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A Note From The Editor

Because we live in a technological age, it is important to think deeply about the meaning of technology both in our everyday life and in our professional life. There is an Old Technology that has had a powerful influence on how people think about business, government, and education. Today there is coming to be a New Technology of the personal computer that has important implications for government, personal life, the struggle for peace, environmental restoration, and social education.

The reason to study the Old Technology is that through an analysis of the Old Technology we can develop awareness of the influence that machines have had on our language, our metaphors, and the conduct of our everyday life. Machines have been the dominant fact of the modern world. We have learned to think about our own life, about education and about social studies with images, ideas, and metaphors based on the operation of machines. Our deep involvement in industrial life tempts us to desire efficiency, economy, and the quality control of many aspects of social life. We are tempted to seek rational management and the industrial design of curricula, and we have even been tempted to accept industrialized hospital systems for delivering babies. We search for the perfect machine with which to manufacture children's learning, children's lives, and children's hopes according to changing fashions of industrial schemes for producing reading abilities, arithmetic skills, science or citizenship.

The reason to study the New Technology is to identify influences on social life, language, politics, and education that may come to be important in the future. The study of the Old and New technologies is a way to notice, discover, become aware, and to some extent to understand, the social world in which we find ourselves today.

The Old Technology

The Old Technology has a grammar that has come to be used to discuss, explain and describe social life and education. The Old Technology is the rational industrial plant that can produce cars, TV sets, coffee makers, and other standard machine products. The old technology is a rational scheme for making rational machines.

The grammar of machines has come to regulate much of our personal lives and to determine the principles of education that we have been instructed to use in our thought about education today.

Basic machine realities are these:

1. Reality (of a factory system and of factory products) is componential; that is, made up of parts.
Based on intimate experience with factory system and bureaucratic organization, people have learned to think of many aspects of social living and education as analogous to the factory componential system. In the educational context this means that we have come to think it is normal or natural to design schools that look like factories, to establish time schedules and testing procedures for children analogous to rational standardized systems for the industrial production. We have tried to produce learning in school analogous to the production of machines by industrial processes. We have componentialized the school curriculum and we have invented a system of schools as factories with a management elite, industrial unions, and teachers as production workers. As in a factory, industrial workers teach separate subjects at different times of day according to a rational production plan. Some educators do research to try to make schools, as children-factories, more efficient, more economical, and more effective. These are metaphors with which we have become comfortable in industrial society.

2. Reality (of a factory system and factory products) is rationally ordered because they are designed that way.

Because cars, TV sets, and factories are rationally ordered we have come to think of life itself as rationally ordered. Because we can make a standardized car, we have come to believe that we can design personal life styles, child raising schedules, and schools as children-factories. In the United States, graduate study in professional schools of education is largely devoted to teaching a science of schools as children-factories. Graduate students are taught and tested on their understanding of machine principles and their commitment to schools as children-factories. Students from many nations come to the United States to study schools as children-factories.

3. Reality (of a factory system and factory products) is that means are separated from ends.

Factory machines can produce refrigerators, tanks or bombs. Schools as children-factories can try to produce one or another sort of nationalism, one or another sort of ideological predisposition, one or another sort of awareness of the issues of war and peace, the environment, or national destiny. Schools as children-factories are machines in the service of one political interest or another.

4. Reality (of a factory system and factory products) is fixable.

A car can be repaired; a carburetor can be replaced; a battery can be recharged. Machine production lines can be repaired or redesigned to produce new products. Problem solving is a reality of machine systems. In social matters, problem solving through expertise, which is appropriate in the industrial procedure, obscures fundamental differences between social life and procedures for factory production. Social difficulties such as crime, poverty, and underdevelopment are moral, political, and economic issues for which there are no remedies in expert problem solving. The difficulties of social life require empathy, compassion, judgment, and wisdom because they in-
solve life process rather than machine processes. Problem solving is relevant to machines and industrial procedures but it obscures political and ethical realities of social life.

The reality of factories that produce radios and golf clubs is not the reality of social life as it is lived in Japan, the United States or anywhere else in the world.

The New Technology

The New Technology will become important when most young people and teachers have computers at home. A personal computer, a modem, and a telephone can connect a young person (and their teachers) with world-wide systems of information and communication. It is unlikely that school uses of computers will change or "reform" education, whatever that term may mean. But what is likely is that personal computers with a modem and a telephone will change both the children and the teachers who will come to school. The basic difference between the Old Technology and the New Technology is that the Old Technology involves the design of machines that produce machines. The New Technology involves the use of tools. Machines serve the social and political interests of those who design them; tools serve the interests of those who know how to use them. We are moving from machines and machine culture to the use of computers as tools and a tool culture. There is a profound difference between these two cultures. This difference should be a matter of concern to those who would be social studies teachers.

We cannot know the future, but we can think about possibilities. What sort of students and teachers are likely to come to school when computers and modems are commonplace? When the factory system was the dominant fact of life, parents, teachers, and students found factory language, principles, architecture, and schools as children-factories acceptable. Schools as children-factories made sense because of our everyday life in an industrial society.

As computer-based communication networks become commonplace, schools as children-factories may no longer be acceptable to students, teachers or parents.

The first and most frequently proposed use of computers is simply to incorporate them into schools as children-factories. Computer Assisted Instruction, management schemes, student monitoring procedures, and curriculum design proposals are different efforts to use computers as machines in schools as children-factories. These adaptations may or may not make schools as children-factories more rational, more componential, or more rigorously managed. It is not likely that school uses of computers will in any way "reform" or improve schools as children-factories.

Some students appear to learn important things in children-factories; many students in the United States appear not to learn or enjoy their life in children-factories. Teachers, parents, and students appear to regard children-factories
as normal parts of life. Children-factories, trees, and rabbits are usually just taken to be parts of life. But trees, in some sense, are part of nature, and children-factories are arbitrary human inventions.

We do know, however, that life in schools, families, playgrounds, and businesses does not conform to the principles of industrial production. Life processes are in direct contrast with industrial principles.

1. Reality (of life activities, love, learning, learning to learn, learning to learn to learn, relationships, play, community life, religious meditation) is socially constructed, holistic, idiosyncratic.

2. Reality (of life activities,) is nonrationally interdependent, symbolic. Custom, tradition, or arbitrary institutional arrangements regulate marriage, play, politics, and diet.

3. Reality (of life activities) involves an interrelationship of means and the ends.

Loving another person or writing an essay are human activities in which means and ends are related.

4. Reality (of life activities) is not fixable.

Crime, poverty, and discrimination are not "problems" to be repaired by experts but social issues to be confronted with wisdom, courage, and moral struggle. Social issues are political issues and/or economic issues and/or moral issues.

Schools as children-factories cannot be expected to be wise arrangements for learning activities for children. Computers cannot be expected to improve children-factories. But computers may transform society and children. The children themselves and their teachers and their parents may change education.

Children who use computers and modems in ordinary life may become reluctant to participate in schools as children-factories. What can we expect children, teachers, and environmentalists who grow up with personal computers to be life? I suggest the following:

1. The use of a personal computer may change the ownership of knowledge.

In the schools as children-factories, knowledge is owned by the school and its management; in the personal computer world, knowledge may become the possession of anyone who knows how to use a computer.

2. The use of a personal computer may change the meaning, purpose and value of learning.

In schools as children-factories, the meaning and purpose of learning is to please school officials and to gain access to the material rewards that result from pleasing school officials. In the personal computer world, the meaning and purpose of learning may be to access the global information networks and to pursue personal understanding. In factory schools, students must please others; with a computer, students may seek to please themselves in what they can know and do.
3. The use of personal computers may lead to the development of new kinds of communities not based on geography and simple propinquity. A student, an environmentalist, a social activist; those concerned with social justice who have a personal computer, a modem, and a telephone may establish communities of common interest with people in other communities, cities or nations.

4. The use of a personal computer and a modem may facilitate communications across national boundaries and lead to a global sense of citizenship.

5. The use of a personal computer may endow users with the belief that they can gain access to, and come to some understanding of, the world in which they live.

6. The use of a personal computer may change expectations students and teachers have of the society and the world in which they live.

If students change through participating in electronic communications, schools as children-factories may also change in ways hard to predict. Our obligation as teachers, as students, as parents is to try to become aware of the social world in which we live and to develop a comparative critical perspective. We have been encouraged to ignore the social processes which led us to develop schools as children-factories. Most of the recently proposed educational reforms in the United States are intended to produce more efficiency or more reliability of the children-manufacturing process. Few, if any, of the proposed reforms are based on a social awareness of the social world in which we live and the social processes that shape our lives.

A consideration of the personal computer, a modem, and a telephone connection may provide some guidance in our effort to make education vital, challenging, and empowering of students. We can try to clarify the circumstances of school life; to invent arrangements for holistic work with language, art, and science; to arrange opportunities to learn which are grounded on life principles rather than machine principles. The factory system is no longer the important fact of our lives; electronic communications are a powerful reality which may provide some hints about holistic work and education.

Art, literature, and poetry may provide more guidance for education today than science, technology, and rational management.

Life-affirming ethically-grounded education that involves teachers and students in communications around the world offers some hope for the future of our planet. Consider the words of Matsuo Basho:

The river of Heaven  
So Wild the Sea  
and, stretching over Sado Isle,  
The Galaxy.

Ara umi ya Sado-ni  
yokotau Ama-no- gawa.
And he suggests,

Under the trees
Soup, fish salad, and everywhere
Cherry blossoms.

Ki no moto ni
Shiru no namasu mo
Sakura kana

Millard Clements
*Editor, TRSE*
BITNET clements@nyuacf
EcoNet mclements

*Letters to the Editor:*

More and Better

I never got to say hello to you in St. Louis last week. I thought the discussion in CUFA about *TRSE* was interesting: I felt that people had lots of divergent opinions about the journal, and were eager to have time to express these points. I personally like the emphasis you and Jane have placed on including a range of perspectives through the book reviews and articles. I believe that the real quality issue derives from us, the potential contributors to *TRSE*. If we’d submit more and better articles, we’d have a better journal. (That’s a lecture to myself!)

As for the “better” part, I’m not sure the article you sent me for review that I’ve just read qualifies. I don’t feel that the author’s aim has been achieved: that is, to argue that values, moral principles and ethics serve as integrating elements across the social sciences. It’s a useful idea, but this paper has not accomplished the task. In addition, the language of the paper is overly wordy and loaded with jargon. I recommend either not publishing or a very serious revision.

Beverly J. Armento
4562 Lake Village Drive
Dunwoody, GA 30338
Charts and Layers/Heads and Hearts: 
Toward an Integrated Theory of Moral Education

Pamela B. Joseph
Assistant Professor
National College of Education

Abstract

This essay explores two dichotomies that depict moral education and examines the strengths and weaknesses of the four orientations. The argument is made that in social education, the dichotomies are not in balance: Social educators emphasize stage-theory explanations and pay little attention to complex theories of human thought, feeling, and behavior; also, social educators favor reliance on cognitive responses rather than consideration of affective underpinnings of moral judgment and action. Approaches engendered by both sides of each dichotomy provide necessary dimensions to research, theory and practice of moral education.

Introduction

Two dichotomies characterize orientations of research and practice of moral education. The first dichotomy contrasts explanation according to explicit categories and stages, with exploration of the hidden dimensions of thought and behavior. The second dichotomy is that of cognitive or rational facets as opposed to the emotional nature of morality, moral development, and moral education.

Social education’s pursuit of moral education demonstrates an imbalance between the sides in each dichotomy. The desire to make moral education a facilely comprehensible, teachable, and measurable branch of social education thwarts social educators’ interest in theory that grapples with complexities—theory that takes into account combinations of thought, feelings, and behavior. Furthermore, inadequate theory limits sophisticated comprehension, giving practitioners the illusion that simplistic strategies produce meaningful results.

Correspondence: Pamela B. Joseph, Interdisciplinary Studies Dept., National College of Education, 2840 Sheridan Road, Evanston, IL 60201
In this essay I plan to delineate orientations intrinsic to the two dichotomies, to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of these approaches, to demonstrate that theory must take into account a tapestry of intricate elements or relationships, and to argue that only by grappling with complexities may theorists and practitioners begin to engender moral education.

Charts

Explanations that utilize specific categories or stages—often presented in the form of charts—inform educators, allowing them to isolate and concentrate on the multitudinous junctures, interactions and dynamics involved in teaching. For example, Piaget's, Erikson's, and Maslow's stage-theory interpretations enable teachers to understand children's and adolescents' capabilities and limitations, what students can know and what they cannot see, their thirst for learning, and their inability to feel curiosity. Such constructs produce powerful illustrations which help educators make sense of experience.

Systematic explanations have also been applied to moral experience. Kohlberg's (1975) theory demonstrates differences in reasoning, from egocentric thoughts to awareness of an abstract conception of justice for all humankind. Gilligan (1982) presents a continuum beginning with self-preservation and leading to an ultimate morality of caring and non-violence. Selman (1976) and Damon (1980) depict a child's journey from egocentrism and impulse gratification to the recognition of the perspectives of others, and Eisenberg (1986) describes the growth of empathy that serves as the connection between hedonistic reasoning and intrinsically held prosocial values. As Scott (1987) reminds social educators, awareness of various models of moral development enriches educators' insight.

The strength of this mode is its clarity. A systematic approach gives opportunities to understand precisely the behaviors and concepts involved in inquiry. Common descriptions and definitions allow shared vocabulary, reference points for dialogue, and an increase in information due to the possibility of replication of studies.

The weakness of the "charts" mode is that it seems to discourage attempts to commingle various theories in order to enrich interpretation and understanding. It appears that acceptance of a model based on categories or stages shuts out inquiry into other realms of experience; one stops thinking about a particular model only as partial insight.

Moral education's dominant orientation has been cognitive psychology, emphasizing hypothetical moral dilemmas which elicit conscious, verbalized, and "chartable" responses. Introductory human development texts used in teacher education programs give cognitive stage theory preeminent attention; curriculum and values education strategies primarily rely on value analysis. Educators' quest for charts, instruments, and "how-to-do it" strategies obliterates the depth, complexity, and power of the subject of moral educa-
tion. The implicit message to teachers is: moral education can be simply understood and taught.

A compelling example of the need to explore complex and intangible facets of morality is revealed in Robert Coles' *The Moral Life of Children* (1986). Coles tells the story of six-year-old Ruby Bridges who initiated school integration in New Orleans "against terrible, fearful odds." He writes:

For days that turned into weeks—and weeks that turned into months—this child had to brave murderously heckling mobs hurling threats and slurs and hysterical denunciation and accusations. Federal marshals took her to school and brought her home. She attended school all by herself for a good part of a school year, owing to a total boycott by white families. Her parents, of sharecropper background, had just recently arrived in the great, cosmopolitan port city—another poor black family of rural background trying to find a slightly better deal in an urban setting. They were unemployed, and, like Ruby, in jeopardy; mobs threatened them, too.

Still, Ruby persisted, and so did her parents. Ruby's teacher began to wonder, HOW COME?—about the continuing ability of such a child to bear such adversity, and with few assets in her family background. (p. 22).

When Coles investigated Ruby's case, he first assumed the child would be anxious and full of turmoil. But that was not the case. She continued to appear calm and full of hope. Thus Coles ponders:

Ruby was hardly a candidate for the higher level of performance with respect to moral analysis—in possession of Kohlberg's concept of "post-conventional" of "autonomous" thought. But . . . Ruby had a will and used it to make an ethical choice; she demonstrated moral stamina; she possessed honor, courage. (pp. 26, 29).

Clearly, Coles demonstrates that one model, one kind of "chart" cannot fully explain moral experience.

Because this mode encourages adherence to one theoretical bandwagon, moral educators ought to have limited use for charts; reliance on explicit categories or stages can obscure the depth and intricacy of moral education, especially when this orientation allows little flexibility or speculation about other possible explanations. Speculation about a configuration of elements is needed to understand an individual's morality and moral development. Moral educators must see that the study of morality is the tentative composition of pieces of a puzzle.

Consideration of the "charts" orientation of moral education generates several implications for education:

1. The power or clarity of categorical or stage-theory models affords understanding of many aspects of moral development. The chart method
itself should not be abandoned, but used in different ways than has been the common practice. A model that organizes and illuminates understanding must not obliterate other ways of seeing.

2. Exposure to many kinds of theoretical organizations should be required in teacher education. Prospective teachers should be encouraged to realize that there are many ways of understanding experience, thought, and emotion. They need to know that there cannot be one easy explanation in the moral realm, no easy remedy for dealing with their students’ values.

3. Social education should foster analysis, criticism, and reconciliation of various theories of moral development and education. Furthermore, moral education strategies created by social educators (or used by them) should be scrutinized. Such inquiry must reflect awareness of the complexity of the subject and manifest intellectual sophistication.

Layers

Theorists who believe that thought and behavior cannot be easily classified see reality as layers of experience, some of which are relatively obvious and some covert. Researchers who inquire in this mode are suspicious of certainty and uncomfortable with finite descriptions. For them, reality is subjective, and there is great need for understanding individual perspectives.

Comprehension of morality in this mode requires recognition of multiple ways of grasping experience. Reality has different meanings for individuals; one's world is not the same as the other person's. For example, individuals’ experiences are dissimilar depending upon variables such as gender, age, and culture. Because of different behavior, modeled to them, expectations held for them, and responses to their behavior, individuals have different moralities.

This mode also demands investigation of intangible influences, of unconscious perceptions and feelings, that affect judgment and action. For example, in order to understand a student's value system, researchers and educators would not center on parents' purposeful teachings. Rather, they would inquire about conflicts between moral teachings and the parents' actual behaviors, ways in which parenting reflects the values of culture, and the emotional dynamics of parent-child relationships affecting the child's identification with parental values. In the classroom, manifest curriculum, its strategies, goals, and evaluation, "dance on the surface of reality," (Giroux, 1988, p. 4), and are less important than understanding patterns of teacher behavior and values taught implicitly.

Taking into account many variables affecting morality leads the moral educator to seek knowledge about human experience through many disciplines. Awareness of multiple academic structures permits educators to represent morality as a matrix of variables. Thus one is able to ask, "What configurations of culture, peers, parenting, and schooling have helped form
this student's morality?" The "layers" orientation provides avenues for questioning moral experience, for pondering origins instead of categorizing explicit behavioral indicators. Thus the strengths of this mode lie in the refusal to accept overt, superficial explanations and in continued probing of experience.

Using a "layers" orientation to examine designs for moral education in recent social education literature, the lack of in-depth questioning and reliance on a one-dimensional explanation by the authors of the strategies is apparent.

Styer (1988) assures us that children can be taught to see that sex equity involves fairness issues; adaptation of Kohlberg's moral dilemma approach "can lead to children's moral development by developing the cognitive conception of justice upon which acquisition of a more mature understanding and judgment of sex equity depends" (p. 174). But as plausible as it seems that school-age children who are concerned with fairness would be stimulated to think about sexism as a fairness issue, what of deeply-rooted cultural values that would affect children's beliefs about gender? Attitudes and beliefs about sex roles are formed by a web of messages and impressions that each child experiences. The dominant roles based on sex in the child's culture, the interpretations of the environment that parents give to the child, the modeling of parental behavior, and the stereotypes of popular culture all influence the child's values.

Leming (1987) attempts to harmonize cognitive and affective components of morality by recognizing that some students do not have middle-class economic values because they desire immediate gratification. The author utilizes Bettleheim's (1970) description of children operating on "the pleasure principle—living for the here and now," but concludes that schools can compensate for deficient values caused by disadvantaged backgrounds by "determining normative goals" of economic education, teaching them in the classroom, and changing the attitudes of students with strategies such as "making greater use of role models." Leming states, "realistic economic success stories in our society have greater potential utility if used appropriately" (p. 73). For several reasons, the strategies in this article do not reflect the author's comprehension of complex psychological and cultural influences.

Firstly, Bettleheim himself takes a far less optimistic position about the effect of schools in changing the value orientation of students; he warns that the teacher must first deal with the child in the here and now, and, in very small steps, encourage the child to delay gratification. Secondly, teaching of values and rendering of success stories may have had quite an impact when Horatio Alger, William McGuffey, and a network of people in a cohesive culture presented their similar versions of the world to children. Such harmonious values, however, would seldom arise in the multicultural society of contemporary America that would encourage children to imagine success that might come to them many years later. It is quixotic to think that schools
can wrest students away from their families and cultures, or that middle-class economic values can be presented so favorably that students will ignore their own experiences.

Recognition of the perplexing task of attempting moral education may lead teachers toward more insight. However, such realism also exposes weaknesses of the "layers" approach. Firstly, seeing morality as complex configurations may usher in confusion so that there is little or no sense made of moral development and behavior. Secondly, teachers who discern the complex ramifications of moral education may feel overwhelmed by the enormity of their task. Teachers may feel helpless or paralyzed instead of working toward examination of how they may become moral educators. Thus realization of the difficulty of teaching moral education may generate the conclusion that it is unteachable. An unbalanced reliance on only the "layers" side of the charts/layers dichotomy could crush inquiry by provoking overpowering uncertainty.

The "layers" orientation also suggests several directions for social education:

1. Educators must study moral experience through multiple disciplines. The gaps in social education's moral inquiry must be filled. As Edward Hall states, "It is frequently the most obvious and taken-for-granted and therefore the least studied aspects of culture that influence behavior in the deepest and most subtle ways" (1973, p. 17). It is necessary to consider how culture influences people to pay attention to some phenomena and ignore others, to see situations as things to live with or problems to solve. Moral educators must give some thought to how culture teaches people to value—to value nurturing or competition, to prize possessions or human relationships. How can educators delineate students' values without searching for the origins of these values? How can teachers attempt moral education without considering patterns of childrearing and culture that mold the perceptions, thoughts, and feelings of their students?

Another discipline that must compel the attention of social education is philosophy. Moral philosophers historically have asked questions seldom raised by contemporary social scientists and educators (Collins, 1987). Although the tradition of moral inquiry cannot create neat curriculum packages, it can offer reflections on the nature of moral thought, behavior, and moral education. Philosophical inquiry examines numerous connections between thought, feeling, and action. In Teacher as Stranger, Greene affirms the need for educators to be philosophers. It is philosophy that can "approach knowledge gained by natural and human sciences, the awarenesses made possible by the arts, and the personal insights into existence such human being accumulates as he lives" (1973, p. 7). Furthermore, philosophy encourages educators to do more than understand their students' realities; teachers must confront their own sense of what is real, truthful, and good by looking at "orthodoxies and sacred writs, and seeing how conventions
limit language and enclose their worlds" (p. 10). Moral educators must understand their own cultures as well as those of their students; they must scrutinize their own beliefs and behavior. It is philosophy that permits consciousness of the many layers of reality experienced by teachers and students.

2. Presentation of one paradigm of theory and research within an academic discipline does not adequately allow understanding of moral experience. Moral educators’ enmeshment with Kohlberg’s cognitive model of moral development demonstrates the pitfalls of one-sided use of a discipline. Feminist (or humanist) critics have established the necessity of expanding this rational, male-oriented model (Eisenberg, 1986; Gilligan, 1987). Yet recent attention to nurturing and caring in the construct of moral theory has not allowed thorough deliberation about the nature of moral development. Little note is made of psychoanalytic theories that describe how pleasure-seeking drives lead children and adults to behave without prohibitions, or how needs and passions propel humans toward malevolent action (Fromm, 1973; Redl & Wineman, 1951). Frames of understanding remain limited if consideration of the dark side of emotion does not come into play.

3. Moral educators need to approach each student with an awareness of individual configurations of moral development. Teachers see an array of moral behaviors in their classrooms. They may work with students who conform unquestioningly to authority or to peers, treat each other unkindly and aggressively, act destructively, and have little respect for others and themselves. Educators must consider the needs of these students. For example, when emotional deprivations have kept egocentric concerns foremost, engagement in value analysis may be an inadequate moral education strategy for children whose impoverished emotional backgrounds must first be filled with nurturing and the development of trust. Students may not have had relationships with adults who demonstrate nonviolent, caring behavior; opportunities to have strong, positive relations with prosocial role models are far more crucial than students’ involvement in cognitive values methods. Also, recognition of serious deficiencies in students’ value systems may prompt educators to recognize their own limitations and seek the advice and help of social workers and therapists in order to develop strategies that meet individual needs (Joseph & Joseph, 1977).

Heads

The “heads” orientation suggests that how people think about moral issues will determine how they will make decisions and subsequent actions. Reasoning is the crucial factor in both cognitive-developmental and rational moral theory.

The major thrust of this mode is the idea that moral development is intertwined with cognitive development; in particular, the ability to understand the perspectives of others. Egocentric children or adults who cannot think beyond their own perspectives will operate on a “me first” version of moral-
ity. Those who can take the perspective of others may show concern for the effect of their decisions on family members, friends, or others in their community. Individuals who can think abstractly can evaluate their moral decisions by weighing them in the light of principles that affect all humanity.

The strength of the cognitive-developmental approach to moral education is the information it reveals about the capacities and limitations of students. Assessment of what students can understand helps educators develop realistic expectations, and suggests language or examples that will help students think about moral choices. Also, knowledge of students' reasoning shows directions for teaching, e.g., encouragement of perspective-taking through personal experiences and viewpoints.

Another major accentuation of this mode is rationalism. Rational morality implies a standard by which individuals make conscious and reasoned choices, conquer primitive or animal instincts, and guide behavior to bring about the best for human life. Rational moralists believe that rationality must ultimately prevail and reduce the influence of the emotions. As Bailey (1980) warns, "Reason and principles tell me my duty in a way that feeling can never do" (p. 120).

Although the goals of rational morality permeate the rationales of moral education curricula (Banks & Clegg, 1985; Dobkin, et al., 1985), social education has provided few forums for reflection upon the power of rationality as applied to morality. Rationality is the explicit emphasis of the "heads" mode, and yet, without consideration of the components of rationality, teachers cannot grasp intellectual directives needed in order to bring forth moral education.

The basic requirement for rationality is the perception of reality. Although the line one draws between rationality and irrationality depends upon an individual's cognizance of what is real (Papineau, 1987; Trigg, 1980; Watzlawick, 1976), reality—although never free from subjectivity—exists through reliance upon common perceptions and analyses of experiences. Rationality depends upon awareness of reality and checking the validity of one's individual experience. For example, people are irrational if they cannot consolidate information about real situations and act accordingly, e.g., imagining unfounded dangers and conspiracies, or acting out by harming one's "attackers" or "persecutors." Individuals cannot live together without some degree of shared perceptions of reality.

Rationality implies that reasoning incorporates awareness of evidence or substantiated experience, and that reasoning must involve flexibility and willingness to modify one's thinking where evidence provides new understanding. A rigid belief system impedes rationality. Highland (1986) postulates an example of a person who attributes to patterns of solar activity all natural and human events such as wars or social confrontations. Ramifications of such systems are:
excessive conformity, or conformity without criticism, [leading] inevitably to bigotry, the refusal to accept any new claim or argument against a particular point of view. It is difficult to think of actual and equally intellectually reprehensible cases of excessive conformity in the form of religious fundamentalism and dogmatic Marxism (p. 129).

Also, rationality requires people to be empiricists. It entails having enough understanding of the environment to be able to see the relationship between actions and consequences. As Dewey explains, “intelligent action is not concerned with the bare consequences of the thing known, but with consequences to be brought into existence by action conditioned on the knowledge” (1922, p. 299). Rational morality depends upon knowledge of how one’s own behavior affects other people and upon insight into the real situations of others. A rationalistic model of a morally educated person is someone “who is able to challenge an action contemplated, a rule, command or suggestion and examine its implications in terms of how it affects the interests of other people” (Sugarman, 1973, p. 211).

Furthermore, by attempting to understand the situations of others, one develops moral imagination, “the imaginative realizations of the feelings of our neighbors” (Frankena, 1966, pp. 242-243). Such insight helps create comprehension of realistically helpful responses and stimulates empathic responses. Therefore, one does not approach knowledge of the plight of others in a detached, passive manner, but perceives, thinks, and plans with heightened and active awareness or sensitivity.

A rationalist’s goal is to allow the intellectual side of human nature to control the emotional side in order to stay grounded in reality and to act intelligently. Individuals must realize that emotions, drives, or desires may distort the perception of reality and reasoning. Through intelligent perception and self-control, rational people seek to control their passions (Rieff, 1959, p. 70). How would rational moralists respond to William James’s assertion that “we shall make moral distinctions and take them seriously is decided by our will and not our intellect?” (Smith, 1966, p. 73). They would answer: It is valid to attribute to the will a strong sway over thought and conduct, but the more awareness one has of how will, drives, and desires influence our beliefs and actions, the better our chances for rational decisions. Control of emotions occurs when one understands their existence by bringing them to consciousness and analyzing how they influence perceptions and behavior.

Therefore, reflection is an important element or rationality. The major tenet of rational morality is the belief in the power of reflective thinking which enables people to rationally adopt an ethical code and adapt moral rules to changing situations. Through reflection and self-scrutiny, the rationally moral person can resist irrationality and externally-created standards. Thus the rational moralist is to a great extent an autonomous human being.
The most significant difference between rational morality and other moral systems is the matter of examination of beliefs. Whereas traditional moralities praise the quality of faith—even when exercised blindly—rational morality invites questioning. Dewey and Tufts warn that:

Moral theory cannot emerge when there is a positive belief as to what is right and what is wrong, for then there is no occasion for reflection. It emerges when men are confronted with situations in which different desires promise opposed goods and in which incompatible courses of action seem to be morally justified. Only such a conflict of good ends and of standards of right and wrong calls forth personal inquiry into the basis of morals (1932, p. 173).

Similarly, Hare explains that a society's morality deteriorates when principles become so settled as to be second nature so that people act without thinking. When people in the society no longer adapt principles to new circumstances, they lose their ability to make moral decisions. "Morality regains its vigour when ordinary people have learnt afresh to decide for themselves what principles to live by, and more especially what principles to teach their children" (1966, pp. 219-220).

Over-emphasis of the "heads" mode has several weaknesses, besides the previously mentioned problem of reliance on the cognitive developmental scheme of moral development. Social educators have been critical of the rational orientation of moral education, noting that it is foolish to consider students' reasoning without investigating whether or not reasoning affects behavior (Fraenkel, 1981; Leming, 1981; Scott, 1987). Greene (1988) criticizes the cognitive focus of the classroom not only because of "what it excludes," but because it is doubtful that "reasoning is enough when it comes to acting in a resistant world, or opening fields of possibilities among which people may choose to choose." She cautions that discussions involving issues that teachers perceive have immediate relevancy to students have not affected students personally—in situations out of the classroom, students have not acted on their opinions (p. 119).

The other major weakness in stressing the "heads" side of the dichotomy is the small account taken of the effect of emotions. On one hand, emotions positively influence morality due to empathy and love (J. Gilligan, 1976; Hoffman, 1976); indeed, a supposedly negative emotion such as anxiety—when not experienced overwhelmingly—can heighten one's cognitive processes (Garbarino & Bronfenbrenner, 1976, p. 77), permitting individuals to be aware of danger and the distress of others. On the other hand, affect can impede moral judgment and behavior (Joseph, 1979/1978). For example, "individuals who remain motivated by unfulfilled, psychological needs may not be able to function at higher levels of moral development, regardless of their stage of cognitive development" (Simpson, 1976, p. 159).
The “heads” discussion calls for continued emphasis upon cognition and rationality in moral education. Clearly, another kind of moral education practice must be initiated.

1. Moral education must actively involve students in the process of thinking about moral issues, not merely passively attempting the clarification of values nor responding to hypothetical situations. Teacher-initiated, textbook-initiated, and packaged materials have not created the relevance or immediacy needed for a genuine dialogue about morality. A promising strategy is Tappan and Brown’s use of narrative which allows students to talk about what they have experienced as moral conflict. Narrative stimulates students to reflect upon their actions and feelings when experiencing personal moral conflict and “seeks to encourage students to authorize their own voices and moral perspectives” (1989, p. 201).

2. Moral educators should not fear to lead students toward disequilibrium—the creation of doubt and questioning, the consideration of alternatives. Students need to explore their own value systems by thinking about why they have beliefs and behaviors. They need to examine the experiences of their own upbringing and to probe their cultures in order to think about the communication of value messages and the rewards and punishments for conformity and deviance.

3. Furthermore, teachers themselves must enter into similar moral inquiry by examining beliefs and formation of values and behavior. The classroom climate that arouses disequilibrium cannot exist unless teachers ask themselves the same kinds of questions that they encourage of students. Moral educators should share the experiences and struggles which have helped shape their beliefs; they may share and reflect upon them in a dialogue with students. But there will be no questioning and examining if teachers see moral education as values teachers hand down to students instead of sharing, speculating, and imagining with them.

4. It is not tenable to unquestionably accept reality, to assume that rhetoric is truth. Moral educators must also lead their students toward honest scrutiny of social issues. Greene (1988) declares that the orientation of schools “has been to accommodation, to fitting into existing social and economic structures, to what is given, to what is inescapably there. Little is done to render problematic a reality that includes homelessness, hunger, pollution, crime, censorship, arms build-ups, threats of war, even as it includes the amassing of fortunes, consumer goods of unprecedented appeal” (p. 12). Rather than just encouraging respect for social institutions, moral educators also must probe: Are these institutions functioning in moral ways? Is human life respected?

5. Cultivation of moral imagination must be a primary responsibility of moral educators. “The point of cognitive development,” writes Greene, “is not to gain an increasingly complete grasp of abstract principles. It is to in-
terpret from as many vantage points as possible lived experience, the ways there are of being in the world” (1988, p. 120).

Issues cannot be presented without stimulating deep involvement and appreciation for the experiences of others. Discussion of homelessness, of discrimination, of war, cannot take place without exploring personal experience. Noddings and Stone (1984) explain that the teacher must involve the students in reflection about their own experiences and then introduce stimulating material that will provoke their imagination. Their goal is to “awaken the inner eye” to have students think, “This really HAPPENED: How would I feel and act in such a situation?” It is to understand, by feeling ourselves, what people may actually have felt and how what they felt influenced how they acted” (p. 127). Without such awareness, students see people as strangers, as impersonal others who do not provoke their interest or attention.

Hearts

The “hearts” side of the dichotomy centers upon affective influences, suggesting that moral decisions have to be understood by looking at the emotions that influence people’s thought and behavior. This orientation explores these questions: What inspires moral behavior? How will people recognize the needs of others and feel connected to others? Examination of affect adds to the theory of moral education by explaining the motivations needed for moral action and consistent moral behavior.

The “hearts” mode reflects a long history of viewing emotions as catalysts for moral behavior, for instance, how sympathy or benevolence influence moral acts and pleasurable feelings reward good conduct and prompt future moral actions (Hutchenson, 1725; Schopenhauer, 1841/1965; Smith, 1759/1853). Contemporary social scientists and philosophers often consider emotions as positive moral influences (Blum, 1980; Eisenberg, 1986; Gilligan, 1977).

The catalyst for moral action is the capacity for feeling. One’s feelings for others provide the incentive for action upon moral decisions. Theorists who emphasize the importance of affect believe that reason alone does not encourage morality. Dewey and Tufts speculate:

Unless there is a direct, mainly unreflective appreciation of persons and deeds, the data for subsequent thought will be lacking or distorted. A person must feel the qualities of acts...“Cold-blooded” thought may reach a correct conclusion, but if a person remains antipathetic or indifferent to the considerations presented to him in a rational way, they will not stir him to action in accord with them. (1932, p. 296).

“Moral intuition construed as moral feeling,” write Noddings and Stone, “is clearly very different from the intuition of moral knowledge...it provides the initial impulse to act in a caring fashion. A person senses the pain
of others and, without deliberation, feels that ‘I must do something!’’ (1984, p. 63). In other words, fools rush in and often do more good than those who can think reasonably but do not feel. However, empathic response may also stir cognitive functioning. Blum asserts, “sympathy and compassion themselves impel, or can impel, the necessary reflection when the situation presents elements of complexity, when it is not evident how best to carry out one’s beneficent intent” (1980, p. 110).

Moral feelings create discomfort or empathic distress. One motivation for moral behavior is the desire to escape from one’s own feeling of distress. It is such emotional response that sustains the monitoring of impulsive or egocentric behavior by giving feelings of remorse. Peters (1966) explains that the wicked man

may know what he ought to do in general and have the judgment to see that a rule applies to his particular case; yet he may ruthlessly and doggedly do what he knows to be wrong. . . . The wicked man . . . is not impervious to obligations; he cares for them only to a limited extent (p. 281).

Without feelings of remorse or guilt, the wicked person continues to have little concern when terrible things happen to other people; Peters attributes to sympathy the quality missing in the wicked person.

Other philosophers (Ellet, 1986; Rawls, 1971; Richards, 1971) insist that feelings must support rational ethical judgments. Remorse or guilt, when not overly destructive, need encouragement. According to psychoanalytic theory, emotion leads people toward impulsive, irrational behavior, but it is emotion that induces such discomfort that people learn to regulate their impulses. Morality depends upon a “psychic balancing scheme” in which destructive passions are manipulated by other more socially positive emotions. Theorists explain that “excessive guilt disables individual action,” but the conscience “is a form of ‘social glue’ which cements . . . the cultural bonds of any society. Without guilt and conscience, life would degenerate into a tooth-and-nail existence and attendant societal chaos” (Rich & Devitis, 1985, p. 18).

However, guilt may be a primitive, limiting emotion; James Gilligan strongly prefers another kind of emotion, a natural caring, a sympathetic sense, or love that leads to a higher morality (1976, p. 145). Similarly, Flugel writes that “much moral conduct is . . . instinctive and spontaneous; some students of ethics would regard this natural morality as the most valuable of all . . . as an ideal” (1945, pp. 16–17). Or, as Hoffman concludes, “the human potential for a sense of oneness, empathy, and sympathy may well be enormous” (1976, p. 18).

Empathic responses and sympathy allow individuals to project their ties to family, friends, and neighbors beyond that limited sphere in order to feel connections with all of human life. It is sympathy that moves humans from
“egocentricity to sociality,” from self-centeredness to concern for all life (Flugel, 1945; p. 243).

As in the case of the discussion of the other sides of the dichotomies, the weakness in this orientation lies in the possibility of overemphasis. If one considers love and sympathy in isolation from cognition and reason, the result is the existence of a feeling person who may not have the insight needed to understand moral dilemmas and cannot demonstrate moral behavior in a constructive manner. Also, as mentioned earlier, one kind of paradigm—viewing only the positive thrust of affect—obscures emotion as an immoral motivation. Emotions such as fear, anger, and hatred negatively influence moral behavior; even love and sympathy become obstacles when, for instance, a person hurts others in pursuit of a love object.

The “hearts” orientation inspires the following directions for moral education:

1. Educators must know that the emotional aspect of valuing and behavior is an integral component of moral theory. No longer can affect be disregarded in ethical inquiry because emotions seem irrational, thus pointless in an understanding or teaching of ethics (McGill, 1954). Any discussion of moral strategies must include awareness of affect and its motivation or moral action.

2. The traditional approach to moral education—value analysis, values clarification, and usage of hypothetical moral dilemmas—must give way to experiences, either in the classroom or the community, that stimulate empathic responses and caring behavior. Without opportunities for cooperative and altruistic behavior, there is nothing particularly moral about moral education. As Martin ponders, “We need to understand why an approach to moral education that stresses caring and love exists in a kind of theoretical limbo and why a perceived failure of other models to do justice to moral sentiments is not considered a grave defect” (1987, p. 205).

3. Teachers must ensure that students see them as caring, compassionate role models who demonstrate and encourage human connectedness. Teachers need to be aware of how they create moral universes in their classrooms (Boehm, 1977, p. 38); too often, teachers assume that modeling of moral values implies teaching conformity to rules (Dewey, 1909, p. 15; Stewart, 1974, p. 17), rather than demonstrating sympathetic responses.

Noddings describes how the caring teacher models moral behavior:

A teacher cannot “talk” this ethic. She must live it, and that implies establishing a relation with a student. Besides talking to him and showing him how one cares, she engages in cooperative practice with him. He is learning not just mathematics or social studies; he is also learning how to be one-caring. By conducting education morally, the teacher hopes to induce an enhanced moral sense in the student (1984, p. 179).

The continuation of Noddings’s vision is that moral educators must look beyond the classroom to create a caring moral universe in the school, ensur-
ing that the culture of the school conveys concern for individuals over arbitrary obsession with rules, cooperation over competition, and altruism over egocentrism.

**Toward an Integrated Theory**

The balance between the “charts/layers” and “heads/hearts” dichotomies cannot be attained if the predilection to avoid complex explanation permeates research, theory, and practice. In order to imagine a multifarious theory that can incorporate clear visions of cognition and affect with rich intricacies of culture, human dynamics, and development, moral educators must change their intellectual bent.

The first imperative for change focuses upon research. The preference for investigations that seldom go beyond the obvious, and certainly the quantifiable, has characterized educational research. This mentality, Scriven explains, is caused by “education’s search for status as a social science.” He notes that rather than striving for conceptual analysis, educational researchers demonstrate a fascination for “overemphasis on mindless data collections, numerical analysis and the hypothesis testing model” (1988, p. 135).

Thus theory reflects research’s orientation. As Giroux declares, “traditional educational theory has always been wedded to the visible, to the literal, and to what can be seen and operationalized. Educational theory has usually not included a language or mode of analysis that looks beyond the given or the phenomenal” (1988, p. 4). If moral educators find satisfaction by merely recording their students’ conscious responses to moral dilemmas experienced by other people, then teachers and students will have no opportunity to envision the complex interactions of emotions and reasoning that influence moral action.

Another necessary change involves practice. Eisner believes that the discipline of education has been strongly influenced by “scientism.” He suggests that from the start, in teacher education, curriculum is introduced as a “series of discrete parts.” Measurement of the learning of the parts becomes educator’s primary aim; what students “believe, feel, or experience does not count” (1985, p. 28). Little attention is paid to what teachers do not easily perceive or manage. The mentality of scientism gives teachers the sense that what can be controlled—the curriculum and its accompanying strategies—are the only realities. Thus, moral educators suppose that their efforts must bring success.

The corollary of this “neat and tidy” organizational mentality is that of commercialism. Discernible steps and stages give birth to curriculum packages; a complex view of thought, feeling, and behavior does not. Certainly, the desire to “make something” of moral development approaches must become a commitment to reflect upon a multitude of variables affecting moral development and to explore quandaries, not to generate commercial products.
Educators cannot operate with the illusion that one lesson or strategy can significantly alter the moral development of students. Indeed, without dramatic changes in moral education practice (such as continually seeking personal reflection about values and stirring dissonance and controversy about values held by individuals, families, peer cultures, and societies), there seems to be very little hope that students will engage in speculation about moral values or behaviors. Also, it may be more realistic to understand moral education in terms of prolonged human relationships between teachers and students than specific methods of moral education, even though optimism must be tempered by the realization that the teacher may be one influence upon students' moral values amidst many other influences.

This all suggests to moral educators that the wish for sure explanation and strategies must give way to living with uncertainty. Rather than being content with what can be easily observed, tested, or measured, they must probe deeply into human experience.

Endnotes

1. The "charts and layers" dichotomy was inspired by Stuart Palonsky's (1987) discussion of the differences between quantitative and qualitative researchers in "Ethnographic Scholarship and Social Education," Theory and Research in Social Education, 15(2), 77-87.

2. The "heads and hearts" dichotomy was suggested by Garry Will's (1978) exploration of this subject in Inventing America: Jefferson's Declaration of Independence. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
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Abstract

Early in the 1980s, a study was conducted by the authors of the status of standards for the initial licensure of secondary social studies teachers in the fifty states. Following the intrusion of a number of highly publicized efforts directed toward the reform of teacher education, a follow-up study was conducted during the winter of 1988–89. The follow-up study surprisingly reveals no general efforts by state education agencies to expand the general education component of teacher education programs and equally surprising moves to increase requirements within the professional component, most importantly in the area of field experiences. Requirements in history and the social sciences have been substantially increased during the decade, though this requirement continues to fall far short of NCSS standards. The behavioral sciences appear to play a lesser role in the history/social science component than at the beginning of the decade.

Introduction

Early in the decade, two of the present authors conducted a series of studies of standards for the initial licensure of teachers, including one concerned with the preparation of social studies teachers (Dumas and Weible 1984a, 1984b; Weible and Dumas, 1982). Immediately following the collection of...
data for those studies, a series of widely heralded national reports promoting reform within teacher education appeared. These reports included *A Call for Change in Teacher Education* (National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, 1985); *Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group* (1986); and *The Carnegie Forum's A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (1986). These recommendations for the reform of teacher education, combined with the efforts of many so-called “education governors” and state legislatures, suggest an irrepressible wave of change in the way teachers are prepared.

Taken as a whole, these reports and reform efforts have exerted pressure on state education agencies and teacher education institutions to establish higher standards for admission to teacher education programs and for licensure, to offer programs that include more substantial foundations in general education studies and the teaching specialty (history and social sciences), to move toward extended programs of study, and to develop better mechanisms of accountability for graduates' abilities, usually interpreted as paper-and-pencil testing.

But have the national reports and actions by state governors and legislatures actually produced major changes in the ways social studies teachers are prepared nationally, or has it been business as usual for those state education agencies which have the responsibility for establishing minimum expectations for the preparation of teachers in their states?

**Problem**

This study was designed to follow up Weible and Dumas (1982) and Dumas and Weible (1984b) by redetermining minimum standards for the initial licensure of secondary social studies teachers by the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The study is concerned with minimum standards for all three teacher education program components: general education; professional education; and history/social science. In addition, the study deals with state licensure requirements apart from the programmatic components, such as testing mandates, moral character affidavits, etc.

It is also important to state here what this study does not purport to do. This study deals with the status of state agency standards (or lack thereof), not directly with the national status of teacher preparation. Teacher preparation is done by universities or colleges which can generally not do less than what is mandated by state agencies, but may do more, if they wish and have the resources. Also, most state education agencies today operate systems of state approval of institutions to prepare teachers for licensure. In some states, approval is based on institutions meeting detailed state programmatic standards; in other states, the agency specifies only those requirements or programmatic aspects which are special concerns in that state agency and leaves much to the professional judgment of institutions and to the rigor of visiting institutional approval committees. Still other states maintain visitation and
program approval procedures with virtually no explicit programmatic prescriptions. It should not be concluded from the data which follow that states in the latter category have no standards or low standards. Procedures in these states generally seem to depend heavily upon both the standards of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), and in some instances those of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). This study does not examine the rigor of institutional approval procedures in these states and no conclusions are justified regarding those states which fail to specify standards under any component of the teacher education program.

Methods

During the fall and winter of 1988-89, the authors requested of the certification division directors of each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia, all materials relating to minimum standards for teacher licensure. In some instances follow-up letters were required, but all necessary materials were received by January, 1989.

The results that were calculated for each of the three program components occasionally required some difficult judgments to be made regarding both categorization and quantification. An example of the former is the variety of names assigned by states to courses which are almost certainly multicultural in intent; and an example of the latter, occasional combination requirements such as “six semester hours in political science and economics.” When faced with such judgments, the authors followed the rule of doing whatever seemed least likely to distort the true picture. A literal interpretation of all of these instances might indeed have produced some serious distortions. These were almost certainly avoided.

In reporting the results, it is important to have some benchmarks against which to compare the current status of the standards. The most important ones in dealing with the preparation of social studies teachers are the results of Weible and Dumas (1982), Dumas and Weible (1984), and the NCSS’s “Standards for the Preparation of Social Studies Teachers” (1987). Secondarily, these results can be related to current standards of both NASDTEC (1986) and NCATE (1987), though the latter defer largely to the NCSS Standards (1988) for programmatic concerns.

Results

Results of this study are presented for general education, professional education, history/social science, and “other requirements.”

General Education. Current NCSS standards require that a minimum of one-third of the program of studies constitute the general education component of a teacher preparation program. This would suggest 40 semester hours of a conventional 120 semester hour baccalaureate degree program or
somewhat more if programs were extended. Seventeen states mandate a minimum semester-hour requirement for the general education program. The mean requirement of these states is 42.9 semester hours and the range 30–60. The current mean of 42.9 is slightly down from the mean of 44.0 reported earlier (Weible and Dumas, 1982).

This slight reduction is almost certainly not a reflection of declining interest in a strong general education program, but more likely of a growing tendency of state agencies to avoid being prescriptive about general education, leaving that judgment to colleges and universities. Eleven fewer states prescribe today than were reported in 1982 (Weible and Dumas, 1982).

Table 1 presents minimum general education requirements of the states which choose to prescribe by discipline. The majority of states leave initial judgments regarding the general education component to institutions and ultimately to the judgment of visiting program approval committees.

Twenty-one states make specific requirements by discipline. These requirements indicate that either coursework or competency is required. The primary value of Table 1 is that it allows one to gauge the relative importance which the specifying states place upon each discipline or subject area. It will be noted that 90% of the states which specified anything, required work in history/social science, and most further required that this work include U.S. history and/or government.

The relative value placed upon the disciplines in the general education component is essentially the same as reported earlier (Weible and Dumas, 1982). The primary difference noted in comparing these results with those reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Coursework or Competency Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History/Social Science</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Composition</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts/Humanities</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Physical Education</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Cultural</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global/International</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of states specifying some requirements within the general education component.
** Number of states specifying some requirement within this discipline or area of study.
for secondary teachers in 1982, as noted earlier, is that eleven fewer states have chosen to prescribe general education expectations, leaving these to institutional judgment and the program approval process. It is noted, also, that some states continue to place less importance on certain major areas of knowledge than do others, despite mandates from NCSS (1987) and NASDTEC (1987) that all major areas of knowledge, including fine arts/humanities, multi-cultural studies, and oral communication, be included in the general education programs of all prospective teachers.

**Professional Education.** Current NCSS standards expect that at least 20% of a teacher preparation program for social studies teachers will be done in professional education courses, including clinical and field experiences. Twenty percent would translate as 24 semester hours of a conventional 120 semester hour baccalaureate degree program. The data reveals that 28 states presently specify a minimum amount of work in this component, and that those states require a mean of 22.4 semester hours with a range of 16 to 31 hours. The current mean of 22.4 is slightly higher than the mean of 20.0 semester hours reported earlier (Weible and Dumas, 1982).

Significantly, despite some pressure from national reports to reduce this component, the movement, at least with state agencies generally, has been to extend it. Table 2 reports requirements of the states within the professional education component. Forty-three states made at least one specifica-

### Table 2

**Minimum Professional Education Requirements by Area**  
\( n = 43^* \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Coursework or Competency Required</th>
<th>f**</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Technology/Computer Applications</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Evaluation/Measurement</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/Methods/Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Organization Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Cultural/Human Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field (or Clinical) Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>42***</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of states specifying some requirements within the professional education component.

** Number of states specifying some requirement within this area of study.

*** The states which make an explicit student teaching prescription require a mean of 8.3 semester credit hours for that experience, a range of 4-15 semester hours.
tion, although in several instances only student teaching was specified. It will be noted that the most commonly required elements of the professional sequence are student teaching, educational psychology (often both psychology of learning and adolescent growth and development), either general or special methods or both, the Exceptional Child, and work in the social foundations of education. Since general methods (63%) and special methods (51%) are treated separately, one could be deceived. One or the other type of methods instruction is required about as frequently as is educational psychology. The category of multi-cultural/human relations also can be deceptive. Such a category appears, it will be noted, under all three program components. If the percentages are added, it becomes clear that most states require that multicultural or ethnic studies be included at some point in programs.

Social Studies educators will likely be concerned by the 51% mandate for special methods in teaching of social studies, since the NCSS standards (1988) clearly require a course (not instruction or competency) in such methods. State agencies continue to avoid this expectation, due almost certainly to the many small teacher education faculties in their states which do not have the resources to offer special methods courses in each secondary specialty. Likewise, many of the other categories of professional studies shown in Table 2, and infrequently required by state education agencies, are expected by NCSS and NASDTEC standards to be universal requirements. An examination of the extent to which state agencies mandate particular types of coursework or competency reveals, for the most part, only minor changes since Weible and Dumas (1982). The most important upward changes have been a 20% increase in the mandating of early field experiences, a 31% increase in the requiring of courses dealing with the exceptional child, and a mean 1.3 semester hour increase in the student teaching requirement. The only important reduction has been an 11% one in the category of instruction in general methods. Since there has been no significant movement towards requiring special methods instruction, one would have to conclude that the change has been for states to less frequently require instruction in both general and special methods.

History/Social Science. NCSS standards (1988) for the preparation of a comprehensive social studies teacher require that no less than 40% (48 semester hours) of a 120 semester hour baccalaureate degree program shall be taken in history and the social sciences. This study reveals that 30 states currently specify a minimum requirement for comprehensive social studies certification and those states require a mean of 41.6 semester hours, substantially less than the NCSS standard of 48 but a substantial improvement over the 37.0 semester hours reported earlier (Dumas and Weible, 1984b).

Table 3 presents results for the 35 states which made some specific requirements by discipline within history and the social sciences. Table 3 should not be seen as suggesting a decline in the status of U.S. or world history in
Table 3
Minimum Requirements in History/Social Science by Discipline or Subject for Secondary Social Studies Teachers
n = 35*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline or Subject</th>
<th>f**</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>f***</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History (general)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>6-24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American History</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Gov't. or History</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2-12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Western Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy/Religion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of states specifying some requirement within the history/social science component.
** Number of states requiring a semester-credit-hour minimum by discipline or subject.
*** Combines those states in column one with those which require an unspecified amount of coursework or competency in that discipline or subject.

Social studies teacher preparation. Ninety-five percent of states specifying anything at all require some work in history. Only 54% require work in world history, 66% require work in U.S. history, and an additional 29% of states require work in history without specifying the type of history. Next in frequency of requirement is political science or U.S. government (74%), economics (71%), and geography (69%). The behavioral sciences and other types of studies lag well behind. With reference to the benchmarks established by the earlier study (Dumas and Weible, 1984b), the ordinal priority of the disciplines is unchanged. There is, however, a clear tendency to place more emphasis upon history, geography, political science, and economics in the preparation of comprehensive social studies teachers and substantially less emphasis on the behavioral sciences. The frequency with which sociology is required has dropped 15%, anthropology 10%, and psychology 5%. Since the overall history/social sciences requirement has risen by almost six semester hours, the decline of behavioral science in the preparation of comprehensive social studies teachers is even more remarkable.
In addition to the above, the majority of states also certify teachers by discipline, (e.g., history, geography). Three certify only by discipline. To further confound matters, a few of those which indicate the granting of a “social studies” certificate clearly do not intend individuals to teach subjects within the social studies without some special concentration or “endorsement” in that discipline or subject. Some of the latter group could as well be viewed as licensure by discipline, but the authors chose in those cases to call it “social studies” if that is what the state calls it.

Other Requirements. In addition to the programmatic standards, the following requirements are made by states for licensure: 38 states require a basic skills test; 27 require a pedagogy test; 23, a general knowledge test; 28, a subject matter specialty test; 12, a moral or ethical affidavit or proof of moral character (most states require disclosure of arrests or convictions if related to moral turpitude); six, U.S. citizenship; six, proof of good health; seven, an age minimum (usually 18); three, a post-baccalaureate internship; seven, a grade point average (usually 2.5 on a 4 point scale); three, fingerprints; one, a teaching of reading test; one, three recommendations; and two, an oath of allegiance.

By far the most significant development since Weible and Dumas, 1982, is the massive imposition of several types of entry and exit testing for prospective teachers. This movement was in its infancy early in this decade. Today, only nine states and the District of Columbia require no examination, and four of those have examinations planned for future implementation (NASDTEC, 1988).

Discussion

This paper began by questioning whether all of the national reports and other reform activity related to teacher education during the 80s would be reflected by changes in state standards for the preparation of social studies teachers.

With regard to the general education component of teacher preparation, there is no evidence that state education agencies have been in the least dissatisfied—their growing inclination during this decade has been to more frequently leave this question to institutional decision-making, and to the program review process.

State agencies have clearly decided that, with regard to the professional component, they would like colleges and universities to do a bit more, despite recommendations of some of the national reports to the contrary. Specifically, institutions are being widely asked to extend field experiences, (both early experiences and student teaching), to more frequently require instruction about exceptional children, and to require more instruction regarding educational technology, presumably spurred largely by the advent of widespread micro-computer use in school—or the expectation of it.
Likewise, state agencies clearly are expanding their demands for work in the specialty (e.g., history/social sciences), while reducing expectations for work in the behavioral sciences for comprehensive social studies teachers. Current requirements, however, continue to fall far short of national standards (NCSS, 1987).

Finally, reform efforts have achieved their greatest successes in the massive expansion of paper-and-pencil testing of teacher education students at program entry and/or exit. Less than 10 states remain which have not joined the testing mania, and that number will be reduced by half by the early 1990s.

While the nation may or may not be less at risk today than in 1982, the reform movement of the 80s has, indeed, had an impact upon standards for the preparation of social studies teachers. However, it remains conceivable that, when examined in retrospect, some of the responses of the 80s may be found to have little relationship to the quality of social studies teaching. Many of these responses were made under considerable duress in an atmosphere of crisis. It is to be hoped that teacher education will be able to retain the widespread sense of importance which it successfully claimed throughout the past decade. It is equally important that the next decade be more often characterized by proactive reforms, based upon a defensible knowledge base, and that changes be more often evaluated in relation to their effects upon the quality of social studies instruction in schools.
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Abstract

Student antipathy toward social studies has concerned educators for decades. While causality studies suggest that the teacher is a prime determinant of social studies attitude, research has left a key issue unresolved. Can improvements in social studies attitude be linked to particular teaching practice? To respond to this question, a sixth-grade teacher was observed periodically for four months and intensively for two. Her lesson plans were categorized to determine the nature of activities she provided students. Results indicated that this teacher did improve class perceptions of social studies. Teaching style (how she treated students) more than strategy (her selection of method) seemed the crucial factor in her ability to improve social studies attitude. Her style featured nine elements: commitment to student learning, confidence, diversity, enthusiasm, fairness, formality, goal direction, praise and reinforcement, and support for the individual.

Introduction

Student negativism toward the social studies has confronted elementary educators for decades. Jersild (1949) placed social studies among the least-liked academic subjects. Research conducted during the “New Social Studies” era reinforced this assessment for the intermediate grades (Herman, 1963; Inskeep & Rowland, 1965). More recent surveys of the status of social studies confirmed that elementary students disliked the discipline and believed it contributed little to their personal development (Haladyna & Thomas, 1979; Morrissett, 1982).

Concerned by the persistence and intensity of this negativism, social studies educators have pursued its causality. Practitioners and theorists have ad-
vanced "probable causes" for student dislike, including teacher performance, the nature of social studies content, curricular patterns, the mass media, gender, neighborhood, social class, scholastic aptitude, classroom climate, and teacher preparation (Shaughnessy & Haladyna, 1985). Intriguing as they may be, researchers have not established that any of these candidates are agents which effect student antipathy.

Although unable to specify causal linkages, investigators have identified factors that seem to influence social studies attitude formation and merit further research. Their studies, admittedly, are few in number and secondary-oriented (Shaughnessy & Haladyna, 1985). One research team has produced a model illustrating that elementary student attitude relates to the interaction of multiple factors: teacher variables, particularly overall teacher quality; learning environment variables, including classroom organization and enjoyment of classmates; and pre-existing student tendencies, such as motivation, self-confidence, fatalism, and a sense of the subject matter's importance (Haladyna & Shaughnessy, 1982, Haladyna, Shaughnessy, & Redsun, 1982a, 1982b).

These factors have not been exhaustively analyzed or assessed in terms of relative impact. Evidence mounts, nevertheless, that conditions over which teachers exercise direct control shape student reactions to social studies (Shaughnessy & Haladyna, 1985). Haladyna et al. (1982a) found a powerful relationship between social studies attitude and a combination of teacher and learning environment variables. Schug, Todd, and Beery (1984) reported that sixth graders perceived social studies as unimportant and contrasted it with more enjoyable subjects that encouraged "active learning." Schug et al. concluded that social studies dislike resulted more from dissatisfaction with how it was taught than rejection of its content.

Some researchers have postulated that teacher behavior is central to attitude formation and explored teaching practices that might reduce student negativism. Weible and Evans (1984) indicated that strategy (i.e., the selection of methods, materials, and content) produced significant differences in the way elementary students viewed social studies. Students reacted adversely to the passive methods with which the field is commonly taught and expressed a preference for activities that engaged them in learning (e.g., games, role play, and simulations). Another study, however, determined that methodology did not significantly impact social studies attitude (McGowan, 1984). Student antipathy remained whether the teacher employed a traditional (text-related, geared to content transmission, academic in tone) or nontraditional strategy (multiple materials, child-centered, activist in tone). The researcher speculated that how the teacher treated students had more impact than method selection.

Related studies support this contention that style more than strategy contributes to improved student attitude. Haladyna et al. (1982a, 1982b) discovered several "teacher personality" variables that appeared to foster
attitudinal change: enthusiasm, commitment to student learning, and attention to individual needs. Other researchers found that perceptions of social studies were better in cooperative than competitive classrooms; they reasoned that modifying teacher style to effect a more "open" classroom climate could generate positive attitudinal change (Wheeler, 1972; Wheeler & Ryan, 1973).

Educators, then, face the reality that many elementary students dislike social studies and think it irrelevant. Research suggests that the teacher plays a key role in student attitude formation, but offers few measures that practitioners might take to reverse student negativism. Related issues remain unresolved. Can improvements in social studies attitude be linked to particular teaching practices? Which elements of teaching style encourage more positive student reactions?

The purpose of this study is to respond to these practical questions. Assuming that a relationship exists between teacher performance and social studies attitude, we proceeded in two parallel strands to confirm practices which promote positive reactions to the field. We selected an upper elementary teacher and verified her ability to improve social studies attitude. Concurrently, observers examined this teacher's classroom behavior to identify stylistic elements that reduced student negativism. We also analyzed her lesson plans to assess the types of methods, materials, and content she provided children. The study's major contributions are confirmation that a teacher can generate more positive attitudes toward social studies, and categorization of the teaching strategy and style she employed in doing so.

Method

Subjects

This study focused on a sixth-grade classroom teacher at the laboratory school of a midwestern state university. This woman has a master's degree in educational administration, approximately 13 years teaching experience, and has held her present position for six years. In the past two years, she became chair of the school's social studies curriculum committee, active in her state social studies council, and a member of the advisor/responder network providing a "practical viewpoint" to the National Commission on Social Studies. A major factor in her selection as subject teacher was her reputation among supervisors as an exemplary teacher who made social studies "fun."

In a sense, the subject's class also participated. The judgment that she effected positive changes in social studies attitude was based on surveys of these students; observing their social studies lessons provided data for assessing the subject's teaching style. Twenty-one heterogeneously grouped sixth graders (11 boys, 10 girls) comprised the class. Because of district policy, one-fourth lived in the school's immediate neighborhood (an inner-city, low-SES area), while three-fourths traveled to the building from as far as seven miles away. Commuters reflected a range of family backgrounds, primarily
professional. With caution, a profile of the “average student” can be constructed. He was 11.9 years of age, registered a 108 IQ on the Primary Mental Abilities instrument, read “on grade level,” demonstrated above-average social studies achievement (as measured by the Iowa Test of Basic Skills), was white, and lived in a two-parent family of four without welfare assistance.

Procedure

Our research design reflects a pragmatic belief that resolving a multidimensional concern like social studies negativism can necessitate a “corporate merger” (though never a “hostile takeover”) between seemingly contradictory paradigms. We blended quantitative and qualitative methods to confirm instructional elements that might improve student attitudes. To verify that a teacher shaped social studies perceptions, we surveyed students and assessed their reactions; categorizing her instructional style required in-depth, naturalistic observation of classroom behavior. In merging the quantitative and qualitative, we have embraced several “compatabilist” contentions. These paradigms are not adversaries, they can be productively integrated, and “what works” seems more relevant than epistemological, and methodological conflicts more apparent than real (Fetterman, 1988; Howe, 1988; Patton, 1988).

In the first of the study’s two strands, straightforward instruments were used to verify that the subject did influence social studies attitude. Students completed these exercises three times during the academic year: at their initial social studies lesson (August), at the semester break (January), and in the final week of social studies instruction (May). At each administration, an examiner asked students to list the nine subjects that comprised the sixth-grade curriculum in terms of enjoyment (from “liked most” to “liked least”) and importance (from “most needed as an adult” to “least needed”). To determine rank-order assessments for the class, student ratings were scaled from one to nine (most to least) and sequenced on the basis of mean scores for each subject.

Additionally, students responded in writing to the question, “What is social studies?” Response volume was measured through word-counts; a class mean was computed for each administration of the exercise. Response quality was determined by comparing definitions to 16 attributes which characterized “good” social studies programs drawn from elementary methods texts. Definitions were scored on the basis of the number of attributes present. Again, a class mean was tabulated for each set of student responses.

The second strand involved examining the subject teacher’s instructional strategy and style. To determine strategy, the subject’s lesson plans were analyzed. Learning activities were classified according to method (e.g., oral reading, lecture, recitation/discussion, small group work, game, project), choice of materials (e.g., textbook, tradebook, realia, map, etc.), and content selection (e.g., nature of topics, organizational structure, discipline from which content was drawn). These classifications provided the basis for a characterization of the subject’s teaching strategy.
To determine teaching style, observations were conducted periodically from December to March and regularly in April and May. Working independently, two university faculty members with experience in a variety of elementary classroom settings observed the subject as she taught social studies lessons. During each session, the participant-observers focused on the nature of teacher-student interaction and recorded rough field notes. These data were converted to an anecdotal summary of each observation.

Analysis of this observational data proceeded in three stages as outlined by Miles and Huberman (1984). Data reduction was accomplished through bounding inquiry with specific research questions, focusing observers' attention on teacher-student interaction, and converting field notes to summaries. Our data display technique involved surveying the summaries as a body of information, separating them into incidents, and characterizing each incident with a descriptive word or phrase (e.g., teacher praise, structuring behavior). In the conclusion drawing/verification phase, similar descriptors were clustered to establish categories of teacher practice. We reviewed the clusters for consistency and regrouped as necessary until we had established elements that characterized the subject's teaching style. Finally, elements were compared to teacher behavior variables identified in previous research (for a complete list of these factors, see Haladyna et al., 1982a). Whenever possible, terminology from this earlier study was adopted to identify instructional elements; otherwise, a label was formulated based on the nature of the descriptors.

Results

Student Perceptions of Social Studies
Surveys verified that the subject teacher positively influenced class attitude toward social studies. As Table 1 indicates, students initially rated social studies least liked and among the least valued of any discipline they studied. Over the course of the year, class enjoyment of social studies and estimate of its importance rose dramatically. Student perceptions did not demonstrate such consistent, positive change for any other content area.

Additionally, students became somewhat more fluent regarding what constitutes social studies as the year progressed. Both response quantity and quality increased markedly, then sharply decreased. The average response to the question, "What is social studies?" contained: 19.2 words (August); 25 words (January); and 16.6 words (May). When answers were examined for congruence with a list of "good social studies" descriptors, the average number of these attributes found was: 1.6 (August); 2.1 (January); and 1.4 (May).

Subject's Teaching Strategy
The subject teacher adopted a relatively traditional strategy for teaching social studies. Of the 170 lessons taught during the academic year, roughly 80% involved a direct or "input" strategy (i.e., using teacher-centered ac-
tivities in which students received information or practiced designated skills). Less than 20% involved an indirect or "output" strategy (i.e., student-centered experiences in which students generated information or applied related skills). The teacher relied heavily on three methods: recitation/discussion; oral presentation; and seatwork. Table 2 breaks down her strategy by teaching method.

Additionally, the subject employed a direct instruction sequence to structure many lessons, particularly those which were textbook-related. Students frequently listened to an explanation of the day's lesson, read assigned pages from a text, completed a written exercise, and discussed this material. As

Table 1

Student Rankings of Social Studies in Terms of Other Subject Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Enjoyment of the Discipline</th>
<th>Student Value of the Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang Arts</td>
<td>Soc St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Lang Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc St</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Subjects are listed from most (top) to least liked/valued (bottom).

Table 2

Analysis of Teaching Methods Employed by the Subject Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Direct Methods</th>
<th>Indirect Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Times Employed</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recitation/Discussion</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Small Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Seatwork</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Reading</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Simulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Field Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Report</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drill &amp; Practice</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Many of the subject teacher's social lessons involved multiple activities, hence the difference between 170 teaching sessions and 261 methods employed.
an alternative, they might review homework, hear a brief presentation, read print materials, discuss this information at length, and complete a vocabulary exercise.

Like her method selection, the subject’s choice of materials was relatively traditional. In lessons requiring an information source, students read the basal textbook 41% of the time and consulted other sources during the remainder of these sessions. The basal was the dominant resource only at the beginning and end of the year. While the teacher often abandoned the textbook, her alternatives were almost always print materials (e.g., newspapers, tradebooks, magazines, alternative texts). The only exceptions were two videotapes, three films, a field trip, and nine addresses by guest speakers. The subject’s primary teaching aid was the chalkboard, although she occasionally used a map or globe.

Her content selection departed from traditional social studies teaching in several respects and might be termed eclectic. She accepted an “Expanding Environments” approach to sixth-grade curriculum, emphasizing the history of South and Central America interspersed with skill-building units (e.g., map reading, study skills). She spiced this fare with a variety of short units, including “The Pan-American Games,” “Martin Luther King and Black History,” “UFOs and Noodleheads,” “The Space Shuttle,” “The School Store,” and “Junk Food.” Her organization seemed more topical than chronological. Most units featured several major themes (including cross-cultural awareness, the change process, and individuals who shaped history). Content came primarily from anthropology, history, geography, and economics. Many lessons incorporated knowledge from subject areas beyond social studies (mainly language arts and science), as well as literature, current events, and children’s experiences. Content was woven into interdisciplinary packages emphasizing a key idea or generalization. In most lessons, facts played a supporting rather than a leading role.

Subject’s Teaching Style

The subject’s teaching style reflected nine elements that persisted whatever her choice of method, material, or content. They have been separated for explication, but were interdependent and interwoven in the classroom. Of these components, eight can be identified using terminology generated in previous research (Haladyna et al., 1982a, 1982b); the term, Confidence, was formulated to characterize a style factor not indicated in these studies. Elements are listed alphabetically.

Commitment to Student Learning. The subject communicated a clear message to students—she served as learning facilitator, not manager, guard, or referee. Several behaviors manifested this pledge to promote student growth. The teacher maintained intense eye-contact with students, scrutinized classroom proceedings, and seemed absorbed by the learning process. During work periods, she remained on her feet and rarely stood still, moving from desk to desk, checking progress, and responding to comments or ques-
Lions. This practitioner knew her students and seemed able to anticipate who would need help. Accessible to those needing assistance, she answered questions on demand.

Interestingly, the teacher supplied information readily, but sparingly, responding whenever asked, but seldom offering too much. She reviewed a process, furnished a useful fact, or posed a question prompting reflection so that children might construct solutions to learning problems. The teacher offered suggestions and presented options (e.g., "You might consider displaying that information on a bar graph; if you decide you want to, I'll help you with it"), but students decided what form projects and reports would take. Students held title to their own work, with rights and responsibilities of ownership. The subject, moreover, involved children as instructional decision makers, allowing them to settle many procedural issues (e.g., the order for delivering oral reports) and to perform such evaluative tasks as critiquing each other's presentations.

The subject held classroom authority, addressing the class as "boys and girls" and reserving final judgment on all issues affecting student welfare. Yet, she opened the decision-making process periodically, convening class meetings in which students struggled to resolve procedural issues and management concerns (e.g., establishing a governance structure, preventing lunchroom rowdiness). The teacher served as parliamentarian for these sessions, avoiding mandates whenever possible and encouraging children to resolve their own difficulties. Throughout the meetings, she seemed more interested in children understanding their own behavior and experiencing group dynamics than settling these problems "once and for all."

Finally, the teacher promoted higher level thinking in every social studies lesson. Assignments required students to hypothesize, infer, judge, classify, interpret, and predict. A major aspect of the teacher’s emphasis on reflective thinking was her questioning technique. She asked mostly open-ended questions, interjecting closed questions when clarification seemed necessary. While a questioning strategy often was difficult to discern, two recognizable patterns did emerge. The teacher employed a modified Taba strategy for concept development and sequenced queries so that students would compare/contrast topics. Perhaps the most striking feature of her questioning was its volume. She probed continually, placing questions randomly throughout the class. Seemingly, the teacher tried to afford everyone the opportunity to increase the quantity and the quality of their social studies learnings.

Confidence. The teacher seemed at ease with students, spoke in a quiet voice, and remained calm. She strolled about the room slowly and steadily, smiling and frequently laughing aloud. Her manner seemed natural and pleasant, not forced or saccharine. The subject was not afraid to admit mistakes and asked students for information she did not know. She accepted students as pre-adolescents who might lack a sense of the appropriate. Outrageous student comments (e.g., lengthy discourses on "Montezuma's revenge" or
"barf bags") did not seem to threaten or embarrass her. When circumstances demanded, the teacher departed the classroom unannounced, leaving students to finish seatwork independently. Her demeanor conveyed expectations that students would attend to social studies lessons and respect her instructional role. The subject exemplified the professional educator in charge of classroom proceedings.

**Diversity.** Over the school year, this teacher was flexible on multiple levels. She varied the time allotted to social studies lessons depending on their nature. Activities ran beyond scheduled time periods and were usually finished later in the day. Scheduled periods for social studies were switched if the situation demanded. The subject spontaneously altered planned activity to capture a "teachable moment." After a student discovered intriguing data in his textbook, for example, the teacher postponed completing a worksheet to conduct a 10-minute quest for additional information. On several occasions, she dropped unproductive activities in favor of more suitable experiences. Additionally, expectations for student conduct varied. The teacher might require that students sit quietly and listen to an oral presentation, but encourage them to move and interact 15 minutes later. Classroom noise levels ebbed and flowed throughout a typical lesson.

**Enthusiasm.** The teacher spread excitement about social studies explicitly and implicitly. She clearly loved the field and communicated her fervor by smiling constantly, laughing frequently, "bubbling-over" occasionally, and growing wide-eyed when treating an interesting topic. The subject found time to interact with students captured by a social studies topic, rewarding their interest by exclaiming, "I love it, I love it!", "Ooooooh yes!", or "Wow! Is that right?" Her involvement in most lessons was emotional and personal.

The teacher communicated her ardor for social studies less directly as well. She knew tremendous amounts of related information, serving as a "walking resource" for students and discoursing on wide-ranging social studies topics. In one activity sequence, she considered Exocet missiles, Helen Keller, the Holocaust, South American heroes, Native American legends, and the Challenger disaster. The subject drew from reservoirs of personal experience for background information, analogies, and examples. She might make reference to a Disney movie, a vacation trip, or a book read recently. Her knowledge emphasized, but was not confined, to three disciplines—anthropology, geography, and history. She read a newspaper daily and commented authoritatively on world affairs.

The subject, moreover, constantly questioned and probed students, seemingly motivated by a hunger for more social studies knowledge. She pursued information that excited her or seemed valuable. The subject often cast herself as a learner and vigorously praised students whose comments enlightened. She concluded several lessons by exclaiming, "You guys have taught me a lot I didn’t know today!"
**Fairness.** Equal opportunity prevailed in the subject's social studies classroom. Everyone enjoyed access to the teacher during instructional time. As students completed seatwork, she circulated widely and responded to questions on demand. The teacher also approached reluctant or hesitant learners with offers of assistance. She shared resources with children regardless of ability level, using these opportunities to involve a broad spectrum of students in the learning process.

When misbehavior occurred, the teacher intervened regardless of SES, race, handicap, appearance, IQ score, reputation, or personality. The primary criterion for punishment was off-task behavior. Disrupting a lesson brought verbal correction, a conference, detention, or banishment whether the perpetrator was boy or girl, problem child or model citizen, honor or marginal student. Similarly, the prerequisite for positive reinforcement was productivity. Enhancing a learning activity brought any contributor immediate reward, usually verbal. Students, moreover, seemed aware of this evenhandedness and appreciated its effects. Talking with observers, children noted that their teacher treated them without bias, and contrasted her impartiality with injustice inflicted in other classrooms.

**Formality.** Structure was a constant in every social studies lesson observed for this study. Each session featured a recognizable focus, a clear organizational pattern, and explicit procedures for accomplishing the daily task. Lessons began with a statement of purpose and ended with closure (e.g., a hand-count of students “who learned something today” before leaving the library; collecting papers at lesson's end). Transitions between activities were clear and deliberate.

At the unit level, the teacher set criteria for assessing student performance and communicated these standards clearly (often in writing). She specified due dates for student projects, broke these assignments into a series of lesser tasks, and outlined a sequence in which these items should be completed. Following a research unit, evaluations of student performance were sent home, signed by parents, and returned the next day.

While this teacher presented students with instructional alternatives and encouraged participation, she enforced behavior concomitant with a structured environment. Students cleared desks and straightened chairs to conclude lessons. As a class, they lined up before leaving the room and were expected to raise hands and be acknowledged before talking. Discussion might become "freewheeling," but if noise grew excessive or students strayed too far from the topic, the teacher interrupted private conversations and quickly reinstated the "raise hands" policy. During discussions, she called on students, particularly those whom she suspected of not attending to the lesson. Students occasionally read aloud from the textbook in round-robin fashion.

The subject, moreover, integrated structuring cues with her teaching dialogue. She repeated instructions, reminded students of expectations,
reviewed vocabulary, summarized information, reinforced positive behavior, clarified major points, referenced previous learnings, and checked repeatedly for understanding. Her presentations contained subtle messages that reinforced desired learnings. These commentaries took several forms, including: referring to students as "classroom citizens," describing procedures in legal terms, or generalizing truisms from information presented in class (e.g., "you know, boys and girls, that's how people often react to rapid changes in their lives").

**Goal Direction.** Throughout every observation, over 90% of the class seemed engaged in the learning process. The subject encouraged involvement by infusing lessons with a clear direction and insisting that students strive to meet this purpose. As indicated earlier, lessons began with explanations of what students would do and why they should do it. Students were taught alternative note-taking formats (e.g., idea webbing) early in the school year, and were expected to use these aids to follow oral presentations and record important information.

The teacher, moreover, rarely let distractions hinder the learning process. She budgeted time for settling business details (e.g., collecting permission slips, recording worksheet scores). These items were isolated from learning experiences, dispatched quickly, and treated as secondary to instruction. When interruptions might break a lesson's flow, the subject refused phonecalls, asked student messengers to "wait until I am through, please," and delayed conversations with classroom visitors until the lesson concluded.

Finally, the teacher pushed and prodded the learning process. She was visible, circulating around the classroom, asking questions, reminding students of their responsibilities, and providing feedback. The subject demanded student attention and intervened decisively to correct inattention or disruption. She did not allow private conversations to intrude on meaningful class discussion and removed individuals from the classroom if they inhibited learning. While she encouraged students to relate their experiences to lesson content (a practice she termed, "telling stories"), the teacher imposed one limitation—contributions must always support the topic for discussion. Students wandering seriously from the topic found anecdotes politely, but firmly, terminated, perhaps in mid-sentence.

**Praise and Reinforcement.** As she pressed students to achieve a goal, the teacher rewarded them repeatedly for their efforts. Reinforcement was verbal rather than material, although the subject occasionally awarded free time or extended a recess if performance seemed exceptional. Praise flowed freely, constantly, and seemed to lift classroom spirits. Individuals were reminded that their questions and comments had value (e.g., "That's a good question, a good question;" "That question shows you've been thinking about how to present your topic;" "Good, good for you!"). Groups garnered accolades for successfully completing projects (e.g., "Liked your brochures,
you all did terrific;” “Wow, what a tremendous job!”). Notable accomplishments gained specific recognition (e.g., “Overall, they were really, really good! One that stands out was Dan’s with his sense of humor.”). Perhaps most important, positive reinforcement seemed evenly distributed and linked to actual achievement.

Support for the Individual. The teacher supported her charges on two levels—one evident, the other quite subtle. Explicitly, she provided great doses of assistance for individuals unable to complete a learning task. The subject searched for, and usually found, her “lost sheep.” These students received one-on-one or small group help whenever circumstances allowed. Some students might require such attention repeatedly; typically, remediation was provided without reservation until the learner could proceed independently.

The subject nurtured individual growth in less tangible ways as well. She dealt with exceptional children as special cases, requiring particular approaches and unique treatment. The teacher, for example, set strict limits for a learning disabled boy with a history of disruptive behavior; within those limits, he had freedom to interact with peers and participate in social studies activity; these guidelines existed only for this child. Additionally, she accentuated the positive in learning situations. If a student provided misinformation, the teacher asked questions or cued the child to correct his or her own response, rather than contradicting the answer or branding it wrong. The teacher, moreover, was receptive to student questions and responded without embarrassing students for “not knowing.” If student work was incomplete, she urged the offender to do more rather than lambasting the child for what was not done. The teacher demanded respect from students, but gave it in return. Her manner supported the individual in a positive, constructive way.

Discussion

Clearly, study findings should be generalized with care. Guidelines for elementary social studies instruction should not be based on data gathered by observing one practitioner. Just as clearly, though, this research increases our knowledge about the formation of social studies attitude. Our results support contentions of prior investigators regarding student perception of the content area, and extend that research by confirming nine stylistic elements that a teacher might incorporate to encourage more positive views of social studies.

The study, first of all, indicates that a teacher can transform student views of social studies. A sixth-grade class began the school year listing social studies as the content areas they liked least of all and valued less than any “academic” discipline. Exposure to a particular teaching style markedly improved these rankings. Other variables that might account for these changes can be discounted. No other subject area enjoyed such positive attitudinal changes. The class population remained relatively stable during the school year; in
fact, these students progressed through the elementary grades almost as a unit. The classroom's appearance and physical conditions (e.g., heat, light, ventilation) closely resembled those encountered previously. Subject area offerings were constant since the fourth grade; the daily schedule approximated the previous year's routine. The school's social studies curriculum followed a standard "Expanding Environments" pattern. From grades 3 to 6, these students experienced social studies programs based on the Silver Burdett text series.

Additionally, students' ability to explain what constitutes social studies improved, at least temporarily. Between August and January, student responses to the question, "What is social studies?" grew longer, and better reflected expert opinion. These changes suggest that student understanding of the field's nature improved after four months with the subject teacher. Admittedly, response quantity and quality decreased from January to May. Yet, this decline might be explained by the effects of repeated measures (i.e., students grew tired of answering the same question) and by weather conditions during the May survey (i.e., a room temperature of 85 degrees with high humidity could inhibit discourse on any topic).

While confirming teacher influence, our findings question the contention that improving social studies attitudes hinges on the use of a particular instructional strategy. One school of thought regarding perceptions of the field has implied that adopting indirect, student-centered methods is a prerequisite for reducing student negativism (Schug, et al., 1984; Weible & Evans, 1984). In the present study, the subject utilized a relatively traditional teaching strategy, yet social studies attitudes improved dramatically. She selected largely direct, teacher-centered methods and often followed a "direct instruction" sequence in planning lessons. While reaching beyond the textbook for teaching materials, the teacher opted almost exclusively for print alternatives. Her program rested on an "Expanding Environments" foundation; content blended historical-geographical-cultural survey, skill-building, and current topics, with emphasis on the first two. Her major concession to nontraditional teaching was the way this content was structured. The teacher organized her program topically, integrated interdisciplinary material, emphasized conceptual understanding over factual recall, and submerged recurring themes within her units.

For the most part, her students sat, listened, discussed, wrote, researched, and read; rarely did they manipulate, role play, simulate, game, or build. Yet the class view of social studies markedly improved as the year progressed. The reason for this transformation lies more with teaching style than with strategy, in our judgment. The subject, after all, taught with relatively traditional methods found in many classrooms where social studies negativism prevails. What distinguished her students from the mainstream was the engaging, dynamic manner in which she related to them. The study's final contribution is the identification of nine elements that characterize this teaching
style. Previous research supplied the terminology for categorizing eight of these elements and supports the contention that seven (enthusiasm, praise and reinforcement, fairness, formality, commitment to student learning, support for the individual, and goal direction) contribute to nurturing a positive attitude toward social studies (Haladyna, Shaughnessy, and Redsun, 1982a, 1982b).

Explaining these findings seems simple enough—the subject teacher taught effectively. Rather than breaking new methodological ground, she structured lessons tightly and conveyed a strong sense of purpose to students. She knew her field and taught it confidently and enthusiastically. She positively reinforced students, inundated them with probing questions, and met special needs. How might elementary teachers encourage positive social studies attitudes? Practitioners can answer this question by demonstrating principles of effective instruction as they plan and teach.

After some reflection, however, “Hunterizing” elementary classrooms seems too simple, too pat an answer. The subject, first of all, never referenced the effective teaching research when discussing her teaching. Direct instruction was an unknown which she could not define or describe. Avoiding such labels, she characterized her own style as, “some things I’ve learned to do over the years,” or, “just good teaching, I guess.” Perhaps more crucial, the subject certainly employed direct methods, structured lessons, focused instruction, and provided voluminous feedback. Yet her teaching style transcended these elements, blending some decidedly child-centered considerations (e.g., support for the individual, diversity, commitment to student learning) with teacher-centered practices. This style seems to rest on a more complex instructional model than the process-product paradigm which drives most effective teaching approaches.

The subject’s ability to influence social studies attitudes seems more related to her conception of the classroom setting than to a devotion to effective instruction. Her style reflected a different classroom metaphor than the image guiding much current research and practice (Marshall, 1988). Her classroom was not a workplace in which accountability, productivity, and management were her primary concerns. Instead, she created a learning setting in which she served as questioner, expert, and strategist. Marshall (1988) has sketched a tentative list of themes which learning-oriented classrooms emphasize: (a) thinking and challenge; (b) schoolwork as learning; (c) peer helping; (d) self-evaluation; (e) supportiveness of errors as part of learning; (f) acceptance of individual differences; (g) positive expectations; and (h) preventive management. Armed with these themes, we can better understand the assumptions underlying the subject’s teaching style, recognize the style’s coherence, perceive its purpose, and grasp its relationship to improved social studies attitudes.

With this awareness of classroom metaphor, our responses to the nagging questions that prompted this study are straightforward, but hardly easy. Can
improvements in social studies attitude be linked to particular teaching practices? Our findings suggest an affirmative answer. Which stylistic elements encourage more positive attitudes? While categorizing nine that seem influential and constructive, we suggest that the answer lies beyond simply adjusting teaching behavior. The practitioner seeking more positive social studies attitudes might well examine how she/he conceptualizes the classroom. If the teacher discovers a workplace, his/her students will experience an environment in which they can dichotomize work from play, disliking the former, but anticipating and appreciating the latter (Marshall 1988). Social studies attitudes, perhaps even perceptions of school in general, are bound to suffer. Instead, the teacher might try to visualize and generate a learning setting in which children are challenged, supported, excited, directed, accepted, praised, probed, informed, structured, and treated fairly. Pursuing a classroom metaphor is not an easy task, but it might well lead to classrooms in which student perceptions of social studies markedly improve. We offer nine instructional elements not as ends in themselves, but as means through which teachers might create such settings for social studies learning.
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Should We Be Teaching More History?

Stephen J. Thornton
University of Delaware

Abstract
Since the middle of the 1980s, there has arisen a social studies reform movement. The most striking common feature of this movement has been the call for an increase in the amount of history incorporated in social studies programs. Although the reformers do not speak with one voice, they are united in the emphasis they place on the role of history in the curriculum. In this article, I question whether the reforms are well-founded. More specifically, will the incorporation of more history improve social studies programs? Is curriculum reform the most urgent need in social studies education? Should we expect widespread change in how social studies is taught?

Introduction
In the late 1980s the United States has witnessed the greatest interest in social studies curriculum reform since the era of the New Social Studies (NSS) in the 1960s. Currently, the most vocal reformers advocate the incorporation of more history (and, to some extent, more geography) in social studies programs. Unlike the NSS reformers of the 1960s who emphasized the structure of the disciplines and inquiry—a process emphasis (e.g., Fenton, 1967)—current reformers stress the content of the disciplines. Prominent among the reformers have been Professor Diane Ravitch (1987) of Teachers College, former Secretary of Education William Bennett (1987), the Bradley Commission on History in Schools (1988), and, most recently, the Curriculum Task Force of the National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools [NCSS] (1989).

The belief that traditional social studies curricula overemphasized content and downplayed process underlay the NSS reform movement. In contrast, the current reformers hark back nostalgically to the first three decades of the century when, Ravitch (1987) says, there was a golden age: History content dominated elementary and secondary social studies curricula. The state of California has already rewritten its history-social science framework along the lines of the reformers' view of the golden years of history curriculum. Since California is the most populous state in the Union, reforms there often
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provide a model for other states and heavily influence the content of textbook series.

The purpose of this brief paper is to argue that there is scant support in the research literature for the reformers' views, and that the substitution of history for other social studies courses will be to little avail unless entrenched patterns of instruction and learning are also changed. Further, I remain unconvinced that there was a golden age of history in the schools: Where is the evidence of what was taught, how it was taught, and what students learned? At best, as Larry Cuban (in press) has written, the evidence on what has occurred in the nation's social studies classrooms over the last century is fragmentary. In my view, Ravitch assumes too readily that curriculum guides and textbooks accurately reflect how teaching and learning proceed in the classroom. Commonly cited goals for social studies programs such as critical thinking and understanding of the American political system do not appear to be prominent in either instruction or in what students learn (Goodlad, 1984; Rogers & Stevenson, 1988; Stodolsky & Glaessner, 1988). In short, officially endorsed goals and practice are frequently worlds apart.

I should emphasize at the outset that my purpose in this paper is not hostile to an important, even a central, place for history in the education of all children—indeed, I have argued elsewhere the indispensable contributions of history to children's educational growth (Thornton, 1987). Nor do I dispute that the present scope and sequence of history courses, such as the common requirement of teaching "world" history in one year, present major barriers to effective teaching and learning. Nonetheless, I remain unconvinced by the reformers' case. I find far more compelling John Goodlad's (1984) disturbing characterization of what happens to worthwhile social studies topics: "something strange seems to have happened to them on the way to the classroom" (p. 212).

More specifically, I raise three questions about the reforms: First, does traditional, chronological history better serve the goals of citizenship education than other social studies courses? Second, will new curricula and instructional materials result in widespread improvement in teaching and learning? And, third, is the substitution of more history for other social studies courses getting at the heart of the central problems of social studies in the schools?

Is Traditional, Chronological History the Best Citizenship Education?

According to state laws and curriculum rationales, the mandate for social studies programs in American schools is citizenship education. With this, the reformers agree. They disagree, however, with what they characterize as the emphases of existing social studies programs. The Bradley Commissioners (1988), for example, note: "That the knowledge and habits of mind to be gained from the study of history are indispensable to the education
of citizens in a democracy” (p. 7). On this basis, they advocate a “history-centered” social studies curriculum in the elementary school and no fewer than four years of history in grades 7 through 12. Although concerned with broader issues than the place of history in the curriculum, in the report of the NCSS (1989), there is a similar emphasis on history.

The call for the inclusion of more history in social studies programs requires some estimate of how much history is currently taught. This is by no means simple. Although certain indicators reveal a decline since the 1950s in enrollments in particular courses such as high school world history, other courses such as high school United States history have been gaining ground since the 1930s, partly at the expense of European history (Downey & Levstik, 1988). Moreover, many social studies courses not usually considered “history” courses, such as civics, may contain considerable history content. For example, judging from the once bestselling Civics in Action by Richard E. Gross and Vanzo Devereaux (1967), civics courses include such historical subject-matter as the growth of democratic thought in the American colonies, the Revolutionary era, and key developments over time in United States foreign policy. In other words, there is no definitive evidence about exactly how much history is currently included in social studies programs.

Even if it were known how much history is now taught, the reformers regard learning from many existing social studies courses as a poor relation to learning from chronological history courses. Ravitch (1987), for instance, condemns the expanding environments sequence of the elementary grades as “tot sociology.” As I have already said, however, the case of the reformers rests on indirect evidence and assumptions concerning the supposed benefits of learning history. In this regard, it is worth noting that recent accounts (Ravitch & Finn, 1987) of how little factual knowledge young Americans have of the nation’s past bear a remarkable similarity to assessments conducted in the early 1940s—a time when those Americans in school studied more history courses than they do today (Committee on American History in Schools and Colleges, 1944). Concerning the long-term benefits of historical thinking, virtually nothing is known (Knight, 1989).

In sum, the supposed benefits of teaching more history are unproven. If the case for teaching more history is to rest on its efficacy as civic education in areas such as informed decision-making about public issues, then the case cannot be sustained from the research evidence. Little is known about the effects of students’ exposure to either more “history” courses 50 or 60 years ago, or to fewer “history” courses in recent decades.

**What Difference Will New Curricula and Materials Make?**

The reformers have designed suggested scopes and sequences and appealed for better-written textbooks. These scopes and sequences have many admirable features such as a sensible insistence on in-depth study of selected
topics rather than a superficial coverage of many topics. Similarly, their appeal for engaging narrative in textbooks promises an improvement over the often disjointed accounts in many existing textbooks.

The reformers err, however, in defining "curriculum" too narrowly. Curriculum is not only curriculum documents and instructional materials (official curriculum); it also includes how teachers transform the official curriculum for instruction. Although Ravitch (1987) briefly notes the need for staff development if new curricula are to be implemented, she does not dwell on it. Similarly, the Bradley Commissioners (1988) state that "curriculum," not "pedagogical techniques" and "teacher training," will be their exclusive focus (p. 3). Like the NSS reformers of the 1960s, there appears to be a tacit assumption that curriculum mandates and dissemination of instructional materials will effect curriculum change.

In the history of social studies education, there is little evidence of new curriculum guides and instructional materials effecting widespread curriculum change. Analysts of the failure of the NSS movement, for example, suggest that teachers seldom alter the curriculum-in-use solely on the basis of curriculum mandates or the availability of new materials. In this regard, James P. Shaver (1979) has compared social studies education to a deep lake with the wind (curriculum reforms) rippling the surface. The innovations do ripple the observable surface of social studies education, but the great body of schooling below the surface remains largely undisturbed.

Similarly, the belief that better-written textbooks will have beneficial effects, although seemingly obvious, may be more apparent than real. While no one would want to argue for badly-written textbooks, the content of textbooks, to a large extent, is secondary to how teachers use them. Ravitch's (1987) assertion that changing textbook content redefines "the way history is taught in schools" finds little support in the research literature (p. 9). Despite the cottage industry in textbook critiques in the social studies literature, little is known about the effects of different textbook contents on what students learn in social studies (Shaver, 1987, p. 122). Moreover, as Matthew T. Downey and Linda S. Levstik (1988) noted in their review of research on teaching and learning history, it appears that many teachers employ textbooks mainly as reference sources. If students do not actually read their textbooks, the quality of writing is unlikely to have much effect on what they learn.

Obviously teachers and students should have the best possible curricula and instructional materials at their disposal. However, the reformers appear to place far more faith in curricula and materials as sources of change than seems warranted by the research evidence. No doubt there are teachers who will use the new materials to good effect, but there is little reason to think that most teachers will change their usual way of doing business.
Is Curriculum Reform the Most Urgent Need in Social Studies?

The answer to this question depends on what is meant by "curriculum reform." In the social studies literature, curriculum reform has traditionally been used to refer to the development of curriculum documents and accompanying instructional materials. Curriculum reform has less often been used to refer to the success of these endeavors in effecting changes in curriculum, instruction, and learning in real classrooms. As I have already suggested, the present reforms in history curriculum have more in common with the first definition than the second.

It is a cliche in the social studies literature that despite many top-down curriculum reform efforts, day-to-day practices do not appear to have changed much since the turn of the century in most classrooms. The present reformers in history curriculum would do well to heed the advice of the late Hazel Whitman Hertzberg: "Reform movements need a much wider and more solid information base about the classroom than they have hitherto been willing or able to develop" (1981, p. 165).

Change at the classroom level involves recognition of the fact that, within a particular context, the teacher serves as a curricular-instructional gatekeeper (Thornton, in press). The content the teacher chooses to emphasize, how that content is presented by the teacher, what the teacher evaluates, and so forth, determine the curriculum that counts—the curriculum that students actually experience. Although there appears to be more variety in the quality of social studies instruction than once thought (Thornton, in press), most social studies instruction probably does focus on low-level information. Students find these learning experiences monotonous and irrelevant to their lives.

This state of affairs is not an inherent characteristic of history or civics or some other social studies course. Rather, the problem concerns what teachers choose to emphasize and how they organize instruction. School children are very interested in social studies questions, but they generally dislike the instruction they receive in the subject (Herman, 197, p. 54). In these circumstances, one wonders if simply mandating more history (or more of anything else) will much alter either the operational curriculum (what happens in classrooms) or the experienced curriculum (what students learn).

My point in this section is simple enough: Rearranging the number and structure of history courses appears to be less important than using scarce educational dollars to help teachers keep the curricular-instructional gate in as thoughtful a fashion as they can. Even carefully planned and implemented curricula must confront powerful forces of inertia in the culture of schools (McKee, 1988). Without careful attention to both institutional barriers and teacher views on the desirability of change (McNeil, 1986), there seems little likelihood that the current history reforms will change the lifeless qualities of the social studies experienced in many classrooms. Experienced in a lifeless
way, the glories of classical Greece and the high drama of the French Revolu-

tion can be every bit as dull and meaningless as the most mundane lesson
on "community helpers."

Conclusion

In the preface to *Historical Literacy* Paul Gagnon, principal investigator
for the Bradley Commission and editor of the volume, notes that the 20
authors included in it are writing "to people who love history, who love to
learn from it, and who love to teach it" (1989, p. xii). I count myself one
of those people. Nonetheless, however strong one's convictions about the
importance of the subject of history, this should not be confused with the
primary rationale for teaching history to school students: Citizenship educa-
tion. For many years, it has been clear from the evidence that students are
often dissatisfied with their experiences in social studies lessons (Herman,
1977; Stodolsky & Glaessner, 1988; Weible & Evans, 1984). There is no reason
to think that simply requiring more history courses—however important the
content for our apparently ahistorical and provincial youth (Torney-Purta,
1986)—will materially alter the qualities of students' experiences in class-
rooms. As Hertzberg noted in her essay in *Historical Literacy* (1989),
"American history is [now] almost universally taught in the schools, yet
Americans seem oblivious to and ignorant of their own history" (p. 97). Until
fuller consideration is given to how, and by what criteria, teachers transform
curriculum for instruction—and how this influences what students experi-
ence—the requirement of more history courses will likely contribute little
to the advancement of citizenship education.
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Commentary

By Michael Hartoonian

"Do You Really Believe That; or Is It Just Research?"

How many times have those of us involved in research and practice heard this kind of comment? Some of us explain the question as a function of "The Two Cultures" (Leming, 1989; Snow, 1959) which seems to exist between researcher and practitioner, or between the intelligentsia and the worker, or even between empiricism/positivism and non-neutral epistemologies. Others of us try to bring meaning to research by separating areas of inquiry into quantitative, qualitative, and critical categories. While our separate realities may seem appropriate to personal or even institutional goals, our behavior may also be understood as a manifestation of the end of a philosophical era.

The end of a philosophical epoch comes with the exhaustion of its motive concepts. When all answerable questions that can be formulated in its terms have been exploited, we are left with only those problems that are sometimes called "metaphysical" in a slurring sense...insoluble problems whose very statement harbors a paradox. The peculiarity of such pseudoquestions is that they are capable of two or more equally good answers, which defeat each other. An answer once propounded wins a certain number of adherents who subscribe to it despite the fact that other people have shown conclusively how wrong or inadequate it is; since its rival solution suffer from the same defect, a choice among them really rests on temperamental grounds. They are not intellectual discoveries, like good answers to appropriate questions, but doctrines. At this point philosophy becomes academic; its watchword henceforth is Refutation, its life is argument rather than private thinking, fair-mindedness is deemed more important than single-mindedness and the whole center of gravity shifts from actual philosophical issues to peripheral subjects like methodology, mental progress, the philosopher's place in society, and apologetics (Langer, 1955).

Has Ms. Langer recently attended any of our CUFA meetings?
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There seems to be a need for a new research agenda; an agenda that reflects the inclusive reality of the world; an agenda that will make explicit the fact that we are not above the community, but part of it. All too often, we take our intellectual agendas for granted, putting a great deal of energy and resources into studies on well-defined issues that have little interest and fewer implications beyond the narrow professional concerns of our discipline.

Is it possible to identify the most pivotal questions and unresolved problems of the profession and republic? An affirmative answer to this question would mean that the research agenda itself must become an object of scrutiny in the hope of both expanding and sharpening our understanding of what questions to raise. Perhaps our world view needs to become more synoptic, and the networks and circles of research more far-reaching. Through usage, we all seem to know that research means "a careful search." Careful, meaning full of care. A better modifier for our present condition might be timidity; that is, a "timid" search. In our profession today we seem to navigate by keeping our collective head down and mind focused on the water and waves touching our scholarship; when we know, if only dimly, that true navigation is more a function of relationships, meaning, and temporal/spatial consciousness.

I would like to ask our research committee to consider placing our research agenda itself on the agenda of CUFA and NCSS.
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**For Jean Grambs: Heilbrun’s Narrative and Ours**

From time to time, you, as I, may avidly read of the adventures of feminist detective Kate Fansler. She is not the creation of “Amanda Cross” but of Carolyn Heilbrun, Columbia University professor of modern British literature, who has now come out of the scholar’s closet as a writer of both popular and feminist fiction. Her elegant little volume, *Writing a Woman’s Life*, is the focus of this review.

*Writing a Woman’s Life* has caused me to think recently about my own writing, my own engagement in social education, and my own commitment to feminism. It reminds me, as I think is its intention, of Virginia Woolf’s *A Room of One’s Own* (1929/1957; Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich, Inc.) in its consideration of the integral connection between the products and the lives of women who write, and in a larger sense of the ingredients of the public lives of all women. For me, writing is a public act, and teaching is a public act; both are processes of social education.

Understanding the importance that I have attached to this book requires a bit of context-setting. This past year, three colleagues (two women and one man) at far-flung edges of North America agreed to participate in an experiment. It was the writing of an interactive text on the relation of feminism, social education, and the social studies profession. Both the process and content concerned us as we collectively recognized the near-invisibility of feminism in the social studies literature. For reasons which we must still articulate, both individually and together, our process of construction was less than successful. We did not write to each other regularly and some sort of unified account did not develop. The “failure” of this project led me to reconsider the three issues above. Heilbrun’s essay has helped in this reflection, and saliently, I turned to it on the specific suggestion of our male group-member.¹

Heilbrun’s purpose, as I read her, is to begin to fill in the absent structure of narrative commonplaces in the literature on women’s lives. This is to create, locate, and retell our stories. She starts from three premises. The first is that women must confront issues of power and control as aspects constitutive of their private-public lives. This is because the world and its condition of oppression cannot be changed without this acknowledgement. The second is that without evident power and control,
women have been deprived of the narratives, or the texts, plots or examples, by which they might assume power over—take control of— their own lives (p. 17).

This is because without narratives there are no models for envisioning change. The third premise is that the circle of power and text connects necessarily as a feminist issue. That is to say, the matter is not merely one of equalizing power in the present but of understanding the persisting influence of the individual past. To assist in this project, Heilbrun adopts Nancy Miller's definition of feminism:

[T]o articulate a self-consciousness about women’s identity both as inherited cultural fact and as process of social construction . . . [and to] protest against the available fiction of female becoming” (p. 18).3

Thus texts have a central place in determining women’s identities: for in them ought to be found the structural commonplaces of women’s lives. One must say “ought to be found” because these structures were largely missing until the early 1970s. Heilbrun offers four ways that narratives “write a women’s life.” Three of these are the genres of fiction, biography, and autobiographical prose and poetry. A fourth is not so easily labeled: “The woman may write her own life in advance of living it, unconsciously, and without recognizing or naming the process” (p. 11). Although this is not really a genre, it is the “scripting” that we do of our lives, the paths and purposes that we set. In this review I especially want to relate this last way of being to social education, that is to validate the texts of those of us who are presently recording our lives (in poetics, reviews, correspondences, journals, lesson plans and the like).

The private lives and public visions of many women writers are woven expertly throughout the book: among them are feminist heroines such as George Eliot, Colette, Virginia Woolf, May Sarton, Adrienne Rich, and Anne Sexton. Two stories seem pivotal to the central narrative as well as to the substory that the author tells of herself. These are the lives of George Sand and Dorothy Sayers.

Although she is rarely included in college courses on nineteenth-century European literature, Sand’s work and influence on the writings of others is undeniably significant. Among her colleagues were Henry James, Turgenev, Flaubert, Balzac, George Eliot, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, and the Brontës. For Heilbrun, Sand exemplifies the central characteristic of woman writers of the past (and to a degree of the present). Her life was unconventional. Biographers portray her as “both man and woman,” with “the power . . . to give and receive, to nurture and be nurtured” (p. 35). In Flaubert’s term, she is “the third sex.” As such, she is without a story that extends beyond her own. For us, her life cannot be connected to others because it is atypical; indeed even if her story is told, it is one of abnormality. Sand married early and separated from her husband; she had friends and lovers who were both
men and women. She had a garden and grandchildren even as she spoke of revolution.

The theme of unconventionality continues in the life of Sayers, the mystery writer and medievalist. Here an important feature is added, what Heilbrun calls “the moratorium.” This is the unconscious or conscious “decision to place one’s life outside the bounds of society’s restraints” (p. 50). It is one way (from above) to define the ways that women have scripted their own lives. Many times the moratorium occurs as a life-changing event, usually as a rejection or alteration of the marriage plot:

It may well be the forming of a life . . . [both for highly gifted men and women] in the service of a talent felt, but unrecognized and unnamed . . . marked by a profound sense of vocation . . . [and] by a strong sense of inadequacy and deprivation . . . [without it] (p. 53).

It is most of all a commitment to creative work. Sayers’ version is of an unattractive woman got pregnant and abandoned who later marries in some sense unsatisfactorily. Resulting from this moratorium—this marriage decision—is the unconventionality both of initial sexual satisfaction and life-long independence. The independence “allows” her first to create the characters of Lord Peter Wimsey and Harriet Vane, and from their financial success, later to pursue writing in scholarly Christian studies. Sayers’ life demonstrates two kinds of moratoria. One is the unplanned consequences of youthful action and the other is the planned middle-aged reinvention of a life (p. 58).

The theme developed is that unconventionality is a commonplace in the lives of noted women writers, a factor just beginning to appear in the narratives. In this regard, among the most significant contributions are recent autobiographic essays and poems that make public what has been privately lived. An important part of these “new” stories are the changes in structures of friendship, love, and marriage that unconventionality entails.

Conventional tales of friendship have been male models. This is seen first in the form of men’s public comradeship and second in their textual constructions of women’s relationships. Most often these are defined as “support groups,” women sustaining each other in times of public or family crisis (p. 98). Emerging now in the literature are descriptions of the lives of women friends that do not fit convention. One early example of what seems to me to be a “transitional” relationship is that of Englishwomen Vera Brittain and Winifred Holtby in the 1920s and 30s. Brittain’s Testament of Friendship (1940/1980; Macmillan/Virago), and two collections of their letters, is a story of “intimacy, admission of vulnerability . . . [and] the openness of the loving gesture” (p. 102) that includes but moves beyond typical connection. This friendship could be told only as it related to the men they knew and loved—and even so, in her writing, Brittain “felt she had to protect herself from accusations of lesbianism” (p. 107).

In our more recent time, other women have not felt so constrained and have written of love and sexuality between women. One example is Rich,
who has "done more than anyone else to revolutionize women's auto-
biography" (p. 66). Rich's story is an exemplar of the complexity of late-
modern feminist identity: the Jewish lesbian mother of three sons now grow-
ing old. Says Heilbrun of her work:

In the old style "autobiography," women never told of their love for
other women. . . [both] wide enough to include all women . . . [and] narrow enough to focus . . . on one other woman. . . [It is this] sense of identification with women alone . . . as fellow achievers and fighters in the public domain, upon which the success of the current feminist movement depends (p. 72).

Finally, along with the new narrative plots of friendship and love between women, the scenario of the traditional marriage is being transformed. This means

one is which both partners have work at the center of their lives and must find a delicate balance that can support both together and each individually. This means . . . that the man, or the exceptional women in an all-woman relationship, must be equally, probably more, nurturing and supportive than the usual "husband" (p. 81).

Illustrations are offered from the lives of literary women. Today we would classify some of their marriages as good and some as bad. Among them are the "conventional" relationship of Alice B. Tolkas and Gertrude Stein, the struggle for identity of Colette, and the unusual although much-criticized union of Virginia and Leonard Woolf. What biographic and autobiographic accounts tell us is that there are no perfect marriages. What is suggested is that friendship serves as an ideal. One of the forms that this can take is a process of reinventing marriage, of rebirth in middle age (p. 93). For women writers (and any other public women) who are already married, this can provide support for the "moratorium" and for subsequent focus on work.

Pain accompanies the unconventional life. Atypicality often means ostracism, isolation, and most importantly denial of attention to and appreciation for creative products. Feminist writers are beginning to write about this pain and of its resulting anger. Anger, like lesbianism, has been denied women. In the past, "...[when] women could find no voice in which publicly to complain . . . they took refuge in depression or madness . . . for suicide!" (p. 15). Today oppression and pain continue as women who assume power and express anger are often labeled strident or shrill. The point is that denial of public anger is denial of power. Denial of power is denial of control over one's own life. This is the content of the new stories.

Heilbrun includes one other commonplace—one last message—and this one is autobiographical. This is about maturity and its contribution. "We must recognize what the past suggests: women are well beyond youth when
they begin, often unconsciously, to create another story” (p. 109). This is true for the autobiographical poets of Rich’s generation as well as for the likes of Eliot, Woolf, and Willa Cather. Most concretely in *Writing a Woman’s Life*, this narrative is told through the character development of Kate Fansler. Twenty-five years ago Heilbrun constructed, in Kate, a “psychic space” and a vehicle for another story in her own life (p. 114). For those of my generation, Kate is also who we wished to be: attractive, adventuresome, making choices, and secure. But Kate too has matured. Heilbrun puts it this way:

She is . . . no longer a fantasy figure but an aging woman who battles despair and, one hopes with a degree of wit and humor, finds in the constant analysis of our ancient patriarchal ways, and in sheer effrontery, a reason to endure (p. 122).

In older age, she is still attractive but no longer concerned with her looks. She is braver and less interested in the opinions of others who she does not value. She has discovered that she need not be afraid or hide from those who might do her harm. She has, as only age shows, little to lose.

Our detective Kate, the women writers, (and Heilbrun too I believe), are to serve as models for feminist women. Before I connect their narratives to social education, I must claim an autobiographical note. In the middle of writing this review, I learned of the sudden death of one of the members of the project on feminism and social education that I recounted in the introduction. This was Jean Grambs. During our ill-fated correspondence, I had several conversations with Jean which mean a great deal to me. We talked of mothers and daughters, retirement and growing old, and death. At one point in this past year, an exchange from her kept me “going.” Although I wrote to her about this, I do not know if she ever knew what it meant to me. Jean was a remarkable model for us as women educators. She was teacher, scholar, mother—woman of the year in 1989 at the University of Maryland-College Park. She connects in my mind directly to Heilbrun because her most recent writing concerned the lives of older women.6 In the social studies she was our outstanding senior woman scholar and the profession loses a great deal with her death. Selfishly, I just miss knowing she’s out there.

In Jean’s memory, then, I want to bring my own essay to a close. This means to tie the narrative of *Writing a Woman’s Life* to the stories of all of us. This means to suggest (more strongly, to convince about) the relevancy of this book for social studies professional women (and men). This means for me, at a particularly sensitive time in my career, to make even more public a commitment to further feminist scholarship in social studies education and in education as a whole. For Jean, I can do no less.

Carolyn Heilbrun gives us tales within and connected to other tales—messages on many levels. This is not merely a literary essay about the lives of other creative woman writers, it is about *ourselves*. Understanding this
idea begins with the notion that, to varying degrees of unconsciousness and consciousness, all women script their lives before experiencing them. More and more of these scripts are in the public domain and connect private realms to public in new ways. Scripting may not mean writing but if it does, writing takes many public forms. Among them are formal statements like autobiographical poems as well as informal statements like lessonplans. New scripts result in a new woman’s identity, that of assuming power and taking control. This need not (and may not) incorporate separation from men, but it is defined in our terms and not in theirs. One way that this is done is to create new narratives which contain new commonplaces. The stories Heilbrun presents of women writers help us to recognize this—both in their unconventionality (that may or may not be our own) and in a changing conventionality. Part of our present public lives must be the support of both the typical and the atypical, claimed for and by all of us. Finally, the narratives demonstrate that it is this capacity for independence that binds women of the past and present together. In the most positive sense it makes us dependent on each other.

As I read Heilbrun’s essay, I was struck by the contrast between its meaning about and for women, and the meanings generated in the social studies. In most social studies classrooms there are no symbolic, and few literal, representations of women’s experience. This is a vacuum within which occur the often unconscious strivings by women students for a voice in history, the polity, the social arena. In most social studies curriculum, women’s place is still understood in men’s ways so that a few famous faces appear—and this is all. From the perspective of women’s lives (of friendship, love, and other relationships) there is only invisibility since this is not the “stuff” of the disciplines and of the curricular texts. Furthermore, in social studies teacher education women’s perspectives are either not included (even as part of the multiculturalism of race, class, gender, and their influences on teaching and learning). The situation is a little different in social studies research in which some attention has been given to gender differences in social development, attitudes, and practices. But this inquiry is still defined by the histories of the research traditions. Women’s questions are not asked or answered, nor are alternative methodologies that might reflect these questions utilized.

Moreover, in all areas of social studies education there is virtually no presence of feminism and thus of the politicization of women’s past and present lives. This is a slight overstatement given the activism of several women’s organizations in the subject field. However, because by default women’s experience (with its privatized norm) is taken as apolitical, a negative position toward feminism is adopted. “Feminism” is either just “too pushy” or “really not needed.” From this stance follows a denial of the validity of women’s equality as it is related to women’s socially-constructed identity (recall Miller’s definition above). Given consciousness raising for each woman and man, how one can deny the ethicality of feminism is beyond my understanding. Finally, there remains one other ingredient about woman’s
public lives that this lovely little book shows. This is that there is really no choice but to be a feminist. For any women who push the boundaries of convention—classroom teachers, university scholars, biographers, and poets—our competent visible presences bring with them the possible cooptation of our political choice. At some point we will be thought of as strident or shrill, at some point the label “feminist” will be applied. My closing point is that we might as well claim the label in the name of our own power and then get on with the many compelling endeavors of an education that is socially transforming. To end: Writing a Women’s Life gave me much to think about with regard to my own scholarship, my own professional place, and my own political commitment. It should do likewise for you.

Endnotes

1. Members of our feminist committee of correspondence were Jane Bernard-Powers, Millard Clements and Jean Grambs. I know that they join me in thanking Carole Hahn and Fred Newmann (and reviewers of a symposium proposal) for their initial encouragement. In addition to the Heilbrun recommendation, each of the group members contributed something special to my thinking for this essay and I have told them this.

2. This is manifest in what is available in texts and even more so (only in the past?) in what is not available.


3. Heilbrun leaves aside fiction because of the “brilliant and sophisticated examination” of women’s fictional lives and their writers in the past decade or so in a growing body of important feminist literary criticism (p. 11). Were she to include it, she writes, the most outstanding contributions have come from black authors Toni Morrison and Alice Walker (and also from the poet Audre Lorde) who have understood better the role of public “aggression” for women and “have claimed identity sooner and more sharply” than their less-aware white sisters (pp. 60–61, 74).


7. I hasten to add that women’s lives were largely invisible in my own secondary social studies classroom of a decade ago.

8. I want to thank Nel Noddinngs, Jane Gaskell, and Jane Bernard-Powers for conversation about feminism, scholarship, and the social studies that led directly to the content of this review.
You couldn’t start the day without McGill” as one Southerner recalled. Regardless of whether or not you agreed with him, he was an integral part of southern politics and culture for almost three decades. From his post as columnist for the *Atlanta Constitution*, Ralph McGill (1898–1969) was the voice of “the conscience of the South.” South Carolina Public Television has provided a detailed documentary account of McGill’s career in *Dawn’s Early Light: Ralph McGill and the Segregated South*.

The documentary traces McGill’s evolution from gentile racist to gentile anti-racist. Once a segregationist, in the 1940s he moderated his position and suggested that the answer to racial discrimination must come from “within the Southern pattern”; still, he eschewed legislation designed to promote racial equality. Amidst the demagoguery of Southern politicians like James Coleman, Herman Talmadge, and George Wallace, he came to believe that segregation was not only detrimental to the progress of the South, but also immoral and unconscionable. He used his front-page editorial column to cajole, prod, and in some instances shame the South he loved so much. As a man who could talk about fatback, barbecue, and hounddogs with the good ol’ boys, he was able to rouse parts of the Southern conscience when other liberal and progressive voices fell on deaf ears. Atlanta was never plagued by the race riots witnessed in Watts, Birmingham, or Detroit, in part due to the efforts of persons like McGill.

When a synagogue on Peachtree Street in Atlanta was bombed in 1958, he wrote: “Let us face the facts. . . . You do not preach and encourage hatred for the Negro and hope to restrict it to that field. It is an old, old story. It is repeated over and over again in history. When the wolves of hate are loosed on one people, then no one is safe.” It was classic McGill: He took reluctant white Southerners by the hand and forced them to confront the vulgarities of the system they helped to sustain, while telling them how much he cherished the South. The editorial won him a Pulitzer Prize one year later.

Unlike other cities in which school desegregation provoked unrest, Atlanta was calm in 1961 when nine Black students entered four previously all-white high schools. It was not that the city did not have strong opponents to desegregation; rather, the uncharacteristic quiet that accompanied the transition was a result of months of preparation on the part of the “architect of peaceful integration,” Ralph McGill. He convinced many of the city's
business leaders that “closed schools do not go well with new industry.” When journalists from around the world arrived in Atlanta to cover the event, they found themselves not taunted and scorned as they had been in other cities, but welcomed, housed, and even fed.

When Martin Luther King won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964, McGill tried to organize a reception to honor him. This time Atlanta’s business leaders balked. But McGill persisted and sought the help of his long-time friend Robert Woodruff, then president of Coca-Cola, who succeeded in convincing the business community that the dinner was in their best interests. After the event, Atlanta was described by Time magazine as the “city too busy to hate.”

While McGill’s efforts earned him accolades from many, they also prompted hate mail, death threats, and obscene phone calls. His son, taught to use a gun when he was quite young, knew that the rifle he kept by his bedside was not for show.

The documentary does not ignore the ironies and limits of McGill’s career. McGill was a classic New Deal anti-communist liberal. He vigorously, and some say stubbornly, supported the war in Vietnam. He red-baited the Highlander Center, a training ground for King and the Civil Rights Movement. He was uncomfortable with the Atlanta boycotts and lunch counter sit-ins; they were, after all, “illegal.” He was both confused and appalled by the rise of the Black Power Movement. Vernon Jordan, then director of the Voter Education Project, recalls that he would occasionally find McGill in his office when he arrived early in the morning, waiting to talk with him and trying to understand the increasing assertiveness of the Movement.

The documentary is most successful as a study of a journalist operating in the midst of traumatic social change. History texts often portray the Civil Rights Movement as a battle between staunch segregationists blocking school doorways, and determined Civil Rights activists marching through the streets. There were others who, like McGill, had a significant impact on the course of events during this turbulent period. Interviews with prominent journalists such as William Emerson of Newsweek, John Popham of the New York Times and Sander Vanocur of ABC News establish McGill as the “last of the thundering editors.” Atlanta Mayor Andrew Young contrasts him with current newspaper editors, calling McGill an “educator, reformer, and visionary.”

The strength of the documentary is also its weakness. The detail that gives richness and depth to McGill’s career also serves to diminish a sense of the drama of the period. It is not recommended as an introduction to the Civil Rights Movement; rather, it is for secondary teachers and students who wish to explore the more intricate dimensions of personal and social change during the period.

Viewing would be most appropriate for journalism, political science, sociology, and United States history classes. An excellent viewer’s guide ac-
companies the documentary; it includes topics for discussion, descriptions of key persons and events, recommended reading, and the transcript.

*Dawn's Early Light: Ralph McGill and the Segregated South* is a provocative study of the complexities of individual and social change, both in terms of its limits and its possibilities. The documentary stands as an honest and insightful account of one man's transition from segregationist to anti-racist, and his efforts to guide others toward a post-segregationist South.

Reviewed by Nancy R. King, Lida Lee Tall Learning Resources Center, Towson, MD 21204

*Educating for Global Responsibility* is a collection of curricular units developed by teachers and submitted in response to a survey made possible by the World Policy Institute. More than 130 curricular units were received from K-12 peace educators and 35 were chosen to be included in this volume. All submissions are available at the Milbank Memorial Library Curriculum Resource Center at Teachers College, Columbia University, and on the computer-based "Peace Education Curriculum Bank" which is available nationwide.

The book opens with a brief introduction to the principal values found in peace education and the importance of addressing peace issues in the classroom. The editor briefly describes the survey and lists the criteria used to select units for the book. The place of peace education in the curriculum is also discussed, and an overview of the book's contents is provided.

The units themselves are organized into four groups. The first section includes four units for the primary grades (K-grade 3). The second section presents seven units for the upper elementary grades (grades 4–6). Four units for the junior high school grades (grades 7–9) comprise the third section, and the fourth section is devoted to twenty units for senior high school students (grades 10–12). Each section begins with introductory comments by the editor which highlight those peace issues and concepts that are particularly relevant to the age of the children for whom the units are intended.

The final segment of the book includes annotated lists of recommended curriculum materials, bibliographies, and resource organizations. All information necessary to locate the materials or contact the agencies is included. Finally, there is a list of references highlighting recent publications about peace issues and classroom practice.

It is clear that the units included in this book were prepared by thoughtful, reflective teachers who care deeply about peace issues and the children they teach. The units are intended to influence classroom practice and to increase the presence of peace curricula in the schools. Most are designed as separate curricular experiences, though there are also examples of infusion programs.

There are several exemplary units in this collection which encourage creative and analytic thinking. For example, the senior high school unit about alternatives to violence includes a lesson in which the students imagine a world without weapons (p. 96). This creative and imaginative activity leads to a reconsideration of recent history and a projection of future events necessary to the development of such a world.
The interdisciplinary unit about conflict resolution designed for gifted high school students is a particularly sophisticated piece of curriculum (p. 112), as is the unit which analyzes a wide range of art works for their political messages. Attitudes concerning the military and nuclear disarmament are particularly emphasized (p. 160).

Finally, the unit entitled "Thinking Skills for the Nuclear Age" encourages middle school students to analyze influences on their own thinking, to think critically about complex issues, to take another's point of view, and to understand the process of negotiation in both interpersonal and international frameworks.

Most of the units presented in this collection do not include enough detail to allow the reader to use the material without further information. The objectives in some units are unclear; other units include vague directions. The descriptions of several units are quite cryptic, and some include little more than introductory material or lists of topics. The editor overcomes these drawbacks by including the name of the author and his or her full mailing address for every unit. Thus, if the reader's interest is piqued by the information included in the book, it is made as easy as possible to obtain further information and guidance.

There are drawbacks in some units, unfortunately, that are not so easily overcome. Several units seem to lack an internal integrity, and in at least one case, this may be attributable to an unrecognized ethnocentricism. A unit for young children groups together a series of activities from various Asian cultures as if these cultures were interchangeable. Further, the activities bear no obvious relationship to each other. The author's contention that studying aspects of other cultures will lead to respect for these cultures seems naive. If this respectable orientation is not provided by the teacher, the children may decide instead that Asian people use primitive cutlery, eat unpleasant food, and listen to strange music (p. 14).

There are also units that are blatantly ideological. (See, for example, page 77.) In the case of one particularly biased unit, the introductory editorial comments suggest using additional materials to present a more balanced approach (p. 116). This is not the only case in which the editor is helpful. Her introductions to each section and to each unit orient the reader to the material; her specific comments about augmenting the scope of one unit (p. 121), and enhancing the instructional approach of another unit (p. 140), as well as other suggestions throughout the book, will be useful to teachers who attempt these units in their own classrooms.

Although peace is an issue which is inextricably linked to issues of power and influence, many units in this volume are not political, and others take a simplistic view of political processes. For example, several units stress building self-esteem and using creative imaging. The emotional state of the students is of paramount importance in these units but the link between per-
sonal peacefulness and political realities is not made. Feelings are discussed, but the situations which produced the feelings are not (p. 12).

In other units, existing political structures are assumed to be positive forces for peace and are not examined critically for their actual strengths and limitations with regard to peace issues. For example, one unit extols "our democratic society" (p. 58) and children are encouraged to express their concerns about war, endangered species, and care of the environment by writing letters to newspapers and government officials and, when old enough, voting (p. 58). While these are worthwhile activities, they do not help children recognize the competing interests within society that may prevent governmental action on controversial issues.

When political issues and contexts are ignored, there is even the possibility of teaching political passivity and conformity in the guise of peace education. One unit for the early grades, for example, includes obeying rules, being polite, being able to abide by rules and guidelines, and giving compliments to others as interaction skills which promote peace (p. 20). While it is possible to see these skills in this light, it is also possible that encouraging these tendencies in children may produce docility and unthinking obedience. This may lead to a confusion between being nice and promoting peace. Here, as elsewhere, editorial comments are helpful to the reader (p. 3).

There is some over-simplification in many of the units which may lead to distortions of reality. For example, a unit for the upper elementary grades about world hunger states that "People are hungry because they are poor" (p. 44). Such a statement comes uncomfortably close to blaming the victim. This unit goes on to suggest several charitable activities for the children, so that they can see themselves as active agents for a better world. These are meaningful activities and their importance must not be overlooked or disparaged. It must also be recognized, however, that such activities have considerably more impact on the self-esteem of the children than they do on the problem of world hunger. Children of this age could appreciate a more sophisticated treatment of this issue and a more balanced perspective on the importance of their own efforts and the scope of the efforts required for a genuine solution.

Some units also display a naivete about the role of schooling in the lives of children. There is a recurring assumption that children are prepared in school for their future roles as adult leaders. While this is not entirely false, the most obvious socialization in classrooms is for the purpose of preparing children for their current roles as pupils. Consequently, those units which consider the classroom context and reconstruct the roles of pupils to include active peace-making skills are among the more successful in the book.

Finally, there is an overriding difficulty in this volume which all books of curricular materials share but which is exacerbated by the fact that these units are about peace issues. This is the problem of pedagogy, and it is clearly
recognized by the editor (p. 4), and by several of the authors (p. 32). The quality of the learning environment is crucial to the success of these units. It may even be that the teaching strategies and the interpersonal relationships they enhance or discourage are more important than the curricular content. Children cannot treat each other with dignity, if they are not treated with dignity. Teachers cannot empower others, if they have no power. Classroom participants cannot explore complex issues in settings where the only important goal is finding the right answer.

Teaching about peace and teaching which enhances peace involve a variety of energetic activities which require time, attention, and effort. Thoughtful reflection, intellectual analysis, active concern, and sustained communication must be practiced by students and teachers alike. Facts must be differentiated from opinions, and fears from values. As difficult as this may be to learn, it is considerably more difficult to teach. This volume provides vision, encouragement, and guidance to peace educators at all levels of schooling. Experienced as well as novice teachers will find it helpful in enhancing their efforts to teach peace.

Reviewed by Lucien Ellington, Center for Economic Education, University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, Chattanooga, TN 37403.

This economic analysis of the effects of government policy on private education is an excellent scholarly treatment of a largely neglected aspect of schooling in Japan. Although the book will assist readers to better understand Japanese education, the authors profess to have written it to stimulate thinking among Western policy makers about the costs and benefits of public policies toward both public and private schools. In this reviewers’ opinion they attained their objective.

The well-known educational accomplishments of the Japanese are at least in part due to private as well as public schools. Japan leads all advanced nations in the percentages of high schools (approximately 50%), and institutions of higher education (80%), that are private. After providing a common public education for almost all elementary and junior high students, the Japanese government deliberately limits the supply of public academic high schools and universities. Student access to these institutions is based solely upon demonstrable performance.

Japanese students who don’t aspire to attend university enroll in public vocational high schools. Regardless of personal economic resources, students can enter the public academic high school or public university of their choice, providing they can pass entrance examinations. Students who can’t pass the tough public high school and university entrance examinations can, if they have the means, attend private high schools and universities which are expensive but generally easy to enter. Large numbers of private educational institutions exist because of consumer demand and as a result of subsidies by the Japanese government to private schools.

The primary effect of the government policy of supply limitation for student admission of public academic track high schools and universities is that in Japan such institutions are more selective and academically superior to private alternatives. Those students who complete public university later obtain better positions than their counterparts who graduate from private universities. Based on the author’s empirical studies, such students in Japan tend to be from much more heterogeneous socioeconomic backgrounds than in the United States.

In the United States, despite major exceptions, the opposite is the case. Most public high schools and universities have either very low or no admission standards while in general, elite private educational institutions are selective and have a reputation for academic excellence. Graduates of Ivy League universities, most of whom tend to be from upper middle and upper class
backgrounds, attain higher status positions than their public university counterparts.

Although the authors include the standard caveats against the dangers of comparing different cultures' educational systems, their major conclusion is that if American public education is to become competitive with the private educational sector and enjoy widespread public support, a significant portion of public high schools and universities should become more selective.

In the U.S., the idea of selectivity in public schools has been often viewed by educators and policy makers as contrary to democratic principles. As a result, if they can afford it, parents who aspire for later university educations for their children, but find them assigned to public schools of low academic quality, choose private schools. While public schools have wide middle class and upper class support in Japan, such allegiance is often lacking in the United States.

Currently there is much debate in the United States over whether increased parental and student choice will improve the schools. If large numbers of "choice models" are implemented nation-wide, both increased selectivity by some public schools and a growth of the private educational sector are likely prospects. Opponents of choice in the U.S. argue that our society would be worse off if either of these events occur. Contrary to these predictions, the Japanese have used a choice model and a large private educational sector to actually strengthen the public schools. Furthermore, in part because of these policies, Japanese students from poor backgrounds have a better chance of entering an elite educational institution than their American counterparts.

Possibly the cultural differences between Japan and the United States are so pronounced that the educational policies of the Japanese government have no ramifications at all for those who want to think very carefully about the issues of educational choice and improvement of public education. I doubt it.
The History of Education Society will hold its annual meeting at Emory University in Atlanta on November 2-4, 1990. Proposals on any aspect of education, formal or informal, in the United States or in other countries are welcomed, and the work of both new and established scholars is solicited. Proposals should include the theme of the paper, significance, methods, and conclusions (1-3 pages) and a one-page vita of the presenter. Session proposals—two or three related papers with commentator(s)—are encouraged. Send proposals (4 copies) by April 15 to Donald Warren, Department of Education Policy, Planning, and Administration, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.
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Book Reviews (two copies) should be sent to Jane J. White at the address in the front of the journal or to 1820 Tucker Lane, Ashton, MD 20861. The length may vary from 500 to 3500 words. The format for the top of the first page of the review is as follows:

Author (last name first). Title (underlined). City of publication: Publisher, date of publication, total number of pages, list price.
Reviewer’s name, followed by your institutional address complete with Zip Code.

The book review, as all manuscripts, should follow the guidelines described above. If you use WordPerfect, please send a floppy disk with your review on it.
An Invitation

I would like to invite all readers of this journal to contribute to TRSE and to encourage friends or colleagues who are engaged in important research to do so as well.

It is my hope that during my editorship TRSE will publish many different kinds of scholarship concerned with social studies education. Publishing recent doctoral research is quite appropriate for the journal. Scholarship dealing with women's issues, racial issues, environmental issues, economic issues, peace issues, political issues, historical issues and or philosophical issues of social studies education are all appropriate for this journal. Scholarship concerned with curricular materials and instructional activities have an important place in this journal. My intention is to include rather than exclude different perspectives on research and scholarship.

We all share a common faith that something we think of as research is at least one way we should seek to improve social education. We, as social studies teachers, want our students to come to some understanding of society and history, to be effective citizens, to avoid the abberations of racial, religious and sexual prejudice. Through social studies education we hope to contribute to the development of a saner, more just, less polluted, less violent world.

Whatever this hope and aspiration, the actual world we live in presents a darker aspect: savage conflicts in Central America, Africa, the Middle East, Sri Lanka, The Philippines, and East Timur. Torture, assassination, arms races, world wide environmental degradation and homelessness, poverty and despair in many United States cities are everyday realities. Often torture and assassination are claimed to be progress, or the defense of democracy or a struggle for social justice. The truths of our planet are infinite and many of them are painful. On our troubled planet what is wisdom in social studies education?

What research is vital to our professional concerns? What should we seek to know that we do not know? About social studies education? About human society? About being human? About the conduct of social inquiry? What research is relevant to our highest aspirations and yet grounded in an awareness of our human condition? What issues should be explored in TRSE?

I would like to invite all readers of this journal to join in the exploration and clarification of ways we may seek to make social studies more honest in its treatment of issues, more significant in its intellectual challenge, more important in the lives of students.

Millard Clements

Editor, TRSE
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