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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since the early 1930s, history textbooks have been the source of much critique among scholars, writers, and political activists (Alridge, 2006; Wade, 1993; Wasburn, 1997). A great deal of the work conducted by researchers representing all areas of the political spectrum has lambasted textbooks for several weaknesses. These include their overuse by teachers, misinterpretation of the past, political biases, the abundance of unnecessary information, heroification\(^1\) of historical figures, the lack of citing primary sources, and presenting history in a non-critical, omnipotent manner (e.g., Afflerbach & VanSledright, 2001; Alridge, 2006; Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; Bain, 2006; Cronin, 1975; DeLuca, 1984; FitzGerald, 1979; Gordon, 1994; Jennings, 1994; Loewen, 1995; Moore, 1969; Paxton, 1999; Ravitch & Finn, 1987; Stern, 1996; Terry, 1983; Vinson & Ross, 2001; Wade, 1993; Walker, 1995; Wasburn, 1997; Wineburg, 1999).

There are many textbook analyses about historical topics as broad as slavery (Wasburn, 1997), Reconstruction (Terry, 1983), the origins of the Cold War (Walker, 1995), the civil rights movement (Epstein, 1994), the treatment of family issues (Gordon, 1994), and ways in which the histories of Japan and the United States are depicted in each country’s textbooks (Goodman, Homma, Najita, & Becker, 1983). There are also many examples of these studies concerning the portrayals of historical figures such as Christopher Columbus (Loewen, 1995), Joan of Arc (Jennings, 1994), Martin Luther King, Jr. (Alridge, 2006), and Emiliano Zapata (Gilbert, 2003).

---

\(^1\) Heroification can be defined as “a degenerative process…that makes people over into heroes.” (Loewen, 1995, p. 19).
However, the vast majority of these analyses have focused on national history textbooks and very few textbook studies have been conducted to determine possible limitations concerning the content found in state history textbooks. A review of the pertinent literature revealed only five analyses of state history textbooks written for primary and secondary students (DeLuca, 1984; Lothrop, 1989; McLaurin, 1971; Moore, 1969; Terry, 1983). With this thought in mind, Wasburn (1997) states that the content of history textbooks is “transmitted to the younger generation, along with the ideologies embedded within them” (p. 470). If Wasburn’s (1997) statement is correct, and the content found in textbooks is influential to students, then it is interesting that with the subject’s long history and large number of students being required to take these state mandated courses, few researchers have analyzed state history textbooks (Isner, 1990).

**Rationale and Purpose of the Study**

State history courses are offered mostly to young adolescents (ages 10-14) in many states throughout the nation, and have been since the 1820s and 1830s (Isner, 1990; Percy, 2003). For example, since 1884 in the state of Georgia, students have been taught Georgia history in various ways from the fourth through eighth grades (Percy, 2003). Since 1985, every eighth grade student in the state has been required by law (O.C.G.A. sec 20-2-142) to take a course called *Georgia Studies*. This course highlights the history, geography, economics, and politics of the state (Governor’s Commission on Georgia History, 2003). Despite the fact that this subject has been a requirement for over 24 years, very little scholarly work has been conducted about this course and the textbooks used in it. Considering the number of middle grades students who are required to take an eighth grade course in Georgia studies, it is troubling that there is a significant lack of research about the content of the textbooks that Georgia’s students are currently using in this social studies course.
In response to the sparse amount of literature concerning state history textbooks, I believed that a content analysis of state history textbooks, guided by critical theory, was a needed addition to the literature. Thus, the purpose of this study was to critically examine state history textbooks (including Georgia’s) and their portrayals of 20th and 21st century United States presidents. The focus of this study was to determine to what extent political scientist Thomas Cronin’s (1974) “textbook presidency” theory was evident in these books.

Theoretical Perspective

I used critical theory as a guiding theory behind my study. Critical theory is defined as “an effort to join empirical investigation, the task of interpretation, and a critique of this reality” (McLaren & Giarelli, 1995, p. 2). McLaren & Giarelli (1995) explain that critical theory “holds that knowledge is socially constructed, contextual, and dependent on interpretation” (p. 2). Wasburn (1997) contends that critical theory is also concerned with “ideology and domination” (p. 472). Overall, researchers using critical theory are interested in “what kind of knowledge best serves human emancipation,” and put that problem “at the core of inquiry” (McLaren & Giarelli, 1995, p. 2).

It can be argued that elements of critical theory are often found in textbook analyses. For example, in her study concerning the accounts of slavery in United States history textbooks, Wasburn (1997) uses critical theory as her theoretical framework. She explains that textbooks are “often presented to students as factual accounts which give an unbiased narrative of the origins and development of social, political, and economic institutions of their society” (p. 471). She incorporates critical theory in her study by using “an analysis of the portrayal of one historic issue to examine the influence of such ideologies on knowledge that is often viewed as factual and unchanging,” and she views the wording and story of slavery found in the books as a way to
“gain knowledge about dominant ideologies and groups as well as societal change” (p. 472). Whether explicitly stated or not, it seems that most textbook studies are similar to Wasburn’s (1996) and are framed in this context. It appears that many textbook researchers tend to believe that the textbook information concerning the topic of their study is being presented in a way that serves the purposes of those who believe in the “dominant ideologies.” In turn, researchers tend to believe that whatever these dominant ideologies may be, they most certainly contain the potential of repression for those students who are required to read them (e.g., Alridge, 2006; Apple, 2001; Cronin, 1975; FitzGerald, 1979; Loewen, 1995).

Though the term “dominate ideologies” can certainly be problematic, and textbooks have been criticized for containing them by almost every group found on the political spectrum, my own experiences as a teacher, textbook content reviewer, curriculum reviewer, and published curriculum writer of state history have led to the formation of my beliefs that, similarly to national history textbooks, state history textbooks can often be written from the perspective of those who favor certain dominate ideologies. These ideologies are held by those who write state history standards and their perspectives may cause the depiction of historic events and figures found in state history textbooks to be inaccurate. Studying the critical analysis of textbooks by Alridge (2006), Cronin (1974), FitzGerald (1979), Loewen (1995) and Wasburn (1997) has solidified my beliefs and my attachment to critical theory in regard to studying the content found in textbooks.

The Textbook Presidency

While critical theory was the foundation of my approach concerning the analysis of textbooks, the specific critical theory on which this study was based was Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory. According to political science literature about citizens’ perspectives
of the presidents, textbook interpretations offer idealized and incorrect images about the men who held the office, as well as the importance of the office itself (Adler, 2005; Cronin, 1974; Cronin, 1975; Cronin & Genovese, 1998, 2004; Hoekstra, 1982; Jenkins-Smith, Silva, & Watermen, 2005; Kinder & Fiskie, 1986). Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory, based on the analysis of college-level political science textbooks, is considered to be the most influential theory in the genre (Alsfeld, 1995; Hoekstra, 1982; Sanchez, 1996). He suggests that textbook authors present an over-idealized image of the office of the president in U.S. history and political science textbooks written for students from elementary school up to the college level (Cronin, 1974, pp. 54-55). Cronin (1974) goes on to declare that American textbooks “…inclined to exaggerations about past and future president performance” (p. 54-55). While Cronin’s (1974) primary focus is to use the theory to examine the institution of the presidency and not individuals, he highlights several individual 20th century presidents, including Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, John Kennedy, and Lyndon Johnson, to illustrate aspects of the “ideal” presidency (pp. 55-57). Cronin (1974) argues that, in textbooks, only certain presidents live up to this idealized vision of the office. These presidents, such as Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and John F. Kennedy, demonstrate the fortitude to “expand the federal governments’ role in order to cope with the increasingly nation-wide demands of social justice and a prosperous economy” (Cronin, 1974, p. 55). Other presidents, such as Warren Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, and even “popular” presidents such as Dwight Eisenhower, are portrayed as failures in textbooks because they did not take on this managerial “responsibility” so seemingly revered by textbook authors (Cronin, 1974, p. 55). Cronin’s later works continue to assert the legitimacy of this theory even after such events as the Vietnam War and the Watergate scandal took some of the luster off the public image of the office of the
president (Cronin, 1975; Cronin & Genovese, 1998, 2004). Cronin (1975) concludes that there are several costly social and political consequences based on textbooks portraying the dominant ideology of textbook presidency, including “the quality of civic participation, the potential for cynicism toward government, and distorted perception within the presidential establishment itself” (pp. 45-46).

**The Four Constructs of the Textbook Presidency**

Cronin (1974) asserts that, based on his research, “four summary propositions” can be used to discuss the ways in which the textbooks portray the scope and power of the United States president (p. 60). According to Cronin (1974), these constructs are “ideal type constructs and do not necessarily describe particular texts or text author orientations” (p. 60). Cronin (1974) admits that “any facile generalization of such a hydra-like institution can be susceptible to oversimplification,” nevertheless, he contends that the similarities he found in the description of the president in textbooks “outweigh the nuances of disagreement” (p. 60). Cronin’s (1974) four constructs of the textbook presidency are as follows:

1. That the President is the strategic catalyst in the American political system and the central figure in the international system as well.

2. That only the President is or can be the genuine architect of United States public policy and only he, by attacking problems frontally and aggressively, and interpreting his power expansively, can be the engine of change to move the nation forward.

3. That the President must be the nation’s personal and moral leader; by symbolizing the past and future greatness of America and radiating inspirational confidence, a President can pull the nation together while directing us toward the fulfillment of the American Dream.
4. That only the right man is placed in the White House—all will be well, and somehow, whoever is in the White House is the right man. (p. 60)

The Evolution of the Textbook Presidency

Cronin (1974) is neither the first nor the last researcher to examine the portrayal of the president in textbooks (e.g., Adler, 2005; Alsfeld, 1995; Cammarota, 1963; Eksterowicz & Watson, 2000; Hoekstra, 1982; Loewen, 1995; Sanchez, 1996; Stern, 1996). Nevertheless, most other textbook analyses, to some extent, concur with Cronin’s (1974) theory. However, they also point out that, based on historic events and modern perspectives, the theory of the textbook presidency has changed over time. Three studies (Alsfeld, 1995; Hoekstra, 1982; Sanchez, 1996) cite Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidential theory directly, and attempt to replicate or slightly alter Cronin’s (1974) study in order to determine the relevance of the theory after the historic events of the Vietnam War and the Watergate scandal. All of these studies use data sources similar to Cronin’s (1974) study: college-level political science textbooks.

Hoekstra (1982) replicated Cronin’s (1974) study by analyzing 30 college-level political science textbooks, many of which were new editions of the same books that Cronin (1974) examined (p. 160). Hoekstra (1982) criticizes Cronin’s (1974) constructs of the textbook presidency and argues that they “…garble arguable propositions with their exaggerated and simplistic counterparts” (p. 160). He also contends that Cronin’s (1974) analysis does not “fully distinguish between the elements of the orthodoxy presumably closest to empirical ‘reality’ and those parts regarded as the most inaccurate” (p. 160). Nonetheless, Hoekstra (1982) states that Cronin’s (1974) theory was provocative, groundbreaking, and extremely important in the study of the presidency. In fact, after reexamining the same textbooks from the period of 1955-1970,
Hoekstra (1982) claims that, even with the difficulties of Cronin’s (1974) stated constructs of the textbook presidency, Cronin’s (1974) analysis was correct (p. 160).

However, in his study of contemporary textbooks, Hoekstra (1982) contends that there is a “new” textbook presidency found after the year 1974. In his analysis he claims that five new themes concerning presidents emerged; all of these are based on the impacts of the abuses of presidential power displayed during the historic events of Vietnam and Watergate (Hoekstra, 1982, p. 161). These five themes are as follows: 1) the changing assessment of presidential power; 2) the new emphasis on presidential constraints; 3) the increasing “secularization” of the office; 4) the explanations offered for Watergate; 5) the new plurality of views on the presidency offered by current textbooks (Hoekstra, 1982, p. 165). Hoekstra (1982) concludes his study by arguing that these themes completely change and supersede Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory.

Alsfeld (1995) disagrees with portions of Hoekstra’s (1982) arguments and accepts two major facets of Cronin’s (1974) original textbook presidency theory. He believes that Cronin’s (1974) four textbook constructs of the president are still relevant and Cronin’s (1974) important findings “reflected the understanding of the [political science] discipline” at the time (p. 677). Alsfeld (1995) also agrees that contemporary textbooks still offer readers an exaggerated and idealized image of presidential power. On the other hand, he agrees with Hoekstra’s (1982) assertion that historic events have and will “prompt changes in the interpretation” of presidents and spark evolutions in the textbook presidency as well (Alsfeld, 1995, p. 677).

Using both Cronin’s (1974) and Hoekstra’s (1982) differing conclusions as a frame of reference, Alsfeld (1995) analyzed 15 American government textbooks using a quantitative content analysis. He wanted to determine if presidential roles in political science textbooks were
portrayed in terms of strength (Cronin) or limitations (Hoekstra). Alsfeld (1995) concludes that both Cronin’s (1974) and Hoekstra’s (1982) textbook presidency theories are evident in these texts. In terms of the president’s role as “Commander-in-Chief,” Cronin’s (1974) theory is still prevalent with 67% of the mentions noting presidential strength, and only 10% implying limitations (the other 23% of mentions were listed as “non-descriptive”) (p. 679). In other presidential roles, such as “Party Chief,” Alsfeld (1995) suggests that Hoekstra’s (1982) version of the textbook presidency is evident in the texts, with only 18% of the mentions about the president indicating “some level of strength” (p. 679). Alsfeld (1995) concludes that, in contemporary political science textbooks, the office of the president is treated in a fashion that is more balanced than either Cronin (1974) or Hoekstra (1982) contend.

Finally, Sanchez (1996) analyzed 40 college-level political science textbooks in order to understand the textbook assessments of individual presidents, instead of the textbook assessment of the office as Cronin (1974) examined. Interestingly, he declares that of “4,465 comments about post-war presidents, only 33% (1,463) were favorable” and the presidencies of Richard Nixon, Jimmy Carter, and Ronald Reagan were routinely criticized (p. 63). This is greatly disproportional to both the amount of overall mentions and positive comments about the other presidents in American history and suggests that, in fact, heroification is found in the portrayals of certain presidents, while vilification is evident for others. Supporting Cronin’s (1974) theory, Sanchez (1996) concludes that the unrealistic expectations about the power of the president are held not only by the general public, but by textbook authors as well.

Therefore, though challenged by Hoekstra (1982), most other studies strongly support the legitimacy of Cronin’s (1974) findings, even in the years after the Vietnam War and the Watergate scandal (Alsfeld, 1995; Cronin & Genovese, 1998; Sanchez, 1996). In addition, in a
pilot study I conducted about the portrayals of 20th century presidents in Georgia history textbooks, the portrayal of the president in these textbooks overwhelmingly corresponded with Alsfeld’s (1995) “Commander-in-Chief” role of the president, which supports Cronin’s (1974) theory, and less with the “Party Chief” role, which aligns with Hoekstra’s (1982) new textbook presidency. Thus, for the purposes of this study, a modified version of Cronin’s (1974) original textbook presidency theory was used as the standard for comparison to the portrayal of presidents found in middle level state history textbooks.

Implications of the Textbook Presidency and its Connection to State History Textbooks

According to Cronin (1975), the textbook presidency offers American citizens unrealistic images about the office, and the 43 men who have held it. In turn, three costly consequences may result from these misconceptions. These consequences can be reflected in “the quality of civic participation, in the potential for cynicism toward government, and in the distorted perceptions within the presidential establishment itself” (Cronin, 1975, p. 46). Though Cronin’s (1974) theory was established by analyzing college political science textbooks written in the 1950’s and 1960’s, for the most part, the textbook presidency and the “costly implications” that stem from it appear to be completely relevant to the most recently published state history textbooks written for and used by middle level students. If these textbooks do, in fact, display an unrealistic interpretation of the powers of the president, which results in the consequences that Cronin (1974) describes, then it is important to inform practitioners about these biases.

The low voter turnout in local elections may offer a poignant example of the costly consequences of the textbook presidency found in textbooks. Though voter turnout has been historically low for presidential elections (which may be attributed to Cronin’s (1974) potential for cynicism consequence), usually a little above 50%, the numbers are even smaller for local
elections (Hajnal & Lewis, 2003; Hill, 2006). In many cases, fewer than 25% of the eligible voters make their way to the polls in many state, county, and city elections (Hajnal & Lewis, 2003; Hill, 2006). For instance, the state of Georgia has one of the lowest percentages of voter turnout in the nation (Holder, 2006). In the 2004 presidential election, only 57% of Georgia’s registered voters went to the polls on Election Day (Holder, 2006). In local elections turnout is much lower, ranging from 13% to 25%, depending on the type of election (Georgia Government, 2008).

Interestingly, Georgia’s students are not only required to understand the role and function of local government, but are also encouraged to participate. One of the purposes of the state mandated Georgia Studies course is to educate students about the structure and workings of Georgia’s government (Georgia Department of Education, 2007). Another purpose is to inform students about their own role in state and local government (Georgia Department of Education, 2007). Obviously, keeping the previously mentioned voter turnout statistics in mind, it is apparent that what students are being taught about the importance of participating in local elections in their state history courses is not being displayed in their adult lives.

As mentioned previously, one of Cronin’s (1975) “costly implications” of the textbook presidency is an effect on “citizen politics” (p. 46) and may explain the large difference found in the number of Georgia voters taking part in presidential and local elections. Granted, though Georgia’s participation in presidential elections has been low, it has certainly not been as low as the participation in local elections. As Cronin (1975) explains, the average citizen is taught from grade school through college that the president is personally powerful enough to “end war, depression, corruption, and all like manner of civic malaise…” (p. 46). With this oversimplified understanding, students may decide that participating only in presidential elections is worth their
time because of the inflated “power” that they believe the president holds. If an adaptation of the textbook presidency theory is found in state history textbooks, then students may be being taught an unrealistic understanding about the role of the United States president. In turn, these students may deem there is little need to participate in local and state government. This possible belief by Georgia’s citizens could be a factor in the state of Georgia’s low voter turnout in local elections. If so, this result would defeat two of the stated objectives of teaching *Georgia Studies*.

However, there could be one major limitation of Cronin’s (1974) theory and its connection to state history textbooks. His theory of the textbook presidency and its four constructs are based on national and college-level political science textbook interpretations. He does not account for strong regional political beliefs or state party allegiances. Though these beliefs may not have been evident in political science textbooks written for a national audience, one could assume that these beliefs may infiltrate state history textbooks used by middle level students in terms of their portrayals of the United States presidents.

For instance, in a Georgia history textbook that I examined in my pilot study, *History of Georgia* (1954) by Coulter, Saye, and King, party allegiance is evident. In discussing the election of Republican Herbert Hoover, the authors make their personal politics clear by writing, “Hoover was elected and carried five southern states. But he did not win in Georgia. Georgians were against Al Smith as their candidate, but in the election they stood by the Democratic Party and voted for Smith” (Coulter et al., 1954, p. 304). In this example, the authors used the phrase “stood by” which makes it appear that while the five other southern states betrayed the Democratic Party, the voters of Georgia refused to do so.

Another example is not as blatant; nevertheless, it is just as politically slanted. In McCullar’s *This is Your Georgia* (1966), while describing the Warren G. Harding campaign, she
writes, “…nominated by the Republicans was a little-known senator from Ohio, Warren G. Harding, who campaigned on the odd slogan ‘A return to normalcy’” (p. 692). She also includes the election’s results in Georgia. She informs her readers that Georgia’s vote was, “…107, 612 for Cox and 43,720 for Harding and his Vice-President, Calvin Coolidge” (p. 692). In this example, not only does she use the term “odd” which has a negative connotation, but she also neglects to provide her student readers with all of the information concerning the election, illustrating her attachment to the Democratic Party. While Harding did lose in Georgia, he won the election of 1920 by a landslide, gaining 404 electoral votes to Cox’s 127 (Loewen, 1995; Liep, 2005).

In addition, these regional beliefs may actually increase the number of presidents, who are portrayed as meeting the standards for what Cronin (1974) considers to be an idealized vision of the presidency. For example, presidents who were born or lived in the state for a period of time may be portrayed in state history textbooks as meeting the requirements found in Cronin’s (1974) four constructs of the textbook presidency. In effect, this may actually increase the total number of over-idealized presidents in the national memory, because, along with the already heroified presidents (e.g., Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt), each president’s birth state could add its native son to this category.

In a pilot study, my examination of the applicability of Cronin’s (1974) theory to state history textbooks resulted in mixed conclusions. Georgia, the focus of the study, was a solidly Democratic state for much of its history (Hood, Kid, & Morris, 2004). In accordance, there appeared to be a strong bias in favor of Democratic presidents in Georgia history textbooks from 1951 to 2005. There were a larger number of positive mentions about Democratic presidents than Republican presidents; however, many Republican presidents were also mentioned with what
appeared to be positive accolades. Additionally, I determined four interesting patterns which in some cases supported and in other cases contradicted Cronin’s (1974) four constructs.

Presidential Patterns

The first three patterns strongly supported the “over-idealized” portion of Cronin’s (1974) theory, but varied in the way that presidential mentions, which made up the patterns, mirrored his four constructs. I named the first pattern after President William McKinley. I discovered that if the president made a contribution or had a positive connection to the state of Georgia, no matter his political party, he usually received a large number of mentions. An example was the textbooks’ mentions of William McKinley. While McKinley was a Republican, he was often mentioned in older Georgia history textbooks. An example of one of these mentions was in the text, History of Georgia by Coulter et al. (1954). They write:

In a speech to the General Assembly he [McKinley] said, "Sectional lines no longer mar the map of the United States. Sectional feeling no longer holds back the love we bear each other." Although he had been an officer in the Union army, he said that the graves of Confederate soldiers were graves of honor; and that the United States government would keep green... He touched the hearts of all as he wore a Confederate badge which had been presented to him. (p. 234)

This mention both mirrored the idealized portion of Cronin’s (1974) theory by praising McKinley and also correlated with Cronin’s (1974) third construct which states that in textbooks “the president must be the nation’s personal and moral leader; by symbolizing the past and future greatness of America, and radiating inspirational confidence, a President can pull the nation together while directing us toward the fulfillment of the American Dream” (p. 60).
I named the second pattern after President Jimmy Carter. In this pattern, presidents who lived in Georgia or who were born in the state (Jimmy Carter, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt) were mentioned more often than other presidents. In the early textbooks the frequency of mentions about Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt were quite high because they both lived in the state for a time. Interestingly, once Jimmy Carter became president the number of mentions about the part-time Georgia resident, Wilson, decreased and the mentions of Carter, the native Georgian, stayed relatively the same since his presidency. This pattern usually did not correlate with any of Cronin’s (1974) constructs because the bulk of mentions about these individual presidents often related exclusively to their connections to the state, and did not reflect any presidential action taken by the individual. Nevertheless, it did support the over-idealized motif of Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory.

I named the third pattern after President Dwight Eisenhower. In this pattern, no matter the political party, presidents were often mentioned if they were in office during the time that the Georgia history textbook was published. The first book I analyzed that mentioned a sitting president was *Georgia Government and History* by Albert B. Saye, published in 1957. In this book, Eisenhower received praise for appointing Georgian Walter F. George as his “personal representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization” (p. 188). In a sense, this pattern also correlated with the over-idealized portions of Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory based on the fact that the author focused on linking the current president to Georgia. Moreover, depending on the context of the mentions which made up this pattern, the Eisenhower pattern often correlated to one or more of Cronin’s (1974) constructs as well.

I named the final pattern after President Theodore Roosevelt. In many cases, Georgia history texts did not cast presidents as heroes or villains; they simply did not mention certain
presidents at all. This pattern seems to run in opposition to both the over-idealized and four construct components of Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory, as well as to Sanchez’s (1996) follow-up study, which determined that certain presidents are vilified in contemporary political science textbooks. Though he was an extremely popular president nationally, Roosevelt was not mentioned in Georgia textbooks until 1966, most likely due to his party affiliation and the little attention he paid to the state during his presidency. The fact that this nationally popular president was not mentioned in Georgia history textbooks is made even more interesting because Roosevelt’s less popular predecessor, William McKinley, and successor, William Taft, were mentioned several times, based on their connections to Georgia (McKinley, because of his speech in Atlanta, and Taft because he played golf at the Augusta National Golf Course). What makes this lack of focus on Roosevelt even more curious is that his mother was from Georgia, and his great-grandfathers were Revolutionary War heroes from the state.

Research Questions

Based on the mixed findings in my pilot study, as well as the lack of critical examination of state history textbooks, I wanted to expand the study by researching the portrayals of 20th and 21st century presidents found in the most recently published and/or adopted state history textbooks for the 14 states in which they were born. Unlike my pilot study, each presidential mention was only analyzed in accordance to Cronin’s (1974) first three constructs. I designed two questions to guide my research: (1) Are the first three constructs of Thomas Cronin’s (1974) “textbook presidency” theory (the belief that textbooks present a dangerous, over-idealized image of the president in college level political science textbooks) applicable to recently published middle level state history textbooks? (2) Are the four presidential patterns which were discovered in a pilot study applicable to other recently published state history textbooks?
In addition, based on the critiques found in the literature concerning the causes behind the weaknesses found in textbooks (e.g., Apple, 2001; Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; FitzGerald, 1979; Loewen, 1995) five sub-questions were analyzed concerning both the texts’ relation to the constructs as well as to the presidential patterns found in my pilot study, these were (a) Is there a difference in the number and percentages of presidential mentions and presidential patterns that correlate to the constructs found in textbooks based on the regions they are from (i.e., North, South, Midwest, or West)? (b) Is there a difference in the number and percentages of presidential mentions and presidential patterns that correlate to the constructs found in textbooks based on the states which they are from? (c) Is there a difference in the number and percentages of presidential mentions and presidential patterns that correlate to the constructs found in textbooks based on each state’s adoption process (i.e., adoption versus non-adoption)? (d) Is there a difference in the number and percentages of presidential mentions and presidential patterns that correlate to the constructs found in textbooks based on the grades the texts are written for (i.e., elementary or middle)? (e) Is there a difference in the number and percentages of presidential mentions and presidential patterns that correlate to the constructs found in textbooks based on the size of the textbook publishers (i.e., large publishers or small/regional publishers)?

Research Design, Data Collection, and Data Analysis

Qualitative content analysis has been the preferred method of many researchers in their studies analyzing textbooks (e.g., Alilunas, 1973; Alridge, 2006; Gilbert, 2003; Harrison, 2002; Jennings, 1994; Loewen, 1995; Root, 1959; Stern, 1996). In constructing his textbook presidency theory, Cronin (1974) explains that he also used qualitative methods and did not use a quantitative content analysis to come to his conclusions (p. 57). Cronin (1974) simply selected data sources (i.e., 15 college textbooks and 15 specialized presidency or national policy making
studies written in the 1950’s and 1960’s), analyzed the data, discovered patterns, and then reported his findings. However, Cronin (1974) calls for quantitative studies to be conducted about the textbook presidency (p. 56).

In response to Cronin’s (1974) recommendation, this study used an applied mixed method approach. Its primary purpose was to determine if the mentions of 20\textsuperscript{th} and 21\textsuperscript{st} century United States presidents found in recently published or adopted state history textbooks correlated to Cronin’s (1974) first three constructs of the textbook presidency. Its secondary purpose was to examine those mentions in order to determine if the four presidential patterns found in a pilot study analyzing Georgia history textbooks, written from 1951 to 2005, were applicable to recently published state history texts from the 14 states which are the birthplaces of at least one 20\textsuperscript{th} or 21\textsuperscript{st} century president. I felt that conducting a mixed method study would be the best way to ensure triangulation of the data (Esterberg, 2002; Patton, 2002).

This study used both the quantitative and qualitative forms of content analysis to evaluate the research questions. Ezzy (2002) declares content analysis to be the “most deductive of all forms of data analysis” and should be used when “a preexisting theory is tested against empirical data” (pp. 82-83). Since the principal purpose of this study was to test Cronin’s (1974) preexisting textbook presidential theory against the presidential mentions found in state history textbooks, along with the preexisting patterns I discovered in a pilot study, I believed that using a content analysis of state history textbooks was the best approach in examining my research questions.

The textbooks I selected for this study were determined based on “criterion sampling” (Patton, 2002). I selected the textbooks used in this study based on the following criteria: (1) the state produced at least one 20\textsuperscript{th} or 21\textsuperscript{st} century president (i.e., Arkansas, California, Connecticut,
Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, Ohio, Texas, Virginia, and Vermont) (The Whitehouse, 2009); (2) the textbooks were on either the state adoption lists, or in the case of non-adoption states, were used by specific school districts in the selected states; (3) the textbooks were published during or after the year 2001 to include 21st century and sitting president, George W. Bush; (4) the state required a state history course in either the upper elementary or middle grades (i.e., grades 4th-8th).

The selection of these criteria was based on five factors. First, though Cronin’s (1974) theory is concerned with the office of the president and not the men who held the office, he uses several presidential examples to discuss his theory. All of the presidents he describes were in office during the 20th century. Second, Sanchez (1996) discovered interesting trends that, as a whole, 20th century presidents received the most mentions in college political science textbooks, and these “post war [World War Two] presidents” received mostly negative portrayals in these texts. Third, my previous findings of the four presidential patterns were based on Cronin’s (1974) examples of the 20th century presidents. Hence, the mentions of all of these presidents were analyzed in my pilot study. Due to the fact that I analyzed all 20th century presidents in state history textbooks, I believed that I needed to continue to examine how they were all portrayed in relation to Cronin’s (1974) constructs in both their home states and other states as well. Fourth, my pilot study demonstrated that the number of presidential mentions was relatively small in the state history textbooks I examined; therefore, I felt that using a large number of data sources would assist with the general soundness of the findings. Finally, the collection of books provided me with a large number of data sources in order to examine the differences between Cronin’s (1974) theory and state history textbook based on the categories of region, individual state, use of adoption boards, grade level, and size of publishers. These
categories were determined based on the reviewed literature concerning the weaknesses of textbooks. The reviewed literature discusses all of these categories as reasons behind poorly written textbooks (e.g., Apple, 2001; Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; Cronin, 1974; FitzGerald, 1979; Loewen, 1995). With this in mind, I felt that these criteria provided me with the most precise data sources in the examination of my research questions.
Outline of the Study

For Chapter 2, I review the literature that has most informed my study in terms of understanding the purpose of teaching history in the middle grades, the factors leading to textbook bias, and the process of analyzing textbooks as data sources. A description of my methodology is found in Chapter 3, which provides a more detailed accounting of my research design, data collection, data analysis, and research stances. In Chapter 4, I present an analysis of the 42 state history textbooks and their relationship to my research questions. Finally, in Chapter 5, I offer discussion, conclusions, and implications that can be drawn from this study. In addition, I make recommendations for further studies concerning the applicability of Cronin’s textbook presidency in state history textbooks, the examination of state history textbooks, and the analysis of state history courses in general.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter is a review of the literature that has most informed my study in terms of understanding the purposes of teaching history in the middle grades, the factors leading to textbook bias, and the analysis of textbooks as data sources. This chapter begins with a brief overview regarding the variously cited purposes of teaching history at all grade levels, and in particular to students in the middle grades. Following is a summary of the literature concerning analyses and criticisms of textbooks, including critiques about the textbook publishing industry, textbook adoption committees, textbook publishers, the impact of special interest groups, and the influence of textbook authors, as well as a subsequent section providing information about both the praise and critiques of the images found in textbooks. This chapter continues with a discussion regarding the existing research about textbook portrayals of eras, events, and individuals. Finally, this chapter concludes with an examination of the limited research concerning the subjects related to my study: the middle level textbook portrayals of United States presidents and the analysis of state history textbooks.

Purposes of Teaching History in Schools

In America’s public schools, the “social studies wars” have been raging since at least the late 19th century, and they continue to this day (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Brophy & VanSledright, 1997; Evans, 2004; Evans, 2007; Gagnon, 1989; Saxe, 1991; Stearns, Seixas, & Wineburg, 2000; Wineburg, 2001). One of the major sources of friction concerns history’s place in social science education. Various “camps” argue whether history should be the core social studies subject from
which all other disciplines branch, or if history should be but one area of a larger interdisciplinary study (Brophy & VanSledright, 1997; Evans, 2004; Evans, 2007; Levstik & Barton, 2001; Saxe, 1991). Another source of friction is the many differing beliefs about “what” or “whose” history is important, and how “history should be taught” (Brophy & VanSledright, 1997). Yet, no matter their political biases or differing views about the methods that should be used for history instruction, the vast preponderance of authors, researchers, theorists, historians, and educators (“experts”) believe that teaching the subject of history in some form is not only worthwhile, but absolutely essential in America’s schools (e.g., Barton & Levstik, 2004; Brophy & VanSledright, 1997; Cheney, 1987; Evans, 2004; Gagnon, 1989; National Council for the Social Studies, 1991; Ravitch & Finn, 1987; Ravitch, 1987; Ravitch, 1989; Saxe, 1991; Stearns, Seixas, & Wineburg, 2000; Wineburg, 2001).

In addition, one can argue that several basic core purposes/goals for the study of history, and the important skills that students should learn from its study, appear time and again in the reviewed literature. These basic beliefs include, but are not limited to, promoting critical thinking or making educated value judgments about issues, citizenship training, instilling knowledge about their own society (collective memory), knowledge of other cultures and the world around them (cultural/global awareness), knowledge about other subjects both within the fields of the social sciences as well as in other disciplines (interdisciplinary knowledge), decision making/problem solving, and understanding ourselves through history instruction (self-awareness) (e.g., Barton & Levstik, 2004; Brophy & VanSledright, 1997; Cheney, 1987; Dewey, 1933; Gagnon, 1989; Hoge, 2003; Hoge & Crump, 1988; Hopper & Smith, 1993; Lee & Ashby, 2000; Levstik, 2000; McNeill, Kammen, & Craig, 1989; The National Center for History in the Schools, 1992;

Today researchers and theorists continue to identify at least one of these broad rationales when writing about the reasons history should be taught and studied in public schools. Nevertheless, recent literature critiquing the varying social studies camps does not seem to take into account their commonalities. While critics spend a great deal of time pointing out the politics behind the methods supported by each camp to teach social studies, they take no note of the similarities found in the rationales of each group (e.g., “Progressive Education,” “New Social Studies,” “Citizenship Training,” “Neoconservative”) (Brophy & VanSledright, 1997; Evans 2004; Evans, 2007).

Though there is much conflict in the literature about history’s place in the social sciences, an overarching set of goals for teaching both social studies and history has been adopted by the National Council for the Social Studies. First published in 1994, and using vague descriptions, these themes can be adapted to traditional history instruction, or any interdisciplinary social studies course, depending on the needs found at the local level (NCSS, 2008). The ten themes for teaching the social studies, including the subject of history, are as follows:

- Culture
- Time, Continuity, and Change
- People, Places, Environment
- Individual Development and Identity
- Individual Groups and Institutions
- Power, Authority, and Governance
- Production, Distribution, and Consumption
- Science, Technology, and Society
- Global Connections
- Civic Ideas and Practices
At the time of this writing, these themes are being updated, but most likely the connection that they have to the purposes of teaching history in schools will have changed very little upon their completion (NCSS, 2008).

**Purpose of History in the Middle Grades**

Social studies is a subject taught in most of middle and junior high schools throughout the country, and the discipline of history makes up the bulk of this subject (Allen, 1988; Bradley Commission, 1989; National Association of State Textbook Administrators, 2007). Not only is American history one of the core subjects of middle school social studies, but many states require that their own history is taught at the middle grade level, usually between the fourth and eighth grades (Menton, 1993; Moore, 1969; Percy, 2003). The literature reveals that the middle level students (ranging from the age of 10-14) who take these courses are unique in comparison to those students in the elementary and high school levels. Both physically and emotionally, these students undergo a more rapid and profound personal change than at any other point in their lives (Allen, 1988; Alexander, 1988; Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989; Jackson & Davis, 2000; National Council for the Social Studies, 1991; National Middle School Association, 1995; NMSA, 2003; Ogawa, 2001; Toepfer, 1988). Due to these changes, middle grades students have traditionally been considered to be the most at risk to become engaged in risky or negative behaviors such as alcohol and drug abuse, sex, violence, suicide, and dropping out of school (Allen, 1988; Alexander, 1988; Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989; Jackson & Davis, 2000; NCSS, 1991; Ogawa, 2001; Toepfer, 1988).

Interestingly, the literature points out that, until the 1970’s and 1980’s, middle level social studies, including history courses, were largely ignored by social studies professionals (e.g., Alexander, 1988; Levy, 1988; NCSS, 1991; Ogawa, 2001). In the first major studies about
middle level social studies and history, researchers began to suggest that the methods and purposes of teaching these subjects should be altered to meet the unique needs of middle grades students (e.g., Alexander, 1988; Allen, 1988; Lengal & Superka, 1982; Levy, 1988; Lounsbury, 1988; Schung, Todd, & Berry, 1984; Shaver, Davis, & Helburn, 1979; Toepfer, 1988). In 1988, *Social Education* released a special edition of the magazine entitled “Can Middle Schools Make a Difference?” (Vol. 52, No. 2). The articles in this edition examine “important dimensions” and differences of middle school social studies in comparison to other grade levels (Levy, 1988, p. 106).

Alexander (1988) writes about one of the dimensions of middle school social studies, which he describes as the “goals and programs from middle level students” (p. 108). Two of the goals resemble those identified for history instruction at all grade levels, including “every student should be given ample experiences designed to develop decision-making and problem solving skills,” and students “should acquire a functional body of fundamental knowledge” (Alexander, 1988, p. 108). Alexander (1988) claims that history and the other social studies courses should be at the forefront of helping to meet these goals.

Toepher (1988) describes the physical and cognitive developments of middle grades students, and then outlines an age appropriate curriculum that he believes can be used to help middle level students reach their full potential. He claims that social studies teachers have a “particular obligation to deal with social issues that are critical during this period of character development” (Toepher, 1988, p. 111). Toepher (1988) concludes his article by offering goals which middle level social studies teachers should promote in their classrooms: “considering complex issues,” the formulation of “values/morals systems,” developing a “sense of global interdependence,” and “predispositions associated with democratic living” (p. 112). While
Toepher (1988) explains that middle school students have different needs than those of students in the elementary and high school level, many of the overreaching goals of history instruction are evident in his proposals.

Allen (1988), an integrated social studies advocate, provides ten recommendations for the “restructuring of middle school social studies education” (p. 113). These recommendations are both method and theory based. In his stated goals, citizenship training, collective memory, cultural/global awareness, interdisciplinary knowledge, decision making/problem solving, critical thinking, and self-awareness are all highlighted as important understandings that middle grades students should learn from the study of social studies, including history, at the middle school level (Allen, 1988, pp. 113-114).

Based on the recommendations of the middle school research and the resulting proposals in the 1970s and 1980s, two independent committees were created to study and make further recommendations about teaching the subject of history to the middle level student. Though differing ideologically, both see the importance of teaching social studies in the middle schools and offer similar suggestions about how to improve the subject. The two committees are the Bradley Commission (1989) and the NCSS Task Force on Social Studies in the Middle School (1991).

The Bradley Commission (1989), a conservative-leaning organization, recommends that history should be the focal point of the middle school social studies curriculum, and suggests four curricular patterns for social studies classes based on the study of history. They propose that school districts throughout the country adopt the pattern that best suits their students’ needs. No matter which pattern the local schools selects, the Bradley Commission (1989) outlines specific goals that the schools should strive to achieve when teaching history to middle grades students.
Some of these goals include a history curriculum that is “directly useful for students,” exercises “the habits of the mind,” relates to “other history courses,” orders “in a developmental sequence of challenge and sophistication, based on current knowledge of learning styles…and stages of intellectual development,” and provides “ways to relate the study of history to biography, to geography, and to other subjects in the social sciences and humanities” (Bradley Commission, 1989, p. 37).

The National Council for the Social Studies’ “Task Force on Social Studies in the Middle School” (1991) makes several suggestions about the purpose of history and social studies in the middle schools. While their methods differed in comparison to the suggestions made by the Bradley Commission (1989), the stated purposes of teaching history/social studies instruction are relatively similar. The NCSS Task Force (1991) suggests three scope and sequence designs that would provide a framework for meeting the needs of middle school learners. These three designs share “topic of study” commonalities which suggest that students should begin learning U.S. history in the fifth grade. It advocates that in the sixth grade the subject of world cultures and the western hemisphere should be taught. In the seventh grade it recommends that students study world geography and history, while American and state history are suggested for eighth graders (NCSS, 1991).

In addition, the report identifies “three areas of developmentally appropriate needs” of middle school students (i.e. physical, social-emotional, and intellectual) and designs a social studies curriculum that would meet middle school students’ unique needs. The report suggests four “unifying motifs” which stress the need for a focus on a social studies curriculum supporting the use of history in the middle school. It also supports a curriculum that uses more of an “integrated” social studies approach (NCSS, 1991).
Using the study of history as the central theme, the Task Force believes that instruction with a focus on the four motifs could, “if addressed positively at the individual level…result in improved social conditions” (NCSS, 1991). The four motifs are: “Concerns with Self: Development of Self-Esteem and a Strong Sense of Identify;” “Concern for Right and Wrong: Development of Ethics;” “Concern for Others: Development of Group and Other-Centeredness;” and “Concern for the World: Development of Global Perspective” (NCSS, 1991). These motifs for teaching middle grades have not changed dramatically since their inception, and, paired with the “ten themes” discussed earlier, can still be used as guiding rationales for teaching the subject of history to middle level learners.

**Criticisms of Textbooks**

No matter how history is taught to middle level students, researchers contend that it is often done through the use of textbooks (e.g., Aliunas, 1973; Alridge, 2006; Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; FitzGerald, 1979; Loewen, 1995; Wasburn, 1997). However, the majority of the reviewed literature examining textbooks offer harsh criticisms of those textbooks used in America’s public schools. While textbook analysis studies have been common in both social studies and history research (e.g., Aliunas, 1973; Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991; Axtell, 1987; Cha-Jua & Weems; 1994; Cobble & Kessler-Harris; 1993; Delger, 1964; FitzGerald, 1979; Root, 1959) perhaps the most influential has been James W. Loewen’s bestseller, *Lies my Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong*. Since its release, Loewen’s (1995) work has been cited in most of the reviewed literature subsequent to its press date. The central argument of his book is the claim that students feel history is “boring,” and a subject that is irrelevant to their daily lives (p. 13). He explains that the main reason for student boredom is that history classes are “dominated by textbooks,” and
lambastes textbooks for being predictable, for never using the present to illuminate the past, for seldom using the past to illuminate the present, for being written in the voice of an “omniscient narrator,” for being “overly-full” of useless information, for possessing an overabundance of blatant errors, and for not allowing students to “analyze controversial issues in our society” (pp. 13-16). Loewen (1995) even goes as far as to make the claim that textbooks actually “make students stupid” (p. 17).

Loewen (1995) suggests various strategies to improve textbooks. Some of these include adding more emotion to the text, highlighting relevance to students’ lives, forming better links between content, focusing on higher order and critical thinking skills, studying fewer topics and examining these topics more thoroughly, and even using the books to teach in reverse chronological order (pp. 300-317). Many of the subsequent textbook analyses following Loewen’s (1995) work tend to agree with many of his claims and recommendations (e.g., Afflerbach & VanSledright, 2001; Alridge, 2006; Apple, 2001; Paxton, 1999; Roberts, 2007; Vinson & Ross, 2001; Wasburn, 1997; Wineburg, 1999).

The Major Players in the Textbook Publishing Industry

To explain the reasons behind the weaknesses of textbooks, the literature often focuses on the ways in which state adoption boards, textbook publishers, textbook protesters/special interest groups, and textbook authors (i.e., “major players”) are the source of many of the flaws found in textbooks. The literature contends that all of these key players are heavily interconnected and are mindful of one another during their respective phases of the textbook creation process. The vast majority of the reviewed works argue that textbooks are indeed biased, and that the practices of the major players lead to extremely flawed textbooks.
FitzGerald (1979) and Loewen (1995) wrote two of the most influential full length textbook studies that have been routinely cited in the collection of literature as guides to understanding the weakness demonstrated in textbooks. While disagreeing occasionally, both of these studies come to similar conclusions about the causes of the limitations found in textbooks, including their assertion that the textbook publishing industry and the textbook adoption committees both overtly and covertly push certain biases on American youth. In most subsequent works, researchers tend to be in accord with FitzGerald (1979) and Loewen’s (1995) findings (e.g., Apple 2001; Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; Aronwitz & Giroux, 1991; Currey, 1988; Giordano, 2003; Marshall, 1991; Menton, 1993; Moyer, 1985; Roberts, 2007; Salvucci, 1991; Tyson-Bernstein, 1988; Unger 1983).

Criticisms about Textbook Adoption Committees

While critics disapprove of textbook adoption committees for their role in producing biased textbooks (Apple, 2001; Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; FitzGerald, 1979; Keith, 1991; Loewen, 1995), almost half of the states have textbook adoption boards. The basic function of these boards is to ensure textbooks meet standard criteria for coverage, length, and reading level (Apple, 2001; FitzGerald, 1979; Loewen, 1995). State adoption boards are also used as “censors,” insisting that textbooks avoid topics and treatments that might offend some parents and other special interest groups (Apple, 2001; Jenkinson, 1979; Keith, 1991; Loewen, 1995; Marshall, 1993).

The textbook adoption process differs greatly from state to state and may lead to varying levels and types of bias (Loewen, 1995). FitzGerald (1979) explains that “some boards, for instance, can adopt only a few books…others simply weed out a few books they judge substandard and leave the real power of decision to the schools” (p. 32). Textbooks can be
adopted by “a board of education, a superintendent of schools, or a special textbook committee” (FitzGerald, 1979, p. 32). These special committees are made up of members who “have been appointed by the governor or the state commissioner of education” (Loewen, 1995, p. 278). They are volunteers usually consisting of “teachers, lawyers, parents, and other concerned citizens” (Loewen, 1995, p. 278). After this step of the process, the board, with the guidance of the governor or state commissioner of education, set up “ratings committees” (Loewen, 1995, p. 278). Ratings committees, as the name implies, judge the textbooks that are up for review.

Loewen (1995) implies that one of the reasons textbooks publishers are permitted to write weak and biased textbooks is based on the “Herculean” task textbook reviewers must endure (p. 279). First, there are usually one or more formal meetings between the ratings committees and publishers’ representatives. The publishers’ representatives in these meetings are instructed to push “the form” (i.e., special features, art work, skill building, and ancillary materials) and not “the content” (Loewen, 1995, p. 279). Second, reviewers are asked to evaluate massive textbooks with little time to carefully read or compare them. Finally, they are asked by the states to use “on average 73 different rating criteria” in their examinations (Loewen, 1995, p. 279). Loewen (1995) argues that it is easy to understand why members of the textbook adoption committees focus on the “flashy” perks of the book and not the writing, which is usually “biased, under-researched, and dull” (p. 279).

In regard to content, the adopters of United States history textbooks are looking for specific pieces of information. Primarily, they want to find mentions of their own state. This causes textbook editors (many of whom who do not begin their careers as historians, but as sales representatives) to attempt to include “everything” in their textbooks in order to ensure that the committees adopt them (Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; FitzGerald, 1979; Loewen, 1995).
After the initial review, where committees rate and approve the textbooks, a hearing is held where “the public is invited to comment on books” (Loewen, 1995, p. 280). These hearings are important because “adoption committees do try to please constituents” (Loewen, 1995, p. 280). The hearings lead to the creation of even more textbook bias because “these are occasions at which organized groups attack or promote one or more of the selections, often contending a book fails to meet a requirement found within the regulations or specifications” (Loewen, 1995, p. 280).

Loewen (1995) explains that states with adoption committees “pressure publishers overtly to espouse certain points of view” (p. 280). Apple (2001) mentions that “…the writing, editing, promotion, and general orientation strategy of such production is quite often aimed toward guaranteeing a place on state approved material” (p. 33). Both Loewen (1995) and FitzGerald (1979) illustrate this with the well-known example that “for years any textbook sold in Dixie had to call the Civil War ‘the War Between the States’” (Loewen, 1995, p. 280). This state sponsored bias continues today; for example, in the state of Texas, “textbooks shall not contain material which serves to undermine authority” (Apple, 2001, p. 55).

While some states do not have textbook adoption boards, Loewen (1995) suggests that this does not necessarily make for less textbook censorship and bias. In fact, Loewen (1995) asserts that censorship is worse in these states, and that “textbook screening takes place on a smaller level, where concerns about giving offense can be more immediate” (p. 278). In addition, because states without adoption boards constitute a smaller market, they must chose textbooks which are designed and written for larger states, such as Texas and California (Apple, 2001; Loewen, 1995). This increases biases because Texas and California “directly affect publishers and textbooks because they [have] statewide adoptions and active lobbying groups” (Loewen,
1995, p. 278). For example, due to the power that statewide adoption groups had on publishers, a collection of “former Confederate states…imposed their racial prejudices not only on the children of their states but on children throughout the nation” (Apple, 2001, p. 34). Apple (2001) argues that due to the large number of state adoption boards in southern states, their “political and ideological climate…often determines the content and form of the purchased curriculum throughout the rest of the nation” (p. 33).

Contrary to the critiques expressed by Loewen (1995) and others, FitzGerald (1979) appears to have mixed emotions about the influence that state adoption boards have on textbooks (p. 16). She contends that since textbook publishers have to revise their textbooks every four to six years in order to “stay in step with the cycles of adoption,” they make “significant changes to the body of work,” thus making them more contemporary than any other form of history (FitzGerald, 1979, p. 17). Nevertheless, FitzGerald (1979) admits that this could have a negative effect. The problem is that “each generation reads only one generation of school books. That transient history is those children’s history forever—their particular version of America” (FitzGerald, 1979, p. 17).

Criticisms about Textbook Publishers

While state adoption committees contribute greatly to the weaknesses found in textbooks, many critics also blame the “publishing houses themselves” (Apple, 2001; Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; FitzGerald, 1979; Loewen, 1995, p. 281). Apple & Christian-Smith (1991) contend that school textbooks are published “within the political and economic constraints of markets, resources, and power” (p. 2). Apple (2001) also argues that textbook publishing is a “commercial enterprise situated within the vicissitudes of a capitalist market,” and that “decisions about the ‘bottom line’ determine what books are published and for how long” (Apple, 2001, pp. 28 & 31).
In the publishing industry, the four largest textbook companies control 32% of the market, while the top eight control 53% (Apple, 2001, p. 29). This causes textbook publishing, for all intents and purposes, to be a “copy-cat” industry (Loewen, 1995, p. 281). Due to the large market share of the major textbook companies, textbooks are often copied as every other publisher tries to emulate the success of the largest selling textbook in the subject area. Loewen (1995) contends that in the subject of history, the largest selling textbooks tend to be boring and biased, which results in most history textbooks following suit.

The influence held by textbook editors offers another problem within the industry. FitzGerald (1979) explains that “…most textbook editors have the same kind of information and tend to think alike on most subjects” (p. 24). Apple (2001) argues that there may be a deeper reason textbook editors’ decisions seem so similar: “The vast majority of these editors will be male, thereby reproducing patriarchal relations within the firm itself…their general background will complement the existing market structure that dominates text production” (p. 30). Unfortunately, these market structures include “financial capital, short-term perspectives, and high profit margins” (Apple, 2001, p. 30).

Finally, there are many factors that textbook publishers take into account when deciding which textbooks to publish. Loewen (1995) explains that when producing textbooks, publishers have “several audiences in mind” (p. 272). These “audiences” include their student readers, historians, professors of education, teachers, as well as the general public (Loewen, 1995, p. 272). Publishers must attempt to please all of these groups if their textbooks are to be successful. These audiences can be extremely vocal about what information they want their textbooks to contain and what “facts” they present (Loewen, 1995, p. 272).
For the most part, Loewen (1995) contends that, due to these interest groups, today’s textbooks strive to meet the same standards suggested by the American Legion in 1925. These standards include “inspiring the students with patriotism,” being careful to “tell the truth optimistically,” only dwelling on “failure for its value as a moral lesson,” “speaking chiefly of success,” and giving each “state and section full space and value for the achievements of each” (Loewen, 1995, p. 272). According to critics, if textbooks follow these archaic guidelines, they are more likely to be adopted by state school boards, and will help publishers make larger profits (Apple, 2001; Loewen, 1995; Masur, 1998).

Criticisms about Special Interest Groups

Surprisingly, after lambasting textbook publishers for much of his book, Loewen (1995) softens his criticisms in his explanation of the relationship between the large number of special interest groups they deal with and the huge amount of money each publisher risks in the production cost of textbooks. He maintains that interest groups include “creationists, the radical right, civil liberty groups, racial minorities, feminists, and even professional historians,” and “in omitting a section to pacify one, textbook publishers are bound to offend another” (Loewen, 1995, p. 282). Loewen (1995) illustrates a textbook publisher’s predicament by claiming that “including a photograph of Henry Cisneros may please Hispanics but risk denunciation by New Englanders demanding a photograph of John Adams” (p. 282).

Special interest groups protesting textbooks are by no means a recent phenomenon. FitzGerald (1979), Giordano (2003), and Evans (2007) write about the prominent role that special interest groups have had on what information is present in history textbooks throughout the 20th century. FitzGerald (1979) and Giordano (2003) provide a chronological outline of textbook protest, while Evans (2007) focuses on how conservative-leaning special interest
groups targeted, and eventually found ways to ban Professor Harold Rugg’s otherwise successful middle school textbook series in the 1940’s.

Special interest groups play an obvious role in what textbook publishers include and omit from their textbooks. Textbooks publishers seek to make a profit and a large textbook publisher will typically make millions of dollars in sales (Apple, 2001; Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; Lankford, 2007). Textbook publishers understand what types of textbooks will sell, and also realize that if they stray too far from the beaten path that they may become the target of special interest groups. If this happens, they are less likely to be selected by state adoption boards. No matter their political connotations, due to the amount of money that publishers risk, “thoughts of the bottom line narrow the range of thought publishers tolerate in textbooks” (Loewen, 1995, p. 282).

Criticisms about Textbook Authors

The final relevant players in the textbook publishing industry are textbook authors. While a few textbook authors approach publishers about writing textbooks, most are usually chosen by textbook publishers for one of two reasons (Lankford, 2007; Menton, 1993; Unger, 1983). The first reason is that they have name recognition in the field and have the potential to influence sales (Lankford, 2007; Unger, 1983). The second is that the authors are thought to have the ability to produce quality work (Lankford, 2007). Textbook companies usually pay textbook writers a flat fee, and the authors of most non-technical textbooks usually make around $50,000 dollars (Lankford, 2007). In some cases authors write for a commission, which means they are paid more money, but over a longer period of time based on how well their books sell (Lankford, 2007; Roberts, 2007).
In many cases textbook authors have little knowledge of the textbook adoption process and tend to heavily rely on publishers’ input to guide their writing. For example, sometimes textbook authors are forced to change their text to include more information about African-Americans, women, and other minorities; in other cases they are instructed to include less (Loewen, 1995; FitzGerald, 1979; Roberts, 2007; Unger, 1983). Many researchers assert that if it comes down to content arguments between textbook authors and publishers or editors, the publishing companies usually prevail (e.g., FitzGerald, 1979; Loewen, 1995; Roberts, 2007; Unger, 1983).

Due to the large amount of power held by the textbook adoption committees and publishing houses, the literature revealed that most textbook authors have a relatively limited amount of freedom over their work. In fact, in many cases, the “names on the cover of a textbook are rarely those of the people who really wrote it” (Loewen, 1995, p. 282). For example, Lewis Todd and Merle Curti are listed as the authors of The Rise of the American Nation, written in 1949, but, by the tenth edition, which was issued in 1991, “Curti was 95, and Todd was dead” (Loewen, 1995, p. 282). With this in mind, Loewen (1995) surmises that “gradually, as books move from the first to the eighth editions, the listed authors have less and less to do with them” (p. 283). FitzGerald (1979) concurs and claims that the major problem with this fact is that “many of the texts omit or contradict the very interpretations of history which their supposed authors made famous” (p. 21).

points out, a publisher will more often than not send newly written material to the authors when it is “too late to make any major changes,” and will focus primarily on the “pedagogical style of the book,” but not the content (p. 283). In these instances, “minions in the bowels of the publishing houses do the work of organizing and writing the textbooks” (Loewen, 1995, p. 282).

When authors actually write the bulk of the textbooks that bear their names, it becomes unclear if authors are solely to blame for the “distortions and lies of omission that mar U.S. history textbooks” (Loewen, 1995, p. 283). For example, Loewen (1995) contends that in interviews with the authors of three of the textbooks he studied, all three claimed textbook editors “never offered a single content suggestion” (p. 283). One said, “I kept waiting for them to say no [about the book’s content] but they never did” (Loewen, 1995, p. 283). Unger (1983) also argues this point concerning his own textbook writing experience and found that censorship was only a small problem with his publishers. However, he mentions that he found the problem of censorship much worse with outside readers.

If textbook authors do in fact maintain a considerable degree of academic freedom in their works, then why do these “experts” in the field of history write textbooks that critics consider to be boring, biased, and lacking in significant scholarship? In some cases textbook authors “do not know better,” and while having immense knowledge about a particular historic genre, they usually have a limited understanding about the larger subjects that they are asked to write about (Loewen, 1995, p. 284). However, in many cases authors “do know better,” and continue to write textbooks which are “boring, biased, and include both lies of omission as well as outright lies” (Loewen, 1995, p. 284).

There are many reasons that textbook authors write in this manner. One reason is that most textbook authors view writing textbooks as “easy” money (FitzGerald, 1979; Loewen,
1995; Menton, 1995; Unger, 1983). They understand that even if they write an outstanding
textbook it will usually not count toward tenure at major universities, and if they produce a
poorly written textbook, it will not likely be peer reviewed, and therefore not hurt their
professional reputations (FitzGerald, 1979; Loewen, 1995; Menton, 1995). Similarly to textbook
publishers, textbook authors want to write textbooks that sell, and, if royalties are involved, sell a
lot (Unger, 1983). Loewen (1995) quotes one textbook author as saying he wrote texts that are “a
McDonald’s version of history—if it has any flavor, people will not buy it.” (p. 284).

Loewen (1995) explains that another reason textbook authors tend to write biased
textbooks is that “the enterprise of writing a high school American history textbook converts
historians into patriots” (p. 285). No matter how critical textbook authors are in their writing for
college-aged students and adults, they want their secondary school textbooks to “promote
citizenship,” and to help students “take pride in their country” (p. 285). Authors enjoy the full
support of textbook publishers in writing in this manner and “do not need to concern themselves
unduly with what actually happened in history, since textbook publishers use patriotism rather
than scholarship to sell their books” (Loewen, 1995, p. 285).

However, not everyone agrees with Loewen’s (1995) claim about the lack of scholarship
found in textbooks. Menton (1993), the author of a Hawaiian history textbook, says she read the
criticisms aimed at textbooks and took them to heart. She explains that she did her best to ensure
the greatest level of accuracy possible, and states that in order to guard against the mistakes
found in other textbooks, when writing her own, she asked a number of scholars from both inside
and outside the various fields of the social sciences to critique and edit her work (Menton, 1993).
Criticisms About the Images Found in Textbooks

Finally, textbooks written for elementary and secondary school students are criticized for the images contained in them. Masur (1998) argues that the images in textbooks provide students with a “superficial understanding of the place and meaning of images in American history” (p. 1409). Masur (1998) also contends that images are primary sources which should play a critical role in the classroom, and should be used to “interpret, assess, and analyze history” (p. 1410). However, as demonstrated by the prevalent use of Paul Revere’s 1770 engraving of the Boston Massacre, textbooks do not use images to “raise the important questions that might move students toward visual literacy,” but instead use them only as a way for textbook publishers to market and sell more textbooks (Masur, 1998, p. 1412).

The images found in elementary and secondary school textbooks are also criticized for being much less controversial than those found in college textbooks or trade books (FitzGerald, 1979; Loewen, 1995; Masur, 1998). Critics contend that these “fluff” images dilute some of the purposes of teaching history. For example, Loewen (1995) uses five of the most famous images from the Vietnam War to illustrate the lack of controversial images in textbooks. Loewen (1995) determines that in the textbook he examined, many of the most well-known images from the war are not found. In fact, there were no pictures of any of the violence or atrocities committed by Americans during the war (Loewen, 1995).

However, Foster, Hoge, & Rosch (1999) view textbook images as offering students “a refreshing accessibility and immediate engagement” to historic understanding. Though they contend that students are “bombarded” daily with an “array of visual images found in textbooks and other instructional materials,” they find that, overall, textbook images can help students with “historical thinking” and “evoke critical and reflective student thought” (Foster et al., 1999, p.
201). Nevertheless, they concede that there is a need for further study in order to determine the influence historic images may have on students’ perceptions of historic events (Foster et al., 1999).

Criticisms About Textbook Portrayals of Events or Eras

A large number of the textbook analyses I reviewed focus on the textbook portrayals of historic events or eras. In addition, almost all of these studies are qualitative studies where authors examine a specific number of textbooks, code their data, and then present their findings. In the end, most of the researchers strongly critique the textbooks for not portraying the event or era in what they deem is a “correct” fashion, and then offer a variety of suggestions for improving textbooks (e.g., Armitage, 2001; Boyer, 1996; Cha-Jua & Weems, 1994; Cooble & Kessler-Harris, 1993; Epstein, 1994; Goodman et al., 1983; Fea, 1995; FitzGerald, 1979; Gordon, 1994; Greenfield & Cortes, 1991; Groff, 1982; Holt, 1995; Kolchin, 1998; Lindaman & Ward, 2004; Moore, 1969; Loewen, 1995; Philipsen, 1995; Ratzlaff & Schick, 1981; Root, 1959; Salvucci, 1992; Salvucci, 1995; Terry, 1983; Von Borries, 2003; Walker, 1995; Wasburn, 1997).

The authors conclude their studies by making several recommendations for improving social studies and/or history textbooks. For example, Goodman et al. (1983) offer three suggestions that are particularly significant. These suggestions are that “controversial issues and personalities should not be glossed over or muted in efforts to present a single version of the past,” “special attention should be paid in the inclusion of up-to-date materials,” and “sources of data, especially dates, should be identified in all social studies textbooks” (Goodman et al., 1983, p. 567). In addition, Wasburn (1997) argues that teachers should “point out ways in which textbooks have been influenced by current ideology,” use multiple sources, and “seek author influence and bias and to search for multiple perspectives” (pp. 486-487).
Criticisms About Textbook Portrayals of Individuals

The overarching problem that much of the literature asserts about the portrayal of individuals in history textbooks is the issue of heroification (e.g., Alridge, 2006; Loewen, 1995; Shimony, 2003). Accordingly, in order to create heroes, certain historical figures must be cast as villains (Alilunas, 1973; Degler, 1964; Harrison, 2002; Root, 1959; Salvucci, 1991). However, vilification is not as common a trait in textbook portrayals of individuals. Most often, historic figures who major players in the textbook industry find to be villainous are either discussed minimally or completely omitted from the textbooks (Alilunas, 1973; Gilbert, 2003; Goose, 1995; Harrison, 2002; Loewen, 1995; Salvucci, 1991). The majority of the works examined suggest that the heroification and, to some degree, vilification of historic figures in textbooks can be used to illustrate character traits that the major players (and in some cases state and national governments) would like for student readers to emulate or disdain (e.g., Alridge, 2006; Degler, 1964; Gilbert, 2003; Harrison, 2002; Jennings, 1994; Loewen, 1995; Root, 1959; Seller & Trusz, 1976).

Consequently, the literature lambasts the process that the major players in the textbook industry employ in order to canonize individual historical figures, and points out how this process creates additional weaknesses in textbooks. First, most of the researchers argue that heroification causes those involved to become extremely selective in choosing the historical figures that they include or exclude in their books (e.g., Alilunas, 1973; FitzGerald, 1979; Gilbert, 2003; Gosse, 1995; Loewen, 1995; McLaurin, 1971). Once these figures are chosen, the facts are selectively included or omitted, and, in some cases, “facts” are completely fabricated in textbooks (Alridge, 2006; Axtell, 1987; Gilbert, 2003; Jennings, 1994; Loewen, 1995; Root, 1959).
Furthermore, the literature points out that, in creating heroes, history textbooks tend to use xenophobic ideals (e.g., Axtell, 1987; Degler, 1964; Harrison, 2002; Jennings, 1994; Loewen, 1995; Salvucci, 1991). For example, many researchers attack American history textbooks for being Euro and Anglo-centric, racist, and colonialistic. In addition, the critics allege that the portrayal of historic figures in textbooks is bland, thus keeping students from the challenge of understanding the complexity of the individual being examined (e.g., Alridge, 2006; FitzGerald, 1979; Loewen, 1995). For instance, Loewen (1995) claims that when students are taught about Helen Keller, they only learn about Keller’s early life as the girl who conquered the challenges of being both deaf and blind. What textbooks do not discuss is that Keller became a radical socialist and supported many causes and organizations such as the NAACP, Women’s Suffrage, and even the creation of the Soviet Union (pp. 21-22). According to Loewen (1995), this information diminishes the actual lessons that Keller wanted us to learn about her life and her struggle against the forces she felt led to oppression for many Americans (p. 20).

Finally, scholars contend that recent historic research about individuals is never discussed in history textbooks, and, in the process of heroification, textbooks use “omniscient” and “master narrative” approaches in their descriptions of individuals, which limits the students’ understanding of historical inquiry (e.g., Alilunas, 1971; Alridge, 2006; Axtell, 1987; Cargill & Mayer, 1998; Loewen, 1995; Seller & Trusz, 1976). For example, in his study about the textbook portrayals of Martin Luther King Jr., Alridge (2006) argues that the “ideas and representations in textbooks presented a teleological progression from ‘great men’ to ‘great events…’” (p. 662). He suggests that his major concern about master narratives is “…how heavily teachers relied on these textbooks, consequently denying students an accurate picture of the complexity and richness of American history” (Alridge, 2006, p. 662).
Textbook Portrayals of Presidents

Though not as prevalent as textbook studies about the portrayal of eras, events, or most historic individuals, there are a few textbook studies about the presidents of the United States (e.g., Adler, 2005; Alsfeld, 1995; Cammarota, 1963; Eksterowicz & Watson, 2000; Hoesktra, 1982; Loewen, 1995; Sanchez, 1996; Stern, 1996). Generally, these studies examine the office of the president and most support Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory, which is the romanticized image of the president in U.S. history and political science textbooks. Most also agree that there is an overwhelmingly inaccurate and overly positive portrayal of the presidents and presidential power found in textbooks. However, a few also echo the insights about the modern textbook presidency offered by Hoekstra (1982), Alsfeld (1996), and Sanchez (1996). Furthermore, most of the criticisms levied at the textbook portrayals of individuals are evident in presidential studies as well.

As mentioned before, Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory is generally accepted by the political science community (Hoekstra, 1982; Alsfeld, 1995; Sanchez, 1996). However, there have been concerns raised about the four constructs. While conceding that Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory is accurate, after examining the same textbooks that Cronin did, Hoekstra (1982) is still extremely critical of Cronin’s (1974) four constructs. Along with claiming that the textbook presidency has changed based on the historic events of the Vietnam War and the Watergate scandal, Hoekstra (1982) points out two problems concerning the constructs. The first is that “his [Cronin’s] analysis did not fully distinguish between the orthodoxy presumably closest to empirical ‘reality’ and those parts regarded as the most inaccurate” (p. 160). The second is that the “statement of the ‘ideal’-type [president] seemed to include a mix of the credible and the distorted” (p. 160). Hoesktra (1982) provides an example
by discussing the third construct. He writes “most scholars could cite instances where presidents have seemed to act as ‘moral leaders,’ capable of ‘radiating inspirational confidence’” (p. 160). With this in mind, he argues that when Cronin (1974) uses terms such as “must be” in his constructs, he “garbles arguable propositions with their exaggerated and simplistic counterparts” (p. 160).

In his study, Alsfeld (1995) claims that contrary to Hoekstra’s findings (1982), Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory is still a “useful marker” in presidential studies. However, he claims that while the description of presidential roles such as “commander-in-chief” in political science textbooks is similar to Cronin’s (1974) theory, many other roles such as “party chief” resemble the arguments made by Hoekstra (1982). He also determines that in current political science textbooks, the office of the president is treated in a more balanced fashion than either Cronin (1974) or Hoekstra (1982) contend (Alsfeld, 1995). Alsfeld (1995) suggests that, based on the characteristics of the “new” presidency, Cronin’s (1974) portrayal of the president in regards to his four constructs, “omnipotent” and “benevolent” may not be the most accurate way to “classify and evaluate” presidents (p. 677). He offers three alternatives to evaluating presidents which he considers to be “eminently more practical” (Alsfeld, 1995, p. 677). The first two include “rating the president based on what a president intends to do and what he actually achieves in office,” and using one president as a “topical model” to rate all others (Alsfeld, 1995, p. 676). The third is the approach Alsfeld (1995) uses in his study, which is asking and researching both empirical and normative questions. However, unlike Cronin (1974), who combined these types of questions in his study, Alsfeld (1995) suggests separating the two and analyzing each individually (p. 678). The example he provides concerns presidential strength. He claims that the empirical question would be “Is the presidency strong or weak?” and the
normative question would be “Is strength or limitation good or bad for the American political system” (Alsfeld, 1995, p. 678).

Sanchez (1996) appears to be the most supportive of Cronin’s (1974) theory, which is even illustrated by the title of his study, *Old Habits Die Hard: The Textbook Presidency is Alive and Well.* Overall, Sanchez analyzed 40 contemporary college level political science textbooks and determined that the textbooks routinely make some presidents into heroes and others into villains. However, though supportive of Cronin’s (1974) theory, he explains that his study of the textbook presidency offers readers something that Cronin’s (1974) did not: a full examination of the portrayals of all of the individual presidents and the textbook mentions that directly evaluate “individual chief executives” (Sanchez, 1996, p. 63). Overall, his findings indicate that there is a huge discrepancy found between the positive portrayals of traditionally popular presidents (e.g., George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin Roosevelt) and the vilification of most post-war presidents in college-level political science textbooks.

Loewen (1995), in his examination of 11 of the most widely used high school United States history textbooks, offers three textbook portrayals of presidents in order to explain several themes he found. The nation’s third president, Thomas Jefferson, is used to illustrate his claim of the “invisibility of racism in American history textbooks” (Loewen, 1995, p. 137). In discussing Thomas Jefferson and the invisibility of racism, Loewen (1995) notes that while “Jefferson’s slave holding affected almost everything he did, half of our textbooks never noted that Jefferson owned slaves.” Even the textbooks that admit Jefferson was a slave owner “go out of their way to downplay the fact” (p. 147).

The second president that Loewen (1995) examines is Abraham Lincoln. Loewen (1995) uses the example of Lincoln to describe the “invisibility of anti-racism in American history
textbooks” (p. 179). Although not always the case, in many older southern history textbooks he was described as a villain (Degler, 1964), today Lincoln is depicted as a hero in most textbooks. Nonetheless, Loewen (1995) explains that textbooks “minimize his ideas, especially on the subject of race” (p. 179). He goes on to explain that, “in life Abraham Lincoln wrestled with the race question more openly than any other president except perhaps Thomas Jefferson, and unlike Jefferson, Lincoln’s actions sometimes matched his words” (Loewen, 1995, p. 179). Loewen (1995) disparages textbooks for not using this fact in a positive manner.

In discussing his final presidential example, Woodrow Wilson, Loewen (1995) asserts that the information students do not learn about the president is “more remarkable” than what textbooks do offer. While students learn that Wilson led the United States through World War I, and that he was a progressive president who supported democratic associations such as the League of Nations, they do not learn about two of his anti-democratic policies: “racial segregation of the federal government and military interventions in foreign countries” (Loewen, 1995, p. 23). Using a number of sources, Loewen (1995) goes into great detail discussing Wilson’s racism and his approved invasions of Latin America, the Caribbean, and even Russia, and why textbooks do not mention these topics based on their attempts to heroify historical figures (pp. 24-25). In discussing Wilson, textbooks often omit information, claim events were not his fault, or use techniques such as “imparting information in a passive voice to insulate him from his own un-heroic or unethical deeds” (Loewen, 1995, pp. 24-25).

The final reviewed work about the portrayal of a president in textbooks was Stern’s (1996) analysis of Calvin Coolidge. Unlike the presidents examined by Loewen (1995), Stern (1996) contends that Coolidge is portrayed as a villain in textbooks, and that this image is neither fair nor accurate. Echoing Cronin (1974), Stern (1996) argues that this negative portrayal of
Coolidge is in relation to the idealism textbook authors hold for Franklin Roosevelt. Generally, “New Deal historians” and FDR biographers often dismiss the trio of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover as poor presidents who did not do their job to prevent or ease the suffering of the Great Depression (Stern, 1996, p. 39). Stern contends that American history textbooks continued to “perpetuate factual errors and misleading conclusions” which are “flatly contradicted by sources readily available in any public school or library” to portray historical figures such as Calvin Coolidge in a negative light (Stern, 1996, p. 39).

Stern (1996) concludes his study by suggesting that the best way to combat the problems of historical bias and heroification is for students to study this bias directly. He contends that “history education…should emphasize the distinction between studying an historical event or person and endorsing or approving of that event or person” (p. 48). He challenges teachers to “provide young people with the skills to master historical thinking, enabling them to understand context, develop a sense of history, and become informed citizens” (Stern, 1996, p. 49).

However, much like the majority of other textbook studies, Stern (1996) offers no pedagogical methods to achieve this task.

**State History Textbooks Analysis**

Overall, many studies about United States history textbooks focus on eras, events, and individuals. Though state history is a requirement in many states, very few content analyses have been conducted to critically examine the texts used in these courses. An extensive review of the pertinent literature revealed only five state history textbook analyses (DeLuca, 1984; Lothrop, 1989; McLaurin, 1971; Moore, 1969; Terry, 1983). Moore (1969) reasons that the rationale behind this lack of research is that state history textbooks “… are often considered sacrosanct
since they are required by state legislatures and presumably dear to the natives of the state” (p. 268).

In the earliest state history textbook analysis, Moore (1969) conducted a broad examination of state history textbooks and describes how the “admirable objectives” of these texts can be detrimental to students’ understanding of their concepts (p. 267). The “admirable objectives” included “appreciation of the state,” “building good citizenship through the knowledge of the society in which he lives,” and “relating the state to the United States and world history” (p. 267). However, he warns that state history texts produce an “ethnocentric belief in the superiority of the state’s culture and disparagement of ‘outside’ contributions” (Moore, 1969, p. 267). After examining 30 state history textbooks (the actual states were not mentioned) and their descriptions of the years 1917 to 1969, Moore (1969) argues that state textbooks “rarely satisfy…the requirements of scholarship, the curiosity of students, or the needs of society” (p. 275). Moore (1969) concludes that state textbooks can serve a useful purpose by “depicting state contributions to national life that might otherwise be overlooked;” however, he warns that in order for these books to be reliable, they must “demonstrate the state’s capacity for self-criticism and analysis” (p. 276).

In the next study, McLaurin (1971) examined five state history textbooks used in the states of Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi, and takes careful note of their portrayals of African-Americans. All of these books were used in either the third, fourth, eighth, or ninth grades. In addition, all of the books were written after 1954, the year that the Brown v. Board decision desegregated public schools (McLaurin, 1971). McLaurin (1971) concludes that most of these textbooks fail to “substantially alter the traditional white stereotypes of blacks” or “chronicle their contributions to society after gaining their freedom” (p. 241). McLaurin (1971)
concludes that the images of blacks in these states history textbooks did little to promote either African-American students’ pride in their own race, or white students’ cultural understanding of the achievements made by African-Americans.

In the third study, Terry (1983) uses “traditional” and “revisionist” historical interpretations in analyzing a series of Georgia history textbooks, published from 1917 to 1982, in order to determine their depictions of the Reconstruction period (p. 6). According to Terry (1983), a traditional interpretation of the period of Reconstruction is a “very critical and pro-southern” view of the era (p. 5). The revisionist interpretation basically takes a “more realistic interpretation” of the period (Terry, 1983, p. 6). Terry (1983) argues that the textbooks published before the mid-1960s display a more traditionalist interpretation but later books slowly began to incorporate a more revisionist interpretation after the civil rights movement. In his conclusion, Terry (1983) warns teachers to be cognizant of state textbook biases, and when deciding which textbook to use they should “read sections that they are particularly familiar with” in order to determine their biases and if the texts are appropriate for student use (p. 9).

The last two state history textbook analyses concern California history textbooks. DeLuca (1984) analyzed six state adopted history texts written from 1945 to 1965, and seven textbooks written after 1980, and notes their portrayals of California’s growth. DeLuca (1984) claims that the recent textbooks focus more on the problems that occur with growth, as well as offer a relatively balanced and realistic examination of “facts.” Finally, Lothrop (1989) analyzed how women have been portrayed in California textbooks and, in a similar vein to most textbook studies, concludes that they have not been represented in a favorable manner.
Summary

In summary, I found that while there are differing opinions about how and what history should be taught, there appear to be a few commonalities about its purpose in schools. Whether it is the “celebratory” history proposed by Cheney (1987), the disciplinary approach supported by Ravitch (1987), or the social studies approach for promoting citizenship advocated by Parker (2003), many educational experts tend to use similar terms in describing some of the primary reasons for teaching history in schools. The purposes of critical thinking, citizenship training, collective memory, global awareness, decision making/problem solving, interdisciplinary knowledge, and self-awareness appear to be advocated by many experts in the field, with only slightly varying degrees.

I also learned that students in the middle grades are a unique group due to their physical and emotional development. Middle level students are considered prone to indulge in risky behaviors based on these distinctive characteristics. With this in mind, many middle level social studies experts provide rationales about why social studies, with or without a heavy emphasis on the discipline of history, can be beneficial in assisting middle grades students in overcoming the challenges and obstacles they face, while developing the skills and qualities needed to function in our pluralistic society. However, no matter how they are presented, these rationales appear to bear little difference to many of the rationales behind the purposes of teaching history to students at all grade levels. With this in mind, I believe that the NCSS ten themes of social studies education, along with the four motifs of teaching middle school social studies, best equate to the purposes of teaching social studies at the middle grade level.

No matter which “history” is taught, the most researchers claim that textbooks are the primary tool used in teaching the subject and lambaste textbooks for a plethora of weaknesses. I
found an interesting conclusion in the discussion of who is responsible for textbook bias. As exemplified by the bulk of the literature about the topic, while it would seem that the most logical people to blame for textbook bias would be the authors who wrote them, this is not the case. It appeared the textbook authors are relatively minor players in the world of textbook publishing and adoption. Textbook publishers, state adoption boards, and special interest groups receive the brunt of the critiques.

In researching the critiques about the images found in textbooks, there appear to be mixed views about the images they contain. Some argue that these images assist students in their understanding of historical eras and bring a connection to those who lived before them. However, others criticize these pictures for being used in order to make textbooks look more attractive in order to sell more copies, or worse, as ways to bring particular biases to the students that read them.

In congruence with arguments presented by Wade (1993), almost every national or state history textbook analysis reviewed studying individuals, events, or eras, contained similar findings about biases and weaknesses found in the discussion of the particular historical topic considered. It should be understood that not every topic or detail can be covered in these books, especially to the degree that the textbook critics would like. Many researchers seem to be enamored with their topics and begin their studies with the assumption that the topic is not being written about thoroughly enough. However, contrary to Wade (1993), I believe that it is still important to study and critique all portrayals of historical events, eras, and individuals found in textbooks, even if the findings are similar. A few of the textbook examinations, such as the recent study conducted by Wineberg & Monte-Sano (2008) comment on the improvements they
found in textbooks over time and one can hope that if researchers continue to conduct and publish these studies, then textbooks may improve with every adoption cycle.

Most textbook analyses about the men who held the U.S. presidency concur with Cronin’s (1975) theory, no matter if the president is made into a hero, like Wilson, or vilified, like Coolidge. In addition, it is also apparent that, for the most part, textbook studies about presidents fall in line with the same conclusions found in the textbook analyses of historic individuals, as well as events and eras. However, as with the majority of textbook analyses, all of the textbooks examined concerning the portrayal of the United States president were written for high school or college-aged students, and not a single middle level state history textbook was thoroughly examined.

Finally, I discovered that there is a significant lack of literature concerning state history textbooks, though this subject is a requirement in many states. The reviewed literature reveals that, similarly to national history textbook analysis, many of the state history textbook analyses focus on eras, events, and/or groups of people. In addition, many offer similar conclusions to those of national history textbooks. This is troubling because, as McLaurin (1971) points out, most students who do not go to college receive a very limited or incorrect understanding about the histories of their state based on what they learn in their elementary or middle grades state history courses. With this in mind, there is a need for more analysis (especially about currently used or adopted textbooks) concerning state history textbooks and the strengths and weaknesses they may contain.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study was designed to analyze the portrayals of 20th and 21st century presidents in the most recently published and/or adopted middle level state history textbooks used in 14 states. For this study, I employed an applied mixed-method methodology, with an emphasis on comparative content analysis. I believed that this design was the most appropriate for examining my research questions, and also to respond to the calls made by Cronin (1974) and Wade (1993) proposing the use of more quantitative and/or mixed methods to promote additional validity in the process of textbook analysis.

This chapter presents the research design of this study and the methods I used to collect and analyze the data. It begins with a description of my research design, and continues with information about my research procedures, data collection, and data analysis. The chapter concludes with an explanation of my own research stances concerning the topic of the study.

Research Design

I used an applied mixed method design for this study, the purpose of which was to provide an understanding of the portrayals of 20th and 21st century U.S. presidents found in recently published (2001 to present) and/or presently adopted state history textbooks in accordance to Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory. Patton (2002) describes a mixed methods study as one that “could include several measurement approaches, varying design approaches, and varying different analytical approaches to achieve triangulation” (p. 249). Therefore, I used both the qualitative and quantitative forms of the content analysis approach to
evaluate my two research questions and five sub-questions in order to ensure triangulation of the data (Esterberg, 2002; Patton, 2002).

This study used both the quantitative and qualitative forms of content analysis to evaluate the research questions. Ezzy (2002) declares content analysis to be the “most deductive of all forms of data analysis” and it should be used when “a preexisting theory is tested against empirical data” (pp. 82-83). Since the principal purpose of this study was to test Cronin’s (1974) preexisting textbook presidential theory against the presidential mentions found in state history textbooks, along with preexisting patterns which I discovered in a pilot study, I believed that using a content analysis of state history textbooks was the best approach in examining my research questions.

Furthermore, the findings of Alridge’s (2006) and Wasburn’s (1997) studies led to my suspicion that state history textbooks could be “written from a particular perspective, that storyline and language can be used to gather information about that perspective, and that these perspectives, taken as a whole, can be used to gain knowledge about dominant ideologies and groups as well as societal change” (Wasburn, 1997, p. 472). Therefore, I also applied a critical content analysis of state history textbooks, in tandem with a mixed method content analysis to this study. However, while I examined a theory that is critical of the ways presidents are portrayed in textbooks, it was appropriate to attempt to limit the possibility of my own biases filtering into the analysis. Therefore I incorporated two of the following approaches in hopes of bringing greater reliability to the study.

First, I only compared mentions concerning presidents which contained words and phrases that most resembled the wording of Cronin’s (1974) constructs, or those that appeared to mirror the elements of the presidential patterns. Esterberg (2002) deems this approach as
examining data for “manifest content,” where the meaning of the text is relatively straightforward and simple to determine. All presidential mentions were compared to all three constructs, and then compared to the presidential patterns. If the mention did not correlate with either one or more of the constructs, one or more of the presidential patterns, or any combination, it was counted as a presidential mention but categorized, using Alsfeld (1995) terminology, as an “indeterminate” mention (p. 677).

Second, based on the recommendations of Frankel (1987) and Wade (1993) concerning ways in which to improve the reliability of textbook analysis, I used additional readers to examine samples of the data. All of the readers had either taught or were currently teaching Georgia Studies. I gave each reader an inter-rater reliability form which consisted of 10 presidential mentions taken from a sample of two textbooks which I deemed as meeting none, one, two, or all three of Cronin’s (1974) constructs. Each reviewer was asked to read a description of Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory, and was provided with a listing of the first three constructs. The reviewer then read each of the mentions and determined if they felt that the examples correlated to any constructs, and, if so, which one(s). After I explained to them how I coded the data, I asked them to circle the constructs that they determined as being the most applicable to the mentions. In all, the readers’ answers show a correlation of 83.3% to my own conclusions.

In order to examine the first research question, which was determining to what extent the first three constructs of Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory were evident in state history textbooks, I employed both a qualitative and quantitative content analysis. I analyzed the data sources (see Appendix B) and then determined the number of mentions based on a frequency count. The number of mentions was based on a sentence by sentence count that either referenced
the president by name or the pronoun “him.” In the case of compound sentences, each presidential reference was identified as a separate mention. Next, I analyzed each state history textbook mention and determined if it correlated to at least one of Cronin’s (1974) first three constructs of the “textbook ideals for the presidency” (p. 60). The three constructs are as follows:

1. That the President is the strategic catalyst in the American political system and the central figure in the international system as well.
2. That only the President is or can be the genuine architect of United States public policy and only he, by attacking problems frontally and aggressively, and interpreting his power expansively, can be the engine of change to move the nation forward.
3. That the President must be the nation’s personal and moral leader; by symbolizing the past and future greatness of America and radiating inspirational confidence, a president can pull the nation together while directing us toward the fulfillment of the American dream. (p. 60)

Cronin (1974) explains that while his constructs may be “susceptible to oversimplification,” the similarities he found in the descriptions of the president in political science textbooks “outweigh” the nuances of disagreement. Though recognizing that “some textbooks are surely more sophisticated than others” and some may “stress certain presidential positions over others,” Cronin (1974) goes on to claim that in his view, all of the textbooks he examined are much more in “consensus” regarding these constructs than in “contention” (p. 60). Cronin (1974) defends his argument by saying that all of these constructs taken together with their “admixture of values, legend, and reality” do, in fact, sum up the textbook presidency, and they provide the most reliable way of simplifying these ideals (p. 60).
As outlined in Chapter 1, I believe that comparing Cronin’s (1974) constructs is an important addition to the literature of both presidential studies, and, more importantly, state history textbook analysis. However, based on reading the studies discussed previously, I determined that there may be significant weaknesses in using Cronin’s (1974) constructs as the lens for a content analysis of state history textbooks. Due to this, I altered four elements of Cronin’s (1974) theory, in order to use it as the comparison for my examination.

First, I only compared presidential mentions found in state history textbooks to Cronin’s (1974) first three constructs. Echoing Hoekstra (1982), as well as Cronin (1974) himself, while it is apparent that the constructs taken as a whole can be considered vague in describing the textbook portrayal of presidential roles, I believed that Cronin’s (1974) final construct of the textbook presidency, which claims textbooks depict “that the right man is placed in the White House—all will be well, and somehow, whoever is in the White House is the right man” (p.60), appeared to be the most ambiguous construct. I felt that its vagaries could have possibly proved to be the most difficult to accurately correlate textbook mentions, due to the fact that it may allow for too much subjectivity in my determinations, perhaps based on my personal beliefs about a particular president. Therefore, in order to minimize the possible chance for unintentional researcher bias, I removed the construct from this study.

Second, in the state history course in which I am most familiar, Georgia Studies, presidents are listed in the standards or written about in the textbooks based on their accomplishments as individual historical figures. The study of individual presidents in this course is not intended for teachers to use as a means to study of the office of the presidency itself. Therefore, in a similar manner to Sanchez’s (1996) study, I analyzed individual presidents, not the portrayals of the office. Similarly to Sanchez’s (1996) findings, I hoped that studying
Cronin’s (1974) constructs in this manner would offer more concrete and less ambiguous findings concerning the portrayals of presidents in state history textbooks.

Third, though studying the office of the president, Cronin (1974) offers examples of the individual presidents who are archetypical of the constructs. However, he does not explain if the textbook description of an individual president must meet all of these constructs in order to be considered an example of the textbook presidency, or if the depiction of an individual president needs to meet only one of these. Therefore, in this study, if one of the descriptions found in the textbooks met at least one of Cronin’s (1974) constructs, I concluded that the state history textbook was displaying evidence that corresponded to Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory.

Finally, one of the criticisms of Cronin’s (1974) constructs that Hoekstra (1982) offers is that the “‘ideal’-type [constructs] seemed to include a mix of the credible and the distorted” (p. 160). In this study, both credible mentions (e.g., Wilson asked Congress to declare war on Germany) and distorted mentions (e.g., McKinley declared war on Spain) were compared to Cronin’s (1974) constructs. However, a discussion concerning the differences and implications of both types of references is presented in the concluding chapter.

A quantitative and inductive form of content analysis based on Esterberg’s (2002) and Patton’s (2002) explanations was used to examine my second question, which was to determine if the four presidential patterns (i.e., McKinley pattern, Carter pattern, Eisenhower pattern, and Roosevelt pattern), which were discovered in my pilot study, were applicable to all of the state history textbooks I examined. The McKinley, Carter, and Eisenhower patterns were determined as being evident in the textbooks based on the frequency of presidential mentions. For the McKinley pattern, if presidents were mentioned because they made a contribution or had a
positive connection to the state, the references were categorized as meeting the pattern. If the president or presidents received the most mentions in a state textbook, simply because they were from or lived in the state for a time, the Carter pattern was determined as evident in the textbooks. Finally, the Eisenhower pattern was determined if the textbook made one or more references to the sitting president at the time of the study, George W. Bush.

Determining the Roosevelt pattern, the theory that often, popular presidents are not mentioned in state history textbooks, was slightly more complex. First, an average ranking of the 20th and 21st century presidents was determined based on three recent presidential ranking polls conducted by the Siena Research Institute (2002) (see Appendix C), the Wall Street Journal (2005) (see Appendix D), and C-Span (2009) (see Appendix E) which all rank the U.S. presidents from “best” to “worst.” The Siena Research Institute’s (SRI) survey began in 1982 and has been conducted during the first terms of each U.S. president since that date (SRI, 2002). The survey ranks all presidents based on the responses of over 200 history and political science professors from several American colleges and universities (SRI, 2002). The respondents scored the presidents on a scale of one to five, with one being the lowest and five being the highest ranking, for 20 categories concerning presidential responsibilities and duties such as “Domestic Accomplishments,” “Integrity,” “Foreign Policy Accomplishments,” and “Leadership Ability” (SRI, 2002). The results of prior surveys have been reported by political science journals, newspapers, and national news networks (SRI, 2002).

The Wall Street Journal survey was conducted in 2005. In this study, 85 “respected” professors of history, law, political science, and economics ranked 40 of the 42 men who held the presidency, with William Henry Harrison and James Garfield being excluded based on their short time in office (Wall Street Journal, 2005). According to the Wall Street Journal (2005), the
presidents were rated on a five point scale, with one being the lowest ranking and five being the highest ranking, and they were then ranked by mean score. There were adjustments made to give equal weight to Democratic and Republican leaning respondents (Wall Street Journal, 2005).

The C-SPAN study was released on President’s Day, 2009. C-SPAN has released only one other presidential survey, which was in 2000. According to C-SPAN (2009), the rankings are based on a survey given to 65 historians and professional observers of the presidency. Each participant gave the president a score of “1” (not effective) through “10” (very effective) based on 10 leadership attributes including “relations with Congress,” “public persuasion,” “economic leadership,” and “moral authority” (C-SPAN, 2009).

For this study, the five 20th century presidents whose average ranking in polls were in the top 10 of all U.S. presidents were searched for in the state history texts. The presidents that were examined included Theodore Roosevelt, who ranked 4th; Woodrow Wilson, who ranked 9th; Franklin Roosevelt, who ranked 2nd; Harry Truman, who ranked 6th; and Dwight Eisenhower, who tied Wilson, with a ranking of 9th (see Appendix F). If at least one of these presidents were not mentioned a state history textbook, then the textbook was judged as displaying evidence of the Roosevelt pattern.

Textbook Selection

The textbooks I selected for this study were determined based on “criterion sampling” (Patton, 2002). I identified the textbooks used in this study based on the following criteria: (1) the state produced at least one 20th or 21st century president (i.e., Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, Ohio, Texas, Virginia, and Vermont) (The Whitehouse, 2009); (2) the textbooks were on either the state adoption lists, or, in the case of non-adoption states, were used by specific school districts
in the selected states; (3) the textbooks were published during or after the year 2001 to include 21st century president, George W. Bush; (4) the state required a state history course in either the upper elementary or middle grades (grades 4th-8th).

The selection of these criteria was based on factors which were found in the reviewed literature. First, though Cronin’s (1974) theory concerns the office of the president and not the men who held the office, he uses several presidential examples to discuss his theory. All of the presidents he describes are from the 20th century. Second, Sanchez (1996) points out that of all presidents, 20th century presidents received the most mentions in college political science textbooks, and, of these presidents, “post war presidents” received mostly negative portrayals in these texts. Third, my previous findings of the four presidential patterns were based on Cronin’s (1974) examples of the mentions of 20th century presidents, and the mentions of these presidents were analyzed in my pilot study. Due to the fact that I analyzed the portrayal of all 20th century presidents in state history textbooks for my pilot study, I decided that I should examine how they were portrayed in relation to Cronin’s (1974) theory in both their home states and the other states examined. Fourth, my pilot study demonstrated that the overall number of presidential mentions in state history textbooks can be relatively small; therefore, a large number of data sources were used to assist with the general reliability of the findings.

Finally, the collection of books provided me with a large number of data sources in order to examine the differences between Cronin’s (1974) theory and state history textbooks based on region, individual state, the use of adoption boards, grade level, and size of publishers. These categories were determined based on the reviewed literature concerning textbook bias. The reviewed literature discusses all of these categories as some of the reasons behind poorly written
textbooks. With this in mind, I believed that all these criteria would offer me the most precise data sources in the examination of my research questions.

I used several approaches in order to determine which state history textbooks were being used in the selected states’ schools. Determining Georgia’s state history textbooks was quite simple; as an eighth grade Georgia Studies teacher, I was familiar with all of the textbooks that have been adopted by the state. The next approach I took in determining state history textbooks used in the selected states was to visit the websites of the two state history textbook publishers I was familiar with: Clairmont Press (2008) and Gibbs Smith (2008). I knew of these companies because I worked with the Clairmont Press as a content reviewer for their Georgia history text and spoke to the textbook representatives from Gibbs Smith at several NCSS conferences.

Once I determined the states for which Clairmont and Gibbs Smith publishes history textbooks, I assumed that there were other publishers competing with them in these markets. I visited each state’s board of education website to determine if they had a state adoption committee. If they did, I searched each state’s website to locate an adopted textbook list. If they did not, I accessed each of their Department of Education websites and search for contact information regarding their social studies coordinators, directors, or consultants. Once I found out the names of these individuals or organizations, I emailed them and asked which textbooks were being used in their schools or examined publishers’ websites for this information. These individuals and organizations were: Berger, 2009; California Department of Education, 2008; Connecticut Department of Education, 2008; Daniell, 2009; Feher, 2009; Glencoe, 2009; Gregg, 2008; Guyette, 2009; Hundleman, 2008; Illinois State Board of Education, 2008; Iowa Department of Education, 2008; Iowa Department of Education, 2009; Iowa History Online, 2008; Keh, 2008; Lerner Publishing, 2009a; Lerner Publishing, 2009b; Learner Publishing,
I used a mixed method of quantitative and qualitative content analysis to analyze the data for my pilot study (Esterberg, 2002; Patton, 2002), and used a similar method for this one. I began my pilot study by determining ways to locate all presidential mentions in the state history textbooks I used as data sources. I decided to first examine the index of all of the textbooks I studied. However, in six of the textbooks, I discovered that some presidents, especially Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, were not listed in the index, but were mentioned in the text. Therefore, for this study, in addition to using the index, I analyzed the chapters in the text that were written about the different eras of the 20th century (e.g., the Progressive era, the Great Depression, World War II, the Cold War) to ensure that I was able to document all of the presidents mentioned in the examined textbooks.

Once I found all of the pages where the presidents were mentioned, I used a Microsoft Excel® spreadsheet to list all of the different presidents, the number of mentions, and the construct(s) which they correlated to, if any. To determine the number of mentions, I counted...
each sentence where the president was mentioned by either his name or the pronoun “him.” To illustrate, in my pilot study when I examined the textbook *This is Your Georgia*, by McCullar (1972), Franklin Roosevelt was listed in the index as being mentioned on 21 pages. When examining one of these pages and counting his mentions, his total number of mentions on that page was eight (McCullar, 1972). An example of one of the paragraphs on the page read:

> Franklin Delano Roosevelt would come president in 1933, lead the country through World War II, and be elected four times. He had polio and couldn’t walk a step. He had come to Georgia to bathe in the healing waters of Warm Springs. Later, when he was President, he built the “Little White House” at Warm Springs. (McCullar, 1972, p. 574)

In this example, the number of mentions was counted as four. The first sentence was counted as containing one mention because the Roosevelt’s name was referenced only once. The second and third sentences also contained one mention because the authors used the pronoun “he” to reference Roosevelt. Finally, though the pronoun “he” was used in the fourth sentence twice, this sentence was deemed as containing only one mention about Roosevelt as well, due to the fact that the sentence was discussing the same event. If this had this been a compound sentence, discussing two separate events, I would have determined that it contained two mentions and the total number of mentions found in the paragraph would have been totaled as five.

All “generic” (i.e., unattributed) references/mentions of presidents were used to answer the first research question. I referenced each mention by page number, typed it on the spreadsheet, and then compared all of the mentions to Cronin’s (1974) first three constructs of the textbook presidency. The total number of comments about presidents which either displayed or did not display a correlation to the three constructs of the textbook presidential theory were tallied. Then an average was taken and reported for each textbook, each state, each region, grade
level, textbook adoption, size of the publisher, and finally, all of the textbooks studied as a whole.

In order to determine if a correlation existed between the textbook description of the president and the first construct, I compared the mentions to Cronin’s (1974) assertion that in textbooks the “president is the strategic catalyst in the American political system and the central figure in the international system as well” (p. 60). However, because I was using specific mentions about the president and not an overall generalization about the textbook’s portrayal of presidents as a whole, a presidential mention that portrayed him to be a domestic “strategic catalyst,” and international “strategic catalyst,” or both, was determined as correlating to the first construct.

Cronin’s (1974) second construct states that only the president “is or can be the genuine architect of United States public policy” (p. 60). I determined there was a correlation to this construct by evaluating the presidential mention and assessing if it discussed the president for acting in this manner. In addition, the comment needed to describe the president as “attacking problems frontally and aggressively,” and expanding his power in order to “move the nation forward” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60). To offer an example, in my pilot study, Franklin Roosevelt appeared to be the model of this construct due to receiving a large number of mentions for his “creation” of the New Deal programs and leadership during the Great Depression (e.g., DeVorsey, Rice, Williams, & London, 1987; Hepburn, 1982; Jackson, Stakes, Hepburn, & Hepburn, 1991; McCullar, 1972, Saye, 1957)

In order to determine a correlation between a presidential mention and Cronin’s (1974) third construct of the textbook presidency, I searched for evidence of the textbooks discussing presidents as “moral leaders,” and directing the nation “toward the fulfillment of the American
Dream” (p. 60). In my pilot study, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson received several of these types of mentions due to their involvement in the Civil Rights movement. In addition the textbooks used excerpts of presidential speeches and many correlated to this construct as well (e.g., DeVorsey et al., 1987; Hepburn, 1982; Jackson et al., 1991).

I then determined the percentage of presidential mentions based on the textbooks examined as a whole that concurred with Cronin’s (1974) first three constructs. In addition, I found the percentages based on the categories of region, state, adoption state or non-adoptions, grade level, and size of publishers. I then identified the presidents who did or did not meet Cronin’s (1974) constructs in state history textbooks based on the frequency and correlation to their mentions.

The four presidential patterns that were used for comparison purposes in this study were determined based on the results of the content analysis from the pilot study. The patterns emerged from the themes found in data concerning presidents in Georgia state history textbooks. This method proved to be quite useful for the pilot study, and was replicated for this one in order to answer the second research question.

To determine the William McKinley pattern in state history textbooks, the theory that if the president had a connection to the state he will receive a large number of mentions, I searched for mentions about our presidents based on their positive contribution or connection to the state. Examples of these contributions or connections included references about the president visiting, the president allocating funds or services, or the president appointing citizens of that state to high ranking national or international positions. To determine the Jimmy Carter pattern, the theory that those presidents who were born or who lived in the state for a time will receive a larger number of mentions than other presidents, I examined the frequency of mentions about these
presidents in the texts. For this pattern to have been evident, a president needed to have a larger number of mentions than the other presidents discussed. To analyze the third pattern, called the Dwight Eisenhower pattern, the theory that textbooks often make references to the sitting president, the mentions of the sitting president (at the time of publication), George W. Bush, were identified. If he was mentioned in the textbooks, then the pattern was considered to be evident. To determine if there was evidence of the final pattern, called the Theodore Roosevelt pattern, when a highly regarded president is left out the textbook, a frequency count of the president’s mentions was taken. If one of the five 20th century presidents whose average rank in the Siena Poll (2002), the Wall Street Journal Poll (2005), and the C-Span Poll (2009) was in the top 10 (i.e., Franklin Roosevelt, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Harry Truman, and Dwight Eisenhower), and they were not listed in the textbook, I considered this as meeting the requirement for the pattern.

**Researcher’s Stance**

Based on my own experience as both a Georgia studies teacher for six years, and a Georgia history curriculum writer for two, I have much subjectivity concerning the subject of *Georgia Studies* and the overall importance of state history courses in general. I believe that state history can be a useful course to the students who take it. I feel that it is important for students to understand the unique history of the state in which they live. I concur with many experts in the field of social studies education who argue that state and local history can be useful in creating student interest in the overall topic of history due to a connection to the area in which they live (e.g., Butchart, 1986; Dewey, 1902; Dewey, 1933; Dewey, 1938; Levstik & Barton, 2001; Levstik & Barton, 2005; Moore, 1969; Isern, 1990; McCall & Ristow, 2003; Menton, 1993; Terry, 1983; Thorndike, 1912).
However, there are three problems concerning state history which I have experienced over my career. First, as Moore (1969) and other critics of state history point out; one of the major issues about state history courses is that the textbooks used in them contain a significant lack of critical interpretations about the state’s history. I have found evidence of this in many of the depictions of historical figures from the state of Georgia, an example of which I have noted is the overly glorified textbook portrayal of Jimmy Carter’s presidency. While the presidential scholars in the Siena (2002), Wall Street Journal (2005), and C-SPAN (2009) polls assign Carter’s presidency an average ranking of 28th, which is considered to be below average, this judgment is certainly not evident in Georgia’s state history textbooks. In fact, the flaws I found about the depiction of Jimmy Carter led to the formation of this study.

Second, I have learned during my teaching experience that we live in a transient society. I have had several students in my teaching career come to my class from another state with no knowledge of Georgia history, stay at the school for a short amount of time, and then leave for another state. Most of these students had no connection to the state’s history and appeared to be uninterested with the lessons about the local heroes, writers, and politicians, which are the focus of state history standards and caused me to question how beneficial the subject was to them and their historic understanding.

Finally, due to the specific nature of state history, I often feel limited in my ability to assist my students in the process of discovering their place in the collective memory of our nation’s past. As mentioned previously, there are many major historic figures and events which are often left out of state history curriculum in order to make room for local figures. For example, in the Georgia Performance Standards for the state’s Georgia Studies course, there are several historical figures and relatively minor events that students are required to learn about.
from Georgia’s role in the American Revolution, including Austin Dabney, Elijah Clarke, Button Gwinnett, Nancy Hart, Lyman Hall, George Walton, and the Battle of Kettle Creek (Georgia Department of Education, 2007). In my opinion, focusing on these people and events leaves Georgia’s students with a disjointed and incomplete understanding about what I perceive to be the more important national figures and events of the Revolutionary War, as well as the historical impact the American Revolution has on them today.

Subjectivities could also exist in the content analysis of the textbook depictions of U.S. presidents. It could be easy for a researcher’s own political biases to interfere with his or her findings. In determining a correlation to Cronin’s (1974) theory about an individual president, a member of a particular political party could either strongly agree or disagree with how the president is portrayed in a state textbook, especially if the researcher lived during the years of the president’s administration and came into the study with strong feelings about the president.

In my case, I am not a member of either major U.S. political party. In fact, I have not voted for a major party presidential candidate since I reached voting age. While I feel that this provides the study with an outsider’s, and likely more neutral, perspective about the depictions of the U.S. presidents, there is also a possibility that with my political views I may have entered the study with a negative perception of most of the presidents due to their affiliation with major parties, or, in the case of Theodore Roosevelt, admiration for his presidential run as a third party candidate.

During this study I did my best to be cognizant that my perspectives as both a state history teacher and a member of a third party may impact my interpretation of the data. Therefore, in addition to using inter-rater reliability, I found it to be essential that I recognized
the assumptions and biases that I brought to the study as I conducted my research. I made sure that I identified the steps that I took in order to limit any possible bias in my findings.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

In this chapter I present findings and interpretations concerning the portrayals of 20th and 21st century presidents found in the most recently published and/or adopted middle level (grades 4th through 8th) state history textbooks used in 14 states. In the first section, I provide information about the data sources I examined for this study. I also discuss the findings concerning the applicability of Cronin’s (1974) constructs of the textbook presidency to the portrayals of presidents found in state history textbooks. In the second section, I present findings and discuss the applicability of the four presidential patterns I discovered in a pilot study to the state history textbooks that I examined for this study. In the third section, I provide a summary concerning the textbook portrayals of the 19 presidents I examined in this study.

Discussion of Data Sources

For this study, I analyzed a total of 42 state history textbooks from 14 states. The states with the fewest number of textbooks I examined were Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Nebraska with one each, while the states of Ohio and Illinois, with five textbooks, had the most examined. Regionally, textbooks from the northern states (i.e., CT, MA, NY, OH, and VT) and southern states (i.e., AR, GA, TX, and VA) had the largest number of textbooks examined with 13 each, followed by the midwestern states (i.e., IL, IA, MO, and NE) with 12. The western region, represented only by the state of California, had four textbooks that were used as data sources (see Appendix A).
I examined a total of 11 textbooks that were written for students in either the seventh or eighth grades and 30 that were written for fourth grade students. The Massachusetts history textbook I analyzed was written for third grade students. Though this grade level fell outside of my initial criteria, I decided to include it in the study due to the fact that two 20\(^{th}\) century presidents, John F. Kennedy and George H.W. Bush, were born in the state. Twenty-seven of the textbooks were published by large national textbook companies (i.e., Glencoe; Harcourt; Holt, Reinhart, and Wilson; Houghton; Macmillan; McDougal Littell; Pearson Prentice-Hall; Scholastic; and Scott Foresman) and 15 were produced by smaller and/or regionally based publishers (i.e., Clairmont, Carl Vinson, Gibbs Smith, Iowa State Press, University of Arkansas Press, University of Missouri Press, and WesMar). In addition, 17 textbooks were produced for states which held adoption committees (i.e., AR, CA, GA, TX, and VA) and 25 textbooks were published for states which did not use adoption committees (i.e., CT, IL, IA, MA, MO, NE, NY, OH, and VT).

Each state’s collection of textbooks varied on the number of 20\(^{th}\) and 21\(^{st}\) century presidents that were mentioned. The collection of state history textbooks with the most presidents mentioned were from the state of Georgia, which referenced all 19. Conversely, the textbooks from Massachusetts and Nebraska mentioned the fewest number of presidents, with one each (see Table 4.1). Finally, each state’s collection of textbooks differed on the total number of presidential mentions, with the collection of Texas history textbooks having the largest number of presidential references with 888, and the textbook from Nebraska containing the least with one (see Table 4.2).
Table 4.1

*Number of 20th and 21st Century Presidents Mentioned by State*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>20th/21st Century Presidents Mentioned</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Wilson, F. Roosevelt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Wilson, Hoover, F. Roosevelt, Reagan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Wilson, Hoover, F. Roosevelt, Carter, Clinton, G. Bush</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Wilson, F. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, G. Bush</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>McKinley, T. Roosevelt, Wilson, Hoover, F. Roosevelt, Clinton</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>McKinley, Taft, Wilson, Harding, F. Roosevelt, Kennedy, G. Bush</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Harding, Coolidge, F. Roosevelt, Truman, Johnson, Clinton</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>T. Roosevelt, Wilson, F. Roosevelt, Eisenhower</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note* Underline represents native president
Table 4.2

*Applicability to Cronin’s Constructs by State*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total Mentions</th>
<th>Construct 1 Percentages</th>
<th>Construct 2 Percentages</th>
<th>Construct 3 Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applicability of Cronin’s Three Constructs**

Cronin (1974) offers four constructs of the textbook presidency that can be used to summarize the ways in which textbooks portray the scope and power of the United States presidents. For this study, the first three were examined. The three constructs are as follows:

1. That the President is the strategic catalyst in the American political system and the central figure in the international system as well.
2. That only the President is or can be the genuine architect of United States Public Policy and only he, by attacking problems frontally and aggressively, and interpreting his power expansively, can be the engine of change to move the nation forward.

3. That the President must be the nation’s personal and moral leader; by symbolizing the past and future greatness of America and radiating inspirational confidence, a President can pull the nation together while directing us toward the fulfillment of the American Dream. (p. 60)

For this study, I analyzed each of the 2,801 presidential mentions found in the 42 state history textbooks and compared them to the first three constructs. All presidential references that displayed a correlation to a construct or constructs were labeled and averaged by the number of total mentions. In addition to analyzing the data based on the collection of all 42 textbooks as a whole, I categorized the data based on region, state, grade level, if the state used a textbook adoption process or not, and the size of the textbook publisher. The reviewed literature discusses all of these categories as reasons behind poorly written textbooks (e.g., Apple, 2001; Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; Cronin, 1974; FitzGerald, 1979; Loewen, 1995). Overall, I discovered that the percentages of presidential mentions that correlated to Cronin’s (1974) constructs were relatively small in comparison to the total number of mentions found in state history textbooks.

It should be noted, however, that the most of presidential mentions found in state history textbooks were often based on the president’s connection to the state (i.e., McKinley and Carter patterns), or their accomplishments prior to or following their presidency. For example, in the Georgia history textbook, published by the Carl Vinson Institute, Jimmy Carter received many pre- and post-presidency references in the text. Some of these concerned his military service, his accomplishments as governor, and his presidential campaign. Additionally, after the details of
Carter’s presidency were chronicled, there were several more references about his humanitarian efforts, as well as being awarded the Nobel Peace prize (Jackson, Stakes, Hepburn, & Hepburn, 2004). Many of the presidential mentions in the examined textbooks of all states were comparable to this example.

Overall, I found the construct that had the largest number of corresponding mentions in the state history textbooks was the first construct, which argues in textbooks, the President is the “strategic catalyst” in both domestic and international affairs (Cronin, 1974, p. 60). For this construct, 19% (522) of 2,801 presidential mentions corresponded to this category. One example of a mention that correlated to this construct was found in the Arkansas text published by the University of Arkansas Press. In describing the presidencies of both Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, and their role as catalyst of the American political system, the authors write that Roosevelt and Wilson, “both showed how government action could improve the lives of people” (Hopper, Baker, & Browning, 2008, p. 282). Another example was from the California history textbook, published by Harcourt. In discussing both the domestic and international acts of President Ronald Reagan, the authors write: “As President, Reagan worked to make the federal government smaller and to keep the United States strong against the enemies of democracy” (Porter et al., 2007, p. 477).

Cronin’s (1974) second construct states that in textbooks the president “is or can be the genuine architect of United States Public Policy” (p. 60). The second largest number of presidential references correlated to this construct, with 16% (441) of the 2,801 total mentions. One example of a reference that correlated to this construct was found in the Connecticut text, published by Gibbs Smith. In describing Franklin Roosevelt’s domestic role during the Great Depression, the author writes “President Franklin Roosevelt had a plan. He called his plan the
New Deal. He started projects in order to create jobs” (Ifkovic, 2002, p. 182). Another example was found in the Georgia text, published by the Clairmont Press. London (2005) describes Bill Clinton’s role in the 1995 government shutdown by describing Clinton’s domestic agenda during the struggle. She writes “…President Bill Clinton fought to save or increase government social programs” (London, 1995, p. 477).

Cronin’s (1974) third construct states that in textbooks the president “must be the nation’s moral leader” (p. 60). This third construct had the smallest percentage of mentions with only 12% (339). One example of a reference that correlated to this construct was found in the Missouri state history textbook, published by the University of Missouri Press. In describing Harry Truman’s presidency, the authors write, “He faced a very difficult task. He had to lead the country through the last month of the war. He also had to be a world leader. Truman did a fine job…many people consider him to be one of America’s greatest presidents” (McCandless & Foley, 2001, p. 309). Another example was from the Ohio textbook, published by Gibbs Smith. Stockwell’s (2004) description of President John Kennedy’s vision of landing a man on the moon corresponds well with Cronin’s (1974) third construct. Stockwell (2004) writes, “President John Kennedy challenged Americans to explore space. He even said that nation should land a man on the moon by 1970. Two Ohioans took up his challenge” (p. 188).

While these numbers were interesting in and of themselves, analyzing the data by region showed that textbooks from the southern states contained the largest percentage of presidential mentions that correlated to the first construct, while the western state had a largest percentage of presidential reference correlating to the second and third constructs. Analyzing the data by state showed that some states’ textbooks held many more presidential mentions that met the constructs than the textbooks found in others. In addition, in the textbooks of some states, the percentages
of mentions that correlated to the constructs were evenly distributed, while other states had a much larger percentage of their presidential references meet only one of these constructs.

Analyzing the data by comparing the states that used adoption committees and those that did not demonstrated that the states with adoption committees held a larger percentage of presidential mentions that correlated to Cronin’s (1974) constructs. Analyzing the data based on the grade level that the textbooks were written showed that textbooks intended for students in the middle grades held a larger percentage of mentions that correlated to Cronin’s (1974) first and second constructs, while the elementary school textbooks held a larger percentage of mentions which correlated to the third. Finally, textbooks produced by smaller/regional textbook publishers held a larger percentage of mentions that related to all three constructs, as compared to those books published by large companies (see Table 4.3). More details concerning the data analysis for each category are discussed below.

Table 4.3

Percentages and Total Number of Mentions Correlating to Cronin’s Constructs by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Overall (2,801)</th>
<th>North (325)</th>
<th>South (2,134)</th>
<th>Midwest (278)</th>
<th>West (62)</th>
<th>Adoption (2,198)</th>
<th>Non-Adoption (603)</th>
<th>Middle (2,080)</th>
<th>Elementary (721)</th>
<th>Large (1,551)</th>
<th>Small (1,250)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19% (522)</td>
<td>13% (42)</td>
<td>20% (424)</td>
<td>16% (46)</td>
<td>18% (11)</td>
<td>20% (435)</td>
<td>14% (87)</td>
<td>19% (393)</td>
<td>18% (118)</td>
<td>17% (262)</td>
<td>21% (260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16% (441)</td>
<td>12% (39)</td>
<td>17% (355)</td>
<td>13% (36)</td>
<td>18% (11)</td>
<td>17% (366)</td>
<td>12% (75)</td>
<td>16% (337)</td>
<td>14% (100)</td>
<td>13% (203)</td>
<td>19% (234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12% (339)</td>
<td>10% (34)</td>
<td>12% (260)</td>
<td>10% (27)</td>
<td>29% (18)</td>
<td>13% (278)</td>
<td>10% (61)</td>
<td>12% (244)</td>
<td>13% (93)</td>
<td>9% (137)</td>
<td>16% (200)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applicability to Cronin’s Constructs by Region

When analyzing each textbook, I found a large variance between the percentages of each construct based on the region in which they were used. In the collection of textbooks from the southern region of the United States (i.e., AR, GA, TX, and VA), 20% (424) of the 2,134 total presidential mentions corresponded to the first construct, or the “strategic catalyst” construct (Cronin, 1974, p. 60). Additionally, 17% (355) correlated to the second construct, which states that the president “is the genuine architect of United States Public Policy;” and 12% (260) to the third construct, which claims that the president “must be the nation’s moral leader” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60).

In comparison, the group of textbooks from the northern region (i.e., CT, MA, NY, OH, and VT) had smaller percentages of presidential mentions correlate to all of the constructs, with 13% (42) of the 325 total presidential mentions corresponding to the first, 12% (39) matching the second, and 10% (34) correlating with the third. The percentages of presidential mentions corresponding to the constructs found in the textbooks used in the midwestern region (i.e., IA, IL, MO, and NE) were as follows: 16% (45) of the 278 mentions corresponding to the first, 13% (36) to the second, and 10% (27) to the third. Finally, the western region had the largest percentages of its 62 presidential mentions corresponding to the third construct with 29% (18), while 18% (11) of the positive presidential mentions correlated to both the first and second constructs (see Figure 4.1).
Applicability to Constructs by State

The results I found when examining each construct based on individual states was that the collected works from the state of Virginia contained the largest percentage of presidential mentions corresponding to the first construct, the president “the strategic catalyst” construct (Cronin, 1974, p. 60), with 47% (21). In contrast, the textbook from Nebraska, with only one presidential mention, had the smallest percentage corresponding to the first construct with zero, followed by the Massachusetts textbook with 4% (2) of its 52 presidential mentions corresponding to the first construct.

The Connecticut textbook had the largest percentage of presidential mentions correlating to the second construct, or the “genuine architect” construct (Cronin, 1974, p. 60), with 45% (6) of its 13 total presidential references. This was followed closely by the Illinois textbooks with 33% (10) of its 27 presidential mentions correlating to the second construct. The lowest percentages of presidential mentions relating to the second construct were again held by
Nebraska with zero percent of its one presidential mention and Massachusetts with 4% (2) of its 52 mentions meeting this construct (see Table 4.2).

Finally, the Nebraska textbook had the largest percentage of presidential mentions relating to the third construct, or the “moral leader” construct (Cronin, 1974, p. 60), with 100% (1) followed by the Connecticut textbook with six (45%) of its 13 presidential mentions matching the construct. The state with the smallest percentage for this category was Vermont, with zero percent of its 44 presidential mentions meeting the requirements for this construct (see Table 4.2).

**Applicability to Constructs by Textbook Adoption**

When I analyzed the correlation of presidential mentions that related to Cronin’s (1974) constructs based on textbooks that were used in adoption states or non-adoption states, the books from the adoption states (i.e., AR, CA, GA, TX, and VA) had a larger percentage of their mentions correlate to all three of Cronin’s (1974) constructs than textbooks from non-adoption states (i.e., CT, IA, IL, MA, MO, NE, NY, OH, and VT). Twenty percent (435) of the 2,198 presidential mentions found in adoption state textbooks correlated to the first construct, that the president “is the strategic catalyst in the American political system and the central figure in the international system as well;” 17% (366) correlated to the second, which states that the president “is or can be the genuine architect of United States Public Policy and only he, by attacking problems frontally and aggressively, and interpreting his power expansively, can be the engine of change to move the nation forward;” and 13% (278) to the third, the president “must be the nation’s personal and moral leader; by symbolizing the past and future greatness of America and radiating inspirational confidence, a President can pull the nation together while directing us toward the fulfillment of the American Dream” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60). In comparison, 14% (87)
of the 603 presidential mentions found in the textbooks of non-adoption states correlated to the first construct, 12% (75) correlated to the second, and 10% (61) correlated to the third (see Figure 4.2).

Figure 4.2 Applicability to Cronin’s Constructs by Textbook Adoption

Applicability to Constructs by Grade Level

When I compared the textbooks written for the middle grades and elementary grades in regards to their correlation to Cronin’s (1974) constructs, with the exception of the third construct, the middle grade texts (i.e., AR, GA, IA, and TX) had a slightly higher percentage of presidential mentions that related to Cronin’s (1974) constructs than did the texts written for elementary grades (i.e., CA, CT, IL, IA, MO, NE, NY, OH, VA, and VT). The middle grades textbooks had 19% (393) of their 2,080 presidential mentions correlate to the first construct 16% (337) to the second, and 12% (244) to the third. In turn, the elementary grades textbooks showed
18% (118) of the 721 presidential mentions relating to the first construct, 14% (100) to the second, and 13% (93) to the third (see Figure 4.3).
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**Figure 4.3** Applicability to Cronin’s Constructs by Grade Level

**Applicability to Constructs by Size of Publisher**

Finally, I discovered that the correlation between presidential mentions and Cronin’s (1974) constructs in textbooks published by large textbook companies (i.e., Glencoe; Harcourt; Holt, Reinhart, and Wilson; Houghton, Macmillan, McDougal Littell; Pearson Prentice-Hall; Scholastic; and Scott Foresman) in comparison to smaller companies (i.e., Clairmont, Carl Vinson, Gibbs Smith, Iowa State Press, University of Arkansas Press, University of Missouri Press, and WesMar) was lower in relation to all of the constructs. The percentage of presidential mentions found in textbooks published by large companies that related to the first construct, which states that the president “is the strategic catalyst” in the domestic and international systems (Cronin, 1974, p.60) was 17% (262) of out of 1,551 compared to 21% (260) of the 1,250
total presidential mentions found in textbooks produced for small companies. There was a 6\% difference found in the percentages for the second construct, which says that the president “is or can be the genuine architect of United States Public” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60); with smaller companies having 19\% (234) of their mentions correlate to the construct, while larger companies had 13\% (203). Textbooks published by smaller companies had 16\% (200) of their mentions correlate to construct three, which declares that the president “must be the nation’s personal and moral leader” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60); while the percentages of presidential mentions found in textbooks produced by larger companies was 9\% (137) (see Figure 4.4).

Figure 4.4 Applicablity of Cronin’s Constructs by Publisher Size

Presidential Patterns

There were four presidential patterns that emerged during a pilot study in which I examined the portrayals of 20th and 21st century presidents found in Georgia history textbooks written from the years 1951-2005. These patterns were named after the president who most
exemplified the model found in the textbooks analyzed. In this study, I examined the presidential
talks found in the 14 states’ history textbooks and determined their applicability by
comparing them to each of the four patterns’ criteria. Overall, I found that the McKinley, Carter,
and Roosevelt patterns were evident in the majority of the 42 textbooks examined, while the
Eisenhower pattern was found in the fewest number of textbooks studied (see Table 4.4)
Table 4.4

*Presidential Patterns in the Examined Textbooks: Arkansas-Illinois*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>McKinley Pattern</th>
<th>Carter Pattern</th>
<th>Eisenhower Pattern</th>
<th>Roosevelt Pattern/Number of Identified Presidents Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Gibbs Smith</td>
<td>Berry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No/All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>University of Arkansas Press</td>
<td>Hopper et al.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No/All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Pearson, Scott-Foresman</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Macmillan</td>
<td>Banks et al.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes /2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Harcourt</td>
<td>Berson et al.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>Viola et al.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Gibbs Smith</td>
<td>Ifkvoic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Clairmont</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No/All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>WesMar</td>
<td>Hodge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>Kline &amp; Pascoe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Carl Vinson</td>
<td>Jackson et al.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Gibbs Smith</td>
<td>Taylor &amp; Myer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Lerner (Scholastic) Children’s Press</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Press (Scholastic)</td>
<td>Kummer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 (cont.)

*Presidential Patterns in the Examined Textbooks: Illinois-New York*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>McKinley Pattern</th>
<th>Carter Pattern</th>
<th>Eisenhower Pattern</th>
<th>Roosevelt Pattern/Number of Identified Presidents Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Children’s Press</td>
<td>Sommerville</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Scholastic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Children’s Press</td>
<td>Burgan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Scholastic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Iowa State Press</td>
<td>Schwider et al.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Children’s Press</td>
<td>Balcavage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Scholastic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Lerner</td>
<td>LaDoux</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Scholastic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Gibbs Smith</td>
<td>Stockwell &amp; Thomas</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>University of Missouri Press</td>
<td>McCandless &amp; Foley</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Gibbs Smith</td>
<td>Gall</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Clairmont</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Gibbs Smith</td>
<td>Lukesh</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Lerner</td>
<td>Gelman</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Children’s Press</td>
<td>Cotter</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Scholastic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 (cont.)

*Presidential Patterns in the Examined Textbooks: New York-Vermont*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>McKinley Pattern</th>
<th>Carter Pattern</th>
<th>Eisenhower Pattern</th>
<th>Roosevelt Pattern/Number of Identified Presidents Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Macmillan</td>
<td>Banks et al.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Macmillan</td>
<td>Banks et al.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Gibbs Smith</td>
<td>Stockwell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Children’s Press (Scholastic)</td>
<td>Kline</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Lerner (Scholastic)</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Children’s Press</td>
<td>Heinrichs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Glencoe</td>
<td>Anderson et al.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Holt, Rinehart, and Winston</td>
<td>Willoughby</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Pearson-Prentice Hall</td>
<td>Fehrenbach et al.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>McDougal Littell</td>
<td>Rocha et al.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Learner</td>
<td>Pelta</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Children’s Press (Scholastic)</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.4 (cont.)

*Presidential Patterns in the Examined Textbooks: Vermont-Virginia*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>McKinley Pattern</th>
<th>Carter Pattern</th>
<th>Eisenhower Pattern</th>
<th>Roosevelt Pattern/Number of “Top” Presidents Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Children’s Press (Scholastic)</td>
<td>Henrichs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Scott Foresmen</td>
<td>Boyd et al.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Harcourt</td>
<td>Berson &amp; DeLaney</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Gibbs Smith</td>
<td>Wray</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### The McKinley Pattern

To determine the William McKinley pattern in state history textbooks, or the theory that if the president had a connection to the state he will be referenced in the text, I searched for mentions about our presidents based on their positive contributions or connections to the state. Examples of these contributions or connections could include the president visiting the state, the president allocating funds or services to the state, or the president appointing citizens of the state to high ranking national or international positions. Overall, I found the McKinley pattern to be prevalent in several of the state history textbooks examined. Of the 42 textbooks analyzed, 28 (67%) had at least one presidential mention that correlated with the McKinley pattern (see Table 4.4). One example of this type of reference was found in the Iowa state history textbook published by Children’s Press, a subsidiary of Scholastic. In the text, President Bill Clinton was mentioned for declaring Iowa a “disaster area” due to a flood that devastated the area in 1993.
(Balcavage, 2002, p. 42). In addition, President George W. Bush was mentioned in the same textbook for eating breakfast in the state during the 2000 presidential campaign (Balcavage, 2002, p. 48).

The McKinley Pattern by Region

When I examined the McKinley pattern by analyzing the textbooks based on region, there were a larger percentage of textbooks from the southern and western states that displayed this pattern, much more than the textbooks used in the northern and midwestern region. The southern states had 11 out of the 13 (85%) textbooks examined display this pattern. The western textbooks displayed this pattern in three out of the four (75%) textbooks examined. In comparison, eight out of 13 (62%) of the northern textbooks and six out of 12 (50%) Midwestern textbooks displayed this pattern (see Figure 4.5).

![Figure 4.5 Percentages of Textbooks Displaying the McKinley Pattern by Region](image-url)
Furthermore, the average number of presidents discussed in the collection of textbooks published for states in each region which met the McKinley pattern was a little over six presidents per text for the South, a little over two presidents per texts for the West, one president per text for the Midwest, and less than one president per text for the North (see Figure 4.6).

![Figure 4.6 Average Number of Presidents Correlating to the McKinley Pattern by Region](image)

The McKinley Pattern by State

When I examined the McKinley pattern by state, some of the noteworthy findings were that the textbooks from the states of Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Iowa, Missouri, and Texas, all contained at least one mention about the presidents that displayed the pattern. Three states did not have textbooks which displayed the McKinley pattern. These states were Illinois, Massachusetts, and Nebraska. The states of California, Ohio, New York, Vermont, and Virginia used at least one textbook that displayed this pattern (see Figure 4.7).
The state textbooks that had the largest number of presidential mentions that correlated to the McKinley pattern were *An Arkansas History for Young People*, published by University of Arkansas Press, and *Texas and Texans*, published by Glencoe, which referenced 10 out of 19 (53%) presidents that meet this pattern. As mentioned previously, the textbooks used in three out of the 14 states did not show evidence of containing the McKinley pattern. Of the textbooks from states that did, seven discussed the pattern in relation to only one president. The textbooks from the states of Connecticut, New York, Iowa, and Virginia had one textbook meeting this pattern. Two textbooks from the state of Ohio and three textbooks from the state of Vermont also met this pattern (see Table 4.5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Adoption State</th>
<th>Number of Textbooks</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>President(s) Meeting Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>T. Roosevelt, Hoover, F. Roosevelt, Reagan, G. H. W. Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>F. Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Taft, Wilson, F. Roosevelt, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Carter, G. H. W. Bush, G. W. Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Two Elementary/One Middle</td>
<td>Wilson, F. Roosevelt, Carter, Clinton, G.W. Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>F. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, G.W. Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>T. Roosevelt, F. Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Wilson, F. Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5 (cont.)

*The McKinley Pattern by State: Texas-Virginia*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Adoption State</th>
<th>Number of Textbooks</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>President(s) Meeting Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>T. Roosevelt, Wilson, Hoover, F. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Reagan, G. H. W. Bush, Clinton, G. W. Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Harding, Truman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The McKinley Pattern by Textbook Adoption

When comparing the McKinley pattern between states that did or did not participate in the textbook adoption process, a much larger percentage of adoption states displayed evidence of the McKinley pattern in their textbooks than that of non-adoption states. I discovered that 14 of 17 (82%) textbooks used by the adoption states (i.e., AR, CA, GA, TX, and VA) displayed the McKinley pattern, while 14 of 25 (56%) textbooks used by the non-adoption states (i.e., CT, IL, IA, MA, MO, NE, NY, OH, and VT) displayed the pattern (see Figure 4.8).
In addition, textbooks from adoption states discussed many more presidents which correlated to this pattern than those textbooks for non-adoption states. The average number of 20\textsuperscript{th} and 21\textsuperscript{st} presidents discussed in the adoption states textbooks that meet the McKinley pattern was a little under six presidents per text, while the average number of presidents that meet the pattern in non-adoptive states was less than one per text (see Figure 4.9).
The McKinley Pattern by Grade Level

In examining the textbooks based on grade level, the middle school textbooks (i.e., AR, GA, IA, and TX) contained more presidential mentions relating to the McKinley pattern than textbooks written for elementary students (i.e., CA, CT, IA, IL, MA, MO, NE, NY, OH, VA, and VT). All 11 of the middle grades textbooks displayed mentions relating to the McKinley pattern, while 17 of the 31 (55%) elementary grades textbooks contained these mentions (see Figure 4.10).
Additionally, the average number of presidents discussed in the middle grades textbooks that met the pattern was almost eight per text, while the average number of presidents that met the pattern for elementary grades was a little over one per text (see Figure 4.11).
The McKinley Pattern by Size of Textbook Publisher

In examining the textbooks based on the size of the textbook publisher, the larger publishers’ textbooks (i.e., Glencoe; Harcourt; Holt, Reinhart, and Wilson; Houghton; Macmillan; McDougal Littell; Pearson Prentice-Hall; Scholastic; and Scott Foresman) contained a smaller number of presidential mentions relating to the McKinley pattern than the smaller publishers (i.e., Clairmont, Carl Vinson, Gibbs Smith, Iowa State Press, University of Arkansas Press, University of Missouri Press, and WesMar). Seventeen (63%) of the 27 textbooks produced by larger publishers displayed mentions relating to the McKinley pattern, while 11 (73%) of the 15 textbooks produced by smaller publishers contained these mentions (see Figure 4.12).

Furthermore, the average number of presidents discussed in the textbooks published by larger companies that met the pattern was a little more than two per text while the average number of
presidents that met the pattern for smaller companies was a little over three per text (see Figure 4.13).

![Figure 4.13 Average Number of Presidents Correlating to the McKinley Pattern by Publisher Size](image)

The Jimmy Carter Pattern

To determine the Jimmy Carter pattern, the theory that those presidents who were born or who lived in the state for a time will receive a large number of mentions in the state’s textbook(s), I examined the number of presidential references in the texts and compared this number to the amount of references made to presidents who were either born or lived in the state for a time. For this pattern to be evident, a president needed to have a larger number of mentions than the other presidents discussed (see Table 4.6)
### Table 4.6

*The Carter Pattern by State*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Native President(s)</th>
<th>Adoption State</th>
<th>Number of Textbooks Examined</th>
<th>Number of Textbooks Containing Mentions</th>
<th>Ranking by Mentions</th>
<th>Number of Mentions/Total Presidential Mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135/293 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Nixon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2/64 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>G.W. Bush</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0/13 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>233/885 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Reagan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14/27 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20/37 (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52/52 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. H. W. Bush</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0/52 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>185/213 (87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0/1 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>T. Roosevelt</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16/65 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Roosevelt</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42/65 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30/147 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taft</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35/147 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harding</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30/147 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75/888 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>267/888 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Coolidge</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33/44 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40/72 (56%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Carter pattern was found in 37 (88%) out of the 42 textbooks examined. However, three textbooks displayed the Carter pattern in reference to one president, but did not discuss all of the presidents from the state. With this in mind, even though a large majority of the textbooks contained this pattern, the result proved to be a bit surprising. Based on the data from my pilot study, I assumed that every state history textbook would mention their local tie to the presidency, but this proved not to be the case (see Table 4.6).

**The Carter Pattern by Region**

Regionally, the southern region had the largest number of textbooks that contained references that correlated to the Carter pattern, with all 13 textbooks displaying this pattern. The northern region contained the second largest number of textbooks displaying the Carter pattern, with 12 (92%) of 13. The midwestern region had nine (75%) of 12 displaying the Carter pattern and, finally, the western region had three (75%) of four textbooks containing mentions that correlated with this pattern (see Figure 4.14).

![Percentage of Textbooks Displaying The Carter Pattern by Region](image)

*Figure 4.14 Percentage of Textbooks Displaying The Carter Pattern by Region*
The Carter Pattern by State

When examining the Carter pattern by state, the textbooks in a large number of the states displayed the Carter pattern. However, this pattern was not evident in every state. At least one textbook from the states of California, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Nebraska, and Ohio, did not mention at least one of their native born presidents (i.e., Richard Nixon, George H.W. Bush, Ronald Reagan, George W. Bush, Gerald Ford, and William McKinley). In addition, the percentages of presidential mentions about presidents from the state in comparison to the overall number of 20th and 21st century presidential mentions varied state by state. The Massachusetts state history textbook had both the largest percentage of presidential mentions discussing a native born president, with 100% of its 52 presidential mentions referencing John F. Kennedy, along with the lowest percentage of mentions, with 0% referencing native George H.W. Bush. The state with the second largest percentage of mentions referencing a native born president was Missouri, with 87% (185) of its 213 presidential references discussing Harry Truman.

The states that mentioned their native born presidents, but had the lowest percentages of presidential references about them, were California, Texas, and Ohio. In the California texts, Nixon received only 3% (2) of 64 mentions about 20th and 21st century United States presidents. In the Texas textbooks, Eisenhower received 8% (75) of the 888 presidential mentions. Finally, in the collection of Ohio textbooks, both McKinley and Harding received only 20% (30) of the 147 presidential mentions (see Table 4.6).

The Carter Pattern by Textbook Adoption

When I analyzed the Carter pattern by examining the textbooks from states that used and did not use the textbook adoption process, there was a 10% difference in the number of textbooks used by adoption states as compared to the non-adoption states which displayed the
pattern. For the adoption states (i.e., AR, CA, GA, TX, and VA), 16 (94%) out of 17 textbooks displayed the Carter pattern. In comparison, 21 (84%) of 25 textbooks from the non-adoption states (i.e., CT, IL, IA, MA, MO, NE, NY, OH, and VT) displayed the Carter pattern (see Figure 4.15).

![Figure 4.15 Percentage of Textbooks Displaying The Carter Pattern by Textbook Adoption](image)

However, in comparison to all mentions of 20th and 21st century presidents found in the texts, native born presidents from adoption states received 34% (752/2,202) of the total amount of mentions, while presidents from non-adoption states accounted for 76% (457/599) of the total number of references (see Figure 4.16).
The Carter Pattern by Grade Level

In examining the Carter pattern by the textbooks based on grade level, I found the middle school textbooks contained a larger percentage of presidential mentions relating to the Carter pattern than elementary textbooks. All 11 middle grades textbooks (i.e. AR, GA, IA, TX) displayed mentions relating to the Carter pattern, while 26 (84%) of 31 elementary grades textbooks (i.e., CA, CT, IL, IA, MA, MO, NE, NY, OH, VA, and VT) contained these mentions (see Figure 4.17).
However, in comparison to all mentions of 20th and 21st century presidents found in the texts, in the middle grades textbooks, native born presidents received 35% (719/2,280) of the total number of mentions, while in elementary grades texts, native born presidents received 68% (490/721) of the total number of presidential references (see Figure 4.18).
The Carter Pattern by Size of Publisher

In examining the Carter Pattern by the textbooks based on the size of the textbook publisher, the textbooks produced by large publishers contained a larger percentage of presidential mentions relating to the Carter pattern than those produced by smaller textbook publishers. Twenty-five (93%) out of the 27 textbooks produced by large publishers (i.e., Glencoe; Harcourt; Hold, Rinehart, and Winston; Houghton; McDougal Littell; Macmillan; Pearson Prentice-Hall; Scholastic; and Scott Foresmen) displayed mentions relating to the Carter pattern, while 12 (80%) of 15 smaller publisher’s (i.e., Carl Vinson, Clairmont Press, Gibbs Smith, Iowa State Press, University of Arkansas Press, University of Missouri Press, and WesMar) textbooks contained these mentions (see Figure 4.19).
However, in comparison to all mentions of 20th and 21st century presidents found in the texts, native born presidents in textbooks produced by smaller publishers received 47% (540/1,137) of the total presidential mentions, while native born presidents in the textbooks produced by larger publishers referenced received 40% (669/1,664) of the total number of references (see Figure 4.20).
Figure 4.20 Percentage of References to Native Born Presidents by Publisher Size

The Eisenhower Pattern

To analyze the Dwight D. Eisenhower pattern, which is the theory that state history textbooks will often make reference to the sitting president, the mentions of the sitting president at the time of publication, George W. Bush, were identified. The Eisenhower pattern was the least identified pattern found in the 42 textbooks examined. Only 16 (38%) of the textbooks analyzed displayed this pattern (see Table 4.4). An example of the types of mentions concerning George W. Bush was found in the Arkansas textbooks published by Gibbs Smith. In discussing Bush’s response to the September 11th terrorist attacks, Berry (2007) writes, “President George W. Bush announced his ‘war on terror’” (p. 239). Another example was from the Georgia history text published by McDougal Littell. Once again, in discussing Bush’s response to September 11th, Kline and Pascoe (2005) write, “President George W. Bush had been in office only nine months when he declared a ‘war on terrorism’ because of the tragic events of September 11, 2001” (p. 518). Unlike the authors of the Arkansas textbook, Kline and Pascoe (2005) go on to
add, “Bush identified several countries as ‘sponsors of terrorism,’ including Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Libya, Cuba, North Korea, and the Sudan” (p. 518).

The Eisenhower Pattern by Region

When I examined the Eisenhower pattern based on region, the textbooks from the southern region had the largest correlation to the Eisenhower pattern, with 10 (77%) of 13 mentioning President George W. Bush. The textbooks from the northern states had the smallest correlation to the Eisenhower pattern, with only one (8%) of 13 textbooks showing evidence of the Eisenhower pattern. The midwestern textbooks had three (25%) of 12 displaying the Eisenhower pattern. Finally, the western region had two (50%) of four of their textbooks displaying the Eisenhower pattern (see Figure 4.21).

![Figure 4.21 Percentage of Textbooks Displaying the Eisenhower Pattern by Region](image-url)
The Eisenhower Pattern by State

When I studied the Eisenhower pattern by state, some noteworthy findings were that all the textbooks from Arkansas, Georgia, and Texas displayed the Eisenhower pattern. Conversely, all of the textbooks from Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, Vermont, and Virginia did not. The collection of textbooks from the states of Iowa, Missouri, and Ohio contained at least one textbook that displayed the pattern (see Figure 4.22).

![Figure 4.22 Number of Textbooks Displaying the Eisenhower Pattern by State]

The collection of state textbooks that had the largest number of mentions about sitting President George W. Bush were from Bush’s adopted state of Texas. The textbook, *Holt: Texas!*, contained the most references about President Bush, with 49. This can be explained based on the fact that Bush was a former governor of the state. Omitting the collection of Texas history textbooks, the text with the second largest number of mentions about President Bush was *Time Travel through Georgia*, published by WesMar. Interestingly, this Georgia history textbook
contained more mentions (18) about George Bush than the 17 references found in the Texas textbook, *Texas and Texans*, published by Glencoe (see Table 4.7).

Table 4.7

*The Eisenhower Pattern by State*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Adoption State</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Number of Textbooks</th>
<th>Number of Mentions about George W. Bush</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary/Middle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Eisenhower Pattern by Textbook Adoption

When I searched for the Eisenhower pattern in textbooks from states based on their participation in the textbook adoption process, I discovered that there was a much larger percentage of textbooks used in adoption states that mentioned sitting President George W. Bush than those used by non-adoption states. Twelve (71%) of 17 textbooks used by the adoption states (i.e., AR, CA, GA, TX, and VA) displayed the pattern. In comparison, only four (16%) of the 25 textbooks used by the non-adoption states (i.e., CT, IL, IA, MA, MO, NE, NY, OH, and VT) displayed the Eisenhower pattern (see Figure 4.23).

Figure 4.23 Percentage of Textbooks Displaying the Eisenhower Pattern by Textbook Adoption

In addition, the average number of mentions for sitting President George Bush in the textbooks used by adoption states was over 39 references per book, while the average number of mentions in non-adoption states was less than one (see Figure 4.24).
Figure 4.24 Average Number of Mentions about George W. Bush by Textbook Adoption

The Eisenhower Pattern by Grade Level

When I examined the textbooks for the Eisenhower pattern based on grade level, more mentions about sitting President George W. Bush were found in the collection of middle grades textbooks than in the collection of elementary school textbooks. Ten (91%) out of eleven middle grades textbooks mentioned President George W. Bush, while six (19%) out of 31 elementary school texts meet the Eisenhower pattern (see Figure 4.25).
Additionally, the average number of mentions concerning George W. Bush in the middle grades textbooks was almost 18 per text, while the average number of mentions concerning this pattern in elementary textbooks was less than one per text (see Figure 4.26).
The Eisenhower Pattern by Size of Textbook Publisher

When I examined the textbooks for the Eisenhower pattern based on the size of the textbook publisher, there was a larger percentage of textbooks produced by smaller companies that mentioned sitting President George W. Bush than those produced by larger publishers. Eight (53%) of the 15 textbooks produced by smaller companies (i.e., Carl Vinson, Clairmont Press, Gibbs-Smith, Iowa State Press, University of Arkansas Press, University of Missouri Press and WesMar) showed evidence of the Eisenhower pattern compared to the eight (30%) of the 27 textbooks produced by larger companies (i.e., Glencoe; Harcourt; Hold, Rinehart, and Winston; Houghton; McDougal Littell; Macmillan; Pearson Prentice-Hall; Scholastic; and Scott Foresmen) (see Figure 4.27).

Figure 4.27 Percentage of Textbooks Displaying the Eisenhower Pattern by Publisher Size
However, the average number of mentions about President George W. Bush in the textbooks produced by smaller companies was one per text, while the average number of mentions in the textbooks produced by larger companies was a little over four per text (see Figure 4.28).

![Figure 4.28 Average Number of Mentions about George W. Bush by Publisher Size](image)

**The Theodore Roosevelt Pattern**

To determine if there was evidence of the Theodore Roosevelt pattern, the theory that presidents whose administrations are highly regarded nationally are often left out of state history textbooks, I took a frequency count of each of the identified president’s mentions. If one of the five 20th century presidents whose average ranking in the Siena Poll (2002), Wall Street Journal Poll (2005), and C-Span poll (2009) was in the top 10 (i.e., Franklin Roosevelt, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Harry Truman, and Dwight Eisenhower), and they were not discussed in the textbook, I determined that this would meet the requirement for the pattern.
To a degree, elements of the Roosevelt pattern were found in a most of the textbooks examined. Seven (17%) textbooks displayed the pattern for all five of the identified presidents, seven (17%) textbooks displayed the pattern for four presidents, 14 (33%) of the textbooks displayed the pattern for three of the five identified presidents, five (12%) textbooks displayed the pattern for two presidents, and four (10%) textbooks displayed the pattern for one. Five (12%) textbooks mentioned all of the identified presidents, thus not meeting the guide lines established for the pattern (see Table 4.4).

The identified president that was mentioned in the most state history textbooks was Franklin Roosevelt, who was referenced in 33 (78%) out of the 42 examined textbooks. Woodrow Wilson ranked second and was mentioned in 21 (50%) of the textbooks. Theodore Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower were both mentioned in 13 (31%) of the textbooks, followed by Harry Truman who was mentioned in 12 (29%) of the texts (see Figure 4.29).

![Figure 4.29 Total Number of Textbooks Mentioning Identified Presidents](image-url)
However, when analyzing each of the identified presidents by the total number of mentions, there were some differences. Franklin Roosevelt, who was in the largest number of textbooks, also received the largest number of mentions, with 539 (19%) out of the total of 2,801. Though Truman was in the fewest number of textbooks, he received the second largest number of references, with 234 (8%) mentions, followed by Wilson, with 124 (4%) mentions, and Eisenhower with 104 (4%) mentions. Theodore Roosevelt, the pattern’s namesake, received only 56 (2%) of the total presidential mentions (see Figure 4.30).

![Figure 4.30 Percentage of Total Presidential Mentions for Identified Presidents](image)

**The Roosevelt Pattern by Region**

I found elements of the Roosevelt pattern in the textbooks of all regions. In the northern region (i.e., CT, MA, NY, OH, and VT), four textbooks did not mention any of the identified presidents (i.e., Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and Dwight Eisenhower), three textbooks mentioned one, five textbooks mentioned two, and one
textbook mentioned three. None of the northern textbooks mentioned all of the identified presidents.

In the southern region (i.e., AR, GA, TX, and VA), seven textbooks referenced all five of the identified presidents, four textbooks mentioned four, and three textbooks referenced three. There was not a single southern textbook that did not mention at least one of the identified presidents. In the midwestern region (i.e., IL, IA, MO, and NE), three textbooks did not mention any of the identified presidents, three textbooks referenced one, four textbooks mentioned two, and two textbooks referenced three. There were no midwestern textbooks that discussed all five of the identified presidents. One western textbook mentioned one of the identified presidents and three mentioned two. Finally, while no single western textbook discussed all of the identified presidents, they all referenced at least one (see Table 4.8).
Table 4.8

*The Roosevelt Pattern by State*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Adoption State</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Number of Textbooks</th>
<th>Identified Presidents Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T. Roosevelt, Wilson, F. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>T. Roosevelt, F. Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wilson, F. Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>T. Roosevelt, Wilson, F. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wilson, F. Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary/Middle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wilson, F. Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wilson, F. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>T. Roosevelt, Wilson, F. Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wilson, F. Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>T. Roosevelt, Wilson, F. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F. Roosevelt, Truman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wilson, F. Roosevelt, Eisenhower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On average, northern textbooks referenced the fewest number of identified presidents with only one per book. The southern textbooks referenced the most with an average of over 4. The western textbooks averaged two of the identified presidents per book, while the midwestern texts averaged fewer than two (see Figure 4.31).

![Figure 4.31 Average Number of Identified Presidents Meeting the Roosevelt Pattern by Region](image)

In addition, Franklin Roosevelt was referenced in the most textbooks for all regions. He was mentioned in all 13 of the southern textbooks, eight (62%) of the 13 northern textbooks, eight (67%) of the 12 midwestern textbooks and all four of the western textbooks. Woodrow Wilson was also mentioned in all 13 southern textbooks and was mentioned in four (31%) northern and four (33%) of the midwestern textbooks. Wilson was not referenced in any of the western texts. Dwight Eisenhower was mentioned in 11 (85%) out of the 13 southern textbooks and two (17%) of the 12 midwestern texts. He was not mentioned in the northern or western texts. Harry Truman was referenced in eight (62%) of the southern textbooks, three (25%) of the
midwestern, and one of the northern (8%). He was not referenced in any of the western texts. Finally, Theodore Roosevelt was mentioned in three western textbooks (75%) seven (54%) of the southern textbooks, three northern textbooks (23%) and none of the midwestern texts (see Figure 4.32).

![Figure 4.32 Percentage of Textbooks Mentioning the Identified Presidents by Region](image)

When I compared the amount of mentions for each of the identified presidents by total number of mentions per region, Eisenhower received his largest number of mentions in southern textbooks, with a total of 102 (5%) of the 2,138 presidential mentions. He received only two (1%) of the 278 mentions found in the Midwest, received zero of the 321 total presidential mentions in the North, and zero of the 64 total presidential mentions in textbooks in the West. Franklin Roosevelt received a total of 100 (31%) presidential mentions found in northern textbooks as well as 20 (31%) of the presidential mentions in western textbooks. He received 384 (18%) of the total southern presidential mentions, and 35 (13%) of the presidential mentions
found in midwestern textbooks. Theodore Roosevelt received a total of seven (11%) of the total number of mentions found in western textbooks, 16 (5%) of the total presidential mentions found in northern textbooks, 33 (2%) mentions in southern textbooks, and zero mentions in the midwestern textbooks. Truman received a total of 185 (67%) of the total presidential mentions found in midwestern textbooks, 47 (2%) of the total presidential mentions found in southern textbooks, two (1%) of the total presidential mentions found in northern textbooks, and zero of the total presidential mentions found in western textbooks. Finally, Wilson received 97 (5%) of the total number of presidential mentions in the southern textbooks, nine (3%) of the total mentions in northern textbooks, seven (3%) of the total presidential mentions in midwestern textbooks, and zero mentions in the western textbooks (see Figure 4.33).

Figure 4.33 Percentage of Mentions about the Identified Presidents by Region
The Roosevelt Pattern by State

The collection of textbooks that mentioned all of the 20th and 21st century presidents whose administrations ranked in the top 10 were from the states of Arkansas, Georgia, and Texas. There were four states that used textbooks which did not mention any of these presidents. These states were Illinois, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Vermont. Both Arkansas textbooks mentioned all five identified presidents, while two of the textbooks used in both Georgia and Texas referenced all five of the presidents. In comparison, the state of Illinois had three of its five textbooks not mention any of the five identified presidents, the textbook from the state of Massachusetts did not mention any of the five presidents, one textbook from the state of Ohio did not mention any of the five identified presidents, and the state of Vermont had two of its three textbooks not mention any of the five identified presidents (see Figure 4.34)

Figure 4.34 Average Number of Identified Presidents Mentioned in Textbooks by State
The Roosevelt Pattern by Textbook Adoption

I discovered that elements of the Roosevelt pattern were found in the textbooks of both adoption and non-adoption states. In the adoption states, no textbook failed to mention any of the identified presidents; however, one textbook mentioned only one, three textbooks mentioned two, three textbooks mentioned three, four textbooks mentioned four, and five textbooks mentioned all five. None of the non-adoption textbooks mentioned all five of the identified presidents. Six textbooks mentioned only one, 10 textbooks mentioned two, two textbooks mentioned three, and no textbooks mentioned four or all five of the identified presidents (see Table 4.8).

Franklin Roosevelt was referenced in the most textbooks for both adoption and non-adoption states. He was mentioned in all 17 of the textbooks used by adoption states, and 16 of the 25 (64%) textbooks used by non-adoption states. Woodrow Wilson was mentioned in 13 (76%) of the textbooks used by the adoption states and in eight (32%) of the non-adoption states’ textbooks. Dwight Eisenhower was mentioned in 11 (65%) of the textbooks used by the adoption states, and two (8%) of the non-adoption states’ texts. Theodore Roosevelt was mentioned in 10 (59%) the textbooks used by adoption states and three (12%) of those used by non-adoption states. Finally, Harry Truman was referenced in eight (47%) of the adoption states’ textbooks and four (16%) of the non-adoption states’ texts (see Figure 4.35).
When I compared the number of mentions for each of the identified presidents by total number of mentions textbooks used by adoption and non-adoption states, Eisenhower received his largest number of mentions in the adoption states’ textbooks with a total of 102 (5%) of the 2,198 total presidential mentions. He received only two (.03%) of the 603 mentions found in the non-adoption states. Franklin Roosevelt received a total 135 (22%) of the textbooks used by non-adoption states and 404 (18%) presidential mentions found in textbooks used by adoption states. Theodore Roosevelt also received a larger percentage of mentions in non-adoption states’ textbooks with 16 (3%) of the total number of mentions found in these books, compared to 40 (2%) of the total presidential mentions found in non-adoption states. Truman received a total of 187 (31%) of the total presidential mentions found in non-adoption states and 47 (2%) of the total presidential mentions found in textbooks used by adoption states. Finally, Wilson received 108 (5%) of the total number of presidential mentions in the adoption states and 16 (3%) of the total mentions in textbooks used by non-adoption states (see Figure 4.36).
The Roosevelt Pattern by Grade Level

When I examined the Roosevelt pattern based on the intended grade level for the textbooks studied, I found that all 11 of the middle school textbooks mentioned at least one of the five presidents identified as meeting the criteria for the Roosevelt pattern. In comparison, seven elementary grades textbooks did not mention any of these presidents. Furthermore, five of the middle grades textbooks mentioned all five of the identified presidents, four mentioned four of the identified presidents, one mentioned three of the identified presidents, and one mentioned two. In contrast, no elementary textbook mentioned all of the identified presidents. Seven mentioned only one of the identified presidents, 12 mentioned two, and five mentioned three of the identified presidents. None of the elementary level textbooks referenced four or all five of the identified presidents (see Table 4.8).

Franklin Roosevelt was referenced in the most textbooks for both middle and elementary grades students. He was mentioned in all 11 of the middle grades textbooks, and 22 of the 31
(71%) of the elementary grades textbooks. Woodrow Wilson was mentioned in 10 (91%) of the middle grades textbooks and in 11 (35%) of the elementary grades textbooks. Dwight Eisenhower was also mentioned in 10 (91%) of the middle grades textbooks and three (10%) of the elementary grades texts. Theodore Roosevelt was mentioned in seven (64%) of the middle school textbooks and six (19%) of those used in the elementary grades. Finally, Harry Truman was referenced in eight (73%) of the middle grades textbooks and four (13%) of the elementary grades texts (see Figure 4.37).

*Figure 4.37 Percent of Textbooks Referencing the Identified Presidents by Grade Level*

When comparing the amount of mentions for each of the identified presidents by grade level, Eisenhower received his largest number of mentions in middle grades textbooks with a total of 98 (5%) of the 2,080 total presidential mentions. He received only 6 (.08%) of the 721 mentions found in the elementary grades texts. Franklin Roosevelt received a total 169 (23%) of the presidential mentions in elementary textbooks and 371 (18%) presidential mentions found in
middle grades textbooks. Theodore Roosevelt also received a larger percentage of mentions in elementary grades textbooks, with 25 (3%) of the total number of mentions found in these books, compared to 31 (1%) of the total presidential mentions found in middle grades texts. Truman received a total of 187 (26%) of the total presidential mentions found in elementary grades texts and 47 (2%) of the total presidential mentions found in middle grades textbooks. Finally, Wilson received 64 (9%) of the total number of presidential mentions in elementary grades texts and 49 (2%) of the total mentions in textbooks used in the middle grades (see Figure 4.38).

*Figure 4.38 Percentage of Mentions about the Identified Presidents by Grade Level*

**Roosevelt Pattern by Size of Publisher**

Finally, when I examined the Roosevelt pattern based on the size of the companies that published the textbooks, I discovered that three textbooks produced by smaller companies (i.e., Carl Vinson, Clairmont Press, Gibbs Smith, Iowa State Press, University of Arkansas Press, University of Missouri Press, and WesMar) discussed all five of the identified presidents of the
Roosevelt pattern, as compared to two published by the larger companies (i.e., Glencoe; Harcourt; Hold, Rinehart, and Winston; Houghton; McDougal Littell; Macmillan; Pearson Prentice-Hall; Scholastic; and Scott Foresmen). In addition, only one textbook produced by smaller companies did not mention any of the identified presidents; while six textbooks produced by larger companies did not mention all of the five presidents whose administrations ranked in the top 10 (see Table 4.4).

Franklin Roosevelt was referenced in the most textbooks produced by both large and small companies. He was mentioned in 13 (87%) of the 15 textbooks produced by small textbook companies, and 20 of the 27 (74%) textbooks produced by larger companies. Woodrow Wilson was mentioned in 11 (73%) of the textbooks published by smaller companies and in 10 (27%) of the large companies’ textbooks. Dwight Eisenhower was mentioned in seven (47%) of the textbooks produced by smaller companies, and six (22%) of the texts produced by larger companies. Theodore Roosevelt was mentioned in four (27%) of the textbooks produced by smaller companies and nine (33%) of the textbooks produced by larger companies. Finally, Harry Truman was referenced in seven (47%) textbooks produced by smaller companies and five (19%) of the texts produced by larger publishers (see Figure 4.39).
When I compared the amount of mentions for each of the identified presidents by publisher size, Eisenhower received his largest number of mentions in textbooks produced by larger companies with a total of 79 (5%) of the 1,551 total presidential mentions. He received 25 (2%) of the 1,250 mentions found in the smaller companies’ texts. Franklin Roosevelt received a total of 295 (24%) mentions in the textbooks produced by smaller companies and 274 (18%) presidential mentions found in textbooks produced by larger ones. Theodore Roosevelt also received the same percentage of mentions in both types of textbooks with 35 (2%) of the total number of mentions found in textbooks produced by larger companies and 21 (2%) of the total presidential mentions found in smaller texts. Based on the large number of mentions found in the Missouri textbooks, which were all produced by smaller companies, Truman received a total of 198 (16%) of the total presidential mentions found in these texts, and 36 (2%) of the total presidential mentions found in the textbooks produced by larger companies. Finally, Wilson received the same percentage of the total number of presidential mentions in both types of texts
with 60 (4%) of mentions in the larger companies’ textbooks and 53 (4%) of the presidential mentions found in textbooks produced by smaller companies (see Figure 4.40).

![Bar chart showing percentage of mentions about the identified presidents by publisher size](image)

*Figure 4.40 Percentage of Mentions about the Identified Presidents by Publisher Size*

**Individual Portrayals of 20th and 21st Century Presidents in State History Textbooks**

To conclude the chapter, I offer a brief explanation concerning what I determined to be the overall state history textbook portrayal of each of the 20th and 21st century presidents examined. Each synopsis includes information about each president’s total number of mentions, the total mentions in the textbook(s) from the president’s native state as compared to the overall presidential mentions in that state, and the number of references about each president that correlates to Cronin’s (1974) three constructs and/or the four presidential patterns, if applicable. In addition, selected quotes or other descriptions about the president from the textbooks used in each president’s native state, as well as other states examined, are provided in order to exemplify the most noteworthy depictions of each president.
William McKinley

William McKinley was mentioned in eight of the 41 textbooks examined. Two were from the state of Arkansas, one from Georgia, one from New York, and four from Ohio. McKinley received a total of 35 (1%) of the 2,801 total presidential mentions found in the state history textbooks, with 30 mentions found in the collection of Ohio state history textbooks. It should be noted that one Ohio state history textbook, *Ohio* (2007), published by Macmillan/McGraw-Hill, did not make any references about McKinley, but he was mentioned in the other four textbooks used in the state (see Table 4.9).
### Table 4.9

**Overall Presidential Mentions: McKinley-Eisenhower**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>States Mentioning</th>
<th>Total Number of Textbooks Mentioning</th>
<th>Total Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Presidential Mentions</th>
<th>Number of Home State Mentions</th>
<th>Percentage of Home State Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>AR, GA, NY, OH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Roosevelt</td>
<td>AR, CA, GA, NY, TX, VA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft</td>
<td>GA, OH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>AR, CN, GA, IL, IA, MO, NY, OH, TX, VA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding</td>
<td>GA, OH, VT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolidge</td>
<td>AR, CA, GA, VT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td>AR, CA, GA, IL, IA, NY, TX</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Roosevelt</td>
<td>AR, CA, CT, GA, IL, IA, MO, NY, OH, TX, VA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>AR, GA, MO, TX, VT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td>AR, GA, MO, NE, TX, VA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.9 (cont.)

**Overall Presidential Mentions: Kennedy-G.W. Bush**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>States Mentioning</th>
<th>Total Number of Textbooks Mentioning</th>
<th>Total Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Presidential Mentions</th>
<th>Number of Home State Mentions</th>
<th>Percentage of Home State Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>AR, CA, GA, MA, MO, OH, TX</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>AR, GA, MO, TX, VT,</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon</td>
<td>AR, CA, GA, TX</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>AR, GA, IA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reagan</td>
<td>AR, CA, GA, IL, TX</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.H.W. Bush</td>
<td>AR, CA, GA, TX</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>AR, GA IA, NY, TX, VT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.W. Bush</td>
<td>AR, CA, GA, IA, MO, OH, TX</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
McKinley’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs

In reference to the correlations of McKinley’s 35 textbook mentions to Cronin’s (1974) three constructs, there were four (11%) comments that correlated with Cronin’s (1974) first construct, which states that in textbooks, “the President is the strategic catalyst in the American political system and the central figure in the international system as well” (p.60). Two (6%) that correlated to the second construct, which argues that in textbooks, “only the President is or can be the genuine architect of United States Public Policy and only he, by attacking problems frontally and aggressively, and interpreting his power expansively, can be the engine of change to move the nation forward” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60). Finally, there was one (3%) that correlated to the third, which claims that in textbooks, “the President must be the nation’s personal and moral leader; by symbolizing the past and future greatness of America and radiating inspirational confidence, a President can pull the nation together while directing us toward the fulfillment of the American Dream” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60) (see Table 4.10).
Table 4.10

*Applicability to Cronin’s Constructs by Individual President*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Total Mentions</th>
<th>Construct One Mentions/Percentage</th>
<th>Construct Two Mentions/Percentage</th>
<th>Construct Three Mentions/Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4/11%</td>
<td>2/6%</td>
<td>1/3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Roosevelt</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14/25%</td>
<td>16/29%</td>
<td>16/29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td>1/3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>49/40%</td>
<td>31/25%</td>
<td>27/22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1/3%</td>
<td>1/3%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolidge</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1/3%</td>
<td>1/3%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>12/9%</td>
<td>12/9%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Roosevelt</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>183/34%</td>
<td>183/34%</td>
<td>126/23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>37/16%</td>
<td>29/12%</td>
<td>28/12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>21/20%</td>
<td>15/14%</td>
<td>16/15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>26/13%</td>
<td>20/10%</td>
<td>22/11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>55/17%</td>
<td>54/16%</td>
<td>41/13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3/4%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>27/11%</td>
<td>11/5%</td>
<td>14/6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reagan</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11/10%</td>
<td>10/9%</td>
<td>8/7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.H.W. Bush</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>18/13%</td>
<td>10/7%</td>
<td>5/4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>12/7%</td>
<td>12/7%</td>
<td>7/4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.W. Bush</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>34/17%</td>
<td>26/13%</td>
<td>20/10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An example of one of these comments was from the book *America the Beautiful: Ohio* (2002), which incorrectly claimed that “McKinley declared war on Spain” (p. 85). This correlated with Cronin’s (1974) first construct by providing student readers with the impression that McKinley, and not Congress, was the “strategic catalyst in the American political system and central figure in the international system” (p. 60) by declaring war on Spain. It should be noted that this is actually a role of Congress and not the president.

**McKinley’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns**

I discovered that none of the five Ohio textbooks displayed references to McKinley which related to the Carter pattern, the theory that the native born president or presidents will receive the most mentions their state’s textbook(s), simply because they are from or lived in the state for a time. This was evident due to the fact that McKinley received the third largest number of presidential mentions in these texts and all Ohio born presidents ranked behind Franklin Roosevelt in total number of mentions in the collection of Ohio state textbooks (see Table 4.6). Furthermore, there were no correlations between the overall textbook mentions of William McKinley and the McKinley pattern, the theory that presidents are referenced in state history textbooks due to their connection to a state. This was the only other pattern in which McKinley met the criteria (see Table 4.5).

**The Nature of McKinley’s References in State History Textbooks**

I found that all mentions in the textbooks from the states of Arkansas, Georgia, and New York concerning McKinley were mainly informative in nature and referenced his assassination (Gelman, 2002; Hodge, 2005; Hopper, Baker, & Browning, 2008). For example, a quote taken from a timeline in the textbook *An Arkansas History for Young People* (2008) illustrated most of the mentions about McKinley. The authors write, “President William McKinley is assassinated
and Theodore Roosevelt succeeds him” (Hopper et al., 2008, p. 276). In addition, only one Ohio textbook, *The Ohio Adventure* (2004), discussed McKinley’s assassination along with his childhood, his work as Ohio’s governor, and his leadership during the Spanish-American War. One of the more favorable mentions about McKinley in this text was, “Americans grew to love their quiet president. He led them in the Spanish-American War” (Stockwell, 2004, p. 132).

**Theodore Roosevelt**

Theodore Roosevelt was mentioned in 13 of the 42 textbooks examined. Two were from the state of Arkansas, three from California, two from Georgia, three from New York, two from Texas, and one from Virginia. In these books Roosevelt received a combined total of 56 of the 2,801 total presidential mentions: 2% of the overall total (see Table 4.9). Roosevelt received a total of 16 references from the New York state textbooks, with the majority of his total references (11) coming from the book *New York: Adventures in Time and Place* (2001), published by McMillan/McGraw-Hill.

**Theodore Roosevelt’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs**

Roosevelt was the only president in the study to have a larger percentage of mentions correlating to Cronin’s (1974) second construct, which claims that in textbooks, “the President is or can be the genuine architect of United States Public Policy” and the third construct, which argues that in textbooks, “the President must be the nation’s moral leader” (p. 60). Twenty-nine percent of all of his mentions related to the second and third construct, in comparison to Cronin’s (1974) first construct, which claims that in textbooks, “the President is the strategic catalyst” in the domestic and international systems, with 25% of his references correlating to the first (p. 60) (see Table 4.10).
An example of one of these comments was from the book *Georgia in the American Experience* (2005), published by the Clairmont Press. In a subsection entitled “Spotlight on the Economy: New Forms of Doing Business,” which mentioned Roosevelt’s “trust-busting” activities, London (2005) writes:

By 1890 there were so many trusts that Congress passed the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890. But it was largely unenforced until President Theodore Roosevelt convinced Congress to support his ‘trust busting efforts’ in 1903. Under Roosevelt, the Department of Justice filled more trusting-lawsuits against corporations than had been filed in all previous administrations. (p. 363)

This paragraph correlated with Cronin’s (1974) second construct by providing student readers with the impression that Roosevelt was the “genuine architect of United States public policy and only he, by attacking problems frontally and aggressively, and interpreting his power expansively, can be the engine of change to move the nation forward” (p. 60). However, it should be noted that this mention does not provide student readers with a completely accurate depiction of the Roosevelt’s “trust-busting” activities. While Roosevelt started the process of using executive power to regulate monopolies, it was actually his successor, William Howard Taft, who “busted” more trusts. However, Taft was not mentioned in the textbook and was not given credit for these actions.

Theodore Roosevelt’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns

In regards to the mentions about Roosevelt correlating to the presidential patterns found in my pilot study, I found that there was a correlation between the McKinley pattern, the theory that presidents are mentioned in state history textbooks because they had a connection or made a positive contribution to the state, and the mentions concerning Theodore Roosevelt that were in
the textbooks used by the states of Arkansas, California, New York, and Texas (see Table 4.5).

Roosevelt’s correlation to the Carter pattern was prevalent in all of the New York textbooks. Though Roosevelt ranked second, with 16 (25%) out of the 65 total presidential mentions in the collection of New York state history textbooks, he only fell behind his cousin and New York native, Franklin (see Table 4.6). Finally, due to the fact that Theodore Roosevelt was identified as a president who ranked in the top 10 in United States history, but was mentioned in only 13 (31%) textbooks, there was ample evidence that the Roosevelt pattern could be found in the majority of the state history textbooks examined (see Table 4.8).

The Nature of Theodore Roosevelt’s References in State History Textbooks

Unlike many of the other 20th and 21st century presidents examined, there were no consistent descriptions of Roosevelt and events that happened during his presidency. In fact, there were several different events concerning Roosevelt, both before and during his presidency, that were referenced in the textbooks of different states. In the textbooks from Arkansas he was referenced for his 1905 visit to the state where he spoke out against the large number of lynchings that were taking place in the south. Hopper et al. (2008) describe this event in their book, *An Arkansas History for Young People*, by writing, “When President Theodore Roosevelt came to Arkansas in 1905, Davis [the Governor of Arkansas] used his formal welcome speech to defend lynching. Roosevelt… ignored his planned remarks and condemned Davis’s lawless and disrespectful ideas” (p. 281).

In the California textbooks Roosevelt was referenced for his conservation efforts in regards to both the state and the nation. Two of the books contained “inspirational” quotes by Roosevelt and photographs of him standing next to some of California’s natural treasures (Banks et al., 2007; Potter et al., 2007). An example of one of these mentions was from the text
California: A Changing State. In the book, there was a picture showing Roosevelt with conservationist John Muir touring Yosemite Valley. Underneath the photo the caption reads, “John Muir took many of the country’s leaders, including President Theodore Roosevelt, on tours of Yosemite Valley” (Potter et al., 2007, p. 25).

In two Georgia textbooks Roosevelt received mentions for his “trust busting” efforts and his connection to the progressive movement (London, 2005; Hodge, 2005). For the most part, the Georgia textbooks did a creditable job in describing Roosevelt’s part in the movement, without overly simplifying his role. However, this was not always the case and Roosevelt was credited for the efforts of a much larger group of people. For example, in the textbook Time Travel through Georgia, Roosevelt appeared to be given sole credit for being the main force behind the progressive movement. Hodge (2005) writes, “It [the progressive movement] was helped greatly by the efforts of President Theodore Roosevelt, who convinced the public that reform was very important” (p. 193). This statement gives the impression that if it was not for Roosevelt’s push for “reform” it would have possibly not happened, or would at least have been more difficult to obtain.

The mentions that Roosevelt received from the textbooks used in the state of New York concerned his role in establishing national parks (Cotter, 2002), being one of the youngest presidents in the United States’ history (Cotter, 2002), and the fact that he was a native of the state (Cotter, 2002; Gelmen, 2002). In addition, his roles as both mayor of New York City and governor of New York State were referenced in all of the texts. One textbook in particular highlighted his progressive views concerning labor (Banks et al., 2001). As mentioned previously, this reference was similar to many history textbooks from the president’s home or
adopted state. For the most part, they contained several references concerning the president’s prior role in state and local government.

The textbooks from the state of Texas discussed Roosevelt for his role in the Spanish-American War (Willoughby, 2003) and his connection to Texan Quanah Parker (Anderson Wooster, De Leon, Hardt, & Winegarten, 2003). Roosevelt received the majority of his Texas mentions (8) from the book *Holt Texas!*, in which he is given credit for organizing, recruiting, and training the “Rough Riders” in San Antonio (Willoughby, 2003). Willoughby (2003) emphasizes Roosevelt’s special connection to the troops from Texas when he writes, “Roosevelt was proud of his troops, especially the Texans” (p. 528).

This example is synonymous with many other references about presidents in state history textbooks. There were several occasions when the prior deeds of a man who would become president were chronicled in the textbook. These references illustrated the general theme of Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory by offering an idealized image of the man who would become president. However, due to the fact that they discussed their pre- or post-presidential actions, these references did not meet the criteria for correlating to one or more of the three constructs.

The final state history textbook which discussed Theodore Roosevelt was *Harcourt Horizons: Virginia* (2003). Similarly to the Texas books, Roosevelt received praise for his pre-presidential role of serving with the “Rough Riders” (Delaney, 2003, p. R17). In addition, a quote by Theodore Roosevelt when he was vice-president was used as the opening for the chapter concerning the 20th century. What is interesting about the quote is it was from the Pan America Exposition which was not held in Virginia, but in Buffalo, New York. The use of presidential quotes both of which either concerned or did not concern the state were often found
in state history textbooks, and were perhaps used to confirm to their student readers the importance and/or wisdom of the men who held the office of president.

**William Taft**

William Taft was mentioned in six (14%) of the 42 textbooks examined. One was in a Georgia textbook and five were from his home state of Ohio (see Table 4.9). Contrary to the limited number of references in textbooks outside his home state, Taft received a total of 35 (24%) mentions in the Ohio textbooks, which ranked him 2nd behind Franklin Roosevelt’s 46 (30%). Similarly to William McKinley, 50% (18) of Taft’s mentions came from the *Ohio Adventure* (2004) published by Gibbs Smith. Most of the references about Taft were not concerned with his political accomplishments as president, but more for his weight, his love of sports, and his eventual appointment as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court (Banks et al., 2007; Kline, 2002; Stockwell, 2004).

**Taft’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs**

There was little evidence that the mentions concerning Taft correlated to Cronin’s (1974) constructs. Only one Ohio textbook, *Ohio* (2007), contained a comment that correlated to Cronin’s (1974) third construct (see Table 4.10). This was a quote made by Taft in 1910 regarding the longevity of the U.S. Constitution. Beneath the quote, Banks et al. (2007) write, “Ohio-Born President William Taft spoke these words…his words still prove true today.” This quote correlated well with the second part of Cronin’s (1974) third construct, which states that a President, “by symbolizing the past and future greatness of America and radiating inspirational confidence” can direct us to “the fulfillment of the American Dream” (p. 60).
Taft’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns

There were relatively few examples of Taft’s state history textbook mentions correlating to the presidential patterns. As discussed previously, Taft’s only mention outside his home state of Ohio was in the textbook *Time Travel through Georgia* (2005) (see Table 4.5). In this work, Taft was referenced for appointing Georgian Joseph Rucker to the United States Supreme Court, which correlated to the McKinley pattern, or the theory that a president will be referenced in a state history textbook based on his positive connection to the state.

Finally, as mentioned previously, Taft ranked second in the total number of presidential mentions in the collection of Ohio state history textbooks. Only two texts displayed the appropriate number of mentions which linked Taft to the Carter pattern, the theory that the president or presidents receive the most mentions in a state textbook, simply because they are from or lived in the state for a time (see Table 4.6). Taft did not meet the criteria set for the Eisenhower and Roosevelt patterns.

Woodrow Wilson

Woodrow Wilson was referenced in the second largest number of textbooks, following Franklin Roosevelt, and was mentioned in 21 (50%) of the 42 textbooks examined. Two were from the state of Arkansas, one from Connecticut, four from Georgia, two from Illinois, one from Iowa, one from Missouri, one from New York, two from Ohio, four from Texas, and three from Virginia. In these books, Wilson received a combined total of 124 (4%) of the total presidential mentions (see Table 4.9). Wilson received a total of 40 (32%) of his textbook mentions from the Virginia state textbooks, with the most (26) coming from the book *Virginia* (2003), published by Scott Foresman. This ranked him first in the total number of presidential mentions found in the Virginia history textbooks (see Table 4.6).
Wilson’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs

Wilson had the largest percentage of his total mentions correlate to Cronin’s (1974) first construct, which states that in textbooks, “the President is the strategic catalyst in the American political system and the central figure in the international system as well,” with 40% (p. 60). Most of these mentions cited him for his leadership during World War I. Wilson also had a relatively large percentage of mentions correlate with Cronin’s (1974) second construct, which argues that in textbooks, “the President is or can be the genuine architect of United States Public Policy and only he, by attacking problems frontally and aggressively, and interpreting his power expansively, can be the engine of change to move the nation forward” and third construct, which contends that in textbooks, “the President must be the nation’s personal and moral leader; by symbolizing the past and future greatness of America and radiating inspirational confidence, a President can pull the nation together while directing us toward the fulfillment of the American Dream” (p. 60), with 25% and 22%, respectively (see Table 4.10).

An example of one of these comments related to the first construct and was from the book Missouri: Then and Now (2001), published by the University of Missouri Press. McCandless & Foley (2001) claim that, “President Woodrow Wilson of the United States asked Germany to stop the U-boat attacks. Germany did not” (p. 279). This correlated with Cronin’s (1974) first construct by providing student readers with the impression that Wilson was the “strategic catalyst in the American political system and central figure in the international system” (p. 60), by personally asking Germany to stop their U-boat attacks.

Wilson’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns

There were many mentions about Wilson that correlated to three of the presidential patterns examined in this study. First, several references about Wilson that could be associated to
the McKinley pattern, the theory that presidents are often mentioned in state history textbook because they had a connection or contributed to the state, were found in textbooks used in Arkansas, Georgia, Iowa, Ohio, Texas, and Virginia (see Table 4.5). Second, the references to Wilson in the Virginia textbooks correlated to the Carter pattern, as Wilson was the most mentioned 20th and/or 21st century president in the texts (see Table 4.6). Finally, though Wilson’s presidency was ranked in the top 10, he appeared in only half of the textbooks studied, thus correlating to the Roosevelt pattern (see Table 4.8).

The Nature of Wilson’s References in State History Textbooks

The state textbook portrayals of Wilson in many cases mirrored the portrayals that Loewen (1995) discovered in high school level American history textbooks. Wilson was referenced in at least one of the state history textbooks used in Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Texas, and Virginia for “leading” the United States during World War I. Though in a few textbooks he was given credit for declaring war on Germany (e.g., Burgan, 2008), in most books Wilson used a stirring speech and either had to ask or convince Congress and the American people to declare war on Germany in order to keep the “world safe for democracy” (McCandless & Foley, 2001, p. 279). Nonetheless, the vast majority of the textbooks either specifically stated or implied that Wilson “hated” war and only joined the conflict as a result of Germany’s actions.

In most of the textbooks it was the sinking of the Lusitania that caused Wilson and the United States to enter the war (e.g., Schwieder, Morain, & Nielsen, 2002). However, in one book it was solely the Zimmerman Telegraph (Fehrenbach, Siegle, & Crowley, 2003), and in a few books it was a combination of both events (e.g., Hodge, 2005). Nevertheless, this international
leadership motif found in the textbooks was what led to the large percentage of Wilson’s mentions correlating to Cronin’s (1974) first construct.

In a few of the textbooks, Wilson was referenced for other actions than leading the United States into World War I. In the Arkansas textbook, published by the University of Arkansas Press, Hopper et al., (2008) mention Wilson for showing “how government action could improve the lives of people” (p. 282). In the other Arkansas textbook, published by Gibbs Smith, Wilson received a reference for calling in troops to end the fighting during a strike at the Coronado Coal Mining Company (Berry, 2007, p. 170).

In two of the Georgia textbooks, Wilson was mentioned due to the specific ties he had to the state. In the textbook produced by WesMar, Wilson was mentioned for appointing Georgian Mary Harris Armor “to represent the United States at the World Congress of Alcoholism held in Milan, Italy” (Hodge, 2005, p. 207). In the same text Wilson was also referenced for “spending his boyhood in Georgia” (Hodge, 2005, p. 195). In the Georgia textbook produced by the Carl Vinson Institute, Jackson et al. (2004) discuss Wilson’s ties to Georgia in more detail, noting that Wilson “lived in Augusta as a boy, practiced law in Atlanta, and married a young woman from Rome [Georgia]” (p. 282).

In the Iowa textbook, Iowa Past to Present, published by the Iowa State Press, Wilson was mentioned for his connection to Iowa native, and future president, Herbert Hoover. Schwieder et al. (2002) write that Wilson appointed Hoover “to take charge of getting this [food grown in Iowa] to people who needed it” (p. 262). Interestingly, Wilson was not referenced in the other two Iowa textbooks examined.

Similarly to examples from Georgia and Iowa, one Ohio textbook mentioned Wilson for his political appointment of a citizen from the state. In the text, From Sea to Shining Sea: Ohio,

In the collection of Texas textbooks, Wilson was referenced in three books for sending U.S. troops under General John J. Pershing to Mexico to search for Mexican revolutionary, Pancho Villa. Interestingly, each textbook relayed the details about Wilson’s decision to send U.S. into northern Mexico and discussed his results quite differently. The first book, Holt Texas! (2003) contended that Wilson’s 1914 decision to send U.S. Marines into Mexico was to stop a shipment of weapons from entering the country. Willoughby (2003) explains that this incident caused Mexican President Victoriano Huerta to leave office and President Venustiano Carranza to take over. Villa, who supported Huerta, reacted violently to Wilson’s involvement and attacked the town of Columbus, New Mexico. Willoughby (2003) writes that in response to these raids, “Wilson sent John J. ‘Black Jack’ Pershing and some 15,000 U.S. troops from Fort Bliss into Northern Mexico to find Villa” (p. 539). He describes the lack of U.S. success in capturing him by explaining, “…U.S. troops searched the rough landscape but failed to capture Villa. Pershing returned home in January 1917” (Willoughby, 2003, p. 539).

In the second book, Texas and Texans, published by Glencoe, Anderson et al. offer this description about the event: “President Woodrow Wilson responded to the Columbus raid by ordering General John J. Pershing and 6,000 troops from San Antonio to pursue Villa across northern Mexico” (p. 479). Anderson et al. (2003) go on to explain that though General Pershing was unable to capture Villa, Wilson’s decision did “keep him [Villa] away from the border” (p. 479). However, the authors also offer students the Mexican point of view concerning Wilson’s decision by stating, “the presence of American troops on Mexican soil caused anger among the
Mexican people and the government” (Anderson et al., 2003, p. 479). Anderson et al. (2003) conclude the story by writing “in 1917 President Wilson ordered Pershing back to San Antonio” (p. 479).

The third book, Celebrating Texas: Honoring the Past; Building the Future, published by McDougal Littell, did not mention Villa’s raid on U.S. territory. In their explanation of the event, Rocha, Crawford, McDonald, & Elbow (2003) write, “One of the legendary generals of the revolution, Francisco “Pancho” Villa, became angry at the United States for recognizing his opponent as the new leader of Mexico” and claimed that in “1916 he killed several U.S. citizens in northern Mexico” (p. 457). In response “President Woodrow Wilson sent U.S. Army General John J. Pershing and his troops into Mexico to capture Villa” (Rocha et al., 2003, p. 457). However, in this version of the story the Mexican people were not just angry at the U.S. for invading their territory but “helped Villa escape” (Rocha et al., p. 2003, p. 457). Rocha et al. (2003) conclude the story by telling their student readers, “in 1917 President Wilson withdrew the troops to Texas where they helped guard the border along with the Texas Rangers” (p. 457).

Interestingly, in the fourth Texas book, Lone Star: The Story of Texas, published by Pearson Prentice-Hall, the authors describe the Villa saga, but do not mention Wilson’s name at all. In this book, where the other text specifically named Wilson, Fehrenbach, Siegel, & Crowley (2003) use the term “United States.” However, Wilson was referenced in the book for appointing Texans Edward House, Thomas Watt Gregory, and Albert Burleson to important federal posts during World War I (p. 395). In addition, Fehrenbach et al. (2003) include a photo of Wilson and House with a caption that reads, “What makes Wilson look presidential in this image?” (p. 395).

In the three textbooks from Wilson’s native state of Virginia, Wilson’s birth connection to Virginia was highlighted. In the textbook Harcourt Horizons: Virginia, Wilson’s connection
to the state was mentioned three times. In the first mention, Bearson and Delaney (2003) assert “Woodrow Wilson was President of the United States during World War I. He was born in Staunton” (p. 237). On the same page is a picture of the house that Wilson was born in with the caption, “Woodrow Wilson, the twenty-eighth President of the United States, was born in this house in Staunton, Virginia” (Bearson & Delaney, 2003, p. 237). Bearson and Delaney’s (2003) third reference to Wilson being born in the state is “Woodrow Wilson was the twenty-eighth President and the eighth born in Virginia” (p. 237).

In what was a common feature of the Gibb Smith textbooks, *The Virginia Adventure*, offered students a full page biographical sketch of Wilson which highlighted his connection to the state. To illustrate Wilson’s birth connection, Wray (2002) writes, “It was a happy day when a Virginian was elected president of the United States” (p. 174). Wray (2002) continues, “Thomas Woodrow Wilson was born in Staunton. He grew up outside of the state but always thought of himself as a Virginian” (p. 174). Similarly to the Harcourt text, a picture of his boyhood home was included with the caption, “this was Wilson’s home in Staunton” (Wray, 2002, p. 174).

The third Virginia textbook, *Virginia*, produced by Scott Foresman, also emphasized Wilson’s connection to the state. The chapter that first discussed Wilson opened with a story that takes place during Wilson’s election concerning a grandfather’s pride that “once again…there is a Virginian in the White House” (Boyd et al., 2003, p. 362). Later in the book, Boyd et al. (2003) tell students that Wilson attended “law school at the University of Virginia” and after his election “worked on making elections fairer” and “fought some giant companies that treated the public unfairly” (p. 363). In addition, Wilson received praise concerning his plan for the League of Nations. Boyd et al. (2003) write, “At first many people did not accept Wilson’s plan. Still
history has shown that his ideas were good ones. Today’s United Nations is based on similar ideas” (p. 363).

**Warren G. Harding**

Warren Harding was mentioned in 10 (24%) of the 42 textbooks examined. Two were from the state of Georgia, five from Ohio, and three from Vermont. Harding received a total of 37 (1%) of the 2,801 total presidential mentions found in the state history textbooks, with 30 mentions from the Ohio state history textbooks (see Table 4.9). The textbook in which Harding received the largest number of mentions was in the Ohio textbook produced by Gibbs Smith where he was referenced 23 times. Harding received the same number of references in the Ohio state history textbooks as McKinley with 30, and ranked third in the number of presidential mentions, behind Franklin Roosevelt and Taft, in these texts (see Table 4.6).

**Harding’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs**

In reference to the correlations of Harding’s 36 textbook mentions to Cronin’s (1974) three constructs, there was one (3%) comment that correlated with Cronin’s (1974) first and second constructs, which argue that in textbooks the President “is the strategic catalyst” in the domestic and international systems and “can be the genuine architect of United States Public Policy” (p. 60). This mention was from *Georgia and the American Experience* (2005), published by the Clairmont Press. London (2005) writes, “President Harding had promised to return the country to normalcy, and that is exactly what he tried to do.” Though ambiguous, this statement was coded as meeting the requirements for Cronin’s (1974) first and second constructs due to the fact that the text gave the president the authority to be the lynchpin for change. I found no mentions concerning Harding that correlated to the third construct (see Table 4.10).
Harding’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns

There was only one Ohio textbook, published by Lerner, which displayed references about Harding that related to the Carter pattern, the theory that a native born president(s) will receive the most mentions in state textbooks from their home state, simply because they are from or lived in the state for a time. This was evident in this text due to the fact that Harding, along with both McKinley and Taft, received the largest number of mentions in the text. However, in the collection of textbooks from the state of Ohio, all native born presidents ranked behind Franklin Roosevelt in the total number of presidential mentions found in the books. As a whole, Harding tied with McKinley for the third most mentions. However, unlike McKinley, Harding appeared in all five of the Ohio textbooks (see Table 4.6).

In addition, Harding received the second largest number of mentions in the Vermont textbooks based on his connection to his vice-president, and Vermont native, Calvin Coolidge, who took over the presidency after Harding’s death. This correlated to the McKinley pattern, the theory that presidents are referenced in state history textbooks due to their connection to a state. This was the only other pattern in which Harding met the criteria (see Table 4.5).

The Nature of Harding’s References in State History Textbooks

The references of Harding in the Georgia and Vermont textbooks were informative in nature. As mentioned previously, the Clairmont Press’ Georgia text used Harding’s “return to normalcy” quote to open up the chapter about the “Roaring 20’s” (London, 2005), while in the McDougal Littell text, Harding’s election was referenced in a timeline used to open the chapter discussing World War I and the 1920’s (Kline & Pascoe, 2005). As mentioned above, Harding was referenced in all three Vermont textbooks based on his death and the succession of his vice-president, and Vermont native, Calvin Coolidge. Purely informative references concerning
Harding were also found in three of the Ohio textbooks, primarily in listings which identified the natives of Ohio who served as president.

However, two Ohio textbooks offered more details concerning Harding. In the textbook, *Ohio*, produced by Macmillan McGraw Hill; Banks et al. (2007) attempt to link the election of Harding to women gaining the right to vote. They write: “They [women] helped to elect Ohioan Warren G. Harding as the 29th president” (Banks et al., 2007, p. 245). The Gibbs Smith text offered a more detailed account of Harding’s life. Stockwell (2004) discusses Harding’s initial popularity, his landslide victory in the election of 1920, and suggests that “most” women voted for Harding based upon his “charm” (p. 168). In addition, she points out that Harding was “the last president from Ohio” (Stockwell, 2004, p. 168). Nonetheless, unlike most of the writing found in the elementary level textbooks, she also makes reference to the scandals of Harding’s presidency. She explains to her fourth grade readers, “Everyone hoped Harding would be a good president. Sadly, he was not. Harding chose men to work for him who were dishonest…Harding became sick and died just as people were learning about the scandal” (Stockwell, 2004, p. 168).

**Calvin Coolidge**

Calvin Coolidge was mentioned in seven (17%) of the 42 textbooks examined. One was from the state of Arkansas, one from California, two from Georgia, and three from Vermont. Coolidge received a total of 38 (1%) of the 2,801 total presidential mentions found in the state history textbooks, with 33 (75%) mentions from the Vermont state history textbooks (see Table 4.9). Coolidge received the largest amount of mentions in the textbook, *America the Beautiful: Vermont*, produced by Children’s Press, with a total of 20 references. Coolidge received the largest number of presidential mentions in all three of the Vermont history textbooks (see Table 4.6).
Coolidge’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs

In reference to the correlations of Coolidge’s 38 textbook mentions to Cronin’s (1974) three constructs, there was one (3%) comment that correlated with Cronin’s (1974) first construct and one (3%) comment that correlated to the second construct, the “strategic catalysis” construct and “genuine architect” constructs, respectively (p.60). The mention that was deemed as meeting both of these constructs was from the book *Hello U.S.A.: Vermont* (2002) published by Learner. Pelta (2002) writes “Coolidge led the nation during the 1920’s” (p. 66). However, I found no mentions concerning Coolidge that correlated to the third construct which claims the president must be the nation’s “moral leader” (p.60) (see Table 4.10).

Coolidge’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns

As mentioned previously, Coolidge received the most presidential mentions in all three Vermont textbooks which correlated to the Carter pattern, the theory that a native born president(s) will receive the most mentions in a state’s history textbook(s), simply because they are from or lived in the state for a time. In fact, 75% of all presidential mentions in the Vermont textbooks reference Coolidge, ranking him third among all 20th and 21st century presidents for the largest percentage of mentions in their home state’s textbooks (see Table 4.6). There were no references about Coolidge which met the McKinley pattern, the theory that presidents are referenced in state history textbooks due to their connection and contributions to a state. It should be noted that I did not code a mention about Coolidge in the Arkansas textbook produced by The University of Arkansas Press, as meeting this pattern due to its negative connotation concerning Hoover’s “failure” in providing relief to the state (Hopper et al., 2008). The McKinley pattern was the only other pattern in which Coolidge met the criteria.
The Nature of Coolidge’s References in State History Textbooks

The depiction of Coolidge in some state history textbooks appeared to be similar to Stern’s (1996) findings concerning the vilification of Coolidge in American history textbooks; however, in other texts he was either mentioned in an informative manner, or, in the case of his home state, appeared to be mentioned more favorably. Examples of what could be considered negative portrayals of Coolidge were found in the Arkansas, California, and Georgia texts. Both he and Hoover were mentioned in the Arkansas textbook published by the University of Arkansas Press for what the authors perceived to be Coolidge’s lackluster support of the state during a 1927 flood. They write, “Arkansans looked to their state and federal government for help and guidance. President Calvin Coolidge, a Republican, named Herbert Hoover to arrange private relief efforts. However, due to government ‘red tape’…none of the relief funds went directly to the victims” (Hopper et al., 2008, p. 326).

Another interesting example that may be construed as a way for an author to vilify Coolidge was found in one of the California textbooks. While many of the state history textbooks I examined appeared to place much of the blame on Hoover for the Great Depression, the California textbook, *California Vistas: Our Golden State*, appeared to shield the part-time resident of California. Banks et al. (2003) introduce the chapter concerning the Great Depression with a quote from Coolidge where the president’s beliefs appear to be short sighted. They write, “During the 1920’s, the economy of the United States was growing. President Calvin Coolidge said ‘the chief business of the American people is business.’ Unfortunately, hard times were ahead” (Banks et al., 2003, p. 347). It should be noted that Hoover’s name did not appear anywhere in this chapter. Additionally, the Georgia textbook produced by the Carl Vinson Institute used the same quote, but Jackson et al. (2004) add, “with little regulation from
government, American corporations and banks were free to operate as they pleased. Sometimes their practices were unsound or unfair, sometimes they were downright dishonest” (p. 295).

However, not all of the state history textbooks I examined vilified Coolidge. In McDougal Littell’s Georgia history textbook, Coolidge’s succession to the presidency was noted in a timeline at the beginning of the chapter concerning World War I and the Great Depression. More importantly, references in the textbooks from his home state of Vermont seemed to take pride in the fact he was a native of the state. In fact, one of the mentions about Coolidge was even more noteworthy. In the text, American the Beautiful: Vermont produced by Children’s Press, Heinrichs (2001) claims that Coolidge’s quiet personality personified the “traditional character” of Vermonters as a whole (p. 111).

Herbert Hoover

Herbert Hoover was mentioned in 16 (38%) of the 42 textbooks examined. One was from the state of Arkansas, two were from California, four from Georgia, one from Illinois, three from Iowa, one from New York, and four from Texas. Hoover received a total of 134 (5%) of the 2,801 total presidential mentions found in the state history textbooks, with 20 (54%) mentions from the Iowa state history textbooks (see Table 4.6). The textbook that contained the most mentions about Hoover was, Iowa Past To Present: The People and the Prairie produced by Iowa State Press with a total of nine references. Hoover received the most presidential mentions in all three of the Iowa history textbooks (see Table 4.9).

Hoover’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs

In reference to the correlation of Hoover’s 134 textbook mentions to Cronin’s (1974) three constructs, there were 12 (9%) comments that correlated with both Cronin’s (1974) first construct, which states that in textbooks, “the President is the strategic catalyst in the American
political system and the central figure in the international system as well,” and 12 (9%) comments that correlated with the second construct, which argues that in textbooks, “only the President is or can be the genuine architect of United States Public Policy and only he, by attacking problems frontally and aggressively, and interpreting his power expansively, can be the engine of change to move the nation forward” (p. 60). However, I found no mentions concerning Hoover that correlated to the third construct (see Table 4.10).

An example of one of these comments was from the book *Georgia in the American Experience*, in which the authors claim that Hoover “realized that the federal government had to take more direct steps to improve the economy” (Kline & Pascoe, 2005, p. 85). This correlated with Cronin’s (1974) second construct by providing student readers with the impression that Hoover, and not Congress, was the “the genuine architect of United States Public Policy and only he, by attacking problems frontally and aggressively, and interpreting his power expansively, can be the engine of change to move the nation forward” (p. 60).

**Hoover’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns**

As mentioned previously, Hoover received the most mentions describing 20th and 21st century presidents in all three Iowa textbooks. This related to the Carter pattern, the theory that a native born president or presidents will receive the most mentions in a state textbook, simply because they are from or lived in the state for a time. Hoover, who was also a resident of California, was mentioned only three times in the textbooks, ranking him as the fourth most mentioned president. With this small number of mentions Hoover’s portrayal in the California texts did not correlate with the Carter pattern (see Table 4.6).

Hoover received one mention that correlated to the McKinley pattern, the theory that presidents are referenced in state history textbooks due to their connection to a state. In the
textbook, *Holt: Texas!*, produced by Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Hoover was referenced for selecting Texan Jesse Jones to head a “government agency that loaned money to businesses” (Willoughby, 2003, p. 551). His mention in the Arkansas textbook produced by The University of Arkansas Press, was not counted due to its negative connotation concerning Hoover’s “failure” in providing relief to the state. The McKinley pattern was the only other pattern in which Hoover met the criteria (see Table 4.5).

The Nature of Hoover’s References in State History Textbooks

Overall, the depictions of Hoover in the state history textbooks I examined appeared to meet the traditional view of his presidency that other researches found in their own textbook analyses (Cronin, 1974; Sanchez, 1996; Stern, 1996). Hoover seemed to be mentioned in a large number of textbooks only to serve as a foil for Franklin Roosevelt. The states that used textbooks that contained these types of mentions included Arkansas, Georgia, Illinois, New York, and Texas. An example of this type of description was found in *An Arkansas History for Young People*. In the text, Hopper et al. (2008) describe the differences between Hoover and Roosevelt, and Roosevelt’s eventual effect on the state. They contend:

> Real help for Arkansas would eventually come from the U. S. Government. When President Herbert Hoover was president, the government gave no aid to individuals and only some aid to businesses. In the 1932 election the Democrat Franklin Roosevelt was elected…He was deeply concerned about people’s distress and was willing to try a number of new federal programs. (Hopper et al., 2008, p. 334)

However, there were a small number of textbooks that appeared to soften the traditional criticisms, and in some cases, even appeared to praise Hoover for his efforts in the beginning stages of the Great Depression. These textbooks were used in the state of Georgia (London,
2005; Kline & Pascoe, 2005). For example, in the textbook produced by the Clairmont Press, London (2005) offers Georgia’s students a completely different portrayal of Hoover’s response to the Great Depression than that of Hopper et al. (2008) and their traditional view of Hoover’s presidency. She asserts:

President Herbert Hoover was the first president to use the power of the federal government to help the economy recover…President Hoover approved a program that loaned federal money to needy businesses. He also supported public works projects such as building of post offices, parks, courthouses, and roads. These projects put many unemployed men back to work. With Hoover’s urging, the government loaned money to states for their own public works projects. (London, 2005, p. 390)

Though most of the textbooks’ references about Hoover were based on his role as president during the Great Depression, some textbooks referenced Hoover for his actions outside the event. As discussed in the section about the portrayals of Coolidge, in the University of Arkansas’ (2008) textbook he was mentioned for his “failed” efforts in providing aid to Arkansas flood victims. In the California textbooks he was not referenced in the discussion of the Great Depression, rather for either being one of the three presidents “from” the state (Porter et al, 2007, p. 465) or the “founder of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University” (Bednarz et al., 2007, p. R17). Similarly, in his native state of Iowa, Hoover was referenced for his appointment by Woodrow Wilson to head America’s war time rationing program and European relief efforts after the war (Schwieder et al., 2002), as well as, being a “successful engineer” (LaDoux, 2002, p. 67), and being the only native Iowan elected President (Balcavage, 2002; LaDoux, 2002; Schwieder et al., 2002). Finally, as previously mentioned, Hoover was mentioned in the Texas
history textbook, published by Holt, for his appointment of Texan Jesse Jones to a position in the federal government (Willoughby, 2003).

Franklin Roosevelt

Franklin Roosevelt was mentioned in 33 (79%) of the 42 textbooks examined, and was the only 20th or 21st century president referenced in the majority of state history texts. He received mentions in two textbooks from the states of Arkansas and Illinois, four from the states of California, Georgia, and Texas, three from the states of Iowa, Missouri, New York, Ohio, and Virginia, and one from the states of Connecticut and Vermont. Overall, Roosevelt received the most mentions in the state history textbooks examined, with a total of 539, which was 19% of the 2,801 total presidential mentions found in the texts (see Table 4.9). The textbook in which Roosevelt received the largest amount of mentions was, *Georgia and the American Experience*, produced by the Clairmont Press, where he received a total of 66 references. He received the most presidential mentions in all three of the history textbooks from his native state of New York. Additionally, Roosevelt was the most referenced president in seven other states’ history textbooks, and received the second largest number of mentions in 18 other textbooks.

Franklin Roosevelt’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs

In reference to the correlation of Franklin Roosevelt’s 539 textbook mentions to Cronin’s (1974) three constructs there were 183 (34%) comments that correlated with both Cronin’s (1974) first construct, which states that in textbooks “the President is the strategic catalyst” in the domestic and international systems, and 183 (34%) mentions for the second construct, which argues that in textbooks “only the President is or can be the genuine architect of United States Public Policy” (p. 60). There were also 126 (33%) mentions that correlated to Cronin’s (1974)
third construct, which claims that in textbooks, “the President must be the nation’s moral leader” (p. 60) (see Table 4.10).

An example of one of these comments was from the book *America the Beautiful: Illinois*. Burgan (2008) claims that Roosevelt “…wanted to help Great Britain and its allies fight Germany and sent them aid” (p. 60). This correlated with Cronin’s (1974) first construct by providing student readers with the impression that Roosevelt was “the central figure in the international system” (p. 60), because the text made it appear as though Roosevelt was solely responsible for sending aid to Great Britain during World War II.

**Franklin Roosevelt’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns**

As mentioned previously, Roosevelt received the most mentions in all three New York history textbooks which related to the Carter pattern, the theory that a president(s) from the state or who lived in the state for a time will receive the most mentions in their native state’s textbook. Roosevelt was also a part-time resident of the state of Georgia, and was the most referenced president in two Georgia history textbooks and second in two others. This high ranking also correlated Roosevelt’s mentions to the Carter pattern in Georgia history textbooks (see Table 4.6).

Roosevelt received several mentions that correlated to the McKinley pattern, the theory that presidents are referenced in state history textbooks due to their connection to a state. In fact, Roosevelt had more comments that related to this pattern than any other president. The states whose textbook references about Roosevelt correlated to this pattern were Arkansas, California, Georgia, Iowa, Missouri, New York, Ohio, and Texas (see Table 4.5).

Due to the fact that Roosevelt was identified as a top 10 ranked president, he qualified to be inspected as a target for the Theodore Roosevelt pattern, the idea that some highly ranked
presidents are simply ignored in state history textbooks. As mentioned previously, Roosevelt was mentioned in 33 (79%) of the textbooks and was the most mentioned 20th and 21st century president in state history textbooks as well. However, there were a total of nine textbooks that did not mention Franklin Roosevelt. Due to the fact that these textbooks did not mention Roosevelt, they demonstrated the presence of the pattern. Interestingly, two were from states that only used one state history textbook in their schools: Massachusetts and Nebraska (see Table 4.8).

The Nature of Franklin Roosevelt’s References in State History Textbooks

The state textbook portrayals of Roosevelt in many cases mirrored the idealized presidential portrayals that Cronin (1974) discovered in college level political science textbooks which he used to formulate the textbook presidency theory. In fact, some of the headings which introduced chapters or sections about Roosevelt that mirrored Cronin’s (1974) arguments included: “A New President; A New Deal” (Berry, 2007, p. 195), “The 1932 Election: ‘Try Something’” (Kline & Pascoe, 2005, p. 376), and “A Hero With a Plan” (Hopper et al., 2008, p. 334). Roosevelt was referenced in at least one of the state histories textbooks used in Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, New York, Ohio, and Texas for two reasons. One was for “leading” the United States through the Great Depression and the other was for “leading” the United States through World War II. In most of the textbooks, Roosevelt’s election over Herbert Hoover, his New Deal plans and their effect on the particular state, his “fireside chats,” his involvement in the Lend-Lease Act, and his response to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor were all chronicled (e.g., Anderson et al., 2003; Banks et al., 2001; Berry, 2007; Burgan, 2008; Ifkovic, 2002; London, 2005; Stockwell, 2004; White, 2007).
However, there were other mentions concerning Roosevelt that did not reference any of these events. In the Arkansas textbooks, Roosevelt was referenced for visiting the state during its centennial celebration (Berry, 2007), bathing in the bath houses in the town of Hot Springs (Berry, 2007), his actions to protect Jehovah’s Witness groups throughout the state (Hopper et al., 2008), and his executive order sending Japanese-Americans to internment camps (Hopper et al., 2008). In two of the California textbooks, Roosevelt was directly referenced for this executive order as well (White, 2007; Bednarz, 2007). In addition, in one Virginia textbook, *Virginia*, published by Scott Foresman (2003), Roosevelt was discussed for his battle with polio and how it showed Americans that he had the fortitude to combat the Great Depression.

In the textbooks from Iowa, Missouri, Ohio, and Texas, Roosevelt was mentioned for his political appointees from the states. For example, in an Iowa textbook Roosevelt was mentioned for his appointment of Iowan Henry A. Wallace as both an advisor concerning the nation’s farming problems during the depression, as well as his appointment of Wallace as vice-president in 1940 (Schwieder et al., 2002). In the Missouri textbooks, Roosevelt was mentioned for appointing Missourian Harry S. Truman as vice-president (Brown, 2010; Gall, 2007; McCandless & Foley, 2001). In the Texas textbooks, Roosevelt was also mentioned for his appointment of many Texans to high ranking political positions, including John N. Garner as vice-president, and Frances Perkins as the first female presidential cabinet member (Anderson et al., 2003; Rocha et al., 2003; Willoughby, 2003), along with his association with Texas Governor Miriam Ferguson (Anderson et al., 2003). Additionally, in two Texas textbooks, he received mentions for visiting the state during its centennial celebration in 1936 (Rocha et al., 2003; Willoughby, 2003). In the Ohio textbook, published by Gibbs Smith, Stockwell (2004) mentions Roosevelt not for one of his political appointments but for his own appointment as Ohioan James

In the textbooks of Roosevelt’s native and “adopted” state, Roosevelt was mentioned for many reasons. In his native state of New York, Roosevelt was referenced for being born in the state and his accomplishments as its governor (Banks et al., 2001; Cotter, 2002; Gelman, 2002). However, as mentioned previously, Roosevelt received many of his references in the collection of Georgia textbooks. These references included his struggle with polio (Hodge, 2005; Jackson et al., 2004; Kline & Pascoe, 2005; London, 2005), his home in Warm Springs, Georgia, called the “Little White House” (Hodge, 2005; Jackson et al., 2004; Kline & Pascoe, 2005; London, 2005), how his experiences at Warm Springs helped him develop ideas for New Deal programs, such as the Rural Electrification Act (Kline & Pascoe, 2005; London, 2005), his association with Georgia Congressman Carl Vinson and Senator Richard B. Russell (Hodge, 2005; Jackson et al., 2004; London, 2005), his death at Warm Springs (Hodge, 2005; Kline & Pascoe, 2005; London, 2005), the belief by Georgians that he was an “adopted son” of the state (Kline & Pascoe, 2005; London, 2005), and for issuing Executive Order 8802, which prohibited discrimination of employees in the defense industry (Kline & Pascoe, 2005).

Nevertheless, there were textbooks used in a few states where the depiction of Roosevelt’s impact on the nation appeared to be slightly diminished. For example, in the state of Iowa, where Roosevelt defeated Iowan Herbert Hoover in the election of 1932, Roosevelt was only mentioned for his role during the Great Depression, not World War II. In one of the Missouri textbooks where native Harry Truman followed Roosevelt into office, Roosevelt was not specifically mentioned in the discussion of the New Deal programs. For instance, McCandless & Foley (2001) interchanged the term “Government,” where in most textbooks the
author or authors used “Roosevelt.” Examples include: “The national government tried to help people,” and “the government helped keep more banks from closing” (McCandless & Foley, 2001, p. 289).

A final example was found in one Texas textbook, *Lone Star: The Story of Texas*, published by Pearson Prentice-Hall. In this book, Roosevelt, who was usually given credit in most textbooks for asking Congress to declare war on Japan after the attack on Pearl Harbor, or even, in some cases, declaring war on Japan himself (Hodge, 2005, p. 223), was not given credit for this action by the authors. Fehrenbach et al. (2003) appear to give the credit to Texas Congressman, Tom Connally, for serving as the catalyst of this action. They write, “One of the Texan members of Congress, Tom Connally, introduced a bill to declare war on Japan. Congress quickly approved it” (Fehrenbach et al., 2003, p. 418). In addition, this text was the only textbook to discuss Roosevelt’s “court packing” scheme in detail.

**Harry Truman**

Harry Truman was mentioned in 12 (29%) of the 42 textbooks examined. Two were from the state of Arkansas, three from Georgia, three from Missouri, three from Texas, and one from Vermont. Truman received a total of 234 (8%) of the 2,801 total presidential mentions found in the state history textbooks. Truman received the largest amount of his presidential mentions in the textbooks from his home state with 185 (87%) mentions (see Table 4.9). The textbook in which Truman received the most mentions was, *Missouri Then and Now*, produced by the University of Missouri State Press, with a total of 95 references. Truman received the largest number of mentions concerning 20th and 21st century presidents in all three of the Missouri history textbooks (see Table 4.6).
Truman’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs

In reference to the correlation of Truman’s 234 textbook mentions to Cronin’s (1974) three constructs there were 37 (16%) comments that correlated with Cronin’s (1974) first construct, the “strategic catalyst” construct (p. 60). There were 29 (12%) comments concerning the second construct, the “genuine architect” construct (Cronin, 1974, p. 60). Finally, there were 28 (12%) mentions that correlated to Cronin’s (1974) third construct, discussing the president’s role as a “moral leader” (p. 60) (see Table 4.10).

An example of one of these mentions about Truman correlated to the third construct, “the President must be the nation’s personal and moral leader; by symbolizing the past and future greatness of America and radiating inspirational confidence, a President can pull the nation together while directing us toward the fulfillment of the American Dream” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60). This reference was found in the textbook Missouri: Then and Now. In this text, McCandless & Foley (2001) describe Truman’s leadership abilities. They write, “The job [presidency] was not too big for Harry Truman. He took charge. He led the United States through the last months of World War II. He helped start the United Nations…He also worked to make things better for the American people” (p. 316).

Truman’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns

Truman received the most mentions in all three Missouri history textbooks. This related to the Carter pattern, the theory that a president(s) from the state or who lived in the state for a time will receive the most mentions in that state’s history textbook(s). In addition, the collection of Missouri history textbooks had the second largest percentage of presidential comments relating to their native son (87%) as compared to the collection of textbooks from the other states (see Table 4.6). Truman also received several mentions that correlated to the McKinley pattern,
the theory that presidents are referenced in state history textbooks due to their connection to a
state. The states whose textbook references about Truman correlated to this pattern were
Arkansas, Missouri, Texas, and Vermont (see Table 4.5).

In addition, due to the fact that Truman was identified as a president whose
administration ranked in the top 10, he met the requirements for inspection based on the
Theodore Roosevelt pattern. As mentioned previously, Truman was referenced in the fewest
number of the state history textbooks examined (12) but, due to the Missouri textbooks, he
received a significant number of mentions even for a president that was identified for the
Roosevelt pattern. However, there were a total of 30 textbooks which did not mention Truman,
which met the requirements for the pattern (see Table 4.8). Though Truman was well thought of
in the presidential polls, his limited appearance in most of the state history textbooks makes it
appear that most of their authors did not view Truman as being as important in their state’s
history.

The Nature of Truman’s References in State History Textbooks

Truman was referenced in at least one of the state history textbooks used in Arkansas,
Georgia, Missouri, and Texas for one of three reasons. The first was for ordering the use of the
atomic bomb on Japan (e.g., Gall, 2006; Jackson et al., 2004; Kline & Pascoe, 2005; London,
2005; McCandless & Foley, 2001). The second was for ordering U.S. troops into Korea during
the Korean War (e.g., Berry, 2007; Brown, 2010; Jackson et al., 2004). The third was for issuing
an executive order banning segregation in the armed forces (e.g., Anderson et al., 2003; Gall,
2006; Hopper et al., 2008; Jackson et al., 2004; Kline & Pascoe, 2005; London, 2005).

However, there were other mentions concerning Truman that did not reference any of the
events. In one of the Arkansas textbooks, Truman received a reference for relieving General
Douglas MacArthur, an Arkansas native, from command during the Korean War (Hopper et al., 2008). Truman was mentioned in the Vermont textbook, *America the Beautiful: Vermont*, for appointing Vermont native Warren R. Austin as the first U.S. ambassador to the United Nations (Heinrichs, 2002).

In the textbooks from Texas, Truman was also mentioned for firing MacArthur (Anderson et al., 2003). Furthermore, he was referenced for holding and putting into action ideals that pushed conservative Texas Democrats to the Republican Party. These included his lobbying for civil rights legislation, vetoing bills that would have allowed Texas to receive revenues from the oil that was found in the “tidelands” (Anderson et al., 2003), and vetoing the Taft-Hartley Act, which was designed to limit the power of labor unions (Rocha, 2003, p. 519). However, Truman was also mentioned favorably in one Texas textbook for presenting Texas solider, Macario Garcia, the Congressional Medal of Honor (Anderson, et al., 2003).

In the collection of textbooks from Truman’s home state of Missouri, all three books contained a mini-biography concerning Truman’s life. All of these biographies referenced Truman’s childhood, his service in World War I, his work ethic, his election as a U.S. Senator, his “surprise” choice as Roosevelt’s vice-president, and his return to Missouri after his final term as president. However; there were some differences in these descriptions of Truman’s life. Brown (2010) calls Truman a “hard worker” and does not mention anything about Truman’s failed businesses (p. 26), while Gall (2006) says that Truman “never did very well in these jobs” (p. 222). Moreover, two of the textbooks mentioned the 1948 election and explained how close Truman came to losing it, even showing the famous photograph of Truman holding the “Dewey Wins” newspaper. However, McCandless and Foley (2001) never mention this in their texts, and
when chronicling the election write, “Truman did a fine job. In 1948 the American voters elected Truman to serve as president for four more years” (p. 309).

Dwight Eisenhower

Eisenhower was mentioned in 13 (31%) of the 42 textbooks examined. Two were from the state of Arkansas, four from Georgia, one from Missouri, one from Nebraska, four from Texas, and one from Virginia. Eisenhower received a total of 104 (4%) of the 2,801 total presidential mentions found in the state history textbooks. Eisenhower received the largest amount of mentions in the textbooks from his native state of Texas, with 75 (8%) (see Table 4.9). The textbook in which Eisenhower received the largest number of mentions was *Lone Star: The Story of Texas*, produced by Pearson Prentice-Hall, with a total of 39 references.

Eisenhower’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs

In reference to the correlations of Eisenhower’s 104 textbook mentions to Cronin’s (1974) three constructs, there were 21 (20%) comments that correlated with Cronin’s (1974) first construct, which states that in textbooks, “the President is the strategic catalyst in the American political system and the central figure in the international system as well” (p. 60). There were 15 (14%) comments concerning the second construct, which concludes that in textbooks, “only the President is or can be the genuine architect of United States Public Policy and only he, by attacking problems frontally and aggressively, and interpreting his power expansively, can be the engine of change to move the nation forward” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60), and 16 (15%) mentions that correlated to the third construct, which claims that in textbooks, “the President must be the nation’s personal and moral leader; by symbolizing the past and future greatness of America and radiating inspirational confidence, a President can pull the nation together while directing us toward the fulfillment of the American Dream” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60) (see Table 4.10).
An example of one of these mentions correlated to the third construct. It was a quote made by Eisenhower found in the Nebraska textbook, *The Nebraska Adventure*, published by Gibbs Smith. In this text, Eisenhower was quoted as saying, “Throughout America’s adventure…our basic purposes have been to keep the peace, to aid progress…and to enhance liberty and dignity…among people” (Lukesh, 2004, p. 214). This quote represents the third construct because Lukesh (2004) appears to be using Eisenhower as a “moral leader” whose quote can symbolize “the past and future greatness of America” and “radiate inspirational confidence” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60).

**Eisenhower’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns**

Eisenhower received his largest number of mentions in all four Texas history textbooks. However, in these books, Eisenhower’s best ranking was second, behind fellow Texan Lyndon Johnson. In fact, in the overall collection of Texas textbooks, Eisenhower ranked fourth behind Johnson, George W. Bush, and Franklin Roosevelt in the number of total presidential mentions. Eisenhower’s second place ranking in the textbook produced by Pearson Prentice-Hall related to the Carter pattern, or the theory that a president(s) from the state or who lived in the state for a time will receive the most mentions in the state’s history textbooks. However, in every other Texas textbook, Eisenhower ranked behind non-native Franklin Roosevelt, which did not meet the specification for the pattern (see Table 4.6). In addition, Eisenhower received several mentions that correlated to the McKinley pattern, the theory that presidents are often referenced in state history textbooks due to their connection to a state. The states whose textbook references about Eisenhower correlated to this pattern were Arkansas, Georgia, Missouri, and Texas (see Table 4.5).
Furthermore, due to the fact that Eisenhower was identified as a top 10 ranked president, he met the requirements for inspection based on the Theodore Roosevelt pattern. As mentioned previously, Eisenhower was mentioned in the second fewest number of the textbooks (13); therefore, there were a total of 29 textbooks that did not mention Eisenhower. Eisenhower’s absence in these textbooks met the criteria for the pattern (see Table 4.8). Though Eisenhower was well thought of in the presidential polls, similarly to Theodore Roosevelt and Truman, his limited appearances in most of the state history textbooks made it appear that most of their authors did not view Eisenhower as being quite as important in the chronicles of their state’s history.

The Nature of Eisenhower’s References in State History Textbooks

Eisenhower was referenced in at least one of the state history textbooks used in the states of Arkansas, Georgia, Missouri, Texas, and Virginia for one of three reasons. The first was for his service as Supreme Allied Commander during World War II (e.g., Brown, 2010; London, 2005; Willoughby, 2003). The second was for ordering U.S. troops to Little Rock, Arkansas, to allow the “Little Rock Nine” into Central High School (e.g., Hopper et al., 2008; Berry, 2007; Kline & Pascoe, 2005) The third was for his “creation” of the interstate highway system (e.g., Anderson et al., 2003; Berry, 2007; Hodge, 2005; Wray, 2002).

However, there were other mentions concerning Eisenhower that did not reference any of these events. In one of the Georgia textbooks, Eisenhower received a mention because he was stationed at Fort Benning, a Georgia based fort, in 1926 (Hodge, 2005). Also, as discussed previously, a quote by Eisenhower was used in the Nebraska textbook published by Gibbs Smith. In fact, this quote was the only reference made in the Nebraska textbook to any 20th or 21st century president.
In the collection of textbooks from Texas, Eisenhower was mentioned for four reasons. One was for being a native of the state (Anderson et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Rocha et al., 2003; Willoughby, 2003). The second was for believing in ideals that were supported by conservative Texas Democrats which led many Texans to vote for the Republican Party for the first time (Anderson, et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Rocha et al., 2003). The third was for his support of allowing Texas to receive revenues from the oil that was found in the “tidelands” (Anderson et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Rocha et al., 2003). The last was for his actions in “ending” the Korean War (Willoughby, 2003). Finally, similarly to the Nebraska textbook, a quote from Eisenhower was used in two Texas textbooks to open a chapter (Rocha et al. 2003; Willoughby, 2003).

John F. Kennedy

Kennedy was mentioned in 15 (36%) of the 42 textbooks examined. Two were from the state of Arkansas, four from Georgia, one from California, one from Massachusetts, one from Missouri, two from Ohio, and four from Texas. Kennedy received a total of 196 (7%) of the 2,801 total presidential mentions found in the collection of state history textbooks. The textbook in which Kennedy received the largest number of mentions was *Massachusetts: Our Home*, produced by Gibbs Smith, with a total of 52 references (see Table 4.9).

Kennedy’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs

In reference to the applicability of Kennedy’s 196 textbook mentions to Cronin’s (1974) three constructs, there were 26 (13%) comments that correlated with Cronin’s (1974) first construct, which claims that in textbooks, “the President is the strategic catalyst” in the domestic and international systems (p. 60). There were 20 (10%) comments concerning the second construct, which argues that in textbooks, “only the President is or can be the genuine architect
of United States Public Policy” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60). Finally, there were 22 (11%) mentions that correlated to the third construct, which states that in textbooks, “the President must be the nation’s personal and moral leader” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60) (see Table 4.10).

An example of one of these mentions correlated to the first construct. It was found in the Massachusetts textbook published by Gibbs Smith. In this mention, Stockwell & Thomas (2004) describe Kennedy’s international and domestic policies and portray Kennedy as the catalyst for these events. They write, “He went on television to talk about civil rights. He started the Peace Corps to help people around the world. He also wanted our country to lead the race to explore space” (Stockwell & Thomas, 2004, p. 183).

Kennedy’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns

As mentioned previously, Kennedy received the most mentions in the Massachusetts history textbook. Kennedy’s ranking in this textbook related to the Carter pattern, the theory that a president(s) from the state or who lived in the state for a time will receive the most mentions in state textbooks (see Table 4.6). In addition, Kennedy received mentions that correlated to the McKinley pattern, the theory that presidents are referenced in state history textbooks due to their connection to a state. The states whose textbook references about Kennedy correlated to this pattern were Arkansas, Georgia, and Texas (see Table 4.5).

The Nature of Kennedy’s References in State History Textbooks

Kennedy was referenced in at least one of the state history textbooks used in Arkansas, California, Georgia, Massachusetts, and Texas for at least two of three reasons. The first was for his support of the Civil Rights movement (e.g. Hopper et al, 2008; London, 2005; Stockwell & Thomas, 2004; Willoughby, 2003). The second was for ordering U.S. troops into Vietnam (e.g. Hopper et al., 2008; London, 2005; Rocha et al., 2003). The last concerned his assassination (e.g.
Anderson et al., 2003; Hopper et al., 2008; London, 2005; Porter et al., 2007; Stockwell & Thomas, 2004).

However, there were other mentions concerning Kennedy that did not reference any of these events. In the Arkansas textbook, published by the University of Arkansas Press, Kennedy received mentions concerning his action of sending federal troops to the University of Alabama to help integrate the university, and the decisions he made during the Bay of Pigs and Cuban Missile Crisis (Hopper et al., 2008). He was mentioned in both Arkansas textbooks for visiting the state to dedicate Greer’s Ferry Dam and Reservoir in 1963 (Berry, 2007; Hopper et al., 2008).

In the collection of Georgia textbooks, Kennedy was referenced for the praise he gave to the Atlanta Public School System for their peaceful integration in 1961 (Kline & Pascoe, 2005; London, 2005), his appointment of Georgian Dean Rusk as Secretary of State, and the role he played during the Cuban Missile Crisis (Hodge, 2005; Jackson et al., 2004; London, 2005). In addition, the Georgia textbook, published by the Carl Vinson Institute, and similarly to the Arkansas text, mentioned Kennedy for using federal troops to integrate colleges in Alabama and Mississippi (Jackson et al., 2004).

In a few of the textbooks used in the state of Missouri and Ohio, Kennedy was mentioned for his support of the development of the United States’ space program. Kennedy was referenced in one Missouri textbook published by the Clairmont press for this reason. In his discussion of the United States’ space program, Brown (2010) does not reference Kennedy’s famous speech, which challenged Americans to help put a man on the moon by the end of the decade, but rather includes a picture of Kennedy with the caption “President John F. Kennedy inspects a Mercury capsule” (p. 274). In two Ohio textbooks, published by Macmillan McGraw Hill and Gibbs
Smith, Kennedy was also mentioned for his support of the space program (Banks et al., 2007; Stockwell, 2004) and how his challenge for Americans to reach the moon by the end of the decade caused native Ohioans John Glenn and Neil Armstrong to be in the forefront of NASA’s space program.

In the Texas textbooks, Kennedy was referenced for several reasons besides his assassination in the state. The first was his selection of Texan Lyndon B. Johnson as his vice-president (Anderson, et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Rocha et al., 2003; Willoughby, 2003). The second was for a 1960 speech in Houston, reassuring voters about his Catholic faith (Anderson et al., 2003) and the support he received by Mexican-Americans in Texas (Anderson et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003). Finally, akin to the Ohio textbooks, his support for the space program was referenced due to Texas’ aero-space industry and the location of the Johnson Space Center (Anderson et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Rocha et al., 2003; Willoughby, 2003).

In the textbook used in Massachusetts, several elements of Kennedy’s life, in addition to his support for the Civil Rights movement and his assassination in Dallas, were chronicled in the texts. Obviously, the fact that he was a native of the state was documented (Stockwell & Thomas, 2004). In addition, his family’s history, his time as a student both in grade school and at Harvard, his service in World War II, and his election as both America’s youngest and first Roman Catholic president were discussed. Kennedy’s leadership in the space program and his life in the White House were also topics included in the text (Stockwell & Thomas, 2004).

Lyndon Johnson

Lyndon Johnson was mentioned in 12 (29%) of the 42 textbooks examined. Two were from the state of Arkansas, four from Georgia, one from Missouri, four from Texas, and one
from Vermont. Johnson received a total of 328 (12%) of the 2,801 total presidential mentions found in the collection of state history textbooks. Johnson received the largest amount of his presidential mentions in the collection of textbooks from his home state of Texas, with 267 (30%) mentions (see Table 4.9). Johnson received the largest number of mentions in the textbook, *Lone Star: The Story of Texas* (2003), produced by Pearson Prentice-Hall with a total of 81 references.

**Johnson’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs**

In reference to the applicability of Johnson’s 328 textbook mentions to Cronin’s (1974) three constructs, there were 55 (17%) comments that correlated with Cronin’s (1974) first construct, which states that in textbooks, “the President is the strategic catalyst” in the domestic and international political systems (p. 60). There were 54 (10%) comments concerning the second construct, which claims that in textbooks, “only the President is or can be the genuine architect of United States Public Policy” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60). Finally, there were 41 (13%) mentions that correlated to the third construct, which argues that in textbooks, “the President must be the moral leader” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60) (see Table 4.10).

An example of these mentions correlated to the second construct. It was found in the Georgia history textbook, published by the Clairmont Press. London’s (2005) description of Johnson’s stance on civil rights, and his vow to pass the Civil Rights Amendment of 1964, illustrates to her student readers that Johnson was “the genuine architect of United States public policy,” and that only he, by attacking Civil Rights issues “frontally and aggressively” was the “engine to move the nation forward” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60). London (2005) writes that “President Johnson vowed to continue fighting for the earliest possible passage of President Kennedy’s civil
rights bill. Under President Johnson’s leadership…the Civil Rights Act of 1964 became law” (p. 444).

**Johnson’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns**

As mentioned previously, Johnson received the most mentions in all four of the Texas history textbooks. Johnson’s ranking in these textbooks related to the Carter pattern, the theory that a president(s) from the state or who lived in the state for a time will receive the most mentions in state history textbooks (see Table 4.6). In addition, Johnson received mentions that correlated to the McKinley pattern, the theory that presidents are referenced in state history textbooks due to their connection to a state. The states whose textbook references about Johnson correlated to this pattern were Georgia and Texas (see Table 4.5). Johnson did not meet the requirements for the Roosevelt and Eisenhower patterns.

**The Nature of Johnson’s References in State History Textbooks**

Johnson was referenced in at least one of the state history textbooks used in the states of Arkansas, Georgia, and Texas for three reasons. The first was for becoming president after Kennedy’s assassination (e.g., Anderson et al., 2003; Hopper et al., 2008; London, 2005). The second was for his domestic policies, such as supporting the civil rights movement, including the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as well as his formation of the Great Society programs (e.g., Hopper et al., 2008; London, 2005; Willoughby, 2003). The last was for escalating U.S. involvement in Vietnam, which led to his decision not to seek a second term (e.g., Anderson et al., 2003; Berry, 2007; Hodge, 2005).

However, there were other mentions in the state history textbooks concerning Johnson that only mentioned one or did not reference any of these events. For example, in the Missouri textbook, published by the Clairmont Press, Johnson was mentioned for signing the Civil Rights
Act of 1964, but nothing was said about his role in escalating the Vietnam War. Additionally, in the Vermont textbook published by Children’s Press, Johnson was mentioned for being the first Democratic presidential nominee to win the state since 1856 (Heinrichs, 2002). In the Arkansas textbook, published by Gibbs Smith, Berry (2007) discusses Arkansas Senator James Fulbright’s strong opposition to Johnson’s Vietnam policy.

In the Georgia textbooks, Johnson’s relationships with three political leaders from the state were discussed. In two textbooks, Johnson was mentioned for awarding Georgia Congressman Carl Vinson the Presidential Medal of Freedom (London, 2005; Kline & Pascoe, 2005). In the two other Georgia textbooks, Johnson was mentioned for failing to listen to Senator Richard B. Russell’s warnings about escalating U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War (Hodge, 2005; Jackson et al., 2004). In addition, three Georgia textbooks mentioned Johnson’s relationship with Secretary of State, and native Georgian, Dean Rusk (Hodge, 2005; Jackson et al., 2004; London, 2005). Johnson was also mentioned for meeting with Georgian Martin Luther King, Jr. (Jackson et al., 2004).

In the textbooks used in Texas, several elements of Johnson’s life, in addition to his becoming president after Kennedy’s death, his support for the civil rights movement, and his escalation of the war in Vietnam, were mentioned. As with most of the other presidents, the fact that he was a native of the state was documented in all of the texts. The Texas textbooks spent more time discussing his work as a teacher (Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Rocha et al., 2003; Willoughby, 2003), his being named by Franklin Roosevelt as the head of the National Youth Administration in Texas (Anderson et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003), his Great Society programs (Anderson et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Rocha et al., 2003; Willoughby, 2003), and his support of the space program (Anderson et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Rocha,
In addition, the textbooks discussed two interesting stories concerning Johnson. One occurred while Johnson was a senator and he arranged for a Mexican-American soldier, Felix Longoria, to be buried with full military honors in Arlington National cemetery, because a white-only funeral home in Texas would not allow him a funeral service (Anderson et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Willoughby, 2003). The other was about how Johnson’s history of heart disease led to the passage of the 25th amendment (Anderson et al., 2003).

Richard Nixon

Richard Nixon was mentioned in 11 (26%) of the 42 textbooks examined. Two were from the state of Arkansas, two from California, three from Georgia, and four from Texas. Nixon received a total of 67 (2%) of the 2,801 total presidential mentions found in the collection of state history textbooks (see Table 4.9). Nixon received the largest amount of his presidential mentions in three textbooks from the state of Georgia, with 37 (60%) mentions. The textbook that referenced Nixon most often was, *Georgia in the American Experience* (2005), produced by McDougal Littell, with a total of 21 references.

**Nixon’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs**

In reference to the applicability of Nixon’s 67 textbook mentions to Cronin’s (1974) three constructs, there were three (4%) comments that correlated with Cronin’s (1974) first construct, which states that in textbooks, “the President is the strategic catalyst in the American political system and the central figure in the international system as well” (p. 60). There were no comments concerning the second construct which, claims that in textbooks, “only the President is or can be the genuine architect of United States Public Policy and only he, by attacking problems frontally and aggressively, and interpreting his power expansively, can be the engine of change to move the nation forward” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60) or the third construct, which claims
that in textbooks, “the President must be the nation’s personal and moral leader; by symbolizing the past and future greatness of America and radiating inspirational confidence, a President can pull the nation together while directing us toward the fulfillment of the American Dream” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60) (see Table 4.10).

An example of one of Nixon’s mentions was from the Arkansas textbook, *An Arkansas History for Young People*. In this text, Nixon was given credit as the “central figure in the international system” when the authors discussed his opening dialogue between the United States and China in 1972. As a reference in a time line, Hopper et al. (2008) write: “Nixon reopens talks with communist China” (p. 416).

Nixon’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns

Nixon received the most mentions in three of the Georgia history textbooks and not in his native state of California. Nixon was only mentioned two times in the California textbooks, ranking him as the sixth most mentioned president in these texts. This did not correlate to the Carter pattern, the theory that a president(s) from the state or who lived in the state for a time will receive the most mentions in the state’s history textbooks (see Table 4.6). In addition, Nixon received mentions that correlated to the McKinley pattern, the theory that presidents are referenced in the state history textbooks due to their positive connection to a state. The states whose textbook references about Nixon correlated to this pattern were Arkansas, Georgia, and Texas (see Table 4.5). Nixon’s presidency did not meet the criteria for the Eisenhower and Roosevelt patterns.

The Nature of Nixon’s References in State History Textbooks

Nixon was referenced in at least one of the state history textbooks used in the states of Arkansas, Georgia, and Texas for primarily one reason. The reason was his involvement in the
Watergate scandal and his resignation from office. Of the eight textbooks that discussed Nixon in these states, seven discussed the scandal (Anderson et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Hopper et al., 2003; Jackson et al., 2004; Kline & Pascoe, 2005; London, 2005; Rocha et al., 2003).

However, there were other mentions concerning Nixon that did not reference this event. In the Arkansas textbook, published by The University of Arkansas Press, Hopper et al. (2008) discuss Nixon’s attendance at the 1969 football game between the University of Arkansas and the University of Texas. In the other Arkansas textbook, published by Gibbs Smith, Berry (2007) describes how Nixon’s Vietnam policies were routinely criticized by Arkansas Senator James Fulbright.

In the collection of the Georgia textbooks, Nixon was referenced for several reasons. In one textbook, published by the Clairmont Press, he was mentioned for naming a nuclear powered aircraft carrier after Georgia Congressman Carl Vinson, and signing the Title IX bill into law (London, 2005). In the textbook produced by McDougal Littell he was mentioned for calling Atlanta Brave Hank Aaron to congratulate him for hitting his 715th home run (Kline & Pascoe, 2005). Finally, in three of the Georgia textbooks, he was referenced for his involvement in the Vietnam conflict and his removal of U.S. troops from the country (Kline & Pascoe, 2005; Jackson et al., 2004; London, 2005).

In the Texas textbooks Nixon was referenced for a variety of reasons. However, in the textbook published by Glencoe, the discussion of Nixon’s role in Vietnam offered a different conclusion about Nixon’s involvement in ending the war than the other textbooks from the state. Anderson et al. (2003) write, “Once in office, Richard Nixon struggled to end the war in Vietnam. His efforts did not bring peace, however, and opponents of the war increased their efforts to ‘bring the boys home’” (p. 563). After this mention of the Vietnam War, no conclusion
was offered to the students, and the section moved on to a discussion of the Watergate scandal. In addition to discussing Nixon’s role and eventual resignation due to the Watergate scandal, this text included a discussion about the two Texans who served on the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, Jack Brooks and Barbara Jordan (Anderson et al., 2003). Finally, Nixon was referenced in this text for “imposing a price freeze on beef,” which the authors claim caused several Texas feedlots to go out of business (Anderson et al., 2003, p. 570).

In the other three Texas textbooks, Nixon received fewer references than he did in the Glencoe text. Contrary to the account found in the Anderson et al.’s (2003) text concerning Nixon’s role in ending the war in Vietnam, in the textbook published by McDougal Littell, Rocha et al. (2003) claim that “in 1972, Republican Richard Nixon finally withdrew the last U.S. forces from Vietnam” (p. 521). However, the authors offered a similar account to the Anderson et al. (2003) discussion of Barbra Jordan’s role in Nixon’s impeachment hearings (Rocha et al., 2003). In the textbook published by Pearson Prentice-Hall, Nixon’s only mention was in the section discussing Congresswoman Barbara Jordon’s role in investigating the Watergate Scandal (Fehrenbach et al., 2003). Finally, in the textbook produced by Holt, Nixon was only referenced for carrying Texas in the 1972 presidential election (Willoughby, 2003).

In the textbooks used in California, Nixon’s native state, Nixon was only mentioned in textbooks published by Harcourt and Houghton Mifflin. In the textbook produced by Harcourt, Nixon was only referenced in the text for being one of “three people” from California to be elected president (Porter et al., 2007, p. 465). He was also mentioned in the reference section of the book for being “the thirty-seventh president of the United States; born in Yorba Linda” (Porter et al., 2007, p. R41). In the textbook published by Houghton Mifflin, Nixon was only mentioned for being born in the state (Viola et al., 2003).
Gerald Ford

Gerald Ford was mentioned in three (7%) of the 42 textbooks examined. All three were from the state of Georgia. Ford received a total of 16 (.05%) of the 2,801 of the total presidential mentions found in the state history textbooks (see Table 4.9). The textbook that mentioned Ford the most was *Georgia in the American Experience* (2005), produced by McDougal Littell with a total of 12 references. Ford had no textbook mentions that correlated to any of Cronin’s (1974) three constructs.

As mentioned previously, Ford received all of his mentions in three of the Georgia history textbooks. Ford did not receive any mentions in his home state of Nebraska, which did not correlate to the Carter pattern, the theory that a president(s) from the state or who lived in the state for a time will receive the most mentions in the state’s textbooks (see Table 4.6). In addition, Ford did not received any mentions that correlated to the McKinley pattern, the theory that presidents are referenced in state history textbooks due to their positive connection to a state (see Table 4.5). Ford did not meet the criteria set for the Eisenhower and Roosevelt patterns.

The Nature of Ford’s References in State History Textbooks

Ford was referenced in the Georgia history textbooks for pardoning Richard Nixon and/or losing to Georgian, Jimmy Carter, in the 1976 presidential election (Hodge, 2005; Kline & Pascoe, 2005; London, 2005). The Georgia history textbook published by McDougal Littell was the only textbook examined that offers a description for Ford’s presidency. Kline & Pascoe (2005) write, “During Ford’s administration, the economy was in bad shape. Inflation was high and people lost their jobs” (p. 489). In addition, though Ford’s native state of Nebraska referenced other native Nebraskans who only lived in the state for a short time, such as Malcolm X, or historic figures that were born in other states but lived in Nebraska for a short time, such as
General John J. Pershing, the authors of the text failed to mention Ford. This was also the case in the textbooks used by Presidents George H. W. Bush’s and George W. Bush’s native states.

Jimmy Carter

Jimmy Carter was mentioned in seven (17%) of the 42 textbooks examined. Two were from the state of Arkansas, four from Georgia, and one from Iowa. Carter received a total of 242 (9%) of the 2,801 of the total presidential mentions found in the state history textbooks. Carter received the largest amount of his presidential mentions in the collection of textbooks from his home state of Georgia, with 233 (26%) mentions (see Table 4.9). Carter received the largest amount of mentions in the textbook *Georgia in the American Experience* (2005), produced by McDougal Littell, with a total of 87 references.

Carter’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs

In reference to the applicability of Carter’s 242 textbook mentions to Cronin’s (1974) three constructs, there were 27 (11%) comments that correlated with Cronin’s (1974) first construct, which claims that in textbooks, “the President is the strategic catalyst” in the domestic and international political systems (p. 60). There were 11 (5%) comments concerning the second construct, which states that in textbooks, “only the President is or can be the genuine architect of United States Public Policy” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60). Finally, there were 14 (6%) mentions that correlated to the third construct, which argues that in textbooks, “the President must be the nation’s moral leader” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60) (see Table 4.10).

For example, a mention that correlated to the first construct was found in the Georgia textbook *The Georgia Studies Book: Our State and the Nation*, published by the Carl Vinson Institute. Jackson et al. (2004) discuss Carter’s success as a central figure in the international
affairs. They write, “He [Carter] won praise for working out a peace agreement between Israel and Egypt” (Jackson et al., 2004, p. 366).

Carter’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns

As mentioned previously, Carter received the largest number of mentions in the collection of four Georgia history textbooks. However, Carter received the most references in only two out of the four, and part-time Georgia resident Franklin Roosevelt received more mentions in the other two textbooks (see Table 4.6). Carter’s ranking in these textbooks related to the Carter pattern, the theory that a president(s) from the state or who lived in the state for a time will receive the most mentions in the state’s textbooks. In addition, Carter also received mentions that correlated to the McKinley pattern, the theory that presidents are referenced in state history textbooks due to their positive contributions or connection to the state. The states whose textbook references about Carter correlated to this pattern were Arkansas, Georgia, and Iowa (see Table 4.5). Carter did not meet the criteria established for the Roosevelt and Eisenhower patterns.

The Nature of Carter’s References in State History Textbooks

Similarly to the mentions concerning Theodore Roosevelt, Carter was not referenced in the state history textbooks for one or more overarching reasons, but primarily for his impact on that particular state. In the Arkansas textbook published by the University of Arkansas Press, Carter was referenced for being the only other Democratic presidential candidate, besides Bill Clinton, to receive Arkansas’ electoral vote since 1972. In fact, Hopper et al. (2008) assert, “Arkansans apparently liked the idea of having a southerner in the White House” (p. 422). Hopper et al. (2008) go on to link the presidencies of Carter and Clinton later in the book when they write, “Clinton chose many to serve in his administration who…had served under former
Democratic President Jimmy Carter” (p. 441). Jimmy Carter was also mentioned in this text for attending the dedication of the William J. Clinton Presidential Library and Museum (Hopper et al., 2008). In the second Arkansas textbook, published by Gibbs Smith, Carter was mentioned for housing 18,000 Cuban refugees at Fort Chaffee. Berry (2007) goes on to claim that these refugees “damaged buildings and other structures in the fort” which made the citizens of Arkansas angry and caused “Clinton to lose his bid for re-election” as governor of the state (p. 233).

Interestingly, Carter was also mentioned in an Iowa textbook. In the textbook From Sea to Shining Sea: Iowa, published by Children’s Press, Carter was referenced for his victory in the 1976 Iowa Caucuses (Balcavage, 2002). Balcavage (2002) goes on to mention that Carter was the “only nonincumbent candidate to win the Iowa Caucuses and then the presidency” (p. 49). She also claims that Carter’s victory caused the caucuses to “gain fame” nationwide (p. 73).

In the textbooks used in Georgia, Carter’s native state, several elements of his life before, during, and after his presidency were mentioned. As with many of the other presidents, the fact that he was a native and the only president from the state was documented in all of the texts. Carter’s earlier life was documented in all of these texts, including his childhood living on a peanut farm, attending Georgia Tech, and receiving a commission in the U.S Naval Academy. In the textbook published by WesMar, Carter’s recollections about his boyhood during the Great Depression were chronicled (Hodge, 2005). In two texts, Carter’s term as a state senator was mentioned (Hodge, 2005; Jackson et al., 2004), but his accomplishments as Georgia’s governor were mentioned in all four of the texts.

In addition, all of the Georgia textbooks stated that the Camp David peace accords were Carter’s greatest accomplishment as president, and they all discussed the factors that led to his
eventual loss to Ronald Reagan in the 1980 presidential election: a poor economy and the Iranian Hostage Crisis. He was also mentioned in two of the textbooks for appointing Georgian Andrew Young as ambassador to the United Nations (Hodge, 2005; Kline & Pascoe, 2005). Finally, three of the textbooks end their discussion about Carter by discussing his post presidential accomplishments, including being awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 2002 (Hodge, 2005; Jackson et al., 2004; London, 2005).

**Ronald Reagan**

Ronald Reagan was mentioned in 16 (38%) of the 42 textbooks examined. One was from the state of Arkansas, four from California, three from Georgia, four from Illinois, and four from Texas. Reagan received a total of 115 (4%) of the 2,801 total presidential mentions found in the state history textbooks (see Table 4.9). He received the largest amount of his presidential mentions in the collection of textbooks from the state of Georgia with 62 (54%) mentions. The textbook that mentioned Reagan the most was, *Georgia in the American Experience* (2005), produced by McDougal-Littell, with a total of 39 references.

**Reagan’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs**

In reference to the applicability of Reagan’s 115 textbook mentions to Cronin’s (1974) three constructs there were 11 (10%) comments that correlated with Cronin’s (1974) first construct, which states that in textbooks, “the President is the strategic catalyst in the American political system and the central figure in the international system as well” (p. 60). There were 10 (9%) comments concerning the second construct, which asserts that in textbooks, “only the President is or can be the genuine architect of United States Public Policy and only he, by attacking problems frontally and aggressively, and interpreting his power expansively, can be the engine of change to move the nation forward” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60). Finally, there were eight
(7%) mentions that correlated to the third construct, which claims that in textbooks, “the President must be the nation’s personal and moral leader; by symbolizing the past and future greatness of America and radiating inspirational confidence, a President can pull the nation together while directing us toward the fulfillment of the American Dream” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60) (see Table 4.10).

For example, a quote made by Reagan during his second Inaugural Address, correlated to Cronin’s (1974) third construct. This quote was found in the California textbook produced by Harcourt and made Reagan appear as the nation’s “personal and moral leader” who symbolizes “the future greatness of America” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60). Porter et al. (2007) include this quote in their biography about Reagan; it reads, “My fellow citizens, our nation is poised for greatness. We must do what we know is right and do it with all our might” (p. 477).

Reagan’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns

Reagan received the largest percentage of his overall mentions in the four Georgia history textbooks. In addition, Reagan received the largest number of presidential references in two out of the four California textbooks, the state where he was elected governor. He also received the largest number of 20th and 21st century presidential mentions in four of the five textbooks from his native state of Illinois (see Table 4.6). Reagan’s ranking in all of these textbooks related to the Carter pattern, the theory that a president(s) from the state or who lived in the state for a time will receive the most mentions in state history textbooks. Furthermore, Reagan received mentions that correlated to the McKinley pattern, the theory that presidents are referenced in state history textbooks due to their positive contributions or connection to a state. The states whose textbook references about Reagan correlated to this pattern were California and Texas (see Table 4.5). There were no other patterns for which Reagan met the criteria.
The Nature of Reagan’s References in State History Textbooks

Reagan was not referenced in the textbooks of the individual states for one specific reason. However, there were several references made about Reagan concerning many different topics. For example, in the Arkansas textbook, published by The University of Arkansas Press, Hopper et al.’s (2008) only reference about Reagan concerned Hinckley’s assassination attempt on Reagan’s life. This reference was placed in a timeline describing major events from the years 1966 until 1991. Reagan was not mentioned in the other Arkansas text.

In the Georgia textbooks, Reagan was mentioned mainly for his defeat of Jimmy Carter in the 1980 presidential election. For example, the textbook published by McDougal Littell discussed how Reagan’s rhetoric about freeing the American hostages in Iran led to Carter’s loss in the 1980 election (Kline & Pascoe, 2005). In the Carl Vinson text, Jackson et al. (2004) mention the hostage crisis as well, but claim that “the nation was ready for a change” and “after Reagan was sworn in as president, Iran freed the 52 hostages…” (p. 366).

In addition, two of the Georgia textbooks discussed two other elements of Reagan’s presidency. One was his domestic supply-side economic policy called “Reaganomics” and the other was his international “success” of bringing an end to the Cold War (Kline & Pascoe, 2005; London, 2005). It should be noted that in the textbook published by the Clairmont Press, “Reaganomics” was given a fairly critical examination in a subsection of the book called “Spotlight on the Economy.” London (2005) concludes this study on Reagan’s economic policies by writing, “Near the close of Reagan’s presidency, in October 1987, the stock market lost over 500 points in one day…Reaganomics had provided a good time for almost a full decade, but economic problems were looming in the nation’s future” (p. 469).
Though Reagan was born in the state of Illinois, he has traditionally been better known for his rise in politics in the state of California. Nevertheless, unlike the examples of the number of mentions concerning Gerald Ford, George H. W. Bush, and George W. Bush by their native states, the majority of the textbooks used by both California and Illinois appeared to claim Reagan as their own. Reagan was mentioned in all of the California textbooks. In these books he received references for being governor of California and eventually the President of the United States. In the textbook published by Macmillan McGraw-Hill, Reagan was referenced with the use of an unspecified presidential speech concerning the accomplishments that were made by immigrants (Banks et al., 2003). In the Harcourt textbook, Reagan received several references in a short biographical subsection of the textbook. In this biography, Reagan’s childhood, life guard heroics, his move to Hollywood and acting career, and his accomplishments as California’s governor and as president were discussed (Banks et al., 2005). Banks et al. (2003) summarize Reagan’s presidency by writing, “As President, Reagan worked to make the federal government smaller and to keep the United States strong against the enemies of democracy” (p. 477).

In Reagan’s native state of Illinois, he was mentioned in four of the five textbooks I studied (Anderson, 2002; Burgan, 2008; Kummer, 2003; Sommerville, 2008). In all four of the textbooks, Reagan was referenced for being a native of the state, his move to California, becoming a “successful” actor, governor of California, and eventually the president. In addition, in the textbook America the Beautiful: Illinois, Burgan (2008) describes Reagan as “one of America’s most charismatic presidents” (p. 110).

George H.W. Bush

George Herbert Walker Bush was mentioned in 11 (26%) of the 42 textbooks examined. One was from the state of Arkansas, two from California, four from Georgia, and four Texas.
Bush received a total of 134 (5%) of the 2,801 of the total presidential mentions found in the state history textbooks (see Table 4.9). He received the largest amount of his presidential mentions in the collection of textbooks from the state of Texas with 101 (75%) mentions. The textbook that referenced Bush the most was *Celebrating Texas: Honoring the Past, Building the Future* (2003), produced by McDougal Littell, which mentioned him 39 times.

**George H. W. Bush’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs**

In reference to the applicability of Bush’s 134 textbook mentions to Cronin’s (1974) three constructs there were 18 (13%) comments that correlated with Cronin’s (1974) first construct, which states that in textbooks, “the President is the strategic catalyst” in the domestic and international political systems (p. 60). There were 10 (7%) comments concerning the second construct, which contends that in textbooks, “only the President is or can be the genuine architect of United States Public Policy” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60). Finally, there were 5 (4%) mentions that correlated to the third construct, which argues that in textbooks, the President “must be the nation’s moral leader” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60) (see Table 4.10).

For example, a mention that correlated to the first construct was found in the Georgia textbook, *Georgia in the American Experience*, published by McDougal Littell. This reference displayed Bush as being the “central figure in the international system” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60). Kline and Pascoe (2005) write “President Bush led a group of 39 nations in sending United Nations military forces to free Kuwait” (p. 495).

**George H.W. Bush’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns**

Bush received most of his mentions in the collection of Texas history textbooks, his “adopted” state, and was the 5th highest ranking president in the state. Interestingly, Bush did not receive any references in his native state of Massachusetts (see Table 4.6). In two of the Texas
textbooks, Bush’s mentions related to the Carter pattern, the theory that a president(s) from the state or who lived in the state for a time will receive the most mentions in the state’s history textbooks, because he only received fewer mentions in these books in relation to the other presidents from the state. However, in two other textbooks from Texas, Bush ranked behind a non-Texan which did not meet the criteria set for this pattern. In addition, unlike Reagan, who was the most mentioned president in the collection of textbooks from both his native and adopted states, Bush was not referenced in the state history textbook used in his native state of Massachusetts, and thus this book did not meet the criteria for this pattern either.

Bush also received mentions that correlated to the McKinley pattern, the theory that presidents are referenced in state history textbooks due to their positive connection to a state. The states whose textbook references about Bush correlated to this pattern were Arkansas, California, Georgia, and Texas (see Table 4.5). There were no other patterns for which Bush met the criteria.

The Nature of George H. W. Bush’s References in State History Textbooks

Bush was not referenced in the state history textbooks used in the states of Arkansas, California, Georgia, and Texas for one specific reason. Each state had a different reason for mentioning him in their text. In the Arkansas textbook, published by the University of Arkansas Press, Bush, along with Richard Nixon, was referenced for attending the 1969 football game between the University of Arkansas and the University of Texas. Similarly to the portrayal of other one-term presidents, such as Herbert Hoover in most textbooks, and Gerald Ford in the Georgia textbooks, Bush was described as an antagonist to the president that won the election, in this case Arkansas native Bill Clinton. In describing the differences between Bush and Clinton, as well as third party candidate, Ross Perot, Hopper et al. (2008) claim that, “many considered both of Clinton’s opponents to be ‘millionaire’ candidates…Voters were concerned about the
economy, jobs, and social security—things many felt Bush and Perot could not relate to” (p. 440). Bush, along with presidents Jimmy Carter and George W. Bush, was also referenced for attending the opening of the Clinton Presidential Library.

In two California textbooks, Bush was mentioned for his official apology to Japanese Americans who were placed in internment camps during World War II. In the textbook published by Houghton Mifflin, a mention of the apology was located directly in the text (Viola et al., 2007). The textbook published by Harcourt mentioned the apology in a subsection entitled “Points of View: Relocation of Japanese Americans.” In this section, a quote from Bush’s official letter of apology was included (Porter et al., 2007, p. 385).

Bush was mentioned in the Georgia textbooks for several reasons. In three of the texts, he was referenced for his leadership during Operation Desert Storm (Jackson et al., 2004; Kline & Pascoe, 2005; London, 2005). In one of the textbooks, the reference concerning the police action in Iraq was followed with a mention that Bush visited Georgia’s Fort Stuart after the campaign (Kline & Pascoe, 2005). He also received mentions in one of the textbooks for the recession that plagued his presidency (London, 2005). In the textbook published by McDougal Littell, Bush was referenced for being the president at the end of the Cold War (Kline & Pascoe, 2005). In the textbook published by WesMar, Bush was only mentioned for being the father of sitting President George W. Bush (Hodge, 2005). Finally, he was referenced for appointing Georgian Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court (Jackson et al., 2004).

As mentioned previously, even though he was a war hero and president born in the state, the Massachusetts textbook made no references concerning George H.W. Bush. However, he received a large number of mentions in his adopted state of Texas. In all of the Texas textbooks Bush was referenced for his service as vice-president under Ronald Reagan and his one-term
presidency (Anderson, et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Rocha et al., 2003; Willoughby, 2003). It should be noted that the Texas textbooks offered a different reason for Bush’s defeat than the one found in the Arkansas textbook, which claimed that Clinton defeated Bush due to his being out of touch with the “people.” For example, in the Texas textbook published by Glencoe, the authors argue that the reason for this loss was the entrance of third party candidate, and fellow Texan, Ross Perot in the campaign (Anderson et al, 2003). Two other textbooks referenced the economic recession as the reason for Bush’s defeat (Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Willoughby, 2003). Bush was also referenced in all of the textbooks for being the father of sitting President George W. Bush, and, similarly to the Georgia textbooks, he was mentioned for his leadership during *Operation Desert Storm*.

Bush was mentioned for several other reasons in the Texas textbooks. In the Glencoe text, Bush was referenced in a subsection called “Economics & History,” with a photo of him presenting Texas Instruments employee Jack Kilby with an unspecified award (Anderson et al., 2003). In three of the textbooks, Bush’s early life was mentioned, including his birth place, his service during World War II, his move to Texas, his pre-political career in the Texas oil industry, and his role in several governmental leadership positions, including director of the Central Intelligence Agency (Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Rocha et al., 2003; Willoughby, 2003). He received mentions in the Holt textbook for appointing several Texans to high ranking governmental positions during his administration, increasing the support for the “War on Drugs,” being president during the end of the Cold War, and signing the Americans with Disabilities Act (Willoughby, 2003, p. 614). Additionally, Willoughby (2003) includes a quote contributed to Bush concerning “freedom,” in an unidentified speech in a skills section of the chapter (p. 633).
In the Pearson text, Bush was also referenced for being president during the end of the Cold War. However, one of the most interesting references about Bush was a caption used for a picture showing him shaking hands with “Texans” after winning the presidency. Fehrenbach et al. (2003) ask their student readers, “Did it matter that Bush was not a native Texan? Why or why not?” (p. 455). He was also mentioned in this text for signing the North American Free Trade Agreement, which the authors claim was important to the Texas economy.

In the McDougal Littell text, Bush was referenced for signing the Americans with Disabilities Act. Rocha et al. (2003) give Bush credit for helping President Reagan win the state of Texas in the 1980 presidential election. Rocha et al. (2003) also include a section in the text called “Texas Tidbits,” which discusses former Texas Governor Ann Richards and her political rivalry with both George H. W. Bush and his son George W. Bush (p. 527).

Bill Clinton

Bill Clinton was mentioned in 13 (31%) of the 42 textbooks examined. Two were from the state of Arkansas, two from Iowa, one from New York, three from Georgia, four from Texas, and one from Vermont. Clinton received a total of 164 (5%) of the 2,801 total presidential mentions found in the state history textbooks. He received the largest amount of his presidential mentions in the collection of textbooks from the state of Arkansas with 135 (82%) mentions (see Table 4.9). The textbook that held the largest number of mentions about Clinton was An Arkansas History for Young People (2008), produced by the University of Arkansas Press. In this text, Clinton was mentioned a total of 98 times.

Clinton’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs

In reference to the applicability of Clinton’s 164 textbook mentions to Cronin’s (1974) three constructs, there were 12 (7%) comments that correlated with Cronin’s (1974) first
construct, which argues that in textbooks the president” is the strategic catalyst” in the domestic and international political systems (p. 60). There were also 12 (7%) comments concerning the second construct, which claims that in textbooks “only the President is or can be the genuine architect of United States Public Policy” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60). Finally, there were seven (4%) mentions that correlated to the third construct, which declares that in textbooks, “the President must be the nation’s moral leader” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60) (see Table 4.10).

For example, a mention about Clinton that correlated to the second construct was found in the Arkansas textbook, *The Arkansas Journey*, published by Gibbs Smith. This reference displayed Clinton as being the “genuine architect of United States Public Policy” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60) Berry (2007) writes:

> When President Clinton took office the federal deficit had reached almost $290 billion. In order to lower this amount Clinton persuaded Congress to raise taxes mainly for wealthy families. He also tried to reduce government spending. The results were impressive. (pp. 234-235)

**Clinton’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns**

Clinton received most of his mentions in the collection of Arkansas history textbooks (see Table 4.6). In both textbooks, Clinton’s mentions related to the Carter pattern, the theory that a president(s) from the state or who lived in the state for a time will receive the most mentions in the state’s history textbook(s). In addition, Clinton received mentions that correlated to the McKinley pattern, the theory that presidents are often referenced in state history textbooks due to their positive contributions or connection to a state. The states whose textbook references about Clinton correlated to this pattern were Arkansas, Iowa, and Texas (see Table 4.5). There were no other patterns for which Clinton met the criteria.
The Nature of Clinton’s References in State History Textbooks

Clinton was referenced in at least one of the state history textbooks used in the states of Arkansas, Georgia, and Texas for primarily one reason. The reason was his involvement in the Lewinsky scandal and his impeachment trial. However, of the seven textbooks that discussed Clinton in these states, only five discussed his impeachment which stemmed from the scandal (i.e., Berry, 2007; Hopper et al, 2003; Jackson et al., 2004; Kline & Pascoe, 2005; Rocha et al., 2003).

In addition, each state had different reasons for mentioning Clinton in their textbooks. In two of the Georgia textbooks, Clinton was referenced for his budget battles with the Republican controlled House of Representatives, led by House Speaker and Georgian Newt Gingrich. This conflict led to the brief government shutdown in 1995 (Kline & Pascoe, 2005; London, 2005). In the third Georgia textbook, Clinton received a timeline reference which states “Bill Clinton wins second term as president” (Jackson et al., 2004, p. 317).

Clinton received relatively few mentions in the textbooks of Iowa, New York, Texas, and Vermont. In these books, there were no references made about his impeachment, but were based on his connection to the state. He was mentioned in two of the Iowa textbooks for declaring Iowa a “disaster area” during a flood that ravaged the state in 1993 (Balcavage, 2002; LaDoux, 2002). He was mentioned in the New York textbook published by McGraw Hill for two reasons. One was about the Erie Canal, which was called “Clinton’s Ditch.” Banks et al. (2001) want students to understand it was named for Governor DeWitt Clinton, not President Bill Clinton (p. 139). The second reference was made for Clinton’s appointment of New York native Ruth Ginsburg to the Supreme Court (Banks et al., 2001). Clinton was mentioned in all of the textbooks from Texas for defeating George H.W. Bush (Anderson, et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Rocha
et al., 2003; Willoughby, 2003). In three of the four textbooks, he was also mentioned for appointing Texas native, Henry Cisneros, to his cabinet (Anderson, et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Rocha et al., 2003). In the Vermont text, published by Children’s Press, Clinton was mentioned as being only one of two democratic presidents, Johnson being the other, who won the state’s electoral votes (Heinrichs, 2002).

Clinton received the largest number of mentions in the two textbooks from his home state of Arkansas. Both texts discussed Clinton’s early life, the fact that he was the youngest elected governor in the United States’ history, his successes and failures as governor of the state, his presidential campaign, his election and inauguration, and his successes as president (e.g., balancing the budget, appointing more women and minorities into federal positions, “ending” the violence in Northern Ireland). The textbooks also discussed the scandals (e.g., “Whitewater,” “Travel Gate,” and the Lewinsky affair) that plagued Clinton’s administration. As mentioned previously, his impeachment was also discussed in both of these texts, and his presidential library was discussed a great deal in both books as well.

However, the textbook produced by the University of Arkansas press contained a much larger number of references about Clinton than the book produced by Gibbs Smith. In the Gibbs Smith text, Clinton was mentioned on only six pages, and, in addition to references concerning Clinton mentioned above, the only other mention concerning Clinton was the fact that poet Miller Williams and author Maya Angelou spoke at his inauguration (Berry, 2007). The University of Arkansas text made reference to Clinton on a total number of 27 pages. In addition to offering more detail about the references above, Hopper et al. (2008) mention Clinton as a point of reference in the geography section of the book, for presenting the “Little Rock Nine” with Congressional Gold medals in 1999, naming Dr. Jocelyn Elders Surgeon General of the
United States, being the “first e-mail administration,” writing his autobiography, and finally for his friendship with television producer and native Arkansan Harry Thomason.

**George W. Bush**

George W. Bush was mentioned in 16 (38%) of the 42 textbooks examined. Two were from the state of Arkansas, two from California, four from Georgia, one from Iowa, two from Missouri, one from Ohio, and four Texas. Bush received a total of 206 (6%) of the 2,801 total presidential mentions found in the state history textbooks. He received the largest amount of his presidential mentions in the collection of textbooks from the state of Texas, with 145 (70%) mentions (see Table 4.7). Bush received his largest number of mentions in the textbooks *Holt: Texas!* (2003), published by Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, and *Texas & Texans* (2003), produced by Glencoe, with a total of 59 references in each text.

**George W. Bush’s Correlation to Cronin’s Constructs**

In reference to the applicability of Bush’s 206 textbook mentions to Cronin’s (1974) three constructs there were 34 (17%) comments that correlated with Cronin’s (1974) first construct, which states that in textbooks, “the President is the strategic catalyst in the American political system and the central figure in the international system as well” (p. 60). There were 26 (13%) comments concerning the second construct, which claims that in textbooks, “only the President is or can be the genuine architect of United States Public Policy and only he, by attacking problems frontally and aggressively, and interpreting his power expansively, can be the engine of change to move the nation forward” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60). Finally, there were 20 (10%) mentions that correlated to the third construct which, contends that in textbooks, “the President must be the nation’s personal and moral leader; by symbolizing the past and future greatness of America and radiating inspirational confidence, a President can pull the nation
together while directing us toward the fulfillment of the American Dream” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60) (see Table 4.10).

An example of one of these references about George Bush correlated to the third construct. It was found in the Missouri textbook published by Gibbs Smith. In this text, Gall (2006) includes a quote from a speech Bush gave “praising volunteers in Springfield, Missouri” in 2004 (p. 248). The quote reads, “The strength of America is in the hearts and souls of our citizens, people who are willing to feed the hungry, provide shelter for the homeless, love a neighbor in need” (Gall, 2006, p. 248). This quote correlated to Cronin’s (1974) third construct because, with its spiritual undertones, the authors appeared to use it as a way to present Bush as the “nation’s personal and moral leader” (p. 60).

George W. Bush’s Correlation to the Presidential Patterns

As mentioned previously, Bush received most of his mentions in the collection of Texas history textbooks, his “adopted” state, and was the second highest ranking president in the state. Interestingly, Bush did not receive any references in his native state of Connecticut (see Table 4.6). In three of the Texas textbooks, Bush’s mentions related to the Carter pattern, the theory that a president(s) from the state or who lived in the state for a time will receive the most mentions in the state’s history textbook(s), because he only received fewer mentions in these books in relation to other Texans. However, in one other textbook from Texas he received fewer mentions than non-native Franklin Roosevelt. Also, since Bush was not referenced in the text from his native state of Connecticut, he did not meet this pattern there either. Bush also received mentions that correlated to the McKinley pattern, the theory that presidents are often referenced in state history textbooks due to their positive connection to a state. The states whose textbook
references about Bush correlated to this pattern were Arkansas, Georgia, Iowa, Missouri, and Texas (see Table 4.5).

Due to the fact that he was the sitting president at the time of the publication of the textbooks studied, George W. Bush was the president examined in order to determine if the Eisenhower pattern, the theory that state history textbooks will often make reference to the sitting president, was evident in the state history textbooks. The Eisenhower pattern was the least identified pattern of the four I investigated found in the 42 textbooks examined. Only 16 of the textbooks I analyzed displayed this pattern (see Table 4.4), while 26 textbook displayed the McKinley pattern, 37 displayed the Carter pattern, and 39 displayed the Roosevelt pattern. However, George W. Bush was still mentioned in the 3rd largest number of textbooks (16), behind highly regarded presidents Franklin Roosevelt (33) and Woodrow Wilson (21) and tied with presidents Herbert Hoover and Ronald Reagan (see Table 4.8). It can be assumed that the main reason behind Bush being referenced in these state history textbooks was due to his position as the sitting president.

The Nature of George W. Bush’s References in State History Textbooks

Bush was referenced in at least one of the state histories textbooks used in the states of Arkansas, California, Georgia, Missouri, and Texas for at least one of two reasons. The first was for defeating Al Gore in the “closest” presidential election in American history (e.g., Hopper et al., 2008; London, 2005; Porter et al., 2007; Willoughby, 2003). The second was for his response to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, such as the U.S. led attacks on Afghanistan, and later Iraq, known as the “War on Terror”, or his creation of the Department of Homeland Security (e.g., Anderson et al., 2003; Berry, 2007; Gall, 2006; Hodge, 2005).
However, there were other mentions concerning Bush found in state history textbooks that did not reference these events. In the Arkansas textbook, published by the University of Arkansas Press, Bush was mentioned for extending the Voting Rights Act of 1964 in 2006, for attending the opening of Clinton’s Presidential Library, and appointing Arkansas native Tim Hutchinson as head of the Drug Enforcement Agency (Hopper et al., 2008). The California (2003) and Ohio (2007) textbooks, both published by Macmillan McGraw-Hill, only made reference to Bush in a timeline concerning his re-election in 2004. Finally, Bush was mentioned in the Iowa textbook published by Children’s Press for visiting a local restaurant in the state during the 2000 presidential election (Balcavage, 2002).

With the exception of Texas, Bush received more references in the collection of Georgia textbooks (42) than he did in the textbooks from any other state. Other than a more detailed description of both the 2000 election and the conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq, Bush was also referenced as being the son of former president George H.W. Bush (Hodge, 2005; London, 2005), for granting a Columbia born soldier who had been killed in Iraq but lived in the state posthumous citizenship before burial (London, 2005), for visiting the state in support of Georgia Governor Sonny Perdue and Senator Saxby Chambliss (London, 2005), as well as to Fort Stewart in 2003 (Kline & Pascoe, 2005; Jackson et al., 2004), his family life (Hodge, 2005), his domestic policies, including “No Child Left Behind” and his support of national tax rebates (Hodge, 2005). In addition, Bush was referenced in a Georgia textbook for being the only governor of Texas to be elected to two terms (Hodge, 2005).

Similarly to both Gerald Ford and his father, George H.W. Bush, George W. Bush was not mentioned in the textbook from his native state, Connecticut. However, he received the second largest number of mentions in the collection of textbooks from Texas, his adopted state.
This largely stems from the fact that in these books he appeared to be a popular Texas governor. So popular, in fact, that he was the only Texas governor to be elected to two consecutive terms. In addition to his election and the “War on Terror,” the Texas textbooks referenced Bush for being the son of a former president (Anderson et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Rocha et al., 2003; Willoughby, 2003) growing up in the state (Anderson et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Rocha et al., 2003; Willoughby, 2003), his education at both Yale and Harvard (Anderson et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003), his military service in the Texas Air National Guard (Anderson et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003), his accomplishments and political appointments as governor (Anderson et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Rocha et al., 2003; Willoughby, 2003), his election as president (Anderson et al., 2003; Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Willoughby, 2003), his appointments of several Texas natives to federal positions (Fehrenbach et al., 2003; Willoughby, 2003) and, similarly to Eisenhower, his presidential policies that were favorable to the state of Texas (Rocha et al., 2003).

Summary
In summary, my examination of the 42 state history textbooks revealed that there was a small correlation of Cronin’s (1974) constructs of the textbook presidency to the 20th and 21st century presidential mentions found in these texts. In addition, there was evidence that the four presidential patterns that I determined in a pilot study were applicable to the presidential references found in the 42 state history textbooks I examined for this study. Furthermore, I found that by categorizing the textbooks based on region, individual state, each state’s use of textbook adoption committees, grade level of the intended audience, and the size of the publishers, yielded slightly different results based on each grouping. Finally, the individual references concerning the 20th and 21st century presidents in state history textbooks both mirrored the presidential
portrayals found in national history textbooks in some cases (Cronin, 1974; Loewen, 1995; Sanchez, 1996; Stern, 1996), but, in other cases, were quite different due to the individual impact that the president had on a particular state’s history.

In regard to the applicability of Cronin’s (1974) constructs to the presidential mentions found in state history textbooks, the number of references that correlated to these constructs was relatively low in comparison to the total number of presidential mentions found in these books. Overall, the first construct, which states that in textbooks the “president is the strategic catalyst in the American political system and the central figure in the international system as well” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60), correlated to the largest number of the overall state history textbook mentions with 522 (19%) of the 2,801 total mentions. When examining this construct based on region, the textbooks from the southern states had the largest percentage of their mentions correlate to this construct while the textbooks from the northern states had the lowest percentage. The textbooks used in the state of Virginia had the largest percentage of presidential mentions correlate to the first construct, while the textbook used in the state of Nebraska had the smallest. In addition, a larger percentage of correlations to this construct were found in the textbooks used by adoption states, intended for audiences in the middle grades, and produced by smaller/regional publishers.

The second construct, which claims that in textbooks the president “is or can be the genuine architect of United States public policy and only he, by attacking problems frontally and aggressively, and interpreting his power expansively, can be the engine of change to move the nation forward” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60), had the second largest percentage of mentions correlating to the total number of presidential references with 16% (441). The textbooks used in the western states contained the largest number of mentions which correlated to this construct, while the
textbooks from the northern states had the fewest. Moreover, the textbook used in the state of Connecticut had the largest percentage of mentions which related to this construct. In addition, a larger correlation of textbook mentions that correlated to the second construct was found in the textbooks used by adoption states, intended for audiences in the middle-grades, and produced by smaller/regional publishers.

The third construct, which contends that in textbooks the president “must be the nation’s personal and moral leader; by symbolizing the past and future greatness of America and radiating inspirational confidence, a President can pull the nation together while directing us toward the fulfillment of the American Dream” (Cronin, 1974, p. 60), correlated to the smallest percentage of the overall presidential mentions found in the state history textbooks at 12% (339). The textbooks from the West had the largest percentage of their mentions correlate to this construct, while the textbooks from the Midwest had the smallest. Furthermore, the textbook used in the state of Nebraska had the largest percentage of its mentions correlate to this construct, while the textbooks from the state of Virginia had the smallest. In addition, a larger correlation to this construct was found in the textbooks used by adoption states, intended for elementary grades students, and produced by smaller/regional publishers.

Overall, in regard to the applicability of the four presidential patterns I discovered in a pilot study to the most recently published or adopted state history textbooks, I found that three of these patterns (i.e., the McKinley, the Carter, and the Roosevelt) were present in a large number of the textbooks studied. However, the Eisenhower pattern was not. In addition, by categorizing the textbooks based on region, individual state, participation in the textbook adoption process, grade level, and size of the textbook publisher resulted in varying conclusions.
I found that the William McKinley pattern, or the theory that if the president made a positive contribution or had a connection to the state that they would often be referenced in the state history text(s), was evident in 28 of the 42 textbooks examined. The region that had the largest number of textbooks that displayed this pattern was the South, while the Midwest had the fewest. The textbooks used in the southern states also mentioned the most presidents based on this pattern, while the textbooks used in the northern states mentioned the fewest. All of the textbooks used in the states of Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Iowa, Missouri, and Texas mentioned at least one president that met this pattern. In comparison, all of the textbooks used in the states of Illinois, Massachusetts, and Nebraska did not contain any mentions that correlated to this pattern. In addition, this pattern was found more in textbooks used by adoption states, textbooks intended for middle grades students, and textbooks produced by smaller publishers. The textbooks in these three categories also, on average, referenced a larger number of presidents who met the pattern.

I discovered that the Jimmy Carter pattern or the theory that a native born president will receive a larger number of mentions in his native state’s history textbook than other presidents was the pattern that was evident in the greatest number of textbooks. All of the textbooks used in the southern states met this pattern, while the collection of western textbooks had the smallest percentage. While most of the states’ textbooks referenced their native born presidents more often than other presidents, this was not the case in all books. The states of California, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Nebraska, and Ohio, used at least one textbook that did not mention their native born president. In addition, this pattern was found in more textbooks used by adoption states, textbooks intended for middle grades students, and produced by larger publishers. However, the textbooks used in non-adoption states, textbooks intended for
elementary students, and textbooks produced by smaller publishers, contained a larger overall percentage of mentions concerning their native born presidents.

I concluded that the Dwight Eisenhower pattern or the theory that state history textbooks will often make reference to the sitting president, to be the least identified pattern found in the 42 textbooks examined with only 16 textbooks making reference to George W. Bush. This pattern also showed the largest amount of variance between the textbooks used in each the five categories I created in order to more fully analyze the data. The collection of textbooks used in the states of Arkansas, Georgia, and Texas all displayed this pattern, while the collection of textbooks used in the states of Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, Vermont, and Virginia did not reference the sitting president. In addition, this pattern was found in a much larger percentage of textbooks used in adoption states, textbooks intended for middle grades learners, and produced by smaller/regional publishers.

I found evidence of the Theodore Roosevelt pattern, or the theory that presidents whose administrations are highly regarded nationally are often left out of state history textbooks was, to a degree, found in a majority of the textbooks I examined. Overall, only five textbooks mentioned all five of the presidents I identified as meeting the pattern (i.e., Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and Dwight Eisenhower). Franklin Roosevelt was mentioned in the largest number of textbooks with 33, while Truman was mentioned in 12, the fewest. However, when I took a frequency count of the mentions of each of these presidents, Franklin Roosevelt also received the largest number of total mentions with 539, but Theodore Roosevelt, not Truman, received the least (56).

Regionally, the textbooks used in the southern states mentioned the largest number of the identified Roosevelt pattern presidents, while the northern textbooks mentioned the smallest.
Franklin Roosevelt was mentioned in at least one of the textbooks used in all regions, while Dwight Eisenhower, Theodore Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and Woodrow Wilson, all failed to be mentioned in the textbooks of at least one region. Additionally, Arkansas was the only state whose collection of textbooks mentioned all five identified presidents. Finally, the textbooks used in adoption states, the textbooks intended for students at the middle grade level, and the textbooks published by smaller/regional companies, all had a larger number of references which were about the identified Roosevelt pattern presidents.

When I analyzed the number of textbook mentions concerning each of the 20th and 21st century presidents, I found that Franklin Roosevelt was mentioned in the largest number of textbooks and also received the greatest number of mentions. In comparison, Gerald Ford was mentioned in the fewest number of state history textbooks and also received the smallest number of references. The president who received the largest percentage of presidential mentions in their home state’s textbook(s) was John F. Kennedy, while Ford, George H. W. Bush, and George W. Bush received the smallest.

Additionally, I discovered that the president who had the largest percentage of mentions correlate to Cronin’s (1974) first construct was Woodrow Wilson. The president who had a largest percentage of references correlate to Cronin’s (1974) second construct was Franklin Roosevelt. The president who had the largest percentage of references correlate to Cronin’s (1974) third construct was Theodore Roosevelt. Finally, while some presidents, such as Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt received references due to their involvement in national historic events, the majority of presidents were mentioned in the history textbooks of each state based on the direct connection or influence that they had on each state’s distinctive history.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

In this chapter, I review and discuss the findings I discovered in this study. I examine my two research questions and five sub-questions. The two research questions were: (1) Are the first three constructs of Thomas Cronin’s (1974) “textbook presidency” theory (the belief that textbooks present a dangerous, over-idealized image of the president in college-level political science textbooks) applicable to recently published middle level state history textbooks? (2) Are the four presidential patterns that were discovered in a pilot study applicable to other recently published state history textbooks? The sub-questions (A) and (B) were: Is there a difference in the number and percentages of presidential mentions and presidential patterns that correlate to the constructs found in textbooks based on the region and the state where they are from (North, South, Midwest, or West)? Sub-questions (C), (D), (E) were: Is there a difference in the number and percentages of presidential mentions and presidential patterns that correlate to the constructs found in textbooks based on the state’s adoption process (i.e., adoption versus non-adoption), based on the grade level the texts are written for (i.e., elementary or middle), and on the size of the textbook publishers (i.e., large publishers or small/regional publishers)? I then provide conclusions and implications that can be drawn from the study. Finally, I make recommendations for future research concerning the application of Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency to state history textbooks, the analysis of state history textbooks, and examining state history courses in general.
Discussion

Are the first three constructs of Thomas Cronin’s (1974) “textbook presidency” theory applicable to recently published middle level state history textbooks?

In his study of college level political science textbooks, Cronin (1974) developed his textbook presidency theory. This theory claims that these textbooks present a dangerous, over-idealized image of the president. Based on his findings, Cronin (1974) created four constructs that can be used to discuss the ways in which textbooks portray the scope and power of the United States president (p. 60).

The primary purpose for this study was to determine if Cronin’s (1974) first three constructs, which he based on the college level political science textbook portrayals of U.S. presidents, were applicable to the most recently adopted or published state history textbooks used by students in the middle level (i.e., grades 4th through 8th). I found that, to a degree, Cronin’s (1974) constructs were, in fact, applicable to state history textbooks when a presidential reference concerned national and/or international events. However, in the 42 state history textbooks I analyzed, the majority of references made about the 20th and 21st century presidents did not necessarily discuss the types of presidential actions on which Cronin (1974) based his theory, rather they focused on the ways in which the president impacted the individual state. Hence, the many of the presidential references found in state history textbooks did not correlate to Cronin’s (1974) three constructs.

Of the mentions that did correlate to Cronin’s (1974) constructs, the first construct, which states that in textbooks the president “is the strategic catalyst in the American political system and the central figure in the international system as well” (p. 60), associated with the largest number of mentions (522). This was most likely due to the fact that the construct was based on
the domestic and international roles of the president. However, this was a small percentage in comparison to the overall total of presidential mentions (2,801), at only 19%. This construct correlated to the largest number of presidential mentions found in the textbooks used in three out of the four regions (i.e., Midwest, North, and South), and seven of the 14 states (i.e., GA, IL, IA, MO, NY, TX, and VA). It applied equally to the textbooks used in adoption and non-adoption states, the textbooks written for both elementary and middle grades students, and the textbooks produced by both large and small publishers. In addition, the 20th and 21st century presidents who had the largest number of their textbook mentions correlate to this construct were McKinley, Wilson, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Carter, Reagan, George H. W. Bush, and G.W. Bush.

Cronin’s (1974) second construct, which argues that in textbooks “only” the president “is or can be the genuine architect of United States public policy and only he, by attacking problems frontally and aggressively, and interpreting his power expansively, can be the engine of change to move the nation forward” (p. 60), correlated with the second largest number of mentions (441). However, this was, once again, only a small percentage (16%) of the overall total of presidential mentions. Because this construct focuses only on domestic policies, and not a combination of both domestic and international policies, like the first construct, it did not correlate to the largest number of presidential mentions found in the textbooks used in the four regions (i.e., Midwest, North, South, and West), nor the mentions found in the collection of textbooks used by individual states. However, this construct correlated to the second largest number of mentions in the textbooks used by seven states (i.e., GA, IL, IA, MO, NY, TX, and VA) and also correlated to the second largest number of mentions in the textbooks used in adoption and non-adoption states, the textbooks produced for both the elementary and middle
grades, and the textbooks published by both large and small publishers. In addition, there were no 20th and 21st century presidents who had their largest number of textbook mentions correlate to this construct.

Cronin’s (1974) third construct, which claims that in textbooks the president “must be the nation’s personal and moral leader; by symbolizing the past and future greatness of America and radiating inspirational confidence, a President can pull the nation together while directing us toward the fulfillment of the American Dream” (p. 60), associated with the smallest number of mentions (339) which was 12% of the overall total. Though this construct correlated to the fewest number of presidential mentions found in the overall number of textbooks, it was found in the largest percentage of presidential mentions in the textbooks used in the western region. This construct correlated to the fewest number of mentions in the textbooks used in adoption and non-adoption states, in the textbooks used by both the elementary and middle grades, and the textbooks produced by both large and small publishers. In addition, there were no 20th and 21st century presidents who had the largest number of their textbook mentions correlate to this construct.

Comparing the applicability of Cronin’s (1974) first three constructs to the state history textbooks based on the categories that the reviewed literature declared as reasons for the weaknesses behind textbooks (i.e., the impact that the state or region, intended grade level, use of the textbook adoption process, and size of the textbook publisher, has on the information found in the textbooks) (Apple, 2001; Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; Cronin, 1974; FitzGerald, 1979; Loewen, 1995) yielded the following results. When I compared the textbooks based on region, the textbooks from the South (i.e., AK, GA, TX, and VA) had the largest percentage of their presidential mentions correlate to the first construct, while the textbooks from the West (i.e., CA)
had the largest percentage of the textbooks’ presidential mentions correlate to the second and third construct. The textbooks from the state of Virginia had the largest percentage of presidential mentions correlate to the first construct, the textbook from the state of Connecticut had the largest percentage of presidential mentions correlate to the second, and the textbook from Nebraska had the largest percentage of mentions correlate to the third construct. When I compared the textbooks based on their use by adoption or non-adoption states, the adoption states (i.e., AR, CA, GA, TX, and VA) had a larger percentage of their presidential mentions correlate to all three constructs. When I examined the textbooks based on grade level, the textbooks written for middle grades students had a larger percentage of mentions correlate to Cronin’s (1974) first and second constructs, while the elementary level textbooks had a larger percentage of mentions correlate to the third. Finally, when I analyzed the textbooks based on the size of the publishers, the smaller/regional publishers had a much larger number of their textbooks correlate to all three patterns.

The results of the study showed that, overall, while there were mentions in state history textbooks that correlated to Cronin’s (1974) constructs, the majority of the presidential mentions were not applicable based on the types of mentions about the presidents that were found in these texts. Nevertheless, most of the presidential mentions appeared to have positive connotations about the presidents which support portions of Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory and his contention that there is an over-idealized portrayal of presidents found in textbooks. Additional insights resulted when I examined the collection of state history textbooks based on the critiques found in the literature. First, I found it interesting that in their works, Apple (2001), FitzGerald (1979), and Loewen (1995) criticize states in both the southern and western regions, primarily Texas and California, for their use of the textbook adoptions process, and how their
large populations cause national textbook publishers and authors to write books that correlate with the dominate political and/or social ideologies found in these states. Additionally, they believe that the ideologies found in southern states supported textbooks that can be considered biased and inaccurate. In this study, the textbooks used in the southern states of Arkansas, Georgia, Texas, and Virginia, as well as, the western state of California, provided 78% (2,198) of the total presidential mentions I examined. Furthermore, all of these states used the textbook adoption process. While I would argue that unlike national textbooks, state history textbooks have little influence on the content found in the textbooks used in other states (though state history textbooks produced by the same publishers have striking similarities), it should be noted that the collection of textbooks from the lambasted states that used the adoption process, had the largest number of mentions correlate to all three of Cronin’s (1974) constructs, which criticize the over-idealized portrayal of presidents found in textbooks, and thus supporting claims made in the literature.

Second, Cronin (1974) claims that one of the problems in the college level textbook portrayal of the president is that it can be assumed that young children are provided with an over-idealized portrayal of the presidents, but as they grow older and advance in their educational studies, the textbooks they use to discuss the president will “become more tempered and he [the student] becomes, perhaps, more cynical about government and political leaders” (p. 55). However, Cronin (1974) discovered that the over-idealized portrayal of the president does not change in both “introductory high school level texts and college level text” and claims that these texts actually “reinforce rather than measurably refine youthful expectations about presidential leadership” (p. 55). In this study, I also found this to be the case. What I considered to be surprising was that the middle grades textbooks contained a larger percentage of mentions that
correlated to the first and second constructs (i.e. the Commander-in-Chief roles), though it should be noted that there were a larger percentage of mentions that correlated to the third construct in the elementary textbooks which relates to the moralistic portrayals of presidents. This may be a result of the focus on heroes and character development that is often found in the curriculum of this age level (Bradley Commission, 1989; Brophy & VanSledright, 1997; Cheney, 1987; Gagnon, 1989; Hess & Easton, 1962; Levstik & Barton, 2005; Stearns et al., 2000). Nevertheless, as stated previously, the vast majority of these mentions whether they correlated to Cronin’s (1974) constructs or not, appeared to be positive in nature, thus supporting his general theory of the textbook presidency.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the state history textbooks produced by smaller/regional publishers contained a significantly larger percentage of presidential references that correlated to all of Cronin’s (1974) constructs than those produced by larger publishers. Apple (2001), FitzGerald (1979), and Loewen (1995), among others, complain that it is the “imitating” nature of the publishing industry that causes the textbooks produced by larger companies to be the standard bearers of the industry and lead to weaker and less accurate textbooks. However, it appeared that in the case of state history textbooks, it was smaller companies who strived to make their portrayals of the president and his powers closely relate to the idealized version of the presidency that their potential purchasers may deem as the “correct” version of each president that should be taught to their students. It appears that the reason behind this is due to the fact that larger companies produce textbooks for many other subject areas and disciplines and state history is not their primary focus. On the other hand, the majority of the smaller/regional publishers’ primary source of revenue may be based on having their state history textbooks adopted and/or sold in each individual state. Therefore, it seems that due to
their competition with both larger and other small publishes, smaller/regional publishers attempt
to ensure that the content concerning the presidents, as well as other historic events and figures,
found in their books is as traditional and non-controversial as possible.

Are the four presidential patterns that were discovered in a pilot study applicable to other
recently published state history textbooks?

In a pilot study based on an examination of Georgia state history textbooks written
between the years of 1951-2005, I discovered four interesting patterns concerning the portrayal
of presidents in the texts, and hoped to determine if these patterns were applicable to the recently
published textbooks for Georgia and the other 13 states examined. Overall, three of these
patterns strongly supported the “over-idealized” theme of Cronin’s (1974) constructs, but varied
in how they mirrored the exact wording of each construct, while the fourth pattern did not appear
to correlate to Cronin’s constructs or his textbook presidency theory in general. Each of these
patterns were named after the president that most exemplified it in the texts.

The first pattern is called the McKinley pattern, and theorizes that if a president had a
positive connection to the state he will usually be mentioned in the state’s textbooks. Some of
these connections could include the president visiting the state, the president appointing a citizen
of the state to a political office, or allocating funds to the state. This pattern was evident in 67%
of the 42 textbooks examined. I discovered that regionally, the South had the largest number of
textbooks correlate to this pattern, while textbooks from the North had the smallest. Additionally,
southern textbooks mentioned the largest number of individual presidents who met this pattern,
while northern textbooks mentioned the fewest. Furthermore all of the textbooks used in the
states of Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Iowa, Missouri, and Texas made at least one
presidential mention that correlated to this pattern, while all of the textbooks used in the states of
Illinois, Massachusetts, and Nebraska, did not. Finally, this pattern was found more in textbooks used by adoption states, in the textbooks written for middle grades students, and in the textbooks produced by smaller publishers.

The second pattern was named after Jimmy Carter, and suggests that if a president was born in the state or lived there for a time he will receive a larger number of mentions in state history textbooks in comparison to other United States presidents. In my pilot study, this pattern was evident with Georgia native Jimmy Carter, as well as Franklin Roosevelt who was considered by these texts to be a part-time resident of the state. This pattern was found in 37 (88%) out of 42 textbooks examined. However, surprisingly, not all native born presidents or presidents who were residents of the state received the largest number of mentions in their state’s history textbooks or in some cases, even mentioned in the textbooks. These presidents were McKinley, Taft, Harding, Eisenhower, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, George H.W. Bush, and Georgia W. Bush.

Regionally, the South had the largest percentage (100%) of textbooks that correlated to the Carter pattern while the Midwest and West had the smallest (75%). However, in all of these regions, the vast majority of the textbooks displayed this pattern. As mentioned previously, there were some states who used at least one textbook that did not mention their native born president; these states were Connecticut, California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Nebraska, and Ohio. Finally, this pattern was found in a larger percentage of the textbooks written for adoption states, textbooks used by middle grades students, and textbooks produced by larger publishers. However, the textbooks used by non-adoption states, written for elementary grades students, and produced by smaller publishers, had a larger percentage of their overall presidential mentions reference their native born or resident president.
The third pattern is called the Eisenhower pattern, and it contends that a sitting president will be mentioned in a state history textbook, solely based on the fact that he is the current president at the time the textbook was published. In my pilot study, this pattern was found in many of the Georgia history textbooks I examined, and I assumed that this pattern would also be found in most recently published and/or adopted state history textbooks for all states. However, this assumption proved to be incorrect and only 16 of the 42 state history textbooks examined made mention to the sitting president at the time of this study, George W. Bush.

Regionally, and similarly to both the McKinley and Carter patterns, Bush was mentioned in the largest percentage (69%) of state history textbooks from the South and the smallest percentage (8%) from the North. The states that had the largest number of their textbooks reference Bush were from the states of Arkansas, Georgia, and Texas, all which can be considered “Red” states or those that support the Republican Party in presidential elections. Finally, the textbooks used by adoption states, written for middle grades students, and produced by smaller publishers had a larger percentage of textbooks that displayed the pattern. However, while the textbooks used in adoption states and written for middle grades students also had the largest average number of mentions referencing Bush, the textbooks produced by larger publishers, based on the state of Texas, averaged more mentions about George W. Bush, than those produced by smaller companies.

The final pattern is called the Roosevelt pattern. I found in my pilot study that in many cases the Georgia history textbooks did not cast presidents as heroes or villains, but simply did not mention certain presidents at all. For this study, I examined this pattern by studying the mentions of five highly regarded 20th century presidents found in the state history textbooks. I
identified these presidents by using an average of the rankings found in three presidential polls, the Siena (2002), the Wall Street Journal (2005), and the C-SPAN (2009). The presidents who received the highest rankings were Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and Dwight Eisenhower. Elements of this pattern were found in the majority of textbooks examined, with 37 (88%) out of 42. Overall, of the presidents who met the qualification for this pattern, Franklin Roosevelt was the only president who was referenced in the most state history textbooks with 33 (78%) of 42. He also received the largest number of presidential mentions in all of the textbooks with 539 (19%) of the 2,801 total presidential mentions. In contrast, Harry Truman was mentioned in the fewest number of state history textbooks with 12 (29%) of 42, while Theodore Roosevelt received the smallest number of mentions in these texts with 56 (2%) of the 2,801 presidential mentions.

Regionally, and continuing the trend found in the other patterns, the textbooks from the South referenced the largest number of the identified presidents, while the textbooks from the North mentioned the fewest. When examined by state, the collection of textbooks used in the states of Arkansas, Georgia, and Texas mentioned all five of the identified presidents, while the collection of textbooks used in the states of Illinois, Nebraska, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Vermont did not mention any. Finally, there were a larger percentage of textbooks used by adoption states, written for middle grades students, and produced by smaller companies that contained references to the identified presidents. However, textbooks used by non-adoption states and written for elementary students had the largest percentage of their presidential mentions reference the identified presidents.

Unlike Cronin’s (1974) three constructs, the presidential patterns I found in my pilot study proved to be applicable to a high percentage of the presidential mentions found in all 42 of
the state history textbooks studied. Most likely this was due to the similarity of the materials that were examined in both studies (i.e., middle grades textbooks). However, it should be noted that three of the presidential patterns (i.e., McKinley, Carter, and Eisenhower) were based on and appeared to relate to Cronin’s (1974) overarching critiques about the textbook presidency, or the over-idealized portrayal of the presidents found in college level political science textbooks.

Of all of the references that correlated to the presidential patterns, I found some of the presidential mentions that related to the McKinley pattern to be the most disturbing of all of the over-idealized portrayals of presidents found in the state history textbooks examined. While I understand the rationale behind referencing that a well respected president had a connection to the state for various reasons, it was difficult to comprehend why an author (or publisher) of a state history textbook would chose to reference President Richard Nixon in their textbooks for anything other than his resignation due to the Watergate scandal, or his policies during the Vietnam War. I found it hard to understand why Nixon attending a football game, or calling Hank Aaron, was worthy of mentioning in the texts, especially after the negative impact that Nixon’s administration had on American history. Additionally, it can be argued that mentioning a president based on the fact that he visited the state for relatively unimportant events, such as eating breakfast there, or campaigning for a local politician, magnifies the over-idealized portrayal of the president in the minds of students, a situation that Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory warns against. To conclude, in state history textbooks, a president, even an unpopular one like Nixon, can be portrayed in a heroic fashion, based on having any positive connection to the state.

Some of my findings in the examination of the Carter pattern proved to be somewhat difficult to comprehend as well. While most states contained the obvious references to their
native born presidents, some did not. It should be noted that all of the textbooks used in the southern adoption states, no matter the size of their publisher or their target audience, had the largest number of mentions about their native born presidents and/or those presidents that lived in the state for a time. However, there were many elementary grades textbooks, used by non-adoption states and found in the North and Midwest that did not mention presidents who were born in the state. Additionally, these textbooks were produced by both large and small publishers. Based on this, some examples of questions that arose from my examination of the Carter pattern in these textbooks included:

- What caused Banks et al. (2008) to fail to mention Ohio native William McKinley in their textbook?
- Why did Lukesh (2004) choose to include a quote by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in her Nebraska textbook, but not use a quote by native born president Gerald Ford?
- Why did the California textbook written by Porter et al. (2007) reference part-time resident and unpopular president Herbert Hoover as a “president from California,” while sitting, and at the time, relatively popular president, George W. Bush was not mentioned in the textbook used by Connecticut, his native state?

Though the constraints of this study did not offer me the opportunity to research these questions, I think they are worthy of further study.

Based on the results I discovered in my pilot study concerning the large number of sitting presidents that were mentioned in the Georgia history textbooks from the dates of 1951-2005, I was quite surprised at the large number of state history textbooks that did not reference sitting president George W. Bush. I assumed, at the very least, that each textbook would mention Bush, due to the fact that he was the current president of the country, especially in the chapter(s)
concerning local, state, and national government that were common in most of the textbooks examined. However, this was not the case, and while the majority of the textbooks used in the southern states mention the sitting president, Bush was not mentioned in many of the textbooks used in all other regions. Nevertheless, it should be noted that Bush received more mentions in the collection of state history textbooks than 12 of the 20th century presidents.

The only pattern that I found in the pilot study that appeared to contradict Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory was the Roosevelt pattern, or that certain presidents, even those who were highly regarded, are often not mentioned in state history textbooks. Based on my results from the Georgia history textbooks’ relatively small number of references concerning Theodore Roosevelt I discovered in my pilot study, I was not surprised that elements of this pattern (i.e., textbooks not mentioning at least one of the highly regarded presidents) were found in the majority of the state history textbooks. However, I was surprised that four of the top five presidents (Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson, Truman, and Eisenhower) were not mentioned in the majority of these texts along with the relatively small percentage of overall mentions that presidents Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Dwight Eisenhower received in state history textbooks. Though these three presidents were influential in some of the major events in 20th century America, which were often discussed in almost all of the textbooks (e.g., the Progressive era for Roosevelt, World War One for Wilson, and the desegregation of public schools for Eisenhower), and their administrations ranked high in the national polls, based primarily on the McKinley and Carter patterns, seven other presidents received a larger percentage of mentions in the collection of state history textbooks.

Finally, it should be noted that there were obvious differences found in the collection of state history textbooks produced for the southern and western states in comparison to the
textbooks produced for the Northern and Midwestern regions. These differences not only concerned the correlation to Cronin’s (1974) constructs, but also to the four presidential patterns. It could be argued that the reason behind the textbooks from the southern states and the western state having the largest percentage of both their textbooks and presidential mentions which correlated to the McKinley, Carter, and Eisenhower pattern, while mentioning a larger number of the identified presidents meeting the Roosevelt pattern, was based on the fact all of the states in the regions (i.e., AK, CA, GA, TX, and VA) were adoption states. As Apple (2001), FitzGerald (1979), and Loewen (1995) describe, there is fierce competition between textbook companies to be selected as suitable textbooks to be used in these states. As mentioned previously, this causes the textbooks in the states to be written in a traditional fashion, which would include an over-idealized perception of the presidents, and many mentions about a large number of presidents, in order to help insure that these textbooks are adopted.

Additionally, it can be argued that, due to their intended audience, the middle grades textbooks obviously contain many more pages than textbooks written for the elementary grades. It can also be believed that because of this the authors have much more space to fill in these texts, and perhaps, they believed that including information about a larger number of presidents visiting or making contributions to the state before, during, and after their presidency would be a way to fill some of the available textual space in the books. Furthermore, it may be assumed that the reason the state history textbooks from the adoption states contained a larger number of references about presidents could be due to the stricter state standards that critics perceive to be found in these states (e.g., Apple, 2001; Keith, 1991; Loewen, 1995; Moyer, 1985); however, it should be pointed out that the state standards for all of the adoption states do not include references to all, or, for that matter, the majority of the 20th and 21st century presidents (Arkansas

For example, in the Georgia standards, only two presidents Franklin Roosevelt and Jimmy Carter are listed as 20\textsuperscript{th} and 21\textsuperscript{st} century presidents to be studied (Georgia Department of Education, 2007). While this may explain the reason the Carter pattern was found in the collection of Georgia history textbooks, in terms of their references to these presidents, it does not explain why all 19 of these presidents were found in the books.

Nevertheless, it should also be noted that though they contained fewer mentions about all of the presidents, four states outside of the south and west, which were non-adoption states and taught state history in the elementary grades (i.e., Massachusetts, Missouri, Vermont, and New York), had a larger percentage of mentions concerning their native born president in comparison to their overall total of presidential mentions. The reason behind this could be related to the moralistic portrayal of presidents found in all elementary level books suggested by Cronin’s (1974) third construct. These elementary textbooks appeared to use their native born presidents as examples of historic figures that their student readers should emulate.

To conclude, I would argue that the findings of this study supported that Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory, though not his constructs, is applicable to the state history textbooks I examined. Even though his constructs did not correlate to a large percentage of the textbook mentions concerning 20\textsuperscript{th} and 21\textsuperscript{st} century presidents in the state history textbooks, there was sufficient evidence that in many instances there was an overtly positive and over-idealized portrayal of the presidents as well as the power of the office. Additionally, there was sufficient evidence that three of the four presidential patterns I discovered in my pilot study were applicable to the state history textbooks. The exception being the Eisenhower pattern, or the
theory that a sitting president would be mentioned in state history textbooks solely because he is the sitting president. However, analyzing each of the constructs as well as each individual pattern categorizing the data based on region, individual state, participation in the textbook adoption process, the grade level, and size of the publisher, displayed varying results. Nevertheless, as Sanchez (1996) concluded in his study, the “textbook presidency is alive and well” not only in the college level political science textbooks, but also in the textbooks used in state history courses throughout the United States.

Implications

The following is a list of applications that future authors of state history textbooks can take into consideration when writing about U.S. presidents based on the findings of this study. Additionally, based on the conclusions of this study, there is a list of pedagogical methods that practitioners can use to enhance their lessons while continuing to use the textbook as a tool in their classrooms. These ideas can be used in state history courses or in any social science course that discusses the roles and responsibilities of United States presidents. The implications of this study have the potential to not only assist in the creation of stronger and more accurate state history textbooks, but to also aid classroom teachers in creating more interesting lessons that minimize the effects of the textbook presidency found in the textbooks that they use in their classes.

Writing about the United States Presidents in State History Textbooks

First, authors of state history textbooks should analyze their presidential references and determine if their depictions correlate to the over-idealized image of the president found in Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory. More importantly, however, authors need to make sure that their depictions of the president and his powers are as accurate as possible. For
example, as Hoekstra (1982) argues, writing a reference about a president that portrays him as the central figure in the international system may be accurate, such as when the president orders troops into a foreign country for a police action, but actually writing that the president “declared war” is a different matter entirely. These blatant inaccuracies describing the powers of the presidents broaden the misconceptions and over-idealized image of the presidency and should be eliminated from textbooks entirely.

In turn, authors should give the appropriate amount of credit or blame to presidents based on their role in historic events. In this study, I discovered cases where an accurate portrayal of the president would have included references that may have fallen into one or more of Cronin’s (1974) constructs. However, for whatever reason, the president who spearheaded the event was not referenced. An example of this was in the Texas textbook that used the word “United States” instead of specifically naming Wilson in describing the search for Poncho Villa (Rocha et al., 2003). Furthermore authors should, as Moore (1969) argues, limit “ethnocentric beliefs in the superiority of the state’s culture” (p. 267). An example of this was in the textbook written by Ferenbach et al. (2003), which made it appear that Congressman John Connaly was the catalyst that caused Congress to declare war on Japan, while not mentioning Franklin Roosevelt and his famous “Day That Will Live in Infamy” speech.

Second, most of the references made about presidents in the state history textbooks, whether they correlated to Cronin’s (1974) constructs or the presidential patterns, appeared to have positive connotations and not a great deal of balance in discussing the successes and failures of the presidents. Once again, these types of mentions illuminated the over-idealized image that Cronin (1974) criticizes in his textbook presidency theory. One example concerned the larger number of presidential mentions discussing the successes of Franklin Roosevelt, and
the small number of mentions referencing the failures of Richard Nixon. As determined from the study, Roosevelt was referenced in 33 textbooks and received a total number of 539 mentions. The vast majority of these mentions appeared positive in nature and seemed to not only praise but heroify Roosevelt. In comparison, Nixon was referenced in 11 textbooks and received 67 mentions. Of the 11 textbooks, only seven discussed the Watergate scandal, while many also discussed Nixon’s superficial acts as president, such as visiting the state, appointing the state’s citizens to political offices, or making congratulatory telephone calls to athletes. If state history textbook authors are going to spend a great deal of time celebrating the accomplishments of one president who may or may not have a connection to the state, then they need to spend just as much time discussing the failures of others and not leaving them out of the texts. If students are going to be taught that a man like Roosevelt can lead the country in overcoming obstacles such as the Great Depression and a World War, they also need to be taught that presidents can become power-hungry, dishonest, and more importantly, that they are not above the law.

Finally, if state history textbooks authors write textbooks for a state that uses specific standards, they need to follow those standards. As mentioned previously, the state standards of Georgia only mention presidents Carter and Roosevelt, but the collection of approved textbooks mentioned all 19 of the 20th and 21st century presidents. The focus on these other presidents may not be necessary in terms of studying a state’s history. Additionally, using valuable book space discussing the fact that a random president visited the state, or including a speech that a president made concerning events outside of the states’ history, may not be as important as discussing the success and failures of the state’s native president or offering students a more balanced and detailed account of other historic figures and events that are important to the state’s unique history.
Furthermore, I hope that this study will provide insight for all educators who teach state history or any social studies course where the roles and responsibilities of the United States presidents are examined. I would like for practitioners to understand what the implications of these findings mean for their students. For the most part, I agree with many of the suggestions made by other researchers in their textbook studies. The suggestions made by Alridge (2006), Loewen (1995), Moore (1969), Terry (1983), and Wasburn (1997) all advise teachers to stay cognizant of textbook biases, or other weaknesses found in textbooks, and to use other sources to balance out these limitations.

However, I believe that students and teachers should attempt to understand textbook limitations at a deeper level. While teachers can be the guides, understanding the problems found in textbooks should be a student-centered activity. Students should be encouraged to read textbook analyses such as this one, and use the same methods to determine if they think that the textbooks they use are as problematic as researchers claim them to be.

Another idea, as suggested by Bain (2006), is if students believe that the textbooks that are provided for their history courses contain important weaknesses, they should be encouraged to write the authors of the texts. For example, students should question textbook authors about the topics that are being addressing from an obviously biased perspective. I believe that textbook authors and publishers should be accountable to the students for whom they write these books.

In addition, powerful classroom questions and discussions concerning Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency can be developed based on reading “master narratives,” as defined by Alridge (2006) and Loewen (1995), and discussing their inaccuracies. Questions based on this study might include the following:
- What is really the president’s job? Does your textbook accurately display his responsibilities?
- Does your textbook give the president too much or too little credit for historical events? Why do you believe this is so?
- What would life be like today if we only had one political party? What would stay the same? What would be different? Would textbooks treat presidents differently?
- What’s your political identification? With this in mind, if you were to write a textbook, how would you represent a president from another party, even if he was “good”? Why?
- Just because a president was from your state, does he deserve the large number of mentions in your state’s textbook? Why or why not? Why do you think a textbook author would do this?

Teachers using these types of questions drawn from analysis of their textbooks not only make the textbooks more worthwhile, but also make the research in the study of the weaknesses found in textbooks more meaningful for everyone involved in education.

Finally, textbooks can be used as the guiding tools in teaching students historical methods, such as historical inquiry. In my own experience, my students enjoyed the classes when they were given the opportunity to “prove the textbook wrong.” One of these inquires was based on the portrayal of Jimmy Carter in the Georgia history textbooks. My students received four historical sources: one was the Georgia history textbook that was used by the county where I taught, the second was a South Carolina history textbook, the third was a middle grades U.S. history textbook, and the last was a movie clip discussing Carter’s presidency. The students were given a chart where they were asked to list what each source claimed to be Carter’s accomplishments and failures as president, as well as his pre- and post-presidential roles. They
were then provided with discussion questions. The first was, “Based on your findings, which source(s) do you feel is the most accurate about Carter’s presidency? Why?” The second was, “Based on your findings, which source(s) do you think was the least accurate? Why?”

Interestingly, a large amount of the students felt that the movie clip was the most accurate source of information, while the state textbook was the least. When asked why, the usual answer was that the movie used “experts” (i.e., political scientists and historians) who discussed Carter’s presidency, while they would answer that the Georgia history textbook was the least accurate because Carter was from Georgia and the textbook was attempting to make him “look good.”

However, this was not always the case; some students would argue that the Georgia textbook was the most accurate because “no other state will understand Carter better than his home state,” while they claimed the other sources were less accurate based on the same conclusion.

Nevertheless, no matter what the students’ answers were, this exercise allowed them to understand that the textbook is not an infallible source of information, and that there are a plethora of other sources that contain information that is both similar and different to the one that they use in their classroom. More importantly, this exercise may also dilute the elements of the textbook presidency found in the textbooks by giving the students a more accurate portrayal of the president from their home state, in hopes that they will carry this knowledge in their examination of all United States presidents.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Many social science and history researchers have conducted textbooks analyses, and the vast majority has determined that the textbooks they examined contained inaccurate portrayals of the people and events that they were studying. Also, while there have been very few studies examining state history textbooks, the results found in these studies were very similar to the
findings of those in national or international textbooks. Furthermore, political scientists, such as Cronin (1974), Hoekstra (1982), Alsfeld (1995), and Sanchez (1996), have examined the textbooks used for their college level political science courses, and have come up with similar conclusions to that of other textbook analyses concerning their topic of interest: the inaccurate description of the United States presidents found in these texts. This study was different than most other textbook analyses, because I attempted to determine if a theory used outside my primary discipline of social studies education, was applicable to middle level state history textbooks. Though unique to the literature, this study had several limitations which should be considered in future research concerning the applicability of Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory in elementary or secondary education textbooks as well as larger studies about state history textbooks and/or state history courses in general.

The first limitation in regards to determining the applicability of Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory to state history textbooks concerns the type and number of data sources that were used. These textbooks had an assortment of varying characteristics, such as the grade level they were written for, the size of the textbook publishers that produced them, the educational background of the authors, the size of the books, etc. Additionally, because I only examined textbooks that were used in the home states of presidents, I used different numbers of textbooks based on the categories I chose to study (i.e., region, publisher size, adoption vs. non-adoption states, and grade level). For example, since only one western state, California, was the home to a 20th century president, I was only able to examine four textbooks from the region. Future researchers should consider dropping the criteria that only textbooks from a president’s native state be studied, and examine a more uniform number of textbooks from each region, as
well as all of the other categories examined to gain a fuller understanding of the similarities and differences found in each of them.

Secondly, this study examined all 19 of the 20th and 21st century presidents. Future researchers should consider either expanding or contracting the number of presidents studied. Increasing the number of presidents could offer the researcher a better understanding of the textbook portrayals of non-modern presidents and how their descriptions correlate to Cronin’s (1974) theory. In addition, similarly to Sanchez (1996), they could determine if there were differences in how modern presidents are portrayed in textbooks. On the other hand, decreasing the number of presidents studied to only a few highly or negatively regarded presidents may offer a more descriptive accounting of how these presidents are portrayed in the textbooks from the different categories examined.

Third, this study only examined the applicability of Cronin’s (1974) theory to state history textbooks; future researchers should compare the findings from state history textbooks in regards to this theory in relation to national history textbooks used in the same grade levels (i.e., grades 4th through 8th). This is especially important in order to determine what students across the country are being taught about the presidents. For example, a study could be conducted concerning what students in eighth grade Georgia Studies are learning about the U.S. presidents in comparison to what eighth grade students in California are learning in an U.S. history class about the same presidents.

Finally, this study only examined Cronin’s (1974) first three constructs. Due to what I determined to be its ambiguous nature, I did not analyze the state history textbook mentions in relation to Cronin’s (1974) fourth construct, which claims that in textbooks “only the right man is placed in the White House—all will be well, and somehow, whoever is in the White House is
the right man” (p. 60). However, future researchers may want to include this construct into their studies. While it appeared that it would be difficult to correlate the presidential mentions found in state history textbooks to this construct, other researchers may find using all four constructs allows for a more accurate depiction of each textbook’s overall correlation to Cronin’s (1974) textbook presidency theory.

In regards to state history textbook analysis, there were three limitations that should be considered in the future research concerning this type of study. First, I only examined one specific topic in the state history textbooks of a relatively small number of America’s 50 states. Due to the lack of research concerning state history and the large number of students who take these courses, almost every historic topic, event, or person can be researched to determine possible historical inaccuracies that may be found in these texts. There is a need for larger topical studies that examine the state histories used in a greater number of states, studies devoted to one specific event in one state history textbook or textbooks, or any topic or topics across this spectrum.

Second, though there was a common criterion set as the primary focus of this study, 20th and 21st century presidents, there was not a single president that was mentioned in every textbook examined. To gain a better understanding of the similarities and differences that can be found in the state history textbooks used throughout the United States, future researchers should consider examining historical figures that can be found in all, or at least the vast majority, of state histories. In examining the indexes for this study, a few figures that were listed in almost every textbook were George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Harriet Tubman, Henry Ford, and Martin Luther King Jr. Based on each individual’s importance in the nation’s history, all of their portrayals in state history textbooks would be worthy of further study.
Third, the only data sources I examined in this study were state history textbooks. While the information found in textbooks is often the subject of interest in these types of studies, very few researchers have examined the state standards that authors use to write these textbooks. In this study, the textbooks that had the greatest correlation to both Cronin’s (1974) theory and the four presidential patterns were those used by adoption states, which have been suggested to have highly structured and detailed state standards. Future researchers should examine these standards in tandem with the textbooks to gain a more accurate understanding about the content found in these textbooks.

Finally, while I hope that this study will impact the research and writing of state history textbooks, as with almost every other state history textbook analysis, or national history textbooks analysis for that matter, I examined a specific topic and determined that there was an inaccurate portrayal about the subject in the textbooks studied. Nevertheless, I consider this type of analysis to be important in order to assist in the production of more accurate textbooks, as well as offering state history teachers insight about the topic they teach and how to improve the teaching methods they use with their students. However, for my own future research, I would like to take the investigation of state history textbooks and the importance of state history courses to a deeper level.

First, though the works of a few textbook researchers, such as FitzGerald (1979) and Loewen (1995) include a very limited discussion concerning the rationales that textbook authors use in writing their works, and a small number of textbook authors such as Menton (1993) and Unger (1983), wrote scholarly articles chronicling their experiences writing their textbooks, to my knowledge there has been very limited research concerning state history textbook authors and their rationales in writing textbooks. Therefore, I think it is important, in answering many of
the overarching questions found in my state history textbook analysis, to interview the authors of
the textbooks I studied. By doing so, I would like to gain a better understanding about why they
wrote the textbooks in the ways that they did.

Second, most textbook studies analyze the textbooks themselves and not what the
students are actually learning by using these books. With this in mind, as I conducted this study,
two questions kept recurring. The first was, “What do students who take these state history
courses gain from its study?” The second was, “Why is a course about state history important
anyway?” While these questions may never be fully answered, one of the first steps, especially in
the era of “high stakes testing” and No Child Left Behind, is to create studies that help determine
what students not only learn, but retain from their state history courses.
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# APPENDIX A

State History Course Information (Arkansas-Ohio)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>President(s)</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Adoption</th>
<th>Publisher(s)</th>
<th>Number of Texts Examined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gibbs Smith</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Nixon</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Harcourt Houghton- Mifflin Macmillan/McGraw-Hill</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson-Scott Foresman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>G.W. Bush</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Gibbs Smith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Carl Vinson Institute Clairmont Press McDougal Littell Georgia Voyager Publications</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Reagan</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Gibbs Smith</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td>K-8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Iowa State Press Scholastic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Gibbs Smith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. H. W. Bush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Clairmont Press Gibbs Smith University of Missouri Press</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Gibbs Smith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, 7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, &amp; 8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Glencoe Macmillan/McGraw-Hill Scholastic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Gibbs Smith</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Macmillan/McGraw-Hill Scholastic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A (continued)

State History Course Information (Texas-Vermont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>President(s)</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Adoption State</th>
<th>Publisher(s)</th>
<th>Number of Texts Examined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gibbs Smith, Harcourt, Scott Foresman</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Coolidge</td>
<td>3rd &amp; 4th</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Scholastic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Bibliography of Data Sources


APPENDIX C


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. Roosevelt</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Roosevelt</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Wilson</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Truman</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Eisenhower</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Kennedy</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Johnson</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Reagan</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Clinton</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McKinley</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Taft</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. H.W. Bush</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. W. Bush</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Carter</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Nixon</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Ford</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Coolidge</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Hoover</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Harding</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Siena Research Institute http://lw.siena.edu/sri/results/2002/02AugPresidentsSurvey.htm
Note: Rankings are based on a total score from 20 categories. All 42 presidents were ranked.
### APPENDIX D


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Performance Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. Roosevelt</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Great</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Roosevelt</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Near Great</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Reagan</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Near Great</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Truman</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Near Great</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Eisenhower</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Near Great</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Wilson</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McKinley</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Kennedy</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Johnson</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. W. Bush</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Taft</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. H.W. Bush</td>
<td>Connecticut 21</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Clinton</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Coolidge</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Ford</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Hoover</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Nixon</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Carter</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Harding</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Highest possible score is five (5), lowest is one (1). Presidents Garfield and Harrison were not included based on their short terms so only 40 presidents were ranked.
# APPENDIX E

C-SPAN Rankings of 20\textsuperscript{th} and 21\textsuperscript{st} Century Presidents (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. Roosevelt</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Roosevelt</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Truman</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Kennedy</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Eisenhower</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Wilson</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Reagan</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Johnson</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Clinton</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. McKinley</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. H.W. Bush</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Ford</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Taft</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Carter</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Coolidge</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Nixon</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Hoover</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. W. Bush</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Harding</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: C-SPAN: 2009 Presidential Survey  
http://www.c-span.org/PresidentialSurvey/PresidentialSurvey_SlideShow/index.html
## APPENDIX F

Comparison of Presidential Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Years in Office</th>
<th>Birth Place</th>
<th>Siena</th>
<th>Wall Street Journal</th>
<th>C-Span Survey</th>
<th>Average Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William McKinley</td>
<td>1897-1901</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Roosevelt</td>
<td>1901-1909</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Taft</td>
<td>1909-1913</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodrow Wilson</td>
<td>1913-1921</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Harding</td>
<td>1921-1923</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Coolidge</td>
<td>1923-1929</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Hoover</td>
<td>1929-1933</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Roosevelt</td>
<td>1933-1945</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Truman</td>
<td>1945-1953</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwight Eisenhower</td>
<td>1953-1961</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Kennedy</td>
<td>1961-1963</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndon Johnson</td>
<td>1963-1969</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Nixon</td>
<td>1969-1974</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Ford</td>
<td>1974-1977</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26 (tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Clinton</td>
<td>1993-2001</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>