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Teacher Perspective Development: A Study of Preservice Social Studies Teachers

E. Wayne Ross
The University at Albany, State University of New York

Abstract

This study investigated the formation and development of preservice social studies teachers’ perspectives. An individual’s teaching perspective is a way of thinking and acting in a teaching situation. Examples of teaching perspectives were obtained through observations of and interviews with social studies education majors (N = 21) at a major midwestern university. The interview data were consistent with the hypothesis that preservice teachers’ perspectives are the product of a dialectical process of professional socialization. The influence of social structural variables, such as teacher education course work and field experiences, appeared to be marginal and apparently did not produce deep internal changes in the belief systems of the participants. The participants were active mediators in their relationships with socializing institutions as represented by the schools and university teacher education. The active role of the individual in the development of a teaching perspective was illustrated through the employment of four strategies: (a) role-playing, (b) selective role-modeling, (c) impression management, and (d) self-legitimation.

Learning to teach requires individuals to change the way they perceive and interpret schooling and classroom situations. During teacher education, preservice teachers begin to develop a new frame of reference for the familiar circumstances of the classroom. How this new frame of reference—or teacher perspective—develops was the focus of this study.

A review of research on teacher education by Fuller and Bown (1975) concluded that there was a lack of theory building and conceptualization about the change individuals experience when learning how to teach. In the years since, this assessment has been affirmed by others (e.g., Feiman-Nemser, 1983; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). The most frequently stated reason for this inadequacy has been that little is known about what actually goes on in teacher education.

Recent research attempted to address these shortcomings by investigating the dynamics of the teacher education experience (e.g., Adler, 1984; Good-
man, 1983; Tabachnick, Popkewitz, & Zeichner, 1979-1980). These studies focus on the preservice and induction phases of teaching, emphasizing concerns such as: (a) how beginning teachers give meaning and purpose to the process of learning how to teach; (b) how they perceive the subjects they will be teaching; (c) how they interpret and respond to classroom behaviors; and (d) how these new meanings give direction to their classroom practice.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the factors that influence the formation and development of teacher perspectives among preservice social studies teachers. Answers were sought to the following questions: (a) What linkages exist between the development of teacher perspectives and the experiences provided by university teacher education? (b) What role does the individual play in the construction of his or her teacher perspective?

**Conceptual Framework**

The literature reveals four basic frameworks for the examination of the process of becoming a teacher. These frameworks may be labeled as: (a) perceived problems of beginning teachers (e.g., Cruickshank, Kennedy, & Myers, 1974), (b) developmental stage concerns (e.g., Fuller & Bown, 1975), (c) cognitive developmental (e.g., Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983), and (d) teacher socialization (e.g., Lacey, 1977).

Researchers using the perceived problems of beginning teachers framework have produced general agreement on the most often perceived problems of beginning teachers, but this approach has little to say about how context, teacher characteristics, and individual differences influence teachers’ perceptions and performance. As Veenman (1984) points out, the three remaining frameworks for examining the process of becoming a teacher are concerned with changes in preservice teachers, but draw their ideas and concepts from different sources. The developmental stage concerns and cognitive developmental frameworks are effective because they provide a way of categorizing teachers according to how they think and what capacities they do or do not have at various career stages. However, the developmental frameworks consider changes in the individual as self-directed and primarily use psychological concepts in the investigation of these changes (Veenman, 1984).

Of the four conceptual frameworks identified above, the teacher socialization framework provides the most inclusive structure for the study of change as an individual becomes a professional. The teacher socialization framework allows for the use of psychological concepts, but also gives attention to the changes within the context of institutional settings. As previously noted, past research has outlined the problems faced by beginning teachers, but has yielded little knowledge of the complex nature of the process of becoming a teacher. Research based upon an interactive paradigm, such as teacher socialization, is able to provide information about the educational situations, the psychological dimensions of meanings...
underlying those situations, and the important personal characteristics of
the individuals that interact in these situations.

In the study of the relationship between the individual and social institu-
tions there are two major foci. The first interest is in how society transforms
the individual. This representation of teacher socialization has been labeled
the functionalist model (Lacey, 1977). In this case, socialization is described
as the process whereby individuals are fitted to society: Individuals are
viewed as passive vessels that give way to the forces of socialization, accept-
ing without resistance the attitudes, values, and behaviors deemed ap-
propriate by society.

The deterministic character of this model is the result of an "emphasis on
structural form and the unchanging nature of social institutions" (Lacey,
1977, p. 19). The history of research on teacher education reflects the influ-
ence of this model on conceptions of how individuals acquire the beliefs,
knowledge, attitudes, and values that represent a teaching culture (Zeich-
ner, 1980). While the functional perspective has contributed to under-
standing teacher socialization, it has failed to account for variations in in-
dividual teacher perspectives.

Drawing upon investigations of professional socialization in other fields,
particularly medicine (e.g., Becker, Geer, Hughes, & Strauss, 1961; Bucher
& Stelling, 1977; Olesen & Whittaker, 1968), a model of teacher socializa-
tion has begun to develop that challenges the deterministic character of the
functionalist view by focusing on the constant interplay between individuals
and institutions. This dialectical model provides a more comprehensive
theory of socialization by acknowledging the constraints of social struc-
tures, while not overlooking the active role individuals play in the construc-
tion of their professional identities. Actions and beliefs that contradict the
dominant norms and values pervading a particular social setting serve as
evidence that the individual is a creator as well as a recipient of values.

In much of the functionalist literature, the exclusive focus has been on ex-
pressed attitudes and ideology. These studies generally employed inventory
surveys and failed to produce an adequate description of the professional
development process experienced by beginning teachers (Zeichner & Grant,
1981). The construct of perspective has been a useful vehicle for overcoming
the limitations of this portion of the literature. Becker et al. (1961) first
developed this construct in a study of medical student socialization. The
term perspective refers to:

a co-ordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with
some problematic situation, to refer to a person's ordinary way of think-
ing and feeling about and acting in such a situation. These thoughts and
actions are co-ordinated in the sense that they flow reasonably, from
the actor's point of view, from the ideas contained in the perspective.
(Becker et al., 1961, p. 34)
Several studies relying in whole or in part on the investigation of teacher perspectives have been conducted (Adler, 1984; Gibson, 1976; Goodman & Adler, 1985; Hammersly, 1977; Tabachnick, Popkewitz, Zeichner, 1979–1980; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1985).

Adler (1984) described the notion of teacher perspectives as a construct that captures the ideas, behaviors, and contexts of particular teaching acts. Teacher perspectives differ from self-reported statements of ideology or attitudes because they are anchored in the world of actual situations and have reference to particular behaviors. Therefore, a teacher perspective is a theory of action that has developed as a result of the individual’s experiences and is applied in particular situations. Teacher perspectives take into account a broad range of factors, including the teacher’s background, beliefs, and assumptions, the contexts of the classroom and the school, how these elements are interpreted, and the interpretation’s influence on the teacher’s actions.

Recent field-based studies inquired into the nature of preservice teachers’ perspectives toward teaching in general and the social studies curriculum in particular. The purpose of this study was to examine the specific processes through which teacher perspectives are created.

**Methodology**

Because this study explored individual teacher perspectives and the processes through which they developed, it was necessary to use a methodology that allowed for the incorporation of the ideas, actions, thoughts, and feelings of the participants as the major focus of the inquiry. Considering the study’s purpose, the naturalistic research paradigm provided the most appropriate framework for the study’s design (e.g., Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Previous research regarding professional socialization and the development of perspectives demonstrated that qualitative research methods and a naturalistic theoretical perspective allow unanticipated phenomena to be investigated as they emerge (e.g., Friebus, 1977).

Students majoring in social studies education at a large midwestern public university during 1984–85 were the subjects of the study. Twenty-one students representing each of the four major phases of the teacher education program at the university volunteered to participate. The sample included students from: (a) the freshman early field experience program, (b) the sophomore level general pedagogy and educational psychology course sequence, (c) the senior level secondary social studies methods courses, and (d) student teaching. Based upon a pilot interview study (N = 4) and previous ethnographic investigations of professional socialization (Becker et al., 1961, Lortie, 1975), an interview guide was constructed.

Data collection techniques included interviews and participant observations, however, interviews provided the main source of data. Interview sessions that ranged from one to two hours were conducted with the remaining
21 participants. The interviews attempted to construct a story of the development of each individual as a teacher. The interviews focused on the development of the individual's teaching perspective over time and were similar to what Levinson (1978) calls biographical interviews. However, the researcher attempted to guide the interviews so that topics from the interview guide were addressed while also allowing the respondent to broaden or narrow the parameters of the conversation. Audio tapes of the interviews were transcribed and the data were analyzed using a modified version of the constant comparative method of data analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Miles & Huberman, 1984). Data categories and patterns were identified, defined, and coded. To add meaning to coded information, marginal remarks and memos were used by the researcher to highlight important issues that codes might have blurred and to suggest new interpretations, leads, and connections between and among particular categories of data.

Respondents participated in follow-up interviews, in which the researcher shared specific patterns that emerged from the study as well as tentative conclusions. The respondents were given an opportunity to confirm, modify, or challenge the information in a summary of the study's preliminary findings. The major means through which the credibility of the findings was established included: (a) triangulation techniques, including a variety of data sources (audio tapes, transcriptions, follow-up interviews, brief written biographical survey), (b) field notes and the research journal of the researcher, (c) member checks (i.e., the clarification of questions and responses during and after the interviews, and the sharing of interview transcripts, working hypotheses, and interpretations with respondents).

Findings

The main objectives of the study were to construct profiles of the participants' teacher perspectives and to examine the processes through which the perspectives were created. This paper focuses on the second of these two objectives.

The findings of this study lend support to the dialectical model of teacher socialization. The data indicate that teacher perspectives appear to be the result of three interactive factors. First, social structural variables prospective teachers encounter in schools and universities provide the curriculum of teaching or the context within which teacher perspectives develop. These variables include such things as teacher education course work and field experiences as well as individuals' apprenticeship of observation as a pupil. Each individual's personal background or biography—values, religion, life experiences, content specialization, etc.—also appeared important in accounting for the differences in teacher perspectives among individuals. Biographical factors operate as filters through which the situations are viewed and interpreted (Adler, 1984). Finally, four interactional processes that illustrate how individuals respond to forces of prior socialization and social-
The Development of Teacher Perspectives

While the university and the schools determined the organization and general nature of preservice experiences, individuals shaped these experiences through any of four mechanisms that have been labeled interactive processes.

Role-playing. The opportunity for role-playing in early field experiences,
as well as student teaching, appeared to be the most important process in the development of a teacher perspective. In this study, role-playing included duties preservice teacher assumed in classrooms that were considered to be teacher activities. These role-playing experiences allowed preservice teachers to participate in and master activities that, up to this point, preservice teachers had only observed inservice teachers doing. Role-playing during field experiences allowed preservice teachers a certain degree of autonomy and responsibility, placed them in situations where they were treated as professionals by others, and allowed them to demonstrate and evaluate their teaching abilities. Through role-playing in field experiences, preservice teachers were able to prove to themselves and others that they mastered, or were on their way to mastering, the skills and knowledge that are necessary for successful teaching.

Respondents’ descriptions of how an individual learns to teach were dominated by references to role-playing during field experiences. The significance of role-playing opportunities is evident in these student teachers’ comments:

I think you learn to teach through hands-on experiences. When you get into the classroom, you just learn as you go. I read a lot of books—and they give you a good background knowledge, but until you have a chance to apply it, I don’t think it really comes to life for you. (Interview ST/3)

Field experiences are the most important because you are doing it. You learn directly from your mistakes. You see your mistakes much faster. At the university, I felt a lot of the issues were based upon opinion. Your answers were based on your opinion and it is easy to do that in a college class. Anybody can fake that, as long as you know how to communicate in a clear-cut fashion. You can write the greatest essay in the world and it may not mean anything, but, in the schools, it’s a different story. There is nowhere to hide. If you goof-up, you goof-up. I think I learned faster and I realized my mistakes much quicker in the field. I really made a lot of mistakes in the classroom, based on opinions that weren’t well-grounded. (Interview ST/2)

In relation to field experiences, the respondents perceived teacher education course work as artificial and separated from the reality of the school classroom. Preparatory activities such as lesson planning, objective writing, test construction, and discussions of various schools of thought regarding subjects such as motivation of students and classroom management were viewed as teacher education activities, not professional activities. Mastery of teacher education course work did not provide a sense of mastery of the activities required of the professional teacher.

As illustrated in the interview excerpts below, many respondents believed
that success in teacher education course work was not linked to an individual’s ability to succeed as a teacher.

I think field experiences are by far more important than course work in education. I think you learn more than you would out of a book. In an education course you might learn the procedures, like how to set up a lesson plan, but there is no room for deviation in a book. When you are out there in the field, you have to react to what you see. (Interview FEEP/3)

I would say you learn how to teach through a combination of course work and field experiences. You really can’t learn it until you have done it. So you have to have practice in the field. (Interview FEEP/5)

It is easy to sit around and talk with a professor about the nature of the adolescent, but when one’s sitting right there in front of you, it’s a whole different story. . . . You get a whole different perspective from the field. They don’t give you little hints about what to look for. I mean, how you’re going to see this kid’s sliding down in his chair, you know. I guess they can’t teach you how to notice little things about the kids while they’re sitting there. I learned everything about teaching from the field experience. [I learned everything] from the student teaching instead of the course work. (Interview ST/6)

[In the course work] you’re not experiencing it. The professor can sit there and give us a certain situation and we could tell him what we’re going to do. I could tell him what I’d do, but once you get out there and there’s just other things that come into play that you have to deal with . . . instantly. So it’s [the course work] detached. In the field you can’t just say, ‘Well, what should I do now?’ and sit back and make up your mind—you have to do something right away . . . you have to. (Interview ST/4)

The opportunity to prove one’s self as a teacher in a real classroom situation is much more important to the preservice teacher than success in the university classroom as a student. One respondent put it this way: ‘‘The important question lurking in the back of my mind all through the program was, ‘Would I really be able to survive in the classroom?’’”

The segregation of theory and practice in teacher education, as evident in these findings, is not a new problem (cf. Dewey, 1904/1964). The practical nature of the work of teaching is not easily replicated in the university classroom, therefore, opportunities to role-play provide a way for preservice teachers to confront the complexity of teaching. Prospective teachers enter teacher education with certain theories regarding what actions will be most effective for them as teachers. These theories of action are the concep-
tual structures and visions that provide reasons for actions taken in a particular situation and are chosen to enhance effectiveness of those actions (Sanders & McCutcheon, 1986). While theories of action may be added to as a result of teacher education course work and other experiences, the major source of their development is through practical inquiry—comparing practices to a vision of what is believed to be effective and by experimenting with actions and weighing the consequences (Sanders & McCutcheon, 1986). Theories of action are developed, then, as a result of actions taken while in the teacher's role. Role-playing in field experiences provided the only outlet for practical inquiry in this setting, and as a result was a highly valued experience for preservice teachers.

Selective role-modeling. Much of the literature regarding the influence of role models on neophyte teachers presents the preservice teacher, especially the student teacher, as indiscriminantly modeling the actions and beliefs of the cooperating teacher. The image that emerged from this research is of the preservice teacher using selective role-modeling in which specific attributes from many different role-models were drawn, instead of globally modeling a single experienced teacher.

Preservice teachers were highly selective in the way they modeled these individuals. They chose specific qualities from different individuals and attempted to blend them into an ideal model, which they considered appropriate to themselves. Role-modeling did not produce the cloning effect described in early investigations (e.g., Edgar & Warren, 1969; Karmos & Jacko, 1977). Based upon their own judgment, the respondents selected specific attributes from other people that they desired to incorporate into their own teaching perspective. The most frequently mentioned attributes or qualities respondents selected from their role-models were: mastery of content knowledge, fairness in dealing with pupils, trustworthiness, humor, concern regarding the holistic needs of pupils, outgoing/enthusiastic nature, use of teaching techniques that emphasized pupil participation, and clarity of instruction.

Time spent observing teachers in elementary and secondary schools played an important role in the preservice teachers' formation of perspectives on teaching. This was particularly evident with regard to selective role-modeling. During their years as pupils, respondents constructed an image of the work of teachers based solely upon teachers' actions that were readily observable to pupils. Experiences gained in university course work and through field experiences provided preservice teachers with a wider variety of teacher models. Selective role-modeling is described by several respondents in the following ways.

I carry my past experiences with me, but at the same time I'm kind of picking and choosing . . . it's like I'm picking things that I think will fit in with me and I'm rejecting others. (Interview ST/3)
In early field experiences I mimicked the instructors who were in the schools...later on, I modeled their tone rather than specific actions. (Interview SSM/3)

I didn’t look at one person and make myself a carbon copy of that person, but I think it is good to listen to other people’s ideas. They might have a real good idea you never thought of or they may give you a new approach. (Interview ST/5)

Respondents had negative as well as partial-positive role-models. Negative role-models were those persons possessing characteristics that respondents did not want to acquire. The influence of school experiences is apparent in the descriptions of negative role-models.

To tell you the truth, some of the worst teachers I had were my history teachers in high school. They were the most boring teachers I ever had. Everything came straight from the book...It was just so dull. They just basically said, “Turn to chapter eight, read section one, answer the questions at the end.” I don’t want to be like that. (Interview ST/5)

My high school government class was the most boring class that I ever had...He [the teacher] was pretty boring. You went into class and he stood up there for 45 minutes and we took notes and had tests on Fridays and that was it. I’m not going to be like that. (Interview ST/4)

From the above examples, it is evident that respondents believed they were the architects of their ideal model. They selected from the various attributes they observed as pupils and synthesized them into a model of what they would like to become.

Impression management. The third interactional process influencing teacher perspective development identified in the data analysis was impression management. Impression management is engaging in activities to please one’s superiors, even when those activities are not part of the individual’s belief system (Becker, et al., 1961; Goffman, 1959; Lacey, 1977). Many of the respondents described instances from field experiences, in which they exercised a form of impression management. In some cases, behavioral conformity was motivated either by the desire to please persons with evaluative power (i.e., cooperating teachers or university supervisors) or by the belief that behavioral conformity was in the best interest of the pupils. In either case, the respondents harbored reservations about things they had done in the classroom and stated that they would not have taken these actions without the influence of situational constraints. The following are examples from preservice teachers in early field experiences and student teaching.

I felt that if it was a class of mine, I might have handled it differently.
But, it is hard to come in when the teacher already has a certain schedule and change it. . . . It was really hard to get the kids motivated. They always had to sit in their seats and keep quiet, so it was impossible to do group work or anything constructive. If it had been my class, it would have been structured completely different. I would have kept trying [to motivate the kids]. I would have tried different things, until I got through to them. I thought it was ridiculous to give up. . . . The cooperating teacher told me to forget it. He said trying to motivate the students was a waste of time. I felt like I couldn’t say anything to him, because it wasn’t my classroom. I was just in a field experience . . . [and] he was evaluating me. (Interview FEEP/3)

I tried to follow the routine of the cooperating teacher. My lesson plan was a bit different actually, but I tried to keep the continuity [with what the cooperating teacher had done before]. I tried to use good judgment and do something that the cooperating teacher would have wanted. . . . I didn’t want to rock any boats. . . . I’m not one that never wants to rock the boat, but I think in that type of situation, you give in because you are taking someone else’s class and it could be a real awkward situation, especially if you didn’t get along with this person. (Interview PI/3)

I was locked into it for weeks, and I guess the reason I felt that locked in is because I hated to go from one type of teaching to another right off the bat. The kids are going to be confused; they won’t know what’s going on. I don’t think I have had enough opportunities where I was allowed to use new techniques—to see how they affected kids. I was very locked in to using the same techniques she [the cooperating teacher] was using and using the same materials she was using. I really didn’t experiment, because I had to keep pace with her classes. . . . I was bored. I thought it was kind of a waste of time. . . . I didn’t want to work with those kids that way because it was failing with them. (Interview ST/4)

I developed a lesson plan that I knew would pass. . . . It had to deal with every second, because that was what this guy [university supervisor] wanted. So I did that, and then I got up in front of the class . . . and I kind of winged it. (Interview SSM/4)

The use of a strategy such as impression management illustrates how an individual may manipulate a situation while still being constrained by it. Despite structural constraints during teacher education field experiences, the respondents were able to play an active role in events.

Self-legitimation. The fourth process illustrative of the individual’s active
role in the development of teacher perspectives is self-legitimation or self-evaluation. The data of this study indicate that preservice teachers, when judging their own performance and competence as teachers, placed great emphasis (but not all) on their self-evaluation. When asked about how one validates him or herself as a teacher—that is, who they look to for cues about their performance—there were two patterns that emerged. First, one group of respondents relied on their judgment of what pupils thought of their performance. These judgments were not based upon systematic written or verbal evaluations, but rather upon the mood or the reaction of the students to the lesson. The second pattern was for the respondents to evaluate their classroom performance based solely upon their sense of competency or their self-perceptions. There were exceptions to these patterns that emphasized self-evaluation, particularly in cases where the respondent and his or her cooperating teacher held similar perspectives toward teaching, but these were in the minority of cases. Just as preservice teachers made judgments regarding positive and negative attributes of role models, they also made judgments regarding their own attributes and actions. The following comments illustrate self-legitimation as it emerged from the interview data:

I would say that your own evaluation is most important. Hopefully you would realize it. I would think in teaching you are going to have some problems. . . . But years from now will you be able to look at yourself in the mirror and be so confident in what you have done that you can't have any critical self-analysis? Or be so blind to what you have done that you just can't see it yourself? The bottom line is my opinion. Somewhere I try to eliminate my mistakes. I guess in the classroom, you have to look out for yourself. There is so much time when you wouldn't have anybody else [to evaluate your performance]. (Interview PI/2)

My cooperating teacher's opinions were important, but my own sense of what was going on was probably the most important. Because in spite of the fact that I thought I did a good job [during student teaching], I don't want to teach any more. I don't feel that I'm that great of a teacher, and I don't think that I would do that well. So I guess it is just more of an internal sense of what was going on. In spite of the fact that my cooperating teacher and the university supervisor said I did a good job, my own evaluation was more important. (SI/1)

My own evaluation of my teaching is the most important opinion. . . . If I had not just stuck to that plan, but I allowed the students to interact, to participate and we got something unique going at the end—that's great! If the kids are really enjoying it and they're learning something from it. I'd say that's how I evaluate my teaching. (Interview ST/4)
Respondents' beliefs that the knowledge base of teaching is founded upon tacit or personalistic knowledge seem to promote the notion of self-legitimation. Preservice teachers in this study described the requisite knowledge and skills of teaching as being highly personal and individualistic. That is, they perceived the knowledge base of teaching as uncodified and relativistic. A utilitarian perspective dominated the respondents' approaches to the study of teaching. Their pedagogical attitudes and actions were summarized in one respondent's remark that, "what is right is what works for you and what you feel comfortable doing." The widespread belief among the respondents was that personality characteristics were more important to success in the classroom than any particular knowledge or skills that might be taught during teacher education. One student teacher put it this way:

I think your personality is going to make you a better teacher than all the knowledge in the world . . . It's a talent. I think it's just as much of a talent as being a musician. You can learn all kinds of technical things, but if you don't have the talent, you can go ahead and play the notes, but you're not going to hear the same soul . . . I don't think you can totally learn to teach, I think that a lot of people just couldn't do it. So, if you don't have it, no matter what the university does, they're not going to make a teacher out of somebody who should be wearing a lab coat and locked in a room somewhere with test tubes. (Interview ST/6)

This perception of the knowledge base of educational studies was reflected in the respondents' generally low and/or negative regard for the importance of expert opinion and critiques of their own teaching performance. This perception of the nature of knowledge about teaching and learning allowed the neophyte teacher to set him or herself up as a competent and qualified judge of teaching performance.

Summary

This study was undertaken to investigate the processes through which preservice social studies teachers' perspectives are developed. The data were consistent with the hypothesis that preservice teachers' perspectives are the product of a dialectical process of professional socialization.

The influence of social structural forces, such as teacher education course work and field experiences, appeared to be marginal and apparently did not produce deep internal changes in the belief systems of the respondents. Preservice teachers perceived themselves to be active in their resistance to the constraints placed upon them by these forces. They appeared to function as active mediators of socializing forces as represented by the schools and university teacher education. The active role of the individual in the development of a teaching perspective was illustrated through the respondents' use of four strategies: (a) role-playing, (b) selective role-modeling, (c) impression management, and (d) self-legitimation.
Recommendations

Drawing recommendations from research such as this must be done tentatively. This study examined one setting in which preservice teachers were engaged in particular roles, it did not examine the complete process of teacher socialization and perspective development. There are other broader ranging sources of influence that play a part in the development of teacher perspectives that have not been addressed in this research (i.e., the selection of teachers, economic factors, etc.), however, based upon the findings there are several recommendations that can be made.

These findings illustrate how teachers are actively engaged in the construction of meanings and are not just passive recipients of knowledge during their preservice education. With these findings in mind teacher educators should reevaluate the purpose and function of education courses and field experiences in the preparation of prospective teachers. By acknowledging the active role of the individual in the process of learning to teach, teacher educators may be able to provide preservice teachers with ways in which they can become reflective practitioners, that is, more critical and analytical in assessments of their teaching perspectives and those of others.

For some, probably many, preservice teachers the broader questions of teaching (i.e., nature of learning and the role of the school in society) are viewed as artificial and separated from the real world activities of the classroom teacher. This situation leads to the divorce of the act of teaching from its underlying educational, social and ethical dimensions (Goodman, 1986a). Findings from this and other studies of preservice teachers illustrate the problem of excessive realism and the development of utilitarian perspectives toward teaching (e.g., Tabachnick et al., 1979–1980; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984). Unfortunately, the traditional organization of the teacher education program encourages this separation with theory-oriented course work and management-oriented field experiences.

Teacher educators are not without models and examples of how these issues may be addressed. Dewey (1904/1964) noted that the twin problems of developing an intellectual method of applying subject-matter and mastering techniques of class instruction and management are not independent and isolated from one another. He stated:

Practical work should be pursued primarily with reference to its reaction upon the professional pupil in making him [sic] a thoughtful and alert student of education, rather than to help him [sic] get immediate proficiency. For immediate skill may be got at the cost of powers to go on growing. (p. 320)

Therefore, the goal of teacher education, based on Dewey's observations, is to produce reflective professionals not master technicians.

To achieve the goal of building an active and reflective cadre of teachers,
course work in teacher education should attempt to make preservice teachers more aware of their past experiences and preconceived beliefs about teaching in order to subject them to scrutiny. The goal would not be to disprove the relevance of past experiences, but simply to expose individual beliefs to critical examination and discourage personalized versions of the teaching truth. Criticism should be directed to making the preservice teachers thoughtful about their work in light of principles as well as practices (Dewey, 1904/1964). This course of action might help break down what has been described as the intellectual segregation between scientific reasoning and pedagogical practice (Lortie, 1975).

Recent literature provides several examples of how teacher education courses can encourage preservice teachers to think critically about and reflect upon their classroom experiences. Adler and Goodman (1986) describe efforts to develop a social studies methods course based upon recent work on critical theory in education. They outline a course that emphasizes a social history perspective and that focuses on students doing as well as learning about history. Ross and Hannay (1986) critique the instructional practices of teacher educators and describe how Dewey’s (1933) theory of reflective thinking may be used to promote critical reflectivity in methods courses through three strategies: (a) increasing social knowledge, (b) acquiring practical skills, and (c) developing ability in critical discourse. In addition to the above examples, which are grounded in critical theory, other strategies that promote critical reflectivity, such as oral history (Lauderdale, 1986) and writing-to-learn (Stover, 1986) have been presented in the teacher education literature.

The role and purpose of field experiences should also be closely examined by teacher educators. Because of the importance of role-playing in the professional development of teachers, field experiences are considered the most significant events in the preservice teacher’s professional preparation. However, as Goodman (1986b) states, “It cannot be assumed that just placing students in practicum sites will automatically provide them with valuable experiences” (p. 351). As illustrated in this research, field experiences may promote the development of utilitarian teacher perspectives. These utilitarian perspectives are demonstrated in trial and error approaches to teaching and are the result of two significant limitations facing neophyte teachers: (a) they are not able to perceive and interpret the professionally significant features of the classroom situation, and (b) they lack the knowledge that would enable them to choose appropriate actions for producing desired consequences (Sanders & McCutcheon, 1986).

The limitations of field experiences as they are currently conducted in teacher education, may be overcome through a closer coordination with the methods course activities described above as well as by having students participate in structured inquiry and reflection about the curriculum and practices of schools. For example, Beyer (1984) and Goodman (1986a) describe
field experience programs that approximate a laboratory experience by emphasizing experimentation, reflection, critique, and discussion. Creating field experiences that promote teaching as an investigative activity rather than a replication of successful practices may be accomplished by having preservice teachers conduct and write ethnographic case studies (Gitlin & Teitelbaum, 1986) and participate in classroom action-research (Biott, 1983). Having students participate in field experiences that emphasize investigations of actual classroom activities may provide them with a way to link the educational research and theory of the university with the concrete practices of the school. These strategies may allow students to take a more active role in their preparation and encourage observation, analysis and reflection on life in schools.

These recommendations illustrate how teacher education programs might encourage preservice teachers to become students of teaching, that is, thoughtful and reflective practitioners instead of merely master technicians. What should no longer be ignored is the active role of the individual in relation to the curriculum of teaching. Excellence in the schools cannot be achieved without quality teachers and quality teachers must have a platform for professional growth. Be recognizing this fact and providing preservice teachers with the initial tools for professional growth, an important step can be taken toward the goal of excellence in the schools.

Endnotes

1. For a more complete discussion of the rationale and methods used in the data collection and analysis, see Ross (1986).
2. Ross (1986) provides a description and analysis of the elements of teacher perspectives held by the participants in the study.
3. McCutcheon (1982) has defined curriculum as what students have the opportunity to learn. With this definition in mind, the curriculum of teaching is what preservice teachers have the opportunity to learn about teaching.
4. Codes following interview excerpts identify the respondents by academic rank and an identification number. The academic rank codes are: FEEP (freshman early experience program); PI (sophomore, professional introduction to education); SSM (junior/senior, social studies methods); and ST (senior, student teaching).
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Abstract

The work of Emma Willard was carried on in the 19th century, but is important to social studies today for many reasons. Willard held an integrated view of social science education and her textbooks, which were highly successful, reflect that. Emma Willard was one of the first women in the field of teacher education and she trained many young women in the Troy Female Seminary. Willard's interests were in geographic education, and citizenship education, as well as history, views more typical of the 1960s than of the 1860s.

Introduction

Over the past ten years a reassessment of the foundations of the social studies has become an integral part of the research in social studies education. Most of this research has been confined to twentieth-century topics with a few notable exceptions (Keels, 1982; Lybarger, 1981; Barth & Shermis, 1980). Even these works, however, concentrated on the latter years of the nineteenth century. In this paper the focus is on the early 1800s, which is not only prior to the time that educators coined the term social studies, but prior to professional associations or interests in social sciences.

In looking at this period, researchers lack reliable and accessible documents regarding curricular policy and processes in social studies, or that which we today call social studies. If one regards curriculum policy as a direction for the curriculum fostered by some governmental or quasi-governmental agency, then there was essentially no state or national curricular policy directions when Emma Willard first appeared on the educational scene around 1807. Furthermore, since the common school movement was not firmly rooted at that time (Katz, 1968), there was little local curricular thrust.

What one is left with is policy as practice or policy as process. In that vein, textbook usage and course content in academies or town schools constituted both policy and practice. In addition, practices and suggestions for
teaching as described by the few educational journals of the time might also be seen as influencing policy to some degree.

Thus, curricular policy in history or geography might be influenced by someone who wrote textbooks, who published articles on teaching, who trained teachers, or who taught those who might influence education. Emma Hart Willard did all of these things and her influence on education in the nineteenth century was substantial. The remainder of this paper examines two topics: Emma Willard and her educational activities, and Emma Willard's impact on schooling as policy and process, particularly in history and geography.

The Case of Emma Willard

Emma Hart was born in Berlin, Connecticut on February 23, 1787, one of seventeen children of Samuel Hart and his two wives. Mrs. Willard's youngest and closest sister, Mrs. Alma Phelps, also became a teacher and textbook writer, authoring well-known texts in botany and chemistry and becoming principal of Patapsco, Maryland, Female Institute (Fowler, 1859, p. 128). Emma Hart received her education at the town school, then spent two years studying with Dr. Miner, a medical doctor from Yale, at his school. At seventeen she began teaching in Kensington at a village school. After further study at the schools of Mrs. Royce and the Misses Patten of Hartford, she again taught, this time at Berlin, Westfield, and Middlebury, Connecticut.

While teaching at Middlebury in 1814, she formulated a design for a female seminary and began to write an address to the Legislature, but did not fill in the blank until 1818, when she had five students from Waterford, New York, and she wrote of her plan to Governor Dewitt Clinton (Woody, 1929, pp. 305-306). Her plan must be seen in perspective. As Goodsell notes:

When Emma Willard came upon the scene about 1807, most states in New England were offering free elementary education to girls in town schools. . . . The day of the free public high school had not yet dawned; and college education of women was unheard of. (1931, p. 12)

Governor Clinton responded favorably to her proposal and she moved to Waterford in 1818 where she anticipated addressing the legislature and receiving support for the establishment and maintenance of a female seminary. Despite Clinton's support the legislature did not consent to hear her until 1819 when she addressed them with her subsequently famous "Plan for Improving Female Education," subtitled "an address to the public, particularly members of the legislature of New York." Willard's object in this address was to convince the public that a reform with respect to female education is necessary; it can't be done by individual exertion, but needs the Legisla-
ture; and to persuade that body to endow a seminary for females. Women at college may seem absurd, but it is not. (Willard, 1893, p. 3)

Willard’s address was divided into four sections. The first spoke to defects in the present mode of female education and their causes. The second considered the principles by which education should be regulated. The third section outlined a plan for a female seminary and the final section presented the benefits which society would receive from such seminaries. In addressing the defects of education Willard observed:

Education should seek to bring its subjects to the perfection of their moral, intellectual, and physical nature, in order that they may be of the greatest possible use to themselves and others; or, to use a different expression, that they may be the means of the greatest possible happiness of which they are capable, both as to what they enjoy and what they communicate. . . . Studies and employments should therefore be selected from one or both of the following considerations; either because they are peculiarly fitted to improve the faculties, or because they are such as the pupil will most probably have occasion to practice in future life. (Willard, 1893, p. 13)

The above considerations, Willard observed in the education of males, but not in the education of females.

Another defect noted was that the first object in educating females was to please males. Not that Willard was against females being attractive, however. “Neither would I be understood to mean that our sex should not seek to make themselves agreeable to the other” (Willard, 1893, p. 17). In attempting to understand Willard’s views on gender roles, it should also be noted that she was not for women’s suffrage; in fact she spoke out against it.

In summing up Willard’s views of the benefits of female education, two final points deserve mention. First, she may have indirectly reinforced the low wages of teachers through her plea for the entry of more women into that field.

There are many females of ability to whom the business of instructing children is highly acceptable, and who would devote all their faculties to their occupation. They would have no higher pecuniary object to engage their attention, and their reputation as instructors they would consider as important. (1893, p. 35)

A second point spoke to the widespread belief that females were illogical and scatterbrained.

Females, by having their understandings cultivated, their reasoning powers developed and strengthened, may be expected to act more from the dictates of reason and less from those of fashion and caprice. (1893, p. 42)
Regarding Willard’s plan, Woody commented that, “The greatest contribution made to our ideals of Woman’s education by Mrs. Emma Willard is undoubtedly to be found in her clear presentation of the obligation resting upon the State to provide effectively for such education” (1929, p. 277). According to Goodsell, the plan was widely noted in a very favorable light.

The clarity and persuasive logic of her appeal, its sanity and freedom from bitterness won for it a favorable hearing from many liberal minded men. President Monroe and Thomas Jefferson are said to have approved it and John Adams . . . wrote Mrs. Willard a cordial letter of commendation. (Goodsell, 1931, p. 24)

Despite the empassioned, but well-reasoned, plan and the Governor’s support, the New York State Legislature failed to provide the funding for a female seminary in Waterford, New York. Willard then received an offer to move her school to Troy, which she did, and where the Common Council of Troy raised $4,000 for the venture. In 1821, the school opened as the Troy Female Seminary. “Troy Female Seminary, established by Emma Willard, has been said, with some exaggeration, to mark the beginning of higher education for women in the United States” (Woody, 1929, p. 344). Goodsell noted:

The enthusiastic judgment of Thomas Wentworth Higginson that, in publishing her “Plan for Improving Female Education” in 1819 and in establishing at Waterford a school under [partial] patronage of the state, Emma Willard “laid the foundation upon which every women’s college may be said to rest” is probably somewhat of an overstatement . . . [However] this woman was in truth a crusader in a great cause, to whom American women owe in measurable degree their rich educational opportunities. (1831, pp. 15–16)

In the years that Willard remained at Troy, she trained over 7,000 women and it became known as one of the premier institutions for the education of young women. In recognition of this a number of graduates published a book in 1898 that sought to revive the memory of Emma Willard through the erection of a statue of her on the seminary grounds and through the formation of the Emma Willard Association (Sage, 1898, p. 4). The women trained by Willard included the daughters of the Governors of Vermont, Michigan, Ohio, and Georgia; three nieces of Washington Irving, and the niece of Mary Wollstonecraft; daughters of United States senators, state legislators, generals, two United States ambassadors; and daughters of state supreme court, federal, and local judges.

**Willard’s Teaching and Textbook Writing**

As early as 1814 in Middlebury, Willard was innovative in her teaching, particularly of history and geography. Fowler quoted Willard’s description of one innovation:
Here I began a series of improvements in geography, separately and first teaching what could be learned from maps, then treating the various subjects of population, extent, length of rivers, etc., by comparing country with country, river with river, and city with city, making out with the assistance of my pupils those tales which afterwards appeared in Woodbridge and Willard's Geographies. Here also began improvements in educational history. (Fowler, 1859, p. 135)

Willard goes on to recount: "Geography, then, I dissected and remodeled, according to those laws of mind concerned in acquiring and retaining knowledge." These included (a) map acquisition knowledge, (b) topics and views of population, altitude of mountains, length of rivers, and (c) general or philosophic views of government, religion, commerce, manufacturers, and productions. This was by her admission an original plan for teaching geography.

The method is now fully established; and has been for the past twenty-five years. . . . These changes in educational Geography (sic) led to some corresponding improvements in History. I devised the plan of series of maps answering to the epochs into which that subject should be divided. This method was first described in 1822, in my Ancient Geography; and directions and names of places there are given to enable the pupil to make himself a set of maps corresponding to the principal epochs of ancient history. (Fowler, 1859, pp. 149-50)

Willard's educational thought, at least as far as teaching geography and history are concerned, was quite reflective of the progressivist thought nearly one hundred years in the future. Goodsell notes:

She advocates teaching geography to beginners by methods adapted to their age and understanding. . . . She declares herself desirous that the child should understand as he goes rather than that he should go far . . . and suggests that she was familiar with the revolutionary methods of the Swiss educational reformer Pestalozzi. (1931, pp. 83-84)

Willard's map and geography organization sound surprisingly like Dewey's or Hanna's model of expanding communities. She suggested that the young child should begin his study of maps by drawing a map of his own town. After he began to understand a map in relation to locality, he could go on to study the map of the United States. Last, not first, as was apparently customary at that time, he could study the map of the world.

In Geography for Beginners, Willard used a conversational method reminiscent of Rugg's social studies materials of the 1920s and 30s. "Mother" and "Frank" carry on the conversation in each chapter, a method which she believed was more suitable to young pupils than the usual formal presentation of a subject.

Goodsell points out another novel approach used by Willard, which we
take for granted. “Believing that maps of ancient times should faithfully reproduce the geography of that time, she sought to give pupils historically accurate maps to dispel their difficulty in distinguishing different periods of time on maps including centuries of history” (1931, p. 85). Willard saw history and geography teaching, then, as going hand in hand.

In regard to geography, as connected with history, it is no less important that the association of the event with the visible representation of its place on the map should be strongly made. Hence, the pupils should always be required to trace on their maps the routes of navigators, armies, etc., and to show the locations of cities and battlefields. (Willard, 1845, p. xvii)

As Roorbach noted:

She taught so that her students could grasp both the continuity of the subject and the cross-section of events. No good teacher she said would require pupils to learn all dates. (1937, p. 86)

Willard combined ethnographic (her term) and chronological forms of teaching history, i.e. from country to country or through the centuries. First, she constructed a chart called the Temple of Time. The base of the pillars indicate the centuries, along the pillars are the outstanding characters of those centuries. The pillars recede from the nineteenth century back to the creation. The floor of the temple is marked off by contemporary nations, which recede to the pillar, bearing the century of their origin. The ceiling is so divided, as to show the contemporaneous persons throughout the centuries in religion, literature, exploration, and war. Willard’s Historic Guide to the Temple of Time described it thusly:

The names on the pillars are of those sovereigns by whom the age or time in which they flourished is chiefly distinguished. On the roof are the names of some of the most celebrated persons of the age to which they belonged. . . . Along the right margin of floorwork are some of the most important battles of which history treats. . . . on the left corresponding margin are placed the epochs of Willard’s Universal History. (Willard, 1849, pp. 19-20)

Impact of Willard’s Work in Geography and History

Apparently, Willard’s texts sold well and were popular. Roorbach describes one text, and provides interesting claims about its popularity:

Willard in 1828 wrote her History of the United States: Exhibited in Connection (sic) with Its Chronology and Progressive Geography, by Means of a Series of Maps. The first of these maps shows the country as inhabited by various tribes of Indians at the time of its discovery, and the remainder, its state at different subsequent Epochs, so arranged as
to associate the principal events of the history and their dates with the places in which they occurred; this was the plan for teaching history in the Troy Female Seminary. This history text was not only popular in the academies, seminaries and high schools of this country before the Civil War, but was printed in Spanish for Cuba, California, Mexico and South America. An 1854 edition announced that Daniel Webster used it on his desk in the United States Senate as a reference book. (Roorbach, 1937, pp. 118-119)

Lutz supports and extends Roorbach’s claim:

Willard’s geography with Woodbridge preceded the history volumes, but it was these latter which were most widely read and used. These included Universal History in Perspective, published in editions from 1844 to 1882, Willard’s Historic Guide, and the History of the United States or Republic of America with editions from 1828–1873 including three German language editions. The success of the geography text initially brought Mrs. Willard “a substantial financial return,” while also increasing her prestige as an educator. (Lutz, 1929, p. 87)

According to S. A. Allibone’s (1876) Critical Dictionary of English Literature and British and American Authors, the sales of her books and charts numbered more than a million at the time of Willard’s death.

**Characteristic Content in Willard’s Texts**

Willard’s geographic concerns are obvious in her works, as was noted previously. The History of the United States is interspersed with maps of the period in question. Map Number 1 (Willard, 1845, p. 12) shows “Wanderings and Locations of the Aborigines,” i.e. native American Indians. Only the area east of the Mississippi River is depicted since that was the U. S. at that time. In discussing the native Americans, Willard provides tribal names as well as “regional nomenclatures”. So Lenni Lenape and Mengue are given along with Delaware and Iroquois. There is relatively extensive native American Indian history with accurate geographic placements.

Willard was not subtle in her prejudices which sing out from her school texts. She was enamored of the Puritans and their strengths (1845, pp. 50–65) and believed that European whites were superior as a matter of biology and through God’s plan. When discussing William Penn and other “noble whites”, the native Americans were made to sound totally enthralled.

Willard’s discussion of foreign affairs was jingoistic. She blithely condoned the annexation of Texas because of the rumor of a British takeover of the area. She claimed that many Mexicans wanted the United States to receive more land following the Mexican-American War, the War of North-
ern Aggression, but the United States government said, "Enough" (Willard, 1855).

Elson reiterates criticism of jingoism in discussing Willard's treatment of the Irish:

The only specific reference to the Irish in discussing immigration in general is in Willard's popular history: she observed that foreign immigration has diminished because of disorders incident to slavery in the United States, and because Ireland had become more prosperous. She concludes: "As about three-quarters of all crimes committed in the country have been by foreigners, we hope our state-prisons may here after have fewer inmates." (Elson, 1964, p. 127)

Willard's *Universal History* was world history from the creation to 1843. Her mixture of secular training and religious belief also reflected her values, which were, for the most part, those of the day. Willard dated her work from creation and devoted 137 pages to the period before Christ with dates for the birth of Moses (1571 B.C.), his death (1452 B.C.), the destruction of Sodom (1897 B.C.) and the great flood (approximately 3,000 to 4,000 B.C.). Willard reported that the great geologist, Curvier, said that the flood could not have been much farther back than five or six thousand years (1855, p. 34).

Willard made some of her prejudices even clearer in a letter sent to Senator Thomas H. Benton, January 7, 1850, and quoted by John Lord:

I feel uneasy about the Mormons getting possession of such a central and important part of the country. . . . a real danger that may accrue from allowing that people to organize a State with their peculiar institutions; which, from what I have been able to learn concerning them, are far more dangerous than slavery. . . . We were born a Protestant Christian Nation. . . . If we tolerate others, that is enough. We should not allow them to form governments or exercise political power on any other basis. . . . Mormons should be held up to this rule; and in doing this, we shall teach the Catholics a lesson. (Lord, 1873, p. 230)

Nonetheless, Willard's beliefs were most likely the norm for textbooks at the time, since they reflected the dominant view of the populace. Woody noted that Willard

prepared numerous important textbooks which, judging from their excellent character and wide use, must have been influential factors in improving instruction in academies and seminaries throughout the Eastern half of the U.S. (Woody, 1929, p. 347)

Willard's books were divided into sections with questions related to each section. Questions were usually lower order—knowledge, comprehension, and application—but some higher order questions occasionally appear.
Willard was not particularly enamored of including questions in texts, as she noted:

As a teacher I never used another's questions, but always my own; and it was with reluctance that I complied with the solicitations of my publishers and the requirements of many teachers, to add questions to my school books. (1849, p. 41)

Willard's history structures have been touched upon previously. In the *Historic Guide to the Temple of Time*, Willard also included biographical sketches of great figures in world history—Columbus, Ferdinand and Isabella, Charles V, Martin Luther, Napoleon. Slightly longer sketches were given of "principal leaders of the western continent"—John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, Simon Bolivar, Andrew Jackson, George Washington.

Willard offered advice to teachers. "The simple rule for the instructor to give his pupils is—Read your lesson with attention, and consider the subject matter in order to understand it as indicated by your author. . . . Possess your subject thoroughly" (Willard, 1855, p. 42).

The impact of the *Temple of Time* was widespread and led to a number of honors. Lutz observed:

At the World's Fair in London in 1851, Mrs. Willard was awarded a gold medal for this original plan of teaching history. . . . She was indefatigable in giving demonstrations of teaching history with the "Temple of Time." She taught every class in history at the Seminary to illustrate the advantages of the new method, and spent four weeks in Philadelphia introducing it into the school conducted by her niece, Helen Phelps. (Lutz, 1929, p. 228)

This teaching of a new, radical method as a form of teacher training is reminiscent of the practice Harold Rugg used with his social science pamphlets nearly 100 years later. And, like Rugg, Willard's success brought jealousy and controversy.

Marcius Willson, also the author of textbooks on American history authored a report submitted to the Historical Committee of the New Jersey Society of Teachers and Friends of Education. The report was subtitled, A Critical Review of American Common School Histories, but it was less a review than an attack on a number of popular history textbooks, most notably Willard's. The report took Willard to task for what Willson saw as significant errors of fact and style in her *Abridged History*. Lutz noted:

She was made very unhappy and indignant about this time by attacks on her histories by Marcius Willson, who also was the author of textbooks on history. He claimed that his book should be used by schools, as previous histories, including Mrs. Willard's, were filled with errors. . . . The result was a succession of controversial pamphlets. . . .
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Mrs. Willard forcibly defended her reputation as a historian and showed that Mr. Willson’s accusations were groundless. (Lutz, 1929, p. 229)

Willard’s Appeal (1847) focused on Willson’s “self-servingness,” his inaccuracies and his plagiarism of her materials. Unlike today when an overly litigious society either deters such attacks or drives the parties into the courts, Willard and Willson slugged it out in print. Mrs. Willard first noted that Willson’s report was not a report at all, but existed only to sell his own books. She disputed his claim that her work contained errors, asserting that all of his stylistic corrections were wrong and that the dates in disputes were correct, or had been corrected in subsequent editions of the volume. She then presented many text parallels between her volume and Willson’s that reinforced her claim that he plagiarized her work.

In the appendix to the Appeal, Willard included testimonial letters of support for the book from the Principal of the Academical Department of The University of Pennsylvania, the Principal of the Female Seminary of Philadelphia, the Principal of the Academy in Philadelphia and other school people in Mt. Joy, Pennsylvania, New York City, and Suffolk County, New York. Also included in the appendix were press reviews from the Boston Traveler, New York American, Cincinnati Gazette, and the Albany Evening Journal with universal praise for Willard’s Abridged History.

Willson reiterated his prior charges in another tract and Willard replied in her Answer (1847a). There she directly refuted Willson’s charges point by point and went on to explicate what she deemed Willson’s bigger errors. Mrs. Willard then called in her reinforcements, quoting well-known people who found her style and substance correct. A letter from the Marquis de Lafayette, who Willard entertained at her school in Connecticut when he visited the United States in 1824 and who she visited in France, endorsed her history of the Revolutionary War. Daniel Webster’s letter, previously noted, to Mrs. Willard claimed her book to be “correct in facts and dates” (Willard, 1847b). Harrison Otis Gray praised its account of the Hartford Convention as the only impartial one he found in a school textbook. Henry Clay found the synopsis of a great speech of his “perfect” and a New York Supreme Court Justice found it “in conformity with the first great law of historic composition—TRUTH” (Lord, 1873, pp. 315-316).

Willard’s contributions to education are clear. She was one of the most instrumental educators in the higher education of women, and in teacher training at Troy, which Goodsell (1931, p. 33) called a pioneer normal school. She was also a leader in the common school movement in her later years (Barnard, 1856), in inservice education (Lutz, 1929, p. 214), and in textbook writing in history and geography. Willard’s text writing also made her a text critic. When working as a supervisor in Kensington, Connecticut, she noted:
I have collected and examined the school books used in the Kensington Schools. The amount of fiction put into the hands of the children in their daily lessons strikes me with surprise and regret. . . . Some of these books, too contain low and vulgar language. Who would send a child among clowns to learn manners? (Barnard, 1840)

Willard also tried to focus on the thinking process and the shaping of a good citizen. She "strove to get away from pure memory work, to encourage reasoning and experimentation, and to make education applicable to life" (Lutz, 1929, p. 109). "In several of the seminaries there developed some practical phases of self-government, responsibility being placed on students by such leaders as Mrs. Willard, Miss Beecher and Mary Lyon" (Woody, 1929, p. 434).

Willard's effect was far reaching because of her textbooks and their wide use, and because of the quantity and quality of young women trained at the Troy Female Seminary. These women, many of whom became teachers with a real impact on further generations, as well as prominent women of society, continued to enhance Willard's reputation long after her death in 1870. It is only fitting that Willard is rediscovered in an era when women are beginning to be recognized for their achievements as professionals rather than as women in professional jobs.
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Abstract

Three developmental perspectives complementary to Kohlberg’s cognitive theory of moral development are addressed: (a) further delineations in the stage development of young children, (b) content that includes caring and responsibility for others, and (c) links to moral behavior. The work of Damon, Selman, Gilligan, and research on prosocial education is explained in light of their contributions to a more comprehensive view of moral development. Implications of this research for moral education are discussed, and a comprehensive model for moral education research is proposed.

Lawrence Kohlberg’s theory of cognitive moral development has dominated the field of moral development and moral education for the last 15 years. In a recent annotated bibliography on moral education, entries on the cognitive developmental perspective far outnumbered any other approach (Leming, 1983a, 1983b). Although Kohlberg refined his developmental stages and revised his recommended teaching approaches over the years (1976; 1978; Colby, Kohlberg, Gibbs, & Lieberman, 1983; Kurtines & Gerwitz, 1984; Kohlberg, Levine, & Hewer, 1985), his critics continue to cite flaws in his theory and methods (Pekarsky, 1980; Johnson, 1983; Kohlberg, Levine, & Hewer, 1985). In two reviews of research for a forthcoming text for elementary and middle school social studies teachers, one on social development and one on moral education, I noted significant gaps between the developmental perspectives being investigated by psychologists and the applications of this research to current views of moral education.

The aim of this inquiry is not to critique Kohlberg per se but (a) to correct significant omissions in Kohlberg’s cognitive-developmental approach by highlighting related theories and research that emanate from Kohlberg’s work and have been largely ignored by the educational community, (b) to discuss the implications of these developmental theories and research for an expanded view of moral development and (c) to suggest a more comprehen-
sive model of moral education that includes the omissions discussed and emphasizes moral behavior. Each of these three objectives will be discussed in turn. First, the following three omissions are addressed:

1. A delineation of the stages of moral development of children ages 5 to 10, including their concepts of positive justice and social role-taking perspectives. Since Kohlberg used participants aged 10 and older, his theory does not sufficiently describe the reasoning of younger children.

2. A view of moral judgment that goes beyond justice and rights as an endpoint to a morality that includes responsibility and caring for others as an equally important aim of moral development. Carol Gilligan and her associates provide evidence for this omission.

3. A view of moral development which is concerned about moral behavior as well as moral reasoning. Research on the development of prosocial behavior addresses this need by investigations of correlates to moral behavior (Staub, 1979; Eisenberg, 1982a; Honig, 1982).

Scant attention to these theories or to research on prosocial behavior occurs in recent books and methods texts dealing with moral education (e.g. Cochrane & Manley-Casimir, 1980; Fraenkel, 1980; Hersh, Miller, & Fielding, 1980; Johnson, 1983; Reimer, Paolitto, & Hersh, 1983; Rosenzweig, 1982; Shaver & Strong, 1982). To correct these omissions, I will present four theories of development that extend and modify Kohlberg’s theory in important ways: William Damon’s research on children’s development of positive justice, Robert Selman’s research on the development of social role-taking abilities, Carol Gilligan’s research on a morality of responsibility and care, and Nancy Eisenberg’s research on prosocial reasoning as well as research on the development of prosocial behavior. Though these researchers have not undertaken extensive longitudinal studies as has Kohlberg and are not all strictly developmentalists, their quasi-developmental frameworks have much to contribute to moral education theory and practice.

Moral Development of Children

Most kindergarten and elementary pupils function at the preconventional level of moral reasoning, Kohlberg’s stage 1 emphasizing a concern for obedience to authority or stage 2 emphasizing instrumental self-interest. Because of the ages of individuals Kohlberg interviewed, 10 years and older, and because the content of the dilemmas used is far removed from the lives of young children, these two stages are not adequate to describe the nuances of children’s development. In recent years there has been a surge of research examining the richness of young children’s thinking about moral issues and their abilities to take the perspectives of others (For critical, integrative reviews of this research, see Shantz, 1983; Rest, 1983).

In particular, William Damon (1975; 1977; 1980) has done extensive
research interviewing children ages four to twelve about their notions of fairness, or positive justice, in response to situations such as how they would share money earned from a class project. He has also examined children's thinking about other issues including authority, friendship, and social rules (1977). Damon has expanded Kohlberg's first two stages into six age-related levels for the development of positive justice, each level incorporating and building on the thinking in the previous levels (see Table 1).

For children five years or younger two types of reasoning predominate.

### Table 1
Early Positive-Justice Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-A</td>
<td>4 &amp; Under</td>
<td>Positive-justice choices derive from wish that an act occur. Reasons simply assert the wishes rather than attempting to justify them (“I should get it because I want to have it”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-B</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Choices still reflect desires, but are now justified on the basis of external, observable realities such as size, sex, or other physical characteristics of persons (e.g., we should get the most because we are girls). Such justifications, however, are invoked in a fluctuating, after-the-fact manner, and are self-serving in the end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-A</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>Positive-justice choices derive from notions of strict equality in actions (i.e., that everyone should get the same). Equality is seen as preventing complaining, fighting, “fussing,” or other types of conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-B</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>Positive-justice choices derive from a notion of reciprocity in actions: that persons should be paid back in kind for doing good or bad things. Notions of merit and deserving emerge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-A</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>A moral relativity develops out of the understanding that different persons can have different, yet equally valid, justifications for their claims to justice. The claims of persons with special needs (e.g., the poor) are weighed heavily. Choices attempt quantitative compromises between competing claims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-B</td>
<td>10 &amp; Up</td>
<td>Considerations of equality and reciprocity are coordinated such that choices take into account the claims of various persons and the demands of the specific situation. Choices are firm and clear-cut, yet justifications reflect the recognition that all persons should be given their due (though, in many situations, this does not mean equal treatment).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First at Level 0-A, choices are based on individual desires (''If I want it, then I should get it.''). Next at Level 0-B, choices also reflect desires but are justified on the basis of external factors, such as ''We should get more because we are girls.''

At Damon's Level I two additional types of reasoning are evident. First, at Level 1-A for ages 5 to 7 children make choices based on strict equality: ''Everyone should get the same.'' At Level 1-B, for ages 6 to 9, ideas about merit and reciprocity emerge such as ''You did more work so you should get more.'' At Level 2-A, for children ages 8 to 10, notions of equity emerge, so that special needs of individuals are taken into account. At Level 2-B, for ages 10 and older, reasoning is based on notions of equality, reciprocity and special needs such that the need for compromising is recognized.

Damon's focus on the content of moral reasoning about a particular issue contrasts with Kohlberg's emphasis on an underlying structure that is independent of content and enlarges our understanding of children's reasoning. In addition to the considerable research Damon and his associates have done to document his levels, other research indicates their successful application as the basis for teaching programs to improve children's levels of reasoning (Enright, 1981; Krogh, 1985).

Robert Selman's research (1971; 1976; 1980) delineates five stages of social-role taking; four stages have been validated as preconditions for Kohlberg's first four stages of moral reasoning and one stage precedes the capacity for moral reasoning (see Table 2). Although to some extent Kohlberg (1976) has incorporated these stages of social perspective in the outline of each of his stages, they are seldom emphasized and usually ignored in explanations of Kohlberg for teachers (i.e., in methods texts). Stages 0–2 of Selman's social role taking also are consistent with Damon's levels 0–2 for positive justice (see Tables 1 and 2).

Selman conducted extensive interviews with young children as well as older pupils to develop his stages (1971; 1976). Individuals progress from a Stage 0 egocentric viewpoint at ages 3 to 6, to a Stage 1 ability to see another's perspective different from his or her own at ages 6–8, to a Stage 2 ability to put herself or himself in the shoes of another at ages 8 to 10. Only beginning at Stage 3, age 10, are children typically able to engage in mutual role taking and step outside an interaction to view the situation from a third party perspective. Finally at Stage 4, age 12 and over, perspective taking is conducted from the view of the social system that all individuals share where social convention and legal rules are considered. As with the application of Damon's levels of fairness, research indicates that moral education interventions are improved by efforts to expose children to higher stages of perspective-taking (Selman, 1980).

Morality of Care and Responsibility

A second major drawback with the emphasis on Kohlberg's theory in moral education stems from its narrow view of morality. Carol Gilligan
Table 2
Developmental Stages in Role Taking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Child’s Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Egocentric Viewpoint</td>
<td>3–6</td>
<td>Child has a sense of differentiation of self and other but fails to distinguish between the social perspective (thoughts, feelings) of other and self. Child can label other’s overt feelings but does not see the cause and effect relation of reasons to social actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Social-Informational Role Taking</td>
<td>6–8</td>
<td>Child is aware that other has a social perspective based on other’s own reasoning, which may or may not be similar to child’s. However, child tends to focus on one perspective rather than coordinating viewpoints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Self-Reflective Role Taking</td>
<td>8–10</td>
<td>Child is conscious that each individual is aware of the other’s perspective and that this awareness influences self and other’s view of each other. Putting self in other’s place is a way of judging his intentions, purposes, and actions. Child can form a coordinated chain of perspectives, but cannot yet abstract from this process to the level of simultaneous mutuality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mutual Role Taking</td>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>Child realizes that both self and other can view each other mutually and simultaneously as subjects. Child can step outside the two-person dyad and view the interaction from a third-person perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Social and Conventional System Role Taking</td>
<td>12–15+</td>
<td>Person realizes mutual perspective taking does not always lead to complete understanding. Social conventions are seen as necessary because they are understood by all members of the group (the generalized other) regardless of their position, role, or experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(1977; 1979; 1982) suggested that Kohlberg’s model presents only one dimension of moral judgment, that of justice. Two aspects of Kohlberg’s methodology contribute to this limited view: (a) initially selecting only male subjects to develop his theory and (b) measuring moral judgment by subjects’ responses to situations that are hypothetical and that have a limited number of options available to resolve the dilemma.
Gilligan has conducted three studies to examine individuals’ conceptions of themselves and of morality (1982). In her first two studies adolescent and adult females were interviewed. Her third study included matched samples of males and females from ages 6 to 60. As a result of these interviews which elicited descriptions of individuals’ own life experiences and difficult choices they have made, Gilligan has proposed a model of morality based on responsibility and care where individuals are seen as connected in relationships with others rather than as separate.

Gilligan’s subjects saw themselves as connected to each other in relationships that require response to others on their own terms to prevent harm or promote the welfare of another. Relationships are mediated by an activity of care that reflects the interdependence of individuals in contrast to Kohlberg’s view of human nature depicting individuals as separate from each other and relationships as primarily reciprocal (see Table 3). For Kohlberg objectivity and fairness are valued and mediated by rules that are carried out through individual’s duties and obligations to each other. In Kohlberg’s morality, moral problems are viewed as issues that can be settled by resolving competing claims through the application of impartial rules, principles, or standards.

Gilligan argues that “the moral problem arises from conflicting responsibilities rather than from competing rights. . . . This conception of morality as concerned with the activity of care centers moral development around the understanding of responsibility and relationships” (1982, p. 19). In her theory, moral decisions are judged on how well they maintain or restore relationships and how effective they are in helping others or preventing hurt. Gilligan critiques the limitation of Kohlberg’s ethics of principle at the expense of care in the following comparison:

The blind willingness to sacrifice people to truth, however, has always been the danger of an ethics abstracted from life. This willingness links Gandhi to the biblical Abraham, who prepared to sacrifice the life of his son in order to demonstrate integrity and supremacy of his faith. Both men, in the limitations of their fatherhood, stand in implicit contrast to the woman who comes before Solomon and verifies her motherhood by relinquishing truth in order to save the life of her child. (1982, pp. 104-105)

Gilligan hypothesizes that individuals progress through a sequence of perspectives with “each perspective representing a more complex understanding of the relationship between self and other and each transition involving a critical reinterpretation of the conflict between selfishness and responsibility” (p. 105). As seen in Table 3, Gilligan (1977; 1982) has outlined three levels of development corresponding to Kohlberg’s preconventional, conventional, and post-conventional levels. At the first level, concern is primarily with self and decisions are made based on what is most expedient for self-preservation. At the first transition individuals con-
### Table 3
Comparison of Gilligan's Morality of Care and Responsibility and Kohlberg's Morality of Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morality of Care and Responsibility: Gilligan</th>
<th>Morality of Justice: Kohlberg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Moral Imperative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care/Responsibility</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Components of Morality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Sanctity of individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for self and others</td>
<td>Rights of self and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Fairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion</td>
<td>Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfishness/self-sacrifice</td>
<td>Rules/legalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Moral Dilemmas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats to harmony and relations</td>
<td>Conflicting rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinants of Moral Obligation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive Processes for Resolving Dilemmas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductive thinking</td>
<td>Formal logical-deductive thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>View of Self as Moral Agent</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected, attached</td>
<td>Separate, individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role of Affect</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivates care, compassion</td>
<td>Not a component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philosophical Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenological (contextual relativism)</td>
<td>Rational (universal principle of justice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stages</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Individual Survival</td>
<td>I. Punishment and Obedience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ia. From Selfishness to Responsibility</td>
<td>II. Instrumental Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Self Sacrifice and Social Conformity</td>
<td>III. Interpersonal Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa. From Goodness to Truth</td>
<td>IV. Social System and Conscience Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Morality of Nonviolence</td>
<td>V. Prior Rights and Social Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI. Universal Ethical Principles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sider the possibility that responsibility toward others is as important as their own selfish concerns. At the second level, moral judgment is based on shared norms and expectations. One's goodness and acceptance by others is of utmost concern. The conventional feminine virtues associated with service and deference to others predominate. Because an individual may consider herself responsible for the actions of others while holding others responsible for the choices she makes, individuals at this level are often caught between the activity of care and the passivity of dependence. During the second transition, individuals reconsider the logic of self-sacrifice and begin to express concern again for their individual needs. At the third level of development, individuals assert a moral equality between self and others; nonviolence or an injunction against hurting governs one's moral decisions. Responsibility now includes care for both self and others.

Gilligan's theory of morality is not suggested to replace Kohlberg's but to be a parallel that reflects the moral thinking of females and males, though males may have a less fully developed morality of care than females because of different social expectations (Lyons, 1983). Although additional research is necessary to validate her claims for developmental stages (Brabeck, 1983), Gilligan's views on morality add an important perspective to the content of Kohlberg's stages. They also expand the moral domain to include moral sensitivity and moral action, in addition to moral reasoning. For these reasons increased attention to Gilligan's theory and research is needed for a more complete approach to moral education. (For additional analyses and critique, see Brabeck, 1983; Kohlberg, Levine, & Hewer, 1985; Nunner-Winkler, 1984; Scott, 1986; Sichel, 1985).

A second approach that complements Gilligan's efforts to expand Kohlberg's view of moral development is Nancy Eisenberg's work on prosocial reasoning, moral thinking related to opportunities to take action that helps others, often altruistic. She has devised prosocial dilemmas that differ from Kohlberg's dilemmas in that they de-emphasize situations in which laws, punishment, or formal obligations are relevant. Instead they involve situations in which individuals must choose between satisfying their own wants, needs, or values and those of others. Situations where individuals have the opportunity to make decisions to act on behalf of others are emphasized.

Eisenberg (1982b) has established four stages in the development of prosocial reasoning: (a) hedonistic reasoning, (b) stereotypic, approval-oriented reasoning, (c) empathetic reasoning, and (d) reasoning based on internalized values and responsibilities. Her studies indicate that the reasoning of children and adolescents in making judgments about prosocial issues is more advanced than reasoning found in Kohlberg's situations that involved constraints. Empathy also played a more significant role. Though her model has been criticized for not withstanding empirical examination of its stages (Rest, 1983), her approach lends further support to the notion that
Kohlberg’s model inadequately addresses the activity of care for others as a legitimate domain of moral education.

**Moral Behavior**

My third concern is the often unstated assumption of moral education that, by increasing pupils’ abilities to reason about moral behavior, teachers can improve the choices pupils make about their own moral behavior. Though there is evidence to suggest that exposure to moral dilemmas and other approaches to moral education can increase individuals’ levels of moral reasoning, especially for secondary level pupils (Lockwood, 1978; Leming, 1980), research to suggest that levels of moral reasoning influence behavior is noticeably weak (Blasi, 1980; Schlaefli, Rest, & Thoma, 1985). Many other factors influence moral behavior such as the nature of the situation, the feelings and self-interest of the individuals involved, their competence to take action, and their level of responsibility for the situation (Fraenkel, 1981; Rest, 1983).

For moral education to address the concern that individuals not only can think morally but can also act morally, a more comprehensive model of moral development than Kohlberg’s is essential, one that includes implications from research on moral behavior. Not widely cited in articles and books about moral education is a growing body of research on the development of prosocial behavior, most commonly defined as “actions that are intended to aid or benefit another person or group without the anticipation of external rewards” (Mussen & Eisenberg-Berg, 1977, p. 3-4). The findings from a large number of studies in both naturalistic and laboratory settings indicate that increased prosocial behavior, such as compassion, sharing, and helping, can be linked with a number of factors. While it is beyond the scope of this article to review and critique the vast literature on the development of prosocial behavior, I will summarize important findings that may be applicable to school settings. (For more comprehensive reviews, see Radke-Yarrow, Zahn-Waxler, & Chapman, 1983; Eisenberg, 1982a; Honig, 1982; Staub, 1979; Mussen & Eisenberg-Berg, 1977; Leming, 1981.) Many of the studies on prosocial behavior involve socialization practices of parents and most apply to children twelve years or younger. The following generalizations are common findings:

1. Modeling of prosocial behavior by adults increases prosocial behavior in children, especially when adults are consistent, nurturing, verbalize their feelings of concern, tell what actions they took to improve the situation, express pleasure or relief at the outcome, and label their behavior as helping others.

2. Though less powerful than adults, other modeling agents, such as peers and television influence prosocial behavior, especially those models with whom children strongly identify or who have high prestige.
3. Empathy is a significant mediator of prosocial behavior. Both the cognitive aspect of empathy, i.e. the ability to recognize the feelings of others, and its affective component, vicarious emotional arousal and response to another's situation, contribute to increased prosocial behavior.

4. Adult use of reasoning instead of power assertion to settle disputes with children enhances prosocial behavior. For example, children whose parents typically explain the reasons for their actions and the harmful effects of other actions are more likely to behave prosocially when away from parental supervision than children whose parents routinely use threats of physical punishment or withholding to influence behavior.

5. Children's prosocial responses are increased when adults set high demands for mature behavior and performance of responsibilities.

6. Adult reinforcement of prosocial behaviors, especially when consistent and accompanied by an explanation of who did what for whom, increases children's prosocial responses beyond the period of reinforcement.

With the exception of programs for empathy training (Feshbach, 1979, 1982), there is little research on the application of the generalizations about the development of prosocial behavior to school settings. If the generalizations cited above were incorporated into moral education programs, they would look very different from ones based on Kohlberg's model in at least two respects. First, educators would view themselves as models as well as facilitators in moral education, and would advocate preferred solutions to moral situations. Second, educators would also evaluate moral behavior and be willing to give constructive feedback in the classroom regarding moral actions. Although teachers frequently inculcate students with their own value systems, particularly as a part of classroom management techniques for student discipline, directive moral education would be discouraged in Kohlberg's approach which emphasizes pupils' reasoning and individual choice regarding moral actions.

Implications for Social Studies Education

Perhaps moral development theory and moral education can be enhanced by the trends in research cited in this paper. It is suggested that an adequate program of moral education should (a) be premised on a comprehensive understanding as possible of students' age and stage development including children five to ten years old, (b) be sufficiently broad to include a morality of care and responsibility for others, and (c) be firmly linked to the expression of moral behavior. In this section I will discuss implications for educational practice of each of these three trends and make recommendations for the dissemination of these findings.

First, by taking into account additional stages in development in chil-
dren's thinking about positive justice and their social role-taking abilities, educators have new schemata to expand their understanding of pupils' responses and shape their expectations about pupils' thinking. A sufficient research base has been established to expand moral development education with these stages. A few curricular activities using children's literature have been suggested (Krogh & Lamme, 1983; 1985). More curricular development using social studies content for kindergarten and elementary grade pupils is warranted.

The second trend, to expand the content of moral decision-making to include an ethic of care and responsibility for others, suggests two directions. (a) Moral research is needed to address questions about the development of stages. For example, are there stages of a morality of care structurally parallel to Kohlberg's stages? (b) Curricular applications of the model need to be developed and applied. Work already being done in prosocial education is relevant here. For example, Pearl Oliner (1979) examined the content of social studies texts for prosocial concepts, generalizations, and examples, and found them wanting. She has recommended a number of strategies to expand the prosocial content of social studies curriculum (Oliner, 1983).

To address the third critique for incorporating moral action into moral education, a sufficient research base exists on the conditions that promote prosocial behavior to translate them into educational practice. Such techniques as empathy training, providing prosocial models, providing opportunities for prosocial actions, use of inductive reasoning, frequent assignment of pupil responsibilities and high maturity demands can be applied in classrooms. At least one model program for prosocial behavior is being tested (Solomon et al., 1985).

However, objections may be raised to the application of research on prosocial behavior to moral education because of the emphasis on prescriptive practices rather than inquiry approaches and individual decision-making. It is important to note that the effectiveness of interventions that promote prosocial behavior also correlate significantly with the age of children. The majority of studies showing the effectiveness of modeling and other direct techniques deal with children under 11 years. Few studies have been done with preadolescents or older students, at the ages when students are able to think more abstractly and better apply principled reasoning.

Hence the effectiveness of moral reasoning approaches may well correlate with the older age of pupils with whom they are most successful while the effectiveness of direct moral education approaches correlate with younger children. Thus we may be able to justify the use of prescriptive practices, or directive moral education, by relating the findings on prosocial behavior to research on pupils' stage development. (See Leming, 1981, for additional justification for the use of directive moral education.)

Third, I recommend that social educators and researchers be more fully informed about the research being conducted in the three areas discussed
New Directions in Moral Education Research

Because of the new research related to moral thinking and behavior, a more comprehensive and integrative approach to moral education is possible (Kurtines & Gewirtz, 1984). Others have proposed alternate frameworks (e.g., Leming, 1981; Harshman & Gray, 1983; Rest, 1983; Ryan & Lickona, 1985). What is needed is a model that is (a) sufficiently broad to include the large number of variables that influence individual’s affective, cognitive, and behavioral processes related to moral behavior and (b) sufficiently focused to guide educational research and practice. While the focus of this article has been on developmental perspectives, my position is that moral education must be formulated in a larger framework. No single developmental theory nor developmental theories collectively are adequate to guide educational practice.

The goal of moral education should be to educate pupils in the most effective way to enhance one or more components of moral behavior. I propose a three-dimensional model that includes the many variables affecting moral behavior, the variety of teaching strategies that can be used by educators for moral education, and the age-related stages of pupils’ moral development. These three dimensions of moral education need to be considered simultaneously with specific attention to how one or more components of each interact with one or more of the components in the other two dimensions. In the remainder of this article each of the three dimensions is briefly discussed.

First, we need an expanded view of moral behavior that takes into consideration a variety of definitions of morality, including Kohlberg's and Gilligan's views. We can examine a variety of variables affecting moral behavior by applying an expanded framework for moral behavior proposed by James Rest (1983). This framework includes four components:

**Moral sensitivity.** Before moral thinking or action occurs, the individual usually recognizes that a situation exists in which moral action may be needed and that his or her actions may have consequences for others. This component is particularly necessary for Gilligan’s orientation for an ethic of care and responsibility toward others and suggests the need for developing attributes such as compassion and empathy.

**Moral judgment.** To make a judgment about what one ought to do, moral reasoning must occur. This component encompasses the bulk of research on moral development and moral education. Kohlberg’s theory of moral reasoning, Damon’s levels of positive justice, and Selman’s developmental stages of role-taking are germane to this component.
Moral decision-making. Before taking action, individuals usually consider their alternatives and weigh the pros and cons of each in light of their probable consequences for themselves and others. Making decisions for action in the context of specific situations is highlighted in Gilligan's model which takes into account many more variables than considered necessary by Kohlberg for moral decisions.

Moral action. Finally, moral action requires the will and skill to implement a decision. Factors such as motivation, assertiveness, perseverance, self-discipline, ego strength, all influence the extent to which an individual implements a decision to act morally. Theoretical perspectives from Gilligan and research on prosocial behavior are pertinent here.

A second dimension for a more comprehensive model of moral development and moral education takes into account the students' developmental levels. If we envision moral education as a matrix, the many variables that are included in each of the four components discussed above, moral sensitivity, moral reasoning, moral decision-making, and moral action, intersect with the students' age and stage development for each variable. Theories such as Damon's, Selman's, Gilligan's, Eisenberg's, and Kohlberg's are relevant, though no one theory addresses all four components. For example, Kohlberg's stage framework and teaching strategies for promoting cognitive development could be applied to an educational goal to increase moral reasoning. Educators and researchers need to consider how the developmental levels of their pupils may be affecting their behavior relative to each component.

Finally a variety of teaching strategies for promoting moral growth need to be considered in conjunction with the expanded view of moral behavior contained in the first two dimensions. The effectiveness of various strategies for moral education can be measured against the particular aspect of moral behavior being targeted and the student's age and stage level. For example, for many outcomes such as prosocial behavior and moral reasoning, we would expect a significant relationship between the methods of education applied and the age level of students.

Proposed here is a complex, pluralistic three-way matrix representation which may increase our understanding of the interrelationships between moral development, moral behavior, and teaching strategies. Further examination and investigation is needed to measure the model's usefulness in guiding moral education and facilitating research in the field.

Endnotes

1. An earlier version of this paper was presented to the College and University Faculty Assembly at the National Council for the Social Studies annual meeting, Chicago, November, 1985. I wish to express my appreciation to James Leming for his helpful comments on the earlier version.
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Abstract

Although global education has been enthusiastically advocated, a thorough intellectual foundation for the movement is assumed rather than apparent in global education literature. This article analyzes one frequently implied theme, viable existence of a social group which encompasses the globe. The proposed global group is analyzed by application of three criteria which define the viability of other social groups. One is group justification through comparison with other existing groups. The second is the psychosocial development of individual group consciousness of membership. Third is the structural features which unify inhabitants in national groups. These sociological criteria do not support the existence of the hypothesized global group.

Global education has been a prominent interest of social science educators during the past decade. Attention has focused upon a deliberate, aggressive integration of global education into the framework of curriculum and instruction in American schools. Global education goals have received strong subjective support as imperatives of a substantive contemporary education. However, a detailed intellectual rationale justifying the repeatedly-cited goals has not been given (Becker, 1982; Kobus, 1983). A need for global education in response to modern world conditions has been widely accepted. While there is no doubt about the urgent need to develop global understandings, a theoretical base for global education programs is lacking. Recommendation without rigorous intellectual justification may have contributed to a weak attempt at curricular innovation.

The primary purpose of this paper is to apply a sociological analysis to a central theme of global education literature, creation of a global social group. The analysis examines the relationship between some sociological and psychosocial principles of human behavior in groups and declared intentions of global educators. The discussion considers the validity of curricular goals which assume that effective global education programs should help students acquire a membership orientation toward a global group. Some reservations about the development of a viable global group concept are presented.
The Global Group Theme

A number of salient contributions to global education literature were reviewed. Goal statements which were clearly prominent in one source or common in several sources were identified. The term global group was conceived as a label for a class of goals which displayed a certain thematic coherence. Goals which were included in the global group class share an intention to establish a consciousness of group. The goals are typified by recommendations to foster a state of mind which recognizes the existence of a world-wide social group and the membership of each individual in that group.

In a seminal volume edited by Becker (1979), social science educators make particular reference to the necessity to develop students' understandings of themselves in relation to their species, their planet, and the society of humans upon the Earth. The goal is to increase awareness that individuals exist within the context of the entire world. Students should, first, develop consciousness of a global group, and second, strengthen their sense of belonging to that group. To accomplish these aims, frequent examples of links and partnerships between local and remote individuals and communities are emphasized (Becker, 1979, 1980; Tonkin & Edwards, 1981). The existence of a group on a world scale, rather than a simple mass of human beings, is implied by the use of descriptors such as the global society, world interdependent system, humanistic ecosystem, and global perspective (Becker, 1979, 1982; Kniep, 1985; Kobus, 1983; Mehlinger, Hutson, Smith, & Wright, undated). Common territory is offered as a reason for the global group claim. One global education goal encourages students to see themselves as inhabitants of the planet. As territorial inhabitants they should realize dependence and responsibility in their relationship to the earth (Becker, 1979). The planet and its inhabitants are described as an ecosystem in which all elements are related. Alternatively, the earth is compared to a spaceship in which all elements have a function, are interdependent, and are contained within physical boundaries (Becker, 1979; Mehlinger et al., undated).

A membership criterion for the global group is active loyalty. A purpose of global education is development of individual loyalty to the global society or human species. Loyalties which reach only to national boundaries are considered outdated in an environment of world interdependence (Tonkin & Edwards, 1981).

Accompanying the goals which advocate membership and loyalty are suggestions of effective participation. A generalization of citizenship skills, ordinarily identified with membership in the nation state, is recommended for preparation to live in the world system (Becker, 1979; Gaddy, 1980; Kniep, 1985). Citizenship competencies described for global membership include ability to make decisions and reach judgements, think reflectively and
critically, solve problems, and contribute to global welfare by influencing processes that shape the quality of life (Becker, 1979, 1982; Hahn, 1984). A humanistic concern for equitable human conditions over the globe is identified as a characteristic of effective world citizenship. A knowledge of living standards for the unfortunate and a desire to make improvements is termed "state of the planet awareness" (Anderson, 1982; Hanvey, 1982; Kniep, 1985; Lamy, 1983).

Analysis of Global Group Theme

The above goals assume that a viable group configuration for the entire human species over the surface of the globe is a rational possibility. The global group theme invites analysis of the validity of a sociological phenomenon on a grand scale. Generalizations which are applied to other human collectives to evaluate their group status are available for application to the global collective. The nation is the most logical social group offering potential for comparison to the earth's inhabitants.

The intention of the following discussion is to reflect upon the validity of the global group concept by applying three general criteria of group existence. First is the principle that individuals formulate a concept of their own group by making comparisons to other groups. The second criterion defines the state of consciousness which individuals possess when they think of themselves as members of a group. The third compares national structural features to global features.

Comparison Groups

Historically, a common function of schooling has been to socialize children for their membership in various groups. Obvious groups are the family, community, and nation. Remy, Nathan, Becker, and Torney (1975) report findings which show that children develop an active identification with their nation during middle childhood. Anderson and Winston (1977) view global society as simply the most recent group to make a claim for socialization. However, Remy et al. suggest that a sense of affiliation with one's own nation is contingent upon an awareness of the existence of other nations. A sense of one's own national identification is facilitated by a sense of social distance from other nations. However, this explanation of group identity cannot be transferred to global group membership. The global group contrasts with other groups by virtue of its solitary existence. No other groups of a global classification can be introduced to the child's awareness. Thus, there is no context containing reference groups for comparison to one's own.

The absence of comparison groups is relevant to the previously-cited goal of loyalty to the global group. National loyalty may be defined as the shared identification of citizens which makes a national society possible. Individuals, who are loyal to a nation, claim it as their own above all others.
Loyalty means that a social group cannot be described as a reality unless individuals prize the group because it is theirs and regard its interests as more important than the interests of comparison groups. A vigorous solidarity of members of a nation-state is labeled nationalism (Znaniecki, 1952). Application of the logic of loyalty to a global group does not appear plausible, because the global group has no comparison groups. A laudable global education goal is the promotion of ethical ideals and high moral standards for humane treatment of all inhabitants of the globe. In the absence of comparison groups, a moral unity of global inhabitants, despite its intensity, cannot qualify as a loyalty. Shared ideals for improvement of the quality of life over the planet should not be mistaken for group loyalty (Oldenquist, 1982). Ideals may serve viable humanitarian functions, but common ideals do not create a group unless they are owned in preference to the ideals of another group.

Heintz (1982) maintains that a global society in which all inhabitants share an identity can only exist as a weak image. In reality, national societies will have a stronger influence upon behavior. A reason, again, for the vagueness of globalism is the absence of other group identities of a global scale. World society cannot be set apart from comparable societies.

**Group Consciousness**

A psychosocial definition of group identifies a shared state of mind as the principal ingredient for group existence. Groups become realities only because humans construct them by conceptualizing a reality composed of groups. A social group is a shared mental image which is treated as if it were a verifiable reality. The mental image of the group is frequently described as the members' common identification with each other or their shared consciousness of the group. A group's internal cohesiveness depends upon the degree to which members are aware of their shared consciousness. In an environment of heightened group consciousness, members assume that their inner subjective thoughts and reactions are shared by other members (Vander Zanden, 1977).

Group consciousness applied to the national level is the community of sentiment which allows individuals to imagine themselves as members of the nation. In fact, a sociological interpretation presents developed national consciousness as the only necessary and sufficient condition for a nation to be said to exist (Jasinska-Kania, 1982). Extrapolated to the global level, consciousness of membership becomes the significant psychosocial criterion for formation of a global group. The notion of global consciousness is not a new or novel creation of contemporary global educators. Znaniecki (1952) reports appearance of the notion of world-wide commonality and global unification in Western philosophical literature of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Contemporary writers advance the idea of group consciousness by advocating a global perspective which is a construct of the
mind (Hanvey, 1982) and a meaningful world society which results from shared knowledge (Heintz, 1982).

It is accepted that individuals have a sense of shared consciousness in several social groups of different size, complexity, and immediacy. In Western societies, the family is usually a small group with face-to-face interactions among members. The nation, in contrast, is a large group composed of multiple subgroups often distinguished by ethnicity, social class, religion, or ideological stance. Still, individuals are conscious of belonging to a national society just as they are conscious of belonging to their family or cultural subgroup. It follows that individuals possess multiple group identification. The issue is whether consciousness of belonging to a global group is probable. In a national survey conducted in Poland, individuals reported a stronger sense of group identification with family, friends, associates and nation than with mankind in general (Jasinska-Kania, 1982). Perhaps production of group consciousness on a global scale poses a substantively enormous challenge.

Some global education goals presume the challenges of establishing a consciousness of membership throughout humanity can be met. The precedent for this presumption is education’s role in building consciousness of other groups, including the nation. Schools act to support the national group by providing knowledge of the national culture and inculcating the prevailing norms, values and cognitions of the national society (Remy et al., 1975; Znaniecki, 1952). Global educators appeal to schools to add a global group to their socialization agenda. They believe schools should build children’s commitment to a global system (Remy et al., 1975) and increase involvement in global processes (Anderson & Winston, 1977).

A truly refined consciousness of membership demands moral empathy among group members. For global group viability, members are expected to have the ability to apply universal moral principles to the governing of human actions everywhere on the globe. Such principled character depends upon development of empathy, also called social role-taking, and minimization of ethnocentric motivations. However, the schools face the task of socializing young individuals, who are in processes of cognitive and psychosocial maturation. There is an admitted relationship between an individual’s capacity for global group consciousness and the individual’s stage of moral development (Jasinska-Kania, 1982). People who have not matured to the postconventional level of moral reasoning cannot be expected to apply universal moral principles. In addition, first feelings of moral obligation result from direct interactions in a small group rather than from an abstract attachment to a large collectivity (Becker, 1979). Maturational considerations introduce reservations about the school-age child’s readiness for global consciousness.

Finally, group socialization itself sustains the mental distinction between in-group and out-group which is a consequence of any group membership.
Ethnocentrism, a psychological phenomenon of long standing, produces veneration of in-group and disparagement of out-groups (Summer, 1906). It could be argued that people cannot take an ethnocentric attitude toward the global group, because there are no out-groups. However, ethnocentrism can interfere with individuals' willingness to accommodate all global inhabitants in one shared group consciousness.

These obstacles to the establishment and maintenance of a viable group consciousness have implications for the citizenship goals of global education. Effective member participation in a global community is related to an image of the global group as a moral unity (Remy et al., 1975). For example, the solution of socioeconomic problems which cause an unequal distribution of access to resources requires commitment to the well-being of culturally diverse group members who are remote from one's own life experience (Heintz, 1982). However, competency to make decisions and take action in the whole group's interest is a central global citizen skill (Becker, 1979, 1982). Perhaps it is possible to address global problems by activating humanitarian ideals, but it is plausible that consciousness of shared global membership would strengthen commitment. The thesis that loyalty has greater influence on principled behavior than moral principles themselves, implies that global morality derives from loyalty to a global group (Oldenquist, 1982).

**National Group Versus Global Group**

No known group of intelligent beings with territorial possession, structurally unifying features, and size and complexity comparable to the proposed group of global inhabitants is available for scrutiny and comprehension. The largest of these groupings occur as a result of membership in nation-states. Nations have been studied, and features contributing to the viability of national groups are available for application to a global group analysis. The following features should be added to, but do not take the place of, shared group consciousness.

National groups are politically unified by laws and formal systems which administer, interpret and change laws (Remy et al., 1975). The political organization and authority of nations is a powerful feature which distinguishes national groups from one another. The political integrity of a nation is important in the consciousness of the inhabitants (Jasinska-Kania, 1982). Visible political symbols, such as the flag or leadership personalities, represent the group to both insiders and outsiders. Unlike the national group, the global group is made up of separate, independent political entities and lacks highly visible and popular group symbols.

National group cohesion is often strongest when the survival of the political entity is threatened by an external source. Defense against a common enemy nurtures group unity (Znaniecki, 1952). Need for the global
group to utilize defense against other planetary beings has not arisen to date. The solidarity which arises from self-protection is not germane to global group existence.

Cultural features, perhaps collectively best described as heritage, contribute to national group viability (Jasinska-Kania, 1982; Znaniecki, 1952). For example a common language creates a kinship feeling through shared meanings and standard patterns of cognition. Active promulgation of the story of the past ensures ongoing possession and transmission of national group identity. A record of a nation's history is a tangible feature of the nation's reality. The record is idealized with interpretations of heroism and myths of superiority. An ethnocentric historical account is used to promote unity and pride through the mass of people in the national group.

The historical heritage of the global group is not thus far characterized by preservation of pride in politico-military superiority. The story of the past is not claimed as a distinction which differentiates groups from one another at the global level. In the absence of multiple global groups, the study of global history does not perform a group identification function. If children everywhere on the globe learned a history of the entire globe, our present rationale of teaching history to support nationalism would have to be modified.

Possession of territory is another important feature of national groups (Jasinska-Kania, 1982; Znaniecki, 1952). The native land is visualized as a collective possession, and inhabitants conceive an attachment to their home territory. A notion of ownership is important in clarifying the connection between national group members and national territory. Extension of the same group feature to the global group requires development of an ownership connection between the Earth and its inhabitants. Global education recommendations to describe the globe as a spaceship suggest a self-sustaining group composed of interdependent elements. This conceptualization focuses upon dependency between inhabitants and their physical surroundings, not inhabitants' possession of the surroundings.

Application of criteria derived from the characterizing features of national groups to a hypothetical global group does not appear to be fruitful. The national group concept based on features of structure and function does not readily transfer to the global scale.

**Summary**

A clear intellectual rationale for the global group concept of global education literature appears to be lacking. The assumption that consciousness of a social group on a global scale is intellectually sound and constitutes a viable supporting rationale for global education curricula is contained in global education goal statements. Goals have been formulated
without questioning whether criteria which sociologists use to define other social groups can be effectively transferred to a hypothesized global group.

In this paper, global group viability was evaluated by using three criteria to shape an analysis. Application of the criteria resulted in conclusions which detract from the credibility of the global group assumption. First, the social context does not contain comparison groups of a global scale. Normally, groups become substantive through differentiation from other groups. Absence of the opportunity for awareness of other groups weakens the potential for global group viability. Second, groups are defined by a shared consciousness of belonging among members. Applied to the global scale, the process of group identification is complicated by psychosocial propensities such as ethnocentrism and the rarity of high-level moral reasoning. Third, structural features which support the cohesion of national groups do not exist in the reality of the global realm. Global group integrity is not facilitated by internally consistent political and cultural distinctions.

Alternatives to the Global Group Rationale

The preceding discussion is critical of one of the themes identified in literature which advocates a global education curricular emphasis. Potential successful establishment of a viable social group on a global scale is frequently assumed in global education goal statements. While this rationale is questionable, the importance of global education for American students is not diminished by the criticisms cited in this paper. This analysis focused upon one intellectual assumption which was found to be weak. Other rationales may offer firm foundation for global education learning experiences.

Two other themes prevalent in global education literature are global interdependence and global diversity (Anderson, 1982; Becker, 1979, 1980; Braun, 1983; Cleveland, 1986; Gaddy, 1980; Hahn, 1984; Hanvey, 1982; Kniep, 1985, 1986; Kobus, 1983; Lamy, 1983; Tonkin & Edwards, 1981). Rapidly increasing interdependence between people in places distant from one another is certainly a contemporary social phenomenon. The theme of interdependence with myriad demands for intercultural understanding offers a framework for rationale building. In addition, the prominence of diversity among interdependent global inhabitants is another obvious condition of world social reality. Instead of allowing the misinterpretations of human behavior which can result from diversity, global educators may use diversity as a potent integrating force. Ironically, knowledge and explanation of differences brings greater understanding between people. Study of foreign cultures and global concerns should not be abandoned as a result of the questionable global group hypothesis. Instead, educators must build a theoretical base to give global education credibility and stability.
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Abstract

Metaphorical thinking can help eliminate some of the confusion over explanatory models in the social sciences and, necessarily, social education by bridging the gap between differing disciplines. Metaphors imaginatively used join two separate thoughts or domains in a single word or phrase that enables individuals to "see" interactions in a new way; to construct, as well as to interpret, a meaningful reality. In the hands of effective instructors metaphorical language can foster critical awareness, expression and problem solving by students, though it must be recognized that if misused they can mislead rather than inform.

Almost forty years ago, an already legendary Briton speaking at little Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri left a legacy to the English language—and to history. The memorable words were:

From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of central and eastern Europe . . .

An iron curtain has descended across the Continent.

Reflect on that image: A final, irrevocable dropping of a curtain on the last act of a play—and darkness. The setting, actors and words are now gone, except in our memories.

Imagine, too, an iron curtain—forcefully, invincibly, rigidly—dividing a continent.

Winston Churchill turned to one of the simplest, but most powerful, literary devices—the metaphor—to illuminate what previously was only dimly perceived.

In the same context is the speech given by statesman Bernard Baruch to the South Carolina Legislature scarcely a year later: "Let us not be deceived—we are today in the midst of a cold war." What is a cold war? Wars are hot, hostile, bloody, and deadly, while cold implies frigidity, insensitivity, even indifference. But cold also can mean contemptuous and scornful. So what is a cold war? A frigid, contemptuous, scornful hostility.
While these particular metaphors have become dead because of overuse and familiarity, metaphors offer us powerful tools for reflective thinking. "Words are transferred from their original and proper sense to a new sense" (Brown, 1966, p. 2). We are encouraged to draw an equation.

The argument here is that theoretical work dealing with metaphorical thinking can profitably be applied to the classroom, which, in turn, could result in the social sciences benefiting from younger minds trained to use metaphors. Theory and practice, then, could be linked in a synergistic relationship.

Metaphors give form to abstractions and help us make sense of the world around us. They "enable us to assimilate, in the light of the familiar, what was hitherto unknown, undigested, or unnamed" (Mooji, 1976, pp. 14, 16). They offer strangeness, surprise, or shock. They are "an affair of the imagination" (Black, 1962, pp. 39, 243).

The term metaphor comes from the Greek metaphorain, meaning to transfer, to express one thing in terms of another; an implied comparison, made by substituting a compared notion for the one to be illustrated (Thomas, 1969). Yet, it is more than a simple substitution: A tension is created by forcing together things normally unrelated, requiring an individual (researcher or instructor) to conceptualize abstractions, which, in turn, serve as models for thinking.

**Metaphors as Models**

The focus here is on how the social sciences and, necessarily, the social studies can better manage the task of understanding ourselves and others. No one in the social sciences has contributed as much to this understanding as Thomas Kuhn has for the natural sciences (Kuhn, 1970). In his classic formulation of the models emerging from the matched articulation of experiment and theory, Kuhn offered to readers a way of understanding what he called a normal science. He argued that practitioners were bound to this normal science and benefit thereby. Scientists know whether they are being scientific. They have models, rules, and guides for formulating theories, for performing experiments, and for making sense out of the formerly unknown.

But what of the social sciences? What normal science prevails? What guides social scientists who, in turn, help educate social studies teachers?

This is not to deny that models have not been posited by social scientists. Indeed, there is no lack of models. We can easily recall the model of bureaucracy suggested by Weber, the structural-functional model of Parsons, the systems model of the 1960s and the analytical, mathematical models of economics, which historians Fogel and Engerman (1974) turned into cliometrics. These models were posited as foci and methodologies appropriate to the social sciences to achieve the perceived status of the so-called hard sciences; to eliminate the alleged fuzziness of the social sciences.
None of these models has measured up to the claims made for them, and the search continues for more appropriate models. The problem is that any useful model must help us construct a shared reality as well as to find names for an already constructed reality. However, typically social scientists suffer from disciplinary boundaries: He is an economist or social psychologist; she a behaviorist or systems analyst. And what are the historians? Do they belong with the social sciences or with the humanities? Despite the rhetoric, Diane Ravitch does little to clarify the picture (Ravitch, 1985).

Social scientists and, consequently, social studies teachers tend to experience an arbitrary isolation and to operate exclusively within a discipline. To an extent this is inevitable, for they must learn the structure, methodology, and terminology of their disciplines to function, and therefore, find it difficult to speak the language of other disciplines. Too often, however, it is a problem of territoriality. Economists particularly seem to claim a higher order discipline employing quantification ostensibly lacking in the behavioral sciences and in history.

A way out of these disciplinary boundaries is suggested by Hugh Petrie, who argued that there is need for (a) a cognitive map—"basic concepts, modes of inquiry, problem definition, observational categories, representation techniques, standards of proof, types of explanation, and general ideals of what constitutes a discipline" and (b) tacit knowing that employs observational categories and meaning of the key terms of other disciplines to develop a metaphor. To Petrie the metaphor is the "key pedagogical tool" to bridge "the gap between differing categories and concepts of the different disciplines" (Petrie, 1976, pp. 11, 14).

Petrie's argument, and the position taken here, is that metaphors (a) will help eliminate the confusion over models in the social sciences, and necessarily, the social studies, and (b) will offer a promising way of creating relationships of different types of knowledge for teaching.

What are Metaphors?

Petrie relied on Max Black's *Models and Metaphors* (1962). Black, in turn, quotes Ivor Richards to the effect that "in the simplest formulation, when we use a metaphor we have two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word, or phrase, whose meaning is a resultant of their interaction." Or, in Black's words, a metaphor is an analogy or similarity, a "filter", "a system of associated commonplaces...readily and fully evoked" (Black's italics) which "selects, emphasizes, suppresses, and organizes features of the principal subject, by implying statements about it that normally apply to the subsidiary subject" (1962, pp. 35, 39, 44-45). The crucial aspect of the metaphor is its "power to bring two separate domains into cognitive and emotional relation by using language directly appropriate to the one as a lens for seeing the other...to see a new subject in a new way" (Black, 1962, P. 236).
Metaphors come in three types, according to Black: (a) scale, (b) analogue, and (c) theoretical. The scale model is the familiar plastic airplane or car from construction kits made to scale, the model husband or model solution. The analogue is a symbolic representation, an isomorphism, illustrating a structure, pattern or abstract idea: Plato's cave or Burke's ship of state.

More difficult to identify is the theoretical metaphor whereby facts and regularities can be discovered and explained, an original body of knowledge can be expanded, or hitherto disparate facts and regularities can be connected. Such models, to be useful, must be "rich enough to suggest novel hypotheses and speculations in the primary field of investigation" (Black, 1962, p. 233). In research as well as the classroom these models must help us to make the leap from the known to the unknown, to accommodate new information rather than simply to assimilate it.

The Role of Metaphors

Metaphorical models can perform the purposes claimed by Black, and though they tend typically to be of the analogue type, do not have to be so limited if they stress process, not just a product, through localizing problems and proposing solutions. As Aristotle argued, metaphors set "the scene before our eyes," and, contrary to Locke's claim, do not necessarily mislead. Rather, "a metaphor is like the richness of an esthetical idea, in which the creative free interplay of the cognitive faculties involves more thought than can be subsumed under some concept" (Johnson, 1980, pp. 48, 63).

While metaphors can be substitutional, A is B; comparative, A is like B; or tensive, A is B, but involves semantic strain; the primary role of metaphors is to offer structure which later can be articulated. That is, metaphors allow us to associate common sense experiences, the relationship of which may momentarily elude us, but which enable us to communicate ideas more vividly and compactly. They encourage us to "live and think in all three portions of our rich world—the level of everyday experience, the level of scientific reasoning and the level of deeply felt wonder" (Holton, 1979, pp. 176–178). They help us to solve the puzzles of life to make social relationships more understandable.

To explain the Cuban Missile Crisis Graham Allison (1969) chose the metaphor of foreign policy as a chess game, involving players, strategies, pace and structure, and outcomes. Players were the Chief (the President, Secretaries of State, Defense and Treasury), Staffers (immediate staffs of each Chief), Indians (political appointees and permanent government officials), Ad Hoc Players (influential Congressmen, members of the press, spokesmen for interest groups). Strategies were the choices between moves the players could make, and the pace and structure depended on the Players' perceptions and personalities, the dimensions of the "chess
board,” and the timeliness of the moves. Finally, the outcome of the game depended on all the foregoing variables.

Allison suggested the chess metaphor could be applied to Vietnam, and one might argue that it could be applied to Central America today.

**Developing Metaphors in Classrooms**

Creating useful metaphors can be encouraged by those of us who choose to be imaginative and by those whose goal is systematic understanding of the structure of our society. It requires thoughtful, interpretive observations and interpretations based, first, on knowledge of the social sciences and their methodologies and, second, on recognition of the characteristics of metaphors. The effort may be analogous to scientific discoveries which are possible only when the discoverers are thoroughly grounded in the disciplines so that they can recognize anomalies or serendipities and make sense of them. They will be vehicles rather than obstacles for our purposeful, adventurous wandering in the social studies.

**Characteristics of Metaphors**

Metaphors, as used herein, must be:

1. two separate thoughts or domains (cognitive and affective) imaginatively brought together in a single word or phrase that enables the listener to see interactions in a new way;
2. symbolic representations drawing exact mental images through a natural language, using familiar, concrete terms;
3. information organized into regularities or classifications that are explanatory;
4. drawn from subject matter of the social sciences and history;
5. heuristic to the extent the user and listener are encouraged to ask questions and to pose possible answers.

**Metaphorical Thinking**

Unquestionably recognizing metaphors involves the affect, but unfortunately the conditions under which it plays a role in thought cannot be studied directly because of the unpredictability and complexity of its occurrence. However, at least theoretically there is a similarity to Kuhn’s view of scientific theory formation in the sense that the individual encounters anomalies which, in turn, results in paradigm shifts and, potentially, the creative thought that leads to metaphor development. A key, then, is to encourage creative thinking (Miall, 1983).

At best the information about the dynamics of creative thought is suggestive. Likely there is a preparation stage followed by an incubation and finally by illumination and verification. The preparation stage involves the introduction of some stimuli, which leads to curiosity. Generally the individual senses a conflict between an experience and existing knowledge. The greater the intensity of the conflict the more likely a new image or insight emerges (Miall, 1983).
There is no end to the stories about how scientific breakthroughs have occurred. An example is Nobel laureate Richard Feynman’s watching an individual throwing a plate around in the air in a cafeteria at Cornell University. Feynman noticed that the plate with the red Cornell medallion went around faster than the wobbling. Bored with what he was doing, Feynman began figuring out the motion of the rotating plate and discovered that at a slight angle the medallion rotation rate was twice as fast as the wobble rate, leading him to ask himself “Is there some way I can see in a more fundamental way, by looking at the forces or the dynamics, why it’s two to one?”

“I don’t remember how I did it, but I ultimately worked out what the motion of the mass particles is, and how all the accelerations balance to make it come out two to one . . . for the fun of it.”

From there Feynman determined how electron orbits start to move in relativity, the Dirac Equation in electrodynamics and quantum electrodynamics. “The diagrams and the whole business that I got the Nobel Prize for came from that piddling around with the wobbling plate” (Feynman, 1985, pp. 173-174).

Feynman made a transfer, creating a tension by forcing together normally unrelated things and by conceptualizing a new relationship.

The sociologist notices what seems a surprising number of divorces, changes in lifestyles or unusual behavior of husbands and wives in their mid to late forties or early fifties. At first there is wonder, and questions follow. This should be a relatively stable, satisfying time in their lives, for they no longer face the problems often associated with parenthood.

Following this seemingly meaningless observation a period of incubation sets in. Mulling over the problem, observing, and collecting data occupy the sociologist’s time. Then there is a creative insight—they no longer face the problems often associated with parenthood, and an analogy is suggested, possibly while idly watching tiny feathered creatures singly and awkwardly flapping wings as they become airborne. A larger bird anxiously watches the frantic activity until there is silence—and a void. The apparently idle sociologist makes the connection between the void experienced by the feathered and human parents. And the judgment, the metaphor—middle age is an empty nest.

The physicist’s discovery is made while idly watching a wobbling plate and the sociologist’s by watching a common annual ritual. Yet, each experiences a creative insight. Both experience an image-exciting connection between metaphorical subject and predicate, a creative insight from common place experiences. There is a shifting of meanings and connections linking consciousness and unconsciousness. Moreover, it is a continual process “not confined to periods during which actual creative work is taking place” (Miall, 1983, pp. 35-36). A humorous nonacademic example provided Sternberg with a rationale for buying a house (Sternberg, Tournangeau, & Nigro, 1979, p. 347).
The work of Ortony (1975) suggests that the learning of metaphors depends on the degree to which the individual can establish connections between the topic and vehicle in nonliteral comparisons where simple substitutions will not suffice. The topic (subject matter) and the vehicle (the metaphorical term) must be matched on the basis of prominent attributes or subschemata. For example, Churchill's earlier metaphor in which "an iron curtain has descended across the Continent" requires one first to identify the attributes of the topic (USSR relations with Eastern Europe on the Continent) and then link the attributes of the vehicle ("an iron curtain") to make this nonliteral comparison. By contrast his pungent metaphor ("that utensil," or better, "cesspool") in reference to Mussolini is a more literal comparison, a simple substitution. The attributes of both the topic and vehicle are much clearer.

Watergate suggested to Sternberg et al. (1979) a more anomalous metaphor, whereby the transformation is harder, because matching attributes of the topic and vehicle is more difficult. The reference is to John Dean's description of the Nixon presidency (the topic) as cancerous (the vehicle). The attributes of the topic (White House operatives assuring Nixon's election through tricks, burglary and coverups) are linked to the attributes of the vehicle, cancer (an indigenous malignancy destroying healthy organs). An even deeper metaphor is suggested by Dean's seeing himself as the surgeon who would remove the cancer, but, in fact, was acting simply as a cosmetic surgeon removing only the blemishes, seemingly unaware of the extent of the malignancy causing the blemishes to reappear. Both of these metaphors require care to understand the attributes because of the figurative language, the difficulty of reducing to concrete statements, and the number of attributes to process.

Another metaphor coming out of the Watergate affair is the case of the White House plumbers (Sternberg, et al., 1979, pp. 349-350). Again, the topic is the Nixon administration, while the vehicle is the plumbers (plugging leaks along a pipeline whereby secrets were conveyed from one agency to another). An alternative reading is that the plumbers are destroying the pipeline along which secrets damaging to Nixon's personal prestige had to be blown up. Both metaphors demand ability to match the attributes of the vehicle to the topic.

Learning Metaphors

The learning of metaphors is rendered more or less difficult by the nature of the comparisons made, which involves:

1. the literalness of the comparisons,
2. recognition of the contextual anomaly,
3. the number of attributes of the topic and vehicle,
4. background to identify and comprehend attributes,
5. the concreteness of the attributes.

Like revolutionary thinkers, we must not be "primarily gatherers of facts,
but weavers of new [at least to ourselves] intellectual structures" (Gould, 1983, p. 19).

Transforming our thinking can begin with recognizing metaphors, in the broadest sense, which are so prevalent in our communication. A beginning is recalling everyday analogies—"touching all the bases," "pinch hitting," or "throwing in the towel." A semi-humorous movie some time back had the illiterate hero, a gardener, appear wise because of his use of what appeared to be horticultural metaphors: "planting the seed," "reaping the profits," "letting ideas germinate," "cultivating a mode of thinking," etc. Metaphors, in the loose sense of analogies, are so abundant we often ignore their impact on our thinking, yet we call upon them often to enlighten, to simplify, to make sense out of the hitherto unrevealed, to make necessary linkages. FDR's famous quarantine speech in 1939 analogized fascism to a plague afflicting Europe and likely to spread if not checked—a powerful metaphor chosen to influence a skeptical Congress.

**Teaching Metaphorical Thinking**

Metaphorical thinking can be taught (Best, 1984). The research of Broderick (1984) indicates that, though there is a qualitative difference, children comprehend and produce metaphorical language from the beginning of their language development. Barell and Oxman (1984), in their experience with tenth through twelfth graders, found metaphorical thinking conforms to the basic process of inquiry, in which comprehension is a function of cognitive development with more creativity demanded by higher levels of abstraction, which corresponds to Schon's (1971) distinction between surface and deeper, more generative, metaphors. Consistent too is the research of Sticht (1979) that metaphorical thinking is highly related to literacy level and, thus, requires considerable student-teacher interaction.

Transferring and accommodating two identities to one another, necessary to metaphorical thinking, however, may be affected by word order (Verbrugge, 1980, pp. 115–116). That is, the order of two noun phrases in sentences strongly affects the directionality of transformation, for a metaphoric sentence is not a symmetric equation or equivalent relation. The sentence subject typically fixes the given to which the predicate becomes the new. For example, the Nixon presidency, referred to earlier, would be the given and cancer the new, with the transformation between the two problematic for some learners.

Important, too, is Petrie's (1979, p. 460) conclusion that the teacher must be mindful that it is the students' point of view which is controlling, for the student must move from one conceptual scheme to another, starting with what and how something is known.

While there are alternative ways to develop metaphorical thinking, one that seems to hold promise was developed by former Harvard professor of Engineering and Applied Physics, William J. J. Gordon and his asso-
ciates—synectics. Synectics relies on process, "the conscious use of the preconscious psychological mechanisms present in man's creative activity" (Gordon, 1961, p. 3). The model posited by Gordon and associates assumes that:

1. The creative process in humans can be concretely described and taught.
2. The phenomena of invention in arts and science are analogous.
3. Individual and group creativity are similar processes.

The goal is to encourage problem solving, arriving at solutions in a fundamentally novel way. While the synectics process involves two strategies, making the strange familiar and the familiar strange, only the first will be referred to here (Gordon, 1973, pp. 241-253):

1. describing the present condition,
2. direct analogy,
3. personal analogy,
4. compressed conflict,
5. direct analogy,
6. reexamining the original task.

**Describing the present condition.** The first stage is rather obvious. FDR wanted to persuade a reluctant Congress to act, Allison wanted to examine foreign relations at the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis, and Dean saw himself charged with helping a Nixon presidency struggling to right itself. In each instance the situation was easily identified.

**Direct analogy.** Here the process calls for a simple comparison of two objects or concepts—fascism as a plague, foreign relations as a chess game, the presidency as cancerous.

**Personal analogy.** This step requires the individual's personal empathic involvement: FDR seeing himself as a public health official, Allison viewing participants in the Cuban Missile Crisis as chess pieces, John Dean's perceiving himself as a surgeon.

**Compressed conflict.** An oxymoron is suggested here: FDR needed a safe attack, the Missile Crisis was an angry game, Dean was healing surgically.

**Direct analogy.** This step returns the problem solver to an earlier phase of problem solving with more conceptual tools to make the necessary transformation by which to render the strange familiar.

**Reexamine the original task.** Here the researcher-instructor returns to the original problem with new insights to view the data collected, to find connections between the data, and to make the creative leap, the breakthrough that leads to problem solving. Why does the plate rotate faster than it wobbles? What causes chess players to opt for one strategy rather than another? How can a public be alerted to the plague spreading over Europe?
Getting Started

A possibly overused metaphor regards a political system as healthy or ill. This links the topic, political system, (A) to the vehicle, health, (B), which suggests the obvious relationship between the topic, the human body (C), and health (B). Thus, A and C are seen as substitutes for the implied comparison with B. The attributes of the human body (C) include interrelated subsystems in a homeostatic relationship, which are affected by the attributes of the environment, not only the physiological, but at a deeper level, the psychological. How does the human body react to these environmental factors, and, switching topics, how does the political system react to its environment?

This metaphor was used by David Easton (1965) to examine not only political, but social and economic systems, as well. It offered a holistic way to envision what he saw as the total environment which became the demands and supports that influenced the way the political system decided among competing values. A healthy political system persists by calling upon the necessary regenerative components of the system. Conceivably, any society could be studied by this metaphorical model, though, in fact, overfamiliarity and overblown claims may have caused it, like Churchill’s iron curtain, to become a dead one.

Imagine an Imperial Presidency. “The mystique of the mandate . . . the secrecy of the system . . . executive privilege and impoundment . . . political and electronic surveillance . . . espionage and sabotage against the political opposition . . .” (Schlesinger, 1973). Note the tacit comparison of unlikes, the connotations, here. The vehicle, imperial, recalls ancient Egyptian, Persian, Chinese, and Japanese dynasties, Czarist Russia and the divine right of kings. The vehicle must be linked to the topic, the presidency. How can a presidency be imperial? What is anomalous about this metaphor? How is this a filter to study the American presidency and the relations between a president and congress?

Carole Gilligan (1982) calls on a different metaphor, based on her research to discover how women respond to their environment. She has women speaking “in a different voice,” because they perceive relationships differently from men. The topic, women, is linked to the vehicle, voice, but this is a deeper metaphor than a simple substitution or comparison. Gilligan discovers that women’s perceptions and responses to life differ from the moral development model posed by Kohlberg, which Gilligan argues, is based solely on research with males. The goal is to help us to understand women better than is generally the case.

Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, and McKee (1978) extended Jung’s metaphor of life cycle (vehicle) to describe adult development (topic) by referring to the particular “seasons of a man’s life.” Levinson’s metaphor, however, derives more from comparison than does Gilligan’s. That is, Levinson’s research showed that males journeyed through life influenced by
the need to follow alternative routes at different speeds involving qualitatively different transitions. Each transition, each season, linked past and present in an organic part of the total cycle. This is an easier metaphor than Gilligan's to use in research, as Levinson did, or in the classroom.

Other examples of metaphors to encourage thinking might be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government/Law</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>revolving door justice</td>
<td>robotic society</td>
<td>spaceship earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benevolent subversion</td>
<td>ethnic salad</td>
<td>artificial intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secular religion</td>
<td>active neglect</td>
<td>genetic engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balance of terror</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gunboat diplomacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the attractive characteristics of metaphors is that they can be shared, yet they are not exactly the same for all of us. This means that metaphors we create and those with which we work must retain the elusiveness that keeps them from becoming dead ones. It is imperative, then, that when we develop metaphors in the classroom, we do not destroy the unique features which characterize them. Metaphors retain their utility so long as they have a freshness to them, a sudden and unexpected release of tension between seemingly competing ideas as we try to solve problems. They come from hints, suspicions, and possibilities—insights or a sense of awe, if you will—as we master new experiences that were previously inexplicable.

It is important to remember that interpreting metaphors is as critical a skill as creating them. “The person and the context are never irrelevant for what is meant nor, for that matter, for what is understood or thought.” That is, individual differences in verbal problem solving and, necessarily, metaphoric thinking, suggest that there is no “general model for all adult figurative activity” (Pollio & Smith, 1980, pp. 388-389). Creativity is demanded as much by trying to make sense of another’s metaphor as it is trying to construct a new one. Both interpretation and construction of metaphors are part of the creative process. And both arise out of a combination of systematic, analytical thinking, insight and tension between ideas. As Ramaley (1985, 12) argued in another context, “ideas do not seem to flow so much as spurt.”

Creating Our Own Models

Thomas Kuhn provocatively posited the thesis that science has advanced by the use of paradigms, or models, which guide discovery. Critical thinking in the social sciences and the social studies, too, can advance through similar use of models, though they might more profitably be metaphors, using familiar, concrete language symbolically representing reality, to discover and explain regularities. They are not empty boxes or semantic strait jackets unimaginatively applied to everything we encounter, but they are
felicitous expressions that foster thinking, expression, and problem solving. They help us achieve at least a minimal level of understanding of the social problems to match the level of sophistication of the potential users.

The social sciences and social studies remain useful to the extent they respond to the problems generated by our complex technological world. But they demand structure, a framework in which to interpret and to think critically about the world. Metaphors offer structure, as well as tools, to filter our experiences.
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Introduction

If asked to choose between teaching primary-grade social studies with available texts or eliminating social studies from the K-3 curriculum, we would choose the latter. Much of the content in current texts is redundant, superfluous, vacuous, and needlessly superficial.

Our concern with the triviality of primary-grade social studies content began more than twenty years ago with several studies of the Senesh materials. One of the striking features of Our Working World was that young children were presented with substantial information. Our impression was that Our Working World stood in stark contrast with other series which provided children with hopelessly noninformative content, such as that families contain parents and children, and that people live in houses, wear clothes, and eat food.

That concern was reinforced year after year as we taught undergraduate courses in social studies methods for the primary grades. We have been concerned first that social studies was largely ignored in the local primary grades classrooms except when interns from the methods course taught their practice units. Second, we were dismayed at the vacuous lessons taught by our interns, and doubly dismayed that neither they nor their supervising teachers seemed to recognize that the topics chosen for practice units were inherently trivial or were trivialized by the interns.

Part of the problem seemed to be that neither the interns nor their supervising teachers believed that history and social science knowledge was im-
portant. The interns appeared woefully ignorant of history and the social sciences, and appeared unconvinced that teachers need to know very much to teach young children.

One upshot of that concern over triviality was a research project which focused on preservice teachers’ knowledge of history and social science content relevant to social studies in the primary grades (Larkins, Hawkins, & McKinney, 1985). Preservice teachers in several samples were ignorant of the most elementary information.

The current review is also related to that concern. We are convinced that part of the triviality of primary grades social studies lessons is due to teacher ignorance. We also know, however, that most teachers rely heavily on texts, and our impression is that primary grade texts impose a vacuous, trivial, redundant content on the curriculum.

Problem and Literature

This review, then, focuses on the extent to which primary-grade texts contain noninformative content. We are concerned with the identification and labeling of categories which help us make sense of ways that primary social studies texts employ nongenuine knowledge or noninformative content. We are concerned with the noncontent of texts. Illustrative categories of noninformative content follow.

Information may be noninformative if it is needlessly redundant. This is knowledge that children already possess. For instance, virtually all school-age children understand the terms mother, father, and family. Attempts to teach the meaning of these concepts are redundant with information possessed by the children.

Superfluous information, knowledge which children will acquire without instruction, is also treated as nongenuine content. Much of the information provided under the topic community helpers seems to fit this category.

Knowledge that texts treat vacuously is labeled superficial information. For instance, prior to instruction children may not know about Martin Luther King, Jr., and perhaps they will not pick up substantial information about him without instruction. If a text, however, only includes two or three sentences about Dr. King, the information is superficial.

Text inappropriate is that category of information which may be important or useful but which may not belong in texts. One type of text inappropriate information is labeled the hall of mirrors, because it reminds us of looking into a mirror that faces another mirror on the opposite wall. Examples are found in texts that have children read about children going on a field trip. Field trips are often useful, but we prefer that children take field trips rather than read about other children taking field trips. Pushed to its absurd extreme, such texts would have children read about children, reading about children, reading about children . . . . who at some point in infinity are taking a field trip. Some of the little lessons that are designed to
boost children’s self-concept also seem inappropriate for text content. Instead of reading about children performing self-image activities, we should bypass the text and simply have children do the activity, assuming that the activity is worth doing.

Other types of nongenuine knowledge, are labeled sanitized information, biased information, and aimless information. Sanitized content is that information which has been purged of any opportunity to give offense. Children may be given a substantial amount of information about an historical figure, for instance, without being told anything remotely controversial. Biased information is knowledge which presents a single viewpoint when multiple viewpoints are appropriate. Emphasis on rules, and lack of information about freedoms, may be one example of biased content. Aimless information is knowledge which is not clearly related to important goals of social studies. Equally distressing is content which bears no clear relationship to any other content in the text.

We reviewed the literature to determine whether published content analyses focused on the redundant, superfluous, or trivial nature of primary social studies (Smith & Larkins, in press). That review included 154 articles published during the last 50 years. Many articles were clearly outside our field of interest. For instance, 18 dealt with the readability of texts. Thirty-seven articles dealt with general topics other than the content of texts. Twelve dealt with procedures for evaluating texts. Various biases, such as gender and race, were the focus of 32 articles. Seventeen focused on the treatment of other lands, and 22 discussed treatment of values.

A few articles, however, were at least remotely relevant to the central issue of this paper. Price (1966) defended texts against a list of criticisms which included the claims that texts are too superficial, too broad, too simple, and that they present an unrealistic view of the world. But Price did not attempt to substantiate or refute those charges through a content analysis of texts. King’s (1977) review was critical of texts, but focused on the way information was presented, rather than on the vacuity of the information itself. Anyon (1978) claimed that elementary texts present an “unrealistic, overly positive” view to perpetuate existing, on-going, social institutions. Anyon’s analysis differs from ours in that it is informed by what some call the new criticism, and in not focusing on our specific concerns. Woodward, Elliot, and Nagel (1986) come closest to our interest, when they charge that texts lack depth, are too broad in scope, and lack substance.

We were also interested in publications that criticize the expanding horizons approach to the organization of content in primary social studies. Criticism by LeRiche (in press) and others were relevant to our conviction that adherence to the sequence of family, neighborhood, community is in part responsible for the trivialization of social studies in the first three grades.

In short, we were surprised that so few authors criticized primary-grade texts for their trivial content.
Primary grade texts in four series were examined. These four series were selected because an informal survey of elementary social studies specialists indicated that some of them are popular, and that taken as a set they are representative of mainstream texts in the field. We wrote to the publishers requesting sample texts, and obtained the latest editions available at the time that this review was conducted, fall and winter of 1986–87.

**Silver Burdett**
- *Families and Neighborhoods* (Grade One)
- *Neighborhoods and Communities* (Grade Two)
- *Communities and Resources* (Grade Three)

**Laidlaw**
- *Living in Families* (Grade One)
- *Living in Neighborhoods* (Grade Two)
- *Living in Communities* (Grade Three)

**Scott, Foresman**
- *Families and Friends* (Grade One)
- *Neighbors Near and Far* (Grade Two)
- *City, Town, and Country* (Grade Three)

**Heath**
- *Starting Out* (Kindergarten)
- *Homes and Neighborhoods* (Grade One)
- *Neighborhoods and Communities* (Grade Two)
- *Communities Large and Small* (Grade Three)

Quantitative content analysis was not attempted. The texts were read and notes were taken to remind us of important characteristics of the texts. Sometimes a simple coding system was used as a mnemonic device. For instance, if a lesson dealt with information which children would likely acquire without instruction, a “1” was entered in the notes. Information that appeared to be too superficial, abstract, or sketchy was coded “2”. Information which was probably unknown prior to instruction, but not very important, was coded “3”. Text inappropriate content was coded “4”. Information which children probably knew prior to instruction was considered redundant and was coded “5”, and so on.

We re-emphasize, however, that this coding system was merely a mnemonic device; no attempt was made to reduce the findings to quantitatively manipulatable data, for several reasons. First, we are simply not interested in quantitative content analysis. Prior experience (Larkins & McKinney, 1982) convinced us that qualitative reviews of texts are more informative. Second, the categories listed above are not exclusive. The same passage in a text may be redundant for some students, superfluous for others, and text inappropriate for all. Third, the coding system was not always the best mnemonic device. For some text passages, we took long-
hand notes rather than summarized the passage with a series of numbers. The goal was not quantification, but recollection of content. Informal agreement checks were conducted among the authors of this review. We read texts, made notes, then met to discuss our findings, to see whether we agreed about the general pattern of information-use within the texts.

Findings

Redundant Information

A middle school student recently hit the problem square on the head. Elementary school, she said, "just taught us things that we already knew." In social studies, first grade children are taught things that any normal six-year-old American has mastered long before she first enters the school house door. Then children are taught and retaught much of the same simple, trivial information in grades two and three that was taught in kindergarten and grade one.

For instance, the title of Unit 1, in Laidlaw's first grade text is (don't hold your breath): What is a family? Laidlaw then challenges the intellectual capability of young children by informing them: "You belong to a family" (p. 8), "Some families have two parents" (p. 9), "Parents and children share the place where they live" (p. 10), and "People in families help one another" (p. 11). We shudder to think of what would happen to America if this information was withheld from our children.

In case you are tempted to believe that the above is simply a pleasant way for Laidlaw to introduce the text, that perhaps families are dealt with in a more substantial manner later on, you might flip to page 73 of Living in Families. There you will find stimulating information such as, "Families do many things together." If you keep turning pages, you will find that "You learn many things from your family" (p. 74), "You can teach your family things too" (p. 75), "Parents share their home" (p. 75), ad nauseum. Later, children are told that a family in Canada lives in a house, buys food and clothing, and that members of the family help each other (pp. 119–121). Would you like to know something about families in England? Well, kids go to school, parents go to work, the family lives in a home, and family members share food, and have fun together. Are you waiting to find out about Japanese families? Parents work. Mother cleans house. Kids go to school.

One could easily make a case for the claim that first-grade children do not come to school knowing that Japanese families eat meals, go to work, and live together in homes. But the point is that children's general conception of family is formed before they enter school, and nothing of substance is added to that general conception when texts shift the scene from America, to Europe, to Japan. Furthermore, depriving them of the content about families would do no serious harm to the average student. On the other hand, belaboring them with the obvious may do serious damage to the
students’ and teachers’ conception of the importance of social studies. We do not wonder at the fact that teachers give first priority to those school subjects which clearly add to the student’s present store of knowledge and skill.

Laidlaw, of course, is not the only sinner. Heath’s first grade text informs children, “You are part of a family” (p. 33), “Families... do things together” (p. 34), “Families live in many kinds of homes” (p. 35) and on and on and on. One of the really neat things that *Homes and Neighborhoods* teaches about families is that they give birthday parties. That takes four pages (46–49). Low these years, we have labored under the impression that most American children master all the essential knowledge about birthday parties (ice cream, cake, candles, gifts, and games) by the time they are able to talk clearly, much less read.

Scott, Foresman is also convinced that children must be taught about birthday parties. A Chinese American family is shown with a birthday cake (pp. 114–115). An American Indian family is shown with a birthday cake (p. 117). And a standard non-minority American family is shown with a birthday cake (p. 118). A superficial dribble of noninformation about the differing cultural backgrounds of the three families is thrown in to help fill out the ten pages devoted to birthday parties. Danny’s Chinese American grandmother tells him how birthdays are celebrated in China. Unfortunately, neither she nor Danny share that information with the reader. Maria’s father tells her about birthdays on the Chippewa reservation, but neglects to tell us. And Janet’s mother tells her, but not us, about what it was like to grow up in West Virginia.

In fairness to Scott, Foresman *Families and Friends* has a clearly different approach to content than the first grade texts in the other three series. Much less time is spent rehashing redundant information about families, and the thrust of the book is clearly slanted more heavily toward improving children’s attitudes about themselves and others than toward acquiring information. It has a more affective tone. At times that approach raises questions in our minds about whether the content is text appropriate. Later, we will argue that text inappropriate content should be presented in other ways than through a textbook.

Silver Burdett reverts to the same redundant approach to families used in Heath and Laidlaw. Children are told, “The people you live with are your family” (p. 18) and “Birthdays are fun” (p. 30). Key facts for chapter two are reviewed on page 24, including: (a) People live in families. (b) Families are alike and different. (c) All families have needs and wants. (d) Families celebrate special occasions. (e) And families learn from one another.

Content devoted to families is not the only redundant information commonly found in texts, but it is one of the most blatant examples. Another example of redundant information is the repetition of topics from grade to grade with little increase in complexity or information load as children get
older. For instance, authors of primary grade texts are devoted to the dairy farm. It is essential that children learn how milk gets from the cow to the kitchen table. (In reading about milk’s trek, of course, you will hunt in vain for the term economic interdependence.) Heath teaches kindergarten children that milk comes from the dairy farm to the dairy to the store to the home (see pp. 86 & 87 of Starting Out). Silver Burdett teaches the same simple chain of events, from cow to kitchen table, to second grade children in Neighborhoods and Communities (pp. 90–95). Laidlaw recounts the sacred story of cow to carton on page 91 of its third grade text Living in Communities. Believe it or not, the 1982 edition of Scott, Foresman Social Studies, tells the tale, in all of its kindergarten simplicity, to students in grade four (pp. 26–28).

Part of the redundancy of the story of milk is that the essentials of the story are told under various guises from grade to grade within the same series. In one grade children learn that wool comes from the farm to the processor to the store to the home. In another grade, the farm product is wheat or beef. But in all cases, the essentials of the story are redundant and unnecessary. Do we seriously fear that the average American will grow to adulthood ignorant of the fact that members of modern society are not self-sufficient in goods and services unless they are so instructed over and over in primary grade texts?

Superfluous Information

Our notes on first grade social studies texts are filled with the code “5”, indicating that much of the information is redundant. A frequently occurring code, however, for grades two and three is “1”, indicating that in our opinion children would learn that content, in the absence of instruction, simply as part of growing up in modern society. The information on transportation in Silver Burdett’s third grade text, Communities and Resources (pp. 111–115), is a typical example. Will the average American reach adulthood without experiencing traffic, knowing what the term rush hour means, or knowing that people go from place to place in cars, buses, rapid transit trains, and bicycles? Will our society suffer if Heath does not teach third grade children that cities such as Memphis have radio stations, television stations, and newspapers? (See Communities Large and Small, pp. 180–183.) Is it really necessary for Scott, Foresman to teach third graders that children go to school, or that parents sometimes have a car wash to raise money for the P.T.A.? (See City, Town, and Country, pp. 66–67.) How powerful is the following information from the third grade Laidlaw text Living in Communities?

All communities have homes. And all communities have buildings where people work, play, learn, and worship . . . Many communities have parks where people go to have fun. Most communities have stores where people shop. Communities also have roads. (pp. 12–13)
These are not isolated examples. Though not all content in the primary grades is spent belaboring information which children do not need to be taught, far too much of it does just that. Though these examples are lifted from their context, in our opinion the case appears even worse when they are read in context. Only then is the full force of the sheer triviality of large sections of primary grade content brought to bear on the reader.

**Superficial Information**

One of the first things that we were taught as undergraduates majoring in elementary education was that children should be presented with concrete, vivid experiences. Authors of primary texts seem doggedly determined to violate that maxim. Text information is sketchy, abstract, bland, and boring. There is very little genuine story telling. In most cases, content is devoid of feelings. And authors hop from topic to topic, flashing only the bare bones of an idea before children’s eyes. Furthermore, on those infrequent occasions when authors decide to present detailed narrative, the topic chosen is often trivial. Of course those cases are more than balanced by instances when important topics are dismissed with a handful of colorless words.

The Silver Burdett third grade text *Communities and Resources* is one of the worst offenders. If one buys into the expanding horizons scheme for organizing content, it is not surprising that this text devotes a fair amount of space to various cities. Unfortunately, virtually every major city is given superficial or trivial treatment. Cincinnati (p. 72), Denver (p. 73), Tampa and St. Petersburg (p. 74), Atlanta (p. 74), and Washington, D. C. (p. 75) are each written off with less than 100 words of description. In defense of the author, it is true that these cities are used to illustrate specific points concerning the establishment and growth of cities. Even given that narrow purpose, however, the treatment is disgustingly superficial. Equally superficial, and in some cases genuinely trivial, treatment is given to Miami, New Orleans, Seattle, Chicago, and New York City. Information about those five cities is crammed into five pages, including photographs (pp. 82–86).

It cannot be said, however, that the author of *Communities and Resources* is unaware or insensitive to the need for detailed narrative. Fifteen pages are allotted to Humble, Texas, a community that is obviously more important than New York or Chicago. Five pages are spent describing the annual trail ride in Humble. Why is Humble so important? Would you like to guess which community in Texas is the text author’s home town? *Communities and Resources* spends approximately 25 pages describing Morris Township and Morristown, New Jersey. Would you like to guess which community contains the home office of Silver Burdett Company?

Adding insult to injury, the chapter review following the section on Morristown emphasizes the following key facts:

1. We all live in communities.
2. We can learn about communities by using maps.
3. Many communities have famous places that show much about the past.
4. There are often different places of business in our communities.
5. All communities have places where people go to learn and have fun.

When texts avoid wallowing in the superficial, they exalt the obvious and the trivial.

It is not uncommon for primary texts to insert biographic sketches here and there, in response, we assume, to the charge that they neglect history. Those sketches are often superficial, bland, and boring. The life of Benjamin Banneker is told by Laidlaw in 41 words. (See Living in Neighborhoods, p. 107.) The same text tells the story of Jane Addams and Hull house in 52 words (p. 77). For third grade children, Laidlaw sketches the life of Benjamin Franklin in approximately 150 words. (See Living in Communities, p. 46.) Children are told that Franklin helped make the Philadelphia post office better, that he started the first subscription library, that he founded a school that became the University of Pennsylvania, that he started a fire department, and helped build a hospital. They are told NOTHING about his role in the Constitutional Convention, his career as a diplomat, or his importance as one of the founding fathers of our nation. Why not? Apparently, because this book is about communities. The frame of the giant Franklin must be cut and trimmed to fit the pygmy-bed called community. And the story of Franklin has been sucked dry of vitality. It is boring. One longs for a children’s author with the story telling talent of Commager (1962).

Other examples of biographic sketches, though not as dry, are found in Scott, Foresman City, Town, and Country: Frederick Law Olmsted (p. 50), Mary McLeod Bethune (p. 71), Dolores Huerta (p. 100), Mary Goddard (p. 139), Elizabeth Cady Stanton (p. 162), Lee De Forest (p. 232). Silver Burdett Communities and Resources also throws in an occasional historical sketch, such as the bland 31 words used to tell about Chief Sealth (pp. 83–84). Heath’s first grade text Homes and Neighborhoods contains a 41 word blurb on Christopher Columbus, with a slightly longer background description in the teachers’ edition (p. 126–127). A typically vacuous description is given of the Pilgrims and Thanksgiving (pp. 128–129), with even shorter blurbs for Martin Luther King, Jr., Abraham Lincoln, and George Washington (pp. 132–135).

Cities and important persons are not the only topics given superficial treatment in primary texts, but they illustrate the point. For most texts in most series most topics are treated superficially.

Text Inappropriate Content

Much of the content of primary texts describes activities that teachers frequently, and for the most part properly, make a routine part of their class. Teachers frequently and properly celebrate children’s birthdays, but as
noted above, children do not need to read about people celebrating birthdays. Teachers frequently and properly attempt to boost the self-image of their children, but we doubt that children need to read about others doing those activities in their texts. Teachers sometimes take children on field trips, and probably should take them more often, but reading about a field trip is no adequate substitute for taking one. Nor is reading about children conducting a study of their community an adequate substitute for a field study of one’s own.

The problem of course, is that directions for the activities listed above properly belong in the teachers’ manual, not in the students’ text. But for the publisher, the teachers’ manual is a give-away; the students’ text is the money maker. So children end up reading about topics that are not best suited to texts.

Silver Burdett *Neighborhoods and Communities* wastes six pages on the manufacture of crayons (pp. 82–87). If there was a crayon plant near my home town, I would not object if teachers took children on a tour of that plant. There are things they can learn from a field trip. For instance, they can feel the heat, hear the noise, and experience the hustle and bustle and sweat and effort present in a real factory. It might open their eyes a bit about the real world of work. It might also help them to be proud of their community. But those goals are not easily reached through a text presentation.

Silver Burdett *Communities and Resources* takes third grade children on a make-believe tour of Washington, D.C. As a mere literary device for getting and holding children’s attention, the make-believe tour might not be a bad idea, if it served to teach important content. In this particular tour, children learn that the White House has 132 rooms, you can take an elevator to the top of the Washington Monument, that there is something called the Jefferson Memorial, and that the *Spirit of St. Louis* is housed in the National Air and Space Museum. It is a tourist’s tour. The purpose is entertainment.

Scott, Foresman *Neighbors Near and Far* has children read about how Mike gave his class report on recycling. Then Mike’s class had a recycling project (pp. 24–29). The first unit in *Families and Friends* contains the sort of self image activities that we believe are best left to the teachers’ manual (pp. 10–28).

**Sanitized, Biased, and Aimless Information**

We are particularly interested in citizenship education. Authors of each social studies series say they share that interest. Consider the following claims by publishers:

The Silver Burdett social studies program *The World and Its People* was developed to help pupils understand themselves and the world around them and to instill in them the knowledge and skills necessary for responsible citizenship. (p. T3)
A carefully-sequenced citizenship education program is an integral part of Scott, Foresman Social Studies, (p. T16)

HEATH SOCIAL STUDIES builds the skills students must have to understand the world around them and become effective citizens. (p. T12)

THE LAIDLAW SOCIAL STUDIES SERIES: Skills and Concepts for Responsible Citizenship. (p. i)

Certainly, respect for law is an important attribute of the modern citizen in a democratic society. Authors of elementary social studies texts break their backs to instill such respect. They exhibit not nearly so much concern that children understand and be committed to democratic freedoms. In Scott, Foresman Families and Friends, one of seven units is devoted to rules. The importance of rules is reinforced in chapter 10 of City, Town, and Country. Lesson 4 of Unit 4 in Laidlaw Living in Neighborhoods focuses on the importance of rules, an idea which is reinforced in lessons 5 through 7. Lesson 2 in Heath Starting Out is titled Community Rules. Chapter 4 of Silver Burdett Neighborhoods and Communities is titled Communities Make Rules. And chapter 7 of Communities and Resources is simply We Need Rules.

We wish that each text had similar chapters on freedom of speech, freedom of the press, religious freedom, the right to petition, and the right to privacy. But when opportunities for such topics are presented, text authors too often become mute. For instance, the make-believe tour of Washington, D.C., mentioned above, presents a wonderful opportunity to discuss the freedoms that Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson helped secure, and that our Supreme Court helps defend. Instead, children who read that text study trivia.

Similarly, Silver Burdett Communities and Resources closes with a long chapter on communication: Bringing Our People Together (pp. 186-201). Children read about the telephone, radio, television, newspaper, magazines, books and the postal system. But there is not a word about freedom of speech or of the press in that chapter.

Here and there, texts hint at freedom. Laidlaw Living in Neighborhoods tells children:

People have rights. Rights are things that people should be allowed to do. Rights should not be taken away from a person by anyone else. Rules help protect people’s rights. People have the right to a safe neighborhood. With this right goes the responsibility of following rules. A responsibility is a thing that people are supposed to do. (pp. 101-102)

One can almost see public school educators cringing in the background as children read that passage, fearful that a vivid, clear, concrete example of
freedom might appear on the page, unsurrounded by a legion of rules.

Scott, Foresman does a better job, though not so good as we would like. For instance, the short story of Harriet Tubman in *Neighbors Near and Far* (pp. 172–175) is delightful.

**Recommendations**

How could things be made better?

First, we must destroy the stranglehold of the expanding horizons rationale on primary grades social studies. Much of the vacuous, redundant, trivial content in primary texts is attributable to our commitment to the organizing sequence of family, neighborhood, community.

Second, we should abolish social studies textbooks for grade one, and possibly two. Young children cannot read well enough for authors to place a substantial amount of content into the texts. School districts are paying through the nose for photograph books. In place of texts, teachers should be supplied with excellent lesson manuals, and a large supply of relevant story books and biographies to read to children. If photographs are needed, they could be handled less expensively through slides than through individual texts for six-year-old children.

Third, we need to develop a clear conception of how elementary social studies can contribute to citizenship education. If we are going to inculcate democratic values, we need to adopt the vivid, concrete, lively hero-stories appropriate to that goal. If strong families are deemed important to the future of our society, we should spend far less time teaching children obvious information about families, and spend more time with those activities that stand some chance of building a stronger commitment to the family. Again, we need lively stories about families who love and care and make difficult choices. We need music, and poetry and art that will stir the emotions of young children.

Fourth, this review did not focus on place geography in primary texts. But, as an aside, let us add that geography gets a strong play in the primary grades. But, authors seem to fear the word memorize. Nor do they suggest ways that teachers can help children associate names with places, and enjoy it. The result is a nation of geographically illiterate adults, who are asked to take a stand on public policy about El Salvador, but who have only the foggiest notion of where it is.

In closing, we reiterate the position stated in the opening paragraph of this review. If we had to choose between abandoning social studies in the primary grades or be forced to use the current crop of texts, we would abandon social studies. The vast amount of money wasted on nearly worthless texts is a national shame.
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