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Few would argue with the proposition that democracy requires people feel a connection to their fellow citizens. With this in mind, even a brief survey of the social landscape in North America produces disheartening news for the state of democracy. For example, what are we to make of the depoliticized, apathetic, and cynical citizenry that set a record low turnout at the polls in the 1998 congressional elections, where just over one-third of those eligible voted? Or, what are we to make of the school shootings in Flint, Lake Worth, Jonesboro, Paducah, Columbine...?

For social education to contribute to a flourishing of democracy we must effectively respond to these (and other) manifestations of disconnections among people. Our efforts must move beyond responding to mere symptoms and get to the heart of the matter, which I believe is alienation in society. We are generally indifferent to our alienation from self, others, and the world in which we live and work. And while periods of crises (individual and social) often produce an awareness of alienation, success tends to numb us to any price we are paying individually and collectivity for that success.

In a speech to students at Yale University in 1964, Fritz Pappenheim offered a series of examples and analyses of how people are separated (alienated) from themselves, their fellow citizens, their political communities and from the forces that shape the trends of our age. His comments are relevant to us today, perhaps more so now than thirty years ago. He observed that,

[M]any a person senses a split between his [sic] existence as a private individual and as a citizen. This often engenders withdrawal from the realm of politics...It is easy to blame the young for their political apathy. But their attitudes are not surprising. To many of them, any talk about the political responsibility of citizens sounds totally phony. What can we say to those young people who doubt that those who do play a role in our political life are genuinely concerned about great political issues? (Pappenheim, 1964/2000, p. 41, emphasis added)

This question central to the work of social educators pursuing a more democratic and socially just world.

From Magruder's American Government (1988), in a chapter ironically titled “Government By the People” we learn,

[F]rom the very first day schools teach children the values of the American political system. They very purposely work to indoctrinate the young and train them to become young citi-
zens. School children salute the flag, recite the pledge of allegiance, and sing patriotic songs. They learn about George Washington and Abraham Lincoln and other great figures of the past...high school students' political knowledge is refined, often through textbooks such as this one.

If this is a fair representation of how social studies education responds to Pappenheim's question, then our efforts are woefully inadequate. Because, as Pappenheim further notes,

Political leaders and statesmen are often alienated themselves, and thus deprived of an authentic relationship to the historical forces which shape our age. They are therefore incapable of coming to grips with the decisive issues of our period. Instead of really understanding historical trends, they try to manipulate them and subject them to their designs and schemes, which often have quite limited purposes. Political "leaders" become more and more like public relations men...trying to find the right sales pitch. (p. 41)

The political quid pro quo is now commonly accepted by all involved, including political spectators, which may partially explain the decline in political participation in the United States.

Politicians, of course, have no special claim to this condition. Nearly all of us are alienated from the situations in which we are involved as well as from ourselves. We have a tendency not to relate to situations as a whole or to other people as a whole; "we tend to isolate that one fraction which is important to us and remain indifferent observers of the rest" (Pappenheim, p. 38). This division of thought is evident in schools and universities as well as the media where people receive interpretations of the world that betray a lack of understanding of the material circumstances of our day. Take, for example, the contradiction of "record-breaking expansion" of the U. S. economy and the wealth gaps among Whites, African-Americans, and Latinos (Collins, 1999). Or the "triumph of global capitalism" as opposed to the impact of neoliberal economic policies on the global south, particularly Latin America (e.g., Magdoff, Wood, & McNally, 1999; Petras & Veltmeyer, 1999).

These divisions in thought are typical. We are almost always interested in the portion of reality that can serve our ends, remaining indifferent to the realities that "don't concern us" and, as Pappenheim concludes, "the more we advance in this separation, the more we create a split within ourselves" (p. 38). For example, as Pappenheim told the Yale students,

I know a white minister in a small town in Alabama. He is as much opposed to racial discrimination as are most of us in this hall. He has said to friends: "To cling to segregation means to pay merely lip service to the teachings of Christ." But when he was asked by a young student of theology, "When are you going to implement the Christian gospel and open your church to worshippers of all races?" His sad and resigned answer was,
"You know as well as I do that the day I did that I would not have a church left." (p. 38)

Are we like this minister when it comes to matters of social education in schools and universities? When our curriculum and teaching selectively avoid certain information, perspectives, or questions because these might create controversy—and/or negatively affect decisions on our tenure or promotion, etc.—we create an inner division between ourselves as educators committed to pursuing truth and our roles as hired employees. This division also affects our connections with the others and the world in which we live and work.

The world of alienation cannot be separated from the world of exploitation. Any examination of alienation must recognize that its three forms—alienation from self, others, and the world—are interconnected. In addition, we need to understand and respond to alienation, not as a mere psychological state, but as a condition that has social and economic bases, making it central social education.

In the early part of the twentieth century, Ferdinand Tönnies (1957/1988) described two types of social relations. Associations that grow out of calculation—Gesellschaft—in which individuals have figured out that they can pursue their interests more effectively if they join together. Members of Gesellschaft are related to one another not as whole persons, but only in a fraction of their beings (e.g., as teachers to students; as consumers to producers; as stockholders in a corporation). The second type of association—Gemeinschaft—does not arise from conscious design, but is the result of belonging, solidarity, where people do not consider their association with others terminated the moment it no longer brings advantages (Pappenheim, 1964/2000). "In the Gemeinschaft, members are essentially united in spite of occasional separation," while "in the Gesellschaft, members are essentially separate from each other in spite of occasional or even frequent connection" (Pappenheim, p. 44).

What has this got to do with alienation and social education? Life in a world in which Gesellschaft is the rule is a world of alienation. It is crucial to our work as social educators that we take stock of our own associations and that we encourage the examination of associations among citizens if we hope to create and sustain a democratic society. Thirty-six years ago, Pappenheim noted that the forces of Gesellschaft were much stronger than Gemeinschaft, today the victory of the former over the latter seems almost complete. This fact is evidenced in education, for example, in the seemingly odd alliance of teacher unions, U. S. Chamber of Commerce, and National Governors Association in support of high-stakes testing, standardized curriculum, and grade retention, which they have collectively promoted in numerous full-page "Challenge Me" advertisements in the New York Times over the past year (see also Mathison, Ross, & Vinson, in press). These calculated relations are also evident in union contracts that pit teachers' pocketbooks against students' interests in pay-for-test-score plans or routes to "excellence in educa-
tion" that promote segregation of students along race, ability, and language lines (see Ross, 1999; 2000b).

In any attempt to reverse the strong trend of social relations defined as Gesellschaft, we must also consider the economic structure of the world and the ways in which it impacts our associations with others and how it fosters alienation. Our market-centered economy is a system of commodity production. "A commodity is characterized by the split between its exchange value and its use value; the exchange value becomes more important than the use value, the intrinsic value" (Pappenheim, p. 45, emphasis in original). We produce and sell commodities not because we have a inner relationship to their intrinsic value but because we are interested in the exchange value. And as Pappenheim makes clear, "there is a deep affinity between the commodity and the type of association we call Gesellschaft..."

As we are related only to one fraction of the commodity, the exchange value, so also in personal associations we are related only to one fraction of other individuals, not to their intrinsic value as human beings. This parallel is more than coincidental. It indicates that an economy based on dominance of exchange values engenders—we might also say demands—human relations which are characterized by the trend toward Gesellschaft and alienation. (p. 45)

Because exchange value permeates every realm of our lives we must confront its impact on our work as educators. Its most explicit manifestation in education is found in standards-based educational reform practices, which reduce students to their test scores and demand that teachers implement curriculum conceived by people who have little or no knowledge of local school communities. Exchange value induces teachers to compromise and forget some of their values and goals (not necessarily for increased salary, but for career considerations and job security). As Pappenheim recognized, "many teachers tend to impart primarily factual knowledge. The reason may be that they are reluctant to impose their values on the thinking of their students...

I have a hunch, however, that there may be still another motive, not necessarily a conscious motive, for focusing on factual knowledge. The teacher may become aware that it is safer not to get involved in discussing the burning issues of our time; from the point of view of job security it may be wiser to resort to a certain neutrality—often conceived as "objectivity"—and to confine himself [sic] to transmitting a type of factual knowledge which at the same time is uninspiring and stifling to the student's curiosity. (Pappenheim, p. 50)

How then do we keep our values and still teach? First, we must realize that we cannot overcome alienation within a world of alienation. Secondly, we must confront the implications of this first principle—which has been so clearly laid out in the work of Chomsky (1999) and many others, including Marx—that is, democracy requires that people feel a connection to their fellow citizens and it is impossible to be a proponent for participatory democ-
racy and at the same time champion capitalism and the worlds of alienation and exploitation it creates. Thirdly, we must take action to foster the bonds among our fellow human beings and build up institutions that enable us to identify our ends with others, our shared interests, as complete persons in Gemeinschaft.

This is an arduous task, but one within our means. We mustn’t forget, however, that choosing to build connected relationships with others and true participatory democracy also means responding to the ruthlessness of the enemies of a democracy that recognizes the sovereignty of the people.

Notes
1 Collins (1999) reports that in 1995, the median African American household had a net worth of $7,400 (compared to $61,000 for Whites). The median net work excluding home equity was $200 for African American households (compared to $18,000 for White households). One in three African American households had zero or negative wealth. Latino households were worse off, with a median net worth of $5,000 including home equity and zero otherwise. Half of Latino households in the U.S. have more debt than assets.
2 Pappenheim does not promblematize the concept of “factual information,” for more on this see Ross, 2000a.
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Abstract
This study examined the “opportunities to learn” related to the democratic purposes of schooling that students receive in eighth, ninth, and tenth grade social studies classrooms. We identified five prominent frameworks linking curricular strategies to the preparation of citizens for a democratic society. We then created rubrics that reflected these conceptions and used these rubrics to code observations of 135 social studies classrooms in Chicago. We found that students in this representative sample of social studies classrooms received an alarming lack of opportunities to develop the kinds of capacities democratic theorists believe are important. We also found that when teachers provided students with more and varied opportunities to develop as citizens, that they simultaneously provided significantly more opportunities for higher order thinking and for deep and disciplined inquiry. Finally, we found that when eighth grade teachers were preparing students for the State-mandated constitution test (the state requirement most explicitly linked to civic goals), they provided significantly fewer opportunities related to developing citizens than when they focused on other eighth grade curriculum.
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Historically, a central purpose of public schools has been to develop the capacities and commitments needed for effective citizenship in a democracy. Unfortunately, while we have philosophically grounded understandings of how schooling can promote these democratic purposes (Dewey, 1916; Gutmann, 1987), we do not know as much as we should about how and how much educators actually promote the development of citizens for democracy.

This need is particularly noticeable when attention turns to social studies instruction. It exists despite statements by social studies educators that preparing citizens is one of if not their primary goal (see Gross & Dynneson, 1991; Anderson, et al., 1997). Indeed, policy statements regarding social studies often trumpet this democratic mission (National Council for Social Studies, 1994; National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools, 1989), but social studies scholarship often fails to systematically monitor and analyze the relationship of social studies instruction to democratic goals.

Most studies of the relationship between social studies instruction and democratic priorities aim to measure the impact of social studies classes or particular pedagogy and curriculum on attitudes and knowledge related to democratic goals. Briefly, these studies find a modest relationship between participation in civics classes and students' attitudes, beliefs, and patterns of participation. The impact of schools on political knowledge is greater (see Niemi & JUun, 1998; Verb, et al. 1995; Almond & Verba, 1963; Langton & Jennings, 1968; Ehman, 1980). Some of these studies also consider the impact of various features of curriculum and pedagogy. Classes with discussion or debates, opportunities to participate in decision making and school activities, an open climate for student expression of ideas, and discussions of controversial issues appear to increase political interest, knowledge, tolerance, involvement, and efficacy (Almond & Verba, 1963; Ehman 1969; Hahn & Tocci, 1990; Blankenship, 1990; Ehman, 1980; Torney-Purta & Schwille, 1986; see Harwood, 1992 for discussion of the methodological limits of these studies). The impact of these features often depend on the age, gender, and ethnicity of students (Blankenship, 1990; Ehman, 1969; Hahn & Tocci, 1990).

While these and related studies provide some foundation, they do not tell us much about the opportunities to develop civic capacities and orientations that do and do not occur in social studies classrooms. They also often fail to clearly articulate links between philosophically grounded conceptions of citizenship in a democracy and curricular practices.

Unlike most previous scholarship, we do not assess the impact of curriculum on students' attitudes and knowledge. Instead, we conceptualize and analyze the “opportunities to learn” related to schooling's democratic purposes that occur in social studies class-
rooms. Specifically, after developing rubrics that reflect philosophically grounded connections between various classroom practices and the development of civic capacities and orientations we use these rubrics to assess the opportunities offered in a representative sample of eighth through tenth grade social studies classrooms in Chicago. Our goal is to develop a method for systematic quantitative assessment of classroom opportunities that attends to democratic priorities. This decision has both costs and benefits. Efforts to quantify the provision of such opportunities will necessarily miss some subtle dynamics and conceptually meaningful distinctions. At the same time, this method may ultimately prove quite valuable. For example, we use data from our representative sample of social studies instruction in Chicago to examine both the frequency of varied opportunities (discussions focused on social problems or examining diversity, for example) and the ways these opportunities or time spent preparing for a state mandated Constitution test are related to the opportunities students receive for higher order thinking and for deep and disciplined inquiry.

In its focus on classroom opportunities, our work is consistent with research by Newmann (1991), Onosko (1991), King (1991; 1994), and Ladwig (1991). These scholars identify factors that constrain or enable opportunities for higher order thinking in social studies classrooms. Most of their work monitors conceptions of authentic instruction and higher order thinking rather than opportunities to develop as citizens. King (1994) is particularly relevant in relation to our study because his study explicitly focuses on both thinking and citizenship. He investigates whether classroom opportunities for higher order thinking are associated with opportunities to develop capacities for “critical, empowered participation.” The teachers he observed were from departments that placed a particular emphasis on higher order thinking and they were recommended by department chairs because they emphasized higher order thinking in their teaching. King found that teachers who emphasized higher order thinking did not develop students’ capacities for civic activism or highlight issues of “domination and inequality” (p. 111).

Unfortunately, systematic and conceptually grounded assessments of social studies teachers’ practices are rare. Cuban (1991), in his review, found few studies of social studies classrooms. For example, he found that only three of 221 articles published in Theory and Research in Social Education described and analyzed teacher practices. He also found that the chapters on social studies in the last three editions of the Handbook of Research on Teaching did not cite any articles focusing on teacher behavior in classrooms. While a number of more recent studies such as those described above (also see Brophy, 1993) report data based on classroom observations, these studies rarely place the
democratic purposes of social studies at the center of their analysis (Hahn, 1998 is an important exception).

The primary goal of this study is to present a method for such assessments and to demonstrate its value. To do this, we present three kinds of analysis. First, drawing on extensive work by educators and political philosophers, we describe five ways social studies teachers can provide "opportunities to learn" consistent with democratic priorities. We consider strategies that promote higher order thinking, deep and disciplined inquiry, participation in civic life, respect for diversity, and the ability to analyze social problems. After locating these goals in the vast literature on education and democracy, we use rubrics reflecting these theoretical positions to code data from 135 classroom observations so that we can assess the frequency and nature of these opportunities. We find that teachers in 8th-10th grade classrooms in Chicago provide few opportunities for students to develop the kinds of capacities democratic theorists believe are important.

Second, we analyze how focusing on three goals associated with the preparation of citizens (experiencing democratic citizenship, developing respect for diversity, and fostering an understanding of social problems) relates to the more mainstream goals of providing opportunities for higher order thinking and for deep and disciplined inquiry. Our motivation for this analysis stems from the commonly expressed concern that an excessive focus on "soft" or "progressive" priorities (such as experiencing citizenship or attending to diversity) distracts teachers from schooling's more fundamental academic mission. We find these worries misplaced on both counts. First, social studies teachers in Chicago do not provide many opportunities for students to experience democracy as a way of life, to consider the complexities of life in a diverse society, or to address contemporary social issues. Second, when teachers provided students with opportunities to develop as citizens, students had significantly more opportunities to develop their higher order thinking skills and to engage in deep and disciplined inquiry.

Finally, we examine the impact of the eighth grade State-mandated Constitution Test. We were particularly interested in this component of the study because there are relatively few empirical studies of the ways high-stakes tests and an emphasis on factual information shapes students' classroom experiences (see Wilson & Corbett, 1990; Madaus, 1988; Smylie & Perry, 1998). Moreover, studies of this issue are not framed to consider the impact on opportunities for civic development. What evidence there is suggests that high-stakes tests based on factual information lead teachers to focus on tested information, but not on the concepts underlying them and that such tests narrow the range of teaching methods used in classrooms (see, for example, Darling Hammond & Wise, 1985; Smith 1991). Consistent with these
results, we find that eighth grade teachers devote substantial time (38% of classes) to test preparation and that the teachers provide fewer opportunities for developing citizens during this preparation than during other eighth grade classes.

Visions of Democracy: Theoretical Framework and Associated Rubrics

Political and philosophical theorists have long debated the meaning of democracy and its relationship to education. Educators almost universally state that a primary function of schooling is the promotion and preservation of democracy. At the same time, educators as well as political and philosophical theorists articulate a broad array of visions regarding both the nature of this agenda and ways schools can fulfill this task.

A central goal of this study is to operationalize assessments of the opportunities students receive in social studies classes for developing civic capacities and commitments. We do this by creating rubrics that enable classification of lessons in accordance with criteria that is consistent with particular theoretical stances regarding the links between the development of citizens for a democracy and specific educational opportunities. We focus on five strategies. Theorists linking education and democracy frequently invoke the importance of 1) developing students' higher order reasoning and analytic skills, 2) engaging students in deep and disciplined inquiry, 3) providing students with opportunities to experience democracy as a way of life, 4) fostering students' respect for and understanding of individuals and groups with differing values, beliefs, and practices and, 5) enabling students to identify social problems, their causes, and possible solutions. These different approaches are not mutually exclusive (many educators want to develop students' analytic skills while providing them with opportunities to experience democracy as a way of life) and the list is not comprehensive. We focused on these strategies because they represent prominent conceptions of the pedagogical and conceptual links between education and democracy (Jefferson, 1939; Dewey, 1916; Rugg, 1996/1921; NCSS, 1992). While rubrics cannot fully capture the subtle distinctions that surround these goals and strategies, they do, we feel, provide valuable indicators of the prevalence of particular opportunities to learn. These perspectives are discussed below. The rubrics are detailed in Tables 1 through 5.

The Informed and Thoughtful Voter

Perhaps the most common link made between education and democracy, a link not limited to social studies, is the notion that schools can promote students' capacity to reason and that this capacity is a
fundamental support for a democratic society. Jefferson (1939), for example, while also attentive to the importance of habits, tastes, and virtue, believed that by developing students’ capacity to reason, formal education helps promote the health of a democracy. This perspective is also shared by both citizens and educators who argue that the capacity for thoughtful analysis, synthesis, and evaluation empowers and liberates citizens while improving the outcomes of democratic processes (see Newmann & Oliver, 1970; Pratte, 1988; Siegel, 1988). This goal is also widely shared by social studies educators (NCSS, 1994). A study of social studies educators by People for the American Way (1989) found, for example, that their most common goal was “developing [students’] ability to think clearly” (in Anderson, et al., 1997, p. 336).

We operationalized this concern through use of two rubrics (see Tables 1 and 2) developed by Newmann, Secada, & Wehlage (1995). Their work is the most extensive and well conceptualized work on the subject in relation to social studies instruction. Their rubrics enable assessments of opportunities for students to develop reasoning capacities and deep understanding of an issue or idea. Specifically, one rubric assesses opportunities for higher order thinking and one assesses opportunities for deep and disciplined inquiry. The scale for higher order thinking grows largely out of Bloom’s taxonomy and the distinction between lower order thinking and higher order thinking. Lower order thinking consists of receiving and reciting factual and pre-specified information or applying information and skills in routine and repetitive ways. Higher order thinking consists of synthesizing, evaluating, and analyzing information, constructing generalizations, interpreting data, or hypothesizing (These distinctions and the rubric in Tables 1 and 2 are taken from Newmann, Secada, & Wehlage, 1995, p. 86-87). The scale we label “Deep and Disciplined Inquiry” (which is labeled by Newmann, Secada, & Wehlage as “Deep Knowledge”), assesses the degree to which “instruction addresses central ideas of a topic or discipline with enough thoroughness to explore connections and relationships and to produce relatively complex understandings” (p. 88).

**Democracy as a Way of Life**

John Dewey’s focus on “democracy as a way of life” differs substantially from a focus on fostering higher order thinking. While those who promote this perspective certainly value higher order thinking, they emphasize the importance of social processes that align with civic life more than cognitive capacities. Rather than emphasizing educators’ role in informing future voters, Dewey (1916) emphasized identification and pursuit of shared goals in a manner that reflected the distinct interests and abilities of community members. The pro-
cess needed to respect the importance of shared commitments as well as divergent opinions.

The 1980's and 1990's have witnessed renewed interest in civic life and civic community and its relation to democratic and economic goals. Commonly invoking Tocqueville's and Dewey's visions of the connection between civic commitments and democratic society, academics argue that the political, social, and at times economic health of the nation are tied to the strength of our civic democracy (Putnam, 1993; Barber, 1984).

The implications of this analysis for educators are substantial. These concerns are perhaps best captured in Dewey's (1902) enduring challenge to create miniature communities in classrooms and schools that embody the ideals of participation, democracy, and community. Proponents of "democracy as a way of life" or what Barber calls "strong democracy" support curriculum that engages students in collective undertakings (building a structure, planting a garden, volunteering at a senior center, or assessing the impact of a change in government policy) through which they develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required for life in a democratic community. To be effective, the processes embedded in such collective efforts must be consistent with the forms of social life educators hope to promote. Thus, group efforts are desirable when they include identification of and commitment to shared interests, respect for and consideration of minority opinions, as well as reasoned and inclusive discussions. Such experience-based curricula provide opportunities for students to develop common bonds, discuss and resolve differences, commit to societal goals, and expand their capacities for collective and participatory undertakings. Such projects also often provide opportunities for group members to build on one another's abilities and to model the use of individuals' particular capacities as a means of realizing group goals. For similar reasons, proponents of experiencing citizenship value connections between academic content and the lives of students, their families, and community members. When students make these connections they have opportunities to consider the significance of school content for community life and, more generally, the human significance of social issues (see Newmann & Oliver, 1967; Wigginton, 1986; Wood, 1992). Thus, the challenge for educators becomes one of embedding efforts to develop students' logical capacities and academic skills in an educational process that simultaneously develops students' capacity for, commitment to, and understanding of social issues and collective endeavors.

We operationalized this priority by creating a rubric (see Table 3) that assessed students' opportunities to experience democratic citizenship as a way of life — the opportunities they had to identify or pursue shared interests, to work collectively on projects of social im-
portance, to work in groups in ways that tapped the insights and different abilities of one another, and to connect academic concerns with matters of personal or community interest.

Respect for and Understanding of Diversity

The relationship of multicultural commitments and respect for diversity to democratic ideals has been a central concern of contemporary educators and democratic theorists. Indeed, those with diverse ideological and curricular commitments argue that by fostering respect for and understanding of the perspectives of individuals and groups, schools can provide fundamental support for a democratic society (Ravitch, 1990; hooks, 1994; Banks, 1993). While broad consensus surrounds commitment to respecting diversity, the implications of this stance are the subject of heated debate and numerous conceptual distinctions. Many, for example, debate whether respecting differences requires that students tolerate or affirm all lifestyles. Voluminous discussions also surround ways to respect and recognize ethnic, racial, gender, sexual, or religious identities without constraining individuality by obscuring the diversity within these groups on the one hand or by undermining broader shared identities as citizens on the other.

For several reasons, schools are well positioned to provide students with greater respect for and understanding of diverse cultures and identities. They provide a location where individuals with different backgrounds mix and they are viewed by many as one, if not the most appropriate place to promote greater respect for and understanding of different groups. As a result, just as there has been ample discussion among democratic theorists regarding these issues, these concerns have received enormous attention in discussions of educational theory, policy, and practice (see Banks & Banks, 1995; NCSS, 1992).

As is the case with other visions linking democracy to educational goals, the breadth and complexity of opportunities to develop respect for and understanding of varied group and individual identities cannot easily be operationalized. In constructing our rubric (see Table 3), we therefore adopt a relatively inclusive stance. We seek simply to assess: (1) whether a given class of students has opportunities to learn from and about the experiences, beliefs, and cultures of different groups and individuals (African-Americans, Muslims, Russians,...) and (2) whether they have opportunities to consider the importance and complexity of respecting these varied perspectives, beliefs, cultures, and practices. To say that a teacher provides opportunities to consider the importance and complexity of respecting the perspectives of a diverse spectrum of individuals and groups is not to say that the teacher endorses value neutrality. Rather, from the stand-
��的课程，我们只是说学生考虑不同的视角。

在讨论不同文化的同时，发展尊重和理解多元性的机会可以来自于对争议性问题的讨论——但这取决于这些主题是如何讨论的。例如，如果学生只是简单地陈述他们的立场和理由，并在课堂辩论上支持或反对死刑，我们将不会记分，认为课堂没有提供学习尊重多元性的机会。如果老师问为什么有些人可能会支持或反对死刑，并让学生有机会认识到持不同立场的人类性，那么我们会记录说课堂提供了这样的机会。

**公民审视并回应社会问题**

在培养知识渊博和富有深思的选民、公民参与集体行动的能力，以及尊重多元性，一些教育者强调为参与社会改进做准备（Rugg, 1921; Counts, 1932）。他们的目标是让学生准备解决明天的难题，并通过提供发展相关态度、知识和技能的机会来准备他们。因此，虽然他们重视高阶思考和广泛的知识和内容，但他们特别感兴趣的是让学生的学习和分析围绕识别和考虑对社会问题的回应来定向。

就像Newmann(1975)和其他人所争论的，然而，可以引导学生深入研究社会问题，而无需推动他们采取特定的解决方案。理想地，学生学习如何识别社会问题和目标，问题的原因，制定进展策略，并在适当的时候，集体行动以促进进展和加深理解。在这样做时，他们讨论政治问题并评估各种意识形态框架与这些问题的关系。他们也可能发展与公民或政治行动相关的技能，如运行会议、公开活动，或收集请愿签名（See Newmann, 1975; Engle & Ochoa, 1988; and Isaac, 1992)。
Method

The data reported here were gathered as part of a three year study of classroom practices by the Consortium on Chicago School Research. The data include 135 structured observations of 8th through 10th grade social studies classes from seven high schools and five elementary schools in Chicago. Thirty-five teachers were observed. The observations took place over a three year period (between 1994 and 1996) and at varied times throughout the school year. The school and teacher samples are largely representative of city-wide characteristics, but include slightly more White teachers and slightly fewer African-American teachers than city averages.

The observations were recorded using a method developed by Stodolsky (1988). Researchers sat in classrooms and maintained running narratives, averaging six to seven pages in length, that described the key activity segments of the class (getting settled, giving directions, listening to a presentation, taking a quiz, etc.) and included what the observer took to be significant teacher and student dialogue within each class period. The narratives recorded the ways the class addressed varied topics, the classroom activities of teachers and students, the materials used, and student grouping. After the lesson, the observer also rated the session according to a set of “authentic instruction” rubrics develop by Newmann, Secada, and Wehlage (1995) and provided a short written explanation for his/her numerical ratings.

Our interest in these data overlapped with but was different from the priorities that initially motivated the data collection. The original study was designed to assess the use and mix of various instructional activities and requirements. In addition to describing the substance of each lesson, those collecting the data placed particular emphasis on students’ opportunities for higher order thinking, on opportunities for deep and disciplined inquiry, on connections between the curriculum and the students’ lives, and students’ interactions with their teacher and with each other. We were interested in the degree to which lessons provided opportunities to learn that might help students develop as citizens. Specifically, in addition to the higher order thinking rubric and the rubric assessing opportunities for deep and disciplined inquiry included in the original study, we created rubrics that assessed opportunities for students to experience democracy as a way of life, to develop a greater understanding of and respect for diversity, and to examine and respond to social problems. Fortunately, the detailed nature of the observation logs enabled us to assess the degree to which lessons provided these opportunities.

Using rubrics we designed to characterize the prevalence of opportunities to learn consistent with developing citizens, we coded the written descriptions of instructional activities. One-third of the obser-
observations were independently scored by two raters on each of five rubrics: Higher Order Thinking, Deep and Disciplined Inquiry, Experiencing Citizenship, Respect for Diversity, and Examining and Responding to Social Problems. The inter-rater reliabilities of the scores were .71, .60, .85, .88, and .80, respectively. When scoring the remaining observations, whenever readers were uncertain how to score a particular lesson, they set it aside and discussed it with the group.

Results and Discussion

Classroom observations revealed few opportunities for students to learn and develop in ways consistent with the democratic educational visions described above. Only 12% of the classrooms engaged students in higher order thinking for a substantial part of the lesson. In only 7.4% of the classes was a focus on deep disciplined inquiry maintained. In 7.4% of classes, students had substantial opportunities to experience democracy as a way of life. Only 1.5% of observed classes provided opportunities for students to consider the complexities of life in a diverse society. Students did have opportunities to identify and discuss social problems in 8.1% of the classes we observed, but in none of these cases did the discussions include analysis (use of categories, principals, or evidence, for example) of causes or solutions. These bleak results were remarkably consistent across the grade levels. One-way analysis of variance revealed no differences on scores for the rubrics among 8th, 9th, or 10th grade classrooms, $F(2, 132) < 2.0, p > .10$.

The failure of so many lessons to engage students in any of the reasoning and analysis required by our framework and methods will, no doubt, ring familiar to many educators. In what follows, we discuss our findings regarding the alignment of classroom practices with each of the five rubrics and illustrate the opportunities teachers provided by drawing on our field notes. We then examine the relationship of several policies and practices to these democratic goals.

Opportunities to Develop Higher Order Thinking

The percentage of lessons observed providing various opportunities for higher order thinking are presented in Table 1.

As detailed in Table 1, 53% of the social studies lessons we observed provided no opportunities for higher order thinking. These lessons commonly emphasized note-taking and brief, often one word or one sentence, answers to factual questions.

Opportunities for Deep and Disciplined Inquiry

The percentage of lessons observed providing various opportunities for deep and disciplined inquiry are presented in Table 2.
Table 1

Percentage of Classes Receiving Each Score on the Higher Order Thinking Rubrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUBRIC SCORE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Students are engaged only in lower order thinking operations, i.e., they either receive, recite, or participate in routine practice, and in no activities during the lesson do students go beyond lower order thinking.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Students are primarily engaged in lower order thinking, but at some point they perform higher order thinking as a minor diversion within the lesson.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Students are primarily engaged in routine lower order thinking operations during a good share of the lesson. There is at least one significant question or activity in which some students perform some higher order thinking operations.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Students are engaged in at least one major activity during the lesson in which they perform higher order thinking operations. This activity occupies a substantial portion of the lesson and many students are performing higher order thinking.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Almost all students, almost all of the time, are performing higher order thinking.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roughly a quarter of all lessons received a score of three, meaning that students were primarily engaged in lower order thinking, but that there was at least one significant question where some students were pushed to demonstrate understanding or interpret material. For instance, during a lesson on Jacksonian Civil Rights, the class discussed class differences and how white men got access to the political structure. Questions such as “Who had the property?” or “What was the price [paid by other groups]?” were posed.

The 12% of the classes that scored a four (no classes scored a five) covered material in greater depth and engaged students in a variety of activities. One class required that students determine who shot first at Lexington. In order to do this, the students first discussed the concept of cause and effect. After identifying historical sources as primary or secondary, the students then used this concept to evaluate the trustworthiness of statements regarding the beginning of the Battle of Lexington.
Table 2

Percentage of Classes Receiving Each Score on the Deep and Disciplined Inquiry Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUBRIC SCORE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Knowledge is very thin because it does not deal with significant topics or ideas; the teacher and students are involved in the coverage of simple information that they are to remember.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Knowledge remains superficial and fragmented; while some key concepts and ideas are mentioned or covered, only a superficial acquaintance or understanding of these complex ideas is evident.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Knowledge is treated unevenly during instruction; i.e., deep understanding of something is countered by superficial understanding of other ideas. At least one significant idea may be presented in depth and its significance grasped, but in general the focus is not sustained.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Knowledge is relatively deep because either the teacher or the students provide information, arguments or reasoning that demonstrate the complexity of an important idea. During the lesson many students do at least one of the following: sustain a focus on a significant topic for a period of time; or demonstrate their understanding of the problematic nature of information and/or ideas; or demonstrate understanding by arriving at a reasoned, supported conclusion; or explain how they solved a relatively complex problem.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Knowledge is very deep because during the lesson almost all students do at least one of the following: sustain a focus on a significant topic; or demonstrate their understanding of the problematic nature of information and/or ideas; or demonstrate complex understanding by arriving at a reasoned, supported conclusion; or explain how they solved a complex problem. In general, students reasoning, explanations and arguments demonstrate fullness and complexity of understanding.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 2, in no instances did almost all students engage in deep and disciplined inquiry during the entire lesson and in only 7.4% of the classes did many students take part in such activities. In 51.1% of the classes, some important concepts or ideas were mentioned, but dealt with superficially. Alarmingly, in 23.7% of the classes, the focus was solely on exposure to factual information. Low level lessons (scored at 1 or 2) take several forms. Some were the result of a lack of classroom control. Often, only low level work was assigned. In one instance, students were told to spend the class period decorating the room and then were to create a crossword puzzle. In this case, 14 words were placed on the board and students spent the period designing the puzzle and writing definitions for each word at the bot-
tom of the page. In few of the observed classrooms was deep and disciplined inquiry sustained. In one such class, students made presentations that represented the “Cold War” from several different perspectives. Their presentations included thoughtful attention to important issues including the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, and the Warsaw Pact.

Opportunities to Experience Democracy as a Way of Life

The Experiencing Democracy rubric and the percentage of lessons observed providing various opportunities for experiencing democracy are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUBRIC SCORE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 A classroom without opportunities to experience democratic citizenship.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A classroom with symbolic, but passive, attention to experiencing democracy as a way of life. For example, a teacher might put students into groups, but not ask students to discuss, debate, or work collaboratively on the material. Alternatively, a teacher might gesture towards a connection between content and personal/community issues without exploring that connection.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 For a sustained but brief period of time, (approximately 5 minutes) some, but not most of the students are experiencing democracy as a way of life.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 For the majority of class time, some but not most of the students are experiencing democracy as a way of life or for a sustained but brief period of time, most of the students are experiencing democracy as a way of life.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 For the majority of the class period, most (or all) of the students are experiencing democracy as a way of life. For example, students might work on oral history projects, create a newspaper, plan a way to serve their community, or work collaboratively on a research project.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 3, in 46.7% of the classes, there were at least superficial links to experiencing democracy as a way of life and 7.4% of all classes provided substantial opportunities. In most classes that received high scores, group discussions were accompanied by direct connections to the students’ lives or to the community in which they
lived. For example, during a discussion of constitutional rights, the teacher used the rules for assembly at a local mall, the validity of searches in public housing, and cases of police brutality as examples. Various examples were offered by the students as well. In a different lesson, after discussing a story about the relationship between a Black family and a Jewish family, the students shared their personal experiences of befriending someone of a different nationality or religious background and then wrote a narrative describing the experience.

The examples noted above helped students make connections between the curriculum and students' lived experience. Classes could also receive high scores by providing students with opportunities to experience democracy as a way of life as part of their classroom experience. Classes that scored well in this regard provided students with experiences working in teams, making presentations, and collectively identifying group priorities. For example, one teacher had students work in small teams to develop a newspaper about the Great Depression and the New Deal. The stories they created had to enable the reader to answer the "5W's + H" (who, what, when, where, why, and how). In addition to finding relevant information in their textbook and other resources, students had to jointly determine the topic of their story, the name and motto of their newspaper, write an op-ed piece, and create advertising.

**Understanding and Respecting Diversity**

The percentage of lessons observed providing various opportunities for respecting diversity are presented in Table 4.

There is broad agreement that our diverse society and the increasing degree to which global contexts shape our lives present citizens with important questions and challenges. Despite substantial policy talk regarding multicultural education and the relative ease with which such issues can be addressed within social studies classrooms, there were few opportunities for students in Chicago to consider issues related to diversity. Indeed, in 78.5% of the classes, no mention was made of a culture, group, or perspective and only 12.6% of the classes included a sustained focus on a culture, group, or perspective. When such content was considered, it was very rarely linked to even a brief discussion of the importance and complexity of understanding and respecting diversity. Only two of 135 lessons received a score of 4 and none received a score of 5. Thus, while students in Chicago may need opportunities to consider the complexities of life in a diverse society, they do not appear to receive many such opportunities in their high school social studies classrooms.
Table 4

Percentage of Classes Receiving Each Score on the Respect for Diversity Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUBRIC SCORE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The score for a lesson that does not mention or acknowledge a culture, group, perspective, or these concepts in terms of issues related to diversity.</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The score for a lesson (brief or long) that has only random and superficial facts about a culture, group, perspective, or these concepts and does not consider the importance or complexity of respecting this diversity.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The score for a lesson that spends significant time considering a group, culture, perspective, or these concepts, but does not consider the importance or complexity of respecting this diversity or a lesson with brief consideration of the importance and complexity of respecting diversity.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The score for a lesson which spends significant time considering a group, culture, perspective, or these concepts and briefly considers the importance or complexity of respecting this diversity.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 The score for a lesson which spends significant time considering a group, culture, perspective, or these concepts and considers the importance or complexity of respecting this diversity.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only lesson that received a five was taught by a teacher to eleventh graders (As explained in the methods section we did not include 11th grade lessons in our formal study because eleventh and twelfth grade classes were only observed when the teacher requested that the observer of his/her ninth or tenth grade class also observe his/her work with older students. See footnote 7). This class dealt with World War II and the treatment of the Jews by Hitler. The teacher began with questions that required students to review the previous lesson. The instructor then asked questions to prompt the students to analyze Hitler’s program of genocide, beginning with “How was Hitler able to get away with his program of genocide?” Students then discussed anti-Semitism and identified “economic ills” and “losing World War I” as possible explanations. The teacher then read a portion of one of Hitler’s speeches, followed by questions by both the teacher and students. The teacher asked if people said similar things about any groups in the US today, and the students offered “Cubans” and “Haitians’ because “no one was standing up for them.” The class then
discussed how other countries dealt with what the Nazis were doing. Students were asked to reflect on the lesson for homework.

Opportunities to Examine and Respond to Social Problems

The percentage of lessons observed providing various opportunities for examining and responding to social problems are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUBRIC SCORE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 No recognition of social problems or of the need for social change.</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Identification of a social problem, but no discussion of solutions, connections to modern times, or action.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Identification of problems, discussions/opinions of causes and solutions, but no analysis of causes and solutions. Discussion includes student opinions (like a TV talk show), but not evidence or structured analysis (use of categories, principles, or evidence, for example).</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Identification of problems with analysis (use of categories, principles, or evidence for example), causes and/or solutions.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Identification of problems and informed analysis of causes and solutions. In addition, this effort is linked to a larger effort that orients students in a significant way towards responding to social problems, resulting in either action or detailed discussion of possible action.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the five rubrics we considered, the least commonly implemented was a focus on social problems. We saw few indications that students had opportunities to focus on social problems or to consider possible responses. Even when social problems were discussed, teachers rarely focused students' attention on data or pushed students to
engage in systematic analysis. As a result, students did not have opportunities to develop capacities linked to social analysis or reform.

In 80.7% of the lessons, no social problem was identified. In 8.1% of the classes, a social problem was identified and students offered opinions regarding causes and/or solutions, but in none of the 135 8th, 9th, or 10th grade classrooms that were observed were students asked to analyze any evidence or theories regarding causes and solutions to these problems.

The most common topic for the 11 lessons receiving a score of three on this measure was violence (4 of the 11 classes). Other topics included: abolitionists, Egypt’s Pharaoh, civil rights, the Holocaust, the Middle East, and the Million Man March. Two observations received a score of three because the teacher discussed a current event with students before moving to a lesson on an unrelated topic.

Class discussions were a common element of high-scoring lessons. Often, teachers asked open-ended questions that required students to say what they would do in particular situations. For example, when discussing the role of the Pharaoh and how a Pharaoh ruled in Egypt, the teacher asked students to tell the class whether they “would want to be King” and “what they would do if they were King/Queen?” When students were slow to answer, the teacher asked, “What about the United States would you like to change?” One student said, “[I’d] help people as a whole. Create jobs, open shelters, help the homeless, and make money at the same time. Then I’d go shopping.” Another said she’d, “get gang members off the street.” One student said she would stop racism, but another objected because, “you can’t change how people think.” The teacher then talked about how current leaders use influence to make change and how politicians often avoid difficult issues.

Unfortunately, even in the cases where social problems were discussed, we observed many missed opportunities to explore these issues fully and to assess possible causes or solutions. Often a student’s thought-provoking comment was not responded to, sometimes because of an interruption. For example, when a class was discussing their reactions to the Million Man March, a student said, “They tried to make it a racial thing; we’re just trying to unite.” Immediately following this comment, three students entered the class late and the teacher spoke with these students. The class then began discussing a different topic.

One teacher asked students to write an essay on violence. It began with students offering reasons for violence and included a discussion of violence around the world. The teacher then had students think of three possible solutions to a source of violence they had identified. While there was significant discussion, students did not analyze data related to this topic, learn about theories related to its causes
or solutions, or read and discuss accounts of violence to assess their significance.

Historically, proponents of curriculum tied to analysis of social problems have been criticized for promoting left-wing perspectives (see Cremin, 1961; Kliebard, 1987). A concern for neutrality is also frequently noted by teachers when explaining their hesitancy to discuss controversial contemporary social issues in the classroom. We examined the eleven classes that focused on social problems and did not find any significant or consistent biases. Indeed, students were so rarely asked to analyze social issues that there were few opportunities for teachers to express or affirm particular ideological stances.

Policies and Practices in Relation to these Priorities

While detailed explanations for the paucity of opportunities to learn consistent with democratic priorities are beyond the scope of this paper, our data does permit two kinds of analysis that can inform the design of productive policies and practices. Specifically, we examined whether lessons that provided opportunities related to diversity, examining social problems, and experiencing democracy, provided more or fewer opportunities for higher order thinking and deep and disciplined inquiry. We also examined whether students working on curriculum tied to the State-mandated Constitution Test had more or fewer of the developmental opportunities we associate with preparation for citizenship in a democratic society.

We decided to correlate scores on the higher order thinking rubric and the deep and disciplined inquiry rubric with the other three rubrics because the focus on higher order thinking and deep and disciplined inquiry most clearly reflects mainstream educational concerns. While many educators do not fully or even partially endorse the other three priorities, almost all educators believe high school students should have opportunities for higher order thinking and deep and disciplined inquiry. Moreover, many worry that a focus on these other democratic priorities can distract educators from these mainstream academic goals. Indeed, the purpose of social studies is frequently subject to debate. The main distinction is between those who emphasize disciplinary knowledge and history in particular (Gagnon & the Bradley Commission, 1989) and others who emphasize citizenship (National Council for Social Studies, 1994).

While the attention to higher order thinking and the opportunities for deep and disciplined inquiry we observed was less than desirable, distraction caused by attending to other democratic goals was not the problem. First, as detailed above, teachers infrequently focus on these alternative priorities. Second, the positive correlation between both opportunities for higher order thinking and opportunities for deep and disciplined inquiry and the other rubrics indicates that stu-
dents were more likely to engage in higher order thinking and deep and disciplined inquiry when they were experiencing democracy as a way of life, considering issues of diversity, or examining social problems than when they were not. The strongest relationship existed between opportunities to experience citizenship and opportunities for higher order thinking ($r = .605$). Evidently, focusing on diversity, social problems, or opportunities to experience democracy as a way of life does not undermine an emphasis on higher order thinking, at least when compared to other classroom practices in Chicago. Indeed, opportunities for higher order thinking and deep and disciplined inquiry are more common when teachers provide opportunities for these other democratic priorities.

### Table 6

**Correlations Among Rubrics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Higher order thinking</th>
<th>Experiencing Citizenship</th>
<th>Respect for Diversity</th>
<th>Deep &amp; Disciplined Inquiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing Citizenship</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Diversity</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep and Disciplined Inquiry</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examining and Responding</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All correlations are significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

While it appears that these five strategies for preparing citizens are compatible, the same can not be said of the State-mandated Constitution Test for eighth graders. The Constitution Tests are created at the school level and tend to focus on factual information. We examined the impact of this policy by comparing eighth grade classrooms where students were learning about the Constitution in preparation for the exam with those in which they were studying other topics.

Inspection of the means presented in Table 7, indicates that scores on higher order thinking were significantly lower when teachers were preparing students for the Constitution Test (mean score = 1.14) than when teachers were teaching students other topics (mean score = 2.48), $t(35) = 4.42, p < .05$. Students were also less likely to engage in deep and disciplined inquiry when they were preparing for the constitution Test (mean score = 1.43) than when they were studying other top-
ics in social studies (mean score = 2.43), \( t(35) = 4.08, p<.05 \). Furthermore, students had fewer opportunities to experience democracy as a way of life when teachers were preparing students for the Constitution Test (mean score = 1.21) than when they were teaching students other topics (mean score = 2.00), \( t(35) = 2.79, p < .05 \). Means of scores on the other rubrics did not differ, \( t(35)s < 1.13, p > .10 \).

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Higher Order Thinking</th>
<th>Deep &amp; Disciplined Inquiry</th>
<th>Experiencing Citizenship</th>
<th>Respect for Diversity</th>
<th>Examining &amp; Responding to Social Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constitution Test Prep (n=14)</td>
<td>1.14 (.53)</td>
<td>1.43 (.65)</td>
<td>1.21 (.58)</td>
<td>1.21 (.58)</td>
<td>1.07 (.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Classes (n=23)</td>
<td>2.48 (1.27)</td>
<td>2.44 (.84)</td>
<td>2.00 (1.13)</td>
<td>1.57 (.90)</td>
<td>1.22 (.52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings are both important and ironic. It is ironic because Article 27, 27-3 of the School Code of Illinois (which mandates that students pass a test on the Illinois and Federal Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and proper use and display of the American Flag to graduate) is the educational policy most explicitly tied to civic goals. Yet when teachers respond to the policy, they provide fewer rather than more opportunities to develop as citizens.

The importance of this finding is two-fold. First, preparation for the Constitution Test comprises a substantial portion of the eighth grade curriculum. Fourteen of the thirty-seven eighth grade classes we examined (38%) were engaged in this activity. While our sample is certainly small and this issue deserves greater attention, the finding is cause for concern. Whether one endorses mainstream academic priorities or the democratic goals outlined in this paper, the Constitution Test appears to lower the quality of educational opportunities students receive. More generally, this finding indicates that standardized tests focusing on factual information may constrain opportunities for higher order thinking, deep and disciplined inquiry, and experiencing democracy as a way of life.

Assessing Social Studies Instruction in Terms of Democratic Priorities

Most writing on democracy and schooling is theoretically, qualitatively, and rhetorically rich, but rarely employs systematic quantitative analysis. Commonly, it highlights best practices and illustrates
their effects (Wood, 1992; Wigginton, 1986), offers detailed qualitative analysis (Goodman, 1992), or provides broad social analysis and commentary (Giroux, 1988). The kind of systematic empirical research Lawrence Kohlberg and others have used to consider the links between education and moral development finds few parallels among scholars focused on democratic educational goals. Strategies like those Ralph Tyler and others (Smith & Tyler, 1942) began developing to examine the relationship of particular curriculum to a democratic agenda have received little attention in subsequent decades (Kahne, 1995).

Clearly, scholars looking for instruments that assess the impact of social studies or other subjects in terms of democratic priorities must proceed with caution. Democratic priorities are complex and those hoping to systematically quantify progress towards them face numerous conceptual and technical challenges. We know very little, for example, about how to holistically measure students’ understandings, beliefs, and actions regarding issues of diversity. The development of instruments is also constrained by important theoretical debates that surround articulation of desirable goals. Clearly, rubrics or other means of quantifying classroom opportunities will miss much that matters. There is an enormous need to undertake qualitative assessments of classroom practices, the motivations that drive them, and the ways they are experienced by teachers and students. Noting these limits, however, should not obscure the potential value of efforts to quantify classroom opportunities as part of an ongoing dialogue. Just as it is useful to examine examples of “best practice” in substantial depth, it is useful to have indicators of the prevalence of such practices.

Basic descriptive data, detailing the almost complete absence of classroom opportunities for students to analyze social problems, for example, should be cause for alarm. Similarly, data from this representative sample which shows how rarely issues associated with diversity are addressed provides an important response to those who fear that multicultural commitments are distracting students from traditional content. Moreover, the positive correlation between classrooms that provide these opportunities and the provision of opportunities for higher order thinking and deep and disciplined inquiry is significant. Whatever else may be constraining the inclusion of opportunities for classroom thoughtfulness, the focus on practices we associate with the democratic purposes of education does not appear to be the problem. If anything, a curricular emphasis on democracy as a way of life, on diversity, and on social problems appears to help. It does, however, appear that high stakes testing (or teachers responses to it) may constrain efforts to provide opportunities for higher order thinking and deep and disciplined inquiry.

This is not the place to discuss the varied and overlapping ways ethnographic, quantitative, and theoretical work can inform our un-
derstanding of education in relation to democratic priorities — though such analysis is needed and would be fascinating. Given the limited amount of theoretically grounded quantitative work linking classroom practices and student development as citizens, however, it does make sense to highlight some potential next steps. First, there is an enormous need to continue developing and assessing instruments that enable assessment of these issues in terms of their technical and conceptual value. Second, such instruments must be used. The knowledge base regarding the impact of various curricular and pedagogical approaches on the attitudes, skills, and knowledge associated with citizenship in a democracy is scant. Third, the relatively consistent finding that educators frequently do not employ strategies scholars believe are consistent with democratic priorities provides a strong rationale for more studies along the lines of those done by Newmann (1991), Onosko (1991), King (1991), and Ladwig (1991) that highlight the ways school and department structures, principal practices, and other policies, facilitate and constrain these opportunities. Studies like King’s (1994) that are theoretically grounded and combine analysis of classroom opportunities with teacher and student interviews are particularly valuable.

Finally, it would be interesting and important to compare the relative access of different groups of students to such opportunities and to examine the links between these opportunities, teacher beliefs, various policies, and outcomes. Of particular importance is the relationship between varied contexts and these opportunities. Many have argued, for example, that low expectations combined with a desire for order and control lead educators to provide working class and poor students fewer opportunities to examine social issues or to engage in higher order thinking than more privileged students receive. Do those who would most benefit from opportunities to develop and voice social critiques have the least opportunities to do so? Studies that examine how various factors such as race, social class, and gender may influence the interpretations and impact of these curricula opportunities would also be quite valuable.

A great deal can be gained by directly and systematically studying the role schools can and do play in helping youth develop into committed and effective citizens. Such endeavors are not simply technical challenges. Consensus surrounds neither the curricular implications of attending to this priority nor the nature of the goal itself. Multiple methods, foci, and conceptions of desirable outcomes clearly must receive attention. These complexities, however, are not a rationale for passivity. This is one kind of study of one city’s schools, but the findings are alarming. The 135 classrooms we examined provided very few high quality opportunities for students to develop the capacity to think clearly and deeply about complex matters, to experi-
ence democracy as a way of life, to understand and respectfully consider diverse perspectives, or to examine and respond to social problems. If we are to attend to rhetoric surrounding the democratic purposes of schooling, these opportunities and their impact must receive sustained and informed attention.

Notes

1 The NCSS, for example, states that “The primary purpose of social studies is to help young people develop the ability to make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world” (1994, p. vii). It should be noted, however, that social studies teachers may not grant this goal primacy. A survey administered in the 1980’s found that teachers rated four goals (basic literacy skills, good work habits and discipline, academic excellence, and personal growth) above citizenship (Rutter, 1986).

2 Onosko (1991) found that teachers’ emphasis on knowledge transmission and covering material, their low expectations regarding students capacity for higher order thinking, large class sizes, and inadequate planning time all constrain the quality of instruction. King (1991) found that department chairs and principals could foster opportunities for thinking in social studies by promoting a common emphasis on it among faculty members and by fostering a collegial culture in which faculty members focused on curriculum development linked to higher order thinking and related pedagogical strategies. Ladwig (1991) reached similar conclusions with the exception that he did not find a relationship between opportunities for higher order thinking and class size, the number of students per teacher, the number of periods available for planning, and the number of different classes for which teachers had to prepare.

3 For example, many theorists argue that it is fundamentally important for citizens to understand the rationale for constitutional democracy. They believe effective citizenry requires an understanding of the rationale for concepts that include majority rule, minority rights, due process of law, checks and balances, and Federalism. We certainly agree with the importance of these curricular priorities, but chose not to make them a specific focus in this study. While those teaching government courses and to a lesser extent American history courses should be held accountable for covering this material, these goals are not central concerns for those teaching economics, world history, or sociology, for example. Moreover, we did not wish to engage in a discussion of whether a substantive knowledge of our constitutional government is fundamentally more important to effective citizenship than a knowledge of our economic system or of American history.

An additional strategy advanced for developing citizens involves promoting civic values or dispositions consistent with democratic ideals. Freeman Butts (1991) argues, for example, that these values include commitments to the “public good, individual rights, justice, equality, diversity, truth, and patriotism” (1991, p. 16). One can argue that it is important for citizens to develop a reasoned commitment to these ideals and that curriculum emphasizing their importance and their rationale is a fundamental support for developing citizens. At the same time, methods of inculcating values are not necessarily democratic. To be consistent with the goal of developing citizens, the desirability of these values must be analyzed and students must have opportunities to consider the costs and benefits of varied understandings of these ideals. The desirability of varied commitments to patriotism or individual rights, for example, are often far from clear. Still, focusing on the ways social studies teachers do and do not attend to these civic commitments is worthy of further study.

4 Readers will notice that the only rubric that explicitly mentions time is the rubric designed to assess students’ opportunities to experience democracy as a way of life. We felt time guidelines would be appropriate in this case since we were literally interested in the length of students’ experiences. In the case of the other rubrics we tried to emphasize the nature of the opportunity more than a particular time allotment. As a colleague pointed out this makes interpreting our findings more difficult for readers. Our observers did monitor the time devoted to different activities and we did consider this factor. In general, when we used the word
"brief" we were thinking about experiences of five minutes or less. When we used the word "significant" we were thinking of experiences lasting 15 minutes or more. When scoring the lessons, however, we were more concerned with the nature of the experience than its duration and we made subjective judgments. While our vague descriptions regarding time in some of our rubrics was not a major source of inter-rater disagreement, when we use these rubrics in the future, we plan to be more explicit about time allotment both for our own internal consistency and to aid readers' interpretations of our findings.

While this perspective has a long history and many supporters among educators and social scientists, it is important to note that some educators' and political scientists' formulation of a desirable democratic process does not emphasize widespread participation in efforts to improve society. While full examination of this critique of mass participation and therefore of efforts to prepare students to examine social issues and act is beyond the scope of this paper, it is worth noting two of their major concerns (For a discussion, see Pateman, 1970). First, some political sociologists and educators believe that the size and complexity of industrialized and post-industrial society necessitates bureaucracy and frequently makes widespread, efficient, and effective participation an unrealistic goal. Hesitancy to emphasize the value of widespread participation in social change also arose from twentieth-century experiences with totalitarianism. As Joseph Schumpeter (1943) put it in his classic book Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy "The electoral mass is incapable of action other than a stampeded" (p. 283). Forms of direct participation in social change can quickly lose their democratic character. (For a discussion of these issues that is tied to social studies education, see, for example, Ross, 2000).

In some cases, high school teachers requested that the observers observe their eleventh or twelfth grade classrooms. We looked at these observations, but did not include this data in our numeric counts because it is quite limited (twelve observations) and because it may not be representative, since teachers specifically requested that these classes be observed. However, because these were some of the strongest lessons in the sample, we did code these lessons and we mention one of them to illustrate a high quality lesson later in the document.

Our findings overlap with King's (1994) in that he also found that high school teachers provided few opportunities for students to develop civic capacities. Our findings differ in that he found that teachers who provided opportunities for higher order thinking did not provide more opportunities to develop civic capacities. Our sample was significantly different, however. Ours was broadly representative of social studies teachers in Chicago (where opportunities for higher order thinking were relatively rare) while his was smaller, much more diverse in terms of location, and focused on teachers who were relatively committed to higher order thinking. Our conception of the kinds of opportunities linked to developing citizens was also slightly different than his. This divergence points to the value of undertaking multiple investigations in varied settings.
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Citizenship Education in the Seattle Schools on the Eve of the Japanese American Incarceration
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Abstract
The Seattle Public Schools' tradition of steering a moderate and progressive course in citizenship education through tolerance underwent a severe test with the news of the Executive Order 9066, calling for the incarceration of Japanese residents and citizens on the West Coast United States. Organized around two sets of primary sources – a 1930s curriculum guide for citizenship and character education in the Seattle schools, and a collection of classroom composition by 7th and 8th grade students of Washington School in Seattle from 1941-1942—this article brings to life the lived experiences of Japanese American students who grappled with the dissonance between citizenship and exclusion during World War II.

March 24, [19]42

Dear Miss Evanson,

Because of this situation, we are asked to leave this dear city of Seattle and its surroundings. I am sure I will miss my teachers and Mr. Sears. There was never a school like Washington School and I sure will miss it. As for me, the one I will miss the most will be you. You have been very patient and kind throughout my work. If the school I will attend next would have a teacher like you I will be only too glad. When I am on my way my memories will flow back to the time I was attending this school and the assemblies that were held in the hall.

Wherever I go I will be a loyal American.

Love,

Emiko
Introduction

Democracy, loyalty, citizenship. These words sound perfunctory today but for the Japanese American, or Nisei, students of Seattle Public Schools, such words were weighted with meaning, especially after their lessons in citizenship and loyalty. As offspring of immigrants who had been denied citizenship and who had experienced a range of racial discrimination, many Nisei were cognizant of their parents’ struggle for dignity. And the one thing Nisei children possessed that their parents did not was citizenship in the United States.

The imprisonment of Japanese American and permanent residents on the West Coast United States, with the signing of the Executive Order 9066 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on February 19, 1942, called into question, the very meaning of citizenship for many Nisei. Despite lessons of citizenship and tolerance the Seattle schools imparted to their students, the reality of Nisei as citizens turned out to be far different from the principle. As expressed in the letter by Emiko, a seventh-grade student in Ella Evanson’s homeroom class at Washington School, she would remain loyal to a government that questioned her very loyalty. Writing to her teacher in response to the Executive Order 9066, the student was attempting to make sense of the dissonance between the idea of citizenship on the one hand, and the experience of being treated as an “enemy alien,” on the other.

This article investigates the Seattle Public Schools’ approach to citizenship education at a time when the status of Japanese Americans as citizens was held suspect. As sites of cultural and social reproduction, schools could not shield themselves, or their students, from wartime hysteria. European Americans as well as a number of minorities in the neighboring communities of Seattle targeted Japanese residents, Nikkei, of having developed alliances with Japan and believed their presence to be a threat to safety. Such fallacious allegations and subsequent increase in racial incidents against Seattle’s Nikkei grew in intensity after the bombing of Pearl Harbor. While the Seattle Public School system prided itself on promoting racial tolerance in its citizenship education curricula (Pak, 1997), democratic principles were put to the test. The tradition of progressive education in Seattle (Nelson, 1998) established by Superintendent Frank Cooper (1901-1922) underwent severe challenges.

This investigation of citizenship education in the Seattle Public Schools, on the eve of the Japanese American incarceration, comprises two major historical sources and is organized as such. The first source is the curriculum guide for citizenship and character education in the Seattle Schools from the late 1930s through the 1940s. Successful Living (SL), the curriculum guide, was to provide the path to democratic citi-
zenship and moral character by developing principles such as tolerance. The study of literature and composition exemplified successful classroom practices that promoted and cultivated tolerance among students of different ethnic and immigrant groups. The authors of Successful Living encouraged all teachers to extend to their students, topics of composition stemming from their own personal lives. Only by examining the circumstances of one’s own life could a bridge toward greater understanding toward others be built. Such lessons on tolerance, however conceived and practiced in the classrooms, aids in contextualizing the writings by Nisei students.

The second, and the more significant, historical source is a collection of classroom composition by seventh and eighth-grade Nisei of Washington School in Seattle, Washington. They, in writing to their homeroom teacher, Ella Evanson, wrote on their school’s assembly the day after the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the message of their principal, Arthur Sears, of practicing citizenship and tolerance. In addition, farewell messages to Ella Evanson in response to the Executive Order 9066 provide critical insights into how Nisei students grappled with the dissonance of democracy and citizenship on the one hand, with the news of the forced imprisonment on the other. Leaning on their lessons in citizenship education and the values taught at home and in the Japanese Language Schools, Nisei students expressed, in composition form, how they would remain loyal to the United States in spite of the public’s view that they were not to be trusted.

Successful Living

The publication of Successful Living in 1935 aimed at implementing a cohesive set of ideals on citizenship, namely through character education. The authors of the guide, a committee of social studies and history teachers, emphasized progressive social goals in two main ways: 1) through character education and 2) integrating the idea of school as society. It examined how public schools, as laboratories of democracy (Parker, 1996), served to facilitate the process of living a democratic way of life. According to the authors, character education was to be thought of, “like health, as the productive way of living through which strength is acquired. Character education in America is the mastery of a truly democratic way of living...a way of living which conserves and produces as many values as possible for as many persons as possible over as long a time as possible. Character education is the facilitation of this way of life” (SL, p. 1). In their view, citizenship and character education were synonymous terms. One could not exist without the other. At the time, the effects of the Great Depression and political unrest overseas necessitated a broader under-
standing of how character was inextricably linked to citizenship (Goodenow, 1975; Moreo, 1996; Tyack, et al., 1984).

The emphasis on school life and democratic living attributed some of its goals to John Dewey in that the school offered a place to equalize opportunities for all children. In the committee’s view the school, “serving all the children of all people, has a unique opportunity for overcoming snobbery, reducing racial and class prejudices, and teaching the brotherhood of man” (SL, p. 4). Furthermore, “The individual must gain a consciousness of his civic responsibilities. Dewey reminds us of the fact that school is not only a preparation for life; it is life itself. It may be so organized as to afford opportunity for the exercise of all the duties and obligations of citizenship” (SL, p. 4). Linking character to citizenship through tolerance became a critical way for students to develop cultural understanding.

*Successful Living* approached the teaching of tolerance by highlighting stories of students who came from various racial, ethnic, class, and religious backgrounds. The “success” stories showcased how immigrant and second generation students should: 1) recognize their cultural or religious background as one that has value and not as subordinate or inferior; 2) not denigrate their parents for speaking a different language and practicing foreign customs; 3) exhibit character at home by practicing the habits of citizenship, thereby serving as Americanizing agents to one’s parents; and 4) understand that there are two sides to every story.

*Successful Living* further articulated why a study of literature and composition augmented the development of character. Such an approach served two purposes: 1) to increase students’ understandings of others’ experiences through literature, and 2) to use writing as a means to express complex world situations. These dual objectives enhanced the growth of democratic citizenship.

*Literature and Composition*

Literature stirred the imagination of students by providing possibilities to envisage a moral life. In the Seattle schools, the writings of Louisa May Alcott, Maude Warren, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Abraham Lincoln exemplified such goals. Certain kinds of literature not only provided a gateway for deeper understanding, but also provided moral guidance — another critical component in the development of character. Writing about literature, and the lessons to be gleaned in leading a moral life, was a natural extension for character and citizenship.

Students’ writings applied the lessons learned from literature to aspects of their own lives. As such, an example of an actual topic for classroom composition was, “Where Was Your Dad Born?” (SL, p. 46). The objective in this writing assignment lay in appreciating the cul-
tural background of an immigrant student, through the study of his or her father. Examining the contributions of the country from which the students' parent immigrated deepened understanding of how world cultures were interconnected. The aim was to make the strange familiar. "The whole unit was worked out on the assumption that we seldom hate those we really know. Interest, understanding, and sympathy should first be developed, and from that, friendship will follow" (SL, p. 59).

A foreign language teacher in the Seattle Schools shared her experiences for how she approached teaching tolerance. Her story, "Tolerance for Foreigners" was lauded for its appeal and effectiveness:

I am glad in my foreign language work to have an opportunity to develop in the children a spirit of tolerance. In foreign books, I emphasize the fact that people of another nationality, though apparently so different from us, are fundamentally made of the same human stuff as we. They have the same emotions and therefore are actuated in much the same way. If all our children cannot be broadened by travel and personal contact with foreigners—their customs, their matter of thinking, and their ideals—at least they can read books which express these ideals (SL, p. 59).

Despite the patronizing tone in which a present-day reader might construe this passage, the emphasis on tolerance is clear. To clarify, the language of tolerance in Successful Living did not fully capture the complex multicultural fabric evident today. It was, however minute, a step toward recognizing ethnic differences in the Seattle schools. Literature would facilitate this process.

Composition extended naturally from the study of literature. According to the curriculum guide, writing was a gateway to one's conscience, to see how students made sense of their world in relation to larger contexts as gleaned from literature. It was also an individual piece of creativity, generated from their unique understanding of their immediate experiences. The process of composing built character and the principles for ethical and moral understanding:

Someone has said that literature is the telescope through which we view human nature. We might add that compositions created by the pupils are the instruments through which we see their innermost souls. Their composition is a piece of creative work built by the student from his own thoughts. If we can help him to strengthen right ideals and can direct him to new avenues of high
thinking, we create a condition that makes for fine character building \((SL, p. 46)\).

The writings by Nisei students add a critical dimension to the study of character education. Although the students' mode of self-representation through composition are mediated and complicated by sociopolitical and racialized contexts, we are, in essence, peering through the gateway to their conscience. While what they write may not be articulate and detailed, their expressions carry heavy meaning. Especially for Nisei students, their sense of self, or lack thereof, becomes salient. The Nisei students' affirmation of their American identities in the writings indicates that their identities were held suspect by others around them. The need to accentuate their loyalty to the United States came at a time when the government questioned Nikkei's loyalty as viable citizens. The prejudices against Nikkei in Seattle and nationwide escalated within a few months time. How students and schools reacted to outside pressures is revealed to varying degrees in the students' compositions and by the school district's response to wartime pressures. Ideas of understanding, sympathy, friendship and tolerance once again surfaced as wartime hostilities and anxieties created tensions between Nisei and non-Nisei students. This crisis became a test of the schools' citizenship, tolerance, character, and democratic education programs.

**Seattle Public Schools' Response to the Bombing of Pearl Harbor**

December 7, 1941, has taken its place beside the dates in the life of America which will endure forever in the minds of the people. Never before in our history had there been so sudden and complete a transition from the ways of peace to the ways of war. On the morning of the 8th of December Seattle teachers and principals began quietly and thoughtfully to meet the challenge. The need for calmness and orderliness was discussed with children who the day before had listened to the broadcasts from Honolulu and who had participated in the first hurried blackout precautions. Tolerance toward Japanese classmates was stressed. One principal reminded her cosmopolitan student body: 'You were American citizens last Friday; you are American citizens today. You were friends last Friday; you are friends today' \((Seattle Schools, January 1942, p. 1)\).

The bombing of Pearl Harbor on Sunday, December 7, 1941 ruptured any semblance of normalcy. Never before did the possibility of
war occur so close to the continental United States. School officials knew that they had to address what occurred on Sunday when students entered school the following morning. As the Seattle School newsletter indicates, teachers and principals prepared to meet the challenge by leaning on their tradition of democratic citizenship education. The school officials, within their sphere of influence, concentrated their efforts on promoting tolerance and citizenship, especially toward their Nisei student body. While they could not affect change in international politics, they at least controlled how schools should respond to the United States entrance into World War II.

In Washington School, Principal Arthur G. Sears instilled democratic principles to his young students early on. In describing this role, and Sears' response to the bombing of Pearl Harbor, Martha Mortensen, a teacher at Washington, wrote, "The Principal, A.G. Sears, long ago laid the ground work for rooting out any existing prejudices. At all times he has tried to break down cultural barriers, establish mutual appreciation, and develop a program which would lead to a deep devotion to the American way of life. He has stressed a better understanding of all races and religions" (Seattle Principals' Exchange, May 1942, p. 7).

Arthur Sears emphasized the teaching of democratic citizenship and tolerance at Washington School during his tenure as the principal. And his approach to the understanding of ethnic traditions was highlighted in a Seattle Educational Bulletin article in November 1937. The story described how Washington School students wrote individual letters to their parents inviting them to the school's open house. Many students were encouraged to write in English and in the language of their immigrant parents—Spanish, Hebrew, Japanese, or Chinese. Principal Sears upheld this practice by responding:

I use this device not only to get the message over to the parents, but also to dignify the parental background. Too often I have seen tragedies among the second generations. They feel frequently that they have reason to be ashamed of their parents when they can neither read nor write the English language. I believe we produce better Americans from the foreign-born if we dignify their background, and while they should love America more, they should not lose their love of the land of their ancestry (p. 1).

Principal Sears understood the importance of preserving one's ethnic heritage. He revealed that total assimilation, at the cost of forsaking one's ethnicity, created a rift not only between the parents and their children, but also within the children themselves. Thus a careful balance between one's past and present identities marked a success-
ful entrée into the American way of life. Sears taught and maintained his views on the American way of life until his retirement in 1942.⁴

**Washington School, 1941-1942**

Washington school, where the writings by Nisei took place, bordered the multiracial “Central District” of Seattle, near a Jewish Settlement House, and served students from different ethnic backgrounds. The student body comprised primarily of Jewish immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe, Asian Americans and immigrants, and African Americans. Washington School, from 1920 until 1942, was among those in which the highest numbers of Japanese American students attended.

Washington was originally a grade school from 1912 to 1938. In 1938 Washington became a seventh and eighth grade center and remained so through World War II when in 1945 it became a junior high school. Washington, according to published reports, embodied cosmopolitanism. A 1961 Seattle School publication describes the history and tradition of the school as follows:

Washington School, as a separate unit, in and of itself, presents a close approximation to the great American ideal that the fathers of the American Constitution hoped to achieve. A visitor to Washington School would find around one thousand children between the ages of 12 to 15, or every race, every religion, and every economic status, working together and playing together, with no tensions between them due to their differences of race, religion, or economic background. Democracy, in the true sense of the word, is practiced from the principal right down through the office staff and faculty, the custodians, and cafeteria workers, and then is reflected back again through the students themselves. The school is truly a small United Nations, actually accomplishing democratic objectives in an extremely significant way. Teachers and students are fortunate and privileged to be able to participate in the democratic situation as it exists at Washington at the present time (*Histories of the Seattle Public Schools*, 1961).

Washington School’s philosophy of promoting democratic ideals is admirable, yet to maintain that no tensions existed between students remains questionable. The passage appears to be excessively romantic and borders on an imagined, color-blind democracy. Nevertheless, a survey of other schools’ histories in the Seattle area revealed only Washington explicitly emphasizing the promise and possibilities of a demo-
cric into the idea of the school, its character, the teachers and principal, and the student body contributed to its unique reputation. Nisei students, through their compositions, expressed the extent to which that was real.

Nisei Reflections on the School’s Assembly post-Pearl Harbor

Keisoo—Dec. 8, 1941
Our Assembly
Today Mr. Sears talked to us about tolerance. As we know tolerance means to be friendly to other in any way.
When war broke out in the Far East situation yesterday some citizen of this country were intolerance. The people who are intolerant do not think before they speak.
Every person should be tolerant to different nationality if they have enemies.

Fumiko—December 8, 1941
Morning Assembly
The morning assembly was good for it tells to be good friends or neighbors wither our skin are different. That skin does not count by shelf but our spirit for helping people and cleaned heart count more for America and honesty too counts more for defending and best of all is love one another. We are all brothers and sisters even our parents and teachers but they are sent to take care of us and to give us more education and to become a better boy and girl.
The poem was good also and that all make to become American.
I wish sometimes if there were no war or evil thing, that do now happen were stop we should be friendly with country more and more until the end of the world than people would be like neighbor, no war, no unclean heart, but all clean and cheerful voice in this world.

Katsu—December 8, 1941
This Morning Assembly
In this morning assembly Mr. Sears experimented about having the morning assembly in the second period and
next week it would be the third period because we always miss the first period class.

He spoked to us about not hating each other first because we have mixed nationalities in this school. But instead cooperate with each other and think of other people as our neighbors.

He also told us a story about a German boy and a Italian boy being a good American Citizens and even if their country is in war they are very good friends.

Mr. Sears read us a poem copied from a bulletin that a boy from Miss Fritzgerald’s room. Then he mentioned about the paper drive. After he was through with his speech we sang America from the bottom of our hearts and we also saluted the flag.

Betty—Dec. 8, 1941
Assembly
This morning we had a assembly in the hall. Mr. Sears told us that if even we have a different color face, it’s alright because we’re American Citizen. We all should be American Citizen.

He read us a poem of prayer because in school or outside the school the people might not be friendly with the other people which as (Japanese people) cause the war is going to be. When I heard Mr. Sears read that poem I was proud to be a American Citizen. And I’ll (I am) always be American Citizen.

This year is the second world war in many years if it goes on.
When we were saluting the flag I was proud to salute the flag. Some people were crying because they were proud of there country.

The language of tolerance and citizenship, as expressed by these students, is clear. They understood Principal Sears’ message of maintaining a steady course through friendship and understanding in light of international turmoil. Their school needed to operate as a bastion of democracy. While teachers and administrators could not affect change in the community’s response to the war – through threats of increased racial violence – they could at least influence how students should act toward each other. Lessons in character and citizenship education became pronounced even more.
The meaning of citizenship weighed heavily in the minds of Nisei. Betty’s statement, “When I heard Mr. Sears read that poem I was proud to be a American Citizen. And I’ll (I am) always be American Citizen,” re-emphasizes the importance of citizenship and an American identity. At a tenuous moment in her life she needed to remind her teacher, Ella Evanson, and herself that she, too, was an American worthy of the rights of citizenship. While Betty’s teacher and principal taught those values, the government’s exclusionary, race-based policy could not be changed.

The idea of difference and race, and how it fit within the concept of citizenship, was central in the minds of Nisei. The students’ interpretations of race, either conceived by them or by Sears, were noted by their use of “different color face or skin” or “mixed nationalities” in their writings. In that regard, citizenship meant an acceptance of individuals from various ethnic backgrounds and racial characteristics, most notably differentiated by skin color. Race as a social and cultural construct permeated scientific communities and popular culture to create an artificial hierarchy of social order (see for example Gossett, 1997; Gould, 1981; Omi & Winant, 1994; Takaki, 1990). And for Sears to express the idea of equality of races, despite skin color, could have come as a surprise, as well as a welcome message, for some students.

The idea of race in the 1940s, especially in the Seattle area, can be understood in greater context according to the minutes of a 1939 meeting of the Council of Jewish Women (CJW), and their work in the Settlement House near Washington School. One of the meetings of the CJW brought an anthropologist from the University of Washington speaking on Franz Boas’ concept of the word “race,” and why the term should no longer be used:

Dr. Rose Ostrow introduced the speaker of the evening, Dr. Melville Jacobs of the U of W who spoke on ‘An Anthropologist’s Point of View on Race.’ He explained that Dr. Franz Boas, noted authority on anthropology, urges the elimination of the use of the word race from the english language. He argues that there is really only one race on the face of the earth,—the human race,—that the gradual shadings from region to region are scientifically unjustifiable as ‘races,’ — he suggests the use of the term ‘varieties’ or ‘regional types’ (Council of Jewish Women, 17 April 1939).

It is not known if Sears was directly influenced by the theoretical concepts of race at the time. However, Sears’ approach to racial tolerance was congruent to the ideas of leading intercultural educators – such as
William H. Kilpatrick, George S. Counts, Harold Rugg and Rachel Davis Dubois – within the Progressive Education Association and the Bureau for Intercultural Education (Montalto, 1982). Time and again, his principles of racial equality, of one race – the human race, and the need for tolerance and brotherly love were reflected in the writings of Nisei. The students’ compositions address how the concept of race should be focused more on the commonalities in the human race rather than one’s facial features. The following writing samples by non-Japanese American students provide illumination:

Maurice—Dec. 8, 1941
American’s
In our first assembly, Mr. Sears our principal spoke on the friendly attitude toward the Pacific crisis. He said, “We are all American’s and we here at Washington want no part of race hated. We are all under the same roof.”

In the short time he spoke he accomplish very much.
He spoke of 23 years ago, of how he work in the naturalazion dept., and of two gents (men), one a Italian and a German who at the same time as Germans were fighting Italians were still good neighbors and good americans. We should now be that way here at Washington school.

Shirley—Dec. 8, 1941
Assembly
In assembly this morning Mr. Sears told us about being intolerant he said that now because of the war different races might fight with each other and say that they started the war. He said that no matter what race or color you are that you are all American citizens and that even if your parent came from country that are fighting againest us that we had nothing to do with it.

Mr. Sears also read a peom that a boy in our school made up it was very patreotic and expressed the feeling that and imigrant might have coming to America.

Mr. Sears said that people said to him that they thought he would have trouble with the children of Washington School because of the many different races and Mr. Sears said that he trust us and knew that we would not be intolerant.

The classmates of Nisei students articulated the message of tolerance
in the assembly conducted by Sears. Leaning on his past experience working for the Naturalization department during World War I, Sears emphasized and reiterated the need to continue the friendships developed between students of different cultures. Intercultural understanding was the ideal for those attending Washington School. Despite Principal Sears' insistence that everyone was an American the reality of the war, and the impending incarceration of Japanese residents and citizens, would soon take its' toll. Nisei students of Washington School prepared for their departure and for a future entirely outside their control.

_Nisei Reflections on the Eve of Their Incarceration_

Nisei students of Washington School, by providing their thoughts in writing, helps us to shape a deeper understanding and interpretation of the events on the eve of the incarceration. The actions of the government, albeit an important factor in deciding historical events, is better understood in the context of the participants for whom the exclusionary policies were affected.

The following farewell entries, then, are reflections by young Americans grappling with conflicting messages of citizenship and exclusion, tolerance and prejudice, loyalty and distrust, and democracy and totalitarianism. They are reflections of lost innocence. Nisei were suddenly thrust into a situation where their racial identity became a major determining factor for exclusion. They found themselves dealing with issues generally confronted by adults — that is, experiencing, first hand, the tensions in democracy, citizenship, and freedom in real and fundamental ways. The message of tolerance did not extend much farther from the boundaries of the school. What they faced outside of school would be too overwhelming. Within a few months time, their schools, homes and all their belongings had to be abandoned for a tenuous life behind barbed wire. The following entries are a lasting reminder of how everyday young people were attempting to reconcile and negotiate the ideal of democracy with racism:

March 29, 1942
Dear Miss Evanson,

We are leaving our city, to where I am going I am wholly ignorant. However I am not unhappy, nor do I have objections for as long as this evacuation is for the benefit of the United State. But I do am regreting about leaving this school and the thought that I shall not see for a long while pains me extremely. Your pleasant ways of teaching had made my heart yearn for the days when I was in your
classroom. Your kind smile and your wonderful work you did for me shall be one of my pleasant memories.

Tooru

Mar. 20, 1942
Dear Miss Evanson,

I well start out my letter by writing about the worst thing. I do not want to go away but the goverment says we all have to go so we have to mind him. It said in the Japanese paper that we have to go east of the cascade mt. but we were planning to go to Idaho or Montana.

Now that the war is going on many Japanese men, women, and girls are out of jobs. And a lot of my friends fater are in consentration camp. If I go there I hope I well have a teacher just like you. And rather more I hope the war well be strighten out very soon so that I would be able to attend Washington school.

Sincerely Yours
Sadako

Mar. 25 1942
Dear Miss Evanson,

I am very sorry I will have to leave Washington School so soon. As long as I am here I will try in some way to appreciate what you’ve taught me.

We all hope we will win this war (not the Japs) and come back to Seattle for more education.

Sincerely Yours,
James

Mar. 19, 1942
Dear Miss Evanson,

I am writing to you today because I am expecting to move away with in very short time. As you always know the japanese people has been asked by our goverment to evacuate. I do not know yet where we will go. I hope there will be some good school in which I can continual, my school work. I am very sorry to leave Seattle and Washington School. And most especially to lose you for my
teacher. I am hoping the war trouble will be soon over and I could come back to Seattle and be in your school and have you for my teacher again.

Sincerely yours,
Chiyoko

March 20, 1942
Dear Miss Evanson,

I am very sorry that I will soon be leaving Washington School and the teachers I have. As you know we have been asked to evacuate. My parents still haven’t decided where to go. Where I am going I hope there will be a school like Washington School. I also hope to have a good teacher like you. I don’t want to leave Seattle because I have been in Seattle from the time I was a little baby. I hate to lose you for my teacher and Mr. Sears as my principal. I know I am going to miss everybody. I am hoping the trouble will be over soon so we will not have to evacuate.

Sincerely,
Yurido

The Nisei students made it clear that they were American born and distinguished themselves from the Japanese or the pejorative “Japs” as James makes explicit. At the same time, however, the students also underscore the reality that they indeed, look like the “enemy” and their evacuation was taking place because of their ethnic heritage. The dissonance of being a citizen, yet not a “true” United States citizen rings in the tone of their writings.

The students’ compositions signify and incorporate the totality of their lived realities in the short but expressive phrases. Ideas of loyalty, democracy, citizenship, the threat of possible violence, and how school officials were helping to cope are unveiled. The most expressive ideas disclose feelings of uncertainty at what the future will hold and of the sadness of having to leave their home. The uprooting of one’s birthplace to a place unknown created extreme anxieties. Proof of one’s loyalty and American identity became a focal point for many Nisei as they were preparing to leave Seattle. Perhaps the opportunity to express the chaotic experiences of being uprooted provided a vehicle for students to attempt to make sense of dissonance. In the end, there was not much that could be done.

Shikata-ga-nai. It cannot [could not] be helped. It was the phrase often used by the Japanese community to express the situation surrounding the imprisonment (see Houston and Houston, 1973; Sone,
1995; and Uchida, 1991). Acts of loyalty toward the United States government would come in acquiescing to the “evacuation” orders. What else could be done? Since one’s loyalty was already in question, the only loyal thing to do was to obey the government’s orders. One of the cultural values Japanese immigrant, or Issei, parents, instilled in their children was a sense of loyalty to their home country (the United States) and accept, to a degree, voices of authority (Kitano, 1993; Miyamoto, 1972). For those who challenged the very ideals of democracy at the time, their civil liberties were quickly stripped away (Daniels, et al, 1991). For the Nisei students of Washington School, writing about their immediate anxieties afforded a limited opportunity to wrestle with the democratic ideal of equality. They believed that the government would take care of them because they were citizens, after all.

**Conclusion and Implications**

Seldom can schools change world events. At best, schools can offer opportunities for students to make sense of the dissonant world around them. Washington School, with teachers such as Ella Evanson and Principal Arthur Sears, provided a context in which to have students discuss, in composition form, how they were making sense of Pearl Harbor and the news of the incarceration. They instilled the lessons of democratic citizenship education that had been a tradition in the Seattle Schools for many decades. While school officials themselves were powerless to overturn the Executive Order 9066, they reminded their students that everyone was an American.

Many powerful ideas emerge in the students’ compositions. Nisei students emphasized their loyalty to the United States regardless of the outcome of their lives. As citizens, they trusted in the government. Schools continued to remind their students that everyone was an American, regardless of which countries were at war with the United States. However, many Nisei still faced chaotic home lives. Some of their fathers were arrested by the FBI and interned in Fort Missoula, Montana. Many of their mothers were left to resolve the final details of their removal from Seattle. Most of their belongings had to be sold. Family memorabilia were either burned—for it might have been deemed “suspect” by the FBI—or were sold to the lowest bidder.

The strength and persistence of Nikkei’s to survive the years behind bars is also a testament to their faith in the power and promise afforded in a democracy (Takezawa, 1995). The Civil Liberties Act, signed by President Ronald Reagan in 1988 acknowledged the findings, of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians, that the imprisonment of Japanese Americans was motivated largely by racial prejudice, wartime hysteria, and failure of political
leadership (Personal Justice Denied, 1997, p. 459). Nisei, Sansei and Yonsei, third and fourth generation Japanese Americans, spearheaded the Redress Movement in the 1980s to seek personal justice for every individual incarcerated during World War II. They reminded the general public that democracy was not in force. American citizens were denied due process and the forced imprisonment of innocent civilians was a serious breach of democratic principles—rudimentary lessons of democracy, loyalty, and citizenship—all students learn in schools.

The constraints of space delimit a full and complex discussion on the implications of incorporating primary source materials in the history and social studies classroom. As such, I concentrate on how the use of students’ compositions provide an example for interrogating modes of grand historical narratives.

My approach in documenting the Seattle Public Schools’ response to the incarceration order of its Japanese American students, primarily through the use of students’ compositions, interrogates grand historical narratives—insofar as questioning what has been generally taught about the history of minorities, in general, and Asian Americans, in particular. Histories of ethnic minorities have existed on the periphery of the grand narrative often represented by white Europeans. To that extent minority histories represent anti-narratives (Lowe, 1996). It disrupts the official transcripts, the accepted conventions of the ways histories are recorded. Centering students’ compositions at one of the more defining moments in our history places Nisei youth at the forefront of an historical event rather than as mere passive victims of a policy enforced by governmental leaders. Their historical subjectivities matter.

Classroom discussion on the incarceration of Japanese Americans can be extended to view the event not in isolation, as something horrific that occurred during wartime, but as a process that developed over decades by immigration restrictions and anti-Asian sentiments along the West Coast United States from the late 1800s (Daniels, et al., 1994; Hing, 1993). Through first-hand accounts of students’ experiences of schooling during wartime, the reader finds human connections to a past wrought by racism and uncertainty. Furthermore, the compositions reveal students as active historical agents, embodying the disconnection between democracy and citizenship with racism. Discussion of democratic living becomes inextricably linked to understanding the history of exclusion in the United States [Takaki (1993) and Chan (1991) are good examples of this].

Questioning what and how particular forms and norms of history have been taught moves educators and students to a place of building critical knowledge by asking what have been, and what are, the limits of democratic citizenship education? More importantly, we
develop a mindfulness to view our society, as historian Patricia Lim-erick has noted, “through its complex, varied, paradoxical history rather than as a collage of stereotypes,” for our nation has been the home of “Indian, Hispanics, Asians, blacks, and Anglos . . . who share the same region and its history, but wait to be introduced” (Taylor,

Notes

1 I am indebted to Nancy E. Beadie and Valerie Ooka Pang for their tireless support throughout this project, and to James D. Anderson and the anonymous reviewers for providing helpful comments on an earlier draft. This article is part of a larger project to be published in a forthcoming book by the author “Wherever I go I’ll always be a loyal American:” Seattle’s Japanese American schoolchildren during World War II (New York: Routledge/Falmer Press).

2 As a point of clarification and accuracy, I shall be using the terms “incarceration” and “imprisonment” over “evacuation” and “internment.” According to David Takami (1998), “Evacuation” was a government euphemism for the forced removal of Japanese Americans on the West Coast. It conveyed the idea that the removal of citizens was for their own safety. “Internment” is a technical term applied to prison camps run by the United States Justice Department for suspect Issei, immigrant Japanese, just after Pearl Harbor and to more permanent army-run camps for some of these detainees. The internment of enemy aliens during a war has a basis in law—specifically the Alien and Sedition Act of 1798—and it is governed by international accord in the form of the Geneva Conventions. The roundup and incarceration of American citizens had no legal precedent and singled out a race of people (7).

3 A content analysis of newspaper articles in The Seattle Times, from December 8, 1941 through May 1942, reveals the escalating discrimination against Seattle’s Nikkei. Some reports in the beginning indicated that tolerance, especially toward Nisei should be practiced, but as the war drew on, public opinion in favor of the imprisonment and the ouster of all Nikkei along the West coast grew. A comparative analysis of The Los Angeles Times revealed similar stories.

4 Several attempts to gather in-depth information on Principal Arthur Sears at the Seattle Public Schools’ Archives and Manuscripts, with the assistance of archivist Eleanor Toews, have been unsuccessful.

5 All the entries are typed in the exact manner in which they were written by the students—including spelling and grammar errors. Only the students’ first names are used. This approach was used to maintain anonymity while focusing on each individual student as real and historical participants. The students’ compositions are all from the Ella Evanson Papers at the University of Washington’s Manuscripts and Archives Division. The students’ compositions were originally the personal collection of their homeroom teacher, Ella Evanson, of Washington School.

   Evanson taught seventh and eighth grade English, Social Studies, and was later the school’s librarian. A Seattle Times Magazine (1974, October 6, p. 12) article on Evanson by John Haigh provides a short biography of her teaching career. Evanson was a native of North Dakota and taught there for a few years. After working for the government in Washington, D.C., during World War I, she came to Seattle and earned a Washington State teaching certificate at Bellingham. She taught for a year in Everett, commuting daily on the interurban. She then taught at B.F. Day Elementary School in Seattle before going to Washington School in 1928. She was there until her retirement in 1956. After her retirement, Evanson went on a freighter trip across the Pacific and continued traveling around the world, being gone more than a year. She traveled extensively for several years and forgot about the collection of letters, until she happened upon them some time later. She died in January 1986 at the age of eighty-eight (Personal Communication, Seattle Retired Teachers’ Association, 1996, October 22).
6 Petronilla Fitzgerald taught Art at Washington School as indicated in the 1941-1942 Seattle Public Schools' Directory.

7 General public protests against the incarceration orders were scant. The few voices of dissent from the general public came from the American Civil Liberties Union (The Seattle Times, 23 February 1942) and from local Quaker activists in Seattle (Daniels, et. al, 1994).
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Abstract
Teachers' personal theories serve as a powerful framework for decision-making in the classroom. The influence these curricular and instructional choices exert on students' opportunities to learn and their access to knowledge raise important questions about educational equity and social justice in a democratic society. This case study of a high school social studies teacher examines the connection between personal theories, life experiences, and teaching contexts as they relate to the enacted curriculum in the classroom. Findings from the study underscore the need for teacher education programs to focus more attention on teachers' theories as they relate to issues of equity.

The Board of the Philanthropic Society is about to begin deliberations. They have listened as, one by one, the different groups made their requests for financial assistance. The first board member presents her argument for allocating assistance. “I think the orphans are the most deserving and have the possibility to have a more positive future if we help. I don’t think the eccentric inventor should get any help.” Back and forth the deliberation rages as the board debates the issue and tries to decide which group to offer assistance. Finally, one of the board members turns to the teacher, Mr. Franklin, and says, “This is hard. I don’t like having to make these choices.” Clearly frustrated someone else adds, “There is just not enough money to help everybody.” Mr. Franklin reminds them that a democracy requires that citizens make such political and social decision, but affirms their recognition of the struggle saying, “These issues are messy. Life is messy, and democracy is particularly messy.”

One might expect that the instructional practices and curriculum content evidenced in this vignette are the mainstays of current high school social studies instruction since they seem to reflect both current views on best practice (Zemelman, Daniels, & Hyde, 1993),
and the critical, reflective inquiry and responsible social criticism advocated by many of the leading theorists in social studies education (Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Stanley, 1992; Stanley & Nelson, 1986). However, large-scale research data indicates that traditional, textbook-bound practices of knowledge transmission, rather than reflective inquiry, continue to pervade classrooms (Cuban, 1984; Goodlad, 1984), including in the social studies (Leming, 1994; Shaver, Davis, & Helburn, 1979). Moreover, studies have shown that social studies teachers tend to be preoccupied with the maintenance of positive student attitudes toward American social and cultural institutions (McNeil, 1986), and thus, hold traditional socialization as their primary goal (Fontana, 1980; McNeil, 1986). What then accounts for the enacted curriculum in Mr. Franklin’s classroom? And, why does it matter?

One way to understand curriculum is as the compendium of teacher thinking and doing (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988). Teachers decide what learning experiences the students in their classroom will have, what issues, content, and topics students will engage with, and the instructional materials and methods that will be used. In this respect, teachers serve as gatekeepers (Thornton, 1989) because their pedagogical and curriculum decisions determine their students’ access to knowledge and bound their opportunities to learn. Therefore, teachers’ thinking and the underlying personal beliefs and theories that form the framework for their classroom decision-making have wide ranging implications for educational equity and student achievement.

Recently, the National Council for the Social Studies and the Association of Teacher Educators have undertaken a joint mission to “reconceptualize and transform teacher education as a practice of social justice for a democratic society” (as cited in Ross, 1998, p. 457). The power that teachers wield in their classrooms regarding students’ access to knowledge, and by extension their life choices, is a significant issue with respect to pedagogy for social justice. Continued research on the development and effect of teacher personal beliefs and theories holds the potential for yielding new insights that can inform the professional education of teachers. This case study adds to this body of literature by examining the beliefs and theories of a high school social studies teacher and the experiences he identified as being integral to the development and enactment of these beliefs.

**Conceptual Framework**

Researchers have long been attempting to tease apart the knot that constitutes teachers’ content and pedagogical thinking and decision-making. This has been no easy feat. Teaching is a highly complex task, one that takes place within the multiply embedded and socially
constructed contexts of schools as workplaces and social institutions (McLaughlin & Talbert, 1990). However, recent research that examines teaching as contextually situated activity has begun to untangle the threads of this knot. In doing so, it is providing us with a richer understanding of the multiple and overlapping influences that personal, organizational, and policy factors have on teacher action and decision-making (Grant, 1996).

**Organization and Policy Contexts of Teaching**

Ross, Cornett, and McCutcheon (1992) have pointed out that, "teachers could not begin to practice without some knowledge of the context of their practice" (p. 3). But, what exactly is the context within which teachers practice? Over the last decade, empirical and theoretical research has fostered an increasingly sophisticated understanding of schools as both formal organizations and as sociocultural systems which are situated in multiply embedded contexts (McLaughlin 1990; McLaughlin & Talbert, 1990). This research frames schools as complex organizational systems comprised of multiple contexts that are the overlapping webs of policy, organizational structures, and personal relationships within which members engage and participate. These contexts function at various sociocultural levels of societal, professional, and community values, and social class structures, as well as encompassing numerous organizational and policy levels. Together, they help define schools as workplaces. Centrally situated within this complex workplace are teachers. It is no surprise, then, that these multiple contexts influence teachers, shaping their teaching and their students' opportunities to learn.

Contextual factors that influence teachers' thinking and decision-making include organizational factors, such as local school culture and norms (Hargreaves, 1994; Little, 1982; Lortie, 1975; Sarason, 1980), departmentalization and resources (McLaughlin & Talbert, 1993), and student tracking (Oakes, 1985), including the tandem issue of diverse student characteristics (Grant, 1996; Romanowski, 1997). This local school context is itself situated within a broader arena of policy influences that includes school reform initiatives (McLaughlin, 1990), curriculum frameworks (Grant, 1994) and standards, and issues of testing and assessment (Corbett, & Wilson, 1990; Whitford & Jones, 2000). Moreover, in many locales such policies are so intricately interwoven that it can be difficult to separate their influences (Whitford & Jones, 2000).

While all these contextual factors may influence teacher thinking and decision-making, two seem particularly salient to the issues of equity in student opportunity to learn: tracking and policies regarding testing and assessment. In studies conducted by Grant (1996) and Romanowski (1997), teachers consistently mentioned students as
a key influence in their pedagogical decisions with respect to the content and types of learning activities that they select. The teachers in these studies seem to be influenced by their perceptions of students' intellectual abilities, students' interest in, or possible resistance to, specific content topics, and classroom management concerns. In Romanowski's (1997) study the teachers speak specifically to the ways in which tracking influences their approach to teaching. This data highlights the teachers' tendency to focus more on basic facts, engage in less in-depth study of topics, and to reduce their teaching efforts for lower tracked students. These findings are consistent with Oakes' (1985) previous investigations of tracking. Clearly, the organizational structure of tracking and the related issue of teachers' perceptions of students in these tracks influence their pedagogical decisions, all too often resulting in differential opportunities to learn for students.

The second factor that seems to be a key influence for teachers is the policy context of assessment and testing. As mentioned, these policies are often pieces of broader reform initiatives. In many states and districts curriculum frameworks are becoming more and more explicitly connected to the content of the assessments, and there are often high stakes that accompany the outcomes of such tests (Whitford & Jones, 2000). Yet, even in the places where curriculum guidelines and testing are not tightly coupled, tests often assume primary focus within schools because of the importance that our society places on test scores as indicators of student learning. In the study conducted by Grant (1996) many of the 11 teacher participants identified both the content and the structure of the state exam as being important referent points when selecting content for instructional units and for the design of in-class assessments. Many of these teachers also set aside instructional time devoted to test review and preparation. These findings parallel those in the case studies and multi-site investigations included in Whitford and Jones' (2000) edited volume of teacher responses to a statewide reform initiative and assessment system.

These studies, as well as others, provide considerable evidence that school structure and organization, and various levels of policy are influential contexts within which teachers practice. Yet, Grant (1996) points out that while these influences interact to pull and lead teachers in multiple ways, there are not necessarily any predictable or discernible patterns. Grant suggests this is because teachers invariably interpret these organizational and policy contexts in different ways through their own knowledge, beliefs, and experiences. In this regard, Grants' research continues to highlight the central role that teachers' beliefs and personal theories, both tacit and explicit, play in the curriculum decisions they make (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Cronin-Jones, 1991; Romanowski, 1997; Shaver, Davis & Helburn, 1979). So, though organizational and policy contexts in-
fluence teacher action and decision-making, the teacher’s beliefs and theories serves as the mediating lens through which he or she defines, understands, and perceives these contexts.

**Teacher Beliefs and Personal Theories**

Elbaz’s (1983) seminal study changed the way the research community conceptualized teacher thinking and theorizing. She determined that teacher thinking embodies not only cognitive knowledge, but also knowledge derived from practice, rules of practice, practical principles, and images of teaching. Further, teachers use this knowledge in personalized and distinct ways as they confront the unique and varied problems of daily life in classrooms. Through her study, Elbaz reframed teacher knowledge as a dynamic, interactive process and thus recast the role of teacher from a passive implementor of externally derived curriculum to that of an active creator in the curriculum process.

Building on this framework, Clandinin (1985) further investigated the constructs of teacher images and thinking. Through observations and interviews with teachers, Clandinin determined that teachers have a fairly well delineated, although not articulated, set of ideas regarding their purposes and intentions in the classroom. Similarly, Sanders and McCutcheon (1986) described teachers’ practical theories as both the “conceptual structures and visions that provide teachers with reasons for acting as they do” and the “principles or propositions that undergird and guide teachers’ appreciations, decision, and actions” (p. 54-55).

Personal theories, then, can be understood as the schemata (Anderson, 1984) that structure one’s knowledge and understanding of the world, and provide the practical knowledge and inference structures required for performing necessary tasks. The schemata that constitute teachers’ personal practical knowledge (Clandinin, 1985; Connelly & Clandinin, 1988), including their personal theories and philosophies, develop from their lived experiences. Clandinin (1985) offered insight into the biographical nature of teacher theories, describing them as, “knowledge which is imbued with all the experiences that make up a person’s being. Its meaning is derived from, and understood in terms of, a person’s experiential history both professional and personal” (p. 362). Since then, researchers have continued to investigate more closely the connection of teachers’ biographical experiences to their beliefs about teaching, learning, and content issues (e.g. Powell, 1992, 1996; Shuell, 1992). These studies have demonstrated the profound influence that life experiences such as prior career and work experiences (Powell, 1992, 1996), and college curriculum and course work in a major area (Shuell, 1992) have on teachers’ curriculum orientations and constructions of content knowledge. Re-
search has also illustrated the influence that other biographical characteristics, such as ethnic background, social class origins, and gender issues, have on teachers' instruction (Raymond, Butt, & Townsend, 1991).

This body of research provides a framework for understanding teachers' personal practical theories as the compendium of convictions, beliefs, and practices about teaching and learning that are derived from the totality of teachers' lived experiences, both personal and professional. It also illuminates how these theories serve as both an organizing framework and a set of perceptual lenses a teachers uses for attending to, and making meaning of, the multiple contexts within which his or her practice takes place. This is why, though situated within the same organizational and policy contexts, teachers who work right next door to each other frequently make vastly different curricular and pedagogical decisions. Individual teachers approach the contextually bound complexity and ambiguity of daily teaching in dynamic and flexible ways because their decision-making is grounded in their personal theoretical framework and belief system.

The second aspect of teacher thinking that has been demonstrated in this literature is the all too often implicit nature of these theories. Within the area of social studies education at least two case studies highlight this point. These studies indicate that social studies teachers often are not aware of their personal theories (Cornett, 1990) and philosophical stances (Evans, 1990) even though these schema exert great influence on curriculum decisions. Using data collected from classroom observations and interviews with five teachers and a sample of students from each classroom, Evans determined that teacher conceptions of history were related to competing ideological orientations and these conceptions influenced the pedagogical approaches of the teachers. While conceptions varied, Evans concluded that overall teachers' philosophies generally remained "unexamined and unarticulated" (p. 127).

In a similar vein, Cornett (1990) sought to make explicit the personal practical theories of one high school socials studies teacher. Using field-based, naturalistic inquiry methods Cornett illuminated five of the teacher's personal theories and two sub-theories. He concluded that not all of the teacher's theories remained constant over various classroom situations and were, thus, arrayed in conflicting theoretical frameworks. Nevertheless, it was apparent that these theories guided her decision-making about curriculum and instruction. Finally, much as the history teachers in Evans' (1990) study, this teacher had no explicit knowledge of her personal practical theories and their framework, although Cornett did indicate that through the process of the research the teacher participant had increased her reflective capacity.
These two studies reaffirm the central role that teachers' personal beliefs and theories regarding their subject area play in determining the content, instructional experiences, and knowledge to which students are exposed. In this way they further illuminate the way in which teacher beliefs and theories form the central thread in the knot of pedagogical and curriculum decision-making. However, they also highlight a problematic issue; teachers' personal theories and philosophical stances often remain tacit and unexamined. The apparent lack of consciously derived curricular and instructional action by the teachers in these studies raises great concern given the gatekeeping role of teachers (Thornton, 1989). The concerns of student access to knowledge and equity within the current national context of standards-based reforms compel the continued investigation of teacher personal theories in classroom settings. We need a more finely tuned understanding of how teacher personal theories and beliefs mediate these other curricular and pedagogical influences, particularly within the different subject areas. Though research on teacher theorizing has been growing, research which focuses specifically on social studies teachers is still somewhat limited. This study builds on the previous research on teacher personal theories by expanding the examination of these issues within the specific context of social studies teaching.

**Method**

Naturalistic inquiry methods of observation and semi-structured interviews were the predominant modes of data collection used in this study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These methods allow for a grounded approach to the data analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and are those frequently used in qualitative case studies (Merriam, 1988). I selected the teacher-participant, Mr. Franklin, through purposeful (Patton, 1980), criterion-based sampling (Goetze & LeCompte, 1984) because he appeared to an "atypical case" of a teacher with explicitly held beliefs whose practice did not reflect the traditional transmission model of social studies teaching so pervasive in the literature. Each of these facets of the study is more fully detailed in the following sections.

**The Teacher Participant**

The oldest son of a coal miner and a homemaker, Mr. Franklin is the first in his family to go to college. His first college degree was in Parks and Recreation and he had a brief career in that field before spending eleven years in real estate. When he was in his late thirties, Mr. Franklin returned to the university to earn a Masters of Art in Education with initial teaching certification. Upon graduation in 1990, he worked for two years in the urban district in which he completed
his student teaching. There he had successive positions as a regular substitute, a full-time interim teacher in an alternative school, and a full-time social studies teacher in a departmentalized high school. After being laid off due to budget cuts in that district, Mr. Franklin secured his current position in 1992 in an adjacent, more rural district where he is one of nine members in the social studies department.

In the fall of 1995, I initiated a research study with the teachers in the high school social studies department in which Mr. Franklin taught. I had known him in graduate school where, as a pre-service teacher education student, he consistently spoke of his identification with the philosophy of Dewey and problem-centered, inquiry-focused teaching and learning. During the fieldwork for this larger study I observed Mr. Franklin's classroom and noted that his instructional practices and curriculum content appeared on first glance to match his stated philosophical orientation, indicating that he might be working from a framework of explicit rather than tacit theories and beliefs. Further, as highlighted in the introductory vignette, his instructional practices stood in contrast with the more traditional transmission model of teaching described by Leming (1994) and others (e.g. Cuban, 1984; Goodlad, 1984; Shaver, Davis, and Helburn, 1979). Within the literature these two attributes appear to be atypical among teachers, suggesting that Mr. Franklin was, if not a unique case (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984), at least represented the heterogeneity within social studies teaching. An examination of his practice and his personal theories might, therefore, offer new insights into these issues. I approached Mr. Franklin about initiating this line of inquiry and, upon his consent, conducted this study concurrently with the original department-based investigation during the 1996-97 academic year.

Data Collection and Analysis

As noted in the theoretical framework of this paper, tracking and the tandem issues of student characteristics are some of the contextual threads that influence teacher decision-making. Because these are critical factors in issues of equity for student learning I sought in this study to focus on Mr. Franklin's teaching and theorizing with the greatest diversity of students. The social studies department in his school makes no official designation of tracking, with the exception of the Advanced Placement (AP) courses. During the period of this study, Mr. Franklin taught courses in AP U.S. history, political science, state studies, global issues, and a freshman social studies course. Of these the state studies, global issues, and freshman courses were more heterogeneous with respect to student academic standing and achievement, and far more representative of the overall student population of the school in terms of race, socioeconomic status, and students re-
ceiving special education services. This was particularly true of the state studies course in which ten of the 28 students in the class were receiving special education services. Therefore, I elected to focus on these courses during the study.

Working within the academic calendar of the school, from mid-August, 1996 until May, 1997 I made regular visits to the school for a total of 21 days while conducting the original departmental study. Data for the study of Mr. Franklin was collected on alternating visits to the department. The resulting database for the case study included field notes from 12 hours of classroom observations, informal, field-based interviews that were not tape recorded, as well as transcripts from two semi-structured interviews which were taped and transcribed. I also collected and reviewed artifacts such as class handouts, teacher readings and resources, and a video tape of student groups' culminating projects, as well as other forms of student work.

To remain as unobtrusive as possible during classroom observations I did not video nor tape Mr. Franklin during his teaching. However, recognizing that language forms and speech can be considered manifestations of beliefs and theories (Bruner, 1986), I attempted to capture as much of Mr. Franklin's utterances and dialogue during the classes as possible. Then, at the end of the class observation I would flesh out the field notes to expand the context of the observation including more detail on the lesson activities and content. During the first four classroom observations I did not engage Mr. Franklin in any conversation about what I had observed. I did this intentionally so that I could focus only on interactions in the classroom as I conducted my initial data analysis. As noted earlier, Mr. Franklin seemed to speak quite explicitly about his beliefs and decisions, but I wanted to focus initially on what he did and said with students.

From the analysis of this data I selected statements from his classroom dialogue that appeared to represent a belief and used them as talking points during the first semi-structured interview (appendix). In this way, I was able to elicit both his reflection on his actions and thinking in the classroom context and the beliefs that he felt undergirded those decisions. I also asked him to reflect on how he developed those beliefs. I used subsequent observations in the classroom, field-based interviews, a second semi-structured interview, and document analysis as a means for continuing to explore the teacher's theories and beliefs and his enactment of those beliefs in the classroom setting.

Analysis of the data was on-going (Maxwell, 1996) and consisted of reading the field notes and making comments in the margins. I used these comments as a form of coding. I then aggregated the comments and sorted them into emerging categories of practices and beliefs. As new data were collected I annotated and analyzed the notes in a simi-
lar fashion for either inclusion in the categories, or to identify or suggest alternative categories, as well as to look for disconfirming data. I then analyzed the data from the transcripts using the established codes and categories to continue the process of identifying Mr. Franklin's extant beliefs and theories. Such a grounded approach (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) allows for the analysis of the data to be developed in interaction with the context of the case. When it appeared I had saturated the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), I presented the data analysis in the form of a "working" theoretical framework to Mr. Franklin. During this discussion of the data, and subsequent member checks, he expressed his belief that I had accurately captured the feel of his classroom and his most important beliefs.

**The Organization and Policy Context of Mr. Franklin's Teaching**

As previously discussed, educational policies and the organization and structure of schools are part of the multiply embedded contexts in which teaching takes place. Furthermore, they are influential factors with respect to teacher practice. Therefore, it is important to clearly establish the local context so that the following section on the findings from this case of a teacher's personal theories are sufficiently grounded.

The school in which Mr. Franklin teaches is located in a midwestern state that began a systemic reform agenda in 1990. This reform is three pronged, focusing on issues of school finance, school governance, and curriculum enhancement. This last effort included the development and implementation of a state curriculum framework and content-based academic expectations, as well as a school accountability assessment system. The state test is tightly coupled to the academic expectations and student scores are part of the state's formula for accountability, along with retention, suspension, and graduation rates. This system is used for evaluating high schools' movement toward meeting the state determined benchmarks for student achievement. School scores can mean rewards or sanctions for schools, including state takeovers. In this sense, the state assessment context is one of high stakes for teachers and principals.

The departmentalized, comprehensive (9-12) high school serves approximately 1100 students and has a certified staff of approximately 70 teachers, administrators, and counselors. The student body reflects the general population demographics of the community, which is predominately White. However, approximately eight percent of the students in the school are African Americans, and there is a growing population of Mexican families who are seasonal farm workers in the community. The county is the third wealthiest in the state. However, the relatively high poverty rate highlights the wide range of socioeconomic status within the district.
The school curriculum offers a wide range of required and elective courses in the core discipline areas, as well as vocational, agricultural, business, and humanities courses. The mathematics, science, English and foreign language departments track students into advanced, honors, and regular level courses.

Students must complete three credits in social studies to meet the state minimum graduation requirements, which includes a mandated one credit in U.S. history. To meet the needs of the students in this area, the social studies department offers a variety of courses, including AP U.S. History, AP Psychology, World Civilizations, Political Science, Military History, Global Issues, Psychology, Sociology, and a state studies course. With the exception of the AP courses, the social studies department makes no track distinction in its course offerings and their classes tend to be more heterogeneous. However, due to the tracking within the other departments, students often cluster together into certain sections of the social studies courses resulting in a form of de facto tracking in the department.

Findings

Mr. Franklin's Personal Theories

Research has indicated that there is often a discrepancy in what teachers say they believe, the way teachers describe their practice to others, and the actual classroom practices in which they engage. So, although Mr. Franklin spoke explicitly about his beliefs, I looked carefully at his classroom practice: the content and pedagogical strategies, and his interactions with students. From this careful examination of his practice and the accompanying interviews, four themes emerged that seemed to constitute the core of Mr. Franklin's personal theoretical framework. In broad terms, these themes reflect his aim of education, epistemological perspectives about the nature of knowledge and of learning, and his images of being a teacher. However, I have used Mr. Franklin's words here in order to capture his theoretical understandings and ways of explaining his beliefs:

- Teaching is about citizenship.
- There are all kinds of truths.
- You've got to know students to make learning meaningful.
- I just try to be a real person, be a role model.

Aim of education: Teaching is about citizenship. Mr. Franklin spoke explicitly of his belief that the fundamental purpose of education and of being a teacher is the development of active, critically thoughtful
citizens who are able to make informed choices in all aspects of their lives. As he emphasized in an interview, he sees teaching as,

[being] about citizenship and inherent in that is making things better. I see myself as giving them the skills to do that. Not, this is the way you should feel; this is the value you should have. [Rather], this is how you do it. Not sitting on your butt. Not just voting and saying "I'm a citizen." I see my classes giving them not just the skills, but probably more important the confidence to go out there and be a citizen.

A key facet of how Mr. Franklin defines citizenship is knowing what choices are available and being confident to make those choices. In his classes he spoke often with his students about life choices and their connection as citizens to each other and the community. The following excerpt from the global issues course illustrates the way in which this belief often emerged authentically during his interactions with students:

Mr. Franklin: What do you see yourself doing in ten years?

Male student (shrugs): Working at Arby's.

Mr. Franklin (smiles): Are you joking with us or are you serious?

Student: I'm serious. I mean, I don't really know. I don't know how to answer that.

Mr. Franklin: I understand. That's a problem. Not just for you, but for all people your age. It was the same for me. Young people have trouble connecting school to later life, and to even thinking about what it might be. We adults, society really, don't help you much with this. We don't help you see how you fit and connect. That is a problem. I hope this class is different.

The something different Mr. Franklin hopes to share with students are different ideas and perspectives that come from engaging with current social and political issues. Within his curriculum he says, "I try to pick out problems that are still with us...situations that are unresolved, and let them [students] look at why they are unresolved." He says he introduces students to strategies for critical thinking, such as how to evaluate evidence. Then, "We start with this problem in
history and work through those strategies.” Student initiated inquiry, simulations, role-plays, and projects predominate in Mr. Franklin’s practice because they lend themselves to a problem-based approach, and provide opportunities to help students “think critically about issues.” Further, framing his instruction around problems serves as a vehicle for connecting history with current events. By doing this, Mr. Franklin believes he can help students engage with the ideas in ways that are meaningful and informative to their lives now, as well as in the future. Moreover, by knowing what is going on in their world, he thinks they will more likely know what their options and choices can be.

In an interview, Mr. Franklin spoke clearly to this issue of teaching that fosters informed citizenship:

If you do not know what is going on, you can’t make decisions. You can’t do much of anything. You are so limited. It is like *Let’s Make a Deal*. Most people don’t have all the choices because they don’t have enough information. So, they are picking the same door all the time. That is why we are here. It is not for any facts in a textbook, that is the basic stuff. They don’t need a teacher for that.... That is not creating an educated citizen.

_Nature of knowledge: There are all kinds of truths._ Mr. Franklin believes that students need to be able to learn from and make sense of the multiple truths and knowledge inherent in a diverse, democratic society. He frequently tells his students that both life and democracy are messy. Therefore, he believes the curriculum and instructional practices should provide opportunities for students to grapple with the messiness of life. He does this by having them engage with and question knowledge and ideas from multiple sources. As he explained in an interview:

I am trying to show them there are all kinds of truths to all kinds of answers. But, they can’t play the game, they are not even in the game, if they are not exposed to all these different views. To the extent that a view is not being made, as hard as it is, I have to make it.

Mr. Franklin clearly feels a responsibility to ensure that multiple perspectives are heard. However, he does not believe that he must be sole bearer of knowledge nor the only conduit for ideas in his classroom. He understands knowledge as being derived from multiple, sometimes competing sources, including the experiences and knowl-
edge his students bring with them. Thus, he provides space for students to share their knowledge, experiences, personal and family stories, and prior or current understanding of an issue. A particularly poignant example occurred one day in the state studies course.

The class was engaged in a unit of study on racism in the state. In groups, students examined a copy of an 1871 petition to the state congress requesting more vigilant protection of the rights of Black citizens. Included in the petition was a list of 116 acts of violence committed against Blacks, which they plotted on a state map by locating the county in which each incident occurred. When he gave the assignment, Mr. Franklin told them to be looking for patterns as they emerged on the map. The groups needed to determine where in the state the violence against Black citizens had been most prevalent, and to be prepared to share a group hypothesis about what might explain the pattern. The students determined that most of the violence occurred in “the rich counties” or the “biggest hemp and tobacco producing counties.” Further, as one group explained:

These areas had the highest number of slaves. So, there were higher numbers of freedmen living there after the [Civil] war and coming into daily contact with their former owners. The former owners probably didn’t like this change in social status, or the big economic change that the loss of slaves meant for them.

This activity led to a discussion of post-Civil War society in the state, the attitudes and actions of Whites, and the continued, pervasive nature of racism in the state, including the modern history of lynching through the 1970s in the South. As often happens in Mr. Franklin’s classes, a student chose to share a family story to help illustrate the issue they were talking about. This student, a White male, told the class the story of his grandmother’s experience as a child:

My grandmother told me once about how her father, my great-grandfather, was a ‘Night Rider.’ She told me that this one time, he and his group lynched a Black man for supposedly molesting a child. It turned out later he hadn’t. But my grandmother, she saw it. She was real upset at seeing that, and about what her daddy had done. She said she had nightmares about it, even when she got old.

This personal story was a piece of local history that neither Mr. Franklin nor the other students had ever known about, and many of them seemed amazed, staring wide eyed as the young man spoke. This
student's family story brought the conversation to the local level and helped them connect the issue of racism to their community's history. Though Mr. Franklin provides space and opportunity for student interests, ideas, and prior knowledge within the curriculum, he also believes that students need to engage with specific discipline content, concepts, and vocabulary so they can "participate fully and with confidence" in the other open-ended activities. Therefore, at the outset of a unit he and the students typically generate working definitions for key vocabulary or in other ways establish what they already know from their own experiences, prior lessons, or other courses. Once students complete this step, the whole class engages in a discussion that is focused on helping the students link their current understandings and definitions to how the concept or word is used within the social sciences. In this way, Mr. Franklin's teaching serves as a bridge between students' experientially constructed understandings and the accepted knowledge within the discipline. Moreover, Mr. Franklin's consistent use of primary sources, the low reliance on a textbook, the incorporation of current issues, and his attention to including the experiences, writings, and perspectives of individuals from different ethnic groups and walks of life present students with a complexity and diversity of ideas with which to construct and understand social and historical knowledge.

The nature of learning: You've got to know students to make learning meaningful. Evident in his classroom practice is Mr. Franklin's concern for developing a classroom culture where students know each other and their teacher, and treat each other with respect. For Mr. Franklin, being respectful of students is about recognizing that they come with experiences and knowledge that are valuable to the educational process. It is also the recognition that they are real people with varied interests, multiple responsibilities, and many roles. In order to get to know his students, Mr. Franklin attends most of the extra-curricular activities at the school, from athletic events to theatrical productions. In these settings he has the opportunity to see the students' other talents, skills, and interests. He also serves as the coach for the academic team and opens his room in the morning as a place for students to wait for the official start of the day. During these times he has the chance to talk one-on-one with students and gets to know about other outside interests and concerns.

Mr. Franklin also has established a sort of ritual within his class as a way to get to know his students, while also setting the foundation for a collaborative classroom climate. On the first day of class Mr. Franklin and the students sit in a circle and each of them shares something about themselves and tells what they expect from the class. I noted this activity on my first visit, which occurred during the opening days of school in the fall. Then in the spring, due to the block
schedule, I saw Mr. Franklin again engage in this “first-day” ritual in three different classes. During the first day in the spring term the students in the global issues class were taking part in this ritual. Around the room, each in turn gave their name, told something about themselves, gave an idea about something they would like to learn, and shared what they hoped to get out of the class. At one point a student told the class that he did not choose to take the course and the following exchange occurred with Mr. Franklin:

Student: I wanted to take the world civilization course but it was closed. This was the only thing still open.
Mr. Franklin: Well, as I said, in this class you all get to help decide what we study. Perhaps some of the things you are interested in from world civilizations will be areas for us to learn in here. This is “Global Issues.” We can explore any issues of global concern, and these typically have their roots in history. I think we can find ways to connect your interests.

Knowing students’ interests is a fundamental piece of building a constructive student-teacher relationship, and Mr. Franklin is emphatic about the importance of that relationship for learning. He thinks that deep learning cannot occur without a positive, trusting relationship, imbued with mutual respect. This is why he has created the ritual of the first day class meeting as a way to get to know his students and for them to know him. Because, he explained, “You can’t really teach them if you don’t know them. I mean, you’ve got to know your students to make learning meaningful.”

Mr. Franklin sees the high-level content and issues-based curriculum of his class as a manifestation of his respect for students and their intellect. He explained in an interview:

I treat them the same way I would treat someone if I were in the faculty lounge. That is the way I see it. We are talking about issues in my class. These are important. So what if you are only fourteen. Big deal.

Evidence of Mr. Franklin’s success at building a strong relationship with students is a response that a student gave on a school survey. She wrote that if she were a teacher she would, “be like Mr. Franklin, because he treats us like we are real people.”

Image of the teacher: I just try to be a real person, be a role model. Mr. Franklin’s fourth theory reflects his image of what it means to be a teacher. For him, being a teacher is about being “a real person” and “a
role model.” So, along with learning about his students, Mr. Franklin takes many opportunities to tell them about himself. During the same “first day” in the global issues class, Mr. Franklin told the students that he had not particularly liked school:

When I was a student, I felt then like we were cattle shuffled from class to class where we sat listening to some man or woman babble on and trying to figure out what I would have to memorize for the test.

In an interview after class, I asked Mr. Franklin about this. He said, “There is a purpose there. [It is] trust me. I’m just like you guys. I wasn’t a straight ‘A’ student. I felt the same way you do, probably worse. I remember that and I understand.” He believes that by being honest about his own experiences as a teenager he lets them know that he is a real person, that he has struggled, and most importantly that, “it is doable, you can make it through being a teenager.”

Since his goal is to help students become active citizens, Mr. Franklin believes he has to lead by example so they can see some of the ways one might engage as a citizen. For example, during the fall the freshman social studies class was involved in a curriculum unit about the presidential election. Mr. Franklin was serving as a volunteer precinct worker, something he had been doing since college. He took some time in class to explain to the students what he did in that position and about the election process in general.

Mr. Franklin’s explicit attention to sharing his own experiences as a student and an adult community member serves as a framework for developing a relationship, while also helping him seem more real to students. Through his stories he believes he helps provide students with an example of the link between the eras of a person’s life. In explaining this belief he said:

I just try to be a role model and tell them what I am doing. I don’t mean as a way to brag, because I don’t think most of these kids think what I do is anything cool or neat. In fact, some of them think it is stupid that I gave up a job in real estate to be in this classroom in the first place. But, you are just a role model that, that there is a world out there. You have to help them see possibilities.

Life Experiences in the Construction of Personal Theories

During the initial semi-structured interview, I asked him to reflect upon his life experiences and try to identify those he felt had most influenced his instructional practice and beliefs about teaching.
During these reflections he identified three loci of experiences that represent the social institutions that often are central to a person’s socialization: family influences, high school, and professional education. One’s experiences within these institutions are generally longitudinal, taking place over a number of years and various events. Mr. Franklin’s identification of these influencing experiences, thus, dealt more with the succession of related experiences within these institutions, rather than specific events. However, he also specifically identified a number of critical incidents and people in his life that he feels were significant influences and key to understanding him as a teacher.

*Family background and childhood experiences.* The first locus of experience Mr. Franklin identified as a lens for understanding his theories about teaching was his family. His life as a child in a working class family profoundly influences his political and economic ideology. He said he remembers, “watching my parents, hard working people. I saw how, not the government, but the system, the economic system, was so hard on them. They were good people but they weren’t getting anywhere.”

During the interview Mr. Franklin made a passing reference to his family’s Native American background. Subsequently, I asked him directly about whether his Cherokee ancestry was important to understanding his practice. He believes so, saying, “[it] has a lot to do with why I teach history the way I do.” His family background has led him to read a wider variety of literature on the culture and history of the Cherokee and other American Indian Nations. By casting this wider net he found more divergent and complex perspectives, and understandings for social, political, and historical issues than he encountered in the formal curriculum of his K-12 education, and most of his college courses as well.

Along with this general family milieu, Mr. Franklin spoke of a particular event connected to his family’s economic status as being a particularly profound influence regarding his teaching practice. His father had been the union organizer at the local factory. Mr. Franklin remembers, with what he feels is unusual clarity, accompanying his father to a strike and standing on the picket line with him at age ten. In relating the account he spoke in an almost reverential tone, saying, “That will be with me forever.”

*High school.* Mr. Franklin remembers four teachers, two “very strong” social studies teachers and two English teachers, who he says were the only teachers who “challenged me to think. They threw the book out the window.” In particular, he identifies the instructional and curricular practices of the social studies teachers as being highly influential. He credits his World Civilizations teacher with opening up “this big world to me.” He remembers studying the world, unlike other students at his school who only studied Western European his-
tory from the textbook. This teacher had a love of China and other Asian cultures that she enthusiastically shared by making it part of the course curriculum. In doing so, she engaged Mr. Franklin's interest in these non-traditional aspects of history and gave him other lenses for looking at the world.

The second social studies teacher he is still able to recollect by name and remembers that she taught a class entitled “Problems of Democracy.” He was seemingly amazed at the issues-based content inferred by the name of this class, commenting, “Can you imaging having a class called that today?” Mr. Franklin recalled that in her class they discussed the daily effects of politics in their lives. He acknowledged that he patterns his elective courses from this class. It is also this teacher about whom he frequently shares in class with his students. In the freshman social studies class he told the students of the profound effect she and her approach to teaching had on him:

I felt I was a better person for that, not just a better teacher now. I was a better real estate broker, a better conversationalist at parties, and most important a better citizen. I thank that women because she helped me be a better person.

Both of these women seem to have influenced him with respect to his content focus and selection. However, he explicitly identified the second teacher as being a role model. He spoke admiringly of her involvement in politics and in her community. Her model of active political and civic engagement led him to his first political protest, one of the two specific key events he identified as being highly significant for him. He talked about that experience as the beginning of his political life that continues to this day.

Teacher education. Though Mr. Franklin’s family background and his high school experiences provide important biographical antecedents for his current teaching theories, he also identified one aspect of his teacher education program as including some important experiences as well. He is, however, pointed about separating these salient experiences from his program as a whole because he feels that not all the courses and experiences were equally important for understanding his beliefs and practices as a teacher. Rather, the influential experiences center around a single person, his advisor and social studies methods professor.

Mr. Franklin is clear that his interactions with her, the course work and field-based experiences he completed under her guidance, fundamentally influenced his current practice and beliefs. He views her as having a well-articulated progressive stance which he feels embodies the core beliefs and understandings about the world, school,
and society that he had already begun to develop before entering the program. He feels she "validated my beliefs" by helping him "put them into a larger education perspective." His recollection of his initial visit to the university to inquire about the program illustrates his point:

I came out of the elevator and there was [her] office. There was a map of the Western Hemisphere 'upside-down' and I thought, 'This is home.' If I had walked in and there had been, I don't know, a bunch of war scenes or something, and it was the typical male history teacher that I had in high school, I think I would have gotten back on the elevator.

Mr. Franklin credits this professor with giving him the "resources and the confidence" to teach in a way that was different from the majority of his school experiences, yet aligned with his few positive learning experiences and the resulting beliefs about what teaching could and should be. He describes her as a role model of someone who modeled non-traditional teaching, which he described as rich in multiple perspectives and engaging learning experiences. She also introduced him to the literature and perspectives of John Dewey and other social education theorists, and helped him expand his experientially constructed worldview and personal theories by connecting with this larger theoretical framework. He explained the outcome of this student-teacher relationship with her as providing him with a firmer grounding for his practice because his interactions with her told him, "You can do this. This is right."

The Influence of Organizational and Policy Contexts

During the field-based and semi-structured interviews I also asked Mr. Franklin to talk about his curriculum planning, about why he does what he does. Along with his personal beliefs, Mr. Franklin identified two other influences: his departmental colleagues and the state reform initiative, including the test. Not surprising, these reflect aspects of the personal, organizational, and policy influences delineated by Grant (1996). The way in which Mr. Franklin's personal beliefs and theories influence his pedagogical and curricular decision-making is captured in the previous section. Consequently, this section concentrates on the other two influencing factors: his departmental colleagues, and state reform.

Examining these influences is, to use Mr. Franklin's turn of phrase, "messy." The issues are woven into such a complex tapestry that is difficult to separate the warp of collegiality from the woof of state reform in any meaningful way. Such an attempt would most likely
lead to a confusing and less informative presentation of this aspect of the case study. Therefore, in this section I present them as an integrated tapestry of influences.

Mr. Franklin and his eight department colleagues function as a collaborative community (Fickel, 1998). Their departmental culture reflects the key characteristics of such communities delineated by McLaughlin (1994), in that they: (a) embrace the diversity of the members; (b) engage in problem solving, critique and reflection together; (c) have high levels of trust, teamwork, and standards for their individual and collective work; and (d) they actively attend to continual renewal of their community. Within the department the teachers work closely together on curriculum issues, typically using the state academic expectations as a reference point in this work.

One effort of their collaboration has been the development of a freshman social studies course. The course is the result of a self-study in which the teachers examined their student scores on the state assessment and analyzed their curriculum and course offerings using the state's academic expectations for the social studies. Through this process they found that their courses were short on economics and civics issues, and, consequently, student scores on the state test in these areas were comparatively low. It seemed to confirm their long held concern about what they saw as the lack of concerted attention given to civics and government, not only within their curriculum but the district as a whole.

Along with beginning to consider ways to address economic and government within all the course offerings, the teachers decided to develop the freshman course. All nine members of the department collaborated on the framework for the class, which they designed as a project-based course that would engage students in local community issues around economics and government. Mr. Franklin and three other members of the department collaboratively teach the freshman course. Together they select the specific curriculum content for the units, share ideas about learning activities, and developed the final student project. Clearly, in the context of this type of collaboration, his colleagues influence aspects of Mr. Franklin's teaching within this course, just as he influences their practice.

Another collaborative effort the department members took on was the coordination of the U.S. history course. During their analysis of the state test, the teachers found this content to be a major focus. This was not unexpected, given the state's graduation requirement of one credit in U.S. history. Within the department it is not uncommon for five or six of the teachers to be responsible for a section of the course. Because of the emphasis of this subject matter on the state test they decide to try to align the curriculum of the course and coordinate
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among themselves the content they would cover. They developed a course content guideline and a common final exam.

Although he was not teaching a section of the course during the period of the study, his reflections are none the less informative of the influences his colleagues have on his teaching. Mr. Franklin expressed a sense of feeling pressure to “cover everything we are supposed to cover for this test.” He felt this sense of “internal pressure” with respect to preparing the students to be successful, and because he wanted to honor the collaborative effort. He says it was a “struggle” because he felt “confined by it.” He felt that they had included “too much history to cover in the time we allotted.” Even so, he had continued trying to work within the course guidelines. As he explained, “It is just that, I think this is what we have agreed to do. But, it is hard for me.”

The influence Mr. Franklin perceives from his collaboration has mainly to do with the selection of content, which in turn is influenced by the state test. These collegial influences do not seem to extend to his decisions regarding instructional activities in these courses, with the caveat that such choices are sometime dependent upon the timeframe agreed on for an instructional unit. Further, these collegial influences do not extend to courses in which he does not engage in either collaborative planning or teaching. As he pointed out, “Only when I teach with other teachers do I feel like there are certain things I have to cover.”

In his other courses Mr. Franklin relies much more on his own sense of what he should cover. That is, he works much more directly from his personal theories and beliefs. He did point out, however, that he tries to ground his practice in a larger professional framework. “It is not like I am out there just doing what I want to do. I use the national standards [NCSS] and the academic expectations.” He also reviews released test items from the state so he knows the content, ways of thinking, and skills students will need to know and be able to use. Even so, his personal beliefs and theories reside at the core of his practice. This centrality of his beliefs and theories is clearly illustrated in a response he gave during an interview. I specifically asked him to, “Tell me about how you decide on the curriculum and the content that you teach.” He unhesitatingly responded, “Mainly what I think the students will find interesting. What I think is important. What is relevant at the time. What they should know, and that is pretty much the stuff I know that they are not going to get anywhere else.” When I asked him to clarify what he meant by “what they should know,” he said it did not refer to specific content or facts. Rather, it was about, “what they need to know to make informed choices; to be educated citizens.”
Discussion

Unlike the social studies teachers in the study by Evans (1990), whose description of their philosophical stances did not match the observed practices, Mr. Franklin’s classroom instruction was consistently reflective of how he portrayed it in the stories and conversation he shared outside the classroom. In contrast with the implicit nature of the personal theories presented in studies by Evans (1990) and Cornett (1990), Mr. Franklin was able to talk explicitly about his philosophical stance and the beliefs that formed the framework for his classroom actions, although he never used the term “theories.” Moreover, in explaining his beliefs and philosophy, Mr. Franklin frequently made reference to John Dewey and his focus on critical inquiry and problem-based approaches to teaching and learning. These references suggest that Mr. Franklin’s knowledge of his beliefs are not only explicitly held, but that he understands them as being firmly rooted within a specific philosophical tradition in social studies education. So, although his theoretical framework is personally constructed, it appears to be less idiosyncratic than one might expect.

Not only is Mr. Franklin aware of his beliefs, he is able to articulate quite clearly the ways in which they affect his approach to teaching, and his curricular and instructional decisions. In this sense, he demonstrated a set of strong schema about education, knowledge, learning, and teaching from which to make conscious and principled decisions. Further, his beliefs form an interconnected web and work in concert to create a complex theoretical framework. In this framework, each theory appears to set some parameters within which the others must function, yet do not appear to be limiting factors. As an integrated whole, his theoretical framework provides a substantially broad repertoire of curriculum and instructional actions and decisions.

Unlike the teacher described in Cornett’s (1990) study, there are no competing tensions among Mr., Franklin’s theories. His personal theories serve as a rubric for selecting both instructional activities and subject-area content. However, though there are no competing tensions, not all of his theories carry equal weight within his decision-making. Rather, all Mr. Franklin’s pedagogical decisions are first filtered through his core belief about the aim of education being the cultivation of active, critically thoughtful citizens for a democracy. In fact, the presence of such a clear and pervasive aim of education is a hallmark of Mr. Franklin’s theoretical framework. With this as his fundamental criteria, Mr. Franklin’s highly articulated, conscious set of beliefs allows him to ‘practice without a textbook,’ widening the social studies content of his curriculum and thus expanding his students’ opportunities to learn and their access to knowledge.
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Evans (1990) noted that two of the teachers in his study “seemed clear about what they were doing” (p. 125). He talked about these teachers as demonstrating a “consonance between their conceptions of history and the curriculum transmitted in their classrooms” (p. 125). Mr. Franklin similarly seems clear about what he is doing. He is teaching for active citizenship and to expand his student’s life choices. In this respect, there is a consonance between Mr. Franklin’s conceptions of social studies education and the curriculum that he and his students construct in the classroom. This consonance is the result of Mr. Franklin’s clearly focused aim of education and his fully articulated theoretical framework.

Moreover, this consonance remains between Mr. Franklin’s aim and the enacted curriculum even in the context of working with students who represent a broad spectrum of human diversity and learning needs. Unlike teachers in other studies (e.g. Oakes, 1985; Romanowski, 1997), Mr. Franklin does not substantially alter the content, intellectual climate, or learning experiences when confronted with diverse student characteristics. This is not to say that he is unresponsive to the unique group dynamics, or student learning styles and needs within his classes. Rather, it means he does not resort to the pedagogical strategy of focusing predominately on basic facts, drill and practice, and textbook-based teaching when working with “low achieving” students. This consonance between belief and practice is most evident in the vignette from the state studies course. Although nearly one third of the students received special education services, Mr. Franklin had them grappling with a persistent and locally relevant social issue, working with primary documents, and manipulating and interpreting data. He believes these students should be engaged in intellectually vital learning experiences, and he believes they can be successful in doing so.

These findings suggest that Mr. Franklin’s theoretical framework, anchored by his aim of education, guides his practice with all of his students. Of course, I did not observe in all the courses Mr. Franklin taught during the year. However, in these other courses, Political Science and AP U.S. History, the students were highly successful academically. Given the robust literature regarding pedagogy with such students, it seems unlikely that Mr. Franklin’s teaching was any less intellectually engaging in these courses.

Mr. Franklin’s theoretical framework also mediates his responses to the surrounding organizational and policy contexts. When planning for teaching Mr. Franklin considered the state test and the content that students were likely to encounter, as well as national and state standards. But rather than seeing these as directives, he used them as guideposts to inform his choices with respect to the problems and issues he selected for students to engage with. He evaluated them
through the lenses of his theories, particularly his aim of education. The result was that rather than approach curriculum planning as an either/or dilemma he viewed it as a both/and process. That is, he attempted to serve students by both preparing them to be successful on the state test and to be thoughtful citizens with choices in life. For him these were not necessarily mutually exclusive. Being “successful” on the test held potential consequences for students in terms of their future choices and options.

Mr. Franklin’s collaborative work with his colleagues was generally one of mutual influences. Within the freshman social studies course Mr. Franklin’s focus on issues of citizenship and problem-based approaches guided his participation in the curriculum planning process and affected the resulting curriculum framework for the course. Even in this collaborative context, his personal theories are evident and influential.

There is, of course, the issue of “constraint” that Mr. Franklin raised when talking about the U.S. history course. He spoke about this mainly in terms of having enough time to cover the content. However, the tightly woven tapestry of departmental collegiality with state reform policies confounds the issue of constraint. If he were not concerned with honoring his agreement with his colleagues, would Mr. Franklin still feel some level of constraint—a pressure to cover content—in the U.S. history course due to the state test? Since he was not teaching this course during the period of the study there is no way to determine how these contextual factors would actually influence the enacted curriculum. Nevertheless, his description of being “constrained” and his reference to his “struggle” indicate that he perceived a tension between his theoretical framework and the departmental, if not the state, context.

It is clear that Mr. Franklin’s personal theories developed from a set of life experiences. As previous research has demonstrated, personal factors such as social class, ethnicity, and gender (Raymond, Butt, & Townsend, 1991) are important aspects of personal biography that can influence teachers’ theories. Mr. Franklin’s identification of these as important facets in the development of his theories are consistent with the literature and serve mainly to remind us of the fundamental way that one’s biography influences beliefs, and ultimately one’s teaching.

There is, however, a more intriguing aspect of the development of Mr. Franklin’s personal theory; the significance he gives to the influence of former teachers on his beliefs and instructional practice. Mr. Franklin singled out two individuals, a high school social studies teacher and his university social studies methods professor, as serving as key role models regarding the enactment of teaching and the appropriateness of content for the social studies. For Mr. Franklin, these
two women embody the image of ‘a good social studies teacher’ that he strives to be like and enact in his own classroom practice.

Lortie (1975) wrote of the ‘apprenticeship of observation’ that future teachers undergo as pupils in schools. From this ‘apprenticeship’ Lortie asserts that individuals construct a tacitly held set of beliefs about how teaching and learning occur, and what knowledge should be included in different content areas and courses. He argued that these accounted for the maintenance of traditional practices. In other words, we teach how we were taught, and traditionally teaching has been rooted in a transmission model.

Mr. Franklin’s case offers two interesting considerations with respect to Lortie’s (1975) construct. First, it would appear from Mr. Franklin’s case that this “apprenticeship” might also provide ‘counter-socializing’ experiences for some future teachers, who, like him, are provided with alternative experiences by their ‘non-traditional’ teachers. We cannot assume that all students have the same experiences in school, nor that they perceive even the same experience in the same way. How an individual constructs their understanding and meanings for their school experiences result in very different worldview and belief structures. This recognition of the socially constructed nature of knowledge and beliefs does not argue against the concept of an “apprenticeship of observation.” The premise of the construct that we teach how we were taught, remains valid. Rather, Mr. Franklin’s case suggests that we need to begin expanding our understanding of the apprenticeship to include multiple possible outcomes. The resulting knowledge and beliefs from one’s school experiences may not necessarily manifest themselves only in “traditional teaching practices.”

Second, during the “apprenticeship” the constructs that people develop likely entail more than an abstracted set of beliefs. When talking about how his schooling experiences were instrumental in the construction of his beliefs, Mr. Franklin grounded these reflections in the images he held of specific teachers. These images seem to embody their words, actions, behaviors, the student-teacher relationship, and a variety of emotions. Such images seem far more evocative and contextually situated than one might consider when talking about beliefs as abstractions. Both Elbaz (1983) and Clandinin (1985) found images of teaching to be powerful facets of teacher knowledge and thinking. Their work highlighted how these images are perceptual lenses for a teacher’s decision-making. Knowing more about the roots of these images, the varied way that experiences with specific teachers influence the hue and tone of one’s images of teaching, could enrich our understanding of both their socializing and counter-socializing effects in the construction and embodiment of teacher personal theories.
Grant (1996) has raised provocative questions regarding where teachers "locate the authority over decisions" (p. 238), and the implications of this issue with respect to "meaningful changes across all classrooms" (p. 266). These questions resound with concerns regarding student access to quality learning experiences and equitable opportunities to learn the socially valued knowledge that can lead to maximum options for the future.

For Mr. Franklin, authority seems to reside in his aim of education, which helps him frame a pedagogical practice that expands students opportunities to learn. His case illustrates the connection between teacher personal theories and locus of authority, and how together these mediate perceptions of the contexts of teaching and decision-making. In this way, the study continues to expands our understanding of the complexity of teacher personal theories and how they influence many facets of the educational process.

**Conclusion**

Research on teacher thinking and decision-making has consistently illuminated the profound influence teachers’ personally constructed theories have on the enacted curriculum. Such findings require that we begin to shine a brighter light on the actual effects of these theories on students’ access to knowledge and their school achievement. This aspect of teacher theorizing is too often neglected in this strand of research, and this study only begins to illuminate one facet of student opportunities to learn. Moreover, these studies on teacher theory should compel those of us in teacher education to consider the ethical obligation that programs and faculty members have regarding the children and youths in the K-12 classrooms of our future and inservice teachers.

Mr. Franklin articulated a clear aim of education and a robust theoretical framework that he was able to ground in a specific philosophical tradition. He also explicitly used this theoretical framework to guide his decision-making. The development of this type of strong theoretical framework seems, then, a valuable goal for teacher education programs. It may help more teachers move from teaching influenced mainly by tacitly held, idiosyncratic theories toward a professional practice guided by explicitly held theoretical frameworks.

Philosophy resides at the core of a theoretical framework. Unfortunately, philosophy is often relegated to the periphery of many teacher education programs, either by getting lost in the focus on methods and strategies, or because university faculty fail to help students see the relevancy. However, Mr. Franklin’s case reminds us that philosophy does in fact matter greatly in the practice of teaching. Per-
haps we need to consider new ways to engage teachers in meaningful and critical conversations and dialogue with philosophical issues. Assisting teachers to make explicit their assumptions about teaching and learning seems crucial to the development of a clear aim of education, and an explicitly held and functioning philosophy, which can guide their continued reflection. More thoughtful attention to the connections between philosophy, theory, and pedagogy could help all of us move teaching toward a more socially just and equitable pedagogy that promotes democracy.

Unfortunately, the experiences and learning of K-12 students generally remain unexamined issues with regard to research in teacher thinking and learning and teacher education. However, we need to begin linking the potential learning and achievement of K-12 students to the choices we make about teacher education and what we want teachers to know and be able to do as a result of their educational programs. At the heart of the educational process reside the life options of future generations. Our continued growth toward a more equitable and socially just democratic society requires that we individually and collectively undertake that responsibility. Because of the gatekeeping role teachers play (Thornton, 1989) it is time we turned a more critical eye to our examination of teacher theories and how we support such critical examination in teacher education programs.

Notes

1 Thanks to E. Wayne Ross and the anonymous reviewers of TRSE for their valuable feedback.
2 A psuedonym has been used to maintain the confidentiality of the teacher.

Appendix

Interview Protocols

First Semi-Structured Interview
I’ve observed several times in your classroom. I’d like to share some quotes with you as a way to begin the interview:

“We’ll get better at that (writing abstracts) as we go on.”
“If you close your mind to all the stuff going on around you, you are limited.”
“I want your own words, not a textbook definition.”
“[Name of student], you mentioned something that I left out.”

1. What beliefs about teaching do you think these quotes reflect?
2. What else do you believe about teaching?
3. What experiences have had the greatest influence on you as a teacher? On your approach to teaching? On your beliefs?
4. How do you go about putting these beliefs into practice?
5. Have you encountered any roadblocks as you have tried to do this?
6. What haven’t you been able to do that you still want to try?
Second Semi-structured Interview

1. In class, you share a great deal about your own school experiences and other aspects of your life. Why do you do that?
2. Tell me about how you decide on the curriculum and the content that you teach.
3. In what ways do you think your own life or learning experiences influence the choices you make?
4. I'd like you to walk me through your curriculum development process with a specific course or instructional unit. In doing that, please try to describe your thinking.
5. What do you see as supports for your teaching? Constraints?

References


---

388  

Summer 2000

**Author**

LETITIA HOCHSTRASSER FICKE is Assistant Professor in the Department of Teacher Education at the University of Alaska Anchorage, 3211 Providence Drive, Anchorage, 99508. E-mail: <aflcf@uaa.alaska.edu>. 
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Abstract

One widely held rationale for economic education is that it helps develop students who possess an economic way of thinking that can produce better economic problem solvers and citizens. Little has been written about whether classroom teachers of economics hold similar goals and/or rationales for their economics courses. This preliminary study was designed to gather data on two broad questions: (a) what reasons do teachers give for teaching high school economics and (b) what are the major goals these teachers hold for their economics courses and students in those courses? Eight high school economics teachers were interviewed, their responses transcribed and the transcripts analyzed to determine if any patterns emerged. Results suggested that teachers held a range of goals and rationales, some that were incompatible with widely held rationales. Following analysis, three broad ‘themes’ emerged: high school economics as preparation for college economics, economics as life skills or economics as good citizenship.

Introduction

In 1999, the National Council on Economic Education (NCEE) launched its Campaign for Economic Literacy designed to “ensure that all of America’s (students) have the economic skills and understanding they will need...as citizens” and to help develop “students who possess economic ways of thinking and problem-solving that they can use in their lives as responsible consumers, producers, savers and investors, and effective participants in a global economy (National Council, 1999a, p. 1).” The Campaign for Economic Literacy is necessary, according to the National Council because these goals are going largely unmet.

Indeed, a recent Harris and Associates poll (National Council, 1999b) of economic literacy found that only 57% of adults—and only 48% of high school students—had mastered even the most basic economic concepts. A Gallup/NCEE (1992) poll found similar results: high school seniors could answer only 35% of basic economics questions.
correctly. Moreover, one-third of the respondents rated their own economic knowledge as poor, with another one-third rating their economic knowledge as merely fair. These results indicate that, as the NCEE Campaign claims, the level of economic knowledge in the United States remains low.

**Economic Literacy**

Why is economic literacy important? The case for economic literacy is well documented. In 1961, the *National Task Force on Economic Education* concluded that “everyone must, to some extent act as his own economist...and both he and the community will be better served if he is well informed and can think clearly and objectively about economic questions” (p. 13). Calderwood (1975) echoed this sentiment when he stressed that “a knowledge of economics is important if we are to meet our responsibilities as citizens...(p. 3).” Miller (1988) noted that many, if not most, of the key issues (e.g., taxation, the federal budget, school finance, the drug “war,” etc.) that confront our citizenry on a daily basis are fundamentally economic in nature. Indeed, Gary Stern (1998), the President of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis has argued that economic education is essential because:

> [Y]ou cannot understand politics and other social sciences—in other words, how the world works—without understanding economics. And you cannot make an informed choice when you walk into the voting booth. This is not to set one field of study against another, but to acknowledge that economics should be given its due in the classroom (1998, p. 3).”

Perhaps the most succinct definition of economic literacy was that given by Symmes and Gilliard (1981). They echoed the importance of developing the ability to engage in economic problem solving outlined above when they defined economic literacy as:

[A] capacity to apply reasoning processes when making decisions about using scare resources. Economic reasoning implies having the capacity to: define the choice-related problems which confront us;...use knowledge (facts and concepts) to analyze the probable consequences of choosing each alternative; and take action based upon the evaluation of the costs and benefits of various alternative choices (p. 5).
Economic Education and the High School Economics Course

If helping students achieve this type of economic literacy is the primary goal of economic education (National Council, 1997), then the high school economics course may be an integral element in developing this goal. Indeed, perhaps the most striking result of the Gallup/NCEE poll was that while most of the high school students surveyed rated their economic knowledge as low, 79% of the respondents rated high school economics/business classes and their high school economics teachers as important sources of economic information (Gallup/NCEE, 1992). Given this key role of the high school economics course in developing students' economic knowledge, it may be important to determine whether the teachers of these courses believe they are helping their students achieve the economic literacy outlined above. Do high school economics teachers believe that achieving economic literacy in their students is important? Do teachers hold the same goals with respect to developing economic literacy (as defined above) in their students? In other words, do high school economics teachers believe that the courses they teach contribute to students’ economic literacy? Do high school economics teachers hold rationales for the courses they teach that are compatible with those expressed above? Are these rationales incompatible? What goals and rationales (if any) do high school economics teachers hold for their courses?

The importance of these questions seems intuitively self-evident. If for example, a high school economics teacher holds a rationale for her course that focuses on developing economic literacy among their students, we would expect to see classroom practice (as well as curricular decisions, etc.) that facilitated this rationale. If the teacher holds a different rationale, then perhaps the classroom practice associated with that rationale would also be different. And what if the teacher holds no rationale at all? Well this certainly begs the question: What are your classroom practices (and other curricular decisions) informed by?

Teachers' Goals and Rationales

A teacher’s rationale for teaching economics would include that teacher’s beliefs about the nature of curriculum in economic education and the importance of teaching high school economics within the wider school curriculum. In other words, how does the economics teacher view his/her course within the general mission of public education—the preparation of future citizens? A teacher’s rationale for economics would also articulate a purpose for teaching economics at the high school level and the goals that teacher holds for students who have completed a high school economics course. Such a ratio-
nale might be driven by such questions as: When the course is completed, what will students know and are able to do? What is it that students will take from the course?

This preliminary study was designed to explore and describe the rationales and goals held by high school economics teachers for the economics courses they teach and to compare these with the widely held goals and rationales for economic education outlined earlier. The study attempted to expand upon the very few previous studies in this area and to develop a more detailed understanding of how high school economics teachers view their charge.

Literature Review

Studies of Teacher Beliefs and Goals in Economic Education

Unfortunately, little research has been conducted on high school teachers’ rationales and goals for the high school economics course. Of this research, The National Survey on Economic Education (Yankelovich, White & Skelley, 1981) provided the most complete picture of high school economics teachers’ goals for their economics classes. When asked to indicate agreement from a pre-ordained list of important goals, 90% of a nationally-representative sample of 500 teachers indicated that “preparing students to make intelligent decisions” and “helping students to understand the current problems facing the country” were “very important goals (p. 55).” Nearly two-thirds of the teachers also indicated that the following were “important goals” as well:

- “teaching students practical skills...such as balancing a checkbook, etc.”
- “giving students the analytical tools to maximize their economic positions”
- “increasing understanding of the free enterprise system (p. 55).”

Unfortunately, the instrument used by the National Survey presented a pre-set list of goals for teachers to respond to, making it impossible to determine exactly how these teachers would have articulated their goals had these fixed responses not been provided. In fact, it is quite plausible that, had these high school economics teachers not been given this pre-set list, they might have indicated their support of very different goals for their students.

Baumol and Highsmith (1988) gathered data on teacher beliefs about the broad goals of economic education using a similar, fixed-response instrument. Using data collected from the teachers of stu-
dents who were part of the national norming sample of the Test of Economic Literacy (Soper & Walstad, 1986), Baumol and Highsmith found that "teachers believe overwhelmingly that they are teaching students to understand the American economy in order to help them make more intelligent decisions (p. 260)." Baumol and Highsmith found, as did the National Survey, that "teachers are much less interested in treating alternative economic systems (p. 260)" in their courses implying that comparative economic theory was a low priority for these teachers.

In spite of obvious limitations, one can nonetheless point to some clear similarities across these two studies. First, it appeared that teachers were very interested in helping students become better economic decision-makers. This goal is an important one and a basic tenet of the widely held rationale for economic education outlined earlier (Symmes and Gilliard, 1981; Miller, 1988; Saunders, et al., 1994). Second, teachers seemed to believe that imparting 'practical' everyday economic skills (e.g., filing a tax return) was an important goal. These goals, while certainly not competing, were somewhat at odds with each other. Indeed, a practically-oriented approach to the economics course (e.g., learning how to balance a checkbook, learning how to take out a car loan) is more in keeping with a 'consumer economics' or 'personal finance' course (often taught in the high school business department as opposed to the social studies department) than with a high school economics course with a curriculum based on the National Council on Economic Education's (1997) Voluntary National Content Standards in Economics—the primary document associated with K-12 curriculum in economic education.2

Studies of Teacher Beliefs and Goals in Social Studies

Although little research has been done on teacher beliefs about, and goals for, the high school economics course, some study has been done on teacher beliefs and rationales for the social studies generally. These findings clearly indicate the impact of the classroom teacher's goals on the content students are exposed to and how that content is taught.

Shaver, Davis and Helburn (1980) found that "teacher's beliefs about schooling (and) his or her knowledge of the subject area" are key factors in determining the "day-to-day classroom experiences" of social studies students (p.5). Thornton (1990) characterized this relationship as "curricular-instructional gatekeeping" on the part of the social studies teacher (p. 237). Thornton concluded that this instructional gate-keeping was a direct function of the teacher's goals and beliefs about the meaning of social studies and that "how teachers define social studies to a great extent determines what decisions they
make about appropriate curriculum and instruction (p. 238).” Thus, decisions about what social studies content to teach and how to teach that content seemed to be directly related to the way teachers viewed their subject and the goals they held for students enrolled in the courses they taught.

Evans (1988) found that the goals social studies teachers held “were related to their life experiences, particularly to previous teachers...resulting in different goals and pedagogy across teachers (p.222).” Thornton (1990) studied several United States history teachers and found that each had “distinctly different views of the goals of teaching youngsters US History” and that these goals shaped these teachers “beliefs about appropriate subject matter (p. 239)” and, ultimately, these teachers classroom practice.

These studies indicated a clear link between the rationale social studies teachers held for their subject area and the subject-matter content they viewed as important, the classroom practice they adopted and other curricular and professional decisions. It was clear that social studies teachers’ rationales for their courses (and the goals they hold for students within those courses) had an impact on how social studies was taught.

Again, while no such studies have been conducted in economic education, we might cautiously extrapolate to this field. If we do extrapolate these findings to the realm of economics education, it would seem that knowing the rationales and goals economics teachers hold (or don’t hold) for their courses and the congruity of these beliefs with widely-held notions of economic literacy may ultimately give us further insight into what and how these high school teachers choose to teach.

**Method**

In order to avoid some of the limitations of the studies in economic education outlined above (e.g., fixed response instruments), this study was designed to allow high school economics teachers to respond to open-ended interview questions. This strategy was employed to develop a more detailed (and perhaps more accurate) view of the rationales and goals high school teachers held for their respective economics courses. This study attempted to shed light on two broad questions: (a) what reasons do teachers give for teaching high school economics? and (b) what are the major goals teachers hold for the high school course and their students?

To answer these broad questions, a multiple case study design was used, and all data were collected via semi-structured teacher interviews (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). The author contacted 10 high
school economics teachers from 6 different school districts within a 30 mile radius of the Purdue University (West Lafayette) Center for Economic Education. Of these, 8 teachers agreed to participate in the detailed interview process. Table 1 provides cursory background information on each of the 8 participants.

It is important to note that economics is not a state requirement for graduation from high school in Indiana. However, many school corporations (in Indiana, many school districts are called school corporations) do have a local requirement that students must take an economics course in high school in order to graduate. High school economics is also part of the Indiana “Core 40” courses required of all students who wish to enter Indiana’s major colleges and universities. In order to allow students to meet these various requirements, school corporations typically offer three types of economics courses. Advanced Placement (AP) economics courses—as the name implies—prepare students to take the AP examination in economics, and perhaps test out of introductory college level economics courses. Consumer economics is often based on the business education model of Junior Achievement and this type of course tends to focus on consumer education as much as it does economic principles and concepts. The most common type of economics course offered in Indiana high schools, however, is the one semester basic economic course typically taught in the twelfth grade and paired with the senior-level government course.

It is impossible to claim that these eight teachers are representative of all high school economics teachers in Indiana. Furthermore, such representation is not an objective of this exploratory study. However, because each of the teachers in this study taught the twelfth grade basic economics course at their respective high schools and because each teacher taught in a school corporation that required economics for graduation, it seems safe to conclude that these teachers are not grossly unrepresentative of Indiana high school economics teachers generally.

A semi-structured interview protocol (see Appendix) was used with all participants and all responses were tape-recorded and then literally transcribed. The interviews took place in each of the teacher’s respective schools and ranged from 45 minutes to one hour in length. Transcripts were analyzed using comparative pattern analysis (Patton, 1990). Using this technique, I first began to look for recurring regularities in the data. These regularities represented initial categories of classification. Once these initial categories of classification were established, I “work(ed) back and forth between the data and the classification system to verify the accuracy of the system (Patton, 1990, p. 403).” For this study, I first read the transcripts from all eight inter-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher*</th>
<th>Years Taught</th>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Economics Courses Taught Per Year</th>
<th>Undergraduate Credits in Economics</th>
<th>Rationale Theme Classification For Economics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jones</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Life Skills/College Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brown</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Psychology/Business</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30+</td>
<td>College Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Woods</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Life Skills/College Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Allen</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Life Skills/College Prep/ Good Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Smith</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>History/Social Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>[not clear]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Edwards</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Life Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jefferies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>History/Geography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Good Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bolton</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>Life Skills/Good Citizen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Names are pseudonyms
views and made marginal notes beginning to identify similarities across responses. I noted these similarities, compiled them and developed a label for each group of similarities. I cut excerpts that represented these similarities from the transcripts and re-reviewed the categories. Finally, these excerpts were, quite literally, grouped together on a table in order to more closely compare responses within the initial categories and to determine the most representative quotes to include in the final report.

Results

This section of the paper provides a brief overview of the backgrounds of participating teachers and reports the results of the analysis of the eight teacher transcripts. All eight teachers were male. This is in fact fairly representative of economic education at the high school level, as the majority of high school economics teachers are male. On average, the eight teachers had been teaching high school economics for nearly sixteen years, implying that they had certainly had time to develop a rationale for their economics teaching. The eight teachers were teaching—on average—between three and four economics classes per year, implying that while economics may not have been the primary course assignment for some, teaching economics was a large part of their teaching load. Interestingly, however, of the eight teachers, none held licenses in economics with most certified in comprehensive social studies or in history. While the participants did have an above average background in economic content this raises an interesting set of questions about who is teaching the high school economics course—a discussion best left to a more comprehensive future study of Indiana high school economics.3

The goal of this study was to explore high school teachers’ rationales for the economics courses they taught. Thus, the study relied entirely on the teachers in this study to articulate their beliefs about their courses. Some may see this as a limitation of the study in that some teachers may not be able to provide such articulation. However, the goal of the study was not only to determine what these beliefs and rationales were, but also, at a more fundamental level, to gauge whether the teachers had thought much about these issues at all.

The eight teachers presented a wide range of responses to the interview questions. Following the data analysis, several key findings emerged. First, it was apparent from some of the responses that several teachers had given little thought to the goals that they held for their economics course or for their students’ performance in the courses they taught. For example, several teachers were unable—or perhaps unwilling—to articulate a well-reasoned rationale for what they were
doing in their economics courses and why. One of the teachers inter-
viewed (Mr. Brown), illustrated this point when he concluded, "I tell
'em that economics is something they all need and leave it at that."

Second, some teachers were able to articulate a rationale or a set
of goals for their economics course and for their students. Following
the initial comparative pattern data analysis, it was possible to iden-
tify three broad, but not necessarily mutually exclusive, ‘themes’ that
could be used to classify the general nature and tenor of the teachers’
rationales and goal statements. These three themes, while not a rigor-
ous typology by any means, represented an initial way of positioning
teacher responses to the interview questions relative to each other.
Thus, these themes were valuable (and valid) for a preliminary study
such as this. After initial analysis, the themes were labeled “Econo-
mics as Preparation for College,” Economics as Life-Skills” and “Eco-
nomics as Preparation for Good Citizenship.”

**Economics as Preparation for College**

This category’s theme might best be paraphrased as ‘we teach
economics because kids who will be going to college need it.’ That is,
the teachers who held this particular goal for their economics course
focused nearly exclusively on the fact that a high school course in eco-
nomics is required for admission to Indiana universities and/or that
the students they were teaching were in a college-prep track. Mr. Brown
illustrated this last point:

> Our student population is such that with 96% of our kids
going to college, it seems to be the appropriate type of
course. There are a few kids that this becomes a challenge
for, a few that probably need a consumer type course.

Mr. Brown’s last remark points to the exclusionary nature of these
goals: that only the college-bound students can benefit from a ‘full’
economics course. Ironically, the teachers whose goals fit in this cat-
egory were aware of the tension this somewhat exclusionary ratio-
nale created. Some of these teachers were able to rationalize this ten-
sion by re-focusing on their articulated course goal. Namely, that high
school economics is preparation for future college economics courses.
This can be seen clearly in excerpts from three teachers:

> There are a lot of things I’d like to do in consumer eco-
nomics that I don’t have time for. But since this is a col-
lege bound class, it is more valuable for them to under-
stand these concepts so those won’t be new to them (Mr.
Allen)
Those that go on to school will in most places—Purdue or someplace else—will take an economics class and I know in high school we cannot cover everything fully we do not have the ability to cover everything. What we do cover maybe Purdue or IU covers in six weeks but at least they have a little bit of background when they sit in a class at those schools, maybe the first two weeks (Mr. Woods).

I think that the basic understanding is real important for every kid, but if kids are going to college, I don’t know very many majors that don’t require an economics course. That way in college they can go on with topics and other kinds of areas that I think would be more appropriate for college level. I think the prerequisite of an economics course or the principles of econ should be a high school course. Colleges can do sort of a micro portion or macro courses of that ECON 210 class that’s taught in high school, but it’s not for every kid, every kid should have a consumer and sort of basic decision making and then the college kid and their decision making skills that are needed to be a lot more, you know, reading wise (Mr. Jones).

Mr. Brown was able to further justify this exclusionary goal structure by drawing on the success he had had with past students: “there are some that come back who are majoring in economics, typically they tell me that their college course is very similar to the course we had and the macro that we touch on is less, but basically the same.” Clearly, the teachers who fit under this category held a set of goals that were quite different from those identified by high school economics teachers in the National Survey of Economic Education (1981). In fact, because this set of goals was not listed among those used in the National Survey, previous findings offered no indication that preparing students for college-level economics was a goal teachers deemed important.

Economics as Life Skills

The second general theme of teacher goals might be paraphrased ‘we prepare kids for the really important life decisions they will be forced to make after school, most of which are economic in nature.’ That is, teachers who held this view emphasized the ‘practical’ nature of their courses. This ‘practicality’ can be seen in Mr. Woods’ belief that “economics prepares (students) for financial questions and answers that they have... parents sometimes will raise kids today without these answers: taxes, how to open a bank account, pricing of items,
buying and selling stocks...economics will give a kid real life skills that I don’t think any other classes will do.”

Teachers who held this view tended to focus their responses on the skills that students acquired in their courses. These teachers felt that their students needed to leave high school with something more than what they deemed a theoretical economic foundation. Some of these teachers even questioned the utility of certain widely-held economic theory. For example, Mr. Allen felt strongly that:

“[a]s I think about it more, some of the basic principles they teach are theory rather than reality. Prices get set by the supplier more than they do demand. The realities of that, I talk to the kids about that. When there is a shortage, buyers don’t bid the price up, the suppliers raise the price, and they say well supply and demand caused that, well no it didn’t, you did. In time, over a period it would force it up. We tend to stereotype economic theories rather than look at the realities. Authors tend to do stereotypical things in text books and they don’t get to actualities very often.”

Teachers who held this view also felt strongly that the high school economics course was perhaps the only place where these ‘life skills’ could be imparted to students. In contrast to the teachers who felt economics should be taught only to college-bound students, these teachers believed strongly that economics should be required of all students:

Economics definitely should be required. It should be because I don’t think schools prepare kids for the important aspects in life. Kids don’t know about these things (Mr. Woods).

I tell ‘em I’m going to try to give them the knowledge of the things I think are going to benefit them 3, 4, 5 years down the road. And most of them say ‘well I’m leaving home right away’ and you know, I tell ‘em I want to prepare you so that your mom and dad doesn’t look around one day and say ‘Joe your 35 now its time you get out of the house.’ All of em want to leave and to be independent but I’m not sure they really understand what it takes to be independent. So I tell them that we’re going to cover some things that I think personally will benefit you and
you’ll look back and say, ‘boy I’m glad we covered those things.’ (Mr. Bolton).

Curiously, teachers who held this ‘life skills’ rationale were much more likely to articulate the widely-held view that economic education should prepare students to be better decision-makers. Perhaps this was due to the fact that these teachers often ‘blended’ the practical and the theoretical in their own rationales and goal statements. For example, one teacher indicated that theoretical economic knowledge was essential in such mundane ‘practical’ activities as reading the newspaper or working in a large factory:

Decision-making and being familiar with the vocabulary in that way when they’re voting for a candidate that is against a free trade agreement, at least they understand what that means that there are potential costs and benefits to that particular viewpoint. I want them to understand their decision for due process and they need to be able to when they read and pick up the newspaper, they need to understand their economics vocabulary .... Well, that kid is a maintenance guy at the local factory, and he just read that there’s a merger happening in his industry, you know, does he understand what that means? The local government is interested in having a new firm invest. They’re going to buy a piece of property in town, what does that mean? Well they’re buying up America? Does that mean that they’re gonna take it back to France with them and we’ll be out with a big hole in the ground, you know. I think sort of the general kid that doesn’t plan on doing any college or university will certainly have training and they need to be able to understand just what that means. (Mr. Jones)

Several of the teachers who held the ‘life skills’ view were adamant about exactly what types of skills students needed upon graduation from high school. Interestingly, many of the skills that these teachers mentioned would not be found in the National Council’s (1997) Voluntary Content Standards in Economics and thus would not be part of a high school economics course based on the Standards. In fact, these teachers seemed fully aware that their goals were less ‘theoretical’ (relative to the Standards) and more ‘practical’ in nature. Mr. Edwards characterized these ‘practical’ skills as follows:
What is the essence of our economic system? To make a profit. The desire to be successful. In America it is the free enterprise system, ever person can go into business if they want to. Only the strong survive. When they buy, when they purchase, what does it mean to lease a car? What is interest? They can be swindled, they can be taken. There are people waiting to take advantage of them. Just consumer-wise with me is so critical to kids to give them a chance to be successful and not taken advantage of. Budgeting to me is critical, kids don’t have any concept what it costs to live. I bring a lady in from an apartment complex to talk about how much rent is. Mom and dad have taken care of everything, they don’t know about taxes, they don’t know about incidentals. These kids will have kids and bring someone into the world by someone who doesn’t have an understanding of the basics it takes to live. Budgeting is another one. Life skills, what I call life skills.

Teachers whose rationales fell into this category held similar views to many teachers in the National Survey (Yankelovitch, Skelly & White, 1981) and in the Baumol and Highsmith (1988) study. Indeed, teachers in the National Survey indicated overwhelming support for the goals of “preparing students to make intelligent decisions” and “teaching students practical skills...such as balancing a checkbook, etc (p. 55).” However, teachers in the current study who fell into this category were also skeptical of the value of a purely ‘theoretical’ approach to the high school course over a ‘practical’ one and took great pains to explain the distinction between them.

**Economics as Necessary for ‘Good Citizenship’**

The third category’s theme might be paraphrased as “economic knowledge is necessary for successful citizenship participation in our democratic society.” This view is characterized by teachers’ beliefs that “good” citizens use economic reasoning to understand the larger world around them. Thus, for these teachers, it was important that all students in high school—not just those who are bound for college—take an economics class.

So there is a myth to that, that we believe in citizenship education and we are teaching for college, but that is a part of citizenship, I guess, but also those concepts are valuable to know outside of college. (Mr. Jefferies).
We have always encouraged college-bound kids to take economics, but the reality is that, if you believe in citizenship education, we are all consumers and you need to understand the economic forces that influence us. I don't teach US History, but I teach government and I talk about economic forces in that (Mr. Allen).

Teachers holding the 'good citizenship' view of high school economics tended to see their charge from a more holistic perspective. That is, these teachers equated successful participation in society (at least that of the US) as a function of economic knowledge and reasoning. Mr. Bolton provided an example of this view:

You have to be productive to be a good citizen, so good citizenship goes with economics and economics is what it's all about. So economics is important because success is not always based in wealth. Money isn't everything, do what you love. Happy citizens are productive citizens.

Results of previous studies contained no references to 'good citizenship' as a goal of high school economics teachers. However, this may not be because teachers did not hold this view, but may instead be due to two other factors. First, the fixed-response instruments used by the National Survey (Yankelovich, Skelly and White, 1981) and Baumol and Highsmith (1988) failed to include a goal statement explicitly about citizenship. Second, among the goal statements used by the National Survey are several that are indirectly related to citizenship in a democratic, free-market society. Indeed, teachers in the National Survey indicated that both preparation for intelligent decision-making and understanding current problems facing the country were very important goals. Baumol and Highsmith (1988) found that teachers felt strongly that they were preparing students to make better decisions. Obviously, successful citizens in our society will need these attributes. Thus, the findings in the present study mirror—although somewhat indirectly—those from previous studies.

Conclusions

Economic educators have long made a strong case for the study of economics in schools and for economic literacy in general. Nearly every widely-held rationale for economic education put forth by economic educators or by economic education organizations has focused on the use of economic knowledge to improve economic problem solving among citizens. However, little has been written about what goals
and rationales are held by high school economics teachers and whether these goals mirror this widely held rationale. Following this study, what can now be said about the goals and rationales held by high school economics teachers?

The results of this preliminary investigation must be interpreted cautiously, of course. In spite of this caveat, however, some interesting conclusions can be drawn. First, it was apparent that this group of teachers held widely differing rationales and goals for their respective high school economics courses. These findings are important, especially in light of the findings of Evans (1988) and Thornton (1990) concerning the relationship between teacher beliefs and goals and the curriculum they implement. It may be the case that economic educators have felt the rationale for economic education was, to a certain extent, self-evident and have failed to fully develop this aspect with future and current teachers. Perhaps economic educators need to help classroom teachers develop more clearly articulated rationales for what, exactly, they are doing in the classroom.

Second, the rationales that were articulated by these teachers were sometimes disconcerting. For example, the belief that the high school course was simply preparation for a college-level principles of economics course ran counter to the basic tenet of economic education that all future citizens need access to the powerful ideas that economics contains. Another example can be seen in the willingness on the part of some teachers to ‘trade-off’ an economic principles-based course for a more ‘practical’ economic curriculum. Or, more precisely, to hold the view that this was a necessary trade-off; that somehow both approaches were incompatible. These teachers perceived that students would be better off learning how to fill out a tax return and how to shop for a car loan than learning about the effects of taxes on the economy, how markets allocate scarce resources and determine prices and why we should care about Federal Reserve policy. Perhaps economic educators need to continue to help classroom teachers see the utility of a curriculum that uses an economic principles-based approach (i.e., using the Voluntary Content Standards in Economics) to teach about ‘consumer economics’. Perhaps economic educators (myself included) need to work on our own goals and rationales for economic education if we are to effectively communicate these to our primary consumers: classroom teachers who teach the high school economics course.

Possible Implications

One implication of these preliminary findings may be to re-think the traditional delivery system for improving students’ economic literacy. Research has indicated, for example, that high school students
who take a course devoted entirely to economics possess significantly more economic knowledge than students who learn economic concepts via other social studies courses (Walstad & Soper, 1989). In an attempt to increase the economic knowledge of their students, thirteen states have mandated an economics course requirement for graduation (sixteen require economics be offered in high school). However, the results of this study call into question the ‘unitary’ nature of the economics course. In other words, is ‘an economics course an economics course an economics course?’ For the teachers interviewed in this study, the nature of the course (and the economic concepts taught within it) seems to be very dependent on the beliefs and rationales of individual teachers as on anything else. Thus, simply mandating that students take an economics course in order to graduate from high school (or mandating that an economics course be offered) may be a simplistic solution to a very complex issue.

A second implication of these limited results may have to do with the future impact of the NCEE’s Campaign for Economic Literacy. Among the goals of the Campaign is to develop in all citizens an ‘economic way of thinking’ based on the kind of economic reasoning to be found in the Voluntary National Economic Content Standards. The results suggested that perhaps the high school economics teachers interviewed for this study found a college preparatory curriculum model or a consumer literacy curriculum model more compelling than the ‘economic way of thinking’ curriculum put forward by Symmes and Gilliard (1981) and further developed in the Voluntary National Economic Content Standards (National Council, 1997). In this, these teachers may have been rejecting the ‘official worldview’ of economic education as developed by the National Council on Economic Education. Or perhaps the teachers in this study were simply unaware (a more likely explanation) of such a widely held (at least among academic economic educators) worldview. In either case, the result may be the same: a general lack of consistency across the high school economics curriculum.

Recommendations

This study attempted to describe, in greater detail than previously reported, the rationales high school teachers hold for their economics classes. Tentative findings indicated that teachers hold different views of the courses they teach and that these views may be exclusionary and can be competing. While this study has shed some light on these questions, it has also raised a number of additional questions that future investigation should seek to answer.

As a preliminary study, this research focused on the teacher’s perspective. Certainly, future study should add additional sources of
data that might further develop, and further define, the three initial themes for analyzing teachers’ rationales that emerged here. Among these additional data might be classroom observations, interviews with students and other teaching artifacts such as course outlines, textbooks and tests and quizzes. Obviously, using classroom observations and other artifacts to analyze a teacher’s beliefs in action would serve as a rough triangulation of this original data. This additional data might also serve—through such a triangulation—to confirm or extend the initial analysis conducted here.

The study reported here was an attempt to explore and describe the nature of the rationales and goals of eight high school economics teachers for the economics courses they taught. As such, any attempt to generalize from these data to other populations is tenuous. In order to determine which of the three rationale themes described here is held by most high school economics teachers—or perhaps to discover other themes—a large survey study might be conducted. Indeed, the initial findings reported here could serve as the basis for developing a study of a much larger, more representative population of high school economics teachers. Among the areas that might be explored in such a study include whether student economic knowledge varies across the various rationale themes. Perhaps a teacher’s rationale for the course has little impact on how much economics students eventually learn, although intuitively, at least, this would seem unlikely. Regardless, if the Campaign for Economic Literacy is to be successful, it seems valuable to move research in economic education to include more about how teacher beliefs and other variables impact student learning in economics.

Appendix

Semi-Structured Interview Protocol

A. Teacher Background:
   Number of years teaching?       Undergraduate degree?
   Master’s Degree?                Economics courses taken?
   Econ. courses taught per year?  Avg. number of students per clas?

B. Rationale for Economic Education/Economics Course
   1. Do you believe that a course in economics is essential for students? Why or why not? Should all students be required to take an economics course in HS? (Prompts: would a state graduation requirement be a positive step?)
   2. Do you have a rationale for the course that you share with your students at the beginning of the course? (Prompts: why is your course important? Do you try to make students see this?)
   3. What are the important skills/knowledge/attitudes that students develop in the high school economics course? [Prompts: provide an example (e.g., “decision-making”) if necessary]
4. Are students who take an economics course somehow better prepared for the office of "citizen" than other students? How? (Prompts: can you provide an example from your experience?)

C. BELIEFS ABOUT OUTCOMES FOR STUDENTS
1. What value do students place on the economics course you teach? Do they see any utility in it? How so? (Prompts: have students given you examples?)
2. What other benefits can you envision for students who have taken an economics course? [Prompts: give an example (e.g., better grasp of current events) if necessary]

D. ATTITUDES/BELIEFS ABOUT "ECONOMICS" THE COURSE
1. What are the major topics of the course as you teach it? Which topics are the most important? Why? What topics do you spend the most time on? Why?
2. Why do you approach your courses this way?
3. How would you rate the focus of your economics classes on a continuum from "practical" economics (e.g., "consumer education," teaching about taxes, checkbooks, etc.) to "theoretical" economics (teaching principles of economics, concepts such as supply and demand, inflation, marginal utility, etc.)

Notes
1 The author would like to thank the anonymous reviewers whose insightful comments improved the manuscript greatly.

2 The National Voluntary Content Standards in Economics were developed in 1997 by a committee of teachers, academic economists and economic educators and provide 20 detailed Standards with accompanying Benchmarks at grade 4, 8 and 12. While the writers do not claim to fully define what constitutes important economic education, they do claim to help define economic literacy. As Robert Duvall (President of the NCEE) concludes in the Foreward to the Standards, these are "signposts to point the way to economic literacy, not to circumscribe it (p. v)."

3 Watts and Walstad (1985) and Baumol and Highsmith (1988) found that more than half (75% and 54% respectively) of high school economics teachers had taken fewer than six semester hours (two classes) of undergraduate economics in their teacher preparation. The eight teachers in this study averaged nine semester hours.

4 For a full treatment of the NCEE's Voluntary Content Standards in Economics, see http://www.economicsamerica.org/standards/index.html
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Abstract

This exploratory study examined how the reading of two revisionist history text accounts concerning President Andrew Jackson influenced the historical interpretations and understandings of two prospective elementary teachers, who at the time also were teaching history during their final internship semester. We begin by providing some of the historical background that the texts traverse, describe the texts and the specific readings themselves, and situate both with regard to the two prospective teachers who were the study’s readers. We then describe the reading task and the analytic procedures used to make sense of the teachers’ verbal-reports about their reading. The data for each reader is presented as a vocalization trail. This trail starts at the beginning of each reader’s encounters with the texts. It then follows that reading to the end. The analysis and discussion focuses on the key verbalizations related to how the readers emerged from the experience with reconstructed understandings from the texts. The results suggest that rhetorically powerful revisionist history texts may have the capacity to re-narrativize the thinking of prospective teachers who are intellectually curious about and receptive to new ideas about the past. Implications for learning to teach history in diverse, urban public schools and for how that learning is provided in teacher education programs are discussed, and questions for further research also are considered.

Two Revisionist History Texts

In the opening chapter of his book, A Different Mirror, Ronald Takaki (1993), the multiculturalist social historian, observed:

...America has been racially diverse since our very beginning on the Virginia shore, and this reality is increasingly becoming visible and ubiquitous. Currently, one-third of the American people do not trace their origins to Europe; in California, mi-
norities are fast becoming a majority. This emerging demo-
graphic diversity has raised fundamental questions about
America’s identity and culture. Indeed, more than before, as we
approach the time when whites become a minority, many of us
are perplexed about our national identity and our future as one
people. [The] need to share knowledge about our ethnic diver-
sity has acquired new importance and has given new urgency
to the pursuit for a more accurate history...there is a growing
realization that the established scholarship has tended to define
America too narrowly. (pp. 2-6)

This set of realizations induced Takaki to write what he calls a history
of multicultural America. In the 13 chapters that follow this opening,
Takaki takes readers on a tour of “national development,” told from
a variety of perspectives, where the standard white, European-immigrant viewpoint often recedes into the background. The story is pro-
vincative and sometimes enervating, especially for those educated on a
diet of typical American history textbooks. In many ways Takaki stands
what he calls “established scholarship” on its head.

Howard Zinn (1980) more than a decade earlier had taken a simi-
lar tack in his widely read A People’s History of the United States. In 21
chapters, Zinn tells the tale of “nation-building” from the viewpoint
of those typically marginalized in prior, consensus-oriented histories,
those told by a generation of historians and scholars predating Zinn.
As with Takaki’s multicultural history, Zinn’s “people’s history” is
equally provocative and often as unnerving for those accustomed to
imagining the history of America in Anglo-Saxon, Whiggish terms.

To illustrate, consider Takaki’s and Zinn’s treatment of Andrew
Jackson, the so-called champion of the “people’s democracy” and In-
dian “removal specialist” all bundled into one. In his chapter on Jack-
son, Zinn notes:

The leading books on the Jacksonian period, written by respected
historians (The Age of Jackson by Arthur Schlesinger; The
Jacksonian Persuasion by Marvin Meyers), do not mention
Jackson’s Indian [removal] policy, but there is much talk in them
of tariffs, banking, political parties, political rhetoric. If you look
through high school textbooks and elementary school textbooks
in American history you will find Jackson the frontiersman,
soldier, democrat, man of the people—not Jackson the
slaveholder, land speculator, executioner of dissident soldiers,
extterminator of Indians. (pp. 128-129)

In their efforts to turn scholarship on its head, both Zinn and Takaki
focus on the latter portrayal of Jackson, as though to balance the por-
trait, to help readers understand something of the complexity and mythology surrounding this American "hero."

**Andrew Jackson in A Different Mirror**

Takaki begins immediately with Jackson the "Indian exterminator." In 21 pages, Andrew Jackson looms large on the American horizon, but not because of his battles with the National Bank or his successes in the War of 1812. Rather Jackson, by Takaki’s pen, towers largest as the military leader, land speculator, and President who would move the "recalcitrant" southeast Native Americans (the Seminole, Choctaw, Creek, and Cherokee) out of their homelands to territory west, "Toward The Stony Mountains," the title of Takaki’s chapter on Jackson. It is a tale of artifice, invective, racism, and the decimation of Native cultures by the hand and will of a widely-respected American military man and President. Takaki’s treatment is as much about the Choctaws and the Creek and the Cherokee as it is about Jackson himself. Takaki tells the story by quoting heavily from Indian chiefs, the Cherokee Phoenix newspaper, and those antagonistic to the forcible dispossession of the Native tribes. For example, after noting how early Choctaw leaders signed treaties with the government, hoping that this would allow them to live in peace but then never realizing that dream, a Choctaw Chief later lamented to an officer charged by Jackson’s Indian Policy with removing the Choctaws:

> Brother: Our hearts are full. Twelve winters ago our chiefs sold our country. Every warrior that you see here was opposed to that treaty. If the dead could have counted, it could never had been made, but alas! Though they stood around, they could not be seen or heard. Their tears came in raindrops, and their voices in the wailing wind, but the pales faces knew it not, and our land was taken away. (Takaki, 1993, p.90)

In Takaki’s description, first to go are the Seminole and the Creeks. Then the Choctaws and the Cherokees are removed, the latter on what has become known as the infamous Trail of Tears. Takaki finishes the chapter by describing in broad strokes how, in the latter half of the nineteenth century, the expansion of the railroad and relentless pursuit by the United States Army drove the Plains Indians to effectively the same fate that Jackson’s policies inflicted on the southeast Natives.

**Andrew Jackson in A People’s History**

With the exception of this description of the Plains Indians’ fate, Zinn’s account is similar to Takaki’s. However, Zinn is even more critical of Jackson and his legacy. Zinn reads Jackson to be a vulgarly prag-
matic politician, able to get his way at will and frequently against serious odds. Jackson served his own interests first, and often only. When he could not obtain what he wanted, he took it by force. When he was commanded—as he occasionally was by the courts—to cease from a course of action he found desirable, he simply ignored the orders. When his soldiers disobeyed his commands, he had them shot. When the Natives refused his overtures to give up their land and be absorbed into white culture, he had them removed. Zinn tells of a ruthless, persuasively duplicitous Jackson, whose attempts to champion the cause of the "ordinary person's democracy" remained strikingly distant from including those ordinary people trying to maintain possession of a land Jackson only saw as the rightful domain of others. Like Takaki, Zinn liberally sprinkles his tale with the voices of the dispossessed Natives.

Whether or not one accepts Takaki's and Zinn's histories, in a number of ways they do represent America's recent effort to come to grips with its classed and ethnically- and racially-diverse past, as well as its present identity (Gray, 1991). This reassessing of who we are also represents a similar effort besetting—some might say besieging—historians. During the past two decades especially, many historians have relinquished efforts to write consensus, stabilized and celebratory histories of America and instead have produced a small mountain of monographs and books that some have called the new social history (Novick, 1988). This social history looks at American culture and history from the bottom up, as they say, in highly particularistic and contextualized ways. Rather than adopting the perspective of the political-military-economic elite and writing about the American past as though this elite was solely responsible for "nation building," the new social historians have explored the influence labor unions, slaves, women, Asian and Irish immigrants, and other groups—previously included, if at all, only as sidebars to our collective past—had on the growth and development of the United States.

**Historical Revisionism and Teaching History**

But what to make of this revisionist, social history, a retelling of the history of America enhanced by the voices and conveyed through the experiences of the marginalized and dispossessed? How should these newer histories appear against the backdrop of the older ones? In the former, Jackson is vilified; in the latter, he is more often than not celebrated. How are these two "versions" to be reconciled? These were the questions we were interested in. In particular, we were interested in understanding what prospective elementary teachers would do with them, what meanings they would construct, especially as they prepared themselves to teach American history to 10- and 11-year-
olds who commonly encounter their first systematic exposure to the story of America as fifth graders in most public schools across the country. After all, what does it mean to learn to teach American history when there are different ways to conceive of it, when the story of "nation-building" can be told from different points of view, when the subject matter one is expected to teach offers a dizzying array of conflicting and competing perspectives? What is a teacher to do with such a subject matter? These questions are made more complex by the sorts of prospective teachers we see as teacher educators and the sorts of schools we ask them to work in.

As statistics continue to show, prospective teachers that matriculate through elementary-level teacher education programs across North America are predominantly white. Most come from middle- to upper-middle-class suburban or small-town backgrounds, many dominated by largely white populations. During the course of their programs, many become involved in school-based practicum experiences that become more time-demanding and intensive during the final two semesters. In our program, these practica take place in elementary schools that are marked by significant linguistic, socioeconomic, racial, and ethnic diversity. It is not uncommon for our prospective teachers to work in nearby urban classrooms where the population is 30% African American, 30% white, 20% Hispanic, and 10% Asian American. The remaining 10% of the classroom population often consists of recent immigrants from nations all over the globe. Anywhere from five to 10 different languages may be spoken in these classrooms. Some students are fully bilingual, and others speak only their native tongue.

Because few of them have had opportunities to learn it any other way, many of our prospective teachers subscribe to the traditional celebratory view of American history found in those textbooks Zinn noted (in the earlier quotation). This view was characterized by O'Connor (1991) as the "quest for freedom." As Wertsch (1998) tells it, the "quest for freedom" view emerged when O'Connor asked a group of 24 American college students to write an account of the origin of their country. Of the 24, 23 constructed narratives in which they suggested that the origin involved the search for freedom from various sorts of oppression Europeans (primarily the British) encountered in the seventeenth century. As the narratives unfolded, the 23 students explained that America was founded by these liberation-minded Europeans through the creation of a democracy in North America. In their separation from a tyrannical England, and in their efforts to follow a line of progress over two ensuing centuries, the students wrote that these freedom seekers produced the boldest and most successful political experiment, and the strongest economic system and military muscle humankind had yet to see. Only one of the 24 students textured the narrative in a way that intimated the sort of multicultural
origins Takaki and Zinn describe and that demonstrated the potential contradictions for women and African and Native Americans (among others) that the male-oriented, Eurogenetic "quest for freedom" implied.

In discussing their views of American history and the origins of the United States in the social studies methods course they take in the semester prior to their fulltime internship, our students frequently report subscribing to the celebratory, Whig version of American history outlined by the quest-for-freedom narratives written by the 23 students in O'Connor's (1991) study. As Wertsch (1998) alludes, this should come as little surprise. Many grade school students in the U.S. receive three iterations of this narrative, once in fifth grade, a second time in eighth grade, and again sometime in high school. Often, it is repeated again in American history survey courses U.S. college students take, especially in large survey lecture courses. It also forms much of message Americans receive about their country's origin through, for example, television, popular culture, and sites of historic preservation (Lowenthal, 1998).

Despite its many mythological qualities, this consensus, celebratory, nation-building narrative is the mainstay of the American history curriculum (some might say that the narrative is indeed American history). It also squares reasonably well with the historical positionalities (VanSledright, 1998) of white, middle-class students entering teaching at our institution. That is, it helps to reify their "middle-classness," the part of their temporal identity that reflects the sociocultural values, principles, and assumptions upon which the white middle class in America acquired the heritage of the freedom-quest narrative. In this sense Wertsch notes, the "quest for freedom" narrative becomes a powerful cultural tool. No doubt, recent changes in historiography—the growth, for example, of social histories—have labored to modify this narrative. However, among our students at least, the historiographic changes have yet to do much to undercut the cognitions and assumptions that support this cultural tool.

Poised at the edge of their professional preparation as teachers, on the brink of assuming responsibility for their own elementary classrooms and the increasingly diverse youngsters that inhabit them, and facing the prospect that a number of them likely will teach American history, these prospective teachers come with this rather entrenched narrative of the American past. The narrative, if it mentions them at all, often unintentionally places the cultural histories of many of the non-white, non-European elementary school students at the margin. However, a number of our prospective teachers see considerable diversity in American life, both at the university and in the schools they have begun to work in. Given the potential dissonance this can generate, how are these prospective teachers to reconcile their freedom-quest
view with the diverse experiences and perspectives evident in their school cultures and in the lives of their students? How do they go about developing a different narrative of American history, one that moves their students and their cultures and histories out of the margins and off the sidebars? This exploratory study attempted to see if reading revisionist histories, such as those Takaki and Zinn provide, might point in that direction, and if not, to understand more about why.

The study, in part, is situated within a group of related studies that have examined how historians (Wineburg, 1991, 1994), high school and college students (Perfetti, et al., 1994; Stahl, et al., 1996; Wineburg, 1991), elementary students (Afflerbach & VanSledright, 1998; VanSledright & Kelly, 1998), and prospective secondary history teachers (Bohan & Davis, 1998; Seixas, 1998; Yeager & Davis, 1996) read and make sense of historical texts and documents. Generally speaking, the studies of college students suggest that they have had few opportunities to read primary sources and compare them to secondary source accounts. While they have a nascent view of the relationship of historical evidence to argument and explanation, this view is underdeveloped. The studies indicate that such readers approach history texts as though the meaning is in the text itself, and not the product of a human inquiry and knowledge-production processes. In historical texts, authors engage readers by using a variety of rhetorical tropes and an authoritative style.

Most of the studies indicate that such results should not be surprising. The history texts appear convincing, and often students simply have not been asked to read them with the sort of well-trained critical eye that characterizes what more expert readers do as they inquire into the past. In the absence of such opportunities, many have appropriated the freedom-quest narrative because it seems compelling, it is repeated so frequently, and because, as we noted, it functions as an important and useful—though largely mythological—American cultural tool (Wertsch, 1998).

However, despite this array of studies, we do not know very much about how elementary teachers—prospective or practicing—understand history through historical texts, revisionist or otherwise, or how these teachers' existing knowledge (e.g., the freedom-quest narrative) is influenced by such texts. On the one hand, we focused on the potential for reconstructing historical understandings through encounters with revisionist texts. On the other hand, we sought to make beginning sense of the implications such results might have for the social studies portion of elementary school teacher education programs, ours in particular. We also were interested in what questions such a study might generate for further research.
As a means of selecting possible readers for the study, in the semester prior to their final fulltime internship, we developed a list of criteria. These included identifying students who (1) generally held to the traditional freedom-quest narrative and used it to explain the origins of the U.S.; (2) were outspoken and articulate in our methods courses (the semester prior to their final, fulltime internship) about learning to teach elementary school in general, and social studies and reading in particular; (3) appeared to be skilled and thoughtful readers; (4) indicated that they held a social studies area of concentration; and (5) were placed in the upper-elementary grades (4 and 5) for their final internship to insure that they would have opportunities to teach American history. The latter factor, we hoped, would provide a degree of ecological validity to the study. That is, those who participated likely would be thinking about and have opportunities in their internships to teach the subject matter of history that was dealt with in the aforementioned text accounts. Also, we thought the participants would be interested in participating if they were asked to read topics tied to what they might teach.

To obtain data on possible participants, the semester prior to the study, the first author kept notes on methods-course discussions about American history and also asked students about their history and social science subject-matter preparation (mostly their college experience but also from grade-school), as a method of assessing their historical knowledge and how they might approach the texts. In a reading methods course the semester before the study, the second author used think-aloud protocols to examine how students read texts and discussed them, as a method of understanding the readers thoughtfulness and ways of articulating ideas based on their reading. By virtue of the way the methods courses are structured and how students move through this penultimate semester of their program, we had an opportunity to get to know students well, both in class and in the practicum settings. The portraits of the two readers that follow are based on assessments and understandings of these participants relative to the criteria described, and on conversations with them across the semester before their fulltime internship.

At the end of the methods semester, we generated a list of five possible participants from a cohort of 22 that met the first four selection criteria. Once fulltime internship placements had been made, two readers, Lynn and Marti, were selected, because they met the fifth criteria by being placed in grade five. Given the nature of the participants’ reading task (i.e., intact chapters, which in the realm of think-aloud protocol research are very long passages), we selected only two participants because we anticipated lengthy protocols.
Lynn and Marti, both middle/upper-middle-class, white females in their 20s reported having had traditional educational experiences, particularly in their study of history. Both matriculated through their college liberal arts core courses and undergraduate teacher education courses in the standard 4-year manner. Both Lynn’s and Marti’s collegiate experience with history was limited to two history courses each, both survey American history (Origins to 1865, 1865 to the Present). Most of Lynn’s remaining coursework for her social studies area of concentration was in psychology and sociology. Marti’s focused almost exclusively in sociology. Most of our undergraduate elementary teacher education students fit this “1 to 2 History/ 4 to 5 Psychology and/or Sociology courses” profile. Lynn’s view of American history recalled the celebratory, consensus version told by those undergraduates studied by O’Connor (1991) and reanalyzed by Wertsch (1998). Marti also reported a similar account, but in social studies methods classes, hers at times was punctuated by a degree of skepticism and a some awareness that there were other stories one might tell about that past, those told from perspectives not often recounted in the standard history textbooks. She attributed this to discussions of multiculturalism in a sociology course and in a educational foundations course, taught by professors Lynn had not taken.

Conduct of the Study

Materials

The participants read two complete chapters from the revisionist, social histories of Takaki and Zinn. From Takaki, they read Chapter 4, “Towards the Stony Mountains: From Removal to Reservation” and from Zinn Chapter 7, “As Long As the Green Grass Grows.” Both chapters and their contents were summarized at the outset of this article.

The chapters were chosen for two principal reasons. First, they allowed examination of how the two prospective teachers—who held to freedom-quest views of American history (Marti somewhat less so)—constructed understandings of a period in that history that was described from revisionist perspectives. As we noted, we were interested in what sense Lynn and Marti would make of two accounts that intersected in potentially disruptive ways with how they had come to understand a portion of U.S. history. And second, we wanted to elicit think-aloud protocols from the two participants as they read lengthy, intact, narrative texts.

Procedures

We purchased copies of the two books for each reader. They were given the books to keep, in part, as gratitude for working on the study.
We also gave them each a taperecorder and a list of instructions about how to provide think-aloud data (see the Appendix). The first author met with Lynn and Marti, asked them to read the instructions, and then addressed any questions they had. In addition to these instructions, Lynn and Marti were asked to begin by picking up the texts and to read with the taperecorder running. We also asked that they not pre-read the chapters or consult other sources in between readings of the texts unless they explained on the tapes that they had done so and in what manner. Near the beginning of their final semester in the program (mid September), Lynn and Marti, independently and on their own, read the two chapters and thought aloud about them while the taperecorders were running. This practice is somewhat unusual in conducting think-aloud protocols. There were two reasons why we pursued it. First, the task was demanding and time-consuming, too much to ask for in a single sitting, as is how these verbal reports are typically evoked. And second, in a related vein, we wanted to give the two readers some flexibility in the way they adjudicated their time on the task, especially given the busy schedules both had while fulltime interns.

Approximately a month later (late October), both readers returned the taperecorders along with the tapes of the think-aloud protocols they created while reading the two chapters. Each reported that they accomplished the readings in approximately five or six intervals (which appeared to be the case by evidence of off-on breaks in the taped recordings), without having time to consult other sources or do much with the texts except read and vocalize as the taperecorders were running. From the actual taped time on task, Lynn spent just over three hours reading and vocalizing, while Marti spent just under three hours on a total of 43 pages of history text (21 pages in the Takaki chapter and 22 pages in Zinn).

**Analysis**

The think-aloud protocols were transcribed and analyzed with a focus on the cognitive strategies and affective components of processing text and how the readers dealt with challenges they encountered between their prior knowledge, particularly with elements of the freedom-quest narrative, and information provided in the texts. Initially, we worked from a tripartite scheme for categorizing readers' verbalizations of reading processes. The scheme, developed by Pressley and Afflerbach (1995), represented a synthesis of all inquiry in reading to date that employed verbal reports and protocol analysis. Pressley and Afflerbach determined that all strategies reported by readers in studies using think-aloud protocol methodology pertained to one of three global categories: (1) how readers identify and remember information, (2) how they monitor their reading progress, and (3) how they
evaluate what they have read. We used this framework as a starting point for our analyses.

Our two readers produced verbal reports that contained instances of each of these general strategies. The readers' protocols included numerous reports of meaning construction. They reported on the prior knowledge they had connected to the texts and historical period, and the manner in which they understood and assessed the different accounts of history presented by the different authors. As we worked our way through these transcripts using the tripartite scheme, we simultaneously sought to develop coding categories that were grounded in and tailored to a best description of this particular protocol data.

We used four cycles of review and refinement of the original global categories to establish four modified ones that best described the protocol data. The first category — status of prior knowledge — described what the two readers knew. Prior knowledge exerted a powerful influence on the remaining three categories of reader strategies and processes. The first two of these — comprehension and comprehension monitoring and readers' evaluative reactions — mapped well onto Pressley and Aflerbach's (1995) descriptions of general reading strategies of monitoring and evaluating. The last category was readers' reconstructions of their understandings. These four coding categories allowed for detailed specifications of readers' processes, conflicts, and their accommodation, assimilation, and appropriation of historical information. An interrater reliability check conducted by the two authors produced a score of $r = .90$ across the four categories.

This analysis of the think-aloud data helped us determine that reconstructed understanding was the prominent outcome of this study. Lynn and Marti considered their prior knowledge, monitored their understanding of the text, and evaluated authors' claims, Andrew Jackson's actions and motives, and their own evolving knowledge towards the end result of reconstructed understandings. The means to this end result are described in the readers' vocalizations; that is, the strategies, reactions, and emotions that were involved in readers coming to their ultimate understanding of the text. The key characteristics of this reading/vocalization process included:

1. a lengthy reporting "trail," leading to verbalized claims that ideas had changed (e.g., a reader's reflection on her prior knowledge in the face of a contradictory statement anticipates the reader's subsequent shift in perspective);
2. strong affective evaluations, vocalized on the trail (e.g., of frustration, surprise, dismay, anger, incredulity with portrayals of historic events);
3. a number of self-referential comments (e.g., reference to prior knowledge with regard to gaining an insight or shifting an understanding); and
4. an expression of a reconstructed idea in an extended online vocalization that averages at least 25% longer—as measured in number of transcript lines—than the next longest vocalization that does not involve rereading the actual text.

In this article, we concentrate on how the two readers' understandings of Andrew Jackson evolved as they read the texts. To this end, we focus on select portions and examples of the verbatim vocalization trails of each reader. In both cases, the trails commence near the beginning of the Takaki text and are traced out to near the conclusion of the reading of Zinn. There, each reader reports through extended on-line vocalizations how their understanding of this portion of history appears to have been reconstructed by their interactions with the content of the text chapters. A product of our following these vocalizations trails is the description of how Lynn and Marti undertake the challenging and arduous process of creating new knowledge about Andrew Jackson, history, and themselves.

**Emotion, Empathy, and Evaluation in the Readers' Reactions to the Texts**

Both Lynn and Marti were deeply engaged readers and vocalizers (see Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995). They frequently reported on their prior knowledge and how it intersected with what they were reading, strategically monitoring their progress by indicating when, for example, they were slowing down to attend to efforts at acquiring meaning or rereading portions if they did not understand. Also of importance was the degree to which they offered rich, sometimes poignant, and often extended evaluations of the text content, the authors' depictions of events, how they were checking the authors' use of evidence by consulting footnotes (Marti more so than Lynn), and how they were constructing situation models in their heads (van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983) as a method of assessing the veracity of what they were reading (see also Wineburg, 1991). Lynn's evaluations most frequently involved rather straightforward affective reactions to the Takaki and Zinn portrayals of the often surprising lengths Jackson and his compatriots would go to advance their Indian-removal policies.

Although Marti offered similar affective judgments, her assessments more often involved a skeptical stance she took towards the texts, engaging in questioning and evaluating the author, trying to understand the position from which the author was writing, and at-
tempting to verify the claims made in the text. As a result, each reader constructed somewhat different understandings. To illustrate, we look next at salient portions of the vocalization trails offered by each reader on their path toward these understandings.

Illustrating Lynn’s Vocalization Trail

From the outset, Lynn registered a number of evaluative comments that suggested some surprise, and disgust at the attitudes Europeans held towards the Native Americans and the subsequent acts of brutality in which they engaged to accomplish Indian removal.

Takaki: During the war against the Creeks, Commander Jackson dehumanized his enemies as “savage bloodhounds…”
Lynn: Oh, gosh!
Takaki: …and “Blood-thirsty barbarians.”
Lynn: OK, so this is the typical feelings of what Indians were like back then. I guess it made it easier for white settlers to go and kill all the Indians because it was an image that people had projected about them. (transcript p. 1 of 45 pages)
Takaki: As chief executive, Jackson supported the efforts of Mississippi and Georgia to abolish tribal units and extend state authority over Indians.
Lynn: You know what this is making me think, I always read positive things about Andrew Jackson. I remember doing a report on him back in fifth grade, but this makes me not think highly of him at all, based on what I am reading. This is horrible. It kind of changes my opinion about Andrew Jackson. (transcript p. 3)

It was not long before Lynn’s creeping doubts about Jackson gave way to serious questions about the apparent superior attitude the Europeans assumed in their dealings with the Natives, an attitude embedded in the notion of what became known in U.S. history as Manifest Destiny, and what Kipling called “the white man’s burden.”

Takaki: “Doubtless it will be painful [for Indians] to leave the graves of their fathers,” Jackson declared.
Lynn: Oh, that’s nice of him.
Takaki: “But what do they more than our ancestors did or than our children are now doing? To better their condition in an unknown land our forefathers left all that was dear and earthly objects.”
Lynn: He’s saying that, since the whites are constantly bettering and improving themselves, and that is the best
thing that the Indians should strive to do too; they should put those feelings aside and try to better themselves. That white culture again he thinks is so superior. (transcript p. 4)

She then encountered in the Takaki text a point of comparison between white culture and Native culture. She connected it to something she had recently read in a way that suggested she was appropriating Takaki's description as her own, because it was aligning with this previous information she had encountered. At this point, she already appeared to accept the sympathetic portrayal of Natives Takaki was fronting.

_Takaki: After the harvest, the people erected a large grain-granary. To this each family carries and deposits a certain quantity according to his ability or inclination...._  
_Lynn: Wow._

_Takaki: ...or none at all if he so chooses, reported a visitor. The "public treasury" supplied individual tribal members in need as well as neighboring towns suffering from the crop failures. Lynn: OK, that's something I just learned in the past six months is that they were very—the quote that I came across was like that they had a very strong community and they are not materialistic and they don't hold onto their possessions. If they have more than their neighbors, then they give it to their neighbor. Because this is consistent with what I've just learned._

_Takaki: They condemned the English for allowing their poor to suffer from hunger. Trader James Adair reported that the Choctaws were very kind and liberal to every one of their own tribe, even to the last morsel of food they enjoy._

_Lynn: I am starting to think of what life would be here today if we kind of followed those same rules, because right now we don't treat our poor very well and we have people that are hungry walking down the street. We need to learn some things from these people and we...killed them all off. (transcript p. 6)"

The farther Lynn went into the chapter, the more she seemed to accept Takaki's account. This appeared to make her progressively more angry when she read Takaki's versions of reprehensible acts committed against the Creek, the Choctaw, or the Cherokee. In turn, this manifested itself in a series of sarcastic evaluations she occasionally delivered that appeared to sometimes displace her expressions of disgust, as though she had by this point come to expect what she found in the
The sarcasm appeared here and there from this point forward and through her reading of Zinn.

Takaki: “The delegation taken to Washington by Mr. Schermerhorn had no more authority to make a treaty than any other dozen Cherokee accidentally picked up for the purpose.” Clearly, the treaty was chicanery; yet President Jackson “relied upon it” and Congress ratified it.

Lynn: It is an absolute joke, the way they went and did all this. I mean, there are no laws, I, uh, (laughs) the scams that went on back then. I guess they still do today, but it was just so obvious. (transcript p. 13)

Zinn: John Donelson, a state surveyor, ended up with 200,000 acres of land near what is now Chattanooga. His son-in-law made 22 trips out of Nashville in 1795 for land deals. This was Andrew Jackson.

Lynn: Here we go, talking about Andrew Jackson again—my little friend. (transcript p. 23)

Even though surprise and disgust seemed to have been displaced by sarcasm, Lynn encountered in Zinn further details of Jackson’s policies and the legacy they had left in their temporal wake, which provoked amazement anew.

Zinn: (An Indian GI, veteran of Vietnam, testifying publicly in 1970 not only about the horror of the war but about his own maltreatment as an Indian, repeated that phrase and began to weep.)

Lynn: Whoa. So even as recently as the Vietnam war, there were Indians that were still faced with being maltreated, and remember that phrase? Whoa, that touches today. Hmm.

Zinn: The Creeks and Choctaws remained on their individual plots, but great numbers of them were defrauded by land companies. According to one Georgia bank president, a stockholder in a land company, “Stealing is the order of the day.”

Lynn: Gosh, I can’t—it boggles my mind about how they totally deceived these people and the fact that it was all right to do so. (transcript p. 30)

As she neared the end of Zinn’s treatment of Indian removal, Lynn appeared to have appropriated his account and fitted it together with what she had read in Takaki. Her understanding of the events of the early to mid-nineteenth century and how it altered the lives of the
Southeast Native Americans showed signs of shifting to a different sense of Jackson and his policies. As Zinn began to summarize, so did Lynn.

Zinn: The forces that led to removal did not come, Van Every insists, from the poor white frontiersmen who were neighbors of the Indians. They came from industrialization and commerce, the growth of populations, of railroads and cities, the rise in value of land, and the greed of businessmen.

Lynn: OK, that makes sense. The Europeans had this whole individualistic and greed ideology when they came over—that just makes sense. That is consistent with what I know about the Europeans—it is all for money I guess. (transcript p. 32)

Zinn: Cherokees could not testify in court against any white. Cherokees could not dig for the gold recently discovered on their land. A delegation of them, protesting to the federal government, received this reply from Jackson's new secretary of War, Eaton: "If you will go to the setting sun, there you will be happy; there, you can remain in peace and quietness; so long as the waters run and the oaks grow that country shall be guaranteed to you and no white man shall be permitted to settle near you."

Lynn: Oh, this is just the same story over and over and over again, how the Europeans just scammed the Indians, so they just were—killing them off practically. (transcript p. 35)

On page 138, Zinn quotes from an account of the Cherokee people in which they discuss their potential removal from their homeland in Georgia and Mississippi:

We are aware that some persons suppose it will be for our advantage to remove beyond the Mississippi. We think otherwise. Our people universally think otherwise...We wish to remain on the land of our fathers. We have a perfect and original right to remain without interruption or molestation. The treaties with us, and laws of the United States made in pursuance of treaties, guarantee our residence and our privileges, and secure us against intruders. Our only request is, that these treaties may be fulfilled, and these laws executed...

This quote prompts Lynn to embark on an extended vocalization in which she pulls together many of the pieces of her reconstructed understanding.
Lynn: So they are trying to—they are pleading for the government it seems—they are trying to make an effort to gain support from the U.S. government, but I guess the U.S. government keeps turning them back. This makes me, ah, this makes me just hate Europeans, and you know, I keep saying “we” like, because I guess it is my ancestors and most everybody’s ancestors that live in this country—well, I guess a lot I should say—but it just makes me hate my heritage almost—you know. I guess it is a different time, a different place, and different attitudes but, it really frustrates me and it definitely gives me a different perspective on my feelings today, and understanding how things are today, and why they are today. It really gives me new insight to have a better perspective on things right now. (transcript p. 42)

Here, she appears to experience a form of collective guilt. Still identifying with her white European ancestors, she attempts to distance herself from them by locating the policies and practices of dispossession in another era. While fighting the will to over-presentize what she has read, she attempts to reduce her guilt. But she seems unable to fully bring herself there, acknowledging that she now has a different sense of her white, Anglo history, one still replete with a degree of historical angst.

A few lines later, near the end of the Zinn chapter, she offers a second, extended vocalization that seems to glue together the pieces of her reconstructed understanding. She appears to reposition herself against her earlier understanding and charge someone with failure to get the story she has just read out sooner.

Lynn: You know, it is amazing I think that, um, so few people really understand the story about the Native Americans. I mean, I think they have the general understanding that we pushed them west, but they have—95% of the population or more—has no comprehension or understanding of the atrocities that went on and exactly what happened and how we just totally got rid of a whole race of people—how we, I mean, all these stories of deception, mistrust, everything. It is an amazing story and I can’t believe that...it’s—I don’t know—you don’t read more about it or hear more about it. I mean, I guess there have been some movies recently, but you can’t trust movies, though it helps if they are accurate. But you don’t know what is accurate and what is
not. I can't believe that there's not more about this—you know—to get the truth out, so that people know exactly what happened. I think that the point of the Native Americans is maybe—I don't know, this is just one idea maybe why it's not so popular—it is just overshadowed I think by our more recent troubles with racism against African Americans mostly. You know the Native Americans, their history, its long past, its gone and people don’t care about it any more. But I think it is important to understand all that, and everything they went through, and understand where we are today. (transcript p. 43)

These extended vocalizations suggest the potential of such revisionist history texts to assist the process of revising an understanding of the past. The texts bring historical evidence together in a arrangement that appears to allow a re-texturing of the freedom-quest narrative, a narrative that, if one accepts Takaki and Zinn, often oversimplifies American history, demeans the meaning of freedom, and impoverishes our collective understanding of who we are. At the end of reading Zinn, Lynn indicated that she had found her "views changing in the direction" of becoming more "sympathetic to the Native Americans," "in learning what they went through." She added, "I [now] believe it was much more the Europeans [who] were the aggressors and the Native Americans [who] were the victims in this scenario."

But one can ask here if these texts will have this same effect on whomever reads them and in what contexts. This is doubtful, particularly if a different sort of prior knowledge is brought to bear. As we noted, by her own report, Lynn knew relatively little about this period in American history. That is, what she knew was generally confined to the common celebratory version of American history, where Andrew Jackson almost invariably appears as a monolithic good guy. Marti worked from a somewhat different understanding of the American past.

**Illustrating Marti's Vocalization Trail**

Marti’s sense of the past was punctuated with enough of a general understanding of the existence of alternative historical accounts (revisionist histories of the Civil War and Reconstruction, for example) that it had made her somewhat skeptical of any historical treatment. In this way, she began with a broader understanding than Lynn. Nonetheless, it did not significantly limit her reactions of dismay and disgust with what she encountered in Takaki and Zinn, nor did it restrain the degree to which she evaluated what she read. If anything, Marti was often as surprised as Lynn by the accounts, but she was
more critical, and sometimes her criticisms tended to be of a different sort than Lynn’s. For example, Marti was less quick to accept Takaki’s or Zinn’s version of events. Unlike Lynn, she checked references in the footnotes. Unlike Lynn, she made a number of online vocalizations in which she assessed the authors’ treatments. She was more apt to step back from the text, to treat it more as rhetoric, and less as fact. However, this did not stop Marti from appropriating elements of Takaki’s and Zinn’s histories in ways that allowed her to reconstruct her understanding of Jackson.

In reading the first several pages of the Takaki chapter where he begins immediately to describe Jackson as proponent of Manifest Destiny and an Indian exterminator, Marti offered comments such as, “Okay, that’s typical; they did that all the time. That fits with other things I have read”; “Okay, typical”; and “I am thinking right now that Jackson—that he probably viewed as perfect if they [the Indians] played right into his hands. So now they fit his term of ‘savage bloodhounds’—‘blood thirsty barbarians.’ He has proof of that”.

Marti reached the point of evaluating the text’s content using sarcasm more quickly than did Lynn. After reading a section in Takaki, in which Jackson wields violence as a means of “advancing civilization,” Marti vocalized:

Hah! That makes me laugh and I can’t believe people actually believe them [Jackson, et al.]. But I shouldn’t be surprised because the same things go on today—just a little bit more modern. God, I think I am getting cynical...(transcript p. 3 of 35)

On several early occasions, Marti also would punctuate her reading with short phrases such as, “Ah, that’s just hysterical!” or “That cracks me up!” which imbued a number of her reactions with this distinct sarcastic (perhaps caustic) edge.

By a quarter of her way through the Takaki chapter, Marti already was invoking her prior knowledge frequently and monitoring her efforts as she tried to make sense of and assimilate what she was reading. Here, her somewhat deeper understanding of differing accounts of certain periods in American history (e.g., antebellum African-American history) played an important role.

Takaki: In his justification for Indian Removal, President Jackson explained that efforts to civilize the Indians had failed. Whites had purchased their lands, thereby thrusting them further into the wilderness where they remained in a “wandering state.”
Marti: I'm reading slower now, because I want to have it all sink in. I don't know much about this time period except for the fact that the Indians were forced off their land, and of course politics and the president and Congress all had to be a part of this whole effort in order for it to be successful. But all of this is relatively new. It reminds me of blacks in the sense that the president and different people tried to keep blacks viewed as savage, unintelligent. They needed our help and our guidance; they meaning, I mean our being white people—so it kind of reminds me of that. (transcript p. 4)

However, Marti, was cautious about accepting Takaki's treatment of events at face value, despite her desire for it to "sink in." For example, encountering a section of Takaki where he describes Jackson's paternalistic ideas about Native Americans, Marti offers a vocalization in which she positions herself in relationship to Takaki himself. This is one of several instances in which Marti stands back from the text, considers the rhetoric, not only Andrew Jackson's, but of the author himself and how he chooses to sculpt a view of the past.

Takaki: Insisting that he wanted to be just and humane towards the Indians, Jackson claimed his goal to protect them from the "mercenary influence of white men." Seeking to exercise "parental" control over them, he regarded himself as a father, concerned about the welfare of his Indian children, [Marti laughs] but if these children refused to accept his advice, Jackson warned, they would be responsible for the consequences. "I feel conscious of having done my duty to my red children, and if any failure of my good intentions arises, it will be attributable to their want of duty to themselves, not to me."

Marti: Oh, this guy [Jackson] was good. [pauses] Okay, I think—you know what I am noticing, and it just dawned on me that this guy, Ronald Takaki, is probably just as cynical about this whole movement as I am. I am getting a very cynical taste—that the author's style in portraying all these events and that makes me even more curious to read Howard Zinn to see how he portrays it. Although I must say if I were writing it, I would probably portray it like Takaki. (transcript p. 6)

A few lines later, after reading the section in Takaki on how the Natives were deceived in the Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek, Marti posits a similar assessment of the author's position with respect to the events he portrays. She states, "Hmm. I'd say that Takaki is definitely
an advocate of the Native Americans." Still further on, following her reading of a paragraph in which Takaki quotes liberally from a Choctaw speaker, Marti adds, "Wow, that's interesting, that's—there are some very powerful accounts in this book. I like the way it's interesting; it's drawing me in. This book creates emotion, which I like."

By this point in the Takaki chapter, Marti had begun to shift back and forth between rather strong reactions—high interest, incredulity, disgust—to what she was reading in the text and her efforts to stand back from it, assessing where its author was headed and where she thought that she therefore might be headed as a result. At one point, Marti read about how the Choctaws were told that they must move or be ruled by Mississippi state law and that, if they resisted, they would be destroyed by force. Takaki notes that a treaty with them was finally obtained by intimidation. Marti reacted, "Wow, wow! That doesn't seem very judicial to me. That's interesting. I didn't know it went to this extent, of Native Americans not having any access to fair and just laws." A few lines later, she encounters the following in Takaki and offers the subsequent comment.

Takaki: The treaty let loose thousands of white intruders, who seized the "ceded" lands, murdering any Cherokee and forcing others to abandon their farms. In a letter to President Jackson, proremoval leader Ridge complained about the atrocities....

Marti: I don't understand how this happened. I don't. I would like a broader perspective of what were the white people thinking at the time. Were they, "Yeah, pro-let's remove these savages"? I assume that is what they were thinking just because they wanted land and they were led to believe by the government that they were savages and brutal and good for nothing. That is interesting. (transcript p. 10)

Several pages later, she is again drawing off her prior knowledge to gauge what she is reading.

Takaki: ...which declared that "hereafter no Indian nation or tribe within the territory of the United States shall be acknowledged or recognized as an independent nation, tribe or power, with whom the United States may contract by treaty."

Marti: OK, this brings it together for me a little bit better. What I would like to do and will probably do is look in a few textbooks and see how this is presented, otherwise, probably not even touched upon to this great amount of depth. I am also very curious at this point to read Howard
Zinn’s interpretation. I am trying to remember even when the Indian Appropriation Act was...I think it was in History 152 [a college course she took]. I remember reading about this and learning about it. But for some odd reason, because it’s so condensed and we have jumped from 1830 to 1871, it’s easier for me to see the progression of events and why...it happened, and actually how horrible it is. It is much easier to see it in a condensed version of events, one dealing with a very specific event, a very specific movement, and the annihilation of Indians, so...(transcript p. 16)

Marti appears to refuse to fully accept Takaki’s account. She thinks she agrees with him, is somewhat sympathetic to his portrayal, and finds his treatment “interesting”—it’s “drawing her in.” But she still has questions. She wants more information. She seems unsure of how to reconcile Takaki’s treatment with her prior understandings. Has Takaki gone too far? Is he unfairly ransacking the freedom-quest narrative in his desire to bury Jackson under the weight of his own brutality? Marti is unprepared to go down the road that Lynn already appears to have traversed by this point. Marti closes her reading of the Takaki chapter with this conversation with the text.

Takaki: Along with the advance of the railroad and the increasing arrival of white settlers came a cry for Pawnee removal. “Pawnee Indians are in possession of some of the most valuable government land in the territory,” The Nebraskan editorialized. “The region of the country about the junction of Salt Creek and the Platte is very attractive and would immediately grow up a thriving settlement were it not for the Pawnees. It is the duty of Uncle Sam to remove the Pawnee population.”

Marti: No way! Okay, this...really I’ve known this, but what I am starting to worry about is that this author puts it so in your face that you can’t even deny—he is definitely taking the anti-American, or anti-white perspective on this, and he’s really giving an empathetic view for the Indians, and it is so in your face. (transcript p. 17)

Marti is, on the one hand, persuaded by the rhetoric of Takaki’s text, by the sometimes angry, often plaintive quotations from the Natives he repeatedly inserts, by the emotion these quotations from the Choctaws and Cherokee provoke in her. On the other hand, she pauses, and comments on the rhetorical style. She appears fully aware of author artifice here and reacts to it, demanding more information before appropriating Takaki’s treatment of events as a historical narrative.
useful for her own purpose,\textsuperscript{6} one that could serve to challenge the oft-employed freedom-quest tale. To service her demand, she moves on to Zinn.

In her reading of Zinn, beyond checking it against her prior knowledge and using a series of comprehension-monitoring strategies, Marti engages in three types of evaluation processes: (1) she evaluates the content of the Zinn account itself by reacting to what she reads with disgust, incredulity, and/or sarcasm much as she had done with Takaki's account; (2) she evaluates Zinn by comparing her reading of it to what she had encountered in Takaki as a form of validation or evidence affirmation; and, (3) once she thinks a validation test has been made successfully, she begins to appropriate the narratives of the two texts for her own purposes. However, the latter never appears as complete as with Lynn. Marti's appropriations are tentative and pragmatic.

Marti's reading of Zinn is scattered with vocalizations in which she reacts rather strongly to Zinn's portrayal of Jackson or his descriptions of how the Natives Americans dealt with Jackson's Indian-removal program. Here are two illustrations that convey the degree to which she appeared to have exhausted her patience with Jackson's chicanery, as portrayed by Zinn.

\textit{Zinn:} Jackson became a national hero when in 1814 he fought the battle of Horseshoe Bend against a thousand Creeks and killed 800 of them, with few casualties on his side. His white troops had failed in a frontal attack on the Creeks, but the Cherokees with him, promised governmental friendship if they joined the war, swam the river, came up behind the Creeks and won the battle for Jackson.

Marti: Oh, what a creep. Anyway this happened in 1814, and then later on—I forget which one it was—but another Indian tribe makes a deal with them, and with Jackson's history. Had the other tribes—if they knew this history—I am wondering why they would trust him to help Indians or to keep his word at all. Maybe they didn't know, but I am sure they had to have known something. They had to have heard of his history with killing them. (transcript p. 22)

\textit{Zinn (quoting Jackson):} "Say to my red Choctaw children, and my Chickasaw children to listen—my white children of Mississippi have extended their law over their country... Where they now are, say to them, their father cannot prevent them from being subject to the laws of Mississippi..."

Marti: Oh, this is such, this is so comical—"father," "children"—give me a break! (transcript p. 28)
In evaluating the content of the text itself, Marti also registered her occasional surprise at the poetic eloquence with which many of the Natives spoke.

_Zinn: A Seminole Chief had said to John Quincy Adams: “Here our navel strings were first cut and the blood from them sunk into the earth, and made the country dear to us.”_

Marti: Wow, wow! This gives me a better understanding the way the Indians spoke of how dear their actual territory and nature was to them, and how respectful they were of it. (transcript p. 26)

Later, upon encountering a section in Zinn where he attempts a tribute to the elegance of the Native’s expression, Marti notes, “I would definitely agree, because the way these people express themselves is quite poetic and beautiful.”

Marti’s evaluative comparisons of Zinn to Takaki appear designed to serve her need for more information about events portrayed before she trusts and accepts Takaki’s accounting. As she ended her reading of Takaki, she was anxious to move on to Zinn in order to test the veracity of what she called the “in-your-face” Takaki account. Reacting to Zinn’s text, Marti noted:

...I would also say that this, as I am reading, I am saying that this text [Zinn] is easier for me to read because I am thinking that it doesn’t—I think the reason that it is not, it’s easier, because it doesn’t have as many breaks for quotes as Takaki did, but Takaki I think presented more. Takaki I think gets more emotion from his writing but, Zinn is more factual and makes comparisons between the Anglo-Saxon perspective and the multicultural perspective and it shows the discrimination in portraying what actually happened. (transcript p. 25)

She notes the differences in style between the two authors. She appreciates the power of Takaki’s rhetoric, but appears to think that Zinn does a more effective job presenting a balanced account, something she feared was absent in Takaki. In this vein, she later adds, “Oh, I have to say one thing that I am thinking. I like the fact that he, Zinn, in this, points out how the Cherokee...were attempting to adapt to the white population; whereas in Takaki, it kind of left you unsure as to if they did or didn’t. So, Zinn gives a little bit more support on the behalf of the Indians.”
Near the conclusion of Marti's reading of Zinn, she makes her final comparison: “I like how Zinn gives strong support and cites actual facts and numbers and I also like how he ties this into present day: ‘Many of their descendants still live in Mississippi,’ he writes.” She then describes the influence both books are having on her and suggests one way she is thinking about appropriating them: “Both books are promoting a great amount of thought, and are also I think very good to spark discussion and debate.” Several lines earlier, Marti had remarked:

I am thinking about using these books in teaching. I think both books, like I said, I was expecting two different perspectives and so far I am getting similar perspectives, but different, maybe a little bit different information, which helps to broaden my understanding of the whole time period. But also what would be, I think, good is to get some really...some type of books that do not go into such depth, or that show more the white Anglo-Saxon perspective, just to do a comparison. (transcript p. 23)

She still worries here about achieving some level of balance in perspective. She still wonders if perhaps Takaki went too far. She is thinking about these books rather pragmatically, in that she is curious about how they might be used in teaching. This is her validation yardstick: How might these texts be used in an elementary classroom where she would be teaching American history? How might they serve as the backdrop to the sort of narrative(s) she conveys to her students? It seems that for Marti, appropriating the texts in order to effect change in her personal understanding is as crucial as how the texts could be used to potentially texture the narrative(s) she conveys in the classroom. At this point, she is in several respects beginning to appropriate these narratives as cultural tools in broader ways than has Lynn.

However, Marti leaves Zinn perplexed. Her ideas have done some shifting and she is thinking about what she might do with the texts, especially the potentially powerful, emotion-provoking Takaki account. Near the end of the Zinn chapter, after reading a quotation from a Cherokee chief, Marti reflected on what she read, playing it off her prior knowledge and suggesting how her ideas and conceptions of this portion of American history were being reconstructed:

You know, I never knew, and I guess it is from learning in the past, or just my learning in elementary and high school, but I honestly never knew that the Indian people presented their argument in such a right, just, and eloquent manner. I always assumed, I mean, I guess being told time and
time again that they were savage. I was assuming that they couldn’t even communicate well. Yet everything I’ve read is just beautifully expressed, and it is powerfully expressed, yet repeatedly denied and ignored. I always thought there was another perspective, but I guess I have never had this perspective recounted to me with so many facts and actual Indian speeches. (transcript p. 33-34)

This appeared to prompt immediate reflection on the influence the texts were having on her understanding in general. After a brief pause in her vocalization, she continued with notable metacognitive insight:

> There is a great amount of conflict in my prior knowledge and what I am reading now. In college we discussed multiculturalism some, how it has come about. I have accepted, you know, I always knew that we were given one Anglo-Saxon perspective throughout high school and elementary school, but I guess that this...I have never gone on to read something that was presented in this manner. Really, really interesting! (transcript p. 34)

For Marti, Takaki and Zinn succeed in putting a human face on what may have been for her a classroom abstraction referred to as multiculturalism, a human face at once ugly and duplicitous, eloquent and poetic. As she encountered, read, and reflected on these two texts, Marti (like Lynn) appeared to generate for herself an understanding of this period in American history that had been reconstructed by an encounter with the historical revisionism of Takaki and Zinn.

**History Texts, Teaching, and Learning to Teach History**

The two readers appear to be involved in a process of arriving at a reconstructed understanding of Andrew Jackson. This reconstructed understanding is a result of the interaction of their previous knowledge of this period in the American past, their self-understanding, and their engagement with the two texts. That is, Lynn and Marti’s historical positionalities appear to have been altered by their readings (VanSledright, 1998). Their comments suggest that they think differently now about Andrew Jackson, the “people’s democrat.” It is as if, as Harlan (1997) notes, powerful history books make readers care: “that a sense of obligation and responsibility has been imposed on us, and that it [caring] is no more to be quarreled with than love itself. Indeed, like love and suffering, like remorse and regret, obligation simply lays
a hold of us: we find ourselves—if we find ourselves at all—in the service of something that takes us beyond ourselves...” (p. 191).

This altering process as evinced by these two readers appears to involve rhetorically-powerful, emotion-inspiring revisionist history texts that was enabled by considerable comprehension-monitoring strategies and ongoing analyses of prior knowledge around the subject matter encountered in those texts. As the process unfolds, the reader, influenced by the text’s rhetorical power, gradually assimilates and at least partially appropriates the author’s narrative account. The evidence for this is left behind as a distinct, traceable vocalization trail. The trail appears to culminate in reflective insights that represent the construction of a different way of conceptualizing the ideas found in the texts.

However, only some of the factors concerning what makes this possible seem clear. From the outset, Lynn and Marti approached the texts rather open-mindedly, and by virtue of their responses, demonstrated a willingness to put their prior understandings to the test. They were curious about the texts’ contents, about what they might learn from their experiences with them. Lynn perhaps was more impressionable than Marti, because her prior knowledge of differing historical accounts was less well developed than Marti’s. Marti began more skeptically; she appeared to have more knowledge of competing historical narratives to work with and, in some of her college course discussions of multiculturalism, had learned to think of the American past with an edge that predisposed her to question an author’s position and interrogate how that author constructed the account. Despite these differences, both seemed receptive to what they might extract from the texts’ pages. But, could we expect all or most prospective teachers to be this receptive, to read the way these two did?

The short answer is probably not. But before dismissing the vocalizations of our two readers as unusual or unique, more needs to be said about this question. First, we know little about what predisposes some readers to be more receptive than others to such texts and the learning opportunities they provide. Why might some who encounter, for example, these two revisionist histories tend to dismiss them, choosing instead to retain their beliefs in celebratory, nation-building narratives of the sort where Andrew Jackson remains an unqualified hero? This question likely puzzles many educators concerned with influencing the perceptions and ideas of their prospective teachers in order to help them become more caring and sensitive to the racial, ethnic, and class diversity their students manifest.

Marti, initially anyway, resisted Takaki’s account. The emotion it attempted to provoke suggested to her that it might be overly biased, and therefore inaccurate and unacceptable. She sought to affirm its rendition via intertextual comparisons. Skeptical Marti remained
open and patient long enough to consult another source. One wonders how many prospective teachers would do so. This raises a further question about whether or not reading Takaki alone, or Zinn by itself, would be enough to sufficiently arouse emerging reconstructions of a prospective teacher’s freedom-quest narrative. In Lynn’s case it appeared to be, but what is it about Lynn that makes the change possible? It could be that her slender knowledge about this period in American history makes her more impressionable to the rhetorical machinations found in the two texts. It could also be that Lynn has cultivated a disposition of openness to such ideas as a method of advancing her knowledge, a disposition she believes may be a result of being liberally-educated. On the other hand, it’s also possible that Lynn is “too receptive,” having had few opportunities to learn to read history texts in the more critical vein evidenced by Marti. All are probabilities, but we need more studies of this phenomenon involving history texts in order to understand it better.

These concerns lead to a second consideration. In the absence of much empirical research work on influencing this disposition to openness with regard to alternative histories and viewpoints, and in the likelihood that a number of prospective teachers will wish to retain their traditional narrative understandings because they function as useful cultural tools (Bruner, 1996; Wertsch, 1998) and their purposes often seem beyond reproach, how do educators structure learning opportunities? Part of the way one might address the question is to think through the history texts prospective teachers are asked to read as part of their preparation.

Something has been made of the value of using primary historical source documents (see, for example, Bohan & Davis 1998; Yeager & Davis, 1996), the sort encountered by readers in several previous studies (see Perfetti, et al., 1995; Stahl, et al., 1996; Wineburg, 1991, 1994). These researchers argue that, in the process of inquiring into the past using primary source documents, prospective teachers as readers will develop the sort of critical reading acumen that exemplifies the way historians, for example, read and understand the past. This in turn will nurture receptivity to multiple points of view and help produce empathy and tolerance, dispositions that later, proponents hope, will be translated into the classroom teaching practices of these prospective teachers.

Although we agree that such documents can serve such valuable purposes and need to be included in the repertoire of the types of reading and inquiry tasks future history and social studies teachers encounter, we are interested in what happens to readers who lack significant prior narrativized knowledge of the events depicted in primary source documents, or who hold narrow narrative perspectives. Do the prospective teachers ignore the sources that do not fit with
their bounded prior knowledge of past events (e.g., freedom-quest understanding)? Do they initially dismiss the reading task because their limited prior knowledge impedes the degree to which they can construct new meaning from the documents?

For reasons that relate especially to teacher licensure provisions in many states, prospective elementary teachers have not been asked to know much about history (or social science, or mathematics, or natural science). This, along with the evidence from the two readers in this study, leads us to think that exercises that entail the use of primary source material would need to be augmented by prior reading experiences with narrativized revisionist texts, ones that challenge, for example, the taken-for-granted nature of the freedom-quest narrative many may hold (O’Connor, 1991). Unless a fairly large number of primary sources are used and they are arranged in a manner that suggests narrative development, they likely will lack the power on their own to call the freedom-quest narrative into question, largely because of the strength that narrative holds as a cultural tool. However, this raises questions concerning which context such reading and narrative development would occur: in history courses, social studies methods courses, multicultural education courses?

The results of this study suggest that experiences with revisionist texts have the potential to provoke concern about how the text’s tale squares (or not) with the traditional freedom-quest narrative. Additionally, in-class conversations could be used to augment the readings and thus further raise cognitive and perhaps emotional dissonance for prospective teachers about the oversimplicity of that narrative. To address that dissonance, one could return to Takaki’s and Zinn’s accounts (or others) and subject their evidence documentation to a validity and reliability check. At a minimum, this would accomplish two important things: (1) it would set the stage for a discussion of primary sources and how they get used by authors, and (2) it would help prospective teachers understand more fully about the nature of historical method and how it is tied up with questions of historical significance, representation, rhetoric, and narrative construction. We suspect that, in part, what differentiated Marti’s reading from Lynn’s is the former’s at least intuitive knowledge of these two matters.

The data from this exploratory study suggest that learning opportunities for prospective elementary teachers who are beginning to think about teaching a subject such as history benefit from careful choreography. The two readers in this study did not need to construct much historical context as they read the Takaki and Zinn revisionist narratives. The context was built up for them by the authors as the narratives were unfolded, using poignant first-person accounts and matching them with powerful, elegant rhetoric. In many ways this drew in the readers and appeared to assist in their production of more
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intense intellectual and emotional provocations than we think primary
documents alone would.

However, these are theorizations that clearly need further ex-
ploration. Using high-powered, “in-your-face” narratives could eas-
ily backfire. Prospective teachers could dismiss them as altogether too
biased, too rhetoricized to be taken seriously. As a result, their free-
dom-quest narratives would remain untouched. Also at issue is the
concern with the process of learning to read all history texts with a
critical eye. Rhetorically-convincing revisionist narratives may help
reconstruct some prospective teachers’ understandings, but to what
end? Does the revisionist narrative simply replace the traditional free-
dom-quest version without much critical appraisal? Replacing one
narrative with another does little to texture an understanding of his-
tory in ways that promote a broad sense of empathy and an apprecia-
tion for how history is constructed, used, and, perhaps most impor-
tantly, by whom.

Other questions also remain to be studied. How does new knowl-
edge produced by encounters with such texts actually influence pro-
spective teachers’ thinking with respect to curriculum planning? Do
these experiences—where new understandings result— influence how
prospective teachers construct and reconstruct ways of teaching his-
torical content? For example, how do teachers collect, judge, and
choose from the wealth of historical information and resources usable
in building a history unit once they become aware of and knowledge-
able about competing narratives? What do they do in selecting mate-
rinals on point of view, for instance? In what specific ways might the
readers’ text-provoked new understandings influence how they cre-
ate the possibility of similar experiences occurring for their students?
If they steer clear of this possibility, why? Do such reconstructed un-
derstandings produce healthy skepticism about ready-made curricu-
um materials, textbooks, and curriculum guides and policies? Do
appropriated revisionist narratives produce unmanageable levels of
conflict with traditional school history approaches that are often rooted
in the freedom-quest narrative? With varying school contexts and
populations, how do teachers resolve these types of “whose story gets
told” conflicts for themselves and their students?

These questions suggest a fertile ground for future research work.
Specifically, they beg for detailed longitudinal studies that are subject
focused, ones that help us understand the trajectories of teacher’s sub-
ject matter thinking, planning, and practice (Shulman, 1987). Without
them, we will be left only to speculate as to how our teacher educa-
tion efforts in such subject domains as history play out in teacher learn-
ing and in those teachers’ classrooms.
Conclusion

From this exploratory study, we draw two general conclusions, one that pertains to research on reading texts and the other to learning to teach history. First, we believe our description of readers' vocalization trails can contribute to the think-aloud protocol literature. As a research methodology, protocol analysis has proven fruitful in collecting data about readers' interactions with text. These interactions are often relatively short and there are relatively few investigations of accomplished readers reading lengthy texts. Our determination of a vocalization trail, or the audible path that a reader takes when constructing meaning in a challenging context, allows for focusing on the array of strategies, questions, and affective involvement that accomplished readers report under such conditions. As such, the vocalization trail is a means for providing a detailed account of how readers reach an end point in their construction of meaning.

And second, at least for some prospective teachers, such as the two in this study, encounters with revisionist history texts can produce reconstructed understandings that augment and texture understanding of American history. This is a potentially important result, relevant on several dimensions of the teaching-reform literature. As an example, rhetorically-powerful revisionist narratives, such as Takaki's and Zinn's, provoked our readers to challenge traditional, celebratory views of American history, allowing the possibility for them to see other versions of "U.S. origins" and development. This in turn could influence them to open up similar possibilities for their students. Possibilities might include: (a) exploring history as an inquiry-based, interpretive, polyvocal discipline without one "right" perspective; (b) focusing on point of view and authorial rhetoric; (c) examining questions of historical significance, evidence, and validity; and (d) learning how to be engaged, thoughtful, and empathic readers. Such moves would place teachers and their students more in tune with developments in the discipline of history, and put them in positions where they do much more than simply convey other's ideas and knowledge. It also might lead these teachers to teach history in ways that connect more deeply with variety of histories and experiences the children in their classrooms bring with them. As a consequence, the students of such teachers would be brought closer to the richness and depth of what it means to think and understand historically, and closer to becoming strong, responsive readers. However, these are possibilities only. We clearly need more empirical work on how they can be obtained by prospective teachers and with what results.
Notes

1 Depending on your point of view, one also could use the term "national destruction." See the examples of the forcible dislocation of the southeast Native Americans in what follows.

2 Here again, the positive connotation associated with the use of "building" in this term assumes a particular point of view, the one often taken in stabilized, consensus history books. By looking at "nation building" from the perspective of those typically marginalized by standard accounts, Zinn, like Takaki, is attempting to turn established scholarship on its head. In this sense, "nation building" carries with it an ironic tone.

3 As Zinn observes in Chapter 6, "The Intimately Oppressed," it was women in our culture, perhaps more than any other group, who seldom gained much through the historical quest for freedom. That most prospective elementary teachers are female (approximately 85% nationally) and that gender therefore plays an important role in their positionality should go some distance toward attenuating the degree to which they accept and appropriate the quest for freedom narrative. However, this is neither obvious in the comments our students make, nor was it clear in the cases Wertsch (1998) describes, suggesting yet again the power the freedom-quest narrative holds as a cultural tool.

4 Students in our elementary program must complete an area of concentration that consists of no less than 18 semester hours of course work. This, however, does not constitute a major. Therefore, graduates receive a B.S. degree in Education where the largest proportion of their coursework occurs. Areas of concentration can include such subject matter clusters as social studies, science, mathematics, literature, or the like.

5 The researchers served as methods-course teacher educators for the two readers in the semester before the study took place, which is where profiles of possible readers were developed. The study began after the methods courses ended. Once students move into their final semester and fulltime internship, educational responsibility for the student interns shifts to a person whose sole role involves the mentoring and assessment of those students. We did not serve in this capacity during the final internship. As a result, we were no position to assess or evaluate the readers in any formal way that would influence the outcome of reader's fulltime internship practicum. In fact, we never spoke to the two readers' mentor/assessor. This was designed to help reduce the degree to which the readers would feel evaluated by their participation in the study and predisposed to read the texts in any particular way. We also stressed that participation was strictly voluntary and that the readers could withdraw from the study for any reason at any point without penalty. Having said this, it is possible that the content of the social studies and reading methods courses (e.g., critiques of standard history textbooks, critical discussions of reading processes and of social studies curricula) may have in some respects influenced both readers to read these texts the way they did. Neither reported on this one way or another; however, this is a facet of such studies that needs further exploration.

6 Again, what Wertsch describes as a narrative that becomes a "cultural tool," but here one used to challenge another more dominant cultural tool. On this idea of narratives as cultural tools, see also Jerome Bruner (1996).

7 She alludes her to the traditional freedom-quest narrative she heard repeated frequently in school.

Appendix

Suggestions for giving think-aloud protocols:
Begin reading the selection. As you are reading the selection out loud with the tape recorder going, tell us about the things you are doing to try to construct meaning from the text.
We are most interested in how you construct meaning, and we would like you to give reports related to your prior knowledge for the content of the texts you read, and the manner in which you understand the different accounts of history presented by the different authors.
Some questions to guide your reading include: Does what you read "fit" with your prior understandings of historical events and figures?
How so? Are there conflicts or agreements between what you read and what you already knew? Are there conflicts between the historical accounts you are presently reading? What is the nature of the conflicts? How do you resolve the conflicts? What sort of reading, reasoning, and thinking strategies do you use? Did you have a reaction to what you read?

We hope that you will be able to provide rich and thoughtful accounts of your reading of these history texts. We are most interested in the details of your interactions with the history texts. The more you can give us about the interactions, the better.

References

Summer 2000 443


Authors

BRUCE VANSLEDRIGHT is Associate Professor and PETER AFFLERBACH is Professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Maryland, College Park, 20742. The can be reached via e-mail at: bv14@umail.umd.edu and pa15@umail.umd.edu, respectively.
The struggle for freedom, democracy, and a better life for all South Africans has been watched by the world for several years. Americans have a particular interest, given their history of slavery, the Civil Rights Movement, and continued racial and ethnic tensions. While issues of race, ideology, identity, and education are prominent in many countries, these have their own peculiar character in South Africa, in a web of sociocultural, political, and economic contextual factors with no analog. Hursh (TRSE, Winter 1999) examined some issues related to these and linked them to revisionist history curriculum development in South Africa, but he drew heavily on examples from the American Civil Rights experience to argue that what happens in South Africa might teach us all. In response, we offer our South African insider perspective, to correct factual inaccuracies, and to add local examples to those given by Hursh to prevent misleading interpretations by readers. We also point out a range of sub-issues central to the race-related discourse in South Africa that Hursh failed to mention and that are crucial to understanding the struggle for democracy in South Africa. Finally, we caution those who would compare South African challenges in matters of race, democracy, and education to those in the United States or elsewhere, as comparing apples and oranges without thorough investigation of the complexities of context or appropriate research to support opinions. This is a problem all too common in the field of comparative education.

Hursh began his account crediting outside events for contributing to the fall of apartheid, omitting to mention the liberation struggle within South Africa that ensued for decades. Such use of sparse ex-
amples creates misleading impressions. He described his visit to the Mayibuye Centre for History and Culture, mentioning he was reminded that the African National Congress (ANC) was banned by the apartheid government and he learned how the Mayibuye Centre for History and Culture collected documentation of all aspects of the liberation struggle. Unqualified, this gives the impression that the ANC was the *only* organization banned; that the Mayibuye Centre was the *place* that collected information. In fact, both the ANC and the PAC (Pan Africanist Congress) were banned in 1960, after which both went underground; on Black Wednesday in October 1977 eighteen other political organizations were banned, after which AZAPO (Azanian Peoples Organization) was founded to continue the struggle; in 1983 the UDF (United Democratic Front), the National Forum, and AZASM (Azanian Students’ Movement) were founded. Each of these organizations had their own perceptions on race and strategies for pursuing liberation (Mashabela, 1987). The Mayibuye Centre was but one of several organizations that served as storehouses and watchdogs during the struggle. For instance, since 1929 the South African Institute of Race Relations has amassed data on all sectors and political movements and was an outspoken critic of apartheid; Kgotso House served the South African Council of Churches but archived ANC materials throughout the struggle too.

Hursh reported observing people needing both “to deny and recognized the significance of race” (p. 105). These are nothing new to report; they have been part of the experience of the oppressors and the oppressed in South Africa for decades, and far too complex an issue to be given fair treatment in a few pages. A more compelling point of departure for considering race in South Africa today would be the arguments anchored in the Freedom Charter and related documents, and the wording in the Transitional and revised Constitution documents in which the struggle for democracy is one that transcends race. South Africa is officially a non-racial state founded on values of “human dignity” and “nonracialism” (SA Constitution, Act 108 of 1996, Chapter 1: Founding Provisions, Sections 1a, b) explicated in the Bill of Rights (Chapter 2). However, the legacy of apartheid and the contested terrains of race, politics, and ideology within the country today complicate the implementation of a bevy of legislation designed to create a nonracial, non-discriminatory democratic state. A swarm of sub-issues indicates the degree of complexity in the race issue: we offer but a few examples of these nuances of “race” in South Africa today.

The ANC position is that race is superceded by human dignity as the overarching fundamental right. Another view is that the notion of race (as colour) overwhelms all debate about inclusiveness and equity because white domination persists. The UDF view, which rallied around the Freedom Charter, is that race issues affected both whites
and blacks. The UDF used "race" descriptively with black referring to oppressed peoples and those who identified with the struggle, wherein some whites, and not all Africans, were viewed as "black". The Constitution differentiates among "race, social and ethnic origin, and colour" in its anti-discrimination provisions. Thus, interpretations and usages of "race" abound.

Hursh cited Bam and Visser (1977) that reporting Africans by tribal affiliation was to create the appearance of greater numbers of whites than blacks in South Africa. This is an obscure reference, a little heard view, and factually incorrect. Rather, it was more widely recognized that the Coloured (note the spelling) and Indian/Asian classifications were actually created to disguise apartheid as more than just a black-white issue. Adding to this complexity, there is the legacy of animosity between English and Afrikaans South Africans, the fact that many whites consider themselves Africans, and the differences in worldview among liberals, conservatives, and hard-line conservatives. Furthermore, there are some tensions over the issue of non-indigenous Africans occupying jobs and being counted in African quotas under current affirmative action mandates.

There are other peculiarities of context. The Population Registration Act of 1950 was a cornerstone of apartheid. With its repeal in 1991, persons born after June 27, 1991 were no longer classified by race, but past race classifications were retained on the population register. Official race classifications disappeared once the new Constitution legislation repealed the 1983 RSA Constitution Act (SAIRR, 1991/92, Population, p. 1). However, progress made by one group relative to another was obscured in statistics reported nonracially. Backlogs afflicting non-whites, particularly Africans, were difficult or impossible to monitor for any real improvement in any sector. Consequently, in the midst of debates over new affirmative action legislation, there arise calls for "reracialization" with a watchdog function (Dyasi, 1997). In 1996, then Deputy President Thabo Mbeki asserted that South Africa "would explode" unless the government introduced affirmative action to achieve a nonracist and nonsexist society, that "conscious and purposeful intervention could not be avoided" (The Citizen, March 30, 1996). Hated or not, the notorious race categories were seen by most South Africans as necessary to monitor progress among oppressed groups (Market Research Africa Survey, 1996, quoted in SAIRR, 1996/97, p. 368).

South Africans are struggling with the need for indigenized definitions of affirmative action, rather than merely using the American definitions. There is also entrenchment of homegrown political correctness, invariably tied to "race": debates over the pros and cons of "representivity" and use of quotas; race/tribe/ethnic identity tensions; accusations of "whiteism" leveled at successful Africans; and charges of "liberal slideaway" against liberals who slid away from
their 1980s opposition to human rights abuses and turned a blind eye to revolutionary excesses (Wentzel, 1995). On top of these there is also the rise of pan-Africanism (considering oneself first African, then another nationality) and the popularization of the African Renaissance by President Mbeki and others, creating potential for multiple identities in the new South Africa, with great import for education in areas such as history, and with no counterpart in the United States (do Americans view themselves in the pan-American sense, along with Mexicans and Canadians?). These are but a few examples of the ways in which South Africans wrestle with a past difficult to erase, with conflicting and changing notions of deracialization and reracialization as the path to democracy is forged.

These sub-issues also make the South African debates about race different to those in the United States where a four part classification did not exist, and so one should not make simplistic judgements about the whole picture based on isolated instances. Above all, one must never forget that the demographics in South Africa are reversed when compared to those in the United States, that in South Africa it was a vast majority dominated by a small white minority, and that minority continues to hold most resources and power.

Timing is another consideration in avoiding misunderstandings about South Africa. While outsiders might view 1994 as the “watershed” year in which the apartheid regime was toppled, the groundwork for democracy and inclusion was being laid even in the late 1980s, part of a continuous process through the early 1990s as negotiations for power sharing and conciliation proceeded. The apartheid-era race reclassifications mentioned by Hursh ended before 1994, with repeal of the Population Registration Act in 1991. In education, efforts to transform the four racially segregated and unequal systems (for whites, Indians/Asians, Coloureds, and Africans) began earlier too. The Education Renewal Strategy (DNE, 1991) was the real blueprint for a transformed single education system, based on late 1980s legislation, leading in 1994 to abolition of the four racially separate education systems (ANC, 1994), and on which current reforms were developed. For an account of these changes in terms of race politics see Brook (1996a, 1996b, 1997).

Hursh framed his arguments regarding the creation and teaching of an inclusive history curriculum on the basis of the American Civil Rights experience, relating at length the Rosa Parks case and the issue of celebrating individuals versus whole communities or groups. On the surface the parallel might appear valid, but we assert it is dangerous to paper over the South African reality with American examples. Hursh portrayed the prospects of teaching inclusive history in South African schools as rather dismal, although later he showed some optimism in his reports of visits to isolated programs. The prospects need to be considered in context. Since the mid 1980s there have
been efforts to develop multicultural, inclusive curricula in South Africa, particularly in innovative schools that served as models for the development of national reforms (Brook, 1991, 1995 and 1996a, b). Hursh appeared unaware that Integrated Studies became an established subject in many independent schools, incorporating history, geography, economics, biology, literature, art, and environmental science. Citing Visser (1977), he argued that “to date” the bulk of history taught in (South African) schools remains the old apartheid-era version. We challenge this as an unresearched opinion. True, the process of national curriculum reform is in its early stages, but the Curriculum 2005 program is currently under implementation in schools and countless endeavors to develop revisionist curricula in history and other subjects are underway in universities, colleges, private schools, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). These are just the most recent developments in a longstanding “people’s education” movement to overcome sociopolitical and socioeconomic domination (McGurk, 1990, p.51). Research conducted in many South African schools also needs to be considered when making judgements about the current status of history or other subjects.

We agree with Hursh that in South Africa, as anywhere, “given the socially constructed and contested nature of history, it becomes possible and imperative for everyone to enter the historical process and debates” (p. 11). However, we argue that his statement on the “need for everyone to enter the historical process” is presumptuous, as that process is well underway in South Africa. Obviously there are many South Africans who resist change, but there are many more who are already involved in the process to one degree or another—a review of the literature in comparative education and in social studies reveals this. South Africans do not need to be told to enter the process. We also disagree with the statement of Marx used by Hursh (p. 110) that “inequality has worsened under the new government.” This is one individual’s opinion, which should not be presented as an absolute fact.

In closing, we have concerns about Hursh’s sparse use of South African examples and obscure references to support his factual claims. We offer some examples of the many other dimensions of race/education/democracy issues in South Africa to demonstrate their complexity and to warn against the making of cosmetic points or undeveloped arguments that can leave a sincerely interested reader with misinterpretations, perpetuating misinformation and stereotypes. South Africans have long suffered from the effects of disinformation, used for political and other purposes by many groups. Enthusiastic interest and intellectual concern can lead outsiders to overlook important contextual detail, leading to what is known to South Africans as the “instant expert” syndrome, with the making of sweeping generalizations and comparisons with the American racial-educational
experience. Consider how many schools, teachers, pupils, and training institutions are visited by a writer; consider the length of time visiting South Africa and the degree of real understanding of the complex context. We suggest that if the tables were turned, if a South African earnestly visited a small number of American programs or institutions, could he or she justifiably comment on what Americans need to do to develop an inclusive and democratic history curriculum? We think not. We urge those interested in South Africa to learn more of the complex context, and to remember that our experiences are unique and different to those in America. As South African educators and scholars we have too much to learn about our own situation than to presume we would teach others from its experience.
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I am pleased to read the response from Napier, Lebeta, and Zungu to my essay on race, democracy and South Africa. I wrote the essay not as a South African, nor as an expert on the country, nor even as an expert in "comparative education," but as someone who visited the country, has colleagues there, and is interested in the struggle of creating democratic schools and society in a time of neo-liberal economic and social policies (Hursh and Ross, 2000; Hursh, 2000).

In writing my essay I hoped to encourage dialogue about teaching history and social studies in countries other than the United States, and particularly in South Africa, a country in which the struggle to end apartheid and develop a democratic, nonracial nation inspires the rest of the world. We have much to learn from one another. The response by Napier, Lebeta, and Zungu, along with the publication of the paper by van Eeden and van der Walt (Winter 2000), provides additional insights into South Africa's struggle for democracy and a critical social studies. While there is much in their response with which I agree, there are a few points over which we disagree. Further, they are, I feel, unfairly critical of what I had to leave out in a short "viewpoint" essay.

I will begin with that which I omitted. They imply that I slight the role of the African National Congress (ANC) and other organizations in ending apartheid. While I referred to the ANC and Nelson Mandela, I did not attempt to give an overall history of the struggle against apartheid and did not intend to slight either the ANC's role nor the role of other organizations such as the Pan Africanist Congress in that struggle. I said less about Mandela and the struggle to end apartheid because I wanted to broaden the issues to include both the socially constructed nature of race, the difficulties of developing a just society in a time of neo-liberal economic policies, and the danger of portraying social change as an outcome of individual heroism, rather than the efforts of persistent political organization. Lastly, I did not want to give the impression that the struggle for a just South Africa, as in the United States, was substantially over. While legal equality may exist, how we develop a society that both recognizes the socially constructed nature of the historical effects of race, and schools where the histories and politics of the past and current struggles can be understood and examined remains problematic.

That the politics of race is problematic and complex seems to be a point on which we agree. They seem to recognize that while South
Africa may officially be a “nonracial” country, the effects of race persist. While race may, as I point out, be merely a social and ideological construct, schooling for Whites and Blacks in both countries remain largely separate and unequal.

Lastly, Napier, Lebeta, and Zungu seem to have a more optimistic interpretation of the recent educational and economic changes in South Africa than I and some South Africans. The teachers and teacher educators with whom I met were sanguine about the possibilities of teaching an inclusive history. Many teachers lamented the lack of funding and curricular materials. They also stated that material intended for schools was often stolen during shipping. Napier, Lebeta, and Zungu argue that teaching history is more prominent than I implied by pointing out that “integrated studies has become an established subject in many independent schools, incorporating history, geography, economics, biology, literature, art, and environmental science.” But the prominence given to history under integrated studies is unclear.

Further, they write that my comments regarding increasing economic inequality reflect “one person’s opinion” (p. xx). My comment was based on an analysis of the economic data regarding economic inequality. According to recent available data, income disparity continues to increase (Goodman, 1999, p. 349; Martorell, 2000). “Since 1991, the average annual income of the poorest 40 percent of black South Africans has declined from $601 to $510 as the government’s free-market restructuring of the economy failed to create new jobs for skilled workers” (Jeter, 2000, p. A14). Many South African’s have been frustrated by the degree to which the government has followed neo-liberal economic and social policies that emphasize producing goods for export rather than internal consumption and reducing spending for social services including education. Consequently, about half of South African’s workforce, frustrated by increasing income disparities, joined the recent, May 10th, national general strike. In some cities, such as Johannesburg, an estimated 90% of the workers participated and 150,000 marched through the streets (Martorell, 2000).

In conclusion, while my comments seem to have been interpreted negatively, they were meant to describe my own awe at the optimism with which South African’s confront an international financial community hostile to social services and an infrastructure in which many of the schools are without basic utilities. While the challenges are many, the creativity and enthusiasm in meeting the challenges is, as I reported, inspiring. Meeting university professors developing courses requiring students to develop community resources and medical doctors volunteering for extended periods in rural health centers gave me hope that South Africans’ energy, enthusiasm and optimism will
overcome all obstacles. We have much to learn from one another in the struggle for a socially just society and schools.

References
Taking up the Dare: Social Education and a New New Social Order


Review by KEVIN D. VINSON, Loyola College in Maryland, Baltimore, MD 21210-2699.

Democratic Social Education: Social Studies for Social Change (Hursh & Ross, 2000a) is the latest contribution to the Falmer Press series Teaching and Thinking, edited by Shirley R. Steinberg and Joe L. Kincheloe, as well as an admirable addition in its own right to the growing and increasingly relevant literature exploring the importance of democracy, social justice, and critical social and pedagogical theories for contemporary social studies and citizenship education. Essentially, Hursh and Ross have brought together an impressive collection of leading scholar-educators, teachers and authors whose work deserves to be taken seriously by not only professional social studies educators but by all whose commitments and work connect them to the everyday challenges of public schooling and to the lives of teachers and learners.

In this review I first lay out the thematic orientations, questions, and perspectives that ground and link the various authors’ contributions. Next, I consider the specific pieces, especially as each is organized with others around particular topics and/or areas of pedagogical focus. I then present my subjective reading of the significant strengths and weaknesses of the book as a whole. Lastly, I explore the potential importance of Democratic Social Education in terms of its utility vis-à-vis theory and research, its possible pedagogical impact (e.g., upon social studies curriculum, instruction, teacher education, policy making, and so forth), and its overall critical contribution with respect to contemporary social studies education as a field relative to its myriad, complex, and dynamic goals, meanings, implications, and contexts.

Introduction: Themes and Orientations

In 1932 George Counts, in his speech “Dare the School Build a New Social Order?” explicitly challenged teachers to develop a democratic, socialist society. In this book
we take seriously the question of what social studies educators can do today to build a democratic society, in a society that is currently marked by antidemocratic impulses of greed, individualism, and intolerance. The essays in this collection respond to Counts’ question with theoretical analyses of education and society, historical analyses of efforts since Counts’ challenge, and practical analyses of classroom pedagogy and school organization. (Hursh & Ross, 2000b, p. 1)

Democratic Social Education indeed presents a multiple yet collective effort on the part of its contributors, many of whom are well known and important leaders in not only social studies education “proper” but also critical/radical pedagogy and its many diverse and evolving subfields, to deal with Counts’ (1932) classic question and its relevance for US social education at the dawn of the 21st century. As the title of the work implies, the authors struggle with the nature and meaning of democratic social/citizenship education, its relationship to social change, and the field’s ethical responsibility to create the conditions necessary for social and pedagogical justice. Each brings her or his own unique experiences, visions, perspectives, and areas of expertise to these and related critical issues, drawing from a range of applied and theoretical traditions and orientations, including Deweyan pragmatism, critical theory(ies), progressive teacher education, cultural studies/popular culture, postmodernism, neo-Marxist socio-economic theory, curriculum studies, Freirean pedagogy, feminist theory, multiculturalism, and participatory/collaborative evaluation.

According to Hursh and Ross (2000b), the included chapters set out to address, and can be understood within, three principal, related, and overlapping concerns, what they call “broad perennial debates that have been central to social studies and education” (p. 1): (1) that “focus[ing] on the social purposes of education, primarily examining the relationship between education and work and conceptions of citizenship” (p. 1); (2) that “focus[ing] on the social studies curriculum [and] whether it should be narrowly defined around the traditional social sciences...or more broadly defined to include multicultural perspectives, media, and the arts” (p. 1); and (3) that which “looks at the process of educating students: whether students are to be indoctrinated and instilled in particular ways of looking at the world or whether we are to develop democratic spaces within school and the larger social order” (p. 1). Overall, Hursh, Ross, and the other contributors to Democratic Social Education come down on the side of (1) “critical workers and citizens” as opposed to “education for economic productivity and political passivity” (p. 3) (or what Ross [2000] calls “spectator democracy” [p. 57]), (2) “curriculum diversity” as opposed
to "the uncritical canon" (p. 6), and (3) "critical thinking" as opposed to "indoctrination" (p. 11). In effect, the authors take on Counts' "dare" and answer in the affirmative—yes, a new social order, but in actuality a new new social order, one that truly is democratic and not so accommodating as was Counts (1932) to the "necessities" of the "bedbugs of imposition and indoctrination" (p. 15).

Moreover, as they approach these debates, the collected works and their authors address and problematize a number of additional and contested thematic concerns, including (among others) the interactive relationships between schools and society (e.g., the societal conditions which may or may not make possible the actualization of a democratic social education and vice versa), the contemporary relevance of the educational theories of John Dewey, the possibilities for "authentic" democracy within a setting of corporate-capitalist (and anti-democratic) political economics, the absurdity of pedagogical "neutrality," the crucial and central role of social studies in both elementary and secondary education (and, arguably, early childhood and higher education as well), and the meanings and implications of indoctrination, counterindoctrination, and anti-indoctrination in the pursuit of such critical ideals as democratic social justice, democratic social education, and democratic social change.

The Chapters: Perspectives, Possibilities, and Practices

The various chapters, according to Hursh and Ross (2000b), are arranged loosely into three roughly discernible sections and around three fluid and overlapping pursuits. The first (chapters 2-5), what Hursh and Ross call "continuing the tradition of democratic social education" (p. 13), encompasses essays by Wendy Kohli ("Teaching in the Danger Zone: Democracy and Difference"), Ross ("Redrawing the Lines: The Case against Traditional Social Studies Instruction"), William Stanley ("Curriculum and the Social Order"), and Sue Noffke ("Identity, Community, and Democracy in the 'New Social Order'"").

The second (chapters 6-8), "reenvisioning democracy and democratic discourse in education" (p. 15), consists of works by Henry Giroux ("Democratic Education and Popular Culture"), Kincheloe ("Cultural Studies and Democratically Aware Teacher Education: Post-Fordism, Civics, and the Worker-Citizen"), and Steinberg ("The New Civics: Teaching for Critical Empowerment").

The final grouping (chapters 9-14), "learning to teach democratically" (p. 16), presents the work of Perry Marker ("Not Only by Our Words: Connecting the Pedagogy of Paulo Freire with the Social Studies Classroom"), Gloria Ladson-Billings ("Put Up or Shut Up: The Challenge of Moving from Critical Theory to Critical Pedagogy [A Formative Assessment]"), Edward Buendia, Shuaib Meacham, and Noffke ("Community, Displacement, and Inquiry: Living Social Justice in a Social Studies Methods Course"),

The chapters by Kohli (2000), Ross (2000a), Stanley (2000), and Noffke (2000) set the theoretical stage for what follows, particularly in terms of excavating the key issues framing "democratic social education" as a concept, but also by (a) situating the notions of "democracy," "social studies," "citizenship," and "new social order" against a pedagogical backdrop grounded in the educational thought of Dewey and that of contemporary critical theorists and pedagogues, and (b) by paving the way toward an inclusive social praxis, one necessitating a reexamination and reorientation of current practices related to curriculum, instruction, evaluation, teacher education, and policy. More precisely, they present clear frameworks from which to explore and consider Counts' question. For Kohli and Ross, this means challenging the dominance of "traditional social studies instruction" (Ross, 2000a, p. 47; see also Ross' discussion of Leming's [1994] "defense"), a classroom culture characterized by teacher-centered knowledge transmission in the pursuit of students' formal content acquisition (principally vis-à-vis "cultural-literacy-type," disciplinary, testable facts and skills). For Ross, this kind of practice ultimately works to undermine genuine democracy (by, for example, reducing the position of "knower-citizen" to that of "detached spectator"; [Ross, 2000a, p. 50]). According to Kohli (2000), such practice cannot promote democracy if by that term we mean more than simply a technology with which to reproduce existing and hierarchical, normative and conforming, and oppressive and unjust structures of power and knowledge. Instead, what must first be recognized is "that this country was not built by and for only one group," and that in order to be politically, ethically, and pedagogically meaningful democracy must therefore be a "multicultural democracy of difference" (p. 36). For Kohli:

Multicultural democracy means that the leadership within our society should reflect the richness, colors, and diversity expressed in the lives of all our people. Multicultural democracy demands new types of power sharing and the reallocation of resources necessary to create economic and social development for those who have been systematically excluded and denied. (p. 36)

It demands "pedagogical strategies that move beyond the liberal and even critical traditions that have informed our teaching practices" (p. 37), "teaching against the grain" (p. 26), sharing with our students "dan-
gerous knowledge” (p. 31), and that we continue to question and request the economic, political, social, cultural, and pedagogical status quo (e.g., Is democratic society/social change even possible within a social setting of hyper-individualism and corporate-capitalist economics?).

For Ross (2000a) it necessitates “redrawing the lines,” an approach to education in which “learning is understood as synonymous with inquiry into problems faced by real people in their everyday lives” (p. 59). Here:

The goal of citizenship education...is not to inculcate students into capitalist democracy but rather to help students question, understand, and test the reality of the social world we inhabit...Remember that neutrality is not objectivity, and educators who are committed to helping students understand their own social situation and contribute to redressing social injustices must engage with students in active inquiry and analysis that resist the status quo. (p. 59)

In “Curriculum and the Social Order,” Stanley (2000) also takes up Counts’ “dare,” first by situating social reconstructionism historically within and against the competing contexts of pragmatism, child-centered progressivism (e.g., Kilpatrick), and “scientific” curriculum making (e.g., Bobbit), and second by posing the initial guiding question: “Is the reconstructionist approach to education still relevant in our current situation?” (p. 68). His answer emphatically is “yes”: “In the face of such widespread problems and threats to our democratic culture, the reconstructionist emphasis on incorporating social criticism into the school curriculum seems more relevant [now] than ever. [For students lacking the competence for critical analysis of our society would be unable to function as fully participating citizens” (p. 69). Yet Stanley’s call is for a “reconceptualized” reconstructionism, one rooted in Countsian social criticism, of course, but one that also takes seriously the equally socially committed critiques against the “inevitability of indoctrination” offered by pragmatists such as Dewey. For Stanley:

This reconceptualized approach to social reconstruction would not be neutral or ambivalent. It would promote democracy as a way of life and the centrality of practical judgment, including the necessity of social criticism. This is not an approach to curriculum that would ever be comfortable with the status quo, but it would not be aimed at
the realization of some fixed or final conception of society. (p. 72)

It would promote a new social order, but one much more unsettled and much less predictable than that imagined in the writings of Counts.

For Noffke (2000), responding meaningfully to Counts’ dare demands a pedagogy committed to: (1) “situating the child within the social context and the curriculum within the child’s identity”; (2) an understanding of the contingent nature of knowledge and the imperative of community engagement; and (3) linking social and political “democracy” with “economic justice” in an expanded interpretation of “citizen” (p. 78). Drawing deeply from the anti-racist and progressive struggles of African-American educators such as Carter G. Woodson and Septima Clark, Noffke reminds readers of the double-edged nature of positioning Counts’ challenge as a “dare.” On the one hand, the dare “represents as much an issue of determination and hope as [one] of means. Yet [on the other] the question of ‘dare’ the social studies build a new social order assumes it is a choice, not an imperative. It is a choice only for those already privileged. For many folks, the choice is never possible” (p. 80).

According to Giroux (2000), Kincheloe (2000), and Steinberg (2000), whose contributions make up the second section of the book, this lack of choice among many citizens stems from—and thus must be understood within the contexts of—those contemporary forces restricting and actively working against the possibilities of authentic democracy. These reactionary, defensive, and increasingly entrenched antidemocratic structures seek to protect various elites and their positions of relative political and economic power—as well as asymmetric and oppressive hierarchies more generally—from the hope and optimism of democratic education, democratic social change, and a new and democratic social order. For Giroux, these conditions include, among others, racism, poverty, and “the [still significant] legacy of neoconservatism” (p. 85). For Kincheloe, they involve “Post-Fordist” political economics and the controlling characteristics of “techno-power.” And for Steinberg, they reflect a power-induced, media-perpetuated “epidemic of cynicism,” “hyperreality,” and “the privatization of democracy” (esp. pp. 127-129). For each, such antidemocratic and unjust circumstances oblige educators to create a curriculum that takes seriously the challenges and potentialities of the media and of popular culture and of redefining the very “nature” of public, citizen, democracy, and social order.

According to Kincheloe (2000), “Focusing as it does on the production and legitimation of knowledge, cultural studies in a college of education opens new conversations about and understandings of the tacit assumptions embedded in the education subdisciplines” (p. 97).
Cultural studies asks [for example]: What are the origins of the ways we construct the curriculum of educational leadership? How do culture and power relations affect the criteria for assessment in special education student placement? What are the political implications of the definitions of intelligence employed by educational psychologists? What cultural narratives ground the way methods courses teach students how to teach? What types of worker-citizens do we expect to produce in the schools where our teachers teach? (pp. 97-98)

In response to such questions, and within the current conservative climate of competition, individualism, and Post-Fordism, he counters:

Understanding that techno-power grants corporate leaders control of a photocentric, aural, and television-directed culture in which electronic images produce knowledge, political perspectives, and identity, critical democratic educators [must] devise a curriculum that confronts techno-power. Such a curriculum is based on three principles: (1) it examines the historical context of particular assumptions techno-power makes about the role of workers, the nature of the workplace, and the needs of business; (2) it devises new ways of analyzing the pronouncements of techno-power, as it refuses to passively accept corporate representations of the world; and (3) it grounds its examinations of the worldviews presented by techno-power on the question: Whose interests are being served by the portrayals in question? (p. 115)

While Kincheloe argues that such a curriculum must consider the imperatives of "economic citizenship," and that it necessitates, in effect, a "cultural studies-driven teacher education" (p. 117), Giroux (2000) maintains that at its core—a reenvisioned center dedicated to "defining a transformative pedagogical practice"—must be "the issue of radical democracy" (p. 94). "It [radical democracy] means creating forms of self-management in all major political, economic, and cultural spheres of society. It also means restructuring social relations so that power flows from the base of society and not from the top" (p. 94). It implies further "the necessity for progressive educators to develop a collective vision in which traditional binarisms of margin-center, unity-difference, local-national, and public-private can be reconstituted through more complex representations of identification, be-
longing, and community” (p. 95). For Steinberg (2000) it means that we need a “new civics and social studies [that] are dedicated to an empowerment of students that results in their improved capacity to shape their own lives....[one in which social studies is an] interdisciplinary tool with which we are able to create democratic and [italics added] cultural citizenship” (p. 131).

In the final section of their book, Hursh and Ross provide essays in which democratic social education is placed into practice and in which the contingencies inhibiting such practice are interrogated, deconstructed, and radically and openly critiqued. Marker (2000) begins this effort by framing the conditions of a classroom praxis created via a commitment to social justice and to the needs of democratic society and democratic social change. Grounding his work in the “anti-banking” pedagogy of Paulo Freire (esp. 1970; Freire & Macedo, 1987), Marker lays out a mode of curriculum and instruction constructed upon: (1) “planning with [italics added] students,” (2) “the importance of student critique,” and (3) the dynamic characteristics of “teaching for democracy and [social] transformation.” Essentially his is a praxis of “problem-posing” and authentic “dialogue,” one built on asking students questions such as: “What do we know about what we are studying? What do we not know? [and] What do we want to find out about what we don’t know?” (pp. 139-140). It depends on students and teachers collectively discovering and choosing resources and, consistent with the needs of democratic social transformation, “ask[ing] students what specific proposals they can make to implement their findings” (p. 141).

The chapters by Ladson-Billings (2000), Buendia, Meacham, and Noffke (2000), and Hursh, Goldstein, and Griffith (2000) all in some way address the roles of university workers relative to the demands of democratic classroom education. Ladson-Billings describes her (and others’) work at the University of Wisconsin to implement a social reconstructionist, multicultural teacher certification program (known as “Teach for Diversity” or “TFD”). She presents a detailed yet concise explanation of how the program was planned and how it is implemented, and a comprehensive and forthright critique of both its various strengths (e.g., a growing commitment on the part of participants) and its various weaknesses (e.g., a failure to anticipate the ideological dogma of some prospective teachers). Buendia, Meacham, and Noffke explore their own efforts to create and actualize a social reconstructionist elementary social studies methods course, and to interrogate and understand its successes, its conceptualizations, and its inherent “constraints and struggles” (p. 175). Particularly enlightening is their extensive list of resources that might benefit not only progressive social studies teacher educators, but also practicing social studies teachers (and elementary educators generally; see especially
Lastly, Hursh, Goldstein, and Griffith relate their experiences in working collaboratively with classroom teachers "to develop a high school seminar that counters the conservative thrust toward individualism, competition, and [the] uncritical preparation for work" (p. 189). They, like Ladson-Billings and Buendia, Meacham, and Noffke, recount their triumphs (unit planning with students) as well as their difficulties, most especially overcoming student "silence" and student "resistance."

In "Diverting Democracy," Ross (2000b) interrogates and challenges standards-based education "reform" (SBER) as incompatible with the demands of a democratic social education (as well as a democratic society). He argues that the standards movement—particularly the national drive toward curriculum standards—contradicts at least three characteristics fundamental to anti-traditional (that consistent with social and pedagogical transformation) and democratic settings of schools and societies: (1) the inevitable role of teachers in curriculum development; (2) the possibilities of alternative modes of teacher education (sacrificed so that prospective teachers might become more "competent" in forcing their students to conform to the demands of high-stakes standardized tests); and (3) the democratic imperative of the "Deweyan ideal" of "grassroots curriculum development" (p. 223). Simply, contemporary curriculum standardization efforts represent a reactionary understanding of democratization and democratic change, an effort to reinforce existing and unjust hierarchies of political, cultural, and economic (and, thus, pedagogical) power, the privileging of the anti-democratic mechanisms of global-corporate-statist-individualist systems of capitalism (i.e., profit at the expense of the common good), and the "normalization" of dominant and "received" knowledges and modes of seeing.

In the final chapter, Mathison (2000) responds to Counts' challenge by offering a framework within which to conceptualize the possibilities of evaluation as a pedagogical means for promoting the conditions and characteristics of democracy. She advocates a "deliberative" and "participatory, collaborative evaluation" that is, as she suggests, "by definition consistent with [authentic] notions of democracy" (p. 229).

Because deliberation is a primary means by which democratic ideals are promoted and because deliberation is key to the process of evaluation, then evaluation has the potential to contribute to the creation of democracy. Evaluation, if done well, is democratizing. It requires that individuals and groups with vested interests in what is being evaluated engage in genuine deliberation about how to
Mathison’s work is appreciated and all the more timely given social and critical educators’ tendencies either to ignore evaluation and assessment completely, to assume all evaluation and assessment is oppressive, and/or to focus on the antidemocratic problematics of standardized testing without simultaneously offering relevant and democratic alternatives.

A Critique

Democratic Social Education is characterized by a number of significant strengths, not the least of which is its fundamental readability. Given today’s trends in critical (educational and otherwise) scholarship toward “difficult writing,” inaccessible language, and the necessity among some authors to make even the simplest and most obvious concepts and conclusions appear difficult and thus beyond the range of all but the most specialized readers, this indeed is no small editorial feat. Readers should find the collection of Hursh and Ross well written, lively, interesting, timely, and approachable.

This is not to say that their work is simplistic, or that it in any way treats demanding topics carelessly or without sufficient academic and theoretical rigor. On the contrary. Democratic Social Education tackles extremely complicated and troublesome issues, yet its contributors manage to present them with both intricacy and precision. That they are able to bring such a range of complicated critical, social, philosophical, and pedagogical perspectives—extending across the domains of multiculturalism, feminist theory, postmodernism, cultural studies, neo-Marxism, and so forth—to their efforts in a straightforward and intelligible way is a testament to their commendable individual and collaborative achievements.

A second strength of the book is the success with which the authors get at those topics representing the “essence” of current social studies education. As they contextualize and explore critically positioned and democratic theories, and then, in turn, seek to connect them to the prosaics of everyday classroom life, they manage, in effect, to present a holistic program of democratic social education—philosophically grounded and consistent relative to the elements of aim, curriculum, methodology, evaluation, policy, and teacher education.

Moreover, in promoting democratic social change, they recognize and pursue several crucial points, among them: (1) that the relationships between schools and societies must be taken seriously (in that, for example, neither can “transform” the other in isolation); (2) that these relationships are neither linear nor predictable, but instead interactive, fluid, often seemingly chaotic, overlapping, and problem-
atic; and (3) that truly democratic pedagogical and social change must begin at the grassroots level, that it is a collective struggle that cannot be imposed from the top or "indoctrinated into" teachers, students, and community members.

Hursh, Ross, and the other contributors understand the complexities of both democratic social/citizenship education and democratic social transformation. Their call, therefore, for a stronger, more significant, and central role for social studies throughout all levels of schooling, and their commitment to the role of the social studies vis-à-vis a new and more democratic social order, ring true. They accept and welcome the political and non-neutral nature of all teaching, and are willing, therefore, to critique not only current pedagogical practices but their own cultural/pedagogical/scholarly work as well.

Lastly, readers should find the individual pieces (as well as the book as a whole) to be well-laid out, well-organized, well-documented, and well-written. Again, this is a major plus given the contemporary status of much socio-pedagogical scholarship.

One suggestion would be (perhaps for what I anticipate will be a second or revised edition) to include a summary or conclusion-type chapter, one in which Hursh and Ross review and react to the essays of the various contributors. This concern, however, does not in the least diminish or detract from my opinion of the book. It is a welcomed and sophisticated contribution to the social studies literature produced by some of our field's strongest scholar-advocates.

Conclusions: Impact, Importance, Implications

If, as they should, social studies professionals (practitioners as well as theorists/researchers) and policy makers take the work of Democratic Social Education to heart, then its conceivable impact, importance, and implications are potentially great. First and foremost, these various works should drive the production of theory and research, especially with respect to the relevance and significance of cultural studies/popular culture; the complex, dynamic, and multiple relationships between schools and societies; the meanings of citizen(ship) and democracy; and the characteristics of a desirable (and new) new social order.

Second, Hursh and Ross' efforts should weigh on the design, development, and implementation of curriculum. For by challenging the dominance of Traditional Social Studies Instruction, their work implies a more inclusive mode of content selection and subject matter orientation—indeed, a threat to the fundamental hegemony of external and top-down, standardized approaches to knowledge in/exclusion.

Moreover, their collaboration should influence greatly the mechanisms of classroom practice, especially in terms of teacher-student-
community collectivity (see, e.g., Marker, 2000; Ross, 2000b). The potential exists here for a grass-roots curriculum and instruction—a democratic classroom praxis—in which teachers work with and not on their students. Such an approach demands a commitment to problem-posing, dialogue, and the socio-pedagogical conditions of justice and public democracy.

Perhaps, though, the greatest impact of this work could be in the field of teacher education. Democratic Social Education suggests a teacher education that is collaborative—involving students, teachers, community members, university personnel—and democratic—inclusive, comprehensive, and non-indoctrinational. Given the readability of this collection, teacher educators should be able successfully to include it as either a primary or supplemental text for their undergraduate social studies and general methods courses and for various courses in the foundations of US education, as well as for more advanced graduate work in the field. Clearly, there is substance here for readers of all levels, and Democratic Social Education should prove useful as an introduction for beginners as well as a review for scholars and as an insightful critical treatise for experienced specialists. Perhaps most importantly, this work should grab the attention of policy makers and make them take notice of the significance of change in terms of educational reform.

Hurst, Ross, and their collaborators indeed seek a new, new social order. Democratic Social Education provides at least a starting point, if not a critical and imperative blueprint, for social and pedagogical change. They are to be congratulated.

Notes

1 The earlier contributions to the series are Real-World Reading in Art Education: Things your Professor Never Told You, by Dennis E. Fehr, Kristen K. Fehr, and Karen Keifer-Boyd (2000), and The Dramatic Arts and Cultural Studies: Acting Against the Grain, by Kathleen S. Berry (1999).

2 Note that several of the chapters originally appeared in a special issue of the International Journal of Social Education (1996, volume 11, number 1).

3 According to Ross’s (2000a) critique, Traditional Social Studies Instruction (or “TSSI” as represented in the work of Leming’s [1994] fictional teacher “Mr. Jones”): is based on a doctrine of inevitability, in which the status quo is accepted without serious examination. Current circumstances are understood as merely the way the world is and reflective of the general consent of the populace. In this way of thinking, conceptions of the roles of teachers and students in schools and the conventional goals of education must remain unchallenged. Thus TSSI accepts the lines as drawn and deflects questions about how education is used as a means of social control and to what ends. It leaves no room to consider questions such as: What do we mean by democracy? What kind of democracy do we want? (p. 50).

Here, and throughout this chapter, Ross’s criticism is thorough and fundamentally convincing.
In many ways these chapters connect with Giroux, Kincheloe, and Steinberg’s continuing project of linking schooling to transformative pedagogy and popular/media culture (see, e.g., Giroux, 1994; Steinberg & Kincheloe, 1997).
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With the current standards push in all schools, the concept of theme approach instruction is ever more popular and needed. Lindquist and Selwyn do an exemplary job of breaking the barriers of fact based social studies teaching by weaving all disciplines into social studies curricula.

Within their book *Social Studies at the Center: Integrating Kids, Content, and Literacy*, they explain that social studies can be the hub of a teacher’s entire school day, with every topic organized around a central theme or concept. Selwyn believes, “There is nothing that is not social studies. Everything happens in context, in an interdependent and interrelated world” (p. 186).

This integrated approach promotes the understanding of the connections among disciplines and activities. The concept of separate discipline based classes are old and outdated. The implication of dividing knowledge into different subject matter is a 350 year-old theory largely based on white dominant males. Current research shows us “as we learn to listen to the female voice, gain greater understanding of the perspectives of indigenous peoples, and become more global, our curriculum will need to reflect richer views of how humans construct meaning” (Costa, Liebmann, p. 23). This new view, which is incorporated within Lindquist and Selwyn’s beliefs, encourages teaching methods, which will ease the pressure of covering large bodies of information. It takes the onerous off the almighty test and allows children to be self-initiating and self-evaluating in their own learning process. These authors successfully walk the reader through the process of integrated curriculum allowing the child to experience personal meaning in the learning process, which is much more valuable than the accumulation of facts.

The organization of the book lends itself to a variety of purposes. The authors begin by describing their views of social studies and the philosophical beliefs of organizing a student’s educational experience around social studies; then, each author takes the reader by the hand and leads them through the thought and structural process of organizing a learning unit. The book concludes with the two authors an-
swering a variety of questions that they have been confronted with on many occasions while presenting workshops on social studies as the center. They then incorporate a chapter filled with a variety of resources, websites, and favorite strategies that may assist educators in implementing this form of teaching style. The reader closes the book with the sense that he/she has just ended a one on one conversation with the authors, discussing the integrated approach and how it extends a learner’s critical and creative thinking power. This in addition, increases the likelihood that students will see the content as interesting and important.

The authors offer students a chance to demonstrate that they possess sophisticated knowledge and understanding that goes beyond their skills of reading and writing, and center on the child’s uniqueness and life experiences. Lindquist and Selwyn create educational environments that inspire and motivate teachers to become a different type of educator, an educator that is willing to take chances and break away from the existing parameters and styles to try out new methods and content. This view of education centers on extending student knowledge by applying it to the lives of people and their social conditions, proposing solutions to societal problems, or recognizing responsibility to their community. Lindquist explains that a perfect end of a unit allows for students to reflect and recognize that new questions have grown out of their new understanding which results in student action. “It leads to the next step, which is independent student participation within the community, either in giving service, righting wrongs, or identifying needs” (p182).

Douglas Selwyn artistically describes how family stories provide children with a link to their own personal background, including cultural diversity, hardships, personality traits, and many other aspects. These links help a child to identify and construct a more whole self. Children strive to make sense out of the world around them. This can only be achieved through a dialectical relationship between experience and the new knowledge.

Many teachers depend on the almighty textbook, however, Jean Anyon makes it clear that many of the topics traditionally covered in textbooks have no clear relation to students’ own experiences, and texts rarely suggest how such topics might be relevant. The challenge for the teacher, then, lies in deciding what aspects of important content match up with elements of students’ lives. Selwyn has demonstrated that the most important way of personalizing education lies in the connection students’ make with their own families and experiences. Using family histories as part of instruction represents the very height of authenticity. According to Dewey, it engages students in precisely the kind of historical understanding that exists outside of school.
Personal stories help students understand that they, themselves, have histories which become much more meaningful when they are linked to other stories, and students begin to see themselves as participants in narratives larger than those of their own lives do.

Anyon goes on to state, "not knowing the history of their own group—its dissent and conflict—may produce a social amnesia or ‘forgetting’" (Anyon, p. 32). The reification of ideas and knowledge into given facts and generalizations that exist separately from one’s biography or discovery contributes to the commodification of knowledge” (Anyon, p. 33). Incorporating material that relates to different students’ situatedness would empower them in a variety of ways. Within Selwyn’s immigration unit he demonstrates that students get to know not just about the family they were born into, but about their extended identity as well: who they are, what their place in the world is, and what they can claim as their personal cultural heritage.

This sense of an enduring connection can be invaluable to a child’s development, particularly in a world where so many things are short-lived and disposable. We currently teach the students who are in much need of connecting and rejoicing in their identities, rote factual information that will kill their creativity and create passive learners. This has resulted in schools that reinforce the separation of curriculum from the child’s life experience. The result for education being, curriculum verses the child, rather than curriculum and the child. However, when Lindquist and her students create a unit it is, “a highly integrated, kid-focused, social studies centered, worth-while unit that provides students with a lifelong model for investigating issues and determining personal opinions using intellectual tools rather than knee-jerk emotions” (p.78).

The authors do a wonderful job incorporating music, art, dance, and language arts within the elementary social studies classroom. Yet, I hope they apply their experience and knowledge in the area of integration to produce a second book with more of a concentration on the relationship of math and science to the social studies curriculum. The field of education could benefit tremendously from their insights into the incorporation of integrated curriculum and additional models of units would be helpful for teachers to view and apply full integration.

This book would work well in a teacher preparation program. Preparing elementary teachers for the realization that most schools have 186 teaching days and to accomplish the required curriculum within each discipline is an impossible task, unless the teacher is trained in an integrated approach. Books like this may impact teacher training programs to alter their discipline based method classes to a more holistic integrated approach which will prepare future teachers with the skills and the content knowledge necessary to build and implement such programs.
Any elementary teacher, from novice to experienced, would be well served in reading Social Studies at the Center. Lindquist and Selwyn provide the inspiration and model for educators to be willing to let students run with ideas or questions and not be halted by state mandates and structural constraints. Lindquist and Selwyn, recognize the constraint teachers are faced with concerning standards and state assessments, however, they value the teachers as autonomous curriculum builders. “We design units in ways that make the most sense, informed by our students, the particular content which we are working, and the skills we want our students to have and hone. We teach in ways that maximize understanding, active learning, and involvement” (p.169). The autonomy and curricular building knowledge of the teacher is key in developing this kind of program.

One cannot deny the importance of the elementary years in laying the foundation for later and increasingly mature understanding of civic responsibility and the information and the skills necessary to make informed rational decisions as a citizen of a democracy. An integrated – centered social studies curriculum provides the opportunities to develop those skills and to foster a life-long habit of active participation for living in a democracy.

We live in a time when nearly all reform efforts and criticisms of the schools are framed by reducing our options and narrowing our vision. We must become aware of these forces, and move away from practices that sacrifice diversity, integrity, and create narrowness and blame. More voices need to be heard within the educational arena and Lindquist and Selwyn are worth listening to.
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