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As a child, you tend to look on the lines drawn as the inevitable nature of things; for a long time, I did. But along somewhere in boyhood, I came to see that lines once drawn might have been drawn otherwise.

-Haywood Burns

The principle obstacle to achieving democratic education, according to John Dewey, was the powerful alliance of class privilege with philosophies of education that sharply divided mind and body, theory and practice, culture and utility (Westbrook, 1991). In Dewey’s day, and still today, prevailing educational practice is the actualization of the philosophy of profoundly antidemocratic thinkers. The distinction between culture and utility, for example, is a dualism Dewey fought hard against in his efforts to transform education. This dualism, which is “imbedded in a social dualism: the distinction between the working class and the leisure class” (Dewey, 1916, p. 341), provided the basis for disparate types of education that emerged in the early twentieth century: one for those who worked with their hands and another for “those who worked with their minds or did not work at all” (Westbrook, p. 173).

The sharp distinctions between these types of education have been blurred in more recent years by educational rhetoric such as “the best education for all” or “high standards for every student.” The fact that educational policymakers are now calling for a “unified” curriculum, with a single set of standards for all students, however, is merely a superficial adaptation of the economic and educational systems Dewey critiqued over 80 years ago. Tidal waves of privatization and globalization, combined with the grotesque gap between rich and poor in the United States—where the average C.E.O is rewarded at a rate 173 times the wage of the average employee—the explosion of temporary, part-time, low-wage work as well as the physical and constitutional assaults on immigrants and poor people and the boldness with which big money controls the lawmaking all illustrate the sickly nature of democracy in contemporary society. Where schools are concerned, those we have now are “even more intensely segregated by class and race through geography, curricula choice, funding, teaching methods, tracking, and standardized examinations” (Gibson, 1998).
Dewey's concern was with the ideas implied by a democratic society and the application of these ideas to education. "The price that democratic societies will have to pay for their continuing health," Dewey argued, "is the elimination of an oligarchy—the most exclusive and dangerous of all—that attempts to monopolize the benefits of intelligence and the best methods for the profit of a few privileged ones" (1913, p. 127).

In this context, what does it mean to teach for a democratic society, the traditional goal of social studies education? This past June a group of social studies educators came together in Detroit to examine this question and discuss what we do as teachers and professors in response. Over the course of three days members of the Rouge Forum addressed questions of racism and national chauvinism in schools, colleges, and educational organizations and discussed the development of democratic, anti-racist, internationalist, social studies curricula in K-12 schools as well as colleges of education.

In one session, over 20 social studies teachers and professors pursued issues that define the challenges of creating and sustaining democracy in schools and society. Topics included: recent school shootings in the USA and the response of the public and the media to violence in primarily White, small-town communities; the sense of hopelessness and oppression that reigns in many urban schools as well as the successes in many others; preparing teachers to go out into the community rather than waiting for the community to come to the school; culturally relevant teaching; racism as a system of ideas—linked to power, privilege, superiority, systematic social control and capitalism—to split people apart; and lastly, organizing for action and demanding change. Obviously, teaching for citizenship in a democracy involves much more than fervent study of historical and related social scientific information.

Throughout the conference participants shared strategies and ongoing actions that promote democratic relations. A notable example is The Whole Schooling Consortium—a collaborative grassroots effort that brings school personnel and university faculty together with families to build schools that provide effective and quality education for all students, including students with exceptional educational needs and other diverse learning needs. To my mind, the WSC's combination of democratic school reform with inclusive education initiatives represents a powerful model of democratic social education, one that breaks free of the fetish that democratic dispositions and associations will flow from the mere study of "democratic ideals," or the history of "democratic" institutions.

Whole Schooling is a contemporary reflection of Dewey's notion that the best way to achieve democracy is to initiate children in a form of social life characteristic of democracy: a community of full participation and "conjoint communicated experience," what he described as the "mode of
associated living” (Dewey, 1916). This is not preparation for living in a democracy, it is participation in a democratic community of inquiry, that:

- **Empowers citizens in a democracy** (through community studies, inquiry and analysis of social situations, and efforts to improve students lives and create an equitable society);

- **Is all inclusive** (all children learning together across culture, ethnicity, language, ability, gender and age);

- **Teaches and adapts for diversity** (designing instruction for diverse learners that engages them in active learning in meaningful, real-world activities and that accommodates learners with diverse needs, interests and abilities);

- **Builds community and supports learning** (intentionally building support strategies within buildings and classrooms; re-aligning use of resources associated with programs with targeted funding, e.g., special education, Title I, gifted education);

- **Fosters partnering** (builds real collaboration within the school and with families and the community; parent and community governance; engages the school in strengthening the community; service-learning and community problem-solving; integrated service and supports for families and students). (Peterson, Beloin, & Gibson, 1998).

Whole Schooling illustrates a way in which we can improve the education and community resources available to children and their families who experience the effects of poverty and lack of resources on a daily basis and combat the alliances that are obstacles to achieving democracy in schools and society. For social education to contribute to a democratic society, it must move beyond teaching platitudes and “truths” that actually sustain the obstacles to achieving democracy and take on efforts in the mold of Whole Schooling.

Dewey’s *Democracy and Education* opens with a discussion of the way in which all societies use education as a means of social control by which adults consciously shape the dispositions of children. He goes on to argue that “the conception of education as a social process and function has no definite meaning until we define the kind of society we have in mind.” Many educators have accepted the “lines as drawn” as the inevitable nature of things and argue any redrawing is “ideological” and to be avoided. “But if one defines ‘ideology’ as the frame within which people fit their
understanding of how the world works, then it is certainly ideological to...assert the primacy of ‘small-d-democracy‘ without venturing into the messy underside of ‘American democracy.’ And it is certainly ideological to demand ‘a seat at the table’ without challenging the terms of the conversation at the table. Put another way, a view of one’s mission is as ideological for what it leaves out as for what it includes.” (Wypijewski, p. 24).

E.W.R.
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Student Teachers Thinking Historically

Peter Seixas
University of British Columbia

Abstract

Prescriptions for the reform of history education routinely advocate increased use of primary historical sources in the classroom, as being fundamental to the teaching of historical thinking. Yet there have been no studies of student-teachers' learning how to teach using primary sources. This exploratory study defines the task faced by student-teachers early in their program. It uses recent discussions among historians and philosophers to generate three general characteristics of the task. It then uses these characteristics as a framework for an empirical investigation of the difficulties student-teachers encounter as they begin to design exercises for teaching students how to read primary sources critically and constructively.

Prescriptions for reform of history and social studies teaching routinely advocate increased use of primary sources in the classroom (e.g. Brown, 1970; Gagnon and the Bradley Commission, 1989; National Center for History in the Schools, 1995). As Peter Lee (1991, pp.48-49) argues, it is absurd...to say that schoolchildren know any history if they have no understanding of how historical knowledge is attained, its relationship to evidence, and the way in which historians arbitrate between competing or contradictory claims. The ability to recall accounts without any understanding of the problems involved in constructing them or the criteria involved in evaluating them has nothing historical about it. Without an understanding of what makes an account historical, there is nothing to distinguish such an ability from the ability to recite sagas, legends, myths or poems.

Peter Stearns (1993) calls the reading of sources "the one analytical capacity humanities programs most commonly acknowledge already." No less than in science or mathematics, understanding the grounds of knowledge claims in history should be a basic goal of the teaching the subject. If his-
tory education is to be any more than rote memorization, then social stud-
ies teachers' ability to teach students the uses of primary sources should
lie squarely in the center of their pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman,
1987). Yet secondary social studies teachers themselves may have had lim-
ited experience working with primary sources (Ravitch, 1997). Even the
completion of a number of post-secondary history courses is no guaran-
tee of deep experience in working with historical sources, much less of
ability to shape exercises which will help their students do so (Wilson,
Shulman & Richert, 1987).

There is a growing literature on students' and teachers' historical
thinking (e.g., Barton and Levstik, 1996; Epstein, 1994; Rouet, Britt, Ma-
son & Perfetti, 1996; Seixas, 1996; Wilson and Wineburg, 1993; Wineburg,
1996; Young and Leinhardt, 1998). McDiarmid (1994) and Yeager & Davis
(1995) have examined the historical thinking of post-secondary students,
including student teachers. But to date, there has been no examination of
student-teachers learning to construct exercises for their own students,
i.e., of student-teachers engaged in historical thinking tasks which are at
the same time specifically pedagogical. Indeed, recent surveys of research
on social studies teacher education do not even identify learning to teach
using historical sources as an issue (Adler, 1991; Armento, 1996; Banks &
Parker, 1990). This constitutes a major gap in the research literature, in
social studies teacher education, or both.

This study uses recent discussions among historians and philoso-
phers to define some dimensions of the task faced by student-teachers in
using primary sources. It then investigates empirically the difficulties stu-
dent-teachers encounter as they begin to choose appropriate primary
sources, and to design exercises for teaching students how to read them
critically and constructively. The study focuses entirely on the early stages
of a student-teacher's learning to teach: almost all of the data collection
occurred within the first term, the university-based component, of a teacher
education program. Thus, its conclusions address only the (heretofore
undefined) problems that student-teachers and teacher educators face, and
not their resolution.

Text and Context

Historians—intellectual historians in particular—and philosophers
of history have recently problematized the relationship between text and
context, or between historical traces (or sources) and accounts of the past.
Because the debates have implications for the construction of historical
knowledge, so too do they have implications for historical pedagogy, and
nowhere more visibly than in attempts to construct exercises where stu-
dents build historical knowledge through the use of primary sources.
“Normal” historical explanation rests on locating specific documents, events, characters or institutions in contexts, i.e., in moments related to broader narratives of historical development (Berkhofer, 1995). "Contextualism," Berkhofer (1995, p.31) summarizes, "is the primary mode of historical understanding." Texts are analyzed by placing them in their historical context. Anachronism—"the greatest historiographical sin"—(in normal historical practice) is the failure to place something in the context of its times (Berkhofer, 1995, p.32). Philosophers of history have attempted to explain this process (e.g., Walsh, 1960; White, 1973). It is not simple.

Discussing text and context, intellectual historian Dominick LaCapra (1983) distinguishes between the "documentary" and "worklike" aspects of the text. This distinction will be central to the analysis of student-teachers' assignments below. The "documentary" aspects of the text involve "reference to empirical reality" and convey information. The "worklike" aspects of the text "supplement empirical reality by adding to and subtracting from it." (LaCapra, 1983, p. 30). In other words, the "worklike" text is part of the action that is under investigation, not an account of the action. A declaration of war or a journal entry expressing love or hatred is rich in its "worklike" aspects. That is, it is not about an event: it is the event. We do not ask of a declaration of war, "is this a biased account?" because it is not an account. Rather, we might ask, "Who was responsible for this decision?" "What were the author's assumptions?" or "What were the consequences of this declaration?"3 To make sense of the "worklike" aspects of a text, one reads subtext, and makes inferences in relation to a context: the text is only one piece, one player, in a more complex set of thoughts, intentions, and actions. On the other hand the historian does not analyze the text simply against a fixed contextual backdrop: the "worklike" text adds to, enriches and reconstitutes the context. "For the historian, the very reconstruction of a 'context' or a 'reality' takes place on the basis of 'textualized' remainders of the past." (LaCapra, 1983, p. 27).4 Thus, the process of building knowledge about the past involves an analysis of the "remainders of the past" (or texts), which proceeds in part through understanding them in the light of what we already know about the past (i.e., contextualization).

Wineburg (1991, p. 500) writes of this "worklike" interaction between text and context:

Texts come not to convey information, to tell stories, or even to set the record straight...Texts emerge as “speech acts,” social interactions set down on paper that can be understood only by trying to reconstruct the social context in which they occurred. The comprehension of text reaches beyond words and phrases
to embrace intention, motive, purpose, and plan—the same set of concepts we use to decipher human action.

Contexts do not exist prior to the texts, but are themselves constructed through our work with texts.

In a debate with David Hollinger (1989) David Harlan (1989, 1997), takes LaCapra's argument one step further, arraying "contextualism" (the process of understanding and explaining texts through their historical contexts) against "presentism" (the position that we can never understand texts except through our own [present] frames of reference). Harlan argues that historians can never escape the present, that the structures of their knowledge are products of the present, and thus that the method of "contextualism," placing texts in "context," can not be defended epistemologically. If there is no prior historical "context" within which to understand a text, then the process of historicizing texts is simply understanding them in relation to other texts, all of which we read through our own (present) frames of reference. Harlan's position appears to undermine, fundamentally, the basis for constructing historical knowledge. Hollinger (1989) and Joyce Appleby (1989) offer rebuttals to Harlan, based largely on historians' practice:

Of course, we live and think in the here and now; the question is whether we can re-create any part of the past to keep us company. If the poststructuralists are correct that we cannot fathom the original meaning of the texts offering us a window on other human experience, we will remain imprisoned in the present. Small wonder that historians draw upon their practice of reconstructing the past in order to resist this verdict. (Appleby, 1989, p.1332; cf. Hollinger, 1989; Appleby, et al., 1995; Ankersmit & Kellner, 1995; Bevir, 1997).

Historians' responses did not, however, lay the postmodernist challenges to rest. Berkhofer (1995) returns to the problematic relationship between text and context. From where, he asks, do the "Great Stories" which provide the ultimate contexts for our textual analyses come? To what extent do our accounts of the past rest on the structures of emplotment, into which we contextualize the documentary evidence (cf. White, 1973)? The act of constructing historical context, and thus the related acts of selection and interpretation of historical texts, are infused with present, contemporary concerns. As LaCapra (1983, p.18) puts it:

...historians are involved in the effort to understand both what something meant in its own time and what it may mean for us today. The most engaging, if at times perplexing, dimensions
of interpretation exist on the margin, where these two meanings are not simply disjointed from one another, for it is at this liminal point that the dialogue with the past becomes internal to the historian.

Current themes or issues that make history potentially significant to us today, help to shape historical accounts which, in turn, shape the analysis of new historical sources. Thus, doing history involves a dynamic interplay among current issues, historical contexts, and historical texts. Though the bulk of this discussion been carried on in relation to the meanings of words in texts, a parallel set of concerns informs recent debates over the historiography of photography (e.g., Tagg, 1988; Kozloff, 1994).

Without attempting to resolve these debates three major points emerge from the discussion: 1. Text and context exist in dynamic tension in the construction of historical knowledge. 2. We never have access to the historical context in direct or unmediated form: the construction of context is shaped not only through work with historical sources (texts), but also through present concerns and issues. 3. Two aspects of text ("documentary" and "worklike") are operative in the process of building historical knowledge, but one, the "worklike" aspect of text, constructs the most potent interactions with context.

If students are to be active learners, i.e. if they are to do something more than memorizing the products of others' knowledge-building activities, then all of these observations about the construction of historical knowledge have implications for teaching and learning history. An exercise where the text merely illustrates an already defined context fails to capture the critical historiographic act. A text as "illustration" does not help to build the context: it tacitly assumes that the context is complete and fixed prior to the analysis of the text. But equally deficient is the anachronistic exercise which fails to understand the text in relation to its historical context. Students need opportunities to read historical texts in dynamic tension with their historical contexts. Of course, students do not have the prior knowledge, language skills or training of the historian. The responsibility thus lies on the teacher to arrange suitable encounters with historical sources and accounts, with rigorous attention to the student's potential paths in constructing new knowledge (cf. Seixas, 1993).

The Empirical Study

The central data for this study are assignments completed by pre-service student-teachers. As will be explained further below, student-teachers were required to design a sequence of questions for analyzing one or more primary historical sources (i.e., texts). The questions they wrote let us see simultaneously into their thinking about the source, and into their
thinking about their own students' thinking about the source. In effect, the assignments comprise representations of the process of reading a historical source for the particular purpose of teaching it. The assignments thus provide insight into student-teachers' initial thinking about the construction of historical knowledge.

In the 1996-97 academic year, in the first term of a one-year postgraduate teacher education program at a western Canadian university, there were three sections of Secondary Social Studies Curriculum and Instruction course (hereafter, "social studies methods"), two of which I taught. The data for this study were drawn from the third section, taught by one of my doctoral students. Her class included 37 student-teachers. She was in the second year of a PhD. program in Curriculum and Instruction. She had been a student the previous year in my seminar, entitled "Problems in Historical Understanding." Prior to entering the program, she had completed six years of teaching, primarily social studies in grades 7 to 10, and had received two Excellence in Teaching Awards from the provincial jurisdiction where she taught.

Social studies methods, a thirteen-week course (meeting six hours a week), included an introduction to the goals of social studies and the prescribed curriculum, assessment, the writing of lesson plans and unit plans. It introduced issues in the teaching of history, geography, and contemporary media, as well as the use of fictional, archeological, and sociological sources in the classroom, within a broad, integrative framework. Two weeks of the course focused specifically on the problems of teaching and learning history. The instructor introduced the history component of the course with a broad, open-ended discussion of historical knowledge, framed by four questions: 1. What is history? 2. How do we know about the past? 3. What is the difference between history and fiction? and 4. What is the difference between a primary and secondary source? In subsequent lessons, she provided students with guidelines for selecting and using primary sources, and provided opportunities for students to analyze and construct lessons around a number of primary sources. She also led discussions of question sequences which students from previous classes had constructed, based on primary source documents. Students read and discussed articles by Tom Holt (1990), Samuel Wineburg (1991), and Peter Seixas (1997), and critiqued historical films ("Ballad of Crowfoot" and "Heritage Minutes") which might be used in the classroom. In the third of the six sessions on teaching history, the instructor gave the assignment which would constitute the core of the data for this study. Students submitted them one week, (plus two weekends) later. Their instructions were to choose one or more primary sources suitable for teaching in high school, construct a sequence of questions which would help students to read and analyze the source(s), define objectives for the lesson, and provide a de-
scription of the teaching context for this lesson (i.e., at what grade level and where in the study of the topic this lesson would occur).

Students also filled out two questionnaires, one about their academic backgrounds, and the other about the process of completing the assignment. I selected four student-teachers' assignments for detailed analysis. After the conclusion of the course, at the beginning of the school-based practicum, the authors of each of these participated in an in-depth, tape-recorded interview, subsequently transcribed. My interviews with the four student-teachers revolved around leading them through a reexamination of the assignments they had constructed. First, I asked about the larger historical significance of the incident or documents from their assignment. Secondly, I asked them to tell me how a good student, who was following the lesson well, would answer the questions they had posed. Finally, (if they had not already volunteered it), after going through the entire sequence of questions, I provided an opportunity for them to say if and how they might revise the assignment before using it with students. (Appendix)

Thus, the study involved three moments of textual analysis: first, of the primary sources chosen by the student-teachers, second, of their readings of the primary sources (through their source-based assignments for students), and third, of their retrospective reflections on their own questions (through the interview transcripts). The analysis was based on questions informed by the three points summarizing the section, above, entitled “Text and Context.” 1. Did the student-teachers’ exercises help to build a dynamic tension between text and context? 2. Was the exercise shaped by a sense of the dynamic tension between contemporary issues and historical accounts? 3. How rich was the source (chosen by the student-teacher) in its “worklike” aspects (i.e., would it lend itself to an analysis of its own purposes, construction, and consequences)? In addition, a fourth point addressed the specifically pedagogical question: was the choice of document plausibly appropriate for secondary school students, and could the sequence of questions help to lead students from what they might already know, through an active interpretation of the source, to new historical knowledge? It should be noted here, that answers to these questions demand explicitly normative judgments of students’ assignments. These judgments rest on a) the outline of historical epistemology explained above and b) a notion of teaching for historical understanding which helps students not only to memorize the products of historians’ work, but also to be able to work out evidence-based historical interpretations themselves. The study is limited in that it focuses on student-teachers’ learning in a methods course and does not extend longitudinally to observations of their use of their exercises in real classrooms.

Of the 37 student-teachers in the class, 36 returned questionnaire #1, and 31 gave permission for their assignments to be analyzed. Of those
who returned the questionnaire, one entered the program with a graduate degree. Twenty listed history as a major, six listed geography; the remainder had other majors. Six had taken a course in historiography as undergraduates. Twenty-nine had written an undergraduate paper using primary sources. Six claimed to have been exposed to the use of primary sources in a high school history class. None, of course, had any prior experience teaching history to high school students. Their ideas about students' prior historical knowledge, interests, and abilities to read texts literally were based neither on recent experience nor on any study as part of their education program.

Of the 31 assignments submitted, 26 were based on a single primary source, five on two sources, and only one on more than two sources. Sixteen used solely textual (i.e. non-pictorial) sources, eight used photographs, five used pictures other than photographs, and two used a combination of types. For the four student-teachers' assignments to be used for a detailed analysis, I sought two that were relatively strong (on the basis of the four questions above), and two that were weak. I wanted to include both text- and photograph-based sources (without, however, analyzing the distinct problems of each medium.) Though I will introduce the student-teachers' academic backgrounds below, the assignments were chosen on the basis of their own strengths and weaknesses, and not on the basis of their authors' academic backgrounds.8

Four Student-Teachers' Lessons

Diane Arkwright had a double major in history and English, and many senior level courses in history. As an undergraduate, she had written a paper based on a critical reading of a mid-nineteenth century book. For this assignment, she chose an 1881 speech to the Canadian House of Commons by then Prime Minister John A, Macdonald, supporting the development of the Canadian Pacific Railroad.9 Her lesson was one of the stronger ones. The document is captioned, "John A Macdonald's speech in the House of Commons regarding the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway (January 17, 1881)." The entire passage reads:

I can trust to the intelligence of this House, and the patriotism of this country, I can trust not only to the patriotism but to the common sense of this country to carry out an arrangement which will give us all we want, which will satisfy all the loyal legitimate aspirations which will give us a great, an united, a rich, an improving, a developing Canada, instead of making us tributary to American laws, to American railways, to American bondage, to American tolls, to American freights, to all the little tricks and big tricks that American railways are addicted
This text locates the speaker's position definitively at the center of potent interpretive themes in Canadian history: Canada's ambivalent relationship to the United States, a trajectory of "progress," the struggle for national unity in the face of diverse and conflicting interests, and the role of the Canadian Pacific Railroad (and the federal state) in relation to all of these. The major issues are both distant from our own concerns (the construction of a railroad), and yet directly connected to contemporary issues through the ongoing problems of Canadian/American relations, public/private relations, the constitution of the nation, the role of political leadership, and the notion of "progress." Moreover, as Arkwright noted with some understatement, "it wouldn't bog you down with words exactly....You want people to pick up a lot from just little" (Interview, Jan. 22, 1997).

The elevated rhetoric of the passage conveys the notion that the speaker's position rests not only on a calculation of various private interests, but of the public good, of right vs. wrong, of "intelligence" and "patriotism" vs. "little tricks...big tricks," addiction, and destruction. The language of these claims is heated, and thus helps us to locate the values and the perspectives of the author very quickly. This document is rich in its "worklike" aspects. It does not tell part of the story; it is part of the story. The speech was one piece of Macdonald's effort to provide support for a vision of nationhood. Similar to other essentially "worklike" documents, the questions of "bias" and "reliability" are not the main interest here, as they might be for a textbook or a historian's account of the period. That is, whether Macdonald's view of the U.S. railroads was fair or not, or whether his assessment of Canadian patriotism was accurate, is secondary to the fact that he said these things at all. The position and perspectives of the speaker, himself, constitute the core of our interest and thus our investigation of the source.

Did Diane Arkwright understand the beauty of her choice, and would she be able to help her students to mine this document for historical understanding? We turn now to her questions and what she had to say about them. She articulated her objectives as wanting students to "be able to distinguish between a primary and a secondary source," to "interpret meaning" from a primary source, and to see "a historical event or issue ...from many different perspectives." She noted that her students "would have to read between the lines to understand that behind Macdonald's speech were his fears, visions, and beliefs." In her description of the process of developing her lesson, she said she "decided what parts connected [the source] with the curriculum, and what key points I wanted to raise
through my questions...” In the interview, she explained, “this was written over 100 years ago and I think so much is still relevant to today...How we’re so influenced by American ways.” But the document was not, in her view, going to provide either a transparent window on the past, or easy lessons for the present. Reading it would involve her students in a process of interpretation: “It’s just to show the rhetoric, a politician’s rhetoric...how it was used to sway opinions in the House of Commons” (Interview, Jan. 22, 1997).

Arkwright proposed to have a “brief discussion of the differences between primary and secondary sources,” followed by a discussion of nine questions. The first three were as follows:

1. **What do you think is shaping Macdonald’s perspective? What insight does his perspective give you into the subject? How?**

2. **What part did the railway play in Macdonald’s vision of Canada? What kind of benefits did he think the railway would bring? How?**

3. **What images do you think Macdonald was trying to present and what feelings was he trying to evoke with his speech? What strategies does he use?**

Collectively, these three questions relate text to context, and help students to construct an interpretive stance towards the source. Question #1, calls for a synthetic judgement of the whole passage, all of its language, its rhetorical strategies, its factual assertions, its definitions of right and wrong, good and bad. It does so before drawing students’ attention to any of the pieces. Questions #2 and #3, again, though somewhat more limited, ask questions of the entire passage. If students are able to read and decode the pieces of the source independently, then these three questions may be helpful. For students who are unable to do so, however, these three questions, placed at the outset of the question sequence, are unlikely to provide much assistance. The next three questions do investigate the passage’s specific rhetorical strategies:

4. **Webster’s Dictionary defines “tributary” as “flowing into a larger stream.” Given this meaning, what potential relationship with the United States do you think Macdonald saw for Canada?**

5. **What is the central comparison that Macdonald makes in his speech? Given the implication of this comparison, what assumptions are revealed?**
6. What types of “little tricks and big tricks” do you think Macdonald refers to?

Question #4 highlights a key term in the passage, offers a definition, and asks how it constructs the relationship between Canada and the US. This question provides the close guidance (for students who need it) which is missing in #1, #2, and #3. Like #4, question #6, placed prior to the broad interpretive questions, could assist students in constructing their other answers. In Question #5 it is unclear (both to me, and to Arkwright, herself, in her subsequent interview) what “central comparison” is meant.

The final three questions return to broader issues of contextualization:

7. If you were present while Macdonald was giving his speech, how would you have felt a) as a Canadian citizen and b) as an American citizen?

8. For what purpose(s) do you think Macdonald gave this speech?

9. Could this speech have been written today?

Question #7 suggests a sharp divide between Canadian and American responses. It is potentially misleading, in that it does not allow for the sharply contrasting reactions that Canadians actually had. Macdonald, of course, wanted his audience to believe that all “loyal” Canadians would fall into line. But Arkwright’s question conflates Macdonald’s intention with his audience’s response. Macdonald had a job to do, to unite Canadians behind generous state support for a private railroad scheme. If all Canadians had been easily receptive to this speech, then Macdonald would not have needed to deliver it. In fact, the Liberal Canadian opposition attacked the scheme vehemently. Macdonald’s hyperbolic terms were aimed, not at Americans at all, but at Canadian resistance to his plan. In her subsequent interview, Arkwright demonstrated her knowledge of the variation in Canadian opinion:

I think you’d get a pretty good range of opinion [among Canadians], probably more so on the supporting it, that they would felt as he felt, especially given the context and the time. That would have been a good debate. (Interview, Jan. 22, 1997)

So here the problem was rooted, not in her own historical interpretation, but in moving from that interpretation to a well-formulated question for her students.

Perhaps Arkwright’s students would recover the interpretive thread with Question 8 about Macdonald’s purposes. Working with this ques-
tion would give them an opportunity to see Macdonald and this speech as major players in the conflicts of the historical period. At the same time, it would enhance their understanding of the ways in which those struggles were engaged: the text builds context. In Question 9, Arkwright takes on LaCapra’s (1984, p.18) challenge: what is the relation between meanings in the past and those in the present? She understood that the students might use the speech to approach this issue:

I think they can get a lot out of a speech that was written so long ago and realize that it hasn’t changed that much, that there are still a lot of similar affairs and the way that politicians can inflate or exaggerate situations...[But on the other hand, they will understand] how things have changed, how the railways were so important then and then you look now, what’s important now? (Interview, Jan. 22, 1997)

How students will respond, given the wording of her question, remains unknown. Will students achieve the comparison she wanted? Will the question stimulate a nuanced and multivalent response? What aspects of the past are being extracted from the speech for comparative purposes? If she was thinking about the dangers of the American threat, the answers should be quite different than if she was asking about funding for the transcontinental railroad. The role of Canadian elites in fostering anti-Americanism for their own benefit entails a rich set of issues, whose configuration has changed, moreover, in the current era of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Arkwright thus chose a source which could call up the particular historical context of railroad- and nation-building in the late nineteenth-century, revise students’ (contextual) understanding of Canadian politics in that era, and extend to potent contemporary issues which both enrich the contextual narrative and enable a cogent interpretation of the text. By the time we discussed the assignment on tape, Arkwright, having spent two weeks in schools, was already eager to revise it in the light of her thinking about students’ thinking:

I know like this is way too hard for Grade 8, way beyond their abilities. Grade 10 it probably still is a little bit too hard, even the whole idea of perspective [from question #1]. I mean that’s like a concept that they may not be too sure of .. and that first question about “what insight does his perspective give you?” They’d be like, “What?” (Interview, Jan. 22, 1997)

Both for contrast, and to explore further the challenges facing student-teachers in this introductory exercise, we now turn to a weaker student assignment.
Alan Sims was a history major, with several courses in Canadian history. He stated his goals for his lesson on the Rebellion of 1837 in Upper Canada, based on a letter to the electorate from its republican leader, William Lyon Mackenzie, a decade earlier (Crawford, 1967):

[Students] will be able to select and state the explicit and implicit political statements in the letter. Using their analysis of the letter they will be able to comprehend the political mood of this man and his supporters within the county of York in 1827.

He was thus looking for students' ability to contextualize the source, as well as their use of the text in building their representations of the specific historical milieu. He did not, however, extend the contextualization of the letter to questions about Mackenzie's significance in the larger frame of Canadian history, nor to questions about how his populist opposition to colonial elites might be important for students today.

The text begins with three paragraphs of general introduction: a pledge to "uphold the general good," with "firmness, moderation, and perseverance..." The next two paragraphs explain what Mackenzie opposes:

I have ever been opposed to ecclesiastical domination; it is at enmity with the free spirit of christianity: and nations which have bowed to its yoke, are become the dark abodes of ignorance and superstition-oppression and misery.

That corrupt, powerful, and long endured influence which has hitherto interfered with your rights and liberties, can only be overthrown by your unanimity and zeal. An independent House of Assembly, to Upper Canada, would be inestimable.

The longest paragraph of the piece follows. Here Mackenzie distinguishes between elected representatives who "fall from their integrity and betray their sacred trust," and those who "maintain and uphold the interest of their country." In closing, he pledges to be one of the latter.

Sims' document is four times the length of Arkwright's abbreviated extract. While it is difficult to assess the choice of a particular source, outside of the context of the interpretive strategy within which student-teachers aim to embed it, nevertheless, Sims' choice poses some prima facie difficulties, including its length, vocabulary, and allusions to contextual information which would have to be provided to students.

Sims' question sequence offers no help for the difficult vocabulary ("ecclesiastical domination...at enmity with the free spirit of christianity...".). Nor is there any line-by-line assistance for students in their analysis of the text. Sims does not ask, for instance, "What does Mackenzie mean by 'an independent house of Assembly,,'" (independent of whom?) or to whom
he is referring as the “corrupt, powerful, and long endured influence.” These are keys to linking the text to the context. Rather, the sequence begins, “Why is this man running for office?” Is Sims after the literal meaning of the text, here, i.e. “to uphold the general good?” If so, the question should have read “What reasons does Mackenzie give for running for office?” On the other hand, if Sims is after a reading of subtext, this document alone does not provide a way to see Mackenzie’s unstated motivations for running for office: there is no way to read a subtextual answer to this question. Question #1 thus obfuscates exactly the reading that it should clarify.

Question #4 (“What does this letter tell us about the role of the church in the politics of Upper Canada? How does the author feel about it?”) and possibly #5 (“What are this man’s political opinions?”) are the only ones which refer to directly to the two key paragraphs explaining what Mackenzie opposes, but again, pedagogically, they offer little help to students in sorting through the difficult concepts and language. One (#8) does potentially confront the letter as a worklike document: “Does the letter make reference to events in other countries? If so why would he [sic] do so at this time?” But the lack of follow-up questions, the lack of guidance to students, and an apparent absence of consideration of what students can and cannot read independently permeate the sequence. Notwithstanding his stated goal, Sims’ question sequence only tenuously makes any interpretive links between this text and a broader contextual significance of William Lyon Mackenzie and the Rebellions of 1837 in Canadian history. Was this a problem, like Arkwright’s, of “translation” from understandings he would have been able to articulate for audiences other than high school students? In this case, I do not believe so. Nowhere, either in his written work, or in the interview (where he was asked directly) did he articulate the larger significance of the document or of Mackenzie, himself, for Canadian history.

The lesson ends with a twist in the text/context relationship. At the very end of the exercise, after students have completed ten questions, Sims suggests, “The lesson will conclude with a general question as to whether [the students] knew who this person [i.e., Mackenzie] was...” We would not have an interest in this letter if we did not know who wrote it: Mackenzie’s subsequent role is largely what makes the letter historically significant for a unit on the Rebellions. The potentially creative interaction between text and context would be extremely difficult to achieve without knowledge of the role that the author of this letter played in the events of the time. Moreover, if students were not given—prior to reading the letter—information on “who Mackenzie was,” it is impossible to imagine how they would be able to ascertain it from the letter. Discussing the lesson in the interview, Sims confirmed his intentions:
...the idea why I picked this particular document to a certain extent was because I didn't think they would understand who this person was, what was going on at the time, and where this would lead to over the next 30 or 40 years. (Interview, Jan. 28, 1997).

Puzzlingly, a student-teacher with a relatively strong background in Canadian history appeared to have major difficulty in selecting a source and developing questions which would help students analyze the text, place it in context, and enrich their contextual understandings in a historical field in which he had had some experience. By the time of the interview, after spending two weeks with students in a school, Sims did have some insight into the difficulty that his exercise would pose for students:

...from what I saw of their Humanities, they have no idea what a primary or secondary document is in Grade 8. They barely know how to write a paragraph which I found out when I asked them to do a research paper. It was an interesting experience. (Interview, Jan. 28, 1997)

He suggested that in conducting the lesson, he would have to go over difficult vocabulary before tackling the passage. Further, following a suggestion from the instructor, he would number the paragraphs of the document, and direct students to particular passages in his questions. While we might reasonably hope that the level of difficulty of this lesson would be adjusted through experience with students in his classroom, there is little reason to believe that school experience will stimulate new insights about the relationships between historical text and historical context. These understandings presumably come from deep and sustained work with historical sources and their interpretation. At best, we can hope that Sims will encounter focused history instruction as a part of his professional development program.

Perhaps because several of the examples used in the social studies methods class were based on photographic sources, ten of the students used photographic documents for their assignments. Like Alan Sims, Darryl Macintosh was a history major. He had taken at least three courses in western Canadian history, and one on "Racism and Anti-Semitism in Canadian History." He reported having done archival research as a part of his undergraduate degree. He based his exercise on a photograph stemming from the Komagata Maru incident in British Columbia in 1914, when would-be Sikh immigrants were refused entry into the port of Vancouver by local immigration officials, despite their being British subjects. The incident receives mention in most recent Canadian high school history...
Figure 1. National Archives of Canada/C-038613.
textbooks (cf. Morton, 1988). It is often used to discuss Canadian—and particularly British Columbian—racism. Macintosh’s photograph shows a group of turbaned men (and one child) posing for the photographer on the deck of the ship (Figure 1).

Macintosh outlined objectives for the use of the photograph with tenth grade students. Almost all were directly concerned with anti-racist education. Summing up his aims, he wrote, “Thus, by studying the primary document and the cases of discrimination the students would become more respectful towards other cultures, which is an important characteristic of our Canadian heritage...” Thus, his explicit goals were of a different type from either Arkwright’s (on reading primary and secondary sources) or Sims’ (on historical interpretation): he sought primarily neither to teach them to use historical sources, nor to have them grapple with interpretive questions in Canadian history, but rather to shape their attitudes in the present.

Macintosh considered the contextual knowledge of his students, and specifically outlined what they would and would not have been exposed to at the time of their examination of the photograph. They would have studied the restrictive immigration policies of 1908 and the general climate of racism. Yet it would only be after the students attempted to answer the questions that he would inform them that this photograph showed “part of the 376 South Asians who attempted to enter Canada ...and their resultant return to the Orient following the decision from the Supreme Court of Canada.” In other words, they would not know the story of the incident as context for the photograph analysis. This withholding of key information about the provenance of the photograph is very similar to Sims’ withholding of the identity of the author of his source (with similar problems for the exercise as a whole.)

His first four questions were the following:

1. Where are these people?

2. Why are there no women in this picture?

3. Why is there a child in the group, why is he in the front?

4. Why is there an elderly man in the group, and why is he in the front?

The four questions share some of the same problems. It is entirely unclear how students will arrive at answers, using either contextual information that they might have been exposed to, or evidence from the source itself. Moreover, it is unclear why they are significant interpretively. They
move the reader towards neither an understanding of the historical inci-
dent nor the potential significance of the photograph in determining such
an understanding. Macintosh did not have a clear sense of their problem-
atic nature at the time of the interview. Discussing his thinking about #3,
he offered the following:

D.M.: It's more one to create discussion, I guess I would have
thrown out hints and then obviously they would be wonder-
ing why is that child there. It's almost like questions I guess to
begin a lecture and then you start giving them the information
and that's what it seems to me at this point, like why is the
child in the group and then you can start lecturing about that,
as opposed to continuing on or maybe the questions themselves
and really using it as primary document

I: I wasn't sure that I could answer that question, "Why is there
a child in the group?" So it's sort of a puzzle that you don't
really expect them to be able to

D.M.: But it's to get them to think about it because possibly
there can be and again when you're looking at photographs
you really do have to question why is that kid in there, like
may be it is a question you should ask yourself. Is he there to
get maybe sympathy, create sympathy when they did take that
picture. Like again you've got the perspective of the photogra-
pher. And when you look at the photographer obviously, well,
you get the older man, the younger child in front and maybe
you're going to get some sympathy. (Interview, Jan. 30, 1997)

He did not recognize the assumptions he had made about the purpose of
the photographer, and the relationship between the photographer and the
group. Not recognizing those assumptions, he could not articulate them
as questions for students to examine.

The next questions exhibit some of the same difficulties, and some
new ones:

5. Do these people look as if they would make valuable
citizens in Canada? Why?

6. Why would you take this picture?

In his written explanation of the lesson, Macintosh highlighted #5, and
imagined students' responses to the picture and the question:
By examining the picture of the South Asians, the students are able to determine for themselves if these people seem suitable to enter Canada. Thus they are likely to form a negative opinion towards reasoning for restricting South Asian immigration... Such criticism would be a desired goal of the prescribed learning outcomes.

Macintosh is apparently confident that students would answer “yes” to Question #5. He has gone through the process of imagining students confronting the questions, but imagines an answer which may well not be the case. Moreover, a negative response to this question is likely to subvert the goals he has defined for the lesson. The subversion will be particularly devastating, moreover, because the wording of the question suggests that the visual evidence is sufficient to determine whether the people portrayed “would make valuable citizens in Canada.” #5 is apparently an open-ended question, which asks students to reframe material from the text (images of “these people”) into a larger interpretive field. But because the students have entertained no discussion of what a “valuable citizen” is, the apparently open-ended question becomes an invitation to the expression of racial stereotypes. Perhaps more importantly, there is no historical context for the question: students have not been asked to consider the values and aspirations either of the subjects of the photograph or of their (hypothetical, at this point) British Columbian opponents. Thus, Macintosh does not mobilize the historical text in the service of further understanding of the context of racism in BC in the early 20th century.

This elision of historical difference is compounded by the ambiguously ahistorical wording of the next question: “Why would you take this picture?” (emphasis added). The photographer’s purpose is a significant question, whose answer will provide insight into the photograph as a “worklike” document: was the photographer supporting the Sikhs by attempting to show their respectibility and decency? Or was s/he documenting their foreignness and strangeness for an audience of threatened white British Columbians? Students encountering the pronoun “you” will not be led towards this issue. In the follow-up interview, as he discussed a possible revision of #6, Macintosh improved the wording:

_D.M._ : Change #6 to may be not, “Why would you take this picture?” but again, “What was the reason for the photographer to take this picture?” and then may be that would flow a little bit better with #5.
I: Okay, change it from “Why would you take this picture?” to “Why did the photographer take this picture?” Is that the change you’re making?

D.M.: Ya, ya, more so that the kids would, you know, they wouldn’t think to put themselves into the shoes of the photographer with that one question and I think that’s an important aspect if they have to look at it and go well, “Why is he taking that photograph?” (Interview, Jan. 30, 1997)

Still, it remains clear that Macintosh assumed that the photographer was sympathetic to the Sikhs and that students who looked carefully at the document would see this. After considerable discussion, he realized how this assumption had skewed some of his questioning. “Who did take the photograph?” he finally asked. (Interview, Jan. 30, 1997)

Question #7, “What was the attitude of British Columbians towards people from Asian countries?” relies entirely on contextual knowledge: one cannot read it from the photograph. Nor does it follow from any of the questions earlier in the sequence. Thus, it constructs a separation between text and context. The photograph becomes merely an illustration of the accepted contextual information, and thus the occasion for a context quiz, not the stimulus for analysis, nor a piece of the historical action. Question #7 would work as a reminder of the context, if it served as an introduction to further analytical questions about the text. It did not do so, in this sequence.

Macintosh’s final question attempts to bridge the past and the present:

8. Are there groups of people today which Canada would not wish into the country?

But without the historical events insufficiently established, the problem of relating present events and attitudes to the past is lost in a kind of free-float.

In sum, Macintosh allowed important contemporary moral issues to dominate the historical context in a way that rendered the historical incident less potent in shedding light on the very issue he wanted to use it for. Secondly, he allowed his own assumptions about the historical context to dominate his interpretation of the text, so that he did not examine the text carefully enough to uncover some of its ambiguities. The historical understanding that emerges from this exercise is so truncated, that it is of little use in helping students to orient themselves morally in contemporary society, the avowed aim of this student-teacher.
The fourth student-teacher's exercise raises related moral issues, but with more skillful questioning. Sarah Mehlen, a sociology major, had considerably less undergraduate experience with history than Arkwright, Sims or Macintosh. She had taken only two history courses—an introduction to Canadian history and history of technology, though her broad liberal arts degree had included courses in French, women and literature, film history and social theory. (Interview, Feb. 5, 1997)

Mehlen chose a photograph from around 1900, which, in her own words, was “extremely powerful and informative.” It portrays a native father posed, despondent and wooden in traditional clothing, next to his three children from a native residential school, dressed in Western clothing (Figure 2). The father is physically separated from the children, who hold each other, but the psychological and cultural gap is far more dramatic. These are two worlds; the inhabitants of each are cut off from the other; and yet in their facial expressions we can read the wound of their separation. The utility of the photograph as a “worklike” text results from the stance of the early 20th century photographer being apparently so at odds with our own, on issues which remain significant to us.

Mehlen offers a sequence of deceptively simple questions. She acknowledged in the interview, “It was really hard getting the right word down, you know the right question.” (Interview, Feb. 7, 1997) She starts with a broad and open-ended question, thinking that the students may be able to do some of the observation and analysis themselves, #1 “What do you see in this picture?” But she continues with more specific questions in order to elicit responses to those aspects of the picture which will contribute to its interpretation as a “worklike” document.

The subjects’ dress, physical arrangement, and facial expressions are the key elements of the photographic text. Moreover, each of them potentially leads outward to issues of broad interpretive significance. Mehlen draws attention first to their dress and its meaning in four questions.

2. What can you tell us about how these people are dressed?

3. Why are they dressed differently?

4. Where were these children taught about Western culture?

5. What kinds of things did these children learn in their school?

These questions draw the students from the pictorial evidence (differences in dress) to questions about the origins of the difference in dress. She may have been asking students to conclude the “kinds of things” these children learned, based on the document, or from their contextual knowl-
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edge. In either case, she is directing students to the larger historical phenomenon which the photograph documents. From there she moves to two questions about the subjects' physical arrangement:

6. How has the photographer arranged the people in the portrait?

7. What does this arrangement tell us about their family dynamics?

Mehlen's wording is significant, here, because it starts to draw the photographer into the student's analytical frame: the photographer as arranger of the portrait. The stance of the photographer becomes the explicit subject of questions 10 and 11:

10. Who do you think took this photograph?

11. For what purpose was this photograph taken?

In the interview, Mehlen explained a range of valid interpretations that she thought might be elicited by these questions:

...the purpose of the photographer...with this photograph, is to show the differences between a family...They were able to assimilate them, to be able to bring them towards the European culture. It's more like a "Look what we can do!" photograph, propaganda kind of. And then on the other hand, I think, too, that this photograph might be showing the dynamics between the family because of what these people are trying to do to them. So it shows you know, the kids clustering together and "Who is this person?" But whether they're [i.e., the children are] doing that because they're told to or whether they're doing that because that's what they've learned, we don't really know. (Interview, Feb. 7, 1997)

The final two questions are broadly interpretive while being firmly rooted in the photographic evidence.

12. What effect did government policies have on Aboriginal traditions?

13. What does this photograph tell us about how First Nations people were treated during this time?
This sequence takes the reader smoothly and skillfully from the details of textual analysis to their larger contextual significance, helping simultaneously to construct the context through the text and vice versa. The photograph documents powerfully the forced cultural shift in First Nations life over the course of one generation. But in documenting what the pose attempts to convey as “progress” over generations, the photographer was an active participant in the historical phenomenon he documented. He is implicated by the stance of his camera, and the photograph, consequently, can be analysed as a worklike document.13

In her written statement of objectives, Mehlen stayed entirely on the plane of substantive interpretation, (e.g., “Students will demonstrate an understanding of the Federal policies in the late 1800’s and early 1900’s pertaining to Aboriginal education.”). She did not (like Arkwright) explicitly state goals about students’ abilities to read sources (though they would have been well-served by this question sequence.) Like Macintosh, she did want students to develop a moral stance. Unlike him, she wanted their stance to emerge from their positioning themselves in relation to the historical incident: “Students will demonstrate an understanding of the loss of native culture, beliefs, and values...Students will demonstrate an understanding that these government policies dominated and discriminated against the native people.” In the interview, in one brief statement, she wrapped together historical text, historical context, and an allusion to contemporary moral judgement about the historical phenomenon:

Based on what I know about residential schools and what was happening at that time, I can actually see it with my own eyes in this picture that it just shows the separation and what’s happened with that family. It’s just obvious. It’s sad I think. (Interview, Feb. 5, 1997)

When I asked her to imagine how a good student would respond to each one of her questions, she started by saying, “This is what I did anyways when I tried to do these questions I thought okay, what do I see when I look at this.” (Interview, Feb. 7, 1997) In other words, she had very consciously followed the same process in testing her own questions, that I had constructed in order to learn about her thinking.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

We are now in a position to discuss collectively, the work of the student-teachers in this early exercise in their social studies teacher education program: How well did they do in choosing texts rich in their “worklike” aspects? Did their choices lend themselves to the construction of a dynamic tension between the text and the historical context? And
were they able to use text and context to build exercises which would be appropriate for students at the middle or high school level?

The “worklike” text in history bears the traces of the authors’ purposes and assumptions, allowing an analysis of its own historicity. Moreover, it bears the signs of thinking substantially different from that of our own times. This kind of text lends itself to students’ understanding of the source’s construction, and of the position of the author as one different from our own. All four students did meet the first challenge, finding texts which had strong “worklike” aspects. Arkwright’s John A. Macdonald and Mehlen’s photograph of the native family were particularly accessible in this way. Macintosh’s Komagata Maru was somewhat more problematic. While it was clear enough in its documentary aspects, it was ambiguous as to the position of the photographer, when used as a single source, with little contextual information. With additional sources and more contextual information it could have constituted a plausible component of an exercise for students. While each of the four exercises could have been enriched by the juxtaposition of more historical sources (after all, historical scholarship is judged in part by the comprehensiveness of the search for appropriate historical sources), Macintosh’s Komagata Maru had a more difficult time standing on its own.

The students’ choice of documents is one challenge. The construction of a dynamic relationship between text and context, such as Arkwright’s nation-building or Sims’ 1837 Rebellions, is the second hurdle. Using the text as a “clue” to figure out the context upsets the constructive tension between text and context. Both Sims (asking students to guess who Mackenzie was), and Macintosh (asking students to guess what the Komagata Maru incident was) construed the historian as detective finding answers to a puzzle whose answers are fixed, rather than historian as a builder of interpretations within limits set by text and context.

Also at play, are the themes or issues that make the historical narrative potentially significant to students today, linking past to present. As discussed in the introductory sections of this article, meaningful historical narratives are shaped, in part, by historians’ explicit or implicit attention to these contemporary themes or issues. Thus Mehlen set up a three-way interaction among her text, the historical context of late-nineteenth century Canada, and our own contemporary understanding of racism. The text deepens students’ understanding of racism, and their understanding of the concept of racism enables students to interpret the text. It is worth reiterating here that the contemporary issues raised by Mehlen’s photograph do not present themselves because the photograph “speaks to us,” but precisely the opposite, because the photographer was acting on the basis of a moral language different from our own. The gap between the photographer’s frame (established through systematic questioning of
the text) and our own provides the opening for enriching students’ present understanding of racism in Canada. Mehlen’s questions successfully established this relationship between the text and both historical context and contemporary issues. Arkwright, too, maintained a constructive tension, in her exercise, among the text of Macdonald’s speech, the historical context of nation-building in 19th century Canada, and the contemporary issues of national identity, U.S.-Canada relations, political posturing and the question of progress itself.

Macintosh’s Komagata Maru exercise attempted to address a contemporary issue, specifically that of racism, but he did not use the historical source historically. The use of a historical source to try to promote certain attitudes in the present, directly and without due attention to historicizing the source, risks presentist misreadings which, in the end, subvert the moral purposes of doing history. If Macintosh constructed too immediate a line between the historical text and our contemporary concerns, Sims’ work had the opposite problem (among others). He did not, either in his question sequence for students or in his reflective interview, draw out the significance of William Lyon Mackenzie or the Rebellion of 1837 for the present. He thus left unarticulated, the answer to the question, “so what?” Of what meaningful version of Canadian history is the Rebellion one significant episode?

These are problems of historical interpretation: in Macintosh’s case, the problem of presentism, in Sims’ case, the problem of historical significance. It would be nice to think that history students come away from their undergraduate studies familiar enough with the problems of historical knowledge and interpretation, to construct this type of exercise. If they do not, it is an open question whether they will have an extended opportunity as teachers to gain the requisite understandings.

The final challenge facing students was that of making their exercises pedagogically appropriate for their own students. At this point in their education, they had the least preparation for this challenge. At the time of the exercise their own students existed only as figments of their imaginations. So the struggle to find just the “right words” for their questions (in Mehlen’s terms), and the right level of difficulty for the texts, was not easy. Furthermore, good historical texts pose particular problems, since the selection of “worklike” texts draws us toward conventions, language and perspectives foreign to our own. The more foreign they are, the more guidance students need in wading through vocabulary and references (in written text) and conventions (in pictorial texts) which may be obscure or unknown to them. The construction of a good exercise demands attention to specific key passages, difficult phrases, and archaic conventions. It also demands careful attention to the framing of questions, so that the sequence leads students smoothly through an analysis of the text towards new learning.
It would be unfair to judge these student-teachers on their abilities to frame exercises for students they had never met, for a classroom whose dynamics they had never experienced. Yet it is worth asking which aspects of the problem of constructing exercises for interpreting historical texts they would have a chance to revisit. Although they had received two weeks of instruction in history teaching, they would not encounter any more formal instruction in the use of primary sources. It would be a matter of chance whether the teachers or faculty supervisors with whom they would work in the subsequent practicum had any interest or expertise in teaching using primary sources: many would not. They would not have any further work on the nature of historical knowledge or interpretation, the subtle and difficult negotiations between past and present. Student-teachers who had not encountered these issues as undergraduates would have to rely on whatever they picked up from elsewhere.

What they all would face was the real classroom, students' responses to their exercises, and opportunities to reflect on those responses. The reflective interviews conducted in the first weeks of their teaching practicum provide evidence that revisiting these early exercises, in the light of even very limited classroom experience, could lead to revision, substantial in some cases. It is thus not too much to hope that those student-teachers who would continue to design exercises with primary sources would soon peg them at the pedagogically appropriate level of difficulty. Being generally optimistic, moreover, I believe that school experience would help some to develop general questioning skills, as they observe and reflect upon engaging and thoughtful classrooms. But there is no reason to believe that the classroom encounter would help them sort through the issues of text and context, past and present, historical knowledge and historical interpretation, if the groundwork was not already well-laid.

Through the analysis of student-teachers' assignments, I have attempted to clarify the manner in which they think historically, the nature of the task in which they were engaged, and the kinds of difficulties they had in the initial stages of the teacher-education program. The study suggests further research in several directions. A broader sample of student teachers and their work on this exercise would provide insight into the kinds of knowledge, experiences, abilities, and dispositions, prior to the teacher-education course, which facilitate the design of history exercises for teaching. The study also cries out for a longitudinal examination following students through the teacher-education year, and into the first years of teaching. A longitudinal examination could also extend backward into the undergraduate education of history majors who intended to become history teachers: how and where do they first confront history as a problem of knowledge? Such research could provide a more extended picture of the process of learning to teach history. This study also suggests the
examination of course materials, particularly textbooks. How do they construct the relationships between text and context, between source and account, between past and present? Are their documentary excerpts, photographs, and artwork merely illustrations to supplement a completed historical narrative? Or do they offer invitations for interpretation which might help to develop the narrative?

As we begin increasingly to teach (and to advocate teaching) with primary historical sources, teacher educators must think far more about what it will take to prepare new teachers for that task. What kinds of experiences will lead Arkwright, Sims, Macintosh, and Mehlen to be able to work with their own students around the interplay of historical text, historical context, and contemporary significance. What kinds of history courses, what kinds of teacher education activities, what kinds of activities in the classroom will best enable them to meet the challenges and overcome the problems exposed in this study? Whatever the answers, it is unlikely that either historians (who bear primary responsibility for teaching future history teachers what it means to do history) or teacher educators (who bear primary responsibility for teaching them to understand the problems of historical thinking in the classroom) or social studies teachers (who bear primary responsibility for modeling good teaching practices for them) can accomplish the task successfully without working more closely with each other than ever before.

Appendix

Questionnaires & Interview Questions

Questionnaire 1
1. What was your undergraduate major?
2. What colleges or universities have you attended?
3. Do you have any graduate degrees? If so, in what area?
4. Approximately how many post-secondary history courses have you taken?
5. List up to five post-secondary history courses you have taken.
6. Have you taken any course in historiography, historical methodology, or philosophy of history? If so, describe it briefly:
7. In any of your post-secondary courses, did you write one or more history papers based on primary documents? If so, briefly describe the project(s):
8. Did you do any work with primary historical documents in secondary school? If so, describe it briefly:
9. Do you have any other experience which you would consider to be background relevant to teaching students how to use primary historical sources?

Questionnaire 2
1. Check one or more of the following: Before choosing the source(s), I
   ___a) had never studied the general historical topic to which it applies
   ___b) had studied the general topic in a post-secondary course
   ___c) knew of the existence of the specific source
   ___d) knew where I could find a copy of the specific source
   ___e) already had a copy of the specific source
Other comments:
2. Rank the following factors in their contribution to your choice of the primary source(s) for your assignment (MOST important=10; LEAST important=1; NOT APPLICABLE=N/A)
   __a) ease of obtaining the source
   __b) appropriateness for the topics in the social studies curriculum
   __c) appropriateness of language (reading level) for secondary school students
   __d) interest level for secondary school students
   __e) appropriateness for issues which I think should be included in the curriculum
   __f) other

Other comments:
3. What goals or objectives did you have in mind for students in completing the exercise you designed?
4. Did you think that your exercise would help students to achieve those goals? If so, how?
5. Once you had a copy of the source, describe the process that you went through in order to design the exercise:
6. What was the greatest difficulty in completing the primary source assignment?
7. What was of the greatest assistance in completing the primary source assignment?

Interview Questions
1. Background: Various questions further probing statements about background from questionnaire #1.
2. Interpreting the source: What do you think is the significance of this [quotation/picture]?
3. Selecting the source: Explain how you actually got to this particular source.
4. Look at the questions you have written. Let's go through them, and you tell me what you think that students might say in response to each one.
5. Any more thoughts on this exercise? The choice of documents OR the question sequence?

Notes

1 An earlier version of this paper was presented at the American Historical Association, New York, January, 1997. I would like to thank Terrie Epstein, Avner Segall and Sam Wineburg for helpful comments on an earlier draft, and Karen Knutson for research assistance. The research was supported through a UBC Humanities and Social Sciences Small Research Grant.

2 In the summer of 1996, the Organization of American Historians and the National Center for History in the Schools announced a major initiative calling for proposals for the development of teaching units based on primary documents in US history.

3 Of course, "accounts" can be part of the action too: that is, accounts which are expressed or published in the midst of the historical period under study also have consequences. Thus LaCapra's wording is more precise than my own, when he refers to the worklike aspects of a text.

4 On "the inevitable textualization of context," also see Toews, 1987, p.886.

5 A recent call for reform of history teaching with primary sources apparently advocated exactly this relationship between text and context, calling for workshops for history teachers based on a series of "basic packets for each era of no more than 25 pages which provide an overview of major trends and a collection of about six edited documents that illustrate the key points of the narrative." (my emphasis) (Saunders, 1996, p.7).

6 A research assistant observed these two weeks of classes, and recorded activities and student responses in field notes.
The use of students' assignments from a teacher education methods class as data to interpret their pedagogical/historical thinking must be approached carefully. The retrospective interviews provided some perspective on the ways that students understood the assignment itself. In his interview, one student-teacher continually referred to the expectations of the instructor: he said he completed the exercise according to his understanding of the instructor's criteria, as opposed to considering how he really would have organized a lesson for a school class. Such retrospective testimony, itself, of course, must be approached critically. The demands, opportunities and constraints of a teacher-education class assignment intervened in other ways for the three other student-teachers. It is important not to misunderstand these products as anything other than what they were: exercises for a class. And yet, as such, they provide a window on student-teachers' thinking about some of the central challenges of teaching history.

By chance, two of the students chosen were male (the weak ones) and two were female (the strong ones). However, this study provides no grounds for claims about gender and history teaching.

All students' names are pseudonyms.

The photograph is reproduced in Burnet, 1988, facing p.56.

Problems emerge here with the use of a class assignment as research data. In the subsequent interview, Macintosh reported that he had written the assignment the night before it was due. He had discarded his earlier work when, that evening, he saw that it would only fit in the Grade 12 curriculum, whose guide he did not have at home. "To be honest, as far as writing down the questions, I just wrote down a list and I didn't look at it a second time because as far as those questions go, it was just.. At the time it felt well these seem okay but I read them again when I was handing it in and going "oh, boy, like I hope this works out." Interview, January 30, 1997. Nevertheless, the interview itself gave him an opportunity to revisit and revise the questions.

The photograph is reproduced in Finkel and Conrad, 1993, p.121.

Kozloff (1994) discusses a related phenomenon in his chapter, "Photographs: The images that give you more than you expected to see and less than you need to know."
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Abstract

As Americans come to understand the effects of globalization, there is increasing concern that schools today are not adequately preparing students for our interdependent world. Although much has been written about the need to infuse global perspectives in education so that students will understand and benefit from the increasing interconnectedness of the world’s cultures, economies, and political relationships, few scholars have studied the actual practice of social studies teachers as they teach global perspectives or tried to understand the contexts of their instructional decisions. In this article multiple perspectives on current classroom practice in global education are examined, including those of master teachers considered the best global educators in their school districts, practicing teachers who have recently completed their first formal instruction in global education, and preservice teachers who are beginning to teach globally-oriented social studies as part of their certification programs. Some commonalities of theories and practice across the three groups include teaching students about their own cultures and diverse cultures through multiple perspectives, connecting global knowledge and skills to their students’ lives, and making connections across historical time periods and world regions. There are also considerable differences across the three groups of teachers as the master teachers focus much more on global and local inequities, interdisciplinary approaches, higher level thinking, and cross-cultural experiential learning.

As Americans come to understand the effects of globalization in our communities and nation, there is increasing concern that schools today are not adequately preparing students for the challenges of a changing world (Alger, 1974; Anderson, 1990; Bennett, 1995; Boyer, 1983; Council on Learning, 1981; National Governors’ Association, 1989). Much has been written about the need to infuse global perspectives in education so that students will understand and benefit from the increasing interconnectedness of the world’s cultures, economies, technologies, ecology, and political relationships (Anderson, 1979; Becker, 1979; Goodlad,
1986; Lamy, 1990; Leetsma, 1979; Tye, 1990). Scholars in education, history, and the social sciences have set forth ways in which schools should prepare young people for life in a global age (Alger & Harf, 1986; Gilliom, Remy & Woyach, 1980; Hanvey, 1976; Kniep, 1986a; Lamy, 1987). The National Council for the Social Studies (1982), other professional organizations, and state and local educational agencies have published rationales, goals, methods, and materials for infusing global perspectives into social education. Teacher educators have developed programs, courses, and instructional materials to prepare social studies teachers to integrate global perspectives into their teaching and learning (Begler, 1993; Easterly, 1994; Flournoy, 1994; Gilliom, 1993; Johnson, 1993; Merryfield, 1993a, 1995; Muessig & Gilliom, 1981; Remy, Nathan, Becker & Torney, 1975; Torney-Purta, 1995; Tucker, 1990; Tucker & Cistone, 1991; Tye & Tye, 1992; Wilson, 1997; Wooster, 1993). Commercial publishers, curriculum development centers, and area studies programs have produced a wealth of resources to support changes in state and district curricular mandates and demands of K-12 social studies teachers for globally-oriented materials. However, few educators or scholars have studied the actual practice of social studies teachers as they teach global perspectives or tried to understand the contexts of their instructional decisions. In this paper I examine multiple perspectives on current classroom practice in global education. Perspectives include those of (1) 16 master teachers considered the best global educators by their school districts, (2) 67 practicing teachers who had recently completed their first formal instruction in global education, and (3) 60 preservice teachers who were beginning to teach globally-oriented social studies as part of their certification programs in a professional development school network (PDS) in social studies and global education. At the end of the paper I suggest how the conceptual literature on global education could be informed and strengthened by the perspectives, theories, and practice of the teachers. The goals of the paper are to (1) gain a better understanding of how teachers conceptualize global education as they plan and teach, (2) develop insights into the contextual factors that influence teachers' instructional decisions as they teach about the world and its peoples, (3) examine how teachers' thinking and practice can contribute to the literature conceptualizing global education. An underlying assumption of the paper is that better understanding of teachers' theories and practice can inform the field of global education and improve social studies education.

**Contexts of the Studies**

Teaching about community, nation and the world from global perspectives differs in several ways from traditional approaches to the study of cultures, world geography, U.S. history, foreign policy, or the history of
world civilizations. Scholars in the field have developed both substantive differences and perceptual differences. Substantively, the world is seen as interrelated systems in which technological, ecological, economic, political and development issues can no longer be effectively addressed by individual nations because the issues become global as they spill over borders and regions (Becker, 1979; Hanvey, 1976; Kniep, 1986b). Global perspectives in education focus as much on cultural universals, those things all humans share in common, and perspective consciousness, knowledge and appreciation of other peoples' points of view, as it does on cultural differences (Alger & Harf, 1986; Case, 1991, 1993; Hanvey, 1976; Kniep, 1986a). A fourth element in the scholarly literature on global education is the recognition that each of us makes choices that affect other people around the world, and others make choices that affect us (Anderson, 1979; Alger & Harf, 1986; Hanvey 1976; Lamy, 1987). Because of these interconnections or interdependence between students, their communities and other peoples, global education includes goals of decision-making, participation, and long-term involvement in the larger world beyond our borders as well as in the local community. Scholars have also included other elements, such as global history (Kniep, 1986b), the changing nature of world actors and transactions (Alger & Harf, 1986; Lamy, 1987), persistent global problems and issues (Kniep, 1986b), and cross-cultural experiences (Wilson 1982, 1983, 1993a, 1993b).

In the last decade scholars have conceptualized perceptual dimensions within a global education. Open-mindedness, anticipation of complexity, resistance to stereotyping, empathy and non-chauvinism have been developed by Case (1991), Darling (1995), and Wilson (1994). Pike and Selby (1988, 1995) have conceptualized an inner dimension in which students examine their own perspectives in relation to the perspectives others hold. They include areas of social justice, gender equity, animal rights, health, human rights, and development education (Pike & Selby, 1995). Recognizing a weakness in global education's lack of emphasis on moral education and social justice, Werner (1990) has applied critical pedagogy to global education in order to get at the contradictions of its conflicting goals and interests. Coombs (1989) and Darling (1994, 1995) have further developed relationships between global education and moral education.1 See Appendix A for a more detailed view of conceptualizations of global education from selected works in the field.

Teacher educators involved in implementing global education in their programs have described their efforts as preparing teachers to (1) make connections across cultures, world regions, and civilizations and across global issues instead of teaching them separately, (2) identify historical antecedents to current world issues, events, and problems, and identify the processes of cultural diffusion and borrowing over time, (3) link glo-
bal content to the local community and (4) teach tolerance and appreciation of cultural differences (Merryfield, 1991, 1992).

Although there has been considerable rhetoric about the need for global education, little attention has been paid to how teachers are actually teaching about the world, its peoples, and global issues. There is much conceptual literature that describes the goals, elements, or rationale for global perspectives in education, yet we know very little about what actually happens in globally-oriented classrooms or how teachers make instructional decisions as they plan and teach about the world.

Within social studies education scholars have studied teachers as instructional decision-makers and delineated some important contextual factors that relate to how teachers make decisions. Researchers have concluded that teachers vary in how they perceive their overall roles in planning instruction and curriculum (Brown, 1988; Marsh, 1984; Stodolsky, 1988; Thornton, 1985). Although some studies have indicated that teachers are affected by colleagues (Levstik, 1989) and other factors within the school building and community (McNeil, 1986; White, 1985), other studies have found teachers' instructional decisions are influenced by instructional materials, particularly textbooks (Lydecker, 1982; McCutcheon, 1981; also see Kon, 1995 for a contrasting view), concerns over classroom management (Hyland, 1985; Parker & Gehrke, 1986) and perceptions of what instruction is appropriate for their students (Cornbleth, Korth & Dorow, 1983; Kagan, 1993; O'Loughlin, 1995). Other studies have identified teacher's underlying beliefs, values, and experiences as primary influences in shaping instructional decisions (Cornett, 1987, 1990; Shaver, Davis & Helburn, 1980; Thornton & Wenger, 1989; Wilson, 1982, 1983).

In summing up his review of teachers as curricular-instructional gatekeepers, Thornton (1991) called for more qualitative studies of exemplary practice in order to understand the classroom realities of instructional decision-making. These sentiments are echoed by other educators (Cornbleth, 1991; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988) and educational research in general as evidenced in recent paradigm shifts towards interpretive and constructivist theories. Armento (1996), writing in the recent Handbook on Teacher Education Research, noted that the field of social studies needs research that gives greater attention to relationships between teacher education, professional development, and the social contexts of teachers' lives and work.

My inquiry into teacher decision-making and global perspectives grew from this literature and my own experiences and concerns. First, as a professor in a graduate program in social studies and global education, I wanted to learn more about how teachers make instructional decisions as they teach about the world, particularly in courses and school systems that are purported to address global perspectives. How do exemplary teachers conceptualize global education? To what degree do they support
and teach the elements of global education as advocated in the scholarly literature? In what ways have teachers developed their own theories of how to prepare young people for their globally-interconnected world? Second, I saw a paradox between the social studies literature on teacher thinking that identifies a handful of discrete factors that affect teachers' instructional decisions and the more broadly-based literature about teacher thinking that alludes to the complexities of how teachers think about teaching and learning and how they make instructional decisions (Calderhead, 1987; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Connelly & Clandinin, 1988; Elbaz, 1981; McNair, 1978-1979; Shavelson, 1983; Shavelson & Stern, 1981; Yinger & Clark, 1982).

Third, from my own experiences in teaching and in research in classrooms in the U.S. and several African nations, I was convinced that most researchers in social studies and global education don't spend sufficient time in observing practice, in systematic reflection with teachers, and in analyzing data to understand the complexities of global education and teachers' instructional decision-making. From the outset of the studies I wanted to address concerns over the lack of prolonged engagement, persistent observation, and idiographic interpretation (see Lincoln & Guba, 1985) that I perceived as limitations in the extant body of knowledge about teacher decision-making, social studies, and global education.

The overall goal of the three studies is to learn more about how teachers make instructional decisions in globally-oriented social studies and what contextual factors influence their decisions. Below I briefly outline the research design of each of the studies and explain how they are connected conceptually. To differentiate the studies I will refer to them as Study 1: focusing on teachers who are considered to be exemplary global educators within their school districts, Study 2: focusing on experienced classroom teachers who have recently studied and begun to teach global perspectives, Study 3: preservice teachers who have studied global education in methods courses and fieldwork within a professional development school network in social studies and global education and plan to make global perspectives an integral part of their teaching and learning.

**Study 1: Exemplary Global Educators**

The study sought to document how outstanding global educators make decisions about teaching about the world. I selected school districts based upon their commitment to global education as demonstrated through course development, allocation of resources, and staff development. The teachers were selected through recommendations from district and building administrators, their achievements in teaching and curriculum development related to global education, their knowledge of global education and its application to their courses, and their willingness to give time each week to the study. Twelve teachers were in the study from 1991-
1993, and another four teachers were in the study from 1992-1994. Each of
the 16 teachers is considered exemplary by his/her school district and
building administrators. Six teachers (two elementary, two middle, and
two secondary in each district) were selected from a large urban district.
Their classes were predominately working-class African American and
white students; most classes had a few immigrants from Asia and the
Middle East. Six teachers were selected from a small, very affluent subur-
ban district. While the vast majority of their students were upper middle
class white students, all classes had one or more students of color, most
frequently Asian Americans. Four teachers were selected from a poorly-
funded school district that was in a transition from rural to suburban as a
near-by city’s suburbs expanded towards this small town. The school popu-
lation was also undergoing significant change as this formerly all-white
rural community was growing from an influx of urban whites fleeing
school desegregation and urban African Americans moving to the new
suburbs. These four teachers were selected for the study because they were
initiating a new program for their district called “World Connections.”
Based upon the reforms of the Coalition of Essential Schools, this interdis-
ciplinary program for tenth graders integrated social studies, language
arts, science, math and art around global themes and issues (see Shapiro &
Merryfield, 1995, for a case study of an eight week unit taught by the team
on international conflict resolution).

Once a week my graduate research assistants and I observed the
teachers as they taught courses in history, geography or world cultures. We
recorded what was said by teachers and students during instruction
and prepared transcripts of each class period that also included teacher
and student actions, the use of instructional materials, and the physical
arrangement of the room. Each observation was followed up with an in-
terview, either after class if possible or by telephone on the evening of the
observation. The interview questions grew out of the observation notes
and most frequently asked the teacher to explain why he or she had made
particular instructional decisions.

From the beginning of the study considerable attention was given to
having the teachers identify contextual factors—for example, teacher be-
liefs and experiences, mandated courses of study, instructional materials
and other resources, student characteristics, team-teaching, parents, state
tests, and so forth—that influenced instructional decision-making. The
teachers helped improve written constructions of their perspectives
through formal member checks, sessions where the teachers reflected upon
and discussed raw data and tentative findings. At regular intervals each
teacher examined all the observational and interview data for his or her
own case study in order to review and think about decisions, content,
strategies, students, and the myriad components of classroom teaching.
Teachers were encouraged to help us understand, interpret and articulate
their perspectives on teaching and learning. New questions were continuously developed from observational and interview data and from discussions during the member checks. Literally thousands of questions were asked during the study. Questions encompassed choices of content, time allocations, instructional materials, teaching strategies, and issues related to student motivation, learning, and evaluation. Some questions were posed to all teachers, such as "what were contextual factors affecting the planning of today's lesson?" Other questions were specific to a teacher's instruction, such as "why did you change the group work assignment in the middle of class today?"

Tentative findings grew out of content analysis (as described by Lincoln and Guba 1985, 332-356). Each sentence (or groups of sentences in some cases where meaning might otherwise be lost) was keyed as to teacher and date, then categorized to answer questions related to content, process, contextual factors and several other aspects of instruction. The study produced over 3500 pages of raw data. The teachers and I examined every line (and categorized and recategorized the data) at least six times during the study. I also interviewed the teachers' building principals, school district administrators, and curriculum supervisors in order to understand better the larger contextual factors of school climate, constraints on teacher decision-making, and their perceptions of the impact of parents and the community on teachers' instruction about the world.

These data and findings were used to develop different frameworks for understanding how teachers make instructional decisions as they plan and teach about the world. The last step in data analysis focused on decisions about global content, loosely defined as knowledge, skills or attitudes taught in order that students understand the world and its peoples. All decisions related to global content that were documented in the observations and interviews were analyzed as to (1) the theories underlying the decision and (2) the contextual factors that the teacher identified as influencing the decision. From these analyses a profile of decision-making was developed for each teacher and for teams where teachers planned and taught together. In a final member check, each teacher examined his or her profile and improved its construction. The profiles were organized by (1) the theories underlying the teacher's decisions on global content, (2) the contextual factors that heavily influence each theory, and (3) an example of an instructional decision guided by that theory. See Appendix B for an example of the profiles. The first year of weekly observations was followed by a second year of interviews to examine in what ways the teachers perceived that they changed their teaching, course content, and perspectives on global education from one year to the next.
Study 2: Experienced Classroom Teachers Who Have Recently Studied and Begun to Teach Global Perspectives

Early on in the study of exemplary global educators I began to notice differences between what I was observing from teachers in my graduate classes on global education and what I was learning from the study. Intrigued by these differences, I began to examine how experienced classroom teachers begin to conceptualize and teach global perspectives. Beginning in 1990, I ask experienced teachers in my graduate seminar, "Infusing Global Perspectives in Education," (see Appendix C for the conceptual framework for global education that I use in introductory courses) if I could follow up on our coursework and collect data six to nine months later on their application of global education in their teaching. From 1991-1997, I collected data from 67 teachers. The teachers shared these characteristics: (1) at the time that they took the course, they had at least three years teaching experience in social studies in elementary, middle, or high schools, (2) the course they took with me was their first formal study of global education, (3) at the completion of the course they planned to infuse global perspectives into their teaching and learning, and (4) they chose to be included in the study.

Data collection included journals written during the course, structured interviews within six to nine months after the course was completed, and collection of other relevant documents such as lesson plans, new courses of study, and instructional materials developed or adapted by the teachers. The journals captured the teachers' reactions and ideas to different rationales and conceptualizations of global education, their evaluation of instructional materials, and their development of an application project in which they infused global perspectives into lessons, units, courses, or curriculum frameworks. Written as the course progressed over ten weeks, the journals provide insights into the teachers' initial construction of global education and its application to their students and courses. The follow-up interviews included these questions:

1. When you think back to the course, what comes to mind? [Probes to knowledge, skills, experiences, resources, other.]
2. In what ways do you think that the course has made a difference in your thinking, your learning or your teaching? [Probes to get at all three elements.]
3. Could you give me a few illustrations of your teaching of global perspectives over the last six to nine months? [Probes to flesh out illustrations, get at main points and underlying assumptions.]
4. What does global education mean to you at this time? [Probes for conceptualization, any "essential" elements, and areas that may be considered important but do not fit into the teacher's current teaching assignments.]
5. What factors constrain your teaching of global perspectives? What factors support your teaching of global perspectives? [Probe for further elaboration, description, illustrations.]

6. What questions or concerns about global education do you have at this time? What are other issues about global education that you value or have relevance for you?

7. Given your experiences with global education, how would you advise me to improve my introductory course?

Beyond the interview data, I asked the teachers for lesson plans, materials they had developed or used, and any other documents that related to their teaching global perspectives. Most of the teachers provided some documentation of their planning and teaching. All these data—from journals, interviews, and other documents—were analyzed according to the methods described in the first study above. Categories were developed for the elements in the teachers' conceptualizations of global education, their application in their teaching, and the contextual factors that influenced their thinking and practice.

**Study 3: Preservice Teachers in a Professional Development School Network (PDS) in Social Studies and Global Education**

Along with my research of exemplary teachers and my teaching and learning in my graduate seminar in global education, I was also preparing preservice teachers for comprehensive secondary (grades 7-12) social studies certification. Because of the impact of the exemplary global educators on my own thinking about intersections of teachers beliefs and experiences, global education, social studies, and teacher education, I began to rethink our B.S. and M.A. teacher preparation programs. One major weakness in our program was the contradiction between what our students learned about global education on campus, and what they learned in their field experiences. Quite frequently they left campus with a foundation in global education and a preliminary resource base and found little or no support in the schools for teaching global perspectives. As I came to know the exemplary global educators over that first year, we often talked about the problems of preservice teacher education and possible ways to improve it.

By 1991, several of the exemplary teachers and I had begun to work collaboratively on improving the preservice program, particularly in the area of global education. In 1992 we implemented a formal restructuring as a Professional Development School (PDS) Network in Social Studies and Global Education that included these components: (1) eight classroom teachers and a college professor team-teaching our methods courses, (2) the collaborative development by the teachers (we began to call them field professors) and the college professor of a new 10 quarter hour PDS meth-
ods block, (3) extensive field experience (four clock hours a day) and ten teaching experiences for the preservice teachers during methods, (4) portfolio and performance-based assessment during methods, and (5) similar teacher/professor/doctoral student collaboration during student teaching, a capstone seminar, and final assessments (for more on the global education dimension of the PDS Network, see Dove, Norris & Shinew, 1997; Chase & Merryfield, 1997, 1998).

As we struggled to develop and implement a cohesive collaborative program, the field professors and I also began an inquiry into the preservice teachers’ thinking and instruction. From 1992 to 1997, we collected data on the preservice teachers during the six months they were in PDS methods and student teaching. As the preservice teachers learned about global education in seminars, field experiences, and readings, they wrote weekly synthesizing essays to bring together what they were learning and to apply the ideas and experiences to their own teaching. (See our conceptual framework for global education in Appendix B.) They were expected to infuse global perspectives into lessons that they developed and taught during methods. At mid-term and the end of the quarter, we engaged them in further discussion both individually and in focus groups about their conceptualizations and teaching of global perspectives in the social studies. Data also were collected from observations during student teaching, their lessons plans, assessments and their in-flight decisions in the classroom. These data were analyzed as they were collected using content analysis to answer similar questions to those addressed in the two studies described above.

In this paper I focus on findings related to how they conceptualized global education, how they infused global perspectives into their preservice planning and teaching, and their explanations of the contextual factors influencing their decisions. Not all of our preservice teachers from 1992-1997 are in this study. Those 60 selected met these criteria: (1) they purposefully sought ways to integrate global education into their teaching during methods and student teaching, (2) they demonstrated a commitment to their own learning about the world and its peoples, and (3) they chose to become a part of the study. Out of 135 preservice with whom I worked from 1992-1997, the 60 in the study were those who appeared over the six months of methods and student teaching to have the greatest commitment to global education and the best ability to infuse global perspectives into their own teaching and learning.

Although these studies were designed separately, they overlap in their examination of teachers’ thinking, their instructional decisions in planning and teaching, and the contexts of those decisions. Together the findings provide insights into the interconnectedness of teachers’ lived experience, their theories of teaching and learning in global education, and their practice in teaching about the world and its peoples. The find-
ings are organized by the teachers' explanations of the conceptualizations or theories for infusing global perspectives into their teaching and learning and by the contextual factors they identified as affecting their instructional decisions. The three groups of teachers differed in their teaching experience and backgrounds in global education. However, they all did share knowledge of the scholarly literature and conceptual foundations of global education, and they all had some experience in applying these ideas as they integrated global perspectives into their K-12 courses.

**Teachers' Theories and Contextual Factors**

Although the teachers phrase them somewhat differently, there are some important similarities in the theories that guide the decision-making of all three groups of teachers in global education and in the contextual factors that the teachers identified as shaping those decisions. There are also some ideas and contextual factors that are unique to each group of teachers and to individual teachers within the groups. The similarities across all groups are discussed first, followed by differences across the groups of teachers and then examples of the ideas unique to individual teachers.

**Similarities Across the Three Groups**

(1) **Guiding theory for preparing students to think with global perspectives:** Teach students about their own cultures and diverse cultures through multiple perspectives and comparisons of both similarities and differences so that students understand the complexity of culture and demonstrate tolerance and respect for differences. A major finding of all three studies is the primacy of the study of culture. These theories include the need to begin the study of culture with an examination of the students' own cultures and their perspectives of what culture means in their daily life. In the study of diverse cultures locally and globally, their students are expected to develop skills in recognizing and analyzing the complexity of peoples' perspectives, and the effects of conflicting perspectives in human relationships. Along with the study of cultures, the teachers include the valuing of tolerance, respect and cooperation.

The guiding theory shared by the most teachers in all three groups was that students need knowledge and appreciation of multiple perspectives, multiple realities, and conflicting viewpoints on issues, events, and people under study. Some teachers phrased multiple perspectives in terms of skills in perspective consciousness, the ability to recognize that other people often have views or perspectives that are different from one's own. The teachers want their students to appreciate the complexity of diverse viewpoints within cultures and examine perspectives different from their own, those of "the powers that be," or those of the U.S. government. Atten-
tion to multiple perspectives was brought about through primary sources and conflicting first-hand accounts of events, biography, non-fiction and historical fiction, supplementary materials written by people from other cultures, guest speakers, or the viewpoints of diverse students during class.

Many of the teachers expected their students to make comparisons across cultures for their ways of living, economic and political development, and other cultural characteristics such as beliefs and values related to families, gender roles, religion, and authority. Cultural differences were usually taught as value-neutral. For example, cultural differences in work, technology, religion, gender roles, or daily life were taught as neither good nor bad but simply different. The teachers’ knowledge goals focused on students understanding of why people do or see things differently and how culture is related to history, geography, religion, economics, and exposure to different influences. Similarities across cultures and cultural universals were stressed by the teachers as important linkages across peoples. Cross-cultural understanding was a part of the study of culture for some teachers. That is, they perceived that the purpose of studying other cultures is to bring people together through mutual understanding of beliefs, experiences and the historical contexts of people’s lives. Many of the teachers teach about cultural conflict and conflict resolution or management as part of teaching about diverse cultures and cultural universals.

It is difficult to separate the study of culture and multiple perspectives from the teachers’ guiding theories of fostering tolerance, respect, and cooperation. Understanding of other cultures was not only an academic matter of facts to be learned. Most of the teachers said they used cooperative learning and collaborative projects to teach students skills in working with people different from themselves. Many of the teachers explained that cross-cultural understanding is more likely to develop if they bring together knowledge of diverse cultures, attitudes of tolerance and respect, and methods that reward cooperation and conflict management. The exemplary global educators called this an “integrative” or “total” or “holistic” approach to cultural understanding fostered by respect for differences and appreciation of commonalities within the classroom, school, and community as well as the larger world. When asked about why they felt the teaching of culture and multiple perspectives was central to global education, a majority of the teachers in each group replied that understanding of one’s own and different cultures is the foundation for education to bring about harmony, reduce conflict and prepare students for the realities of many interconnected cultures in their neighborhoods, nation and world.

**Contextual factors shaping the study of cultures.** There were two major contextual factors shaping these guiding theories. First, many of the teachers in all three groups stated they were personally committed to developing tolerance and respect for views different from one’s own. For many
teachers this commitment has grown from their own lived experiences, such as observing overt discrimination, growing up in poverty in Appalachia, participating in desegregation, and experiences with students different from themselves in race, class, religion, language or national origin. For the exemplary global educators, appreciation of diverse cultures and multiple perspectives came from cross-cultural experiences in their teaching, travels, or from living in other countries.

Second, no matter what the characteristics of their school population, the teachers see their students as needing to become less ethnocentric and more empathetic with other people. Teachers in relatively homogeneous settings see the school experience as critical in helping their students to overcome their parochialism (see also Zimpher & Ashburn, 1992) and come to understand that not everyone is like them and that difference is not bad or bizarre, it is simply different. Teachers who have classes with diverse racial, ethnic or religious groups also see their influence as critical for the survival and integration of their students into the larger community and American society.

(2) Guiding theory: Connect global content to students' lives. Most of the teachers consistently acted upon the premise that global content should be connected to the experiences, knowledge base, and interests of the students. Many teachers decided to spend more time on a topic because their students were very interested or involved in it; or they spent less time when they perceived students as uninterested or unconnected. Many of these teachers made overt attempts in every lesson to relate the content under study to their students’ lives.

It is quite remarkable the degree to which students affected instruction in the exemplary group. Most of these teachers were acutely responsive to student interests, abilities, behavior, and concerns. When students were involved and excited about a topic such as an oil spill in the news, the teacher frequently would extend time spent on it at the cost of time for other topics. If a topic related to the background of some students, such as African history for African American students, again that topic received more attention. In one suburban classroom, a question about jewelry in Africa by the only African American student in the sixth grade led to an impromptu unit on African lifestyles and adornment that the teacher developed to build upon student interest about a part of the world her students had never studied.

Contextual factors shaping the connection of content to students' lives. Teachers believe that they increased the motivation of students to succeed in school by connecting content to student interests and experiences. Some saw connections between content and students as a way to increase their students' self-esteem as they learned that they are a part of history and the world today. “Connections to social studies content place my student in the center of history as opposed to leaving them out as some textbooks
do," explained one high school teacher. Student characteristics led the teachers to connect their students to the curriculum overtly since it is easier to teach students who see the topics under study as relevant to their lives and who perceive their teachers as caring about their questions and concerns. Some teachers used the connections to students' lives as the basis for community service learning, exhibitions, and other authentic learning and assessments.

(3) Guiding theory: Have students make connections across time and space. A third category of guiding theories common to all three groups was a focus on relationships or linkages across time periods and world cultures and regions. The teachers had different ways of articulating this goal. Some referred to their students as "seeing the big picture." Several spoke of students understanding "cause and effect relationships in history," or examining "the ways in which history repeats itself." What these teachers saw as a major goal was student understanding of the dynamic nature of change and the human condition. They wanted their students to see how one event or invention leads to many changes in trade or class distinctions that lead to more and more change in governance or lifestyles. They wanted students to make connections across cultures and throughout history and in their lives today so that the world is seen as an interrelated system that is directly connected to historical antecedents, contemporary decisions, and global issues.

Contextual factors shaping connections across time and space. There were several contextual factors influencing the goal of making connections across historical time periods and across cultures and world regions. Many of the teachers explained that their interest in connections came from their own study of history, geography, economics, comparative political systems, literature, or global education. Some teachers noted that the reason they wanted to teach about the world was because they believed it to be important for students to recognize how today's world was directly related to past events, the acceleration of global interdependence, and the future of the planet. For some teachers, their mandated courses of study (official documents of curriculum content) emphasized making connections across cultures and across historical periods.

The relationship between the official curriculum and the theories of global education in the exemplary group was more extensive. Five of the teachers had written their school districts' courses of study for their classes or grade level and three other teachers were in the process of revising their districts' courses of study. Therefore it is not easy to distinguish between these teacher beliefs and their mandated curricula. In all 17 school districts connected with the three studies, teachers considered the best by the district leaders play a major role in developing the P-12 courses of study in social studies and in choosing texts and other resources for those courses.
**Differences Across the Three Groups**

Each group had, to some extent, theories of global education and contextual factors that were different from the other groups. For example, content analysis of the data from the exemplary group produced several theories underlying their teaching of global education that were rarely touched upon by the teachers in the other groups.

**Findings Unique to the Exemplary Global Educators**

1. **Guiding theory:** Teach about the interconnectedness of global and local inequities, the human struggle for rights, self-determination, social justice and a better life. Recognizing the hegemony of the United States in the world today and the global political and economic power Americans hold, the exemplary global educators sought to help their students understand the relative privilege Americans have compared to other peoples on the planet. Many of their lessons of global interconnectedness taught about global inequities in technology, health care and mortality rates, education, employment opportunities and income, civil and human rights, trade, distribution of capital, and other indicators of peoples' and nations' standard of living. Several activities built off students' interests, such as two activities where students research the global assembly line of how locally-sold baseballs and running shoes are made. Students examined the conditions of work and wages paid in other countries as well as the profits taken when they are sold in the United States. Similarities were drawn to circumstances in the United States where workers have been exploited or underpaid and issues such as who benefits from economic integration, the policies of the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund, and bilateral trade agreements.

Another theme developed by some of the teachers was the interconnectedness of European imperialism, colonialization in Africa, the slave trade, contemporary media stereotyping of Africans, and African Americans' fight for rights and respect in the United States. The themes related to inequality and privilege at times integrated economic, political, or cultural factors, such as a fourth grade study of American immigration past and present. The teachers perceived that this attention to global inequity goes hand in hand with the multiple perspectives and understanding of culture described above. In simulations and research projects students were asked to interact from the situations of people who are different from themselves. They explained that "walking in others' shoes" helps students to empathize with children and young people their ages in China or Nigeria or Bolivia who happen to have been born into quite different economic and political circumstances.

Human rights, civil rights, women's rights and children's rights are some other topics that teachers taught about in an effort to help their students understand global inequities and privilege. The genocide of the
Holocaust was compared with Pol Pot's reign in Cambodia and the destruction of indigenous peoples of North America. In another lesson, a high school history teacher challenged the conventional wisdom that glorifies the Greeks as the founders of democracy by bringing in supplementary materials on their treatment of women and slaves.

Contextual factors shaping the study of the interconnectedness of global and local inequities. In explaining why they chose content about local and global connections of inequity, the teachers most frequently referred to their own beliefs and the characteristics of their students. The teachers reminded us of commitments they had to improving the lives of peoples in their own community and around the world. When we asked them to identify the contextual factors that led to a lesson about basic human needs, prejudice, or injustice, the teachers often brought up how sheltered or uninformed or parochial their students were about the human condition on the planet or even the way people live in a neighborhood five miles away. At times they explained their instructional choices by relating their concerns that their students did not have either knowledge of or empathy for people different from themselves. After a series of lessons to teach a global perspective of the connections between the economic development of the U.S. and that of several other countries, a high school teacher explained that her students had never been challenged to think about how the things they buy or the jobs their families hold affect and are affected by people around the world. Other lessons that related to political freedoms, refugees, land use, and cultural norms were developed by the teachers to get their students to recognize injustice as a global issue and examine multiple perspectives of how injustice and inequity are linked to their daily lives.

(2) Guiding theory: Provide cross-cultural experiential learning. A second commonality across the exemplary global educators was a determination that their students must interact with people different from themselves both within the local community and the global community. Some teachers referred to "cross-cultural competence" as expertise that they wanted their students to develop. Most spoke of skills in working cooperatively with others, listening and trying to understand a person whose English or first language was different from their own, or "cross-cultural communication" skills in interacting across cultures and nationalities.

For several of the exemplary teachers, their cross-cultural experiential learning was grounded in the multicultural nature of the school population or community. Two teachers taught in an international magnet elementary school, two taught in an international magnet middle school, and two taught in a high school that was designated as the district's ESL (English as a Second Language) secondary school. These schools have many nationalities, languages, and cultures within every class.
Multicultural perspectives were shared daily in class discussions and activities.

**Contextual factors in cross-cultural experiential learning.** When the teachers explained why they brought in resource people from other cultures, took a field trip to a mosque or organized cooperative groups that created a positive interdependence of students born in the U.S. with students born in other countries, they spoke of the power of personal experience in bringing about cross-cultural appreciation and understanding. Usually they would compare some experience in their own lives with the experiences they were planning for their students. A summer spent back-packing in Turkey, a childhood in France, a high school exchange in Peru, the adoption of children from another race are examples of the experiences which led to profound changes in the way these teachers viewed themselves and others.

The second contextual factor was the diversity of people in the school or local community which makes it possible for students to have experiences with people different from themselves as a part of each unit of study. Teachers noted that there are many ways to sustain cross-cultural experiences so that they become a part of learning history or geography or the study of current events. All the teachers had contacts in the local community with resource people and organizations and used these networks to enrich their teaching and assessments.

(3) **Guiding theory: Use themes, issues or problems to organize and integrate global content.** The exemplary teachers found ways to bring together different disciplines in their social studies instruction in global education. Some teachers used concepts such as the environment or technology in order to integrate social studies with science, agriculture, or health. Others use themes such as religious conflict, cultural change, or globalization in an integrated multidisciplinary approach. Literature, art, and philosophy were used to enhance history and geography. Teachers explained integration as helping students learn by approaching the topic in many different ways and with different materials. Recurring global issues such as hunger or development or questions such as “how do people resolve conflicts?” served as a constant reminder of goals of a course and helped students organize and use large amounts of information over several weeks, a semester, or even the entire course.

**Contextual factors shaping the use of themes, issues or problems.** The teachers' expertise, interests, or past experiences were the contextual factors that most heavily influenced planning through themes, issues and problems. These were sometimes selected by a team process or by the entire school as in the case of one of the international magnet schools. Some themes, such as culture, were chosen from the school district's course of study and honed by the interests of the teacher and his/her students. Issues were discarded or received less attention if there were few instruc-
tional materials to support them or if the students appeared to be uninterested.

(4) Guiding theory: Emphasize skills in higher level thinking and research. One of the most consistent similarities across the exemplary teachers is their commitment to teaching students higher level thinking skills (analysis, synthesis, evaluation, etc.) and research skills (formulating questions, collecting and analyzing information and writing up findings) as an integral part of global education. From elementary through high school and urban to suburban districts, students were asked higher level questions and expected to find, analyze, evaluate and present answers. Some teachers framed the thinking and research skills within a process of decision-making or problem-solving. Although most teachers were more concerned with the use of information, some teachers highly valued the learning and recall of facts. The teachers integrated thinking and research skills with other skills (reading comprehension, writing, use of statistics and maps, categorization, presentation or debate) into assignments and projects.

Contextual factors shaping the emphasis on skills in higher level thinking and research. Although every course of study includes skills in thinking and research, most teachers explained their decisions based on their own (and, in some cases, their team’s) beliefs that these skills were important for their students in order to prepare them for further education or adult life. Elementary teachers spoke of preparing kids for middle school, middle school teachers for high school, and high school teachers for college or adult decision-making. Many teachers explained that they had grown to appreciate these skills or had learned how to teach these skills from colleagues, administrators, or teacher education programs. The ability to integrate higher level thinking skills with globally-oriented content is one of the few places where teachers said a teacher education program or course had made a positive difference in their teaching.

(5) Guiding theory: employ variety of teaching strategies and instructional resources. The teachers used many different teaching methods, a variety of instructional materials (data bases, primary sources, literature, videos, simulations), resource organizations (university programs, a local council on world affairs) and people (most frequently people from other countries). Most teachers required students to keep up with the news and they linked news stories to the subject under study. Since 1990-1991 was the year of the Gulf War, current events received more attention in the first year of the study than in other years (see also Merryfield, 1993b).

Part of the research design for the exemplary global educators focused on selecting days for observation so that the widest variety of teaching methods could be seen over a school year. Even in April and May teachers were still asking us to come on a particular day because we still had not seen this or that strategy. Most of the teachers purposefully sought out new materials and strategies through their involvement in professional
meetings, curriculum development within their school districts, and inservice education or graduate degree programs.

**Contextual factors shaping the use of a variety of teaching strategies and resources.** The use of a wide variety of materials, resources, and teaching strategies was most frequently explained in terms of increasing student achievement and involvement as in “helping them learn,” “getting them involved,” or “keeping them thinking.” The teachers perceived that diverse strategies were needed to address the range in student abilities and learning styles. Some teachers used a variety of methods to individualize instruction and assessment. Other teachers were concerned about the brevity, shallowness, or biases of textbooks. The teachers used their textbooks as one of many resources. When teachers did use texts, they skipped certain chapters or took them out of order. Their rationale for these decisions was that some topics are more important than others based on their own values, experiences, and education and the characteristics of their students.

In regards to the news as an instructional resource, most of the teachers expressed the view that keeping up with what is going on in the world was an integral part of teaching social studies. Many saw the nightly news as one way to make their subjects relevant to their students’ lives. When relatives and teachers began to be called up for the Persian Gulf and the war began, the teachers explained their attention to the news in terms of responding to student fears and questions. As in other guiding theories, it is difficult to separate the teachers’ valuing of current events from the teachers’ valuing of student concerns and interests.

**Findings Unique To The Experienced Teachers Who Were Beginning To Teach Global Perspectives**

These teachers had taken an introductory, ten-week graduate course in global education and had from six-nine months of experience in beginning to teach global perspectives. Unique to their profiles were these ideas guiding their instructional decision-making.

1. **Expand curricular focus on less taught about parts of the world and global issues.** When asked about how the global education course had made a difference in their teaching, many of the teachers talked about specific parts of the world they had not taught about in the past and global issues that they were now including in their courses. Out of the 67 teachers in the study, 41 said they were now bringing more African, Asian or Latin American history or cultures or current events into their social studies courses. An elementary teacher illustrated her new expertise with a lesson that integrated Vietnamese and Ethiopian experiences into her class’s study of immigration and cultural change. A high school teacher had developed a unit on 20th century political and economic globalization for his world history class. Other teachers had changed their teaching by add-
ing comparative dimensions with a country or region of the world that they had not included before, such as comparing political protests in the U.S. and China or the effects of colonization in the U.S. and Mexico. A middle school teacher of social studies and health provided a copy of her new unit on hunger in which she had the students look at food production and distribution globally and locally.

*Contextual factors shaping the decision to include more on less taught about parts of the world and global issues.* According to the teachers, the factors influencing these additions were a new awareness of global change and interdependence and the availability of instructional materials to help them develop lessons. Several teachers mentioned specific books, such as *On Prejudice: A Global Perspective* (Gioseffi, 1993), that motivated them to make some changes in the content of their courses. Almost all mentioned publications of instructional materials from curriculum development centers, such as the Stanford Program for Intercultural Education (SPICE), that they said were essential in helping them get started in global education. Several of the teachers made reference to their application projects in the course which helped them begin the process of thinking through how global perspectives could improve their courses. A few teachers spoke of being able for the first time to respond to curriculum mandates in their districts for global history or global geography because now they understood what a global perspective meant and could now see how their students would benefit from global education.

(2) **Bring current global events into social studies instruction.** About half of the teachers responded to the question of how the course had changed their teaching by sharing examples of how they now integrated current global issues and events into their social studies courses. The political changes in South Africa, the break-up of the Soviet Union, elections in Bosnia, the development of Eritrea as a new nation, the Internet, environmental changes in the Amazon Basin, and gene-therapy were among the examples teachers gave of news items that they related to topics in their social studies courses. One middle school teacher had made a game out of his students abilities to bring in what he called "global news" and make arguments for the economic, political, environmental, historical or cultural connections of the new story to their world cultures course.

*Contextual factors shaping the attention to current events.* The teachers spoke of their own recognition that they now could better see connections between their course content and contemporary events and issues. One teacher described how he had used some globally-oriented time-lines and some of Paul Kennedy’s (1993) writings from the class to develop a new emphasis on human problems throughout history that continue to dominate the news today, such as the need for security, peoples’ aggression against others, changes in social norms, and the desire of people to better their lives economically. Several teachers referred to the readings in John
Maxwell Hamilton's Entangling Alliances as critical in their understanding of the complexity of world actors and relationships.

(3) Recognize one's own biases and those of one's students and the community. Ten of the teachers brought up their thinking about prejudice or bias in their classrooms and teaching. They expressed concerns about their students' prejudices and ways in which they felt superior to people in other parts of the world. Some spoke of seeing how racism in their schools colored how their students perceived events in Asia or Africa. A handful spoke of confronting their own biases about people different from themselves as they recognized that they held attitudes or beliefs that were constructed from ignorance or stereotypes. Those who brought up their thinking about bias as a result of the course did not provide solutions to these problems. They reflected upon their mental or emotional struggles to accept the recognition that the biases did exist, and they shared their thoughts about the complexity of the problems.

Contextual factors shaping recognition of bias. During the course the teachers work in pairs and small groups with people from many parts of the world as they discussed readings, evaluated instructional materials and developed projects and presentations. Five out of the ten teachers who brought up their reflection on bias referred to specific times in which a cross-cultural exchange brought about a reflection or "mirroring" of prejudice that they could not ignore. One older teacher spoke of "seeing through Mohammed's eyes the hurtfulness of American prejudice against Muslims." Another recalled how impatient she was with two Indonesian students whose English she had trouble understanding until she had read their "trees of life" (an autobiographical activity where students in the class identify important cultural learning in their lives; see Merryfield, 1993a) and was suddenly humbled by their abilities to overcome poverty and educate themselves. Some of these ten teachers were unable to say what specific activity or reading in the course provoked their reflection upon bias and prejudice beyond their perspective that the course did have that effect.

Findings Unique To Preservice Teachers

The preservice teachers were taking a globally-oriented methods course within a professional development school in social studies and global education which requires substantive content (90 quarter hours) about the world in history and two social sciences. They were being mentored in the methods course and in extensive field experiences (four hours a day during methods, all day during student teaching) by eight classroom teachers across six school districts who have expertise and experience in global education. During the six months of methods and student teaching they read conceptual literature in global education, examined and used extensive print and media resources, and they were assessed on their applica-
tion of global education in their own teaching. The preservice teachers upon which these findings are based appeared to be committed to the goals of global education and demonstrated some ability to teach global perspectives. The most frequently mentioned conceptualizations are those discussed above that go across all three groups—the teaching of diverse cultures and multiple perspectives, connecting global content to the lives of their students, and making connections across time and space. However, unique to their data was one idea that appeared again and again.

1) Integrate multicultural and global education so that students can identify local/global connections and understand how globalization is increasingly bringing diverse peoples closer together economically, politically and culturally. The preservice teachers looked at global and multicultural education holistically. They perceived the two fields of study as complementing each other in that they both focus on understanding one's own as well as diverse cultures, multiple perspectives, and the nature of human problems and desires. Often they spoke of making connections between issues in the community with global issues, local and national history with global history, and developing ways in which their students could use global knowledge within the local community.

Contextual factors shaping the integration of multicultural and global education. By the time they were completing student teaching, the preservice teachers rarely spoke of multicultural education and global education separately. They were "as two sides of the same coin," or "the way we connect the world to their life here." One young man explained that "it all comes together when I teach because of my students. They are a multilingual and multicultural group who need to see themselves as citizens of Columbus, Ohio and citizens of larger worlds. They need to see where they are on the planet." When asked where these ideas came from, most answered that they had seen them in practice or learned them from the experienced teachers with whom they worked. A few mentioned early readings that had influenced their thinking, such as work by Christine Bennett (1995), Christine Sleeter (1993), Lisa Delpit (1988) and Robert Hanvey (1976).

The Unique Quality Of Individual Profiles Within Each Study
For all their commonalities, each teacher's theories were to some degree unique. Some teachers had guiding theories that grew out of interests in specific topics or approaches within history or geography. For example, the analysis of decisions across the exemplary teachers revealed that a middle school teacher's first concern was historical chronology. She explained her approach as based on her own undergraduate and graduate work in history which had led her to value chronology. In much the same way, new trends in geography influenced a high school teacher. He focused on the National Geographic Society's five themes of geography
as a major factor in his design of his world area studies course and found that they provided entry for global perspectives.

Other teachers' profiles were heavily influenced by their commitment to specific educational goals, philosophies or educational reforms. Two elementary teachers explained their belief that students must develop the ability to work independently from the teacher. This major goal affected their instruction about the world every day. As part of their philosophy in teaming in an informal classroom, the independent work encouraged students to follow up on their own interests in global topics. The independent work habits enriched the curriculum by encouraging students to explore different cultures, individuals, and ideas and then share what they had learned with the rest of the class.

An elementary teacher had guiding theories that he alone followed. As part of his educational background and experiences, he had come to value the process of building a sense of community in the classroom. This was a challenge in that his students were very diverse in race, class, language, and religion. Many of his routines, such as the students developing their own rules, finding time each day for validations (praise for another person), or gathering together in a circle for discussion, were designed to foster a caring environment where students cooperated and helped each other in many ways every day. This sense of community also contributed to his global education goals of developing connections to other peoples, appreciating multiple perspectives and building tolerance and respect.

Some teachers' global content was also influenced by their commitment to a literature-based approach to learning. Their students read the literature of the peoples they studied. They learned about multiple perspectives, cultural diversity, and cultural universals through stories. The contextual factors influencing the literature-based approach were explained as beliefs and experiences, the support of colleagues, and the availability of large numbers of literature books through schools or local libraries.

One teacher who taught social studies within a gifted education program had a unique profile because her course of study mandated skills, not specific knowledge. Because of her knowledge and experience as a gifted education teacher, she focused first on the development of higher level thinking skills. Her attention to teaching global topics stemmed from her own interests and values. Her attention to global education was supported by colleagues and the school district.

Each teacher had his or her own preferences on which topics warrant more or less time and attention. One middle school teacher valued China and a high school teacher valued the Middle Ages and they spent considerable time on those topics. In the same vein, a high school teacher hurried through the Industrial Revolution, and a middle school teacher skipped over much of ancient Africa because they or their students did not value it as much as other topics.
Not surprisingly travel or living overseas did have the effect of increasing attention to that part of the world. Teachers spoke of living in Taiwan, growing up in France, and travel in the Soviet Union as affecting their instructional decision-making. Most of the exemplary global educators had traveled overseas, and all spoke of those experiences as helping them teach about culture and cross-cultural perspectives in general. In reflection they looked at their overseas experiences as major turning points in their motivation to improve their instruction about other peoples and the larger world. The teachers with extensive cross-cultural backgrounds pointed out that these experiences contributed significantly to their commitment to teaching perspective consciousness, recognition of cultural universals, and valuing of cultural diversity.

Conclusions

The teachers agree on the primacy of culture and multiple perspectives, of relating global content to the lives of students, and connecting knowledge across time and space. There appears to be some consensus across all three groups about the theory and practice of teaching global perspectives. Culture is the central component from which other elements in global education develop. The study of culture begins with those of the students in the teacher’s class or school and expands to diverse cultures in the local community, the nation and the world. But instead of an expanding environments approach where each is studied separately, the process of making connections between local and global creates constant comparisons and an appreciation of the complexity of cultural borrowing and change. Global approaches do not focus solely on cultural differences. The teachers consistently had students examine cultural universals and explore ways in which the lives of diverse peoples are similar.

Perhaps the most significant difference for these teachers between global education and other ways to teach about culture is the emphasis on multiple perspectives, perspective consciousness, multiple realities and multiple loyalties. These ideas require skills in perspective taking, the ability to look at an event or issue through the eyes of someone different from oneself. Finally, there are attitudinal goals in the teaching of culture. Teachers want their students to develop tolerance and respect for cultural differences that are foreign to or may even conflict with their own. The teachers want students to develop their own ideas and ideals of cultural norms, and they expect their students to recognize other peoples’ rights to do the same.

Based on rationales of providing culturally relevant instruction, motivating students to become involved in their own learning and constructivist learning, the teachers made instructional decisions based upon student characteristics. Their choices of topics to include or exclude,
amount of time allocated to units and lessons, and their choices of instructional methods were influenced by what teachers perceived as curricular connections to their students' lives, interests and knowledge.

The teachers also focused on teaching the interrelatedness of different time periods in history and different world regions, nations, and peoples. The world is taught about as interconnected and interdependent with attention to the development of a perspective through which students can see their place in the world, and their world as connected to many people, past and present.

There are differences between the exemplary global educators and the practicing and preservice teachers at the initial stages of global education. The exemplary group taught from several guiding theories of global education that were rarely mentioned by the other groups. A major focus was the interconnectedness of global and local inequalities and the human struggle for rights, self-determination, social justice and a better life. In seeing the world as an interrelated system, the teachers went beneath the economic connections and political connections to examine the complexities of power, control, and inequality.

Their emphasis on cross-cultural experiential learning set the exemplary global educators apart from the other teachers also. They planned their instruction so that their students would interact with and learn from people different from themselves in the school, local community and other countries. They brought in resource people, enjoyed on-going relationships with the international community in their city or neighborhoods, and they highly valued their own cross-cultural experiences.

In explaining their planning in global perspectives, the exemplary group demonstrated how they organized units by global themes and concepts. Instead of adding a global component to a lesson or unit as the less experienced teachers did, these teachers began with global content and organized their unit around a global focus. The exemplary teachers also spoke frequently of interdisciplinary knowledge needed for a global perspective and approaches to integrating disciplines around themes and issues. In describing their units and lessons, they frequently connected global education with the teaching of higher level thinking and research skills and the necessity of bringing a variety of methods and resources into their teaching.

The most important contextual factors are teachers' beliefs, values, experiences, their knowledge of globalization and access to resources to teach it, and their perceptions of student characteristics. The studies have focused on major contextual factors (in contrast to all factors) in order to bring some order or priority to the very complex question of how and why instructional decisions are made. In the hundreds of answers to the general question, "What were the contextual factors influencing that decision?" or specific questions such as "Why did you choose to spend more time on China?"
there are some factors that the teachers consistently viewed as more im-
portant.

Teacher beliefs, values, and experiences were identified as the most
important factors in teacher decision-making. In response to question af-
ter question the teachers explained their decisions in terms of their own
personal values and experiences. Many contextual factors are phrased as
"a belief in," "valuing of," "experiences in," or "concern for." Many of
these personal values or experiences are natural connections between cur-
riculum and the teachers' own lives. There were some common values
and experiences articulated by a majority of the teachers. They valued
tolerance, cultural diversity, and cooperation. They recognized the need
for diverse people to interact, manage conflicts and find ways to work
together.

Second, student characteristics are a major influence on teachers'
instructional decisions. Students' backgrounds, their abilities and disabili-
ties, experiences, interests, behaviors, questions and responses are major
factors in teachers' instructional decisions. To a much lesser degree, the
characteristics of the school system, the mandated courses of study, the
goals of magnet schools, common tests, availability of instructional mate-
rials, libraries, parents and the local community influence teachers' deci-
sions about global content. However, the teachers in these three studies
rarely perceived them as negative influences. For example, parents sup-
ported the global education of their children by serving as resources (speak-
ing to the class about Islam in their lives or sharing photos and artifacts
from a recent trip to France) and in the cases of the two international mag-
net schools, by advocating global education within the school district.
Perhaps these factors are ranked below the teacher and student character-
istics because these school districts are very supportive of global educa-
tion in general.

Each teacher has some contextual factors that are not shared by most
of the teachers. For example some teachers were heavily influenced by
their teaming. It was a major factor in how they structured units, lessons,
and each day's routine. Current local and international events were a major
influence on the instruction of a few teachers. One high school teacher's
instruction was influenced considerably by a state-wide proficiency test
in citizenship. Time had to be taken away from the regular course content
to review and coach the students for a test that they had to pass in order to
receive a high school diploma. The relationships between teacher beliefs,
student characteristics, and global content are complex and dynamic as
teachers, students and the milieu in which they operate are always chang-
ing. Events in the community and world also influence what is taught
about the world. Undoubtedly content if not the goals of global education
is fluid as it is shaped by all these contextual factors over time.
For all of its ambiguity and controversy in curriculum reform, there are some conceptual elements and goals of global education that have been accepted by the teachers in these studies, and they are teaching these across grade levels and school districts. The contextual factors also do indicate that there are a core of beliefs central to teaching global perspectives. Further study is needed to examine relationships between global education and the characteristics and experiences of teachers. The teachers see cultural diversity as positive. They believe in understanding and appreciating the perspectives of people different from themselves. They want their students to connect themselves to people, issues, problems, and events around the world yesterday, today and tomorrow. Are these beliefs prerequisite to the implementation of global education? If they are, then the implications for teacher educators and school leaders involved in global education are immense. Learning to teach global perspectives does not simply depend upon the acquisition of new knowledge or skills, it is grounded in the teacher’s own perspectives of cultural diversity and global linkages and is to some degree dependent upon a willingness to tolerate and even appreciate beliefs and behaviors quite different from one’s own.

The teachers’ theories and practice can inform the scholarly literature. Although there is considerable overlap between the theories and practice of global education in these studies and the conceptual scholarship, there are also some compelling differences. Compare Appendix D: Teachers’ theories and practice in global education with Appendix A: Conceptualizations of global education from selected works in the field. First, teachers can inform the field on how to develop a global education that is student-centered. Teachers in all three groups choose and organize global content based upon their students’ interests, abilities, and experiences. Global content is used to connect students to their local communities, to people in diverse cultures, and to historical and contemporary issues around the world. Global systems and global interdependence are the basis for most of the conceptual literature as scholars try to demonstrate how a global education is different from the traditional curriculum. Yet these teachers rarely approach global economic, political or environmental systems directly. They place the student in the center and connect the global content to their students so that a study of the global assembly line begins with products or services used by the students or produced by a company where their parents work. They begin with the students’ concern about local race relations and connect those experiences to ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and the struggle for human rights in other parts of the world. Goodlad (1986) wrote of “the learner at the world’s center.” These teachers would rephrase his ideas to place their particular students at the center of their global education. Their goal is to help students see them-
selves as actors affecting and being affected by an increasingly interconnected world.

Along with student-centeredness, the teachers contribute to the literature by grounding global perspectives in the study of culture as the foundation of a global education. First they want their students to study their own cultures, the role of culture in their daily lives, and the human beliefs and values underlying their cultural heritage and contemporary ways of living. Then, once their students have a foundation of knowledge and multiple perspectives of their own cultures, the teachers connect the students’ learning to the study of diverse peoples.

Third, the exemplary teachers are characterized by a commitment to teaching about local and global inequities, subjects rarely mentioned by the American scholars writing about what global education is or should be. For these teachers, one reason for a global education is for students to understand how and why inequities exist within their local community, their nation, and the world at large and to look at alternative solutions to these problems. Students’ questions about disparities in local standards of living or access to technology lead to research on access to jobs, education, health care, and political power that compare their community with ones in Japan, Poland or Brazil.

Finally, the exemplary teachers place considerable emphasis on cross-cultural experiential learning. Although the literature is replete with goals of cross-cultural awareness or understanding, the teachers place a much higher value on face to face experiential learning that brings their students together with people of other cultures (see Wilson 1982, 1983a, 1983b). These four ideas—placing students at the center of global education, beginning with the students’ own cultures before other cultures, connecting local and global injustice and inequities, and cross-cultural experiential learning—provide a new vision of education for local/global interconnectedness (Alger, 1974).

Note

1 Most of the conceptual work on perceptual dimensions and moral education has been developed by Canadian and British scholars. Angene Wilson is the only American scholar who has consistently advocated perceptual dimensions and cross-cultural experiential learning as essential components in global education.
Appendix A
Conceptualizations of Global Education from Selected Works in the Field

(1) Understanding of humans and the world/planet as dynamic, organic and interdependent systems
state of the planet awareness (Hanvey 1975)
knowledge of global dynamics (Hanvey 1975)
global interdependence is a pervasive reality (Leetsma 1979)
transnational cooperation (Leetsma 1979)
boundaries labeled foreign and domestic as misleading and artificial (Leetsma 1979)
world-centeredness (Becker 1979)
study of humankind, the human species (Becker 1979)
spaceship earth (Muessig & Gilliom 1981)
global procedures and mechanisms (Alger & Harf 1986)
global actors (Alger & Harf, 1986)
global transactions (Alger & Harf 1986)
global systems - economic, political, ecological, technological (Kniep 1986a)
the spatial dimension of global education, relational holism (Pike & Selby 1988, 1995)

(2) Understanding of global issues
international human rights (Leetsma 1979; Kniep 1986a)
literacy in global problems and issues (Leetsma 1979)
global issues (Alger & Harf 1986)
global issues and problems, peace and security issues, development issues, environmental issues (Kniep 1986a)
the issues dimension of global education (Pike & Selby 1988, 1995)

(3) Understanding of diverse cultures and multiple perspectives
perspective consciousness (Hanvey 1975)
understanding of diverse cultures and cultural pluralism of the world at large (Leetsma 1979)
understanding of one's own culture and what it means to be human (Anderson & Anderson 1979)
multiple loyalties, diversity of cultures (Muessig & Gilliom 1981)
[human] values (Alger & Harf 1986)
human values and culture, universal values, diverse human values (Kniep 1986a)
multiple perspectives and exploration of world views (Lamy 1987)

(4) Understanding of, skills in and responsibility for making choices and decisions and taking action locally and globally
involvement and decisions within the local community (Alger 1974)
awareness of human choices (Hanvey 1975)
tergenerational responsibility (Leetsma 1979)
exercise of influence (Anderson 1979)
involvement in world system (Anderson 1979)
judgment and decision making (Anderson 1979)
strategies for participation and involvement (Lamy 1987)
development of analytical and evaluative skills (Lamy 1987)
positive interdependence and cooperation (Johnson & Johnson 1987)

(5) Interconnectedness of humans through time
global history, contact and borrowing and interdependence over time, the
ecumene, development of global systems, antecedents to today’s world, causes
of today’s global issues (Kniep 1986a)
the temporal dimension of global education (Pike & Selby 1988, 1995)

(6) Cross-cultural understanding, interactions, and communication
cross-cultural awareness (Hanvey 1975)
cross-cultural experiential learning, cross-cultural effectiveness (Merryfield

(7) Perceptual growth for prejudice reduction and moral education within
critical contexts
reduction of ethnocentrism, both personal and national (Leetsma 1979)
open-mindedness, anticipation of complexity, resistance to stereotyping,
nonchauvinism (Case 1991, 1993; Wilson 1994)
inclination to empathize (Case, 1991; Darling, 1995)
global education as moral education, moral perspectives (Coomb, 1989; Dar-
ling 1994, 1995; Werner 1990)
critical pedagogy for global education (Werner 1990)
inner dimension of global education (Pike & Selby 1988, 1995)

Appendix B
A Profile of Instructional Decision-Making in Global Perspectives

Carl’s Profile

Teaming with Robert, Carl taught fourth and fifth graders in an urban elemen-
tary international magnet school. He has certification in elementary & special
education, a MA in global education and was in his sixth year of teaching at
the time of the study.

(1) Guiding principal: Relate global content/interconnections to students’
backgrounds and interests.

Contextual factors:
• Carl’s beliefs that learning must meet student needs and interests
• Student characteristics: fourth/fifth graders, 9 boys, 17 girls, diversity in
class, race, a “u-shaped” ability curve, some students with significant learn-
ing or behavioral problems
• Parents who are, in general, supportive and involved
• Conflict with district’s competency-based testing
• Problem with “too much going on” in building that takes time away from instruction in his classroom

**Example:** 4/30 Students plan a garden based on their interests and what they have learned from a unit on agriculture and technology.

(2) **Infuse global content through interdisciplinary themes such as conflict, technology, culture, people’s contributions to the world past and present.**
• Carl’s degrees in elementary ed and global ed
• Teaching in an international magnet school
• Carl’s teaming partner’s experience and materials

**Example:** In unit on technology, students do scientific experiments, examine the history of the plow, and learn from literature about how technology affects people’s lives.

(3) **Use current events.**
• The conflict in the Persian Gulf
• Carl’s interest in the news
• Students’ questions, fears, family experiences
• Availability of local and national newspapers, speakers, other resources in community

**Example:** Carl’s first six-week unit focuses on the conflicts in the Middle East and Persian Gulf.

(4) **Train students to find and make use of different types, sources, perspectives on global content.**
• Carl’s belief in teaching “how” to learn
• Carl’s valuing of multiple perspectives
• Course of study skills
• Carl’s cross-cultural experiences in Denmark
• Student diversity in race, ethnicity and class

**Example:** 2/14 Students report on their community poll about people who have made important contributions to the world.

(5) **Prepare students to be independent learners who take responsibility for their own actions.**
• Carl and his teaming partner’s commitment to open classrooms, informal learning, and cooperative learning
• The principal’s support

**Example:** 10/3 Students begin to design a research project to answer their own questions on the Middle East or Persian Gulf conflict.

1 Names of the teachers have been changed.
2 Course of study refers to the legal document that outlines the content (knowledge, skills and attitudes) mandated by the school district and approved by the state.
Appendix C
Conceptual framework used in the courses Infusing Global Perspectives in Education and Social Studies Methods

1. Human values
   - one’s own values, universal and diverse human values
   - perspective consciousness and multiple perspectives
   - recognition of the effects of one’s own values, culture, and worldview in learning about and interacting with people different from oneself

2. Global systems
   - economic, political, ecological, technological systems
   - knowledge of global dynamics
   - local/global interconnectedness
   - procedures and mechanisms in global systems
   - transactions within and across peoples, nations, regions
   - interconnections within different global systems
   - state of the planet awareness

3. Global issues and problems
   - development issues
   - human rights issues
   - environmental/natural resource issues
   - North-South issues
   - issues related to distribution of wealth, technology & information, resources
   - issues related to dependency and post-colonialism
   - peace and security issues
   - issues related to prejudice and discrimination (based on ethnicity, race, class, sex, language, national origin, religion, politics, etc.)

4. Global history
   - acceleration of interdependence over time (J-curves)
   - antecedents to current issues
   - origins and development of cultures
   - contact and borrowing among cultures
   - evolution of globalization
   - changes in globalization and global systems over time

5. Cross-cultural understanding
   - recognition of the complexity of cultural diversity
   - the role of one’s own culture in the world system
   - skills and experiences in seeing one’s own culture from others’ perspectives
   - experiences in learning about another culture and the world from another culture’s values and world views
   - extended experiences with/in other cultures
6. Awareness of human choices
- by individuals, organizations, local communities, nations, regions, economic or political alliances
- past and present actions and future alternatives
- recognition of the complexity of human behavior

7. Development of analytical and evaluative skills
- abilities to collect, analyze, and use information
- critical thinking skills (e.g., ability to detect bias, identify underlying assumptions, etc.)
- recognition of the role of values in inquiry

8. Strategies for participation and involvement
- opportunities for making and implementing decisions
- experience with addressing real-life problems
- attention to learning from experience


Appendix D

Teachers' Theories and Practice in Global Education

Across all three groups of teachers:
(1) Begin with culture
• first the students' cultures, then diverse cultures;
• teach perspective consciousness, multiple perspectives, multiple and conflicting realities, perspective-taking
• teach cultural universals and cultural differences,
• teach for understanding of the complexity of cultures,
• teach for tolerance and respect

(2) Connect global content to students' backgrounds, daily experiences, interests, and communities

(3) Have students make connections across time (historical periods) and space (world regions/nations/cultures within nations)

Additional theories of the exemplary group
(4) Teach about the interconnectedness of global and local inequities, the human struggle for rights, self-determination, social justice, and a better life

(5) Teach students cultural knowledge and cross-cultural interaction skills through cross-cultural experiential learning and assessment
(6) Use global themes, issues or problems to organize and integrate global content across disciplines

(7) Emphasize skills in higher level thinking and research

(8) Employ a variety of teaching strategies and instructional resources

Additional theories of the experienced teachers
(9) Expand the curricular focus on less taught about parts of the world (usually Africa, Asia and Latin America) and global issues

(10) Bring current global events into social studies instruction

(11) Recognize one’s own biases and those of one’s students and the community

Additional theories of the preservice teachers
(12) Integrate multicultural and global education so that students can identify local/global connections and understand how globalization is increasingly bringing diverse peoples closer together economically, politically, and culturally.

Additional theories unique to individual teachers
(13) Integrate global education with other valued elements of educational philosophy or reform, such as service learning, whole language, interdisciplinary teaming, cooperative learning, authentic assessments, geography standards, constructivism, state/local testing, an alternative school’s mission, etc.

(14) Connect global perspectives to teacher or student interest in specific cultures/places (Latin America, Russia, Egyptians, Cuban culture) or global issues (conflict resolution, environmental change, hunger, technology transfer).

(15) Blend global perspectives in with non-global elements such as art, spelling, reading, extracurricular activities.
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Abstract
Critics of issues-centered instruction contend that it is fine for advanced students but too difficult for lower achieving adolescents. This article explores this assumption through the lens of a case study of two ninth grade world geography classes composed of low achieving students. It describes the organization of knowledge, the social interaction, and adaptations made for low achievers in a unit on Latin America based on the principles of issues-centered instruction. The authors conclude that teachers confront a series of obstacles and difficulties in planning and implementing such instruction with low achieving adolescents. Although many low achievers valued the exposure to in-depth knowledge and the opportunity to think and talk about its meaning, the promise of such instruction depends on the skills and resources of teachers and schools to make adjustments to manage the obstacles. The authors offer a few implications of the research for the future of issues-centered instruction.

A primary goal of social studies education is to create informed, thoughtful citizens able to make decisions and take action on important contemporary problems. Advocates of this goal have long called for social studies instruction organized around the study of historical and contemporary public issues. The essential principles of such instruction include a focus on problematic issues that contain elements of doubt or controversy, an in-depth understanding of the content surrounding the issue, a spirit of inquiry that provides opportunities, support, and assessment mechanisms for students to interpret and give meaning to knowledge, and the use of interactive teaching strategies (Evans, Newmann, & Saxe, 1996; Rossi, 1996). Many teachers contend that such instruction is fine for above average and advanced learners but too difficult for low achieving adolescents (Metz, 1978; Oakes, Gamoran, & Page, 1992; Onosko, 1991).
Other educators (King & Kitchener, 1994; Leming, 1994) report that many adolescents are developmentally incapable of the higher order thinking required by issues-centered instruction. Others claim that low achieving adolescents demonstrate little interest in public issues and therefore are less likely to engage in interactive strategies. The purpose of this article is to investigate what issues-centered instruction looks like in two classrooms composed of significant numbers of low achieving high school students. In the first part of the article we will describe the key principles and theoretical base for issues-centered instruction, review the research about its use in everyday classrooms, and examine the barriers of the approach with low achieving adolescents. In the second part of the article we will describe and analyze two classrooms of low achievers who studied Latin America and the Caribbean using an issues-centered approach.

**The Principles of Issues-Centered Instruction**

The issues-centered approach to instruction rests on a rich theoretical framework, developed and refined by John Dewey (1933), Alan Griffin (1992), Hunt and Metcalf (1955), Oliver and Shaver (1966), Newmann and Oliver (1970), and Engle and Ochoa (1988). What are the key principles of issues-centered instruction, and what is its theoretical base? First, issues-centered units of instruction are organized around problematic, persisting questions that contain elements of doubt or controversy. For example, a unit on Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal rather than becoming a litany of famous "alphabet agencies" would investigate the question "Who is responsible for reducing poverty in the United States—the government or the individual?" Such a question is persisting and controversial, going to the heart of several subject matter disciplines and relevant to the contemporary interests and experiences of students. According to cognitive psychologists (Cornbleth, 1985; Cornbleth, 1985; Torney-Purta, 1991), such a question allows students to organize information about the New Deal around a key idea and provides a functional base for its use, thereby affecting its accessibility and depth of understanding by students. In other words, it offers students the opportunity to organize and use information to make disciplined, thoughtful decisions about important social issues.

The second principle is that in-depth understanding of a topic is more important than superficial coverage. The study must be grounded in challenging content that introduces students to an issue's complexities and details (Evans, Newmann, & Saxe, 1996). It means that students must examine numerous pieces of information from divergent sources about the many dimensions of a topic. For example, in the unit on the New Deal students need to understand the effects of the Great Depression on different groups such as migrant farmers, black sharecroppers, and factory workers as well as how the New Deal programs did or did not respond to
these effects and the implications of Roosevelt’s policies for the role of
government. The point is that asking students to make reasoned decisions
about important societal issues requires a sufficient knowledge base (Chi,
1985; Cornbleth, 1985).

Third, issues-centered instruction provides opportunities, support
and assessment mechanisms for disciplined student-centered inquiry. Bel-
ieving that information cannot simply be put into peoples’ heads, this
principle places the learner’s active mental construction of information at
the heart of instruction. It asserts that real understanding emerges from a
learner’s own struggle to make sense of the data (Resnick, 1983). This re-
quires teaching students thinking skills like identifying bias, separating
fact from opinion, and using evidence from primary and secondary sources
to support argumentation. It also requires an open classroom climate that
fosters skepticism, open-mindedness, reflectivity, and the persistent de-
sire that claims be supported by reasons. In other words, issues-centered
instruction is not a series of detailed, coherent and meaningful lectures
delivered by the teacher on the New Deal and its implications for the role
of government. Rather, it de-emphasizes the role of the teacher as trans-
mitter of knowledge and challenges the student to draw conclusions and
defend positions.

Fourth, the sense of inquiry thrives when there is substantive conver-
sation between the teacher and students and among students about the is-
issue being explored. In the classroom this means extensive use of interactive
strategies like teacher-led discussions, scored group discussions, debates,
and role-plays. Theoretically, this principle recognizes the social aspects of
thinking about and understanding knowledge. The free interchange of opin-
ions with adults and peers as well as opportunities to try out ideas in a
dialogue are potent forces in awakening a learner’s potential and restruc-
turing student understanding of knowledge (Torney-Purta, 1989; Vygotsky,
1978). Thus, in issues-centered instruction the sense of inquiry about knowl-
edge is enhanced by continual dialogue among students.

Issues-Centered Instruction in the Classroom

What happens when curricula designed around these principles meet
the externalities of the everyday classroom? In her review of research on is-
ues-centered instruction, Carole Hahn (1996) concludes that issues-centered
social studies under the proper conditions holds much promise for its posi-
tive effects on students. In particular, she concludes that in issues-centered
classrooms students enjoy social studies more, become more interested in
and knowledgeable about societal issues, and perceive social studies instruc-
tion as useful for understanding the world around them. Moreover, under
the proper conditions, students are more likely to participate in class discus-
sions and express more reflective thinking than they do typically.
Perhaps the most extensive research project on issues-centered instruction was the evaluation of the Harvard Social Studies Project (Levin, Newmann, & Oliver, 1969; Oliver & Shaver, 1966). At the junior high school level, the Project researchers found that the issues-based program did make a difference on measures of analytic ability in understanding concepts and on increasing interest. In addition, the time spent on issues analysis did not diminish the amount of traditional content the students learned. At the high school level, the students in the issues-based program scored higher on measures of concept attainment than students in conventional programs. However, while they did as well as other students on a standardized Problems of Democracy test, they did less well on the U.S. history test.

While showing these positive effects, issues-centered approaches also create some difficulties. Such curricula can become too complex and challenging. It requires trained teachers capable of conducting interactive lessons and promoting an open classroom climate. Yet, these skills are among the most difficult for teachers to acquire and implement (Leming, 1992). Bickmore (1991) reports that in the issues-centered history course she investigated the curriculum was often too challenging for teachers to prepare and students to learn. Sometimes there was confusion, frustration, and gaps in participation. Based on his study of a 10th grade public issues class, Rossi (1995) concludes that such instruction is no panacea because of the dilemmas it creates for teachers and students. Last, there is the belief among many teachers that issues-centered social studies works only with above average to advanced older adolescents. It is to this claim that I now turn.

Social Studies for Low Achieving Young Adolescents

Even though issues-centered instruction is not common in most high school social studies classes, it is particularly absent in classes composed largely of low achieving young adolescents. A review of social studies programs and curricula for low achieving students reveals a pattern of simplified courses of questionable validity if the primary purpose of social studies is the development of informed, open-minded citizens (Curtis, 1991). Classes of low achieving middle and high school students more often offer a passive drill and practice curriculum that emphasizes trivial bits of information and avoids exposure to more demanding topics and skills (Metz, 1978; Curtis, 1991; Oakes, Gamoran, & Page, 1992). Teachers are less likely to ask high level, divergent and evaluative questions to low achieving students during discussion (Wilen and White, 1991). Rather, teachers tend to prefer more concrete, highly structured assignments that reflect more deductive than inductive modes of instruction.
Why do teachers adopt these methods of instruction with low achieving adolescents? What are the barriers that block issues-centered instruction with such students? First, many teachers assume that adolescents, particularly low achieving ones, are developmentally incapable of the higher order thinking required by issues-centered instruction. The validity of this belief is hotly contested. Although an advocate of a modified, scaled-down version of issues-centered instruction, Leming (1994) argues that on average even most high school seniors are not developmentally ready for reflective thinking. King and Kitchener (1994) posit that an individual’s development in making judgments about ill-structured problems follows a seven-stage model. They report that on average high school students, particularly ninth graders and low achievers, barely reason at stage three. At this stage individuals have not yet fully acknowledged that knowledge is uncertain and problematic. As a result, they frequently have difficulty relating evidence to their opinions, choosing to believe what they want to believe. On a more optimistic note, however, King and Kitchener (1994) also report that, depending on their level of involvement in effective academic programs, their personal maturity, and other experiences outside school, most individuals slowly move upward into higher stages of reasoning as their educational level advances.

From a different perspective, Keating (1988) and Pogrow (1990) contend that there is no persuasive evidence of fundamental constraints on the ability of adolescents to engage in higher order thinking. Pogrow (1990) claims that at risk students demonstrate the intellectual ability to work with difficult concepts when supplied with adult models and key thinking strategies. He and others (see Willis, 1992) argue that the direct teaching of specific thinking processes and strategies benefits all students. Likewise, Keating (1988) posits that what is important is not the intellectual capacity of the learner but the ability of teachers to create effective classroom climates for thinking. Those who agree with Keating argue that thinking will naturally emerge in a climate of thoughtfulness where there is interaction about big ideas.

Second, many teachers believe that low achieving students have an insufficient knowledge base to understand, discuss, and make decisions about controversial questions. The acquisition of such task-relevant knowledge is necessary for reasoning to occur about such questions (Cornbleth, 1986; Glaser, 1984) and to participate in interactive activities. Yet, low achieving students often do not complete the homework or fully understand the readings that supply the information. Thus, teachers are forced to proceed with activities in which students lack the knowledge base to participate in a reasoned manner or opt solely to supply content without asking students to draw conclusions about a problematic question (Bickmore, 1993; Rossi, 1996).
The failure to develop the knowledge base and do homework partially reflects a third barrier—low motivation among low achieving students. Teachers report that students have changed over the years and are less willing to put effort into school (Onosko, 1991). In Rossi’s (1996) study of an issues-centered 10th grade course in the Midwest, one teacher reported that high school seemed less central to the lives of students who were often pulled away from school by outside social forces such as jobs, extracurricular activities, and television.

Fourth, establishing and maintaining classroom control is a top priority of teachers in low level classes. According to teachers, issues and strategies that invite dialogue among students often make classroom control more difficult (Bickmore, 1993; McNeil, 1986; Metz, 1978). Thus, teachers turn to structured worksheets and tasks as a means of keeping students quiet and orderly.

These barriers do not necessarily mean that issues-centered instruction is ineffective with low achieving students. Curtis and Shaver (1982) report that issues-centered instruction with low achieving students increased their interest in contemporary problems, increased their skills in critical thinking, and reduced closed-mindedness. Even though it made classroom control and coverage of content more difficult and many students remained silent, Bickmore (1993) claims that a more conflictual curriculum gives low status students a better opportunity for participation. Furthermore, researchers studying the effects of Channel One news broadcasts found that lower ability students seem to benefit the most when structured public issue discussions were combined with news viewing (see Hahn, 1996). These research results suggest that despite all the barriers issues-centered instruction can be beneficial for low achieving students.

The Research Agenda and Design

What we have established so far is that while issues-centered instruction shows promise in fostering interest in and knowledge about social issues, it is also difficult for teachers to put into practice. In particular, many teachers perceive issues-centered social studies as possible only with above average and advanced students, pointing to the numerous barriers that make such instruction ineffective with below average students. Yet in a democracy it is essential that all citizens regardless of socioeconomic status, ability, or level of academic achievement have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be responsible citizens. Furthermore, some research suggests that issues-centered instruction or elements of it can be effective with lower achieving students. Missing in the research are studies of the actual barriers and difficulties teachers face when using issues-centered instruction with low achieving students. What does such instruction look like in practice with low achieving adolescents? How do teachers modify
instruction to manage these difficulties? What is needed are case studies of how teachers and students behave in low achieving social studies classrooms following an issues-centered approach.

The purpose of the research reported in this article is to provide a description and analysis of issues-centered instruction in two ninth grade world geography classes composed of large numbers of low achieving students and taught by two different teachers. The intent was neither to ascertain how much knowledge students gained nor to determine whether issues-centered approaches worked in low achieving classrooms. Rather the intent was to describe and analyze what issues teachers and students faced in an issues-centered classroom. The central question that guided the research was "what does issues-centered instruction look like in classrooms with large numbers of low achieving students?" More specifically, three sub-questions guided the study: (1) how was knowledge organized and used, and what adjustments did teachers make for low achieving students when organizing the knowledge? What meaning did students give to the knowledge? (2) What was the nature of social interaction in these classrooms? What meaning did students give to the interaction? (3) What teaching dilemmas and obstacles did teachers face in such classrooms, and how did they manage them?

Interpretive Approaches to Research

These research questions are consistent with interpretive approaches to research that involve fieldwork by a participant observer. Erickson (1990) claims that such interpretive fieldwork best answers questions like what is happening in a particular setting and what do the actions in the setting mean to the actors involved. He asserts that such research is most appropriate when variables are difficult to control and isolate, when the primary concern is how do certain things happen, and when the focus is the meaning-perspectives of the actors. Such was the situation in our study of these two teachers and their classrooms.

It is best to view interpretive fieldwork as a family in which there are several members. The research design for this study comes closest to the characteristics of one of those members—an interpretive, participant observational case study. Merriam (1988) defines such a case study as "an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single entity" (p. 16). An interpretive case study involves intensive, long-term participation in a field setting, careful recording of what happened through fieldnotes and documentary evidence, and analytic reflection using narrative vignettes and direct quotes (Erickson, 1990). Such case studies may also include data gathered by survey instruments (Merriam, 1988).

The design for this study followed three essential properties of case study research (Merriam, 1988; Stake, 1978). First, the concern for a thick and holistic description that would resonate with the experiences of the
reader took precedence over the demands for typicality and representativeness. Second, the thick and holistic description contains an interpretation that seeks to include the immediate local meanings of the actions from the point of view of the teachers and the students. Although unavoidable, the subjective lens of the researcher clearly influenced the interpretation. Therefore, the researcher sought to discipline his subjectivity through a deliberate search for disconfirming evidence, the triangulation of sources, and seeking feedback from the teachers about his assertions. Third, data collection and analysis were largely inductive. Although guided by theory and previous research, the initial and final assertions emerged not from an initial working hypothesis but from an examination of data grounded in the context of the classroom.

**Setting and Participants**

The research occurred in two ninth grade world geography classes at Taylor High School, located in a suburb of a metropolitan region in a mid-Atlantic state. The first class taught by Alan Nicholson was composed of 24 students, at least half labeled by Nicholson as "low level" students, some because of "lack of motivation" or "lack of confidence" and others labeled LD (learning disabled), ED (emotionally disturbed), or ADD (attention deficit disorder). The second class taught by Frank Eastwood was composed of 32 students, also of diverse abilities, officially classified as a collaborative class because of the 10 special education students in the classroom. Seven or eight other students, although not labeled as students with special needs, were low achievers because of lack of motivation, attention, skills, or ability. Except for two or three students, both classrooms consisted of white teenagers from middle to low income families.

The primary participants included the two teachers and five students who were interviewed. Holding an undergraduate degree in history, Nicholson had taught for 13 years, the past nine at Taylor. A recent graduate in social science, Eastwood was in his second year of teaching and was working on his master's degree in curriculum and instruction. Both attended a one-week institute the previous summer sponsored by the United States Institute of Peace on teaching about international issues since the end of the Cold War. During the institute they received some exposure to the principles of issues-centered instruction and various interactive teaching strategies. Although open to and interested in alternative methods, both teachers typically utilized traditional lecture-recitation, textbook-based modes of instruction. They were selected because of the academic level of their classes and their participation in the institute. The two teachers and the researcher selected the five students to be interviewed. They included three males and two females, chosen because they were low achievers and would not be intimidated by an interview setting.
The researcher served as a participant observer whose mix of participation and observation varied. He was an active participant with the teachers during the planning of the unit. He worked with several small student groups when they prepared their presentations. However, during the teacher-directed lessons and the student presentations, he simply observed and took field notes. The continuous interaction between the researcher and the teachers created bonds of trust and openness that deepened his understanding of their perspectives. Similar bonds developed between the researcher and only a handful of students.

Data Collection and Analysis

The primary techniques for data collection included observation, interviews, examination of instructional materials, and a student survey. Data collection began with fieldnotes from two daylong planning sessions during which the two teachers and the researcher planned an eight-day unit on Latin America and the Caribbean. Over the next three and one half weeks, the researcher observed and took fieldnotes on thirteen 90 minute class sessions, conducted two independent interviews with each teacher, one before the first planning session and the other at the end of teaching the unit. He also conducted one joint interview with the teachers following the planning sessions and interviewed the five students individually or in teams of two at the end of the unit. He utilized data from other sources to increase opportunities of triangulation, including student readings, worksheets, student written work, and a student survey. Given at the end of the unit, the student survey asked each student to rate and report what they had learned and what interested them about the content and activities in the unit. Mean scores for each of the survey items were calculated and qualitative comments were recorded.

The analysis process included coding chunks of data to form domains from which a list of initial assertions were drawn (Spradley, 1979). In order to ensure an analysis consistent with the perspective of the teachers, Eastwood completed a similar analysis using the same fieldnotes and interview transcripts and responded to the researcher’s initial set of assertions. Eastwood and the researcher met three times to discuss the two sets of domains, the assertions, and the first draft of the manuscript. The two analyses produced the descriptive and interpretive portrait of the two classrooms that follows. It is written in a realist style (see VanMaanen, 1988) but with the deliberate attempt to include the voices of participants in the text.

The Organization of Knowledge and Dynamics of the Unit

In selecting and organizing the knowledge for the unit on Latin America and the Caribbean we followed many of the precepts of the Engle-Ochoa Decision-Making model (Engle & Ochoa, 1988). Our model included
six elements: (1) a central unit question that focused on a persisting issue of interest to students, (2) an introductory grabber that would generate student interest, (3) in-depth knowledge about the issue, (4) a sense of inquiry where students had opportunities to give meaning to information; (5) social interaction among the students about the knowledge, and (6) sustained time for the unit (Rossi, 1993). Released from their normal teaching responsibilities, Nicholson and Eastwood met with the researcher during two full days to plan the unit.

The planning process first turned inward to identify the essential knowledge for the unit and then turned outward to determine how best to communicate the knowledge to students. We identified economic underdevelopment, income disparity, political instability and cultural richness as key themes in the region. Our next concern was how to connect these themes to the concerns and experiences of ninth graders. Above all others, this concern for how to engage the students dominated the conversation. Nicholson and Eastwood reported that their students are always raising questions about why they need to study other cultures. Thus, we agreed that the central question would be "Why should we care about Latin America and the Caribbean? While liking the question, we also discussed its limitations. Because of its probable focus on illegal immigration and drug trafficking, we feared that it de-emphasized the cultural richness of the people and might stereotype them as "a bunch ... who want to emigrate and deal in drugs." In addition, by using this question we ran the risk of defining countries in terms of U.S. interests, not what is important to them. We proceeded with the question anyway because we believed it matched the interests and concerns of the students.

We designed two grabber activities to generate student interest and to foreshadow the central question. We all believed that such grabbers were particularly vital with low achieving students to capture their interest in the unit. The first grabber was an attitude questionnaire on immigration, drug trafficking and Latin America which students completed and discussed. The second was a map activity in which students acted as drug lords plotting routes to ship their drugs from Colombia to various U.S. cities without getting caught in DEA security areas. Both activities generated student interest and involvement. In fact, in the student survey students reported that the drug route activity was one of the top three activities in the entire unit.

The provision for in-depth knowledge entailed teacher-directed student research about Mexico, Cuba, Colombia, Panama, and Haiti using PC Globe and selected readings. First, each student completed a physical and political map of the region and took a quiz on the region's features. Next, to help students gather and organize the data, we designed a chart. Divided into six categories such as physical geography and history, the chart asked students to identify important information, link the informa-
tion to its effect on the United States, and identify the issue raised by the information. We used data on Mexico to model the use of the chart before we asked them to do it independently for one of the four other countries. For example, in the physical geography category, most students decided that the location of Mexico on the southern border of the U.S. linked the two countries in terms of the movement of goods and people, thereby creating immigration and trade as potential public issues. For assessment purposes, each student wrote a letter to President Clinton explaining why we should or should not care about Mexico.

For resources, we rejected the textbook as too superficial. Rather, we found relevant articles and used the statistical data available in PC Globe. The data for students came from publications like Scholastic Update and Great Decisions, off the Internet, and PC Globe, a computerized database of maps, text, and statistics from all nations of the world. We decided that long, difficult articles from these publications might frustrate the students. Consequently, we combined, condensed, and edited them to make them more manageable.

The social interaction in the unit revolved around two culminating activities—presentations on the four countries and policy debates on immigration and drug trafficking. During the country presentations, groups of student experts on Cuba, Colombia, Haiti, and Panama made presentations to another group of students who acted as the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In each presentation the group built a case for why its country deserved foreign aid from the United States and answered Committee questions. The teachers selected leaders for each group and primed them privately on their roles as coaches and mentors in their groups. For the policy debates, the class was divided into six groups, three debating immigration policy and three debating drug trafficking policy. Each group was given a policy option and prepared arguments and evidence in support of the option. For example, on immigration three groups debated the following options: (1) The U.S. should support Latin America economically to prevent immigrants from leaving their countries; (2) The U.S. should tighten border control; and (3) The U.S. should pass laws that punish employers who hire illegal immigrants and deny education and welfare benefits to illegal immigrants. The three groups argued their positions and were questioned and judged by the other three groups. We designed a worksheet for each group where the students listed their reasons and evidence for the option. Like before, we also combined, condensed, and edited readings on each issue. At the end of the unit, each student wrote a short essay on the central unit question.
The Nature of Social Interaction

Social interaction during the unit occurred in a variety of forms, from teacher-led analyses of data to student presentations and policy debates to small group discourse. In the next two sections of the article, we will examine the character of this social interaction using Lampert’s (1985) concept of teaching dilemmas to clarify the practical problems faced by the two instructors. Lampert asserts that a teacher’s attempt to solve everyday common classroom pedagogical problems can lead to a series of practical dilemmas. Lampert accepts these dilemmas as a continuing condition entangled in a web of contradictory forces that teachers seek to manage. Nicholson and Eastwood confronted a series of such dilemmas as they directed and monitored the social interaction during their issues-centered unit for low achieving students.

The first form of social interaction consisted of teacher-led discussions of data gathered from PC Globe and supplemental readings. These discussions confronted Nicholson and Eastwood with the first practical dilemma—a struggle between the desire for open, spontaneous discourse and the need for structure and teacher direction. Eastwood believed that ninth graders liked to argue, declaring that “some low achievers are very volatile human beings...discussion is the one thing that will ignite them.” On the other hand, he also believed that such spontaneity occurs only after helping students to gather and organize relevant data. For example, in the unit he and his students together gathered data on Mexico from PC Globe, placing the information in one of five categories on a chart. They also read articles aloud, stopping after each paragraph to dissect its meaning. Eastwood praised this structure because it allowed low achievers to identify and explain information in a language all could understand.

Although pleased with the directed readings, Eastwood did have a reservation about them, commenting “…it’s a lot of reading, a lot of teacher-directed activity …and will produce a lot of boredom by the end of the period for the students.” Here’s an example from a teacher-directed reading on Mexico’s economic situation:

Eastwood: (reading from the article) He works as a painter’s helper and makes over $200 a week. He used to send $40 to $50 back to his family, but that does not pay for anything anymore. Why not? Why is that money not worth anything?

Tom: Prices have gotten higher.

John: The peso has been devalued.

Eastwood: Good. You guys are picking this stuff up. Then it says, “he did not want to emigrate to the U.S.” He didn’t
want to do this. He just wanted to get a job, make some money and help his family survive. You said that was silly. Why would it be silly for him not to want to emigrate to the U.S?

**Tom:** We have a better form of life here.

**Eastwood:** We have a better standard of living over here. But let’s say that the U.S. economy went bad. Would you want to pick up and move to Canada? Haven’t you always lived here? Isn’t there some advantage even if the economic conditions aren’t that great? Don’t you kind of want to stay where your house is?

Stopping after each paragraph to ask questions and to explain the meaning of the text, Eastwood believed that such directed reading deepened student understanding. Yet, midway through the reading, interest level waned with approximately one-fourth of the class no longer following the reading. Despite the emerging boredom, Eastwood continued the activity because his key concern was that low achievers would not understand the information unless guided by his direction.

Nicholson also believed in the importance of structure, particularly with low achievers:

I think kids respond mostly to structure and discipline. I really do. I feel like if you can...if you can let them know what you’re doing on a daily basis, where you’re going, when you’re going to be doing it, what order you’re doing it, they know what to expect; there aren’t any surprises. And I feel like they’re...they’re better learners like that. They stay on task more. They’re prepared for the next lesson of the day.

However, Nicholson’s structure gave students responsibility and autonomy for the research and interpretation of the data. While using the same chart as Eastwood, he provided time for his students, individually or in pairs, to collect and interpret the data without his direction. He then conducted a full class discussion during which students announced what they had found and talked about what its implications were for the United States.

**Nicholson:** What is the next category? What did you find?

**Jane:** Well, 91% of the population speaks Spanish; 93% are Catholic. The largest ethnic group is mestizo.

**Nicholson:** What does that mean?

**Jane:** I think half-and-half.

**Tim:** Half Indian and half-Spanish.
Nicholson: Any connection with the U.S?
Mary: Their culture will affect us.
Nicholson: The dominant language in California and Arizona will soon be Spanish.

Proceeding in this fashion, the students remained on task and highly engaged throughout the activity. What Nicholson provided was a structure and direction within which students had some autonomy and were more likely to stay on task. Developing structure and direction that promotes autonomy and spontaneity, not boredom and teacher domination was a dilemma each teacher faced as their students struggled to collect and give meaning to data.

**Student Presentations**

A second form of social interaction revolved around the country presentations and policy debates. During these activities there was variation among students in terms of depth of understanding, amount of student involvement, and quality of student-to-student discourse. In this section we will describe and analyze three samples that illustrate the variation.

In the first sample, a group representing Colombia in Nicholson’s class made a presentation to the Foreign Relations Committee (FRC) asking for assistance from the United States for their country. Their presentation consisted of reading a newstory from the local newspaper about the drug pipeline from Cali into their state, a role play of an interview with a Colombian cocaine farmer, a second interview with a Colombian drug enforcement officer, and an extended exchange between the group and the FRC. Here’s an example of that exchange:

**FRC 1:** What types of programs do you have now to help stop the drug problem?
**Frank:** Our drug enforcement agency cut down only about 30% of the drugs that go out on the street, not knowing how much goes out to the U.S. Right now we only got what we have. That is why we are asking for money for more programs.

**FRC 2:** For how long would we have to give you aid to see a noticeable change in drugs coming to America?
**Frank:** We are not really sure how long it will take. No matter how long it would take, it would be the best for both countries.

**FRC 1:** Do you plan to change your laws to increase the penalties on the drug lords?
**Frank:** Definitely.
FRC 1: Would you be willing to emphasize other crops for farming? To try to get farmers to go away from growing cocoa and start farming other things.

Frank: We have already done that. We've had one law to try to change farmers because of stricter laws. They get off with barely anything. Most just go back to growing.

Susan: We believe that once stricter laws are passed, the farmers will stop making cocoa leaves and choose coffee instead.

FRC 2: What other ways do you intend to stop it?

Frank: For people to crack down on things like the Cali cartel with the help of other countries. We've split them apart but small ones still remain. The money would help us with agents. To do what we need.

FRC 1: If we were to give you aid, would you be willing to reform your government at our discretion?

Frank: To a certain extent. To a point that we have no control. Whatever it takes to get this problem controlled. Not completely destroyed but controlled. Our president is under investigation for being involved with the drug lords. If we get a normal president who is not involved with these people, our government will be much better.

These students were able to organize and carry out a creative presentation that also demonstrated an understanding of the content, in this case the origins of the drug trafficking problem in Colombia. Nicholson's skill as a teacher facilitated the success of the presentation. Prior to the presentations, Nicholson showed a videotape of a poor presentation and asked a group from another class to showcase their exemplary presentation. In addition, as the presentations continued, Nicholson encouraged the FRC to request that groups return at the next session with rebuttal statements and rough drafts of treaties for the FRC. The Colombia group did, in fact, return with an official treaty on parchment, leading one student to comment that she thought the activity was "cool." On the down side, even this "cool" presentation contained a rather narrow U.S. perspective on "Columbia's problems."

In the second sample the social interaction is more deliberate and scripted, reflecting a basic but limited understanding of the issue. It comes from a group presentation on the second policy option in the debate on what the U.S. should do about drug trafficking from foreign countries into the United States:
Nicholson: Okay. That was A. Now B. The U.S. should reduce the demand for illegal drugs through education, rehab, and treatment. The emphasis is on education, rehab and treatment. Policy B will be John, Michael, Jennifer, and Joan.

John: Our policy is if we have educational programs to stop drugs, we believe the use of crack and cocaine will be reduced. One reason we support this policy is if you were hurt at a young age by drugs and you were arrested, the rearrest rate for people who were in programs is lower than people who had never taken a program. The people who were put in prison, the rearrest rate is higher.

Michael: The second reason is if we just lock up the people and don’t educate them, they are more likely to return to drugs. What backs up this reason is that people who are locked up have a higher rearrest rate than those who have been through a drug education program.

John: One program that helps is the STAR program, which helps people in schools in Kansas City and Indianapolis. For the past few years their drug rate has dropped from 20-40% each year.

Michael: A third reason is the law enforcement is increasing in the budget with no significant effect. What backs up this reason is over a three-year period the drug budget has grown from 439 million in 1992 to 1.2 billion and there is no noticeable decrease. And their budget was still rising.

Nicholson: Is that it?

The three presentations on drug trafficking were followed by only five student questions and a brief exchange between two students on a few factual items. The dialogue was not spontaneous and lively but mirrored the worksheet each group had prepared. Students merely read what they had written. The thinking was scripted and mechanical, the students becoming captive of the procedures in the structure. Although disappointed, Nicholson indicated that student participation in discussion is developmental:

You don’t get them all engaged in class discussion because some are shy. They’re just not confident enough to speak up, where others will come forward with the information. It’s nice to engage freshmen and have a nice discussion. Many times that doesn’t happen until they’re juniors and seniors. It’s starting to
happen now, so I guess that’s a big goal that’s been accomplished this year.

Thus, while discussion could be the “one thing that will ignite them,” Nicholson believed that low achieving ninth graders gradually acquired the confidence to participate in discussion. The use of preparatory worksheets and a scripted procedure aided that confidence.

In the third sample, the student presentation provokes student interest but contains little content or understanding. For their presentations before the FRC, one group in Eastwood’s class role played a drug bust and another conducted a Jeopardy-like game that mostly focused on facts about their country. For these groups, the presentations became more important that the substance of the issue and how it affected the U.S. These groups became more excited about the form of presentation, not realizing that you need to know what you want to say before you design a presentation. For Eastwood these two presentations were the low points in the unit and demonstrated the potential danger of issues-centered instruction.

These presentations highlighted the second teaching dilemma. On the one hand, Nicholson and Eastwood wanted creative, high interest presentations that would engage the entire class. At the same time, they wanted presentations that contained substantive content and exhibited a deep understanding of the knowledge. Eastwood expressed the dilemma in this way:

> It’s hard to do that because you need the content before you can think of a presentation. You can think of the style, but you can’t think of specific things to do until you know what’s going to be the meat and bones of what you’re saying. And I think that the group I just talked about, they were so excited, and then once they did their presentation, the smarter kids realized that “This is not what was assigned,” and they were disappointed in themselves, whereas the low achieving students...“This is great! This is so much fun!”

Eastwood believed that the prospect of role playing activities often served to motivate students to delve into the subject matter, what he called “the carrot-in-front-of-the-mule type thing.” In both classes, the groups responsible for representing Colombia, Cuba, Haiti, and Panama did become more excited as their conversation moved from the content to the format of the presentation itself. Unfortunately, for some groups the resulting presentations were stronger in style than in substance. Meanwhile, other groups merely reported information in dry ways that failed to generate much interest by other members of the class. According to Eastwood, this
dilemma particularly resonated with his practice.

Last, the presentations also exposed a weakness in the unit’s essential question—why should we care about Latin America and the Caribbean? The presentations often described these countries in terms of their problems—they produce and sell drugs and their people want to escape. And even these problems were examined mostly through a U.S. perspective—what should the U.S. do to protect its interests? Absent was any discussion of political and economic democracy in these countries or the cultural richness of their peoples. The danger we discussed but disregarded during the planning became visible.

**Conclusion**

The quality of social interaction in these two classrooms varied dramatically. At times, like during the Colombia presentation in Nicholson’s class, there were examples of thoughtful, analytical inquiry where students demonstrated understanding of the complexity of the issue and used evidence to support their beliefs. At other times, like during the drug trafficking discussion or the Cuba presentation, the interaction reflected a superficial or rote understanding of the issue.

The nature of social interaction in the classrooms revealed two teaching dilemmas that depended on the skill of the teacher to manage. Both dilemmas demonstrate a complex web of competing demands for structure, spontaneity, teacher direction, student autonomy, and student interest when developing an in-depth understanding of knowledge. The first dilemma entails providing the structure and teacher direction necessary for student understanding without retarding student interest, spontaneity and autonomy. The skilled teacher is able to establish and maintain structures that encourage student engagement. The second dilemma entails encouraging creative, high interest student participation that also demonstrates an understanding of the content. Students understand and enjoy games like “Jeopardy” or role-plays of drug busts. But they emphasize recall or superficial application of information, not real understanding. To manage these dilemmas, both teachers provided brief, condensed readings that would not frustrate low achieving students. Nicholson promoted student spontaneity during the discussion of the data by asking them to gather the data independently using a chart prior to the discussion. He also realized that some students lacked the confidence at this age to participate in presentations. Therefore, he provided charts and worksheets, models of similar presentations, opportunities for each group to refute comments, and encouraged groups to revise their requests. These structures created a serious, disciplined tone for the activity and provided students with incentives to do their best. Consequently, there was a greater likelihood that the social interaction would not only ignite student interest but be substantive and thoughtful as well.
In addition to class discussion and student presentations, a third form of social interaction occurred in small groups in which students worked together to gather data and prepare their presentations. Nicholson and Eastwood encountered a third dilemma when organizing and implementing group work. On the one hand, they understood the benefits of group work—placing the responsibility for learning in student hands, promoting trust between the teacher and student, allowing for sharing of ideas, and taking the pressure off the teacher. On the other hand, they admitted that some groups have trouble working independently because of status differences within groups composed of students with different levels of perceived ability, popularity, and motivation (see Cohen, 1994). Nicholson commented on the challenges created by these differences:

That’s also another problem sometimes when you do these types of units where they’re working together in a group and they’ve got to depend on one another for success, and sometimes the best students ...they don’t have the patience to work with a kid that knows that he’s failing and is not trying.

Diana Monroe, a student in Nicholson’s class, confirmed the dilemma. Even though liking the unit, she expressed some frustration about group work, indicating that “two or three people would get off into another little conversations about something totally different” and “just did not want to work.” Frustrated by such behavior, she did not know what to do.

Nicholson also reported that group work was more difficult in classes with large numbers of low achievers. In comparing his “best” class with his sixth block class, he stated:

For my 4th block, I didn’t have to be, I guess, as on line with them as much as I did with my 6th block. With my 6th block, it was ...I mean, I was like a social butterfly academically. It was ...I was going from one group to the next group to the next group ...I mean it was just a constant merry-go-round...I would be with that group to make sure they stayed on task, and also to make sure they stayed on that point, and they were all doing their jobs, and they were distributed evenly, they were doing their responsibilities, and I could answer any questions, and then I’d go to the next one and do the same thing.

Clearly one way Nicholson managed the dilemma was through coaching each group. Although a “constant merry-go-round,” he concluded that progress and understanding occurred when he worked individually with
each group. He referred in particular to two low achievers, Mike Stewart and Mike Reynolds. Stewart was excited when he showed Nicholson what he had accomplished in his group. Reynolds, on the other hand, asked questions to confirm whether or not he “was doing it right.” Nicholson was proud that they were both on task.

A second way Nicholson and Eastwood managed the dilemma was through the use of student leaders in each group. They chose the members of each group, designating a student leader in each group who could serve as a tutor and mentor. Realizing the danger of inflating the egos of these leaders, Nicholson and Eastwood met with them one-to-one beforehand to clarify expectations. The best group leaders designated individual responsibilities for each member, communicated with them as they did their work, and stopped periodically to check on what each member had found. In the end, these groups made the most thoughtful and creative presentations. However, the teachers and the students had little experience or training in the tenets of cooperative learning. Consequently, some groups had trouble working independently and their leaders were frustrated in carrying out their function. Despite the variability, mentoring and coaching from the teacher or student leaders did minimize the frustration and inertia in the majority of groups.

**Higher Order Thinking**

Nicholson and Eastwood recognized that the unit required students to think beyond the recall of facts. They believed that low achievers are capable of thinking beyond recall. However, they also recognized that past experiences often had deprived low achievers of the opportunity to think and express their opinions. Nicholson in particular claimed that teachers who believed that low achievers could not think either “hadn’t tried” or were “extremely complacent.” In defining his own beliefs on this issue, he commented:

> A lot of kids, especially low level kids, are hesitant, I think, to state an opinion because many times, I guess, throughout their life and education, it’s been questioned, or they’ve been questioned, or they’ve been put in a setting where they’ve really not been given the opportunity to speak out loud, and to share a voice, or to share it within a group ...I think it’s because it’s something they’re not accustomed to doing. They’re meat and potatoes kind of guys. They like to see it both ways, you know, book questions, straight forward.

Therefore, they set high expectations for low achievers that extended beyond “straight forward book questions.” They designed lessons where
students created and revised policy. On the other hand, after planning the unit, they admitted that it might be tough for low achievers because the unit’s conceptual framework asked them to apply information in new settings. Nicholson expressed these reservations:

Another thing that’s tough about the unit is that with low level of ability kids ... we’re dealing with some pretty heavy duty conceptual things here. Things that require not only knowing and understanding information, but then being able to apply that information to a certain way of doing this ... that’s a big leap. I can think of some of mine that might get hung up and not be able to make the jump.

Making the leap to conceptual understanding was particularly evident in the country presentations and policy debates. In preparing their presentations on their Latin American or Caribbean country, groups found it difficult to translate raw data from their charts into clear reasons for why their country was important to the U.S. In preparing for the policy debates, some students had difficulty distinguishing between reasons that support a position and evidence that supports the reasons. Frustration and excitement existed simultaneously in the room during these preparations. Low reading skills, the lack of a right answer, and the challenge of drawing inferences from unfamiliar data were all sources of frustration. Yet many students like Diana Monroe and Jason Hackman were excited about the thinking required by the two activities. Diana applauded the unit because “we got the information, and in that information we had to infer what that meant for policy.” Diana and Jason were excited because these activities were more than just “regular, boring reports” that “none of your classmates listen to.” You had to think about what you were doing.

Nicholson and Eastwood managed these frustrations the same way they managed the other dilemmas. They did a good deal of individual and group coaching to help students comprehend what they were reading as well as identify what data were relevant. They asked students to complete charts and worksheets after the two teachers had modeled their use. These charts and worksheets provided step-by-step procedures leading students to draw conclusions or make decisions. Their approach to the higher order thinking was to teach specific thinking skills directly, then to ask students to apply them to new content. Both agreed that explicit instruction and coaching were necessary to promote higher order thinking. Without it, they asserted, students who were not already good thinkers probably would not catch on. On the one hand, this approach helped
some students to synthesize data, make recommendations, and support them with evidence. On the other hand, other students became captive to procedure, their thinking being mechanical and scripted and their evidence not supporting their reasoning.

**Inside and Outside the Classroom**

In working with low achieving students, the demand for higher order thinking and the use of small groups took its toll on Nicholson and Eastwood. Inside the classroom, Nicholson found that issues-centered instruction required more stamina and energy than more traditional forms of instruction:

When you’re changing activities where the teacher is constantly on his feet for the hundred minutes continuously, going from one group to the next and trying to keep them on task, and just being ready ...in constant motion like three classes out of the day, it just ...by the end of the day, by 4:00, I’m pretty bushed. I did notice that, I did notice that my, and I feel like I have a lot stamina in the classroom, but I really did feel like it did take its toll.

Outside the classroom, he indicated that the extensive planning required by the unit came in conflict with his other responsibilities at school and at home. Specifically, he pointed to his responsibilities at school as a coach (both he and Eastwood were expected to coach one sport) and as a father who regularly arrived home anywhere from 6:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at night. He wanted more planning time and a teacher’s aide to assist with the paperwork. He questioned whether other teachers in his department would be willing to make such a commitment.

If I had just gone with the textbook, and that’s it ...or even just PC Globe and that’s it, for them to be getting material it would have been mainly a lecture, a few worksheets, a few questions, quiz, test, move on! ...extensive planning for teaching this unit is entirely different, using alternative methods like this. It just requires a lot more energy, and some teachers, like I said, are very complacent. They’ve been doing it for a long time, and it’s been working well, the kids are getting the grades, but I’m wondering what are they learning?

Nicholson believed that the unit had “aroused and stimulated interest” in his students and that his students had learned about important issues, but wondered whether he and his colleagues had the energy and whether his
school division had the resources and commitment to sustain and support such instruction. The lack of planning time, the non-teaching responsibilities, and the energy demands were in his mind "the biggest negative" about issues-centered instruction.

**Student Voices**

So far the voices of students are largely missing from the description and analysis of the two classrooms. Nicholson and Eastwood characterized their students as provincial and isolated, even from Preston, a neighboring town of approximately 15,000 people. "They think Preston is on the other side of the world," Eastwood reported in one planning session. Nicholson reinforced Eastwood's perception: "Enough of them haven't been out of the state. Hardly out of town. I'm serious ... They have been to the malls around there, but they can't identify with anything else."

Given their isolation, how did these ninth graders perceive the knowledge and social interaction in the unit on Latin America? The student survey and interviews revealed that students responded to the knowledge in different ways. Expressing a sophisticated view of the world one group of students demonstrated and reported a deeper understanding of the interrelatedness of peoples and nations, the divergent perspectives of different cultural groups, and the international origins of certain domestic issues. An excerpt from the Haitian group's presentation to the FRC illustrates this growing sophistication:

*Diana:* Our country is Haiti and we would like to tell you why it is important. For one thing Haiti does not like the U.S. It is pretty much the US's fault. In 1859 a republic was declared, but from 1915-1934, U.S. forces occupied and ruled this country. In the past two years troops have been here to help out. It has helped a little. The government is becoming more stable, but it is still the poorest country.

*Tim:* Urban geography. The population of Haiti is declining because more people are leaving to come to the U.S. Haiti is a poor country. Second of all a number of our people are leaving because they are refugees who are being persecuted by the government.

*Mary:* Many Haitians resent the United States. In 1915 U.S. troops occupied Haiti. The soldiers that were there were corrupt and treated people very badly. Many of the problems that Haiti has are because of the U.S. For a long time Haiti was under a dictator who we supported. And because we supported him ... (inaudible).
In their presentation, Diana, Tim, and Mary demonstrate an ability to view the refugee issue from the Haitian perspective. Likewise, Jason Hackman confirmed that he had a more complex understanding of the international origins of controversial domestic issues like immigration:

Yeah, because I didn’t really know much about Latin America and what little I did know wasn’t that much. This helped me understand it a lot more and made me want to learn more about it. So I liked this unit. I didn’t know it [immigration problem] was this bad ... that they were that poor where they just wanted to get away that bad ... you never really think about where it comes from, like I never thought about the Latin American countries before and how coming over here and their immigrants and everything and so it kind of put it into perspective.

Comments from the student survey further illustrate this growing world-mindedness:

“...Latin America is just south of us and shares a border, that alone gives it value; they have great potential to help or hurt us, depending on how we treat them is how they will treat us.”

“I had no idea that Latin America had such a large effect on the U.S.”

Nicholson confirmed this change in thinking, claiming that the best feature of the unit was how it helped students become “world thinkers:”

I think this kind of unit gave them more of an awareness of everything around them. I think that’s probably the thing I like most about this unit—it has made them more aware of these issues in the area, as far as a world thinker, a world learner. They’re able to look at the big picture now. They’re able to pick up the paper, and read about these, and know exactly, “Hey we learned about this in geography.”

Not all students shared this level of understanding. Some students expressed an extended awareness of the complexity of issues like immigration and drug trafficking but did not demonstrate the same level of world-mindedness as the first group. What they learned was more limited to
"immigration and drug trafficking and what can be done to stop it." Another group of students saw no or little value to the unit beyond map making. For example, Mike Stewart reported that he learned the most from "making the physical, political and economic maps of the region."

The student surveys revealed a wide variation in student reaction to the activities. The one consistent area of agreement was that the textbook was uninteresting and not a source for much learning. On the average the highest rated activities, both in terms of level of learning and interest, were the drug route mapping activity that served as the grabber, the use of PC Globe to gather data, the country presentations, and the policy debates. Students applauded them for their sense of authenticity and interactive dimension:

"We got to see how politicians might debate a subject."

"Working in groups because I was able to express my views."

"Everyone state their opinion and debated back and forth; I wish we had more time to spend on it."

"I got to voice my opinion; the other class members got to decide which idea was best. I got to ask questions; it was enjoyable."

"We acted like real government people."

"When debating about immigration and drugs, we got freedom to argue points and persuade other people."

Students clearly valued the freedom to express their opinions and participate in activities connected to the real world outside the classroom. These low achievers clearly appreciated such opportunities, apparently unavailable and discouraged in previous social studies classrooms. Eastwood confirmed this assertion, commenting that the above quotes were "a key point, what it's all about."

Others concluded that they learned more from these activities because of the depth of knowledge and amount of higher order thinking required. In the survey, several students remarked that they learned from the presentations because "you had to know what you were doing to do the presentations" and "you learn a lot while others are talking." Lisa Baldwin, in particular, appreciated the exposure to more in-depth information: "...you had to know how to get more details out, little problems, not just the big ones as well. So I mean, you were able to learn more." Jason Hackman agreed, praising the supplemental readings for contain-
ing “better, more in-depth and direct information.” In addition, Jason valued being able to use the information for purposes other than recall: “I agreed with this chapter ... you had to think about what you were doing. You couldn’t just sit there; you had to think about what you were doing.”

What many low achieving students seem to value about issues-centered instruction is the opportunity to go beyond passive geography instruction where they sat, listened, and read superficial, bland descriptions of foreign countries. Although struggling in the process, they valued and learned to make inferences and decisions from in-depth information. Likewise, they valued and learned from expressing their opinion and debating the information in ways they had observed in real life. Last, at least for some, these activities opened up their minds to a deeper awareness of the complexity, differing perspectives, and interrelatedness of the world.

**Conclusions**

The description and analysis of what happened in these two classrooms raise several issues about what teachers face when attempting issues-centered instruction with low achieving adolescents. The data from this study reveal that these two teachers confronted a series of difficulties and dilemmas in planning and implementing the unit. In planning the unit, one difficulty they faced was choosing a persisting question that would guide the unit. With its focus on immigration and drug trafficking, the persisting question for this unit did grab student attention, but it also lead to a narrow, sometimes ethnocentric understanding of Latin America. This focus reflected the teacher’s attempt to choose content that would be engaging and interesting for low achievers. Preeminent in their minds was the importance of motivation when teaching low level students. Thus, the challenge is to develop questions that not only grab student attention, but also open doors that explore meaningful and significant themes that would broaden a student’s worldview. The danger lies either in choosing a question that will not grab student interest or proceeding with one just because it will.

A second dilemma the teachers faced was developing structures, strategies, and activities that were manageable and engaging but that also conveyed real understanding of content. This dilemma involved providing structures that promoted student autonomy and spontaneity in acquiring and organizing information. Too often such structures generated boredom and passivity. In addition, this dilemma involved creating activities and strategies in which students could use information to demonstrate a conceptual rather than a rote understanding of the knowledge. Too often these activities and strategies induced student frustration, became too mechanical or scripted, or produced more heat than light. Too often they produced only a rote understanding of the issues. These dilemmas are persisting...
ones regardless of the achievement level of the students. However, they highlight the reservations that some teachers believe make issues-centered instruction impossible with low achieving students—their insufficient knowledge base, their struggle to think critically, their lack of discipline when working independently in small groups, and their need for direct instruction. These dilemmas support King and Kitchener's claims that most adolescents, particularly low achieving ones, have difficulty constructing and defending beliefs using reasoning and evidence.

There was a third difficulty created by issues-centered instruction. It required more time and energy than more traditional forms of instruction. Although it could be used again next year, this unit required more extensive planning that consumed hours of the teachers' time. It required more stamina in the classroom as the teachers coordinated student-centered activities. Meanwhile, these teachers had a myriad of other responsibilities outside their classroom that also required time and energy. In the end the greatest challenge that confronts issues-centered instruction may be the toll it takes on committed teachers.

This is not to say that using issues-based approaches with low achieving students is futile. We should not ignore the voices of the students, many who praised the depth of knowledge, higher order thinking, and opportunities to express their opinions in the unit. Furthermore, growth in one's ability to reason and reflect about public issues depends on opportunities to develop the necessary skills and dispositions encouraged by issues-centered instruction.

What are the implications of these conclusions for the future use of issues-centered approaches to social studies with low achievers? We propose the following ones:

• In planning issues-centered units, teachers should choose persisting issues with great care, not only for the issue's capacity to generate student interest but also for the likelihood it will convey a broad and deep understanding of a meaningful topic.

• Teachers should approach issues-centered instruction with the full appreciation of the developmental aspects of learning, realizing that such instruction will be new and foreign to most low achievers. Teachers should remember that students differ in their capacity to use the skills of critical inquiry. Likewise, teachers need to respect the frustration and difficulties that students confront in this developmental process.

• Given the developmental nature of the reflective thinking required in issues-centered instruction, it is desirable for teachers to engage adolescents in activities that improve reasoning
over the long haul. Teachers should: (1) create opportunities for students to make judgments about public issues; (2) expose students to different points of view about these issues; (3) provide examples and models of reasoning skills like using evidence to form beliefs; (4) ensure a broad and deep information basis to help students make judgments; and (5) encourage students to participate in discourse.

- Teachers should design structures and make adjustments that help low achievers understand information and that promote student autonomy, ownership, and spontaneity;

- Issues-centered instruction needs to combine three instructional elements: (1) explicit and direct skill instruction; (2) a classroom climate that values in-depth knowledge, informed student opinions, and spontaneity; and (3) group work led by well-prepared student leaders.

- Teachers should approach issues-centered instruction with a realistic understanding of the demands it places on one's time and energy. Issues approaches demand extensive planning, an enormous amount of energy, and instructional skills not required in more traditional forms of instruction. Yet the grind of the modern high school with its myriad of responsibilities for teachers inside and outside the classroom often limits the opportunities for teachers to plan new curriculum, reflect on their practice, and refine their instructional skills. We would suggest that it would be wise for schools as they restructure to encourage collaborative teacher planning and provide opportunities for teachers to observe other skilled teachers who use issues approaches.

- Issues-centered instruction would benefit from teacher education programs, both preservice and inservice, that focus on teaching skills such as leading discussions, organizing group activities, and conducting debates, role plays or scored discussions.

The belief that low achieving students lack the ability or the motivation to participate in the analysis of public policy is troublesome if our central goal is to prepare all students to become informed and thoughtful citizens. Becoming such a citizen requires an understanding of the enduring historical and contemporary public issues that have shaped our history and will shape our future. Becoming a citizen requires the opportu-
nity to develop the skills and dispositions to make and defend decisions on these issues in rational ways. In seeking to attain these goals, issues-centered instruction creates difficulties and dilemmas for students and teachers. Many low achieving students find public issues interesting and enjoy the opportunity to state and defend their opinions. Others enjoy the exposure to in-depth knowledge beyond the textbook and the opportunity to think about its meaning. Yet the depth of understanding of students varies, reflecting their struggle to synthesize and give meaning to knowledge. Similarly, teachers face difficulties in choosing issues, creating structures and activities, and finding the time and energy to promote a deeper level of understanding. The promise of issues-centered instruction depends on the skills and resources of teachers, schools, and students to manage these difficulties and dilemmas.

Note

1 The research for this study was supported by a grant from the United States Institute of Peace, 1550 M Street, NW, Washington, DC. We would also like to acknowledge the insightful comments and suggestions made by four reviewers and the editor in responding to earlier drafts of the manuscript.
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Abstract
In this essay, the author, a social studies teacher educator, reflects on what she learned during a six-month Fulbright experience in Ghana. As an oburoni, or a white person, outside the whale, or the United States, she read and listened to specifically Ghanaian perspectives of history, economics, women's issues, and culture and was reminded both of the power of the dominating, western cultural and economic imperialism and the value of contrapuntal thinking.

Introduction
The title for this reflective essay comes from the Fante language of Ghana and from Edward W. Said's *Culture and Imperialism* (1993). "Oburoni" means white person in Fante. Said uses whale to describe "the West" and urges intellectuals not to withdraw "the West" from its experiences in "the peripheral world" because that "shuts out the possibility of knowledge and of discovery of what it means to be outside the whale" (p. 27).

My Story
From January through June 1997 I was an "oburoni" outside the whale as a Fulbright professor in the Social Studies Department of the University College of Education of Winneba in Ghana. As one of a handful of white people in a town of 70,000, I encountered the word "oburoni" regularly as I walked around the campus and town during my first weeks in Ghana. I walked from my house down the road to our department office, and children trying to dislodge green mangoes from the trees just beyond my house said "oburoni" laughingly. When the school term began, children in brown and yellow uniforms, carrying multicolored knapsacks or black plastic bags holding exercise books and maybe a textbook and a covered plastic cup with lunch inside, said "Good morning, oburoni" respectfully. As I passed the library, the small son of the library messenger ran outside, yelling "oburoni" and pointing at me. On my first Sunday at
the little church across the main road, several older children brought a toddler to the “oburoni”—and he cried. So I asked a schoolboy who came to my house to read books the meaning of “oburoni.” “They are saying white woman,” he informed me, “and you can say obibini, black, back to them.”

Why did I say to him, “Oh, no, I can’t do that?” Why did I resent “oburoni,” resist the naming of my color or the color of others? I am not one of those who says “I don’t see color.” Of course, I do. And I know African American friends are proud of being black and see color as a crucial part of their identity. Race matters in the USA even though race is not a viable anthropological concept.

In contrast, I suppose I am not particularly proud of being white Anglo-Saxon Protestant. After visiting Cartagena, Venezuela twenty years ago and learning about the destruction Sir Francis Drake wrought there, I didn’t want to brag that I was a direct descendant of his brother. (Or should I believe the Spanish deserved Drake given their violence against the indigenous populations?) As a child, I did enjoy knowing that I was a descendant of the Pilgrims who came on the Mayflower (my brother was named after Giles Hopkins and my cousin after Stephen) and seeing my known ancestors portrayed positively in the textbooks and trade books (Drake was portrayed from the British, not Spanish, point of view).

Only later, as an adult, did I really begin to understand what the invasion by my British ancestors meant to those already living in other parts of the world, including what we call the Americas. As Dussel asserts in *The Invention of the Americas*, “Amerindia was no empty, uncivilized, or barbaric world, but rather a plenum of humanization, history, and meaning...In 1492 the European ego first transformed other subjects and peoples into its objects and instruments for its own Europeanizing, civilizing, and modernizing purposes” (Dussel, 1995, pp. 85, 90).

In addition to having mixed feelings about my WASP heritage, I, like most white people, have usually not had to think of myself as white while living in the USA, and what that means on a daily basis. Although in Ghana I was categorized with other whites as European, in the USA I am not immediately categorized with other whites who live in Appalachia or whose ancestors are from another part of Europe or who blew up the Federal Building in Oklahoma City. In contrast, African-Americans and other so-called minorities are often categorized together and asked, even expected, to represent their group. I am accustomed to usually being myself, or melting into a crowd with all the privileges of not being noticed, not being the different one, not being a type. Even if I am in a situation in the USA in which I am a minority, I know I am a member of the powerful, privileged group. And I have never been mistaken for a domestic worker instead of a university professor or a criminal suspect instead of a graduate student.
My six months in Ghana was not my first time as a white person outside the USA in “the peripheral world.” From 1962 to 1964, I was a Peace Corps volunteer at a secondary school in Liberia. I then lived and taught for two years (1966-68) in upcountry Sierra Leone and for two years (1970-1972) in Suva, the capital of Fiji. Those six years as a minority of the washed-out, pale, white kind, introduced me to the wonderful richness and variety of black/brown, beautiful, and in-charge people, and I became comfortable living in West Africa and in the South Pacific, outside the USA, the whale. In fact, it was difficult to return to the USA.

However, 25 to 35 years ago is a long time ago, and the optimism of the 1960’s is muted for white liberals and gone for many black Americans. In 1962, I could write idealistically, perhaps naively, that the red dust of Liberia’s laterite roads covered black and white, making us the same. In 1997, I returned to West Africa, aware that, although the USA has moved forward in civil rights since the 1960’s, individual and institutional racism are still alive and well, and aware that, although African countries moved forward with regained political independence in the 1960’s, economic and cultural imperialism are also still alive and well.

So what could I, a white American, learn from being outside the whale again? Could I be reminded that “being on the inside shuts out the full experience of imperialism, edits it and subordinates it to the dominance of one Eurocentric and totalizing view”? Could I be reminded that another perspective “suggests the presence of a field without special historical privileges for one party” (Said, 1993, p. 28), a worldwide perspective which would grant equal voice to Africans and not allow, for example, Livingstone and Stanley to continue to dominate the story of nineteenth century Africa as in the new National Geographic Atlas of World History (1997)? Being thus reminded, could I bring new insights and new materials home to my teaching in the USA?

In this essay, I try to answer those questions through vignettes and reflections from my experiences in Ghana. I include writings by Ghanaians as part of an attempt to foreground their voices. My perspective remains, of course, because I have made the choices.

**Background Reading and Research**

Let me make clear that this essay is not mainly a story of identity and personhood. My reaction to being an oburoni was not so much a personal one, although my personal biography is relevant. I did not contemplate my white ethnicity or white privilege in the USA, although that can be instructive (See, for example, Tatum, 1997 and McIntosh, 1989).

I was an “oburoni” outside the whale, a white person outside the USA or “the West,” and so my first reaction, hardly three weeks into my six months in Ghana, was to read “on location” and to write in order to think. In fact, the title of this paper—the situation—came before the writing
and thinking. I reread Said, as well as J. M. Blaut’s *The Colonizer’s Model of the World: Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History* (1993) and Basil Davidson’s *The Search for Africa: History, Culture, and Politics* (1994) and also found Ngugi wa Thiong’o’s *Moving the Centre: The Struggle for Cultural Freedoms* (1993) in the university library. All four authors indict “the West”: Davidson, Ngugi, and Said have hopeful visions for the future, while Blaut calls for more scholarly inquiry on the “diagnosis and treatment of a serious malady (Eurocentric diffusionism) of the mind” (1993, p. 215). Because of Said’s analysis, I also reread, in the context of imperialism, Austen’s *Mansfield Park* and Conrad’s *The Heart of Darkness*, buying both in the university bookstore. Although the Mansfield Park estate is supported by a Caribbean sugar plantation, there is scant mention of Antigua in the novel, and the only mention of the slave trade is when Fanny Price reminds her cousin that after she asked Sir Thomas about it, there was a dead silence (1814, p. 200). Conrad did see that imperialism was “essentially pure dominance and land-grabbing, [but] he could not then conclude that imperialism had to end so that ‘natives’ could lead lives free from European domination” (Said, pp. 29-30). Interestingly, on rereading *The Heart of Darkness*, I found Sir Francis Drake on the third page as a man “of whom the nation is proud” (Conrad, 1902, p.7).

My second reaction, as an “oburoni” outside the whale, was to read books by Ghanaians, from novels to textbooks to annual Ghana Academy of Arts and Sciences lectures, as well as newspapers. I also listened to my Ghanaian students and colleagues and tried to understand where they were “coming from” in a world in which “the West” typically sidelined their perspectives because of attitudes born of imperialism, racism (prejudice plus power), and just plain ignorance. Those are the voices I am sharing in this paper.

Ghanaian voices are not the only voices which could be shared, of course, or which we need to hear. For example, I also read *The English Patient* twice while I was in Ghana and was immediately struck by what had been left out of the movie version. Yes, it is a wonderful movie, but it is also a wonderful example of how we shut out the full experience of imperialism. Listen to the Sikh sapper Kip’s rage against the “English” patient (who stood for “the West”) after the dropping of the atomic bombs on people who are not white. What a movie scene it could have been!

My brother told me. Never turn your back on Europe. The deal makers. The contract makers. The map drawers. Never trust Europeans, he said. Never shake hands with them. But we, oh, we were easily impressed-by speeches and medals and your ceremonies. What have I been doing these last few years? Cutting away, defusing, limbs of evil. For what? For this to happen?...I’ll leave you the radio to swallow your history
lesson... All those speeches of civilisation from kings and queens and presidents... such voices of abstract order. Smell it. Listen to the radio and smell the celebration in it. In my country, when a father breaks justice in two, you kill the father (Ondaatje, 1992, pp. 284-85).

In earlier research and writing, I have described the impact of cross-cultural experience as four-fold: substantive knowledge, perceptual understanding, personal growth, and interpersonal connections (Wilson, 1993a). Because of the impact of the experience, a cross-culturally experienced person often becomes a cultural mediator or a bridge between cultures. Obviously, a teacher is in a good position to play that role. In fact, we teacher educators advocate and even organize cross-cultural experiences at home (Merryfield, 1997, Wilson, 1993b) and overseas (Wilson, 1983, 1984, 1986, 1993a) for pre and inservice teachers, because we believe such experiences are essential to preparing teachers "who can effectively teach K-12 students of diverse cultural backgrounds, languages, and worldviews" and "who can build bridges between their students' lives and the wider world" (Merryfield, 1997, pp. 9, 10). We also insist that teachers reflect on their own backgrounds and these experiences (Merryfield, 1993).

In the following vignettes and reflections, it will be clear that I gained knowledge—and that I have a strong desire to share that knowledge. There was also personal growth in Ghana, particularly learning to live alone, which I didn't like. As well, interpersonal connections with Ghana are evident in the subsequent exchange of some e-mail and many letters and packages and the planned exchange of people. However, perceptual understanding is the crucial element of impact for this essay. I include in perceptual understanding such concepts as open-mindedness, perspective consciousness, complexity of thinking, resistance to stereotyping, inclination to empathize, non-chauvinism, consideration of multiple perspectives, reflection in action. While in Ghana, I was reading and listening to Ghanaian perceptions and considering them in light of critiques, such as Said's, of our tendency to privilege "the West" and to ignore, in this case, African actors and deny African agency in the centuries-long interpenetration of "the West" and West Africa. The following vignettes/reflections may seem to be loosely coupled, to even be random compilations of experiences and writings, but the common thread is that they all feature Ghanaian voices, almost always dealing in some critical way with Ghana's interaction with "the West" and/or putting Ghana on center stage. My questions at the end of each of the vignettes/reflections come from my experience outside the whale in Ghana and are meant to challenge us to think both about what the whale means for Ghanaians and what Ghanaians, on center stage for a moment, have thought and are thinking.
In terms of teaching, such a challenge is related to the critical consciousness Ladson-Billings writes about in her description of culturally relevant pedagogy. She wants K-12 students to “develop a broader sociopolitical consciousness that allows them to critique the cultural norms, values, mores, and institutions that produce and maintain social inequities” (1995, p. 162), and she finds that teachers who use culturally relevant pedagogy do that. I am working on another paper in which I and Ghanaian colleagues will use her ideas as one lens for looking at Ghanaian responses to teaching from a global perspective. Ghanaian teachers feel strongly about demanding academic success and teaching cultural competence (helping students maintain cultural integrity and utilizing students’ culture as a vehicle for learning), the other two elements of her culturally relevant pedagogy. Here, however, I am focusing on Ghanaian voices which will inform and challenge those of us who live inside the whale to understand that the world we live in is not the blandly interdependent world of the chocolate bar analogy. We need to develop critical consciousness and then help our students who will be teachers develop that consciousness and will to act as well.

Vignettes And Reflections From Ghana

The Slave Trade and Ghanaian History

On the first day of one of my classes in Winneba, a student asked my opinion of the reparations for slavery idea. He believed the USA should make substantial monetary reparations to all countries from whence slaves came. Another student, while not necessarily supporting reparations, pointed out that the slave trade made possible important African contributions to the United States. I later read Ghanaian poet and former ambassador the United Nations Kofi Awoonor on reparations:

Underdevelopment in countries such as those in Africa is neither God-ordained nor self-willed. The advanced nations have yet to come to terms with their responsibility. African underdevelopment is the fundamental outcome of a massive historical injustice for whose redress the word “reparation” is utterly inadequate (1994, p. 76).

Near the end of my six-month stay, I accompanied the first year students on a field trip to sites near Winneba. Our first stop was Fort Good Hope, one of many coastal forts and castles. “How do you feel as a white person?” asked a student as we came out into the sunshine from the dungeon. Beside me, another student queried a friend, “Did some of your ancestors sell slaves?” “Oh, no, not mine,” she answered quickly. Could I
say that, too? Perhaps. After all, I grew up in northern Ohio with stories of the Underground Railroad. Still, how do I feel as a white person?

On my own, I visited the famous Elmina and Cape Coast Castles, now designated as World Heritage Sites. Built in 1483 by the Portuguese and in 1547 by the Swedes (van Dantzig, 1980), they are huge, white structures with museums, including an exhibit on the diaspora, and tour guides who explain the differential treatment of men and women (women could be "chosen" by the European Residents) and point out the feces line in the dungeon. Standing in the dungeons was for me comparable to visiting the Dachau concentration camp in Germany almost 40 years ago, except that as an American I somehow feel more connected to and appalled by this centuries-long, horrific enterprise of the slave trade. Although one Ghanaian historian points out that the Asante policy of not enslaving its own citizens tended to prevent the physical collapse of that kingdom (Agbodeka, 1992, p. 35), another historian summarizes the general impact of the slave trade on Ghana as causing an irreparable drain on human resources, leading to the decline of indigenous arts, crafts, and industries, encouraging wars, and generating callousness and corruption among Africans involved in the trade (Buah, 1980, pp. 72-73).

In terms of history, what happens if we take off the sunglasses of a whale citizen and, instead of assuming a Eurocentric, diffusionist perspective in which Europe is inventive and progressive and passes on its innovations to others who are traditional and static, we consider a non-diffusionist or uniformitarian model which is driven by the "concept of equal capability of human beings—psychological unity—in all cultures and regions" and which demands that inequalities be explained? (Blaut, 1993, pp. 14, 42). Then we learn that the Ghanaian coast, once known as the Gold Coast, was part of the protocapitalist system before 1492, after which Europe began to become the headquarters of capitalism because of the assets gained from colonialism. We know the Akan were state-organized. We know that between 1493 and 1600 they produced more than a third of the world's gold.

In production and trade of this commodity, there was no evidence of a culture of dependency. The commodity was not rudimentary in nature, production methods, by the standards of the period, were not primitive, skills and craftsmanship were indeed very sophisticated (reference the gold weighing systems), and producers and traders were in very firm control of their commodity." (Frimpong-Ansah, 1993, p. 149. See also Agbodeka, 1992, pp. 9-24.)

We learn that the British later became concerned about the Fante people on the coast cultivating cotton. Instructions from the British Board of Trade
to the English Resident of Cape Coast Castle in 1751 read:

the cultivation of agriculture and the promotion of industry among the Negroes is contrary to the established policy of this country, England; there is no saying where this might stop, and that it might extend to tobacco, sugar, and every other commodity which we now take from our colonies in the New World and elsewhere, and thereby the Africans, who now support themselves by wars, would become planters and their slaves be employed in the cultivation of these articles in Africa, which they are employed to work in America. (Buah, 1980, pp. 72-73)

So what about reparations? Should they be dismissed as impractical? If reparations are inadequate, what is “the West’s” responsibility?

**CNN and Ghana Today**

I read a column in Ghana’s weekly newspaper, The Mirror, on February 15, 1997. It began:

Thanks to the magic of CNN, it not uncommon to hear loud arguments over O.J. Simpson’s guilt or innocence over a plate of fufu and ukrakra down in suburban Accra where the impact of the petrol increase has not quite sunk in.

I read an editorial in the daily Ghanaian Times on May 16, 1997. It began:

From time to time the Western information media, like CNN, preach to the third world countries that they are living in a global village, and that this global village deserves the attention and care of all the human beings dwelling on this planet, and that the protection of this village is the responsibility of all.

and concluded:

The world’s communities are not living in a global village. They are living in different worlds, one in the North and the other in the South. If in reality mankind is living in a global village, then this village is plagued by strife, inequality, exploitation, and the domination by the North over the South. If mankind is living in a global village, this village needs a deep revolution to become a better place to live in.
An experienced teacher who was my student shared his views on CNN and gave me a letter to post to CNN when I returned to the U.S. In part, he wrote:

In your expositions on Africa, conflict issues, wars, famine areas have been featured. My worry is about the kind of impressions that these expositions give to the world about Africa, and the neglect of most important and dignifying situations on the continent...I want to see more of my country Ghana and Africa in general on CNN, and when it is in its best clothes and not its rags.

It is clear that what Blaut calls the diffusionist model did not end with political independence. “Rarely before in human history has there been so massive an intervention of force and ideas from one culture to another as there is today from America to the rest of the world” (Said, 1993, p. 318). So, for example, CNN is on Ghana television three hours a day. Ghana is integrated into a world system of communication, but has no input in that system.

Ghana is also integrated into a world system of economics, and feels it must abide by IMF’s trade liberalization and structural adjustment. Ghanaian economist Frimpong-Ansah has made proposals for flexibility and responsiveness in dealing with externally driven structural adjustment (1996), but ordinary Ghanaians feel buffeted by economic forces beyond their control as the cedi continues to lose value against the dollar; in February 1997 the exchange rate was 1600 cedis to the dollar and in February 1998 it was 2300 cedis to the dollar. My students used the words “advanced” and “developed” to describe the U.S. and Europe; my colleagues worried about how the technological gap between those countries and the so-called developing nations like Ghana could ever be closed. Both my students and my colleagues understand well the “neo-colonial arrangements that still bind Africa to the west in a partnership of the rider and the horse” (Ngugi, 1993, p. 118). The rider, of course, controls the horse.

CNN represents power with an extraordinary global reach. Although Ghana is not powerful in relation to the USA, it is nevertheless proud. There is evidence that Ghanaians and other Africans are no longer depending on the West to solve governance issues-in Liberia, in Zaire/Congo, and Sierra Leone. Back in 1960, Kwame Nkrumah, Ghana’s first president, in his desire for economic emancipation and a united Africa, called for “an African common market, a common currency area and development of communications of all kinds to allow the free flow of goods and services” (Asamoah, 1991, p. 241). On a regional basis, those ideas are beginning to be put into practice, and proposals for a united Africa are appearing again.
Is a united Africa an idea whose time may yet come? Will the twenty-first century, in the words of Ngugi, “be the century of Africa and of all others exploited and oppressed people of the earth” (1993, p. 151)?

**Women and Internal Solutions**

In Ghana I taught a course entitled Gender Issues to a post-diploma class of 24 men and one woman. On the first day of the course, I asked for written responses to the question “Why is gender equality important in Ghana and in the world?” Only one of the 24 men said it was not important, another argued the idea was utopian, and a third wrote that “in fact, it would never be possible for women to be equal with men in the African environment.” One man wrote: “There are times when I feel that men are superior to women, yet always I come to realize in the end that it is the two together that makes life real.” Do these voices sound familiar?

But if voices and even issues occasionally seem familiar, there are also profound differences. I found The Emancipation of Women: an African Perspective (1991) by Dolphyne, a Ghanaian linguistics professor and now chancellor of the University of Ghana at Legon, particularly insightful in suggesting what might be called “internal solutions.” I take that language from Davidson who, after noting the failures of the application of the lessons of external culture to Africa, asks “May it not be, just possibly, the lessons of internal culture that are required?” (1994, p. 13). Again, we are talking about African voices, African agency. In fact, Dolphyne makes clear in the book’s introduction that she is presenting an African perspective, as opposed to a Western perspective, on the emancipation of women.

Dolphyne notes issues in which law may follow tradition and others where it may change tradition. Because the concept of illegitimacy is foreign in African culture, the 1985 Ghana Law on Intestate Succession follows tradition in stipulating that all children a man has, inside and outside wedlock, have equal interest in his property. However, that law broke tradition by making “provision for surviving spouse(s) and all the children that a man claimed to be his during his lifetime, to inherit the greater proportion of his self-acquired property” (p. 28). Before that reform, wives had no interest in their husband’s property. Child marriage is another area in which Dolphyne believes the remedy of legislation might be helpful, but she wonders if a law making formal education compulsory until age 15 would be more effective than a law stipulating a minimum age for marriage.

Dolphyne also deals with the issue of female circumcision. While agreeing that female circumcision is a serious health problem and every effort should be made to put an end to it (there is now a law against it in Ghana), Dolphyne points out that a law banning female circumcision may only push the practice underground and make it more difficult for those suffering from its effects to seek proper medical attention (p. 37).
Dolphyne is concerned about exorbitant bridewealth and suggests upper limits might be set by traditional rulers and heads of religious bodies. In Ghana some churches now refuse to bless a marriage if bridewealth is given above a certain value. Dolphyne does not see polygamy as a high priority issue and writes that rural women may see more equal status in traditional polygamy than in monogamy with a mistress or successive polygamy where a man divorces and remarries, creating problems for children in each succeeding marriage. Dolphyne points out the harsh economic situation and education of women, which will delay the age of marriage, as the most important factors influencing family size. While western aid pushes family planning as critical, Dolphyne argues that good drinking water, childhood immunization, and general improvement in living conditions are more important than provision of contraceptive devices and posters advertising a two-child family.

Dolphyne’s two-pronged approach to the emancipation of women focuses on education and economic independence. Evidence of the need for female education is obvious in the following statistics from *The United Nations World’s Women 1995*, with 64 females per 100 males enrolled in secondary school and 22 females per 100 males enrolled in tertiary education. Evidence of changes coming was the University of Ghana’s announcement in April 1997 that its goal was 50% female enrollment by the year 2000.

Dolphyne’s descriptions of women’s income generating activities supported by the National Council for Women and Development, such as a fish-smoking project in the Volta Region, make clear that

with increased income comes greater self-confidence and higher self-esteem. Some of them started saving with the banks, and they have been able to obtain loans to buy canoes and/or fishing nets, thus increasing their access to more fish for processing. An expansion in the fish-smoking activity means that they can now provide employment for members of their extended family as well as other members of the community, something which brings them added respect and status in their own family and in their community (p. 80).

While in Ghana, I received a letter from one of my former Kentucky students. How was I dealing with controversial issues like genital mutilation in the classroom, he wondered. I replied that I took the same stance as I did at home, usually being impartial in encouraging discussion but disclosing my own commitment or views at some point or if asked. I told him that halfway through the semester in Ghana, my first year students organized a mock Parliament in methods class. In a debate about female circumcision, both men and women spoke passionately for out-
lawing it and some used the term genital mutilation. Several men and one woman advocated allowing grown women the choice with the operation performed in the hospital. Interestingly, no one asked my view, although most would probably have assumed they knew. Or perhaps they thought it was none of my business.

Can we consider the value of “internal solutions” in other countries? Does “the West,” the whale, always have the right answer? Might we ourselves even learn from others’ solutions?

All of Us and Contrapuntal Reading

My students were hungry for handouts and books. They read carefully and thoroughly whatever I handed out and asked for more. I brought a class set of an anthology of African women’s literature for the Gender Issues class, and they persuaded me to let them keep the books. My colleagues were very appreciative of the journals and books about social studies which I brought. I was hungry, too, and went on a wonderful reading binge. I borrowed and bought and read mostly books published in Ghana about Ghana, about culture, economics, geography, government, history, philosophy, sociology. I also read poetry, plays, novels.

The National Commission on Culture’s cultural policy for Ghana states bluntly that to sustain domination of Africa by Europeans, “it was necessary to employ the instrument of cultural imperialism” (quoted in Takyi, 1996, p. 3). In Moving the Centre: The Struggle for Cultural Freedoms, Ngugi writes that “the economic and political conquest of Africa was accompanied by cultural subjugation and the imposition of an imperialist cultural tradition whose dire effects are still being felt today” (1993, p. 42).

Those “dire effects” are not limited to Africa. Because of imperialism, Americans and Europeans have usually heard the stories of and/or by the white man or woman in Africa. That is also true of books made into films, as in “Out of Africa.” Even the film “Cry Freedom” does not make Steve Biko the hero. As mentioned earlier, there are stacks of Austen’s and Conrad’s books in the University of Ghana’s bookstore. Chinua Achebe’s and Wole Soyinka’s books are more difficult to find in American university or other bookstores. Paton’s Cry the Beloved Country is still more likely to be on USA high school reading lists than Achebe’s Things Fall Apart. We do not read many African voices, and we do not read western voices in the context of imperialism.

Said suggests that “as we look at the cultural archive, we begin to reread it not univocally, but contrapuntally, with a simultaneous awareness both of the metropolitan history that is narrated and of those other histories against which (and together with which) the dominating discourse acts” (1993, p. 51). Said analyzes how such writers as Austen and Conrad situate themselves in the imperialistic world, taking imperialism for granted or not being able to imagine its end, and compares them to
writers such as Achebe "who speaks and acts on territory taken back from empire" (p. 31).

What have Ghanaians written which would be contrapuntal reading for Americans? What could we learn about how Ghanaians look at the encounter between Europeans and Africans? How do they see themselves? How do they see us? Three examples follow.

The first excerpt is from the final pages of Ayi Kwei Armah's historical novel, The Healers, about the war of 1873-74 between the Asante and Great Britain. Armah is generally considered "the Ghanaian fiction writer of the greatest stature today" (Angmor, 1996, p. 79). The Asante, founded as an empire with Osei Tutu as leader beginning about 1695, were not finally conquered until 1901, with the final resistance being led by Yaa Asantewaa, the Queen Mother, after the British had earlier arrested the Asantehene, Prempeh I, and many important chiefs and exiled them to Seychelles (Buah, 1980, pp. 23, 96). Armah is not only critical of Europeans; he criticized the first Ghanaian president, Kwame Nkrumah, and his regime in his first novel, The Beautiful Ones are Not Yet Born. He lives in Senegal now and his most recent novel, Osiris Rising, has an African-American heroine.

General Wolsely was lifted up on the ship out on the open sea. In no time the ship was chasing the horizon, taking the lucky conqueror home.

The West Indians had played solemn music to send the white general off. But once the ship had disappeared their playing changed. The stiff, graceless beats of white music vanished. Instead, there was a new, skillful, strangely happy interweaving of rhythms, and instead of marching back through the streets the soldiers danced. Others joined them. The dancers did not go back to the castle. They passed it, veered right to go past the great open ground, and took their procession meandering through the streets of Cape Coast.

All the groups gathered by the whites to come and fight for them were there and they all danced, except the whites who looked on, shaking their heads, bursting into laughter now and then, shaking their heads when some particular feat of a dancer baffled their imagination.

Here were Opobo warriors from the east, keeping at a distance from their neighbours from Bonni. Here were Hausas brought by Glover from the Kwarra lands. Here were mixed crowds with men from Dahomey, Anecho, Atakpame, Ada, Ga, and
Ekuapem. There were a few Efutu men, and numbers of Fante policemen in ill-fitting new uniforms. Here were tough, hardened Kru men from the west, Mande and Temne men from even farther west, and the fierce Sussu men inseparable from their swords of war... 

Ama Nkroma continued to laugh. "It's a new dance all right," she said, "and it's grotesque. But look at all the black people the whites have brought here. Here we healers have been wondering about ways to bring our people together again. And the whites want ways to drive us further apart. Does it not amuse you, that in their wish to drive us apart the whites are actually bringing us work for the future? Look!"

Together with Ama Nkroma's laughter, tears came to her eyes. (1975, pp. 308-309)

Ama Ata Aidoo is perhaps the best known African woman writer. Besides writing plays, novels, and poetry, Aidoo has been a university lecturer and Minister of Education in Ghana. Like Armah, she agonizes over the fate of Africa, past, present, and future (James, 1990, p. 8).

The following is poetry within her book, *Our Sister Killjoy or Reflections from a Black-Eyed Squint.* She is describing a trip to Upper Volta, now Burkina Faso, and reflecting on Europe and on Africa more generally.

The road from the Ghana border to Ouagadougou was Out-of-sight!

The French, with Characteristic contempt and Almost Childish sense of Perfidy had A long time ago, tarred two Narrow Strips of earth for motor vehicles Each wide enough for One tyre...

After a prose section recounting a near disastrous accident on the road, Aidoo continues:
A sickeningly familiar tale.
Poor Upper Volta too.

There are
Richer, much
Richer countries on this continent
Where
Graver national problems
Stay
Unseen while
Big men live their
Big lives
Within... (1979, pp. 54, 55)

Finally, Kofi Anyidoho forces us, Americans who are reluctant to call ourselves imperialists, to look at ourselves. Anyidoho has been described as an Ewe cantor "who assumes the social conscience of the ethnic group but also looks at global issues" (Senanu and Vincent, 1988, p. 305) and a poet of the revolution (Angmor, 1996). This poem was written in Bloomington, Indiana in 1978. I found it in an African literature book published for West African university students. "Your dirge" is a reference to Kofi Awoonor, his better known cousin, and his poem "Harlem on a winter night."

Long Distance Runner

From Frisco once
we drove across the wide yawn of the breezy bay
to the Oakland home of Mike who fixed
a memorial dinner for his years among our people
They call for song and I sing the story
of our wounds: the failures and betrayals
the broken oaths of war leaders grown smooth
with ease of civil joys

They laugh they clap they call for more

For a change just a little change I sing
your dirge about their land's defeat in the beauty
of her dawn: the ghost of Harlem standing guard
across their bridge of mirth their launching pad of dream
and myth.
I sing also your long lament for grand Geronimo
Amerindian chieftain who opened his heart a bit too wide
the lonely horseman who now perhaps only may be
still rides his old stallion across their dream their myth
forever riding his memory among mirages along eternities
reserved for him among snowfields spread across the breast
of the Earth this Earth and all his Earth
Halfway through your songs I see the folly
and the wisdom of our choice in the cold stare
the shifting look in the eyes of our hosts our very kind hosts
Who are we to throw back at a man the image of things
he strove so hard to burn to ashes in history’s bonfires?
We know there is an agony in waiting for the long distance
runner
who breaks the finisher’s line for the judges to declare he
jumped the starter’s gun stepped upon some other
runner’s toes threw him off balance and off the race
And what is a race, Cousin, without the rules
without other runners?
But leave him alone leave him alone to his
glory looming large above his olive dreams. (1988, pp.308-309)

Are we comfortable with the image of the whale, the USA, as the
long distance runner who jumped the starter’s gun, who stepped on an-
other runner’s toes? Can we deal with what Blaut calls “the myth of the
European miracle?” He argues that “capitalism became centrated in Eu-
rope because colonialism gave Europeans the power both to develop their
own society and to prevent development from occurring elsewhere (1993,
p. 206). Can we consider issues of our current imperial power? As Said
points out, “the word ‘imperialism’ was a conspicuously missing ingredi-
ent in American discussions about the Gulf” (p. 295).

Conclusion

So what did this “oburoni” learn outside the whale in Ghana? I
learned to refer to myself as “oburoni” with good humor, although I never
got used to being pointed at by children in town. I came to realize that a
light-skinned Ghanaian could also be called “oburoni,” that the bank man-
ger was calling me “oburoni” in a friendly way while waiting for me to
figure out my Akan name which is given according to the day of the week
you are born, and that a junior secondary student was combining recogni-
tion and welcome when she greeted me, "Good morning, oburoni. You are invited." I even discovered that my married name, Wilson, is a Ghanaian name. It is important to say that I was never discriminated against, just noticed. In fact, I felt much appreciated. However, unlike the writer V. S. Naipaul, of Indian ancestry but born and raised in Trinidad, I was relieved to leave recognition of my difference in color in Ghana (Storti, 1997, p. 35)

Race can matter in Africa. In fact, some argue that some Africans favor whites. Black Americans do have a different experience from white Americans, although Keith Richburg's negative experience as a black journalist in Africa, detailed in Out of America (1997), is not the norm. Other African-American journalists look beyond the horrors of war to report Africa in a more balanced, multi-faceted way (for example, see Louisville Courier-Journal, Sept. 14, 16, 18, 1997 and review of Richberg in Worldview magazine, summer 1997). And Maya Angelou, who deals with a more hopeful time (she lived in Ghana during the early 1960's) in All God's Children Need Traveling Shoes (1986) is also a contrast to Richberg in affirming the connection between Africans in Africa and those in the diaspora.

However, race may matter less than culture in understanding Africa. In In My Father's House: Africa in the Philosophy of Culture (1992), Kwame Anthony Appiah argues against the idea of an African race, inherited from European and American bad biology and bad ethics in the nineteenth century, and for a release from bondage to racial ideologies. Although he sees a place for an African identity, an African solidarity, he also writes "that there are times when Africa is not the banner we need" (1992, p. 7). Appiah, who grew up in Kumasi, Ghana as the son of a Ghanaian father and an English mother and is now a professor at Harvard, dedicates his book to nine children

a boy born in Botswana of Norwegian and Anglo-Ghanaian parents; his brothers, born in Norway and in Ghana; their four cousins, three boys in Lagos, born of Nigerian and Anglo-Ghanaian parents, and two girls, born in New Haven, Connecticut, of an African American father and a white American mother. These children, my nephews and my godchildren, range in appearance from the color and hair of my father's kinsmen to the Viking ancestors of my Norwegian brother-in-law; they have names from Yorubaland, from Asante, from America, from Norway, from England. And watching them playing together and speaking to each other in their various accents, I at least, feel a certain hope for the human future (p. viii).

I find myself hoping with Appiah. I think I was on the wrong track as a young Peace Corps volunteer, writing that we could be the same with
that coat of red dust. Would we want that? Another phrase from Appiah seems more apt—"the world as a network of points of affinity" (p. viii).

As a result of my six months in Ghana, I do have new insights, as well as new materials, some of which I have just shared. I am reminded that there are multiple, interesting, valid perspectives on topics ranging from marriage and funerals to economics and governance, and that those perspectives come from people who are not problems to be solved but human beings who are trying to make the best decisions for their lives they can. I better understand that "no one today is purely one thing...and that it is more rewarding-and more difficult-to think concretely and sympathetically, contrapuntally, about others than only about 'us'" (Said, p. 336). Finally, I am challenged to consider how I can make a "contribution to the building of a postimperialist culture...a culture that can have no place for racist assumptions in any of their forms" (Davidson, 1994, p. 14). I hear Awoonor who pleads for American professors to not only provide brilliant descriptions but to include Africa's human condition in our research and to engage our own politicians in discourse about the work to be done in Africa (1994, p. 104).

So, back inside the whale, I will act personally, professionally, and politically to continue a committed connection with West Africans, now including Ghanaians. But my most important contribution will be to my University of Kentucky students who will be are teachers. In fall 1997, I developed a model unit on Ghana and challenged my methods students to learn about Ghana's past and present and our conflicted connectedness and to ask thoughtful questions in letters to my Ghanaian students, letters that are already leading to a dialogue. I have always demonstrated "non-oburoni" perspectives within the USA, such as Japanese-American perspectives of the World War II "relocation" or the third perspective of Tejano residents of San Antonio of the battle of the Alamo or the perspective of Sethe in Toni Morrison's Beloved. I have also asked students to describe multiple ethnic perspectives in South Africa after reading the novel Time of the Butcherbird (La Guma, 1979), to role play a chapter in Things Fall Apart (Achebe, 1958) which presents justice in traditional Igbo society, and to consider whether the issue is tradition versus change or tradition and change after reading the short story, "The Duom Tree of Wad Hamid" (Salih, 1969), set in Sudan. In fall 1997, I tried poetry-a poem which is not only another perspective but a perspective critical of us. My methods students read Anyidoho's poem and were asked to respond to it. Some didn't get the point, saw Ghana or maybe Britain, but not the USA, as the long distance runner. Others were quite eloquent in their understanding. I was reminded that students need to read more outside the whale perspectives in order to gain perspective consciousness and practice perspective-taking and in order to become critically conscious.
Each day as I returned home from the Social Studies Department on the Winneba campus, I saw the single palm tree standing at the foot of the Fulbright house. It reminded me of the need for and reality of interdependence, that word we use often in thinking about our country and the world. As the Akan proverb says, “A person is not a palm tree that he or she should be self-sufficient.” But there is another Akan proverb that we need to take seriously. It is a powerful proverb because gold has been and remains an important export for Ghana, as well as being highly valued in the culture, and because kente and other kinds of cloth are also very special and valued. The proverb is: “It is a human being that counts. I call gold, it does not answer. I call cloth; it does not answer. It is a human being that counts” (Gyekye, 1996, pp. 25, 37). Can we say the human being counts? That all human beings count? What would it mean, as we begin the 21st century, for social studies teacher educators and teachers to act as if all human beings and all voices count in a curriculum which does not acknowledge special historical privilege?
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"The revolution we need is a revolution of the mind."  
Malcolm X

"...prepare your minds for action; be self-controlled...do not conform to the evil desires you had when you lived in ignorance."  
1 Peter 1:13,14, New International Version

"What do I want for you? To know the necessity of struggle. The absence of struggle is death...do not be lulled into passivity and indifference, self-indulgence, and isolation."

Janice Mirikitani, Letter to My Daughter

Race and racism continue to define issues of life in the United States, but are virtually ignored in current official CUFA (College and University Faculty Association) work, and sterilized in much of the work of NCSS (National Council for the Social Studies). This is an anomaly which must be carefully examined and changed. Social studies education, like all forms of education, is not neutral. Social studies education necessarily incorporates social issues, social criticism, and efforts to improve society. It is a field most directly concerned with such topics as race, racism, and racial inequality, and other issues of social justice like sexism, gender bias, and classism. NCSS has the opportunity and the challenge to improve on its

We gratefully acknowledge the comments of Jack Nelson, Cheryl Ooka, and anonymous TRSE reviewers in the development of this article.
less than sterling record of leadership in the pursuit of social justice. NCSS's civil rights record has been called “negligent at best and indifferent at worst” (Nelson & Fernekes, 1996, p. 96).

CUFA was established to enhance the scholarly and critical work of higher education in social studies. The original CUFA charter of 1969 established a standing Committee on Political and Social Action and another Committee Against Racism (Minutes, 1969); CUFA's founders recognized that social justice and equity were legitimate interests of CUFA members. Ironically, there is little evidence that CUFA has continued that course.

The goals of justice and equity demand that organizations like CUFA and NCSS work ceaselessly towards eradicating racism and racial inequalities in all areas of education. All forms of negative bias maintain a system of advantages to keep one (racial, gender, class, religious) group of people in power at the expense of others. In the United States this is a result of the unconstitutional legacy of the unjust and evil construction of racial superiority. This belief has legitimized laws and policies like the Jim Crow Laws, denial of women's right to vote, and the unjust taking of Native American land. These laws and policies have been used to justify the marginalization of people from underrepresented groups. Today “neo-nativism” is used to continue this marginalization; American Indians are US natives and the indigenous people of this country. They were The First People, the nativists. In its earliest form, neo-nativists were immigrants who defined themselves as US natives and settlers of this nation; their actions served to redefine the term native at the expense of real natives.

To combat the marginalization process, those who are in the best position by way of political and social resources must take the lead in social justice. The membership of CUFA and NCSS can look back in history to individuals in the Northern States during the Civil War and others who aligned themselves with those fighting to preserve the Union and eliminate slavery. While African Americans fought and died for change, change also occurred, in part, because people from the dominant group joined Northern armies, fought for, and died to protect the principles of liberty and justice, and to take a stand on the dignity of every human life.

We, the authors, call upon social studies organizations like CUFA and NCSS to wake up and give a public accounting of where they stand on, and what they are doing to address, the issue of race and its negative impact on K-12 education and the quality of life in the US. It is time for the organizations to take a hard look at how social studies educators are helping students become more successful in school and develop the citizenship skills needed in order to challenge social inequities.

The founding members of CUFA believed in social justice and committed themselves to social action in their national charter, however CUFA has not shown strong leadership in exposing racism or actively working
to eradicate racism. Where is the point at which the organization’s moral commitment to equity a genuine priority? After all isn’t it the breaking of our word to one another as individuals, and the breaking of our national word to other nations and to the people of this country, that has fostered and maintained many of the injustices in today’s society.

Though many social studies teachers may speak out individually to expose inequities in society so that their students can see how change is implemented, NCSS as the largest national organization of social studies educators along with CUFA, must take its role as an organization which brings to the national debate an understanding of the complexities of these issues. Political debates have an important place in the nation’s overall strategy for dealing with racial issues. Such debates need to be structured to lead the discussions into deeper layers of the issues. To accomplish this deeper dialogue, debate questions such as the following can be posed: What are the self-interests involved in racism? Where did these interests originate? What alternative methods might there be for meeting those needs/interests? Otherwise choices are often seen only as bipolar and reduced to racist and anti-racist slogans.

A common approach in political venues these days is to try to frighten voters by narrowly focusing the discussion and saying that opportunities will be taken away from Whites and given to immigrants and other less “qualified” people of color. This narrow approach appeals only to the negative forces of greed and self-interest while further alienating and excluding those who have been plagued by systematic and institutionalized discrimination. Without the freedom and option to develop their abilities, people often find themselves as Derrick Bell has written “at the bottom of the well.” Whenever this occurs, all is not “well” with our nation. And as King reminded us, “none of us are free until we are all free.” Who is in a better position than social studies organizations to help balance the discussion by shedding light on the reality that many people, because of their skin color or ethnic membership, have been denied an equitable and just opportunity to develop their careers, become financially stable, and care for their families?

Many social studies educators and professors take the position that they cannot teach issue-centered or value education yet by taking that stand they are teaching a viewpoint. Research by Hahn, Nelson, Engle and Ochoa, and Shaver have shown that issues-centered education is one of the most effective ways to teach higher order thinking, decision making skills, and moral development; all of which are key to academic achievement and citizenship. By not addressing critical social issues, are we, as social studies professionals, giving up our moral responsibility as educators to do a more effective job to prepare a mostly White teaching force not only to educate children of color, but also to educate all students
about racism and its negative effects? Educators need not be doctrinaire in their teaching, nor be liberal extremists, but issues-centered education must be at the center of social studies education because it encourages students to examine the many layers of social issues in an open-ended environment.

How can we, as an organization, raise and discuss the real issues at the heart of this race for our country's destiny, without being pegged as racist ourselves? How can we explore the benefits of diversity without being considered anti-white, for example? These are among the questions we are challenged, and abundantly able, to answer. The fact that these issues have become part of our national budget debate, should encourage us, all the more, to find ways to raise them and discuss them, but at a much deeper and more comprehensive level.

Our nation's strength is built in part on the value of democracy. One of the consequences of this orientation which does not assist in eliminating racism and which does not result in equity, is that it opens the door for tyranny by the majority. This runs counter to the founding principles of our nation. We cannot afford, as a nation, to turn our back, whether purposely or by default, on protecting the rights of the minority voices among us. We should never allow certain rights to be eliminated just because the majority wants them eliminated. The majority is not always right, even if they are able to pass propositions and make laws. CUFA and NCSS can help in the efforts to balance the rights of the majority with the rights of the minority and individuals, if our nation is ready to do the kind of self-examination and change needed to achieve that balance.

Civil rights has never been a majority movement and that is why our nation must build on the Brown v. Board of Education Supreme Court Decision of 1954. Clearly children of color are dropping out and not achieving at parity with their mainstream peers. This is extremely troubling when demographics show the numbers of children of color will be increasing at phenomenal rates and we, as educators, are unprepared to teach all students equally and effectively. In a short fifty years, we will be a different society. The United States will not only look physically different, but the country also will be closer to being a nation of ethnic diversity. Though presently the US population is 73.6% White, 12% Black, 10.2% Latino and 3.3% Asian, by 2050 the US Census Bureau predicts that we will be 52.8% White, 24.5% Latino, 13.6% Black, and 8.2% Asian American (Hicks, 1997). In fact in cities like Los Angeles that change has already occurred. Today Whites are a numerical minority in that city; the population is 43.5% Latino, 35.1% White, 11.4% Asian, and 9.9% Black (Hicks, 1997). In Los Angeles by the year 2040, Latinos will make up 69.1% of the population, while Whites will be only 13.8%, Asians 10.9%, and Blacks 6%. Will mainstream institutions, businesses, and organizations wait until 2050 to make substantial changes in regards to race? National organizations like NCSS
and CUFA must position themselves to make significant contributions to participate in serious national conversations about race and how schools should be preparing all students for the 21st Century.

We must work diligently and collectively to give the phrase ‘we the people’ an inclusive meaning not only for the privileged, but for all.

What can be done?

We encourage CUFA to act. The membership along with its executive board should set the following, and more, as goals for the coming years:

1. Commit ourselves to positively impact the way the United States deals with racial inequalities by developing a ten year plan of action to positively impact the way racial issues are taught in social studies and by taking leadership in social change. National inaction validates racism and impacts the way social studies teachers teach all children and deal with equity issues. We must raise the level of discussions and take clear and definite stands on national issues like Affirmative Action and Proposition 187 (Ross, 1997), and their impact on academic achievement.

2. Organize a Task Force of interested members to work with NCSS to develop a multi-dimensional plan to address racism and racial inequalities. Curriculum and instruction presented in the journal of Social Education is important, but it is not enough. The plan should address issues by inviting opposing groups to participate in forums to encourage deeper dialogue and more thoughtful reflection. Invitations could be extended to organizations like the NAACP, Family Research Council, Southern Poverty Law Center, Claremont Institute, Japanese American Citizens League, Capital Research Center, Mexican-American Legal Defense Fund, Center for Equal Opportunity-Linda Chavez President, and the Heritage Foundation. This plan should also address strategies to effectively recruit educators of color to the social studies profession, invite culturally diverse educators to join the professional organizations, and offer to mentor new professionals of color.

3. Conduct ongoing serious collegial discussions about racism and racial inequalities using thought-provoking texts like Other People’s Children by Lisa Delpit at the national conferences. Do we have those difficult discussions about issues of race? Note the collaborative authorship of this article by way of example (Asian, Indigenous/Chicano, and White). As part of the annual CUFA national conference, have a meeting agenda which raises social issues; the meeting could be designed to encourage social action through the use of culturally meaningful curriculum in social studies and teaching different discipline strategies which lead to less student discipline referrals by race; both strategies should lead to higher academic achievement in students of color.

4. Encourage the development of issues-centered education as a ten-year long thread in our national conferences where racism is the key is-
This is especially critical since much of our school materials are dominated by value consensus rather than serious consideration of different points of view and serve to maintain present social policies rather than doing the hard work necessary to make changes which will allow and encourage the participation of all peoples. Social studies research has proven that teachers with a well-conceptualized and issues-centered classroom curriculum develop in their students high order thinking skills, encourages political participation, and students become more capable of including diverse perspectives in creating a more humane society (Hahn, 1996). Showcase positive efforts of teachers at national conferences.

5. Support research in how culture and race impacts views of democracy and citizenship. Conduct research to better understand how students of color and White children develop knowledge about how race, class, ethnicity, and privileged status influence democratic participation (Hahn, 1996).

6. Get personally more involved with culturally different underrepresented communities. Go into the communities, learn about, interact with, serve, and understand those who may have different worldviews through first-hand experiences.

7. Encourage and participate in the development of teacher education programs that promote discussion of key questions such as:

- What does it mean to be "color blind" or "color conscious"?
- Why does multiculturalism mean anti-White to some individuals?
- How are the issues of diversity and equity linked to power relationships?
- How can educators address the achievement gap in schools?

**Conclusion**

Race is still about power in the United States. We cannot afford to deny how racism and racial inequalities negatively impacts the opportunities each of us have—the rights and privileges. Race is a socially constructed concept (Omi and Winant, 1994): Race impacts the schooling of our children and the running of our businesses and government. Social studies organizations like CUFA and NCSS must become active participants in shaping how our nation addresses the issue of race in society and in our schools. CUFA and NCSS must develop full-blown national plans so that the organizations and their members can take a united stand against racism and fight for culturally affirming schools, equity, and equal opportunity in schools evidenced by just outcomes. Our future as a nation depends on the commitment of organizations like CUFA and NCSS to take action on this critical issue.
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Review by MARY S. BLACK, The University of Texas at Austin, 78712.

The dynamic nature of the social studies curriculum is apparent in this volume of essays designed to explore some of the challenges and controversies in the field as liberally conceived. For example inclusion of nontraditional perspectives and the design of improved assessment strategies, rather than relying on standardized curricula and testing, are two issues that illustrate the transformative approach that is taken. The main discussions in the book include the purpose of social studies, the infusion of social issues into the social studies curriculum, and pedagogical issues or the curriculum in action. The collection is intended for professionals in the field, graduate studies in social education or as a supplement for teacher preparation courses.

E. Wayne Ross introduces the book with a discussion of tensions and contradictions in the social studies curriculum. He poses three main questions: what is the curriculum? who controls it? and what is the teacher’s role? The debates over these questions shape social education today and will continue to do so in the future.

The contributors to this edited volume share a progressive view of what the social studies curriculum could be like, pushing readers to go beyond the confines of traditional configurations. Various authors discuss alternate perspectives of the social studies mission; expand the discussion of gender, race and culture; and exhort readers toward creative forms of pedagogy and assessment. Together these essays act as a compass, pointing towards a forward direction for social studies education.

For example, Michael Whelan argues for maintaining history at the social studies core, but expands the notion of what should be included in the historical pie. He discusses four interrelated concepts teachers should consider when planning their history curriculum. Whelan contends first that history should be a dialog between the past and the present. That is, that relevant issues from the past should be seized upon by teachers to help explain ever-changing contemporary situations. This implies that

[Editor’s Note: O. L. Davis, Jr., a member of the TRSE editorial board, directed all editorial aspects of this review.]
social studies teachers must be both well-informed and flexible enough to integrate information quickly as the situation demands. For example during the Gulf War period, teachers with adequate preparation, resources and resourcefulness successfully used historical issues concerning the Middle East and the development of a world energy-based economy to engage their students in exploration of the immediate situation affecting their lives.

Whelan also advocates a history-centered curriculum built around nontraditional topics, such as crime or health care, and multiple perspectives. Examining historical phenomena from more than one point of view, including that of those with little political or economic power, enriches students' understanding of social processes, according to Whelan. He urges that students have the opportunity to study hypothetical alternatives, to use problem solving skills to consider a variety of possible outcomes for historical events or situations. For instance, analytical reflection is particularly valuable for students when considering the possible consequences of various political and policy decisions.

Finally, he proposes that students study historical conditions, not just historical events. He encourages the study of comparative social conditions through time in order for students to understand the complexity of human existence and reflect on current issues through the lens of social history. By advancing this agenda for the history-centered social studies curriculum, Whelan opens the gate for an issues-driven history classroom. Whelan offers an alternative to a chronological structure in social studies without losing the significance of time.

David Warren Saxe writes about the fundamental purpose of social studies, promoting civic competence. He argues that the study of history, as traditionally conceived, does little to promote civic-minded behaviors such as increased civic participation, voter registration or actual voting. Saxe contends that the fundamental problem with traditional history is that it is delivered to students from the perspective of control. He argues instead that the dual nature of freedom and responsibility, as the basis for democratic society, should be emphasized in order to encourage civic competence.

Saxe urges teachers to continue using conservative pedagogical techniques when called for to produce safe, harmonious classrooms. He also counsels maintaining a common core of knowledge for all students using English as the common language of instruction. In addition to these subject-centered teaching strategies that focus on control, he advocates utilizing process-centered teaching when appropriate to encourage freedom of intellectual exploration. He particularly encourages the use of discovery, inquiry, challenge, exploration, imagination, problem solving, decision making and reflection to promote student understanding of freedom and responsibility. By understanding the relationship of these two concepts,
students begin to embrace true liberal democratic principles, according to Saxe.

Nel Noddings also urges a wider conception of social studies curriculum. She argues that the examination of social life, including family relations and general human development, should be the nexus of social studies. This suggestion would establish a new emphasis in social studies that enlarges the traditional notion of citizenship. Noddings articulates a feminist perspective of equality rather than assimilation into the mainstream curriculum.

Noddings speculates about how a fully articulated view of feminine culture could be expressed in social studies. She proposes that there might be more emphasis on private life, including family membership and the historical, multicultural and philosophical aspects of homemaking. She expands the concept of citizenship to include preparation for parenting and responsible social life in the private sector as well as the public. Embedded within this framework, she sees the study of human development, caring and spiritual education as important to social studies. Instead of merely adding information about women leaders and suffragettes, Noddings envisions a 180 degree turn from the male dominated world we have known so long as social studies. Granted this would be a radical approach, but the challenge stimulates readers to consider what knowledge is important to teach.

Issues of gender in social education are further elaborated by Jane Bernard-Powers. She claims that “omissions, neglect, and misrepresentation [concerning gender and other issues] have served to miseducate” in the classroom (p. 89). Bernard-Powers calls for a reformulated curriculum that incorporates both public and private facets of life in order to understand community citizenship. She advocates greater awareness of gender attitudes and experiences in the preparation of teachers in order to encourage teachers’ critical reflection.

Cameron McCarthy challenges simplistic notions of race and urges educators also to consider within-group differences of class, gender and ethnicity to form a more complex picture of social influences on human behavior. He calls for a more vigorous approach to what and how we teach in school. This revised approach should include multiple perspectives, interdisciplinary curriculum, and critical analysis by students. David Hursh continues this argument to “broaden multicultural education to include class and gender” (p. 107). The goal of social studies for Hursh seems to expand the traditional notion of citizenship to a generalized ability to make sense of our lives. The logical outcome of Hursh’s argument, however, seems to be to increase the teaching of sociology in schools, rather than to restructure the content of social studies.

Examining social studies teaching in the classroom, Gloria Ladson-Billings presents two examples of teachers who create culturally relevant
curriculum in collaboration with their students. She asserts that by involving students in the exploration of issues critical to them in their own community, students become actively engaged in learning social studies, regardless of their prior academic preparation. Ladson-Billings focuses on the instructional choices teachers make in order to foster responsible democratic participation in society, especially by students who may not have benefited from previous schooling.

She suggests using community studies that focus on the local neighborhood setting and explorations of family history and migration to help students cross the bridge from traditional studies of major national and world events to a culturally relevant curriculum. She elaborates on the concepts of knowledge that culturally relevant teachers possess. For such teachers, students’ informal prior knowledge is used as the foundation for further learning. Culturally relevant teachers challenge students to view course content critically. These teachers are enthusiastic and excited about what they teach. Plus they also help students develop prerequisite knowledge and skills without penalty. Finally the teachers Ladson-Billings describes allow students to demonstrate their learning in a variety of ways through carefully constructed authentic assessments.

The difficulties of incorporating the Science and Technology in Society (STS) strand, as called for by the National Council of Social Studies (1994) and others, into social studies education is discussed by Stephen C. Fleury. Fleury argues that school science and social studies tend to separate the investigation of facts and values, thus “preventing student awareness of the relationships between knowledge and power” (p. 166). The tendency of STS programs to promote technical understanding rather than expanding the view of social knowledge is also discussed. What is needed to counter this, Fleury declares, is critical examination of the traditional categories of science and social studies so that students can understand the social ramifications of technological development.

Fleury’s chapter addresses sophisticated philosophical and epistemological questions facing social studies theorists. It presents an interesting review of the development of scientific conceptualization in regards to social education. While it is thought provoking, it does not offer much practical advice for classroom teachers wishing to undertake studies of the effects of science and technology on human society. Rather, it delineates the question of why the dynamics of science and social goals are generally omitted from the basic education of youth.

Additional chapters include discussions of the uses of art in social studies by Terrie L. Epstein; global perspectives in the curriculum by Merry M. Merryfield; an issues-centered curriculum by Ronald W. Evans; and alternative modes of assessment by Sandra Mathison. Epstein suggests using “artlike” primary sources such as oral histories, poems, paintings, and songs to teach social studies. Students can also interpret or create
artistic forms to construct complex understandings of the past or present social condition. Epstein offers concrete suggestions for the production and evaluation of historical artwork by students which could enliven many classrooms. She includes a number of examples from various art forms that can be adapted for social studies lessons.

Merryfield’s treatment of global education concerns is well-founded, but not particularly new. She claims that global education includes at least the following eight elements: human values; global systems; global issues; connections across global history; cross-cultural awareness; human choices; analytical skills; and participation strategies. Infusion of these into the curriculum is necessary because of increased economic and political interdependence, as scholars have previously observed. Merryfield also offers several methods for incorporating global perspectives into social studies classrooms on an ongoing basis. For example she advocates connecting global content to students’ lives, making comparisons across cultures, utilizing multiple perspectives, linking knowledge across time and space, and developing new global education courses.

Evans presents the most detailed view of social studies reform in this collection of essays with his articulation of an issues-centered curriculum. In his view “thoughtfulness, reflection, problem-solving, valuing, and social criticism should be at the heart of social study” (p. 209). He constructs an idealistic vision that is valuable nonetheless because he stretches the possibilities of the classroom beyond the norm. He also shares two examples of lesson plan construction that provide a springboard for further development.

Both examples are built around a newspaper story about tension and unrest in American society. The first example is an inquiry lesson in which students consider alternative explanations for the events described in the story. In the second lesson plan, students practice decision-making skills to plan civic policies to address the problems indicated in the news story. Both lessons use dynamic discussion formats to involve students in creative exploration of contemporary issues.

Mathison gives a brief overview of the movement towards performance assessment as a method of evaluating the quality of student learning. Rather than relying exclusively on tests which assign a numerical value to how much learning has been accomplished, Mathison argues for multiple means of assessment, including portfolios of student work. She also describes the challenges and dilemmas of implementing assessment reform.

Questions over state and national versus local control of curriculum affect assessment decisions. With standardized state and national testing pushing curriculum in many parts of the nation, authentic assessment in the classroom becomes a heightened issue. New forms of assessment are often seen as an addition to standard, multiple choice tests. Limited time and other resources restrict the development of true performance assess-
ments for social studies. Fossilized knowledge must be open to consider-
ations about the goals and objectives of any school subject, including so-
cial studies. Finally, because performance assessment challenges both po-
itical and technical concepts of student learning, care must be taken in
the implementation of new forms of assessment.

This volume is a welcome addition to the social studies bookshelf. The essays invite readers to rethink the structure of social studies educa-
tion in order to increase student learning. Several topics are not addressed,
however, such as technology in the classroom, or the profound issue of
access to unlimited information for some students and censored or con-
fined access for others. Alternatives to history, such as economics or cul-
tural development, as alternative organizing social studies principles are
also given faint attention. Many areas of social education, such as the
growth of culture, human developmental psychology, and others, remain
silent. Several chapters discuss various efforts at pedagogical reform, but
the critical overall need to develop new delivery methods for social stud-
ies to replace lecture and textbook driven instruction is not elaborated.
Nor is the purpose of social studies education examined in a significant
manner. Even though Saxe writes compellingly about the unique mission
devloping civic competence through social studies, no unified defini-
tion of such competence is expressed in the volume as a whole, nor are
alternative goals clearly explored.

What is needed is a clear description of the “new land” to which this
volume points. If educators took these compiled suggestions to heart,
what would the new social studies curriculum look like? How would it
be organized? How would competing visions be integrated or justified?
What source material would be utilized? What forms of teaching could
be employed? How would students demonstrate what they had learned?
And at the most basic level, how would it all fit within the school day?
Part of the way to this new land has been traced by this volume, but a
final synthesis chapter to explain how these suggestions might work to-
gether to revitalize social studies would be a significant addition. As it is,
this volume is stimulating and cogent, but stops short of its potential to
define the leap into transformative social education the authors seem to
espouse.
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History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past is the story of the recent formulation of the National History Standards and the resulting furor. Perhaps the biggest reason the book is important is that it is clear evidence that many professional historians are now again seriously engaged with K-12 education. The development of the world and United States history standards, which History on Trial chronicles, was also positive for a number of other reasons: some of the finest teachers and professors in the country collaborated, the standards reflect the new social historical scholarship, and non-western societies are included in world history without denigrating the West.

Despite the fact that the standards are often too difficult for secondary students, hopefully they will actually have some positive impact on improving student historical understanding. Still, after reading portions of the standards and all of History on Trial, my strong feeling is that ultimately the standards in and of themselves will not result in much improvement in student historical understanding.

A week before writing this review, I mentioned Mao Zedong’s disastrous attempts at promoting equal opportunity to my 35 educational foundations students at the mid-level state university in which I teach. It occurred to me while using the example that some people might not know who Mao was. I stopped and asked the class and only two students could identify Mao and both were over thirty years of age. This example is only one of many I could have used. The historical ignorance of most young Americans spans the socioeconomic and educational spectrum. Ivy league professors report the same sorts of stories as the one cited above. Readers of this journal are no doubt familiar with National Assessment of Educational Progress results and other data that reinforces the extensive anecdotal evidence of student historical ignorance that those of use engaged in teaching history or social studies encounter.

With the above as context, recounting the formulation of the National History Standards and the subsequent controversy, by three principle standards architects seems somewhat beside the point. While the authors and their critics battled over what constitutes history, my strong impression is that both the obviously liberal authors and their just as ideologically conservative chief opponents, such as Lynne Cheney, warred about the politics of history and, inadvertently, did not directly address the problem of a largely ahistorical younger generation.
History on Trial does provide some guidance as to how historical literacy declined, most of which is familiar to social studies educators. The authors discuss the rift between the Organization of American Historians and the National Council for the Social Studies that began in the 1920s. The authors go on to depict the exodus of the majority of professional historians from K-12 education. They also describe the ambiguous at best, and hostile at worse, attitude of a critical mass of NCSS policymakers through the years toward the discipline of history. The authors recount the political battles over appropriate United States and, to a lesser extent, world history in the mid-1990s that occurred both before and after World War II. Nash, Crabtree, and Dunn further demonstrate quite adequately in History on Trial that similar battles over the politics of history are occurring in other countries, such as Japan and Great Britain.

For those who are interested in the political controversy over the history standards this book is useful. While the authors tend to demonize most conservatives and make a couple of sweeping generalizations to the effect that real professional historians all supported the standards, (ignoring criticisms by eminent historians such as the University of Pennsylvania's Walter McDougall), they quite accurately describe Cheney's incredible flip-flop on the standards, the Clinton Administration's abandonment of support, and Slade Gorton and Rush Limbaugh's mostly inaccurate charges. But again, if you believe as I do that the first priority is teaching young people basic historical information neither this book nor the standards themselves are particularly germane to that objective.

While the authors obviously believe the standards, now that they have largely weathered the firestorm of controversy of a few years ago, will lead us to a generally more informed public. I think they are incorrect for one major reason. Despite the history standards, young people in the United States will continue to be more ignorant than their counterparts in other developed countries in history and other academic subjects unless widespread systematic reform of public education occurs.

What do we do to insure that students learn more history? First, we admit that the social studies movement is one of the major reasons for the problem of historical ignorance. Since the birth of the social studies, a critical mass of leaders in the field have emphasized process and political objectives over content, and interdisciplinary studies and other social sciences over history. When this tepid endorsement of history on the part of many social studies educators is combined with a public education system that, despite exceptions, makes fewer demands on most of its students than is the case in almost all other developed countries, is it any wonder that even most of our best students learn little history?

A disproportionately high number of students will continue to emerge ignorant of basic historical content until such trite excuses for curricula as are most character education programs, DARE programs, and
virtually all affective/self-esteem content are replaced with academic subject matters taught not by "facilitators" but by knowledgeable teachers who place high demands on students and give Fs if the demands aren't met. The well-meaning scholars and teachers who developed the history standards could only address the question of what constitutes sound historical content. For this work the developers of the standards should be mostly commended. Unfortunately, a largely self-serving reactionary public education establishment that often celebrate mediocrity and fads mostly negates their noble efforts.
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