



SOCIAL STUDIES TODAY

Research and Practice

SECOND EDITION

Walter C. Parker, Editor



SOCIAL STUDIES TODAY

Social Studies Today will help educators—teachers, curriculum specialists, and researchers—think deeply about contemporary social studies education. More than simply learning *about* key topics, this collection invites readers to *think through* some of the most relevant, dynamic, and challenging questions animating social studies education today.

With 12 new chapters highlighting recent developments in the field, the second edition features the work of major scholars such as James Banks, Diana Hess, Joel Westheimer, Meira Levinson, Sam Wineburg, Beth Rubin, Keith Barton, Margaret Crocco, and more. Each chapter tackles a specific question on issues such as the difficulties of teaching historical thinking in the classroom, responding to high-stakes testing, teaching patriotism, judging the credibility of Internet sources, and teaching with film and geospatial technologies.

Accessible, compelling, and practical, these chapters—full of rich examples and illustrations—showcase some of the most original thinking in the field, and offer pre- and in-service teachers alike a panoramic window on social studies curriculum and instruction and new ways to improve them.

Walter C. Parker is Professor and Chair of Social Studies Education and (by courtesy) Professor of Political Science at the University of Washington, Seattle.

This page intentionally left blank

SOCIAL STUDIES TODAY

Research and Practice

Second Edition

Walter C. Parker, Editor

Second edition published 2015
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2015 Taylor & Francis

The right of the editor to be identified as the author of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

First edition published by Routledge 2010

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Social Studies today: research and practice / [edited by] Walter C. Parker. —2nd ed.
pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Social sciences—Study and teaching (Secondary)
2. Social sciences—Study and teaching (Middle school)

I. Parker, Walter.

H62.S72471925 2015

300.71'2—dc23

2014039107

ISBN: 978-1-138-84681-4 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-138-84604-3 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-72688-5 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by RefineCatch Limited, Bungay, Suffolk

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	<i>ix</i>
Introduction	1
1 Social Studies Education eC21 <i>Walter C. Parker</i>	3
PART I	
Purpose Matters	15
2 Social Studies and the Social Order: Transmission or Transformation? <i>William B. Stanley</i>	17
3 The Social Studies Wars, Now and Then <i>Ronald W. Evans</i>	25
4 Why Don't More History Teachers Engage Students in Interpretation? <i>Keith C. Barton and Linda S. Levstik</i>	35
5 High-Stakes Testing: How are Social Studies Teachers Responding? <i>S.G. Grant</i>	43

vi Contents

6	Authentic Intellectual Work: Common Standards for Teaching Social Studies <i>M. Bruce King, Fred M. Newmann, and Dana L. Carmichael</i>	53
7	Achieving Authentic Pedagogy: Plan Units, Not Lessons <i>John Saye and Associates</i>	65
8	Putting Bloom's Taxonomy to Rest <i>Roland Case</i>	73
PART II		
	Perspective Matters	83
9	Education and Diversity <i>James A. Banks, Peter Cookson, Geneva Gay, Willis D. Hawley, Jacqueline Jordan Irvine, Sonia Nieto, Janet Ward Schofield, and Walter Stephan</i>	85
10	Isn't Culturally Responsive Instruction Just Good Teaching? <i>Kathryn H. Au</i>	95
11	Silence on Gays and Lesbians in Social Studies Curriculum <i>Stephen J. Thornton</i>	105
12	Race, Gender, and the Teaching and Learning of National History <i>Terrie Epstein and Jessica Shiller</i>	113
13	Should Social Studies be Patriotic? <i>Joel Westheimer</i>	120
14	Building the Civic Potential of Immigrant Youth <i>Kathryn M. Obenchain and Rebecca M. Callahan</i>	127
PART III		
	Subject Matters	135
15	What Can <i>Forrest Gump</i> Tell Us About Students' Historical Understanding? <i>Sam Wineburg, Susan Mosborg, and Dan Porat</i>	137

16	What Does It Mean To Think Historically . . . and How Do You Teach It?	144
	<i>Bruce VanSledright</i>	
17	Assessing Students' Historical Arguments	151
	<i>Chauncey Monte-Sano</i>	
18	What Do Children Know About Cultural Universals?	160
	<i>Jere Brophy and Janet Alleman</i>	
19	Holocaust Fatigue in Schools Today	168
	<i>Simone Schweber</i>	
20	High Quality Civic Education: What Is It and Who Gets It?	179
	<i>Joseph Kahne and Ellen Middaugh</i>	
21	Action Civics in the Classroom	189
	<i>Meira Levinson</i>	
22	Civic Identity Development in the U.S. History Course	198
	<i>Beth C. Rubin</i>	
PART IV		
Global Matters		207
23	Using Literature to Teach About Others: The Case of <i>Shabanu</i>	209
	<i>Margaret Smith Crocco</i>	
24	The Two World Histories	217
	<i>Ross E. Dunn</i>	
25	Around the World with Geospatial Technologies	230
	<i>Andrew J. Milson and Joseph J. Kerski</i>	
26	Keeping, Making, and Building Peace in School	238
	<i>Kathy Bickmore</i>	
27	Judging the Credibility of Internet Sources	246
	<i>Mark Baildon and James Damico</i>	

PART V	
Puzzles	255
28 Discussion in Social Studies: Is it Worth the Trouble? <i>Diana Hess</i>	257
29 What Constrains Meaningful Social Studies Teaching? <i>Catherine Cornbleth</i>	266
30 Can Tolerance be Taught? <i>Patricia G. Avery</i>	275
31 Are Middle Schoolers “Ready” for Intellectual Challenge? <i>Hilary G. Conklin</i>	284
32 Teaching <i>With</i> and <i>About</i> Film <i>Jeremy Stoddard</i>	292
<i>Permissions</i>	301
<i>Index</i>	304

PREFACE

The chapters in this book are brief essays on some of the most important questions animating social studies education today. These include foundational issues and more: What is the core subject matter of social studies? How is social studies different from the social sciences? Do children need to learn anything at school about food, shelter, and clothing, or are these cultural universals learned at home? Is that most-prized pedagogy, classroom discussion, worth the trouble? Can tolerance be taught? Do students from different social groups learn the same history lesson differently? What is the testing-and-accountability frenzy doing to social studies?

The book grew from my column “Research and Practice” in *Social Education*, the flagship journal of the National Council for the Social Studies. That column in turn grew from a concern expressed often in NCSS that social studies researchers and practitioners are living on two different planets. I understand that concern but I don’t subscribe to it.

I have inhabited both planets since I began teaching social studies in a school district on the north side of Denver. I taught there for ten years, studying and practicing teaching the entire time, learning from my colleagues and my own mistakes. Then I shifted gears, went to graduate school, studied the philosophy and sociology of education, curriculum and instruction, and social studies education, and eventually joined the faculty at the University of Texas and then the University of Washington where I teach today.

The book’s 32 chapters were published over the past several years in my “Research and Practice” column, thanks to contributions from some of the field’s top scholars. Happily, the column has been recognized by the Association of Educational Publishers with its “best column” award.

My Introduction ([Chapter 1](#)) interprets the social studies field today and sketches the book’s five themes. But first, please notice the “and” in the subtitle of

x Preface

this book. It is not research *into* practice, nor *from* research *to* practice, research *on* practice, or any other suggestion of hierarchy or sequence. “And” is a term of equality. Research and practice are on equal footing. This is what John Dewey meant by “the double movement of reflection” in his 1910 book *How We Think*. The point is that “Research and Practice” is another name for normal life. We humans do things intentionally (this is practice), and we reflect on what those things mean (this is research). We then test our countless little theories in countless new experiences, and we use the new experiences to revise those theories, and so forth. This is how we get on in the world. It is as true when we are trying to grow tomatoes in the backyard, summer after summer, as when we are trying to raise children, teach history or geography, govern a country, or discover a cure for cancer. When we joke, “Don’t bother me with the facts, I’ve already made up my mind,” we acknowledge that our research has ended, that we believe a particular theory and aren’t going to pay attention to experience—evidence—any more. When we say, “I’m a practical sort of person who doesn’t put much stock in theories,” we mean that we’re not thinking about what we’re doing, which of course isn’t true. Actually, we are, all of us, loaded up with theories *and* experiences. Everyone is a researcher and a practitioner. Everyone inhabits both planets. They are, in fact, the same planet. Together, “Research and Practice” equal learning.

Walter C. Parker, Seattle

Introduction

This page intentionally left blank

1

SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION eC21

Walter C. Parker

Social studies is at the center of a good school curriculum because it is where students learn to see and interpret the world—its peoples, places, cultures, systems, and problems; its dreams and calamities—now and long ago. In social studies lessons and units of study, students don't simply experience the world but are helped deliberately to understand it, to care for it, to think deeply and critically about it, and to take their place on the public stage. This, at any rate, is the goal.

It matters, for without social understanding, there can be no wisdom. Good judgment has always relied on the long view; historical understanding. This involves long-term thinking and long-term responsibility alongside an intimate knowledge of particulars. So it is with the other social literacies: without geographic understanding there can be no cultural or environmental intelligence; without economic understanding, no sane use of resources; without political understanding, no *We The People*, no freedom, and no common good; and without these in combination, no inventive work to build a just and sustainable society, both locally and globally.

One thing is clear: such wisdom cannot be achieved by a handful of courses in a middle or high school curriculum. Social studies needs to be set deeply into the school curriculum from the earliest grades. What results is a snowball effect: knowledge growing each year on its own momentum, empowering students with each passing year. I can remember the teachers at my junior high school in Colorado, thinking that those of us who came from Lowell Elementary School were the smart kids. We were certainly not the smart kids, just ordinary working- and middle-class children who were lucky enough to have been taught social studies daily and with good materials since kindergarten. Consequently, we knew quite a lot about the world and, for this reason, were better able (and therefore more willing) to learn new material.

Educational researchers dub this the Matthew Effect¹ after that section in the biblical Book of Matthew where we read that the rich get richer and the poor poorer. The rich get richer because they can invest their surplus—what they're not spending to live—thereby earning still more, which they reinvest, and so on, becoming more wealthy. The Matthew Effect in education is based on the fact that prior knowledge is a powerful predictor of future learning. The knowledge and skills children *already* possess—the investment in learning that already has been made—enables them to learn still more. Knowledgeable students become more knowledgeable because their prior knowledge serves as a fertile seedbed in which additional knowledge can take root and thrive. Switching metaphors, knowledgeable students are building a house atop a foundation that already has been laid. This is much easier than building the house at the same time they are struggling to lay its foundation. Here's the point: not having access to social studies learning from the earliest levels of schooling is disabling intellectually and socially.

The Book's Purpose

The purpose of this book is to help teachers, school leaders, curriculum workers, policymakers, and scholars think freshly and critically about social studies education. More than thinking *about* it, however, the book's purpose is to engage readers in thinking *through* some of the most intriguing questions that animate social studies education today, and to do so with the help of some of the field's top scholars. While the book's setting is largely the United States, I believe it can be useful elsewhere, too, as a contrast, a comparison, and a reflective mirror. Some of the most important questions are hardly unique to any one country.

Why, for example, do so few middle and high school history teachers engage their students in actually doing historical work: making, supporting, and evaluating claims about historical events and forces? Is the teacher's own historical knowledge too spotty for that? Is the school's climate stifling? Are students simply not "ready" for the intellectual challenge of interrogating a thesis or constructing one of their own? Are they able only to listen to adults *tell* them a historical narrative? Furthermore, and connecting school learning to democratic citizenship, aren't there serious consequences for democracy if high school graduates haven't learned to distinguish between a claim that is supported by evidence, on the one hand, and one told to them by an authority figure, whether a teacher, pastor, or politician?

Consider a second question, this one involving the youngest students. Is there really a need to teach about cultural universals in the primary grades? It seems obvious that children already know so much about food, shelter, and clothing simply as a consequence of being alive—eating pizza, living in an apartment, wearing shoes and socks—that taking precious school time for it is redundant. Or, is their knowledge of these powerful concepts frail and loaded with misconceptions

(e.g., people eat food because they're hungry; they wear clothes because it's cold), hardly the foundation needed to support later learning?

Each one of the book's chapters opens a unique window on the social studies education scene early in the twenty-first century: eC21. "eC21" draws on Raymond Williams' system for historical dating where *e*, *m*, and *l* designate the early, middle, and late thirds of a century. Williams, who had an original analytic mind, wrote *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*.² In that book, he grappled with more than 100 terms that are central to our thinking but fundamentally ambiguous. They are always in flux and, because they are important, subject to argument, for example, *history*, *culture*, *educated*, *science*, *ideology*, and *democracy*. Williams didn't take these concepts at face value. He didn't try simply to define them; he tried to get to the bottom of them and to place them in historical context.

His work inspired the book you have in your hands in a basic way: I wanted to present an array of contemporary thinking about social studies education so that readers could deepen their understanding of this field but also so they could look critically at how contemporary scholars are thinking and writing about social studies today in its various aspects. It is a book about social studies education, but it is also a book about how we construct social studies education, again and again, by enacting it, describing it, and debating its means and ends. *Social studies* is the keyword of this book. It is a concept, a social construct. It is human-made like a pyramid, not natural like a tree; its meanings change with time, place, and political context. Social studies education is contingent, buffeted by social forces, and it reflects the anxieties, power dynamics, and "culture wars" of the day.

Contentious Curricula

The term "social studies" means different things to different people. Generally, in the United States today it connotes a loose federation of social science courses: history (world, national, and state), geography, government, economics, sociology, psychology, and anthropology. "Social Studies," as such, is the name of a *department* in middle and high schools—the department that houses courses with names like these—and of a *subject* in primary schools. In the latter, "social studies" is an amalgamation of these social science disciplines and is thereby distinct from two other amalgamations found in the primary school curriculum: "science" (biology + geology + physics, etc.) and "math" (arithmetic + algebra + geometry, etc.) Reading, writing, speaking, and listening—together "language arts"—are another amalgamation. The first four of the social science disciplines (history, geography, government, economics) are dominant in eC21, which is a consequence of tradition, interest group politics (historians are better organized and bigger than the others), and to some extent the standards and accountability movement that began in 1C20. That movement narrowed the curriculum in some communities to the point where social studies was edged to the sidelines in favor of still greater

attention to literacy and math instruction and, because of current anxieties about economic and military competitiveness, science and technology.

Defenders of the loose federation approach have sought foremost to maintain the disciplinary integrity of each of the social sciences. At its best, this approach gave birth to the “inquiry” teaching movement in social studies (still much revered if scarcely practiced). That movement aimed to help students reconstruct, by their own intellectual efforts, the central concepts and generalizations of a discipline.³ At its worst, however, the approach made more than a few scholars into rigid disciplinarians guarding the disciplinary gates and defending what they think is disciplinary purity from polluters who would scramble the disciplines into an interdisciplinary omelet. Here, the integrity of an individual scholarly discipline, often history (or in math, algebra, or in science, physics), is held to be superior to competitors (e.g., geography) and to the jumble the subject is believed to become amid the pressures of curriculum enactment in schools: not history, algebra, and physics but “social studies,” “math,” and “science.”⁴ Neo-conservative federation-ists in the 1980s invented the hyphenated terms “history-social studies” and “history-social science” to draw a line between the egg and the omelet. One can imagine the result were this practice to be extended to the other federations, resulting in the names “algebra-math” and “physics-science.”

In contrast to social studies as a federation of the several social sciences, there stands another meaning that is less attached to disciplinary purity than to the development of students as enlightened and engaged democratic citizens. This approach is sometimes called “social education.”⁵ It defines social studies as “the integrated study of the social sciences and humanities to promote civic competence”⁶; not the study of the social sciences for their own sakes, note, but for a civic purpose. Its aim is enlightened political engagement, we could say, or informed civic action. Its strategy is to combat *idiocy*, by which the ancient Greeks meant selfishness and inattention to public issues, and to nurture civic intelligence. This is a goal rooted in republican political thought, from Aristotle to Hannah Arendt. Its thesis is that neither humans nor their communities mature properly until individuals meet the challenge of *puberty*, which to the Greeks meant becoming public persons. These are people who see freedom and community not as opposites but as interdependent. They fight for others’ rights as well as their own. As Aristotle wrote, “individuals are so many parts all equally depending on the whole which alone can bring self-sufficiency.”⁷ *Idiots* are *idiotic* because they are ignorant of this insight and indifferent to the conditions and contexts of their own freedom. Idiots do not take part in public life; they do not *have* a public life. In this sense, idiots are immature in the most fundamental way. Their lives are out of balance, disoriented, untethered, and unrealized. For this reason, they are a threat not only to themselves but to the community.⁸

The two models, *social science* and *social education*, overlap and exist in tension with one another. It is a useful, productive tension, like others in education (depth/breadth, knowing/doing, child/curriculum). Consequently, much better

than choosing between the two is to intersect them artfully, maintaining each as a corrective and challenge to the other. The first model seems to predominate in the secondary school in eC21 while the second has more influence in the elementary school. But, does it matter?

Does it matter which model or what manner of hybrid a school decides to enact? On at least one level it does not. What matters more is that on the lived, everyday ground of educational practice what teachers do behind classroom doors largely determines the curriculum students actually receive and the sense they make of it. This is not to say teachers work in a vacuum; they don't. They are subject to national and local policies, the expectations of the communities in which their schools are embedded, the myriad social forces that bear down on schools and teachers, and the intelligence, strength, and style of building leadership. Despite these, teachers do have agency: their choices matter, as does what they know (their reading habits, news sources, past learning, and opportunities for continuing professional development). But no matter which of the two models is enacted, social studies is likely to be boring to many students, especially in secondary schools; it is likely to be superficial rather than penetrating, and to feel irrelevant to many students. Whatever the model, *coverage* of a broad mass of subject matter alongside classroom *control* of more-or-less disengaged and potentially misbehaving students are two tacit purposes of instruction that continue to haunt the field to its bones.

Who Decides the Social Studies Curriculum?

Public schools are technologies for creating persons of particular kinds. Nations everywhere use schools for this purpose: to form subjects and citizens with particular identities, imaginations, and abilities in relation to the government, ethnic groups, civil society, church, market, family, and strangers. Schools are not asked simply to instill knowledge and skills but to “make up people.”⁹ Political scientists know this people-making process as *political socialization*: the largely unconscious activity of reproducing people who embody the dominant social norms, customs, beliefs, and institutions. But educators, political leaders, and parents are concerned to intervene in history and intentionally to shape society's future, that is, they are concerned with *conscious* social production. Their currency is not description and explanation, as with political scientists, but planning and prescription: renewal, improvement, transformation, liberation, social justice, cultural restoration, and so forth. They don't merely observe schooling, they create it. In doing so they specify not only what students will learn but what sorts of people they will become: responsible, knowledgeable, loyal, compliant, critical, religious, secular, competitive, collaborative, law-abiding, caring, and so forth. The list is long. It is often contradictory and always contentious.¹⁰

For this reason, public schools have been “ground zero” in the culture wars. “The struggles for the control of the schools,” Walter Lippmann wrote in 1928,

are among the bitterest political struggles which now divide the nations. [...] Wherever two or more groups within a state differ in religion, or in language and in nationality, the immediate concern of each group is to use the schools to preserve its own faith and tradition. For it is in the school that the child is drawn towards or drawn away from the religion and the patriotism of its parents.¹¹

Witness the epic battles over the desegregation of schools, the teaching of evolution, and the multiple ways of telling America's story, from Columbus's expedition to today's disputes over immigration policy. At the core of many controversies in social studies education is disagreement about the relationship between education and society: should schools serve the status quo or transform it? This is an enormously important question and the subject of the chapter that follows this introduction. Suffice it to say that there are roughly three responses to this question, and they fall on the political left, right, and center. On both the right and left are rather clear visions of society, and schools are "technologies" (in the sense used earlier) for realizing them. On the right, students are to be made into people who serve the current social order and thrive on its terms. On the left, students are to be made into people who change it in order to create a more just and vibrant democracy, one that would include the economy rather than leaving it in the hands of the market. In the center is the Deweyan position: students should be helped to build knowledge through, as he put it, "intelligent study of historical and existing forces and conditions."¹² They should also be taught to use their minds well; to think critically, to engage in higher order reasoning, to value and use scientific inquiry. But they are not to be told to what end they should use these competencies; they should not to be indoctrinated. Rather, they should be left free to use their minds as they see fit. It is up to them—well-educated democratic citizens, trained thinkers—to engage in the ongoing work of government of, by, and for the people.

In addition to this fundamental issue, there are loads of specific subject matter controversies. This is due to the simple fact that the social studies field contains an almost limitless body of potential subject matter, but limited instructional time. This means that very little can actually be taught. Indeed, every school has three social studies curricula: the explicit, the null, and the implicit.¹³ Only a tiny sample of the universe of possible topics and skills is included in the explicit curriculum. This is the officially planned and publicized curriculum found in curriculum standards of states, school districts, and national organizations; it is also found in teachers' lesson and unit plans, on classroom bulletin boards and websites, and in curriculum materials. What is not included in this subject matter is tossed, figuratively speaking, into a huge bin marked "null curriculum." This is a giant absence. It consists of all the subject matter that is not included in the taught curriculum. Here are whole topics (e.g., inequality), whole peoples (e.g., gays and lesbians in history), and whole disciplines (e.g., anthropology) but also the intellectual

processes and values not cultivated. Whole subjects such as art, music, and even social studies and science were sometimes tossed into the null curriculum as the standards-and-accountability hysteria bore down on schools in eC21.

Occupying the third dimension—the implicit or hidden curriculum—are the values, perspectives, and behaviors that are shaped not deliberately by the official curriculum but subtly by the social interaction patterns of the school and its reward systems. Students quickly learn, for example, that they need to share the teacher’s attention with many other students, that compliance and attendance are crucial to success in school, that the computer lab is mainly for testing, that sexual harassment of female students and faculty is or isn’t sanctioned, and so forth.

Who has the legitimate democratic authority to select the tiny sample of potential material that will get taught? We arrive at the ‘who decides?’ question. Parents and educators are two of the key players in curricular decision making, of course, but so are citizens. (Because these are roles, not persons, they overlap.) Parents may claim they have a natural right to exclusive educational authority: natural because, first, the children in question are “their” children (the ownership assumption), and second because parents are naturally concerned to maximize the welfare of their children (the evolutionary assumption). Both assumptions are specious, as both educators and citizens are quick to point out. Parents may have given birth to or adopted children, but that does not establish possession. Children have been imagined to “belong” to the gods, to God, to the state or the village, for example. The propensity of at least some families to teach racist, sexist, and other values that contradict the liberal-democratic ideal, particularly the bedrock values of freedom, equality, popular sovereignty, tolerance, and justice, undermines the second assumption, as does the frequency of child abuse and neglect.

Neither professional educators nor democratic citizens are inclined, as parents sometimes may be, to claim exclusive educational authority, because that would be blatantly undemocratic. Rather, both groups claim a seat at the deliberative table, alongside parents, where curricular policy is developed in a democratic society. Amy Gutmann has developed a comprehensive portrayal of this democratic role conflict as part of her democratic theory of education.¹⁴ She concludes that collective moral argument and decision making (deliberation) among the array of educational actors is the most democratically justifiable approach to the authority question. In brief, who should decide the curriculum by which the next generation of democrats shall be educated? All of us together, weighing the alternatives, arguing, and listening.

The Book’s Plan

Each of the 31 chapters that follows was written at my invitation as editor of “Research and Practice,” a regular feature in the journal *Social Education*. In this role, I had the luxury of wondering about the social studies field, developing

questions based on that curiosity, and then asking leading scholars to respond to those questions. Their responses were published at the rate of one every few issues between 2001 and 2015. These authors not only knew a great deal about the literature on the topic (hence, the sometimes lengthy reference section at the end of a chapter), but also how to compose an essay that was rich but brief and accessible to non-specialists.

Glancing at the table of contents, you will see that there are five sections after the Introduction you are reading. These five parts and their chapters correspond to the themes I now introduce.

1. *Purpose Matters.* Social studies has always been a battleground where curriculum controversies reflect the cultural and academic conflicts at play in society. Should the social studies curriculum aim to transmit the existing social order, preparing students to succeed within its norms and values, or should it aim to transform the status quo, helping students create a better society? If the latter, what sort of “better” is it? Should history, geography, economics, or something else be the driving force in the social studies curriculum? Diverse purposes also insinuate themselves into daily instruction even more intimately. Why, for example, do so few history teachers engage students in historical inquiry? One possibility is that many teachers are bound to a different purpose: not authentic intellectual challenge, but coverage and control.
2. *Perspective Matters.* Social perspectives are not trivial in teaching and learning. African American and immigrant students may interpret U.S. history lessons differently than do suburban white students. The enduring “nation of immigrants” narrative is swallowed easily by some students while catching in the throats of others; those Latino students in the southwest, for example, whose ancestors never migrated but experienced a change in government. Girls and boys may perceive social studies differently as have Christians, Jews, Muslims, and Native American students. A student’s location in the hierarchy of social status and power can serve as a strong filter of the teacher’s lessons and the contents of curriculum materials. Indeed, students’ social perspectives, stemming from the groups and locations of their birth, are pivotal in teaching and learning.
3. *Subject Matters.* School subjects, like social studies, math, science, and language arts, are constructs: they were assembled at various points in time and space, and they are hotly debated and periodically remodeled. In eC21 we find the school subject called “social studies” and the various courses and themes within it again in a period of heightened debate and renewal. Three examples: we are learning a great deal about how young people think about the past and how teachers can provide more powerful history instruction; we are learning that there is a new consensus as to what are best practices in civics education but that students have strikingly unequal access to them; and we

are learning more deeply about the variation with which a single topic, such as the Holocaust, or course of study, such as World History, is taught from one school and community to another.

4. *Global Matters.* Something called “global education” is all the rage in eC21, making it difficult to separate the wheat from the chaff, the globalism from the globaloney, the curriculum from the slogan. Nations everywhere create schools to serve *national* purposes, and they are doing so even more intensely today as they struggle for economic competitiveness; consequently, we are prudent to treat claims about “global” or “international” education with skepticism until proven otherwise. Social studies educators are well-positioned to teach a new generation to see the world more clearly and know it more accurately, but to do this we must steer clear of the hype and prattle. The stakes are high. With rapidly-developing Internet resources, geospatial technologies, and social media come all sorts of opportunities to teach students new literacies, and old ones, too. A central challenge remains judging the credibility of information sources, and this might be *the* core literacy objective of social studies teaching and learning in a globalizing world.
5. *Puzzles.* Five puzzles are presented. First, picture this: a monotonous teacher is conducting a recitation (*Ferris Bueller’s* “Anyone? Anyone?”) while students snooze or goof off. Hollywood likes to seize upon this image when it portrays high school history classes, underscoring the surprising absence of lively discussions and debates, mock trials and moot courts. Students say they love these things, and they can be profoundly educative. So, why the scarcity? Second, social studies instruction is situated in highly variable school environments: “chilling climates,” for example, where teachers engage in self-censorship out of fear of community pressure groups; and “drought-stricken” climates where pupils are assumed to be burdened by family and personal pathologies. Third, tolerance. Defined as the willingness to extend civil liberties to those whose views you find objectionable, it follows that you don’t tolerate people you love or groups you support or ideas you believe in. Tolerance is something different. But can it be taught at school? Or is it part of life-long learning, maturation, or, simply, good fortune? Fourth, middle school students are effervescent adolescents with hormones ramped into high gear. Is there any room for intellectual development? Finally, and returning to *Ferris Bueller*, we focus on the use of film in social studies teaching and learning. What are the best practices? Are teachers limited to, as the phrase goes, “showing a movie”; is a documentary any more credible than a narrative film?

These are my themes, but there is no reason they need to be yours. A useful exercise for readers will be to create their own set of themes based on their own interpretations and groupings of the chapters.

Social Studies at the Center

Jailed after leading a nonviolent protest against racial segregation in Birmingham, Alabama in 1963, Martin Luther King, Jr. sat in his cell and drafted a letter that has become a fixture in the American literary and political canon. Probably no one can claim to be well-educated who hasn't read it, not in the United States at least. Its keywords are two of the most difficult and dynamic in any language: *justice* and *injustice*. The tricky part of taking one's place on the public stage, King wrote, is to square law with justice. He asked a key question rhetorically, knowing that this is what he was being asked about his civil disobedience: "How can you advocate breaking some laws and obeying others?" His reply:

The answer lies in the fact that there are two types of laws: just and unjust. I would be the first to advocate obeying just laws. One has not only a legal but a moral responsibility to obey just laws. Conversely, one has a moral responsibility to disobey unjust laws.¹⁵

It was an open message to the world, but King's immediate audience was a group of white clergymen who had written a few days earlier that his activities in their segregated state were the "unwise and untimely" doings of an "outsider." Sincerely and patiently in this letter, he educates them. It is a respectful adult-to-adult letter, cleric-to-cleric, black-to-white. He tells them he is in Birmingham "because injustice is here" and because "injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."¹⁶

Re-reading the *Letter from Birmingham Jail* myself, and listening to classrooms of middle and high school students discuss it in socratic seminars, I am reminded of another original educator, Thomas Jefferson, who two centuries before had warned that because "the people themselves" are democracy's engine, "their minds must be improved to a certain degree."¹⁷ In other words, democratic citizens don't grow on trees or appear out of thin air; rather, We The People must be *educated* from idiocy to puberty and then to enlightened political engagement. King was trying to accomplish a piece of instruction in his letter. But I wonder why these grown men needed his tutorial, why they hadn't already learned it. This wasn't two centuries ago, after all. I can't presume I would have done any better at that time and place, of course; in my judgment, this is why social studies is at the center, not the margins, of a good school curriculum and why it needs to begin early in the primary grades and continue, snowballing, straight through college.

About the Author

Walter C. Parker is Professor and Chair of Social Studies Education and (by courtesy) Professor of Political Science at the University of Washington, Seattle.

Notes

- 1 Herbert J. Walberg and Shioh-Ling Tsai, "Matthew Effects in education," *Educational Research Quarterly* 20, no. 3 (1983): 359–73; and Keith E. Stanovich, "Matthew Effects in reading," *Reading Research Quarterly* 21 (1986): 360–407.
- 2 London: Fontana/Croom Helm (1976). See also the revision by Tony Bennett, Lawrence Grossberg, and Meaghan Morris, eds., *New keywords: a revised vocabulary of culture and society* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005).
- 3 For example, Edward Fenton, *The new social studies* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967), and Irving Morrisett, ed., *Concepts and the structure in the new social science curricula* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967).
- 4 Classic criticisms along these lines include Arthur E. Bestor, *Educational wastelands: The retreat from learning in our public schools* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1953); and Diane Ravitch, "Tot sociology, or what happened to history in the grade schools," *American Scholar*, 56, no. 3 (1987): 343–54.
- 5 Stephen J. Thornton, *Teaching social studies that matters* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2005); also, Hazel W. Hertzberg, *Social Studies Reform, 1880–1980* (Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium, 1981).
- 6 This is the definition of the National Council for the Social Studies at www.socialstudies.org.
- 7 Aristotle, *The politics of Aristotle*, trans. Ernest Barker (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958): 6. Also, Alasdair MacIntyre, *After virtue* (Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame Press, 1981): 263.
- 8 I develop the concepts "enlightened political engagement," "idiocy," "puberty," and "citizenship" in my book, *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2003).
- 9 Ian Hacking, *Historical ontology* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).
- 10 See Amy Gutmann, *Democratic education*, 2nd ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999); Jonathan Zimmerman, *Whose America? Culture wars in the public schools* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002); and Herbert M. Kliebard, *The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893–1958*, 3rd ed. (New York: Falmer, 2004).
- 11 *American Inquisitors* (Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1928/1993): 22–23.
- 12 John Dewey, "The crucial role of intelligence," *The Social Frontier* 1, no. 5 (1935): 9.
- 13 Elliot W. Eisner, *The educational imagination*, 3rd ed. (Columbus, OH: Merrill/Prentice Hall, 2002).
- 14 Gutmann, op. cit.
- 15 "Letter from Birmingham Jail," in King's *Why We Can't Wait* (New York: Mentor, 1963): 82.
- 16 Ibid: 77.
- 17 *Notes on the State of Virginia* (New York: Norton, 1787/1954): 148.

This page intentionally left blank

PART I

Purpose Matters

This page intentionally left blank

2

SOCIAL STUDIES AND THE SOCIAL ORDER

Transmission or Transformation?

William B. Stanley

Should social studies educators transmit or transform the social order? By “transform” I do not mean the common view that education should make society better (e.g., lead to scientific breakthroughs, eradicate disease, and increase productivity). Rather, I am referring to approaches to education that are critical of the dominant social order and motivated by a desire to ensure both political and economic democracy. This progressive or radical (depending on one’s point of view) view of education for social transformation crystallized in the 1920s and ’30s and remains a persistent school of thought. However, the impact of a focus on social transformation on educational policy and practice has been marginal.

Given our cultural commitment in the United States to individualism and free market theory, the limited impact of education for social transformation should not be surprising. Schooling has functioned, in general, to transmit the dominant social order, preserving the status quo, and it would be more plausible to argue that the current economic and political systems would need to undergo radical change before fundamental change in education could take place. Still, the question remains: What should be the role of teachers, especially social studies teachers, with respect to the social order: transmission or transformation?

The Quest for Democracy

Debates over education reform take place within a powerful historical and cultural context. In the United States, schooling is generally understood as an integral component of a democratic society. To the extent we *are* a democratic society, one could argue that education for social transformation could be anti-democratic, a view held by many conservatives. From the left side of the political spectrum, however, the view is that our nation is not now (nor ever was) a fully democratic

society. In addition to a history of ethnic, racial, and gender discrimination, the gap between the wealthy and lower classes continues to increase, meanwhile, a significant percent of Americans still live in poverty. Most people have little or no influence on corporate or government institutions and policy, which are largely controlled by dominant groups who support a system that serves their own interests. If one accepts this line of thinking, education for social transformation becomes a moral imperative in the service of democracy.

But the either/or conception of education described above tends to oversimplify and distort. There is a more productive way of looking at this issue. Democratic societies have been rare throughout history, only expanding significantly over the last two centuries. Democratic thought and action (citizenship) must be learned, and schools are places where children receive formal training as citizens. Democracy is also a process or form of life rather than a fixed end in itself, and we should regard any democratic society as a work in progress.¹ Thus, democratic society is something we are always trying simultaneously to maintain *and* reconstruct, and education is essential to this process.

When one looks at the question of education for social transformation in the context of American history, three prevailing perspectives emerge. First, a strong form of education for social transformation was developed by George Counts in the 1930s and remains part of more recent work by various proponents of “critical pedagogy” and counter-socialization.² A second, and frequently misunderstood, perspective is found in John Dewey’s curriculum theory, which rejected Counts’s core argument. The influence of Dewey’s pragmatic approach to education is also found in the work of more recent curriculum theorists such as Cleo Cherryholmes and Tony Whitson.³ A third view, opposed to education for social transformation, is found in the work of various conservative writers, most recently George Posner, a federal appellate judge, and social studies educator James Leming. Posner’s views have roots in the earlier work of Walter Lippmann, one of Dewey’s intellectual colleagues in the 1920s and ’30s. I will summarize briefly each of the three perspectives and then conclude with my thoughts on how this issue remains relevant to social studies education.⁴

George Counts’s Reconstructionist Challenge to Teachers

In 1932, Counts called on teachers to “build a new social order.” It remains the most explicit argument for education for social transformation or what he called social “reconstruction.”⁵ Counts believed the Depression in the 1930s confirmed that America was in a state of crisis and required a new social order based upon democratic social justice and a fundamental redistribution of economic and political power. Since political and economic power was held largely by powerful elite groups, the realization of a truly democratic social order could not happen unless the capitalist economy of the United States was eliminated “or changed so radically in form and spirit that its identity will be completely lost.”⁶

The progressive education movement was in full swing at the time. While Counts acknowledged progressive education's positive focus on the interests of the child, "progress" implied moving forward and this, he wrote, "can have little meaning in the absence of clearly defined purpose."⁷ The progressive education movement's failure to develop such a purpose, a theory of social welfare, "unless it be that of anarchy or extreme individualism," was its core weakness.⁸ Progressive educators seemed incapable of responding to the great crises of the 1930s. Members largely of the middle class, progressives were too fond of their material possessions and tended to "follow the lead of the most powerful and respectable forces in society and at the same time find good reasons for doing so."⁹

Progressive educators must free themselves from philosophic relativism and the undesirable influences of an upper middle class culture to permit the development of "a realistic and comprehensive theory of social welfare" and "a compelling and challenging vision of human destiny."¹⁰ In addition, progressives must come to accept "that all education contains a large element of imposition, that in the very nature of the case this is inevitable, that the existence and evolution of society depend upon it, that it is consequently eminently desirable, and that the frank acceptance of this fact by the educator is a major professional obligation."¹¹

Counts's curriculum for social transformation was designed to expose the anti-democratic limitations of individualism and free market economic theory, promote a strong form of participatory democracy, and create an economic system that reduces disparities of income, wealth, and power.

Dewey's Critique of Social Reconstructionism

Dewey, like Counts, understood that education must have a social orientation. The question, Dewey wrote, "is not whether the schools shall or shall not influence the course of future social life, but in what direction they shall do so and how."¹² The way our schools actually "share in the building of the social order of the future depends on the particular social forces and movements with which they ally."¹³ According to Dewey, education "must ... assume an increasing responsibility for participation in projecting ideas of social change and taking part in their execution in order to be educative," with particular attention to a more just, open, and democratic society.¹⁴ Consequently, teachers cannot escape the responsibility for assisting in the task of social change or maintenance.

Considering such sentiments, it is not surprising that many scholars have mistakenly described Dewey as a social reconstructionist.¹⁵ Dewey did believe that the schools should assist in the reconstruction of society, but his view of this process differed significantly from Counts's. Rather than indoctrinating students with a particular theory of social welfare, Dewey believed the schools should participate in the general intellectualization of society by inculcating a "method of intelligence." This would provide students with the critical competence for reflective thought applied to the analysis of social problems.¹⁶ Education's central

aim is “to prepare individuals to take part intelligently in the management of conditions under which they will live, to bring them to an understanding of the forces which are moving, and to equip them with the intellectual and practical tools by which they can themselves enter into the direction of these forces.”¹⁷ Over time, students would acquire the knowledge and skills that would enable them “to take part in the great work of construction and organization that will have to be done, and to equip them with the attitudes and habits of action that will make their understanding and insight practically effective.”¹⁸

To grasp the difference between Counts’s and Dewey’s stands on our question, it is important to understand that Dewey was committed to an educational *method*, not to any specific social outcome as a result of employing that method. He explicitly rejected Counts’s position that the schools should indoctrinate students in order to promote a particular theory of social welfare. It was up to well-educated democratic citizens to clarify and determine preferred social ends. To attempt to use education to impose a particular social order would be to abandon the method of intelligence and replace it with indoctrination.¹⁹ However, while Dewey’s curriculum theory was not based on a particular theory of social welfare, it did emphasize the centrality of providing the conditions under which the method of intelligence could be applied, and critics exaggerate when they claim Dewey’s pragmatic theory had no political implications.²⁰

Counts attacked Dewey’s educational approach for being neutral. But Dewey did not believe it was neutral, nor was it mechanical, aloof, or “purely intellectual.” The pragmatists’ application of modern advances in science and technology to improve society took place not through indoctrination but by the “intelligent study of historical and existing forces and conditions” and this method “cannot fail . . . to support a new general social orientation.”²¹ In this sense, indoctrination was unnecessary, because the application of the method of intelligence would eventually reveal ways to improve the social order.

Those supporting indoctrination rest their adherence to the theory, in part, upon the fact that there is a great deal of indoctrination now going on in the schools, especially with reference to narrow nationalism under the name of patriotism, and with reference to the dominant economic regime. These facts unfortunately *are* facts. But they do not prove that the right course is to seize upon the method of indoctrination and reverse its object.²²

Dewey did recommend that educators *impose* the pragmatic method of intelligence, but he did not see this recommendation as contradictory. “If the method we have recommended leads teachers and students to better conclusions than those which we have reached—as it surely will if widely and honestly adopted—so much the better.”²³ In contrast, any attempt to inculcate a preconceived theory of social welfare would ultimately work to subvert the method of intelligence and was antithetical to education for democracy.

The Conservative Critique of Education for Social Transformation

The conservative critique of Counts's reconstructionism and Dewey's progressivism is rooted in three interrelated intellectual traditions: democratic realism, individualism, and free market theory. Democratic realism, which emerged in the early twentieth century, concluded that most voters behaved irrationally, were motivated by narrow self-interests, and lacked adequate knowledge and competence to participate in meaningful deliberation regarding public policy. The most influential democratic realist in the 1920s and '30s was Walter Lippmann, a prominent journalist (and former socialist and progressive intellectual).

Lippmann argued that industrialization and urbanization had transformed fundamentally the widespread network of small communities that had provided the context for democratic life throughout the first century of our national history. Loss of local community undermined the capacity of individuals to acquire directly the knowledge to determine their interests and make informed public policy decisions. The exponential expansion of social and scientific knowledge and the increasing complexity of modern society only worsened the masses' inability to comprehend social issues.²⁴

According to Lippmann, only an enlightened elite (disinterested experts), not the masses, could understand the social science knowledge required to make complex public policy decisions in the public interest. The average person had neither the time nor interest to acquire the knowledge necessary for participating in this way. In addition, the increasingly sophisticated use of mass media and propaganda by government and business had resulted in the "manufacture" of public opinion, thereby laying waste to the liberal democratic assumption that public consent arose from the collective actions of informed citizens. Lippmann's critique of liberal democracy intensified over time, and he came to doubt even the capacity of elites themselves to acquire the knowledge adequate to resolve the increasingly complex policy problems.²⁵

Dewey was impressed by Lippmann's analysis of social and political conditions in the 1920s, but he rejected his antidemocratic recommendations.²⁶ Regrettably, Dewey never adequately addressed the devastating criticisms Lippmann raised regarding the core assumptions of liberal democracy.²⁷

More recently, Richard Posner (while never citing Lippmann) reintroduced democratic realism in the context of America's postindustrial society.²⁸ Posner makes a case for the current U.S. political system, which he describes as functioning much like a free market economy. Like Lippmann, Posner considers modern society far too complex for the mass of humanity to understand in any depth. Even elite technocratic groups never have a full understanding of social issues. Nevertheless, the current American political system does provide a workable structure wherein highly complex technical information is sorted out and politicians sell their candidacy to voters much as entrepreneurs sell products or

services. The masses' key role is voting in free elections. These elections build public confidence, legitimate public policy, and ensure that politicians compete for public support. While the average person is unlikely to have the competence to make complex policy decisions, he or she is qualified to determine, over time, if elected officials are acting in the public interest. That's not a strong democracy, but it is, realistically, all that we can manage.

Following the logic of Posner's argument, education for either Counts's social reconstruction or Dewey's method of intelligence would be a bad idea. The former requires citizens to attain an unattainable level of knowledge (the correct theory of social welfare), and the latter aims for an illusory and unworkable conception of participatory democracy. Posner considers Dewey's conception of deliberative democracy as a quixotic and even counterproductive approach to governing modern societies. Instead, schools should help students understand how our current democracy actually works, how it might be improved, and why it is the preferred political system.

In a related development, social studies educator James Leming recently made a case for abandoning what he sees as a progressive emphasis on citizenship education for critical analysis of social problems and social transformation.²⁹ Leming has tried to demonstrate that the progressive view of education is antidemocratic because it is substantially at odds with the majority of social studies educators and the general public.

Rather like Lippmann and Posner, Leming also contends that critical analysis of social problems is beyond the cognitive capacity of the vast majority of K-12 students. Knowledge of history and the social sciences should be the bedrock of social studies education, he believes. Like E.D. Hirsch, Jr., Leming sees the acquisition of basic core knowledge ("cultural literacy") as fundamental to any successful education program.³⁰ He does not rule out a limited focus on critical thinking, but social educators need to avoid asking students to engage in thinking activities "beyond their abilities. . . ."³¹ In his view, most progressive approaches to education are actually thinly disguised liberal or Left political agendas for radical social transformation.

Conclusion

Dare social studies educators try to build a new social order? I have presented three perspectives on this question, and the debates over the answer continue today.

Counts was right to claim that education couldn't be neutral. Every teacher, whether consciously or not, is working in some relation to the dominant social order. Furthermore, the arguments in favor of education for social transformation continue to direct our attention to persistent social problems (e.g., poverty, discrimination, inequality, and the concentration of power in the hands of dominant groups). As Dewey made clear, however, Counts advocated an approach