EVAL: Deeply religious, highly intelligent (237)

*army (277) / each person in army contributed in some way to army (cavalry or service) / army with no cost to gort or C (237)
**NAME:** Charlemagne  
**PAGES:** 161, 163, 179


**BIOGRAPHIC:** son of Pepin, 771 became king, 800 crowned by the pope, died 814, had 3 grandsons (161)

**TRAITS:** wise, ambitious, ruthless, willing to use force; forceful personality (161)

**ACHIEVEMENTS:** reunited much of western Europe, supported founding of schools, gathered scholars to teach and copy ancient works, defended Pope against Roman nobles (161) crowned by Pope

**BELIEFS/GOALS:** wanted title of new Roman emperor, had misgivings because crowning by the pope seemed to imply church officials were superior to political leaders, didn’t agree with that, set out to strengthen the empire (161)

**CONTEXT:** worked closely with the Church to establish control, forcefully converted new subjects to Christianity, few western Europeans literate (161)

**SALIENCY:**

**EMPHATICS:**

**HEDGES:**

---

**NAME:** Charlemagne  
**PAGES:** 268, 269


**BIOGRAPHIC:** grandson of Charles Martel, born 742 or 743, tall, deeply religious mother, son of Pepin the Short, his son was Louis the Piou, accompanied his father on military campaigns, became king in 768 (268); capital at Aachen (269)

**TRAITS:** energetic and courageous, effective ruler (269); well traveled (268); forced Saxons to become Christians (269)

**ACHIEVEMENTS:** built capital at Aachen, close ties with the pope, tried to expand Christianity, invited scholars to Aachen, established system of checks and balances in government, supported the pope against the Lombards and the Byzantine emperor, conquered parts of Italy and Germany (269)

**BELIEFS/GOALS:** regretted appearing to rule by pope’s authority

**CONTEXT:** w.Europe small population, little trade w/East, divided politically, Aachen became famous for its palace, chapel, and school; close alliance with the pope (268)

**SALIENCY:** Europe improved for a time under rule of C (268)

**EMPHATICS:** C was "even more successful than his father or grandfather" (268)

**HEDGES:**
**EVAL:** first outstanding western European monarch (161); it is not surprising that control was lost when C died (161)

**STRUCTURE:** (GOAL/PLAN/ACTION/OUTCOME)
* (?) / literacy for western Europe/ founded schools, imported scholars/ preserved much of classical learning (161)
* control over peoples/ (?) / worked closely with church/ (?) (161)
* strengthen his empire/ (?) / trained local officials, established royal officials to inspect/ (?) (161)

**EVAL:**

**STRUCTURE:** (GOAL/PLAN/ACTION/OUTCOME)
* (?) / expand Christianity/ forced conquered people to become Christians/ (?) (269)
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TEXT:
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SALIENCY:
   Explicit
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   General
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   History
   Contemporary

EMPHATICS:
HEDGES:
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### 21 MOST SIGNIFICANT PEOPLE IN THE TEXTBOOKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>AW</th>
<th>GI</th>
<th>HIJB</th>
<th>He</th>
<th>HM</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>PH1</th>
<th>PH2</th>
<th>SF1</th>
<th>SF2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bismarck, Otto</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaparte, Napoleon</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar, Julius</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlemagne</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, Christopher</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confucius</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandhi, Mohandas</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautama</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitler, Adolph</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenin</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis XIV</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luther, Martin</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marx, Karl</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mussolini, Benito</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter I</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalin, Joseph</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ = ½ page or more  ○ = not included  all others = less than ½ page
VITA

Geraldine Landis received an undergraduate degree in history in 1958 at the University of Washington in Seattle, Washington. She earned her M.A. in history in 1967 at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia.

Ms. Landis has taught secondary, college, and adult students in world history in Germany, Japan, and Libya, and, in the United States, in Washington and Virginia. She has also taught United States history, world geography, and other secondary social studies courses, as well as language arts and other courses, throughout her career. She has taught in urban and rural settings in state-supervised programs and in programs supervised by the Federal government and by state university overseas extension programs. She has supervised curriculum development, participated in teacher education, and supervised other social studies program elements as significant parts of her responsibilities as the social studies specialist for Fauquier County Public Schools in Virginia.

In the last several years, Ms. Landis has supervised student teacher clinical experiences, taught social studies methods courses, and advised student teachers at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech).
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