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Welcome to the *Oregon Journal of the Social Studies’* winter 2015 issue. This issue aims to introduce readers to innovative ideas in the social studies that develop critical thinking through strategies such as integrating multimedia, different perspectives, current events and teaching controversial issues. During the past two years and in this issue, we have highlighted a variety of methodologies and activities. As educators in the field of social sciences, we often find that our perspectives or methodologies do not align with those of our colleagues. The first article in this issue, *Social Studies in and through Diverse Lenses,* by Catherine Broom addresses these methodology variances and issues by outlining justifications for differing social studies’ philosophies. Next, Gayle Thieman and Susan Lenski share findings on a study addressing the teaching of literacy skills by social studies teacher candidates’ teaching in high poverty schools in their article, *Preparing Secondary Social Studies Teacher Candidates to Address Common Core State Standards and the C3 Framework with Diverse Learners.*

The winter issue has four practice articles. In *Hands on Feet Forward: Learning Basic Map Skills,* C. Glennon Rowell and Gail Hickey write about how four pre-service teachers used student-centered, active learning techniques to teach elementary students geography education. In *Joining the National Discussion: A Plan for Discussing Same-Sex Marriage with Secondary Students,* Terence Beck presents an argument against the individualized market value of education and for the collaborative value of education that emphasizes our shared humanity while providing extensive information about the philosophy and practice of nonviolence in education. Mark Pearcy, in “A Mean and Infamous War:” *Teaching About Dissent in the Mexican-American War,* forms an argument for teaching the dissent perspective. The authors of *Participatory Democracy for Gifted Students: An Opportunity for Methods Instructors,* Shawn Daley, Phil Teeuwsen, and Dick Windhorst, address a long overlooked area of schooling, gifted education. Their article provides best practices for teacher educator methods instructors in implementing democracy conferences to teach civics education that meets the needs of gifted students.

For our technology article, Judy Lambert and Victoria Stewart explain three strategies social studies teachers can use to involve students more actively in *Engaging Students in Powerful Social Studies Teaching and Learning with Multimedia Technologies.* Steve Wohlmuth shares a lesson on climate change that requires students to critically analyze data and Jessica Bray wraps up this issue with a review of social studies apps. We trust you will enjoy the articles and, as always, welcome your comments on this issue or back issues by emailing your feedback to caranok@wou.edu.
Social Studies in and through Diverse Lenses

Catherine Broom

Many scholars have described different definitions of social studies. These varying conceptions are tied to the history of the subject. This manuscript describes this history, from which four major philosophical orientations to the subject emerge. These philosophic lenses are then explained in detail and illustrated with sample lessons. The author concludes with the argument that these varied options are enriching for both teachers and students and that there is no one “correct” way of teaching social studies. It is this rich diversity of options that provides spaces for the inclusion of all students.

Social Studies in and through Diverse Lenses

Valuing diversity is at the heart of democracy, for--by definition--democracy means government of and by the people. People are of varied types, and they have different interests and perspectives. Democracy thrives on the richness of diverse perspectives, and on the resulting contestation, deliberation, and negotiation that these bring (Dewey, 1916). For democracy to work, people have to appreciate difference and be respectful of diversity and open-minded. These values are particularly important in contemporary, pluralistic democracies. This manuscript will argue that social studies ought to embrace multiple perspectives and methods of teaching. Embracing a number of perspectives opens spaces for the inclusion of diverse students with varied learning styles and intelligences (Gardner, 1983). This is how, in effect, we teach social studies to include all learners.

The manuscript begins by briefly reviewing the history of social studies, from which four major orientations to the subject emerge. Then, I describe the four orientations in detail, explaining their underlying philosophies of education and illustrating their possible methods. I conclude by arguing that all four of the orientations are valid and enriching for both teachers and students, and that teachers ought to choose the orientation that best fits their authentic teaching selves. By embracing this diversity, we illustrates that we value multiple perspectives, and we allow students to experience varied teaching styles within which they will find the teaching style that fits who they are and how they best learn.

Social Studies’ Story

At the turn of the century, American society was changing rapidly due to a number of significant social and economic changes including industrialization, immigration, and urbanization. These changes led pressures on schools and calls for reform. As a result, The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education of the National Educational Association (NEA) was established. It set up a number of subcommittees including the Committee on the Social Studies. The members of this latter committee discussed and then released two important documents: the 1915 Civics Education Report and a curriculum report.
The newly defined social studies aimed to teach history, combined with other social sciences including geography and economics, in a way that developed students’ patriotism and understanding of their society. Practical problems were to be presented for students to think about “critically.”

**Debate at the Subject’s Foundation**
The Social Studies committee report was flexible and open to interpretation as it was a compromise of a broad range of perspectives. Hence, it set a foundation that has resulted in a vibrant debate over, and various conceptions of, social studies (Author, 2011; Crocco, 2003; Ravitch, 2003; Saxe, 2003; Watras, 2003), from which we can identify four major orientations to the subject (Evans, 2004).

**Social Studies’ History over the Twentieth Century**
The *meliorist* orientation was the first movement to arise during the 1920s (Evans, 2004). It was a progressive-based movement. Its advocates believed students should analyze society’s problems and issues with the aim of improving society. Meliorists aimed to make students into better citizens, defined as individuals who are aware of society’s injustices and actively worked to ameliorate them. A more extreme version of the meliorist group was the *reconstructionist* group (Evans, 2004). This group aimed to remake citizens through education and thus transform society. It attempted to shape citizens who believe in the equality of all groups. It became popular during the 1930s and was illustrated in Rugg’s problem-based textbooks.

During the 1940s, as a result of World War II and in response to the meliorist and reconstructionist visions, *traditionalists*, supporters of a history-based course, argued that meliorists and reconstructionists aimed to indoctrinate students to scorn American institutions and that history teaching required greater emphasis (Evans, 2004). Influenced by Nevin’s writings, this group believed that history should be taught as a positive nation-building narrative. In this view, good citizens were nationalistic supporters of current institutions and structures. Their criticism continued during the 1950s with the writings of Bestor, and was fuelled by rise of anticommunism due to the Cold War and the launch of Sputnik in 1957. The latter resulted in the National Defense Education Act, which allocated federal funds to discipline-based studies, seen as necessary for developing students’ intellects and as a defense against communism.

The New Social Studies emerged from this context in the 1960s. Advocated by social scientists, it argued for an intellectual, discipline-focused, and discovery-learning curriculum. Evans (2004) calls these advocates the “mandarins.” The New Social Studies was opposed by the “newer Social Studies,” a progressively-based “reconstructionist” approach which argued for a focus on: race, class, and gender issues; values clarification; and social activism. It aimed to create citizens involved in improving and transforming society.

During the 1970s, rising conservative influences, such as the “new right” and “new conservatives,” resulted in a traditional backlash. Reforms and textbooks were criticized and back-to-basics movements developed. Conservatives exerted pressure for economic growth, the preservation of society as is, and increased economic competitiveness through a focus on
academic excellence, to be achieved with standards and testing. This trend continued during the 1980s, with the re-emergence of a strong discipline-focused history movement. This history-based movement led to the Bradley Commission and the issuing of standards for history (Symcox, 2002).

Four Philosphic Lenses through which Social Studies can be Interpreted

The historical review presented above illustrates that Social Studies is differently understood by traditionalists, mandarins, progressivists, and reconstructionists (Author, 2012; Evans, 2004). Each of these orientations will now be described in more detail by identifying the philosophic orientations underscoring each.

Traditionalist/Classict

The Classicist or Perennialist orientation to social studies draws on Western heritage, particularly the thought of the Ancient Greeks and Liberal Educationalists such as Hirsch and Oakeshott (1989). Evans labels it “traditionalist.” However, “traditionalist” has negative connotations attached to it, which do not do justice to the depth of thought that this orientation can encompass, when it goes beyond focusing on basic classroom instructional strategies. It is on the right side of the spectrum as it takes a socialization orientation: education is understood to be the process of “inducting” students into our heritage of thought. This acquisition of learning makes students “human” and occurs through the reading and discussion of “great books.” Acquiring knowledge enables students to participate in “conversations” on a multitude of topics that have occurred in the past and continue today (Oakeshott, 1989). Students require more than book learning, however, for they must also be able to engage in vibrant debate and discussion of ideas. Teachers are knowledgeable in their subject areas and must develop their students’ critical thinking, in order to teach students how to distinguish the true from the false (Plato, 1999). Plato (427-347 BC), in the Republic, for example, illustrates Socrates to be an educator who forced people to deeply think about what they believed using the “Socratic method.” Teachers in this frame tend to view social studies as primarily a History-based course. The following scenario illustrates how a class might be taught using this frame:

Ms. Sherlock stands at the front of the classroom elegantly suited in a grey pin suit. She props her glasses back onto her nose as she completes the morning roll call. “Good morning, students,” she says in a confident and polite manner, as she leans on her small podium. “Good morning, Ms.,” the students reply in kind. Ms. Sherlock continues, “Today, we are going to discuss some of the causes of World War I. Who did their homework? Who can list some of the causes of the war? James? Good for you. Why don’t you come and write your point on the board? Sam? Sarah? Alfonso? Good for all you. You can each come and write your points on the board.” The students each come up and write their causes on the board. James writes about problematic alliances, Sam about imperialist sentiment, Sarah about increasing nationalism, and Alfonso about the assassination of the Archduke Ferdinand. Ms. Sherlock praises the students on their answers and encourages their classmates to write down their answers. She hovers near the students who she sees to be potentially at risk and provides them with extra guidance. She then guides the students through a discussion of these (and other) causes of the war, elaborating and clarifying as needed. Once students are clear on the causes of the war, she asks the students to think about the following questions, and then write their answers in the
notebooks: “Which cause do you think is the most important? Why?” Students scribble their answers in the notebooks. A few minutes later, she calls the class together and asks the students to share their answers. Most of the students have chosen the assassination of the Archduke Ferdinand as the most important, as it was the final trigger. She discusses with the students whether it is in fact the most important cause, or only one of many necessary events that increased tensions and hostilities to a breaking point. Students are engaged and thoughtful. She asks them to think of a time when they lost their own tempers. Was only one cause responsible, or were many irritations building on and reinforcing each other? The students come to agree that many causes were interrelated and significant. Just before the bell rings for the end of the class, she reminds students of their upcoming test and praises them again for their hard work and effort. She leaves them with some homework: She asks them to consider how they would have addressed the events unfolding in Europe at the turn of the twentieth century if they had been a politician at the time, and to consider whether these events could have been managed differently: could one have acted differently without the hindsight we have today? She also asks students to explore the causes of another twentieth century war (or possible war, i.e., time of tension) and compare and contrast similarities and differences in events and their political management to those discussed in class. She tells students that she will collect and mark their homework and wishes them a good day. “Bye, Ms.,” several students say as they leave the class, “Thank you…I enjoyed our discussion…It made me think.”

This vignette illustrates some of the key features of the Classicist frame including a focus on learning key facts and developing the mind with the use of questions that promote critical thinking, a view of the teacher as authority, and a well-structured learning environment. It is an orientation that will suit students who have linguistic, logical-mathematical, and interpersonal intelligences (Gardner, 1983).

Table 1
Summary of the Key Features of the Classicist Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core: History</th>
<th>View of Knowledge: Truthful Facts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aim: Socialization and liberation from False belief; developing “humanity”</td>
<td>Teacher: knowledgeable, wise authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods: reading, discussion, Socratic questioning; developing critical thinking</td>
<td>View of student: unequal; educated according to ability but males and females as equal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Essentialist/Mandarin

The second philosophic frame through which social studies can be viewed is the Essentialist frame. Like the Classical frame, it also aims to develop students’ knowledge and critical thinking. However, it expands its view of social studies beyond that of History to encompass the Social Sciences including: Anthropology, Archaeology, Political Science, and Economics. Knowledge learning is focused, first, on conceptually grasping the theoretical and organizing principles of each of the Social Sciences that are viewed to encompass social studies. The methods used are social science methods. Rather than a teacher-focused class, this frame views learning as an active process in which students become like social scientists themselves.
as they engage in inquiry based projects. The teacher is a guide and a model. For example, students will study primary documents in order to learn Historical knowledge and conceptually grasp “what” history is and what its methods are. They will take part in simulated Archaeological digs in order learn about Archaeology and learn Archaeological content. They will explore a landscape in order to map it and acquire Geographical knowledge and understanding of the subject. As Bruner (1987) stated:

Every subject has a structure, a rightness, a beauty. It is this structure that provides the underlying simplicity of things, and it is by learning its nature that we come to appreciate the intrinsic meaning of the subject...knowledge has an internal connectedness, a meaningfulness, and that for facts to be appreciated and understood and remembered, they must be fitted into that internal meaningful context... Consider now what benefits the child might derive from the experience of learning through his own discoveries....increased intellectual potency, intrinsic rewards, useful learning techniques, and better memory processes. (p. 244)

The following scenario illustrates how a class might be taught using this frame:

Mr. Curio nods with satisfaction as he looks over the classroom. Ready to go: the tables are grouped together, students have been assigned to groups in order to ensure best learning conditions for all, and each group has an authentic World War II suitcase at the centre of its table. He opens the door. Students come in. Some are laughing and chatting, others are quiet. He directs them each to their prepared chairs. He wanders around the classroom as he welcomes the students and gets them settled down. Once they are ready to learn, he states that today they are going to explore some of the consequences of World War II for families and individuals living in Europe at the time. He tells them that they are to imagine they go on holiday to Europe and stay at a small bed and breakfast. Their room is up on the second floor. As they place their luggage in their rooms, they trip over their shoes and hit the wall. Surprisingly, the wall gives way and exposes a small hideaway, in the corner of which is a suitcase. They are to work together as a group to explore who the suitcases belonged to and the owners’ stories. Each group, he tells them, has a different suitcase and will share their findings with the class. Students excitedly open their suitcases...

The vignette illustrates how learning is concept and discovery-based and how the teacher guides students’ self-learning. This orientation will suit students with visual-spatial, body-kinesthetic, interpersonal, and logical-mathematical intelligences (Gardner, 1983).

Table 2
Summary of the Key Features of the Essentialist Frame

| Core: the Social Sciences |
| View of Knowledge: Conceptual and applied; less focus on facts and more on process |
| Aim: Understanding the foundational concepts of each Social Science and its methods |
| Teacher: Guide and mentor |
Methods: inquiry based, student-based discovery learning, social science methods
View of student: all students have the potential to learn the disciplines but are not equal

Progressivist

The third frame draws on the work of philosophers such as Comenius who argued for education to be interesting to the child, Pestalozzi who stressed child centred play, Rousseau, Piaget, Hall, and Dewey. Rousseau (1979) believed that education should be as “natural” as possible in the sense that educators and parents should allow the child to develop through natural stages. The child’s teachers should study the child in order to see what to teach him for he “must remain in absolute ignorance of ideas of that estate which are not within his reach” (p. 178). The curriculum would thus be formed according to the child’s abilities.

Dewey (1916) developed his theory from these earlier thinkers. His central argument was that, “education is a social process” (p. 99): students develop through experiences in their society and environment. For Dewey “experiences” meant real, day-to-day activities. Education should, thus, be composed of life-like experiences that were relevant and engaging. Students were to be actively doing in order to learn; facts were to be used by discovering students as they worked together with other students. The teacher was responsible for providing the right environment and guiding students’ learning through reflective discussions.

As the curriculum emerged from living experiences, it was interdisciplinary and developed according to students’ interests. Geography and History, defined as a “study of social life” (Dewey, 1916, p. 247), for example, provided supporting facts and knowledge for understanding humans, as students were involved in activities that were purposeful, “until pupils have arrived at a knowledge of some fundamental principles by understanding them in their familiar practical workings...the important thing is that the fact be grasped in its social connections—its functions in life” (p. 170). History should be made relevant to the present: “past events cannot be separated from the living present and retain meaning. The true starting point of history is always some present situation with its problems” (p. 253). The following scenario illustrates how a class might be taught using this frame:

Mr. Levit reviews the student permission forms. Good they have all been received and are completed correctly. He motions to the students chatting excitedly to follow him. They walk through the school hallways and out of the school to the nearby bus stop. They take the bus down to City Hall. Students huddle together in small groups reviewing their speeches with each other. They look nervous and proud. The teacher reflects over the last few months of work. The initiative began after a class discussion where students were asked to contribute their ideas as to a possible class project. One student mentioned how he walked to school each day beside a small stream void of life, and that one day he had seen a dead fish, belly up, floating in the water. He wondered what had happened to the stream. A few students weren’t excited about the topic but others began to voice their theories as to the reasons why. Others began to get interested once the discussion turned to possibly unjust actions committed by a local company. After a little more discussion, students agreed to investigate the stream as their grade project. The teacher linked together with other teachers to create an interdisciplinary project. Over the next few weeks, students walked along and explored the river in P.E. class, dissected dead fish and other creatures, finding cancerous tumours and other growths, in Biology, identified chemicals in the water and their characteristics, estimated the volume and quantity of water...
flows in Math, explored the current and historical land use of the region and city policies and government in Social Studies, and wrote speeches in English classes, once they had identified their theories as to the causes of the dead stream and their recommendations. Today, the students were making their speeches at City Hall. At City Hall, many students eyes widened as they took in the elegant foyer with its vaulted ceilings; they understood power. They looked at each other. They walked into the city council meeting. They were prepared as to what to expect. They were introduced to the government officials, and then they made their speeches. Some of the students’ speeches were so well written and well informed they had been published in the local newspaper the week before. Consequently, local community members had dropped in to listen to the students. Many were moved by the environmental destruction quietly unleashed on an unsuspecting community, destruction harmful to all, including local residents. After the speeches, the city thanked the students and promised an investigation into the matter. They also voted a fund of $1,000 to the students for their continued care in repairing the stream and its habitat. On the bus back to the school, students reflected on the experience. Many stated it was life changing and made school real to them for the first time in their lives. “Hey teach,” one said, “thanks.”

This vignette illustrates a real-world, student-based, experiential approach to learning through a problem-solving, inquiry-based pedagogy. The orientation matches learners who have body-kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, linguistic, visual-spatial and logical-mathematical intelligences (Gardner, 1983).

Table 3
Summary of the Key Features of the Progressivist Frame

| Core: Real world problems or experiences |
| View of Knowledge: Developed through student-based activities |
| Aim: Cultivating citizens who foster a continually improving democratic society |
| Teacher: Guide and mentor |
| Methods: inquiry based, student-based discovery/experiential learning, interdisciplinary |
| View of student: all students have potential to learn when learning is made relevant |

Reconstructionist

Theorists, including Foucault, Freire, Apple, and Pinar, view education as a process of individual and social transformation. They argue that education has been used to “indoctrinate” individuals to social norms. Knowledge is thus viewed with suspicion, as particular individuals with vested interests create it in order to maintain their power. Knowledge is viewed as a social construct framed within larger discourses that structure meaning, and is argued to be power (Foucault, 2006). Discourses can be made visible, and their meaning discovered by looking at alternatives. Power exists implicitly in all social relationships. It is maintained in modern societies through the establishment of norms against which behaviour is judged, the use of administrative records, and surveillance techniques, such as “visability,” that lead individuals to regulate themselves. A key methodology for education in this frame is reflexive questioning of ourselves and society. Possible methods include critically deconstructing historical texts, presenting multiple accounts of historical events, using dialogical discussions of the meaning...
and methods of maintaining “power” and exploring issues in order to develop students’ critical thinking.

Freire (2000), for example, aims to empower the “oppressed” through a liberating curriculum. Educators and students co-construct this curriculum, and reflective dialogue develops individuals’ awareness of their embeddedness in unjust conditions that perpetuate inequality. Pedagogies include “problem posing” and “critical questioning.” The following scenario illustrates how a class might be taught using this frame:

_Students enter the classroom in a relaxed and casual manner—the same atmosphere that pervades the classroom. Some of them head over to the tea center and help themselves to a cup of tea, or drop off some more tea (Ms. Mei never has to add any more supplies). Then, the students sit in a circle. The walls are decorated with posters from Amnesty International and other aid organizations dramatically illustrating human rights abuses; other posters show a number of well known change advocates, from Gandhi to Che, and inspiring quotes. The students have been exploring varying concepts associated with poverty among different social groups and political parties. The students are familiar with the various political platforms of mainstream and alternative parties. “Hi everyone,” the teacher says informally. “Today, I am going to ask you to share the findings of your interviews on what poverty means. Before, we start though, let’s remind ourselves of the different political parties and their platforms.”_

After a few minutes reviewing these ideas in an informal but highly respectful manner, the teacher asks the students to begin sharing the findings of their interviews. Students describe their interviews with a vast spectrum of individuals: some question what poverty itself means and how it is defined, others tend to view poverty as a consequence of poor choice or lack of ambition or effort. Yet other people describe the hurdles and challenges the poor face. Students listen to each other quietly, respectfully, and thoughtfully. Then, the class discusses the general significance of the findings and relates them back to political perspectives. Students gain insights into the situated nature of knowledge and perspective. As a concluding activity, Ms Mei asks students to pull out their original statements on poverty, to read them over, and to reflect on whether their thoughts have changed. As the bell rings, one student asks, “Ms Mei, what can I do to help?”

This final vignette demonstrates that learning through a critical pedagogy is based on critical questioning society’s structures and aims to transform students’ understanding. The learning environment atmosphere is informal yet supportive of students’ engagement in the process of critical self-reflection. This orientation supports learners with body-kinesthetic, linguistic, intrapersonal, interpersonal, and logical-mathematical intelligences.

_Table 4_

**Summary of the Key Features of the Reconstructionist Frame**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core: critical questioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>View of Knowledge: Constructed and used to maintain power inequalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim: Transforming society to be more socially just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher: Teacher as student; student as teacher; co-investigators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods: multiple texts/stories, exploring issues, debates and discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of student: all students have potential to learn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The four frames are summarized in the following diagram. Figure 1 illustrates that the Classical and Essentialist lenses are found on the right side of the spectrum, as they focus on socialization into current social structures and give knowledge a key role. Progressivism and Reconstructionism are found further left on the spectrum as they aim to modify society and place less emphasis on knowledge-learning and more on student-based activities.

**Figure One.** Summary of varying philosophic orientations.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

The history of social studies illustrates that varied constructions of the subject exist (Evans, 2004). These variations emerge from the open and interpretive nature of the original committee report (The Social Studies in Secondary Education) that argued for the establishment of social studies. The document was a compromise of the various perspectives of its committee members (Watras, 2003). The four major orientations to social studies are underlain by different philosophies of education, and range from those that focus more on knowledge acquisition and maintaining the status quo to those that are highly suspicious of knowledge and aim to transform society.

Is one of these orientations better than the others? Is one the “right” way to teach social studies? The history of social studies illustrates that scholars will often argue strongly that one of these orientations is better than the others. I, however, disagree and argue that all
of the orientations to social studies, when well taught and when philosophically rooted and not simplified to a negative stereotype such as “traditionalism,” are effective and valuable ways of teaching the subject.

Teachers should be introduced to these varying orientations and should be able to choose the one that best matches their practice. Having a variety of conceptions of social studies is a strength, as teachers can choose the orientation that best fits their practice and beliefs about teaching, thus leading to more authenticity in teaching. Further, students’ learning is enriched by having teachers who have varied perspectives and methods.

The teaching vignettes illustrate how varied classes could be, and Table 5 presents more examples of how methods will differ. Openness to diverse perspectives of social studies is fitting for a pluralistic democracy in which varying positions and viewpoints are embraced. It illustrates the valuation of this principle in practice. If students are exposed to different perspectives and methods of teaching and they are guided through reflection, they can come to develop their own unique perspectives on the meaning and processes of learning, social studies and citizenship. Their exposure to diverse viewpoints provides openings to new perspectives and develops respectfulness to a variety of positions and viewpoints. This enriches society overall. The original committee members of the 1916 Social Studies Committee were smarter than many of us realize.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varying Orientations to Social Studies and their Associated Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perennialism/Classic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Plato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook (SQR3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socratic Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q and A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductive and Deductive work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Preparing Secondary Social Studies Teacher Candidates To Address Common Core State Standards and the C3 Framework With Diverse Learners

Gayle Y. Thieman & Susan J. Lenski

This study investigates the relationship between the literacy strategies used by social studies teacher candidates, the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies (CCSS), and the College, Career and Civic Life (C3) Framework. In an initial study the authors discovered that teacher candidates (TCs) in high-poverty schools tended to teach lower-level literacy strategies. We also explored the differences between TCs who were identified as using more high-level literacy strategies and those who used lower-level strategies. This follow-up study examines the work samples of six secondary social studies TCs in high poverty schools to understand the degree to which the literacy strategies they used address the CCSS and the C3 Framework. Using a cross case analysis, findings suggested that TCs who used CCSS literacy strategies and addressed the C3 Framework demonstrated skill in using increasingly complex literacy strategies, organized their instruction around compelling questions, and taught social studies through an inquiry perspective.

Introduction

Once relegated to language arts classes, literacy instruction is now a major component of core academic classes in many secondary schools. In the last decade the consensus has been that if students are to be prepared for college, career and civic life, they need to develop advanced literacy skills to master the cognitive demands of math, science, language arts, and social studies (Heller & Greenleaf, 2007). According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), however, reading scores remain low with only modest increases in the last decade for eighth grade students (NCES, 2013a). The most recent NAEP reading scores indicate that while the achievement gap across racial and socio-economic groups continues, Black, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander students have made higher gains overall than white students since 1992, and the achievement gap is narrowing somewhat (NCES, 2013a).

Compared to national results, the average eighth-grade reading scores remained stagnant in the state where this study is being conducted; only 37% scored at or above proficient which is slightly higher than 2011 but not significantly different than 1998 scores. Moreover, the performance gap across racial and socio-economic groups has not significantly improved since 1998 (NCES, 2013b).

Nationally, improvement in middle school reading scores is not seen at the high school level. NAEP reading results for twelfth-graders nationally declined over the last ten years; only 38% of students performed at or above Proficient in reading in 2013, while the percentage of
The score gap between black and white students increased, and no racial/ethnic gaps narrowed (National Assessment Governing Board, 2013). Similarly, white students and students not eligible for free or reduced lunch were among those who scored better than their counterparts on the NAEP 2010 civics test (NCES, 2011).

**Literacy in Social Studies**

Reports such as these spurred a renewed national focus on adolescent literacy, and many teacher preparation programs now require secondary teacher candidates (TCs) to take a content area literacy course that typically consists of teaching generic literacy strategies, assumed to be applicable across disciplines. However, experts suggest literacy strategies should be used with authentic texts and lessons within specific disciplines (Alvermann, 2002), and secondary educators are calling for disciplinary literacy instruction (Draper, Broomhead, Jensen, & Sibert, 2010; Moje, 2008; NCSS, 2010). Shanahan and Shanahan (2008) assert learning to read disciplinary texts requires high-level skills that must be explicitly taught. Furthermore, teachers need to incorporate multiple literacy tools including digital texts to build bridges from students’ lives to academic content (Sheridan-Thomas, 2007; Walker & Bean, 2005); this is especially important for struggling readers and writers. However, according to the International Reading Association (2012) “many content area teachers continue to feel ill prepared to support the literacy demands within their discipline” (p. 4).

Specialists in social studies suggest that students need to have a grasp of discipline-based literacy strategies to become proficient readers and consumers of social studies (Thieman & Altoff, 2008; Nokes, 2010). In a report on academic literacy, Lee and Spratley (2010) list the kinds of discipline-specific literacy strategies that students use in social studies. They include:

- building prior knowledge,
- building vocabulary,
- using knowledge of text structures and genres to predict main ideas,
- posing relevant questions,
- comparing claims across texts, and
- evaluating evidence.

The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS, 2010) also suggests literacy strategies that are most helpful before reading (making predictions, identifying text features), during reading (drawing non-linguistic representations, developing questions, identifying unfamiliar concepts, using graphic organizers), and after reading (summarizing and note taking, comparing information with other students).

**Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies**

The thinking about disciplinary literacy influenced the work of the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers as they developed the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) (Shanahan, personal communication). The CCSS include specific standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies for grades 6-12 and are predicated on content area teachers “using their expertise to help students meet reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language” expectations in social studies. (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010, p. 4).
3). The History/Social Studies standards are organized around anchor standards for reading and writing, but their content is similar to the recommendations from the NCSS which focuses on understanding text structure in order to identify central ideas and evidence to support a position (NGA & CCSSO, 2010).

The CCSS for Literacy in History/Social Studies were adopted in 2010 by the state in which this research was conducted. Expectations for reading are organized into four anchor standards: key ideas and details, craft and structure, integration of knowledge and ideas, and range of reading and level of complexity (see Appendix A for the detailed standards). Similarly writing expectations are organized into four anchor standards: text types and purposes, production and distribution of writing, research to build and present knowledge, and range of writing (see Appendix B for the detailed standards).

**College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies State Standards**

The social studies community initially viewed the development of the CCSS for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies (CCSS) with some apprehension. Fearing that CCSS might “make the English Language Arts Standards the de facto standards for social studies,” (NCSS, 2013, p. xi) the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) joined with the Civic Mission of Schools (CMS) and fifteen other professional social studies organizations to draft the College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies State Standards. They developed a working definition of social studies that acknowledged the role of literacy education:

The social studies is an interdisciplinary exploration of the social sciences and humanities, including civics, economics, geography, and history, in order to develop responsible, informed and engaged citizens and to foster civic, economic, global, and historical literacy. (NCSS, 2013, p. xii)

The C3 Framework focuses on instructional planning via an “Inquiry Arc” that features four dimensions of instructional strategies (NCSS, 2013, p. xvii):

1. developing compelling questions and planning inquiries
2. applying disciplinary content and tools
3. evaluating multiple sources and using evidence
4. communicating conclusions and taking informed action

The C3 Framework also builds on the CCSS by emphasizing literacy to support inquiry and disciplinary understanding. Inquiry literacy includes questioning, evaluating sources, using evidence to construct and present arguments and explanations, analyzing problems, and taking informed action. Disciplinary literacy focuses on specific skills of citizenship, economics, geography, and history.

**Depth of Knowledge**

The CCSS standards and C3 Framework instructional strategies can be identified as applying to different levels of literacy thinking. In a previous study (Lenski & Thieman, 2013), we decided to characterize the literacy strategies, used by the TCs in our research, by identifying the Depth of Knowledge (DOK) level for each literacy activity (Webb, 2002; 2007). DOK has been used as an alternative to Bloom’s taxonomy and as a way to connect standards and assessments (Herman, Webb, & Zunia, 2007).

DOK describes the cognitive complexity of intellectual tasks, considering both the depth of content understanding, and the scope of the learning activity. Level 1 (Recall/Reproduction)
asks students to identify, list, define or recall information such as who, what, when, and where. Level 2 (Skills and Concepts/Basic Reasoning) requires students to compare or contrast, classify, describe, interpret or explain issues or consider cause and effect. Level 3 (Strategic Thinking/Complex Reasoning) requires the use of evidence in drawing conclusions, applying concepts to new situations, solving problems, analyzing similarities and differences, or making connections across time and place. Level 4 (Extending Thinking/Reasoning) requires students to analyze, synthesize information from multiple sources, consider alternative perspectives across time and place, make decisions, plan and develop solutions.

**Work Samples (WS) in Teacher Education**

The WS is a tool for learning and understanding what teacher candidates know and can do. It was developed as a way for teacher candidates to develop units of study that focus on student learning. WS methodology enables TCs to examine ways in which they can connect teaching and learning and is currently being implemented in many teacher preparation programs (Henning, Kohler, Wilson, & Robinson, 2009). Research indicates that WSs are both a mirror and a window into teacher candidate’s thinking (Devlin-Scherer, Burroughs, Daly, & McCartan, 2007). Although WS research has focused mostly on its effects on student learning, the state in which this study was conducted requires all teacher candidates to document “purposeful attention to literacy in instruction” in each work sample (Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, 2013)

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between the content literacy strategies our TCs provide their students and the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies (CCSS), and the College, Career and Civic Life (C3) Framework. Specifically this study investigates:

1. What levels of literacy activities do six social studies TCs use with linguistically and culturally diverse students in high-poverty schools?
2. What is the relationship between these literacy strategies and the CCSS standards and C3 Framework?
3. What characterizes the TCs whose literacy strategies address the CCSS standards and C3 Framework?

**Methodology**

The study design is a qualitative document analysis (Altheide, Coyle, DeVriese, & Schneider, 2010). Two researchers in a large urban university in the Pacific Northwest conducted this study.

**Context**

All of the data are from a graduate teacher education program that emphasizes a critical constructivist and social justice orientation to curriculum and instruction. The program’s vision statement emphasizes diversity, inclusiveness, equity, and social justice. Teacher candidates take required coursework that emphasizes principles and practices of multicultural education, investigates developmental needs of secondary students and effective instructional practices, and teaches instructional planning and content area reading strategies. Social studies TCs take social studies methods coursework that emphasizes differentiation and literacy strategies to
meet secondary students’ needs, specific discipline-based reading strategies and technologies to support multiple literacies, and investigation in social studies disciplines.

As part of the documentation of teaching competency all teacher candidates complete two WSs during Student Teaching. In this follow-up study, we examined six full-time Student Teaching II social studies WSs representing high poverty, ethnically diverse classrooms.

Participants

The six participants for this study were drawn from a larger data set of 27 work samples from 21 teacher candidates who gave us permission to use their WSs as data. For this follow-up study, we selected TCs who were teaching ethnically and linguistically diverse students in high-poverty schools and decided to use a contrastive sample (Maxwell, 2013, p. 98) of six sets of data that indicated higher and lower levels of literacy strategies.

Data Sources

We used five sections from the WSs as primary data sources: a) the school and classroom context such as class size; students’ gender, racial, ethnic, and linguistic diversity; poverty level; and student exceptionalities, b) the lesson plans, c) TC-created instructional materials, d) TC reflections on lessons, and e) a section titled, “Attention to Literacy” which summarized the way the teacher candidates used literacy in their WS. These sections were not written at the same time, and we considered them documents in action (Prior, 2010). The lesson plans and instructional materials were developed first; the reflections were written after each lesson; and the section summarizing literacy was written after the WS was taught. We used school and classroom context as background to contextualize the lessons during data analysis.

Data Analysis

Consistent with emergent qualitative document analysis (Altheide et al., 2010), we kept our analysis flexible as we read the data. To answer the first research question about the level of literacy activities used by the six TCs, we first identified the DOK level (Webb, 2007) of each strategy that we encountered. We developed a chart to guide us in this initial coding (see Table 1) listing the literacy activity and identifying whether the activity could be characterized as DOK level 1 (recall), 2 (skill/concepts), 3 (strategic thinking), or 4 (extended thinking). We then developed a “literacy strategy profile” for each WS, using the analysis of DOK levels to examine literacy strategies in context and to see how TCs scaffolded literacy instruction.

Next, we developed a matrix (see Table 2) that showed the classroom contexts and the levels of literacy strategies for each of the WSs and decided to focus on the six WSs that showed the greatest contrast between higher and lower level literacy strategies. We used the literacy profiles, the matrix, and the raw data to write a case for each of the data sets. Each case was a rich description of ways each TC used literacy in the WS (Hancock & Algozzine, 2011).

To answer the second question about the relationship between the TC’s strategies and the CCSS standards and C3 Framework, we created a crosswalk between the CCSS Standards and C3 Framework and the literacy strategies we noted in each of the six work samples (see Table 3). Finally, to answer the third research question we used a collective case study approach (Creswell, 2013) to compare across the six cases to find similarities and differences among the data sets.
Contexts of Six Cases

The contexts of the TCs varied tremendously but all six were in high-poverty schools (free/reduced lunch ranging from 41% to 53%) with high levels of ethnic and linguistic diversity ranging from 21% to 62% of the students in the class. The following are descriptions of the school contexts.

Ted (all names are pseudonyms) taught in a diverse, low-income urban middle school. In the past decade Handsen Middle School overcame its longstanding reputation of low academic achievement and high rates of student delinquency. Ted’s work sample class of 33 eighth graders included equal numbers of students receiving Talented and Gifted and special education services (six) but only one student identified as ESL.

James taught at Charter High School located in a low-income suburb. James described the community: “There is a significant immigrant population [who work as migrant labor]. The area is largely middle class, religious, and blue collar.” The school had not met benchmarks in reading and writing in the past several years. James taught his work sample to 30 students; twelve represented ethnically diverse students and four received academic support services.

Chuck taught at Mason Alternative High School, located in a large suburb. Mason is a part of the Coalition of Essential Schools, a national network working on restructuring and redesigning schools to foster student achievement. Chuck taught in a full-day program for thirteen students in grades 11 and 12 who were finding little success in school. Over half the students qualified for free and reduced lunch, and the same proportion received special education services.

Sheila taught her WS at Plainfield High School, a majority minority, high poverty high school located in a suburb of the metropolitan area. Historically the area was a relatively homogeneous blue-collar white community. However, as inner-city neighborhoods experienced gentrification, minority populations moved further out, contributing to the neighborhood’s current demographic diversity. Sheila taught an honors global studies course to 29 sophomores, including students who were once identified as ELL students but had exited the program, and Sheila expected they “read and wrote at a high level.” [WS Context]

Lily taught in the same high poverty and diverse suburban school where Sheila student taught. Lily commented, “The relatively transient nature of the community, resulting primarily from the low socio-economic status of the residents, created challenges in the classroom.” [WS Context] She taught her work sample to 35 eleventh and twelfth grade students. According to Lily many students were recent immigrants; six students were designated as ELL; three of the four students who received special education services read at the third grade level.

Ashley student taught at Bethel High School, a public magnet school in an urban school district. Bethel is a career/technical school and at the time of this study, served a majority minority population. Almost half the students received free or reduced lunch, and the graduation rate was 63%. Ashley did not provide any information about her classroom context but we believe it reflected the school as a whole.

Findings

Levels of Literacy Strategies

Our first research question asked: What levels of literacy activities do six social studies TCs use with students in high-poverty schools? We found a great variety of lower and higher-
level literacy strategies summarized in Table 2. Ted, James, and Chuck evidenced a higher than average combined percentage of Level 3 and 4 literacy strategies (ranging from 40%-46%) than those of Sheila, Lily, and Ashley (ranging from 10%-22%). DOK Level 3 involves strategic thinking/complex reasoning. The secondary students used a variety of graphic organizers, compared and evaluated evidence across a variety of primary sources as they developed historical arguments and drew conclusions. DOK Level 4 involves extended thinking/reasoning; the secondary students made connections between current events, social issues, and personal experiences in their analyses and critiques.

**Relationship between literacy strategies and CCSS standards and C3 Framework**

Table 3 helped us visualize the second research question about the relationship between the literacy strategies used by the TCs and the CCSS standards and C3 Framework. Virtually all of the CCSS reading (Appendix A) and writing standards (Appendix B) were addressed by at least three of the TCs in their work samples. For example reading CCSS 1 and 2 (close reading, determining central ideas of a text, and citing textual evidence) were evident as TC’s taught their students to identify patterns and themes, develop hypotheses, and make predictions. Reading standard seven (integrating and evaluating text in diverse formats and media) was frequently apparent as students analyzed political cartoons, paintings, photos, maps, charts, graphs, timelines, historical quotes, and news headlines. TCs taught their students to write argumentative, informative, and narrative text (CCSS 1, 2, 3) via position statements, expository letters, research reports, and fictional diaries. Writing standard 10 was evident in all the work samples as TCs taught students to write extended essays as well as graphic organizers, journal prompts, and Cornell notes.

TCs also addressed the CCSS speaking standards (Appendix C) through partner, small group, and whole class discussion and teaching students to present information orally and visually. All of the TCs addressed CCSS vocabulary standard 6 (Appendix D) and taught the academic language embedded in the unit.

Finally the C3 Framework was evident in three areas: developing and asking compelling questions, building students’ prior knowledge, and developing real world connections between the subject matter and students’ lives.

**Characteristics of TCs whose literacy strategies addressed CCSS and C3 Framework**

We used the findings from the first research question to organize our findings for the third research question: What characterizes the TCs whose literacy strategies address the CCSS standards and C3 Framework? We relied on cross-case analysis to answer this question. TCs who most often used CCSS literacy strategies and addressed the C3 Framework demonstrated skill in using increasingly complex literacy strategies, organized their instruction around compelling questions, and taught social studies through an inquiry perspective.

**Skill in Using Increasingly Complex Literacy Strategies**

We initially used the DOK levels as an organizing structure for levels of literacy strategies because our original analysis predated the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The kinds of literacy strategies we analyzed, however, are subsumed in the Literacy Standards for History/Social Studies 6-12. To that end, we looked at ways TCs taught students how to access prior knowledge, increase vocabulary, use higher order thinking skills, develop graphic organizers, write summaries, and make connections.
Readers use prior knowledge to help them understand written text; accessing and building prior knowledge are essential strategies for learning. Ted and Sheila used journal prompts to ask students to share their prior knowledge and opinions on a topic. James specifically taught background knowledge about human rights and social justice to help his students understand these complex topics. Chuck used a film to provide background knowledge on anarchy and help his students understand the need for a social contract.

All six teacher candidates taught key vocabulary; however, three challenged their students to go beyond defining terms. James and Chuck’s students used context clues to determine word meaning, and Ted’s students drew pictures to represent the vocabulary. Four of the six teacher candidates provided opportunities for students to make predictions and develop hypotheses based on their reading. For example Sheila’s students analyzed maps of the Middle East and predicted political issues involving Palestinian and Israeli conflict over territory.

Ted, James, Chuck, and Sheila posed relevant and compelling higher order thinking questions in their lessons that challenged students to think critically. For example, in his unit on the civil rights movement Jeff asked students to develop their own philosophy of nonviolence and decide how the use of nonviolence promotes social justice. Chuck asked students to draw conclusions on why the Bill of Rights was necessary to ensure passage of the Constitution and to hypothesize what would happen without these amendments. Similarly Ted, James, Chuck, and Sheila asked their students to evaluate, cite, and compare evidence across texts while Lily and Ashley did not include these literacy strategies.

Graphic organizers were a frequent method of supporting student note-taking while listening to a lecture, multimedia presentation, or reading. Ted incorporated word webs, Venn diagrams, T-charts, and a protocol for analyzing primary sources. James engaged students in constructing a timeline; Chuck also used a document analysis protocol; Sheila created an artifact comparison chart; and Ashley’s students completed a KWL.

Each of the teacher candidates engaged their students to some degree in summarizing information through note-taking and identifying patterns such as compare/contrast or cause/effect. Ted and Sheila taught students to take Cornell notes and then formulate a written opinion. For example Sheila’s students developed an argument about the Palestinian/Israeli conflict. James’ students read a series of articles, noting key events and how each historical figure influenced the Civil Rights movement and created a timeline.

All of the teacher candidates understood the need to build connections between the subject matter and students’ interests. Tyler integrated current reform movements throughout his unit on the Antebellum period; James’ students examined statistics on current local and national school segregation and attitudes regarding undocumented immigrants and LGBTQ issues. Chuck asked students to relate anarchy in the novel, Lord of the Flies, to their personal experiences of bullying. Lily’s students wrote in their journals about the “generation gap” and compared stereotypes of women in the 1920’s to stereotypes of teenagers today.

Finally, we traced the progression of DOK levels from one to four within the same lesson sequence recognizing that literacy strategies should be scaffolded from simpler to more complex through the unit. Again, TCs who addressed CCSS and C3 Framework were more skillful. Ted excelled in scaffolding his eight grade students through exploration of an issue, noting multiple solutions, creating solutions and then synthesizing and communicating their learning. Similarly James led his students to define, summarize, interpret, compare, draw
conclusions, cite evidence and synthesize their knowledge of the Civil Rights Movement. Chuck’s students summarized, interpreted, compared and then developed a logical argument. Sheila also taught her students to gather information, evaluate web sources, and write a position statement.

**Skill in Organizing Instruction around Compelling Questions**

As part of the social studies methods courses, the TCs were taught to use principles of backwards-curriculum design (McTighe & Wiggins, 2013) with curriculum framing questions, including a unit essential question that focused instruction on the big ideas and key concepts of the unit. We found a variety of ways the TCs organized their instruction around essential questions or “compelling questions” to use the C3 Framework nomenclature.

The three TCs (Ted, James, and Chuck) whose literacy strategies addressed the CCSS and C3 Framework also had the most conceptual essential questions. For example, James taught a unit on the American civil rights movement; his curriculum framing questions connected students to larger ideas than simply learning historical facts, indicating a constructivist view of teaching history. James’s essential question was “How can we ensure social justice for everyone?” Using this question as a guide, James wanted to help students understand “contemporary definitions of rights” and move students to understand the American civil rights movement in the context of rights and social justice and to have students apply these ideas to current social issues. James used primary documents such as the U.S. Constitution and the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights as the basis for teaching the civil rights movement. He also wanted students to understand how post-civil rights decades still have “prejudice and oppression” “based on race, sex, sexual orientation, nationality, etc.” [WS: Rationale]

Developing a strong essential question did not necessarily mean that the TCs infused the question throughout the unit. However, the TCs whose literacy strategies addressed the CCSS and C3 Framework referred to their essential question throughout the unit. For example, Chuck’s students examined, “How do governments balance power?” and he reflected: As students begin to understand this dynamic they begin to formulate a more nuanced understanding of their own rights and responsibilities, in turn creating more agile and responsible citizens.” [Work Sample: Rationale]

**Skill in Supporting Inquiry**

When analyzing qualitative data, it is illuminating to understand the participants’ theoretical viewpoints. According to Maxwell (2013) when a researcher tries to understand a participant’s actions, “any attempt to interpret or explain the participant’s actions without taking account of their actual beliefs, values and theories is probably fruitless” (p. 52). Therefore, we searched the data to get an understanding of the ways the TCs viewed inquiry.

One of the prerequisites for social studies inquiry is to read primary sources. We found that all of the teacher candidates incorporated primary source analysis into their WSs. However, how they used the documents differed. Ted, James, and Chuck explicitly taught methods of inquiry. Ted’s eighth grade students interpreted political cartoons, paintings, map, charts, graphs, timelines, and analyzed quotes from former slaves. James and Chuck asked their high school students to interpret, compare and draw conclusions from their reading of excerpts from the Constitution, Supreme Court decisions, and Declaration of Independence. To prepare
for a debate on territorial conflict between Israel and Palestine. Sheila’s students conducted library research with a variety of primary and secondary sources.

**Conclusions and Implications**

We concluded from our study that TCs are incorporating literacy strategies in social studies teaching that address the CCSS and C3 Framework. That was the good news. However, there were wide differences in ways TCs taught higher-level literacy strategies, especially in high-poverty schools. We identified three skills of TCs who used a preponderance of literacy strategies: organizing instruction around compelling questions, supporting inquiry, and using increasingly complex literacy strategies. These conclusions lead us to several plans for change.

Based on our findings we realize that our instruction in social studies literacy strategies has just scratched the surface. We have been successful in helping TCs incorporate literacy strategies, but not in helping all TCs incorporate the full range of the Common Core State Standards or the College, Career and Civic Life (C3) Framework. We need to teach our TCs how to scaffold instruction from lower-levels of thinking to higher-levels within a unit of study. We also need to help TCs identify their own views of social studies inquiry and help them expend those views when necessary. We find we have been successful in helping TCs develop compelling questions, but now we need to help them infuse the questions throughout a unit of study. We also plan on continuing to work with TCs to move students to higher-levels of thinking through literacy strategies in a series of lessons.

We believe that this study has opened our eyes to the next steps we need to take to help our social studies TCs become stronger teachers in general and also to help them become more responsive to the needs of students in high-poverty schools. Since this research study was completed, the graduate teacher education program has revised the secondary program to include additional coursework in literacy for diverse students and English Learners and clarified WS requirements to include compelling questions and explicit literacy strategies in all lesson plans.

**Limitations**

One of the limitations of relying on participant-created documents as the only source of evidence is there is less opportunity to triangulate data. While the lesson plan may indicate the amount of time for a given literacy activity, without direct observation the researcher cannot objectively confirm whether and how the literacy strategy was implemented. We did read the lesson reflections and often teacher candidates commented on the effectiveness of implementing various literacy strategies. Also the “Attention to Literacy” section of the work sample highlighted literacy strategies that TCs used in the lesson plans. We are developing ways to provide confirmatory evidence including teacher candidates’ videotapes of teaching and analysis of literacy strategies as well as observations of student teaching lessons by university supervisors.
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Table 1
*Literacy Strategies and Depth of Knowledge Levels*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Literacy Terms</th>
<th>Depth of Knowledge (DOK) Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Define vocabulary</td>
<td>I Recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label Maps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall Information</td>
<td>I Recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause/Effect</td>
<td>II Skill/Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare/Contrast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predict</td>
<td>II Skill/Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Patterns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence/Chronology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Argument</td>
<td>III Strategic Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draw Conclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>III Strategic Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply Concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cite Evidence</td>
<td>IV Extended Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Maps or Models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
<td>IV Extended Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Classroom Contexts and Literacy Strategies for Work Sample II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Ethnic diversity</th>
<th>Poverty</th>
<th>ELL</th>
<th>IEP</th>
<th>TAG</th>
<th>% Level I Strategies</th>
<th>% Level II Strategies</th>
<th>% Level III Strategies</th>
<th>% Level IV Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Handsen MS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>US History</td>
<td>21% 41%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Charter HS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>US History</td>
<td>40% 48%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Mason Alternative HS</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>US Govern</td>
<td>23% 53%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Plainfield HS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Honors, Global</td>
<td>53% 50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily</td>
<td>Plainfield HS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>US History</td>
<td>53% 50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Bethel HS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Global Studies</td>
<td>62% 45%</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3  
*Teacher Candidate Use of Literacy Strategies, Common Core Standards and C3 Framework*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Description of Literacy Strategies Used by TCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read 1</td>
<td>Read closely</td>
<td>develop hypotheses/ make predictions; cite text evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read 2</td>
<td>Determine ideas</td>
<td>Identify patterns &amp; themes; compare/contrast; cause/effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read 3</td>
<td>Analyze text</td>
<td>Analyze key ideas US Constitution, Supreme Court decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read 4</td>
<td>Interpret words</td>
<td>Interpret excerpts from key political documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read 5</td>
<td>Interpret text structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read 6</td>
<td>Assess point of view</td>
<td>Primary source analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read 7</td>
<td>Evaluate media</td>
<td>Political cartoons, paintings, photos, maps, charts, graphs, timelines, historical quotes, news headlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read 8</td>
<td>Evaluate argument</td>
<td>Identify claims and counter claims in text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read 9</td>
<td>Analyze multiple</td>
<td>Evaluate, cite, compare evidence across texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read 10</td>
<td>Read complex text</td>
<td>Documents, oral histories, diaries,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write 1</td>
<td>Write arguments</td>
<td>Debate prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write 2</td>
<td>Write informative text</td>
<td>Position statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write 3</td>
<td>Write narrative</td>
<td>Story quilt, fictional diaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write 4</td>
<td>Write coherently</td>
<td>Position statement, timeline, expository letter, research report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write 5</td>
<td>Plan, revise edit</td>
<td>Peer editing and revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write 6</td>
<td>Use technology</td>
<td>Word document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write 7</td>
<td>Research project</td>
<td>Document based questions, web quest. debate prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write 8</td>
<td>Multiple sources</td>
<td>Document based questions, web quest, debate prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write 9</td>
<td>Use evidence</td>
<td>Document based questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write 10</td>
<td>Write routinely</td>
<td>Essays, graphic organizers (word-webs, Venn diagrams, T-charts, SOAPS protocol, timeline, journal prompt, Cornell notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak 1</td>
<td>Discuss, collaborate</td>
<td>Partner, small group, whole class discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak 2</td>
<td>Diverse Media</td>
<td>Documentary film, digital audio files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak 3</td>
<td>Evaluate point of view</td>
<td>Documentary film, newscasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak 4</td>
<td>Present info</td>
<td>Oral presentation, Debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak 5</td>
<td>Digital Media</td>
<td>Create multimedia presentation, newscast, Facebook page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak 6</td>
<td>Adapt speech</td>
<td>Debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocab 6</td>
<td>Use academic language</td>
<td>Define terms, visualize, use context clues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Frame</td>
<td>Compelling questions</td>
<td>Essential questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Frame</td>
<td>Build prior knowledge</td>
<td>Film, role play, novel, journal prompts, hypothetical scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Frame</td>
<td>Connect student /subject</td>
<td>Develop real world connections to subject matter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Reading

Key Ideas and Details
1. Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.*
2. Determine central ideas or themes of a text and analyze their development, summarize the key supporting details and ideas. *
3. Analyze how and why individuals, events, or ideas develop and interact over the course of a text. *

Craft and Structure
4. Interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text, determining technical, connotative, and figurative meanings, and analyze how specific word choices shape meaning or tone. *
5. Analyze the structure of texts, including how specific sentences, paragraphs, and larger portions of the text (e.g., a section, chapter, scene, or stanza) relate to each other and the whole. *
6. Assess how point of view or purpose shapes the content and style of a text. *

Integration of Knowledge and Ideas
7. Integrate and evaluate content presented in diverse formats and media, including visually and quantitatively, as well as in words. *
8. Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, including the validity of the reasoning as well as relevance and sufficiency of the evidence. *
9. Analyze how two or more texts address similar themes or topics in order to build knowledge or to compare the approaches the authors take. *

Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity
10. Read and comprehend complex literacy and informational texts independently and proficiently. *

* Referenced by College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework (NCSS, 2013)

Appendix B: College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Writing

Text Types and Purposes
1. Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence. *
2. Write informative/explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content.
3. Write narrative to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, well-chosen details and well-structured event sequences.

1 http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI_ELA Standards. pdf (p. 60)
2 http://www.corestandards.org/assets/CCSSI_ELA Standards. pdf (p. 63)
Production and Distribution of Writing
4. Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose and audience.
5. Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach.
6. Use technology, including the Internet, to produce and publish writing and to interact and collaborate with others.

Research to Build and Present Knowledge
7. Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects based on focused questions, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation. *
8. Gather relevant information from multiple print and digital sources, assess the credibility and accuracy of each source, and integrate the information while avoiding plagiarism. *
9. Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research. *

Range of Writing
10. Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks purposes, and audiences.

* Referenced by College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework (NCSS, 2013)

Appendix C: College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Speaking and Listening

Comprehension and Collaboration
1. Prepare for and participate effectively in a range of conversations and collaborations with diverse partners, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively. *
2. Integrate and evaluate information presented in diverse media and formats, including visually, quantitatively and orally. *
3. Evaluate a speaker’s point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric. *

Presentation of Knowledge and Ideas
4. Present information, findings, and supporting evidence such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning and the organization, development, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. *
5. Make strategic use of digital media and visual displays of data to express information and enhance understanding of presentations. *
6. Adapt speech to a variety of contexts and communicative tasks, demonstrating command of formal English when indicated or appropriate. *

---

Appendix D: College and Career Readiness Anchor Standards for Language

**Vocabulary Acquisition and Use**

6. Acquire and use accurately a range of general academic and domain-specific words and phrases sufficient for reading, writing, speaking, and listening at the college and career readiness level; demonstrate independence in gathering vocabulary knowledge when considering a word or phrase important for comprehension or expression. *

* Referenced by College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework (NCSS, 2013)

---

4 Ibid.
Hands on, Feet Forward:
Learning Basic Map Skills

C. Glennon Rowell & M. Gail Hickey

Education experts agree children should learn essential map and globe skills in the elementary grades. At the same time, there is less agreement about how children best learn these skills. This article describes how four pre-service teachers taught geographic skills to young children through an active, hands-on approach.

There is general agreement on what map and globe skills are important for students in the elementary school to know. Parker (2011) identifies essential map-reading skills (see Table 1). By the time they have completed elementary school, students should be able to “…read, use, and make maps and globes in a way that shows mastery of the four basic map skills of reading direction, reading distance, understanding map legends, and orienting the map to the real world” (Turner, 2004, p. 143). The National Council for the Social Studies curriculum content standards (2010) note elementary students should have experiences …that provide for the study of people, places and environments so that the learner can… construct and use mental maps of locales, regions, and the world that demonstrate understanding of relative location, direction, size, and shape and interpret, use, and distinguish various representations of the earth, such as maps, globes, and photographs.

Other national experts provide important information on vital geographic understandings. Savage and Armstrong (2008) discuss seven basic map and globe skills (see Table 2). Chapin (2013) states that students should be able to identify continents by shape, identify the hemispheres, and be able to compare maps and make inferences.

At the same time that there is general agreement about which map and globe skills are important for students to learn, there also is general agreement that children should learn map and globe skills actively. Welton (2004) points out children should be actively involved in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential map reading skills for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. orient a map and note directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. locate places on map and globe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. use scale and compute distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. interpret map symbols and visualize what they mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. compare maps and make inferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. express relative location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Walter A. Parker, 2011)
learning about maps through map making as opposed to copying existing maps, saying that the latter “…teaches little or nothing about what maps are or the purposes they serve” (p. 370). Maxim (2013) insists students should have direct involvement and concrete experiences in learning about maps and globes. He illustrates initial learning of what maps represent by having students use their milk cartons to make tables (cutting off the top, turning the open end over and cutting parts of each side but leaving enough of each corner to give legs to the table). The students then place each table on a large sheet of cardboard placed on a real table that simulates the classroom. The placement of each milk-carton table represents how students’ desks are arranged in the real classroom. Thus, students learn that location can be represented by symbols as on a real map.

One creative fifth-grade teacher in Texas annually procures pumpkins from a Pumpkin Festival in order for her students to work individually or in pairs to make their own globe, complete with equator, latitude, and longitude. In these instances, students are making, not coloring in certain features of an already-existing representation of a globe (or map) or copying features of a globe (or map) on a flat representation (Welton, 2004). Parker (2011) likewise advocates that students be active in learning map skills, stating that “…early experiences with maps should be kept simple. This can best be done by using diagrams and maps that the teacher and the children make of their immediate environment.” (p.172). Parker also states that a globe should be used alongside maps “to prevent and correct misconceptions.” (p.172).

Where do teachers start? How do they build a foundation for these skills to be developed by the time students have completed elementary school? How do teachers build on the myriad experiential backgrounds of students to develop these skills, thus implementing constructivism that educators see as important (Elkind, 2004; Marlowe and Page, 2005; Maxim, 2013; Zahorik, 1995)? How do teachers make the activities interesting, and at the same time, meaningful enough to carry students into middle school with a sound foundation for using map skills? To help answer these questions, the senior author of this paper asked a group of 15 elementary school pre-service teachers taking their first social studies methods course to do one of the following “hands-on” activities in their elementary school field experience:

1. plot where three news stories (either national or international) occurred and show their location and distance relative to Knoxville, Tennessee.
2. follow three consecutive days of news stories in one locale and graphically
illustrate some of the map skills involved in telling about these events.

3. work with students in getting a better understanding of the earth in terms of major bodies of water and landforms.

4. work with students on building a relief map that shows a region of the world or an entire country while graphically using the major map skills.

5. work with students on researching/presenting a project on customs/features of people from another country, using map skills to show where the people lived.

6. work with students on developing a map of their community, including location of the school, major service agents serving the school, and notable landmarks.

The pre-service teachers were asked to select one activity they could plan and implement that would best demonstrate how they would teach basic map skills to elementary school students while keeping the young students actively engaged in the geographic activity. Since the pre-service teacher were enrolled in their first social studies methodology class, their professor provided several examples of possible activities, including the traditional, although still useful, stretching of yarn between a location on a map and a story mounted close by (for activities numbers 1 and 2); having students make a globe by blowing up a sturdy balloon and placing papier-mâché on it before coloring in major bodies of water and the continents (activity number 3); building a relief map of any substance placed on cardboard that would allow for variations in elevations of landforms (activity number 4); using the internet to learn more about a group of people, including where they live and what they do for a living (activity number 5); and constructing a map on butcher paper that resembles what students know or need to find out about their immediate locale (activity number 6). The pre-service teachers were asked to tie their selected activity to several themes covered in the elementary school preparatory program in which they were enrolled, including individualized instruction, constructivism, interactive engagement of elementary school students, and lesson/unit planning (following the Tennessee state planning model).

The pre-service teachers far surpassed their professor’s expectations for the geographic education assignment, both in the planning and implementing of their chosen activity, although most of the fifteen pre-interns stayed away from the news stories activities (activities 1 and 2) and the activity on customs and features of a chosen group of people (number 5). Four activities* were particularly well-developed, including making a papier-mâché globe (for activity number 3), the making of a map of the community (for activity number 6), using the playground and movement activities for learning cardinal direction (allowed as an activity but not clearly fitting under any one of the six activities in the assignment), and the making of a relief map (for activity number 4). The remainder of this article describes how the pre-service teachers implemented their geographic education projects.

**Making Papier-Mâché Globe**

The pre-service teacher’s activity we describe started with a “Jeopardy” type game where her fourth graders learned (or relearned) a number of terms that would later be used while making their globes. Such terms as continent, ocean, prime meridian, equator, and island
were among the terms learned or relearned. The game was played over a two-day period, primarily during a single period each day devoted to social studies. Maps and globes (including a plastic globe for each table where students worked) were available for students to find the continents, oceans, the North Pole, and other locations taught in the game.

The pre-service teacher then introduced the idea that each student in the class would build his/her own globe. Each student was given a sturdy balloon already blown up. Then students placed papier-mâché (and in some cases, Celluclay) around their balloon. Because the globes were not absolutely round, one end of the balloon had to be placed in a bucket-like cardboard container that the pre-service teacher borrowed from the art room at her school. This steadied the balloon globes so students could more easily work on their projects.

On the third day of the activity when the covered balloons were dry, the painting activity began. The pre-service teacher and her mentor teacher placed sheets of newspaper under each of the tables on which the globes rested, waiting to be colored. Students wore smocks to keep the tempera paint from soiling their clothes. To line up the continents properly, the equator and the prime meridian were first painted on the globes, using a color other than blue that was reserved for the water areas of the globes.

The activity was a huge success. The professor visited the classroom during the time when the fourth graders were putting in the continents on their globes. Young students closely studied the plastic globes placed on their tables, using yarn to measure approximate distance of one continent from another, deciding which ocean touched or encircled each continent, what continents constituted an island, where peninsulas were located, and so on. Students asked questions as they examined their globes, such as “How big is Australia compared to South America?” or “Is North America north of the equator?”

As mentioned, this activity has been around for a number of years, but the value of a student making his/her own globe is beyond description. Students study a globe more closely than they otherwise would, and try to determine location and approximate size of landforms and bodies of water and their proximity to landforms. They note with more purpose directions on a globe and map. They refer to the legends on a map in a way that they might not otherwise do. They learn such concepts as equator, latitude, and longitude in ways that are much more meaningful than memorizing terms for these concepts. And lastly, in the actual making of their own globes, young students take pride in not only how their globes look but how closely they come to placing landforms and bodies of water in the right places.

Making a Map of the Community

The pre-service teacher who worked in a first grade classroom decided to have her students make a map of the community. First graders were encouraged to think of their school as a community during the activity. Other goals included learning how to use a compass rose, and understand the meaning/use of a map legend (referred to as “map key” to maintain consistency with curriculum standards). Introducing the concept of the school as a community with its different places and helpers (examples: school cafeteria and cafeteria worker, respectively) helped set the stage for identifying various parts of the immediate community (example: police station) and the functions performed by people who work there (examples: policeman, policewoman).
Following the first-day activities in which the concepts of map and community were introduced, the first grade students used butcher paper and cutout drawings to begin their map making. The cutout drawings became symbols that were easily recognized as keys to be used on both the map and the legend for the map. Thus, an ABC’s cutout became the key for the school, an addressed envelope with a stamp intact became the symbol for the post office, a cutout of fruits became the symbol for the supermarket, a cutout badge became the symbol for the police station, and a red cross was the symbol selected for the hospital. Altogether, nine objects were shown on the map with a corresponding map key. Directions north, south, east, and west were shown as appropriate arrows, each in place for students to follow as a compass rose would be used.

A quite interesting part of this lesson was not only having students learn directions of north, south, west, and east by appropriately placing the objects on their large map made of butcher paper, but also having students walk (thus, the concept of “feet forward”) in the appropriate direction on the map that was placed on the floor (examples: The post office is south of the school, so walk south from the school toward the post office; Walk west from the school toward the supermarket.).

**Using the Playground/Movement Activities for Learning Directions**

The third pre-service teacher selected a “feet-forward activity” for her kindergarten class. The pre-service teacher used sidewalk chalk to write on a paved area outside the classroom. She wrote the letters standing for cardinal directions (N for north, S for south, W for west, and E for east). Then she led the kindergarten students in a game of “Simon Says,” giving such directions as “Simon says, Take two steps to the east”; Simon says, “Point to the north”; Simon says, “Turn to the west, and stand on one foot.” These game instructions were carried out in a playful, yet meaningful way, helping students understand cardinal directions.

The same pre-service wanted to help students grasp the relationship of a map to a globe. To facilitate kindergarten students’ comprehension of how a map relates to a globe, she used a photograph of one of the children. “The photograph is flat,” she explained to her young charges, “but that the boy in the photograph is not flat.” Another activity done by this pre-service teacher was having the students stop a spinning globe with their finger and identifying “land” or “water”, depending on where the spin stopped.

**Building a Relief Map**

The traditional relief map for teaching students about land elevations was made of salt, with some baking to be done. However, one pre-service teacher chose to use Celluclay with her second grade students. Celluclay is an excellent substitute for the usual salt-and-flour recipe, and does not require as much time to dry. In this case, students created a landform map of Tennessee, their home state. The second graders used tempera paint to illustrate various landforms and patches of foliage on their Celluclay maps. Students worked together, usually three or four students per table, although some students elected to make their own map. The young students depicted the state’s three distinct, easy-to-identify elevations (East Tennessee with its mountains, Middle Tennessee with its rolling hills and the state capital, and the relatively flat West Tennessee area).
Talking about landforms and elevations with second graders seemed unusually abstract. Eventually the pre-service teacher realized she needed to tie abstract notions such as mountain, hill, and river to students’ lived experiences, such as taking a trip to the mountains or going to a part of one’s state that is relatively flat. These experiences can then be easily transferred to the notion of relief maps. Then the second graders learned to decipher the keys on a textbook map depicting land elevations. Finally, students engaged in a discussion of appropriate colors to use to illustrate elevations of different parts of their Tennessee Celluclay landform maps.

**Summary**

Teachers must be willing to actively engage their students in hands-on activities to teach the basic map/globe skills. Reading direction and distance, interpreting map legends, and orienting the map to the real world seem to be meaningless abstract busywork to many students unless and until these students have opportunities to construct, move about to learn, examine commercial maps and globes, and discuss what they are doing. Teacher mediation and advance planning are essential to the success of hands-on activities.

Geographic activities such as those described in this article not only help students learn somewhat abstract terminology, but help them carry out the maxim of learning by doing. If done during the elementary school years, students should enter middle school appropriately equipped with the basic map skills deemed by experts to be essential for students to know.

*The authors particularly wish to thank interns Kristy Baker, Sarah Coleman, Kendall Gecsei, and Stacy Klein who so masterfully carried out the “hands-on, feet-forward” activities herein described. All four are now teaching in elementary schools in Tennessee.*
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Joining the National Discussion: A Plan for Discussing Same-Sex Marriage with Secondary Students

Terence A. Beck

Is there a constitutional right to same-sex marriage? Social studies students should grapple with this question. The issue is current and is a productive means for exploring ideas such as federalism, equal protection, due process, majority rule and minority rights, and the role of precedent in our judicial system. This article provides curricular materials based on the case of Kitchen v. Herbert, the Utah same-sex marriage case decided in June, 2014 by the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals. The materials are adapted from those tested with high school classes in two conservative communities in Washington State.

Is there a constitutional right to same-sex marriage? It’s a question whose time has come and one that social studies teachers should help their students to explore. The question has a long history in the courts. In 1971 Richard Baker and James McConnell applied for a marriage license in Minnesota. When the clerk turned down their request because they were both men, they sued. The Minnesota Supreme Court dismissed arguments that denying the men a marriage license violated their constitutional rights. The Minnesota court said that denying the couple the right to marry did not, in 1971, violate the Fourteenth Amendment guarantees of equal protection and due process. A year later, the U.S. Supreme Court refused to hear the case saying that there was no “substantial federal question” (Baker v. Nelson, 1971).

More than 40 years later this same issue is racing through the federal court system with very different results. State bans on same-sex marriage have been ruled unconstitutional in red-state enclaves from Utah to Texas. The issue has been appealed to the Supreme Court.

As social studies curriculum, the question of a constitutional right to same-sex marriage has much to teach students about federalism, equal protection, due process, and the role of precedent in our judicial system. In addition, as is true with controversial political issues in general, discussing if there is a constitutional right to same-sex marriage builds skills such as the ability to “[l]isten with respect..., ask questions of their classmates..., articulate their own views and the reasons supporting them..., have their views examined and to be courageous enough to examine the opinions of others” (Hess, 2009b, p. 348).

The question is also a current event extraordinaire. With regular reports in the news, students are generally aware of the controversy and my recent experience suggests they want to learn and talk about it. As one high school student recently told me, “I think we’re in a time of change a lot in society and I think I’m just another piece of that.... I want to see it from both sides.” High school students I’ve interacted with on all sides of the issue seem to realize that a Supreme Court declaration of a right to same-sex marriage would signal a significant change in the United States, particularly in states with laws forbidding the recognition of same-sex
marriages. Social studies educators should help students understand the issues with which the nation is grappling during this historic time.

Admittedly, discussing same-sex marriage poses challenges (Beck, 2013; Hess, 2009b). One of those challenges is guarding the safety of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or questioning (LGBTQ) students. Luckily, recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions can help. As will be discussed below, with Romer v. Evans (1996), Lawrence v. Texas (2013) and U.S. v. Windsor (2013) the Court has made it clear that it is not permissible to harm gay and lesbian people because they are unpopular or because the majority disapproves of them. Mirroring the expectations of the Court, teachers should make it clear that students are not required to approve of homosexuality, but denigrating lesbian, gay or bisexual people in class is not permissible and is, in fact, likely to backfire because it suggests the speaker is operating from animus rather than reason.

A second challenge is locating materials that help students consider same-sex marriage in these days of multiple court cases winding their way through the judicial system. I am not a lawyer. My purpose here is to provide teachers who see the importance and relevance of students discussing the same-sex marriage issue with materials and suggestions designed to help the discussion go as smoothly as possible. I developed these materials and observed their use in four AP U.S. Government classrooms in two comprehensive high schools in conservative rural communities in Washington State. I used the case of Kitchen v. Herbert (Kitchen v. Herbert, 2013), from the State of Utah as a basis for the discussion. Most of these materials are adapted from the arguments made in briefs submitted by the State of Utah and the same-sex couples to the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals. While the 10th Circuit ruled in favor of the same-sex plaintiffs, theirs is not the last word and the arguments presented in this document will reappear when the Supreme Court considers the question. Even if the Supreme Court decides this question quickly, the decision is likely to remain controversial and exploring these materials will help students understand it.

The materials provided here were designed for use in a controversial political issue (CPI) discussion (Hess, 2002, 2009a). CPIs are designed to slow down thinking and debate by engaging students in a thorough exploration of an issue before asking them to state an opinion. Students examine a question from all sides, considering the strengths and weaknesses of various arguments. The teacher leads the discussion but does not steer students toward a particular conclusion. Instead, the teacher wants to hear what students think and gently probes and challenges every opinion regardless of what the teacher thinks about it. For teachers who prefer a different format, these materials can easily be adapted for a Structured Academic Controversy (Parker, 2003) or a moot court simulation (Bell, 2002). Appendix One illustrates a possible progression of a CPI discussion.

A weeklong study of same-sex marriage begins with an introduction to Kitchen v. Herbert (decided by the 10th Circuit on June 15, 2014). Students are provided in advance with a summary of Kitchen v. Herbert (see Appendix Two). The summary frames the issue as one of federalism: a conflict between the rights of states to regulate marriage and the rights of individuals under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution. Utah is an interesting case in that its laws forbid not only the recognition of same-sex marriage (including those performed in other states), but also domestic partnerships and civil unions. Further, Utah
limits adoption to married couples, effectively excluding lesbian and gay people from adopting children.

Once the students have a basic introduction to federalism and the specific prohibitions imposed by the State of Utah in this case, they are asked to apply what they have learned previously about due process and equal protection. Looking closely at the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, students can talk about the Plaintiff’s substantive due process claim (meaning that the Plaintiffs argue that by denying same-sex couples the right to marry the person of their choice, they were being unfairly deprived of liberty). Regarding equal protection, the Plaintiffs argue that marriage laws were not being applied equally to same-sex and other-sex couples, a possible violation of the equal protection clause.

Level of scrutiny questions quickly become complicated and technical, making them difficult for students to understand. Briefly, the three levels of scrutiny are “rational basis,” “heightened” or “intermediate,” and “strict.” In this case, students must abide by precedents of the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals and the U.S. Supreme Court. Generally, the 10th Circuit has ruled that cases involving sexual orientation are subject to rational basis review. That is, as long as the State shows that a law is rationally related to a legitimate state interest, the court will allow the law to stand (Kitchen v. Herbert, 2013). Rational basis review assumes that the law is constitutional unless the plaintiffs can prove otherwise. However, when dealing with a fundamental right, the courts apply the heavy burden of strict scrutiny: assuming the law is unconstitutional and requiring the state to show that the law is “narrowly tailored to serve a compelling state interest” (Kitchen v. Herbert, 2014, p. 42). In other words, the State must show that their interests are important and that are not other, less restrictive ways of accomplishing the state’s goals.

If teachers choose to explore questions around levels of scrutiny, students must first decide if same-sex marriage is a fundamental right (not a new right—the materials explore this distinction) and based on that decision, decide which level of scrutiny to apply. Teachers might not spend much time dealing with levels of scrutiny, except to note that with any case, the state’s justification must be legitimate and permissible: it cannot be based in animus or a desire to punish an unpopular group.

Once students have a basic idea of the issues involved, five previous court cases are used to help students apply precedents as a court might. The same-sex marriage cases provide a way for students to explore stare decisis, the idea that courts follow previous decisions (or precedents) of other courts (with particular attention to higher courts and especially to principles set down by the U.S. Supreme Court). Among other things, stare decisis promotes consistency and stability and helps assure that people are treated similarly (Gerstmann, 2004).

Because the Kitchen case was not at the time a Supreme Court case, the students were instructed that they would be required to adhere to Supreme Court precedent. I selected five cases most likely to be used as precedent based on my reading of the briefs, the District court’s decision, and the 10th Circuit’s ruling. Here I begin with the most recent and most relevant case before discussing the earlier cases.

**Windsor and the Floodgates**

In June of 2013, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down Section Three of the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) in the case of *U.S. v. Windsor* (United States v. Windsor, 2013), opening...
the floodgates for court challenges in the thirty-three states with laws banning same-sex marriage. In the ten years prior to the Windsor decision six state or federal courts “found it unconstitutional for a state to withhold the designation of ‘marriage’ from same-sex couples” (Soubly, 2014). Less than a year after the Windsor decision, no less than eight decisions had found such bans unconstitutional (Soubly, 2014) and the number continues to grow. Understanding these court decisions requires that students understand the Windsor decision and the precedent it provides to the lower courts (see Appendix Three).

Contrary to information in some parts of the popular press (Socarides, 2014), Windsor did not overturn all of DOMA. While the Court declared that Section Three of DOMA (requiring the federal government to recognize only marriages between one man and one woman) unconstitutional, the Windsor case did not challenge Section Two of DOMA (allowing states to ignore the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution when it comes to same-sex relationships).

While the Court in Windsor based its decision primarily on the due process protection of liberty in the Fifth Amendment, it also reasoned that control of marriage is designated to the states under the Tenth Amendment. The Court said that since some states had decided to recognize same-sex marriages, the federal government should defer to those states in this matter.

Thus, in Kitchen both sides claim that Windsor supports their position. The same-sex couples argue that Windsor supports their claim that their substantive rights to due process and equal protection are being violated. Utah argues that the Court deferred to New York State’s definition of marriage and must do the same for Utah. While federal courts have consistently reasoned that “a state has broad authority to regulate marriage, so long as it does not violate its citizen’s federal constitutional rights” (Bishop v. United States, 2014), Windsor presents an opportunity for students to grapple with the concept of federalism and with constitutional principles that seem to conflict.

The Road to Windsor

Four additional cases are often quoted and contested in the briefs (see Appendix Four). Loving v. Virginia (1967) struck down anti-miscegenation laws and established that marriage is a fundamental right. Students must decide if Loving suggests a fundamental right for lesbian and gay people as well. To what extent are race and sexual orientation similar when it comes to marriage?

If Baker v. Nelson (1971), the case I mentioned in the introduction, is controlling precedent, there is little to discuss. The Minnesota Supreme Court said that Loving did not apply to same-sex marriages and it ruled that same-sex marriage is so different from opposite-sex marriage that denying a marriage license to a same-sex couple is not a violation of due process or equal protection. Dealing with Baker introduces summary dismissals and how court rulings can change over time.

Romer v. Evans (1996) struck down Colorado’s constitutional amendment that forbid state and local governments from passing laws protecting gays and lesbians from discrimination. In Romer, the Court established that animus is not a justifiable reason to discriminate against gay and lesbian people.
In *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003) the Court ruled that sodomy laws are unconstitutional. The Court asserted that “homosexual persons... are entitled to respect for their private lives. The State cannot demean their existence or control their destiny by making their private sexual conduct a crime. Their right to liberty under the Due Process Clause gives them the full right to engage in their conduct without intervention of the government.”

This conclusion in *Lawrence* overturned *Bowers v. Hardwick*, a Supreme Court ruling issued just 17 years before and affirmed that the state must respect the personal liberty of gays and lesbians to make choices about their intimate lives (as long as those choices do not harm others). While the Court was careful to state that this ruling did not suggest a right to same-sex marriage, *Lawrence* advanced the idea that the State cannot demean gays or lesbians through its laws.

**The Arguments for and against Kitchen**

Once students understand a few of the most important precedent cases, they are given “position papers” arguing for and against overturning Utah’s ban on same-sex marriage (see Appendices Five and Six). These papers draw directly on the arguments put forward by the State of Utah (Reply brief of appellants Gary R. Herbert and Sean D. Reyes, 2014) and the Plaintiffs (Brief of plaintiffs--appellees Derek Kitchen, et al., 2014).

The State of Utah focuses on the definition of marriage and on what it views as the optimal environment in which to raise children: a biological mother married to a biological father. Utah asserts that its high number of children being raised by both parents and its relatively small number of children living in poverty are direct results of its focus on a man-woman definition of marriage. Forbidding same-sex couples from marrying is, in this view, a legitimate state interest.

Utah’s brief also asserts Utah’s right to determine the definition of marriage under the Tenth Amendment. The brief lists several harms that might occur should the Court impose a right to same-sex marriage on an unwilling state. Among those harms is infringing on religious freedom of people who object to same-sex marriage on religious grounds. It is worth noting that the Utah brief goes out of its way to assert its respect for same-sex couples and their children, and their right to “order their private lives in the manner they have chosen.”

The Plaintiff’s brief emphasizes the harm to same-sex couples by Utah’s ban on same-sex marriage. They argue that the ban “intentionally seeks to impose inequality on a vulnerable group,” violating basic due process and equal protection principles. Borrowing from the language in *Lawrence* and *Windsor*, the Plaintiffs argue that bans on their marriages demeans their most important relationships and stigmatizes their children.

The Plaintiffs suggest that the bans were created from a desire to punish an unpopular group based on moral disapproval and religious beliefs. They assert that imagined harms cannot be used to deny people the liberty promised by the Constitution and that prior Supreme Court decisions demand better reasons than the ones offered by the State of Utah.

One class period is used for students to do a critical reading of both papers to ensure that they have a thorough understanding of the arguments that were presented to the 10th Circuit in this case.

Once students have a basic understanding of the issues of the case and the opposing positions, the question is opened up for a lively and respectful discussion. Following the
discussion, students can write their answers to the question, “Is there a Constitutional right to same-sex marriage?”

Student report that they learned a lot from this experience. Some surprised me by saying that their opinions had changed. Most maintained their basic opinion but said they came away with a greater appreciation of why the question of same-sex marriage is important and the difficult choices courts face as they consider the question of a constitutional right to same-sex marriage.

Regardless of how the Supreme Court ultimately rules in this case, students of every political persuasion will benefit from understanding the larger Constitutional issues behind the case. And in case the Supreme Court declares a Constitutional right to same-sex marriage, students will be in a position to understand and represent the Court’s reasoning in localities where majorities might find such a claim unimaginable.
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Appendix One: Suggested outline

- Day One: Introduction to *Kitchen v. Herbert* and *U.S. v. Windsor* (Figures Two and Three)
- Day Two: From *Loving* to *Windsor*: Supreme Court Precedents (Figure Four)
- Day Three: Understanding the two positions: Critical Reading (Figures Five and Six)
- Day Four: Controversial Political Issue Class Discussion
- Day Five: Wrapping up the Discussion and Writing Opinions
Appendix Two: *Kitchen v. Herbert, 2013*

**Background**

The U.S. has a federalist system of government. The Constitution gives some powers to the federal government, some are left to the states, and others are shared. This separation is spelled out in the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution that says, “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

The U.S. Constitution also protects the freedom of its citizens. It does so in a couple of places. Amendment Five to the Constitution protects people from having their life, liberty or property taken from them without a careful legal process, called, due process of law. For example, to keep someone in jail there needs to be a fair trial—a due process.

The Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution applies the guarantee of due process to the states laws as well. The Fourteenth Amendment says in part, “No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.” The Fourteenth Amendment adds the phrase, “equal protection of the laws.” This is the only place in the Constitution that uses the term “equal.” It is generally understood to mean that laws must treat people fairly and equally.

**Facts**

Utah has two laws prohibiting same-sex unions and an amendment to the Utah Constitution.

1. Utah law Section 30-1-2: marriages “between persons of the same sex” are “prohibited and declared void.” 1977
2. Section 39-1-4.1: “it is the policy of this state to recognize as marriage only the legal union of a man and a woman as provided in this chapter. Except for the relationships between a man and a woman ... this state will not recognize, enforce, or give legal effect to any law creating any legal status, rights, benefits, or duties that are substantially equivalent to those provided under Utah law to a man and a woman because they are married.”
3. Nothing in Subsection (1) impairs any contract or other rights, benefits, or duties that are enforceable independently of this section. 2004

Utah Amendment 3 Passed with 66% in favor on November 2, 2004:

1. Marriage consists only of the legal union between a man and a woman.
2. No other domestic union, however denominated, may be recognized as a marriage or given the same or substantially equivalent legal effect.

Three same-sex couples sued the State of Utah claiming that their Constitutional rights to Due Process and Equal Protection were violated by Utah’s bans on same-sex marriage. The district court ruled for the couples in Kitchen v. Herbert. The state of Utah appealed to the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals.

**Issues:**

Does Utah’s statues and Constitution violate the Constitutional rights of same-sex couples who seek to marry? In other words, is there a Constitutional right to marriage for same-sex couples? Should the federal government be able to overrule a state’s policy about marriage (an area typically left for state decision-making)?
Appendix Three: *United States v. Windsor, 2013*

New York resident Edith Windsor married Thea Spyer in Canada before same-sex marriages were recognized in New York. Eventually, New York State recognized their marriage. When Spyer died, she left her estate to Windsor. Federal law allows a spouse to inherit without paying taxes. Yet, Windsor was required to pay $365,053 in taxes because the federal government refused to recognize her marriage to Spyer. The Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) required the federal government to only recognize marriages between one man and one woman.

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that Section 3 of DOMA (the section that said only one man, one woman marriages could be recognized) was unconstitutional because it treated some marriages recognized by individual states (i.e., same-sex marriages) as different other marriages that states recognize (i.e. different-sex marriages), violating the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment.

The District Court argued that *Windsor* applies because the U.S. Supreme Court said DOMA violated the Due Process clause of the Fifth Amendment that protects individual liberty by making same-sex couples in “second-tier marriages.” The Court said that such a distinction “demean[ed] the couple, whose moral and sexual choices the Constitution protects.”

The State of Utah argues that *Windsor* applies because *Windsor* acknowledges an individual state’s rights to decide what counts as marriage under the Tenth Amendment. By recognizing same-sex marriage in the states where it is legal, *Windsor* requires that the federal government honor a state’s definition that does not include same-sex couples. To overrule Amendment 3 is to say the federal government must defer to some states’ marriage laws (for example states like Washington that have legalized same-sex marriage), but, doesn’t need to defer to other states’ marriage laws (for example, states like Utah that make same-sex marriage illegal).
Appendix Four: Additional Precedent Cases

Loving v. Virginia (1967)
A white man and a black woman were married in Washington D.C. where marriage between people of different races was legal (marriage between people of different races was against the law in Virginia). When the couple returned to Virginia, the State of Virginia invalidated their marriage.

The U.S. Supreme Court held that marriage is a fundamental right and the individual’s right to marry takes precedence over the state’s right to regulate marriage.

Does Loving apply here? The District Court says it does because decisions after Loving affirmed that the right to marry applies to all individuals. Same-sex couples are seeking the right to marry just as interracial couples did. It isn’t a new right.

The State of Utah says Loving does not apply because Loving was about racial discrimination. Granting same-sex couples the right to marry changes the fundamental definition of marriage (as between one man and one woman) and creates a new right, one that is not within our traditions. Loving didn’t do that.

Baker v. Nelson (Minn. 1971)
Two men were denied a marriage license in Minnesota. They sued saying that denying them a license violated their rights of Due Process and Equal Protection under the Fourteenth Amendment. The Minnesota Supreme Court ruled against them saying that the “Constitution does not require that things which are different in fact or opinion … be treated in law as though they were the same.” In other words, the Court claimed that marriage between people of the same sex is different from marriage of people from different sexes, so same-sex marriage doesn’t need to be treated equally with opposite-sex marriage.

The Minnesota Court said that Loving v. Virginia did not apply in this case because in a “commonsense and in a constitutional sense, there is a clear distinction between marital restriction based merely upon race and one based upon the fundamental difference in sex.” The Minnesota Court ruled that denying a marriage license to a same-sex couple was not a Due Process or Equal Protection violation.

The U.S. Supreme Court refused to hear the appeal of Baker for “want of a substantial federal question.” Basically, the Supreme Court believed that the Minnesota court had settled the question and there was no need to hear the case again.

A key point in this case is whether or not Baker is precedent. The District Court judge said Baker does not apply because: 1) it was a “summary dismissal” (the US Supreme Court did not actually hear the case) and summary dismissals aren’t always binding; and 2) it was decided in 1971, before Romer v. Evans (1996) protected people from discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and before Lawrence v. Texas (2003) said that it is unconstitutional to “demean [the] existence [of gay men or lesbian] or control their destiny by making their private sexual conduct a crime.”

The State of Utah claims that Baker is precedent in this case because: 1) summary dismissal are precedent unless the Supreme Court says otherwise; 2) Baker is about this exact issue; and 3) other courts have recognized Baker as precedent for this type of case (no other
court has ruled that *Baker* is not controlling and only the US Supreme Court can reverse the *Baker* decision).

**Romer v. Evans (1996)**
In 1992, citizens of the State of Colorado passed Amendment 2 to their state constitution. Amendment 2 forbid the state government and local governments from passing laws protecting gays and lesbians from discrimination.

The State of Colorado defending the Amendment saying that it created equality for gay and lesbian people by refusing to grant them “special rights.” The Supreme Court disagreed saying that rather than granting special rights, the amendment imposed a “special disability” only on gay people.

The Court ruled that laws may disadvantage a group of people if there is a legitimate government interest. However, the Court invalidated Amendment 2 in part because the desire to punish or disadvantage an unpopular group is not a good enough reason to enact a law.

**Lawrence v. Texas (2003)**
John Lawrence and Tyrone Garner were arrested for engaging in sex in Lawrence’s bedroom. They were fined $200 each. They appealed arguing that the Texas law violated their Due Process rights and their Equal Protection rights under the Fourteenth Amendment because the law prohibited certain sexual acts between same-sex partners but not between different sex partners.

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in favor of Lawrence and Garner saying that they “are entitled to respect for their private lives. The state cannot demean their existence or control their destiny by making their private sexual conduct a crime.” This ruling overturned the 1986 *Bowers v. Hardwick* decision that said states could regulate sexual conduct based on moral disapproval.
Appendix Five: Utah’s Position
Utah’s Amendment 3 is constitutional
The State of Utah argues from two basic positions. First, changing the definition of marriage to include same-sex couples has consequences. Second, the ability to define marriage is a power guaranteed to the states through the constitution.

The risks of changing the definition of marriage:
Justice Alito of the Supreme Court wrote in his dissent of the *Windsor* decision that changing the definition of marriage to include same-sex couples fundamentally changes the institution from one focused on the needs of children to one focused on the self-interests of the adults involved.

The State of Utah prides itself on a consistent approach to the welfare of children, an approach that has worked remarkably well. The state provides for marriage counseling before a couple gets a marriage license. The state gives preference to natural parents in cases where welfare workers are considering removing a child from the home. The Juvenile Court system works to keep children with their parents and children can only be adopted by adults who are legally married to each other. In keeping with this emphasis, Utah allows the spouse of a biological parent to adopt the child.

Utah’s approach has been successful. Utah has the lowest percentage of unwed births in the nation (19.4%—less than half the national average of 41%). Utah ranks “first among states in the percentage of children being raised by both parents from birth until 17—78.6%.” Utah has a relatively small percentage of “children growing up in poverty—15%, the fourth lowest in the Nation, compared to a national average of 23%. Utah children have “one of the highest rates of upward mobility for its children.”

Changing the definition of marriage breaks the link between marriage and procreation. It will encourage “more parents to raise their *existing* biological children without the other biological parent.” More children are likely to be born out of wedlock. Parents will be less likely to make sacrifices for their children as they come to see marriage as an institution dedicated to the needs of adults. People will be less likely to see marriage as important and it could open the door to other drastic changes in marriage. Why not group marriage? Birth rates could drop as they have in other countries and states that allow same-sex marriage.

Changing the definition of marriage could undermine social harmony. Utah’s citizens do not approve of same-sex marriage. They are unlikely to take kindly to court intervention in their political affairs. Further, governments would be pressured to force religious organizations or businesses owned by religious people to treat same-sex couple as they do opposite sex couples. Teachers could be punished for refusing to teach that same-sex marriages are good. Business could be sued for refusing to provide goods to same-sex weddings. Unnecessary tensions could be created between parents and public schools. Changing the definition of marriage creates huge problems for the religious liberty of those who object to same-sex marriage.
**Defining Marriage should be left to the States**

Since same-sex marriage is so divisive, the best approach to it is through democratic decision-making. To rule against Utah in this case is to say that deeply held religious beliefs of Utah’s citizens are irrational and this undermines the democratic process and creates social divisions.

The 10th Amendment to the Constitution gives states the right to determine the definition of marriage. In *Windsor*, the Supreme Court acknowledged this right and used it as a basis for overturning the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA). The Court reasoned that DOMA undermined states that had legalized same-sex marriage by forbidding the federal government from acknowledging those marriages. To overturn Amendment 3 is to say that the right to define marriage that was extended to other states is not a right that Utah has. This is unjust.

There is no right to same-sex marriage in the Fourteenth Amendment. Creating a new right requires that the right be rooted in the nation’s history. This is not the case. The State of Utah has a compelling interest in reserving marriage for one man and one woman. Courts cannot overturn laws where such an interest is evident.
Appendix Six: Plaintiff’s Position
Utah’s Amendment 3 is unconstitutional

The main argument of the Plaintiffs in this case is that they are being harmed by Utah’s ban on same-sex marriage. The ban is unconstitutional because the law “intentionally seeks to impose inequality on a vulnerable group.” Thus, the law violates basic due process and equal protection principles.

The law’s primary purpose is excluding same-sex couples from marriage because of religious objections. The bans were enacted in response to progress gay and lesbian couples were making in other states, starting with Massachusetts in 2004. Those supporting Amendment 3 wrote in the voters’ manual: “The Declaration of Independence specifically recognizes the “Creator,” “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God,” “the Supreme Judge of the World” and our “firm reliance on the protection of divine providence.” This quotation illustrates the religious rationale behind the bans.

The lower court ruled that Amendment 3 is unconstitutional, saying that the right to marry is a fundamental right based upon “an individual’s rights to liberty, privacy, and association.” The State of Utah cannot deny people this right without a legitimate state interest. The argument that same-sex marriage might somehow hurt opposite-sex marriages can’t be supported logically—it makes no sense to suggest that two married women threaten the marriage of a man and a woman. Also, suggesting that same-sex marriages harm children ignores the harm that Utah’s ban on same-sex marriage does to the children of same-sex couples. The Supreme Court was concerned with these children in the Windsor decision. When the State of Utah talks about its children, it ignores the welfare of the children of same-sex couples.

The ban harms same-sex couples. It denies them “the stability, security and protection” that married families enjoy. It demeans their most important relationships and “stigmatized their children by suggesting that their families are second class.” The Lawrence decision (2003) and the Windsor decision (2013) both have said that the state cannot demean gay and lesbian people just because they don’t approve of how they live their lives.

The Constitution has not changed. But, we now understand gay and lesbian people did not choose their sexuality anymore than straight people chose their sexuality. Changes in marriage laws have happened before. At one time white society did not believe that blacks and whites should marry. People thought that prisoners should not be allowed to marry. At one point, people who were divorced could not remarry. As we have come to understand the basic humanity of people of all races, of prisoners, and of divorced people, we have changed our laws and extended the right to marry. Allowing more people to marry did nothing to change the Constitution. It did not create new rights. Extending the right to marry to same-sex couple does not create a new right.

States cannot make laws that deny people their constitutional rights without a good reason. Same-sex couples have the equal right to freedom as guaranteed by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. There is no good reason for denying them this right. The Court must overturn Utah’s ban on same-sex marriage.
“A Mean and Infamous War”: Teaching About Dissent in the Mexican-American War

Mark Pearcy

Teaching about dissenting voices in American history is not only valuable in representing less privileged perspectives (Chandler, 2006). It also provides a rich and dynamic opportunity for teachers to explore the role played by anti-war movements or similar protest-related events in our national story. The Mexican-American War—often treated as little more than a prelude to the Civil War, over a decade later—can serve as an effective platform for teaching about dissent and protest at a crucial point in American history.

When compared to other historical conflicts, the Mexican-American war tends to get short shrift. As a singular event, it rates little beyond the standard “mentioning” in textbooks and curricula (Block, 2008). It lasted less than two years from start to finish (from 1846 to 1848), and ended—at least for the U.S.—in fairly successful fashion. The war is mostly noted for the acquisition of the modern U.S. Southwest and a seeming validation of the conceit of “manifest destiny.” When it is brought up at all, the Mexican-American War is mostly depicted as a secondary cause of the Civil War, a decade later, as the newly-won territories became the subject of debate over the possible extension of slavery. But by itself, as a subject of historical inquiry, the Mexican-American War gets scant attention.

This is a pity, since the war (and the events leading to it) provides social studies teachers a rich opportunity to explore topics of American social and political history that are often missing from standard narratives. As the first real foreign war in America’s history, as well as the first fought primarily by volunteer “citizen-soldiers,” the Mexican-American War was unique in its time. But the real value of its study can be found in its contentious beginnings, the degree to which many Americans disagreed with the war’s goals and tried, passively or actively, to stop it. The efforts of those Americans opposed to the war provide a through-line for educators to consider subsequent citizens’ initiatives, concerned both with war and a host of other concerns (Lawrence, 2013). The Mexican-American War is a compelling story of dissent and citizen activism, and it affords teachers and students an opportunity to explore the role of opposition to war in American history.

“Mr. Polk’s War”

After Mexico won its independence from Spain in 1821, the new nation continued the prior practice of encouraging settlement of its northern border region by American settlers. Most of these settlers were slaveowners, and their adherence to that institution (combined with their general unwillingness to either convert to Catholicism or to become Mexican citizens, both requirements of the Mexican government) caused increased tension. So, too, did their
swelling numbers—by 1836, the Anglo-American population of Texas outnumbered the Mexican minority ten to one (Reséndez, 1999). That year, Texas won its independence from Mexico and its dictator, General Antonio López de Santa Anna. The general expectation that, at some point, the Texans would seek annexation by the U.S., was complicated by a rash of financial disputes between the two nations, particularly over debts owed by Mexico to U.S. nationals dating back to the 1820s (Gardner & Chambers, 2001). By the time of the 1844 presidential election, the hostility along the border (exacerbated by raiding on both sides) was reflected in the broader electorate, and enthusiasm for the outright annexation of Texas was growing (Foos, 2002).

In 1845, the new President of Mexico, José Joaquín Herrera, recognized Texas’ independence (at the behest of Great Britain and France), in an effort to prevent it from joining the United States. The effort did not pay off, as Congress approved the annexation of Texas just as the newly-elected U.S. President, James Polk, was taking office. Polk had campaigned on the issue of “manifest destiny,” forcefully asserting that Texas (and the Oregon Territory, as well) rightfully should belong to the U.S. Herrera attempted to forestall possible hostilities by signaling confidentially to Polk his willingness to negotiate, particularly on the issue of the Texas-Mexican border. Polk sent John Slidell secretly to Mexico City, to negotiate a deal.

By the time Slidell reached Mexico City, however, news of the mission had preceded his arrival—and in the outcry over possible capitulation, Herrera refused to receive him. Upon his return, Polk commanded General Zachary Taylor to occupy the disputed border region between Texas and Mexico along the Rio Grande. Mexican and American troops skirmished, and Polk seized the opportunity, asking Congress for a declaration of war on May 11, 1846, in “further vindication of our rights and defense of our territory” (“Message of the President of the United States,” 1848). Members of the Whig Party, angered by Polk’s expansionism, harshly criticized the President and called the event “Mr. Polk’s War” (Schroeder, 1973); even so, two days later, Congress authorized the action by an overwhelming vote.

**Teaching about Dissent**

John Schroeder (1973), in *Mr. Polk's War: American Opposition and Dissent, 1846-1848*, describes three factors that contribute to the failure of most peace movements in the U.S. The first factor is a practical one—peace movements generally lack any means to really stop wars, beyond public outcry. They do not control the aggressive policies of other nations, and they are not generally part of the policy mechanisms of the U.S. government. Second, anti-war groups have often had difficulty in articulating viable alternatives to existing policy (one wonders what might have been an appropriate reaction, for example, to Pearl Harbor other than a declaration of war). Finally, peace movements almost always face a troubling dilemma after a war has begun—how to “reverse government policy without deserting or undermining American forces already under fire” (Schroeder, 1973, pp. xii-xiii). In the war with Mexico, for instance, peace movements were caught between their resistance to expansionist goals and the argument that “once Polk placed American troops on the Mexican ground, the time for debate was over” (Lawrence, 2013, p. 60).

Given the impediments to success faced by anti-war movements throughout American history, it’s perhaps unsurprising that very few of them are featured prominently in classroom instruction. It would be unproductive to simply insist that teachers focus to a greater degree on
these topics, since they are already pressed for time in an era of increased pressures and a shrinking calendar (Pearcy & Duplass, 2010). Teachers generally ask whether or not a given historical topic can present potential benefits that are worth the investment of time and energy; and so, before discussing how to teach about dissent by using the Mexican-American war as an example, it is necessary to consider why the topic is worthwhile at all.

One point in defense of teaching dissent is the connection between dissent and patriotism. A usual critique of anti-war movements is that they somehow represent cowardice, hesitancy, or other “un-American” virtues; worse still is the assertion that to be anti-war is, in some manner, “un-American” itself. These views are neither accurate nor particularly thoughtful. Westheimer (2009), in exploring how patriotism is taught in social studies classrooms, described two ways to think about the concept—authoritarian and democratic. Westheimer describes the submission and resignation of individuality that attends authoritarian patriotism, and how the depiction of one “unified, unquestioned version of ‘truth’ is one of [its] hallmarks...and of a totalitarian society” (p. 317). Contrary to this is democratic patriotism, in which educators aim to “teach about patriotism [rather] than to demand patriotic fidelity” (p. 318).

A foundational element to democratic patriotism, then, is the ability (and the desire) to question the actions of those in authority, as part of the deliberative process. If we teach our history in a manner that promotes consensus and “certainty” (Apple, 2004; McLaren, 1998), however, we inadvertently promote the idea that the decisions made, and actions carried out, by our leaders have generally enjoyed popular assent. This is, of course, historically incorrect; De Benedetti (1984) points out that activist dissent has been present in American history practically since its founding. Described as “one of the more enduring features of American national life,” the history of American dissent includes a diverse range of figures and organizations that seemingly have nothing in common from “Andrew Carnegie and Emma Goldman [to] the International Workers of the World and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce” (p. 75). The American Revolution, of course, was born in ideological and economic dissent; it’s more than a little ironic, then, that after the republic’s founding, former revolutionaries largely supported laws “designed to suppress and punish political dissent” (Landman, 2004, p. 278). Such laws contradicted a thoroughly American tradition of dissent and cultural support for its various manifestations in political life.

A deeper concern is the likelihood that, in failing to study the presence of dissent in American history, we delimit the degree to which we can incorporate alternative historical perspectives into our classrooms. Lawrence (2009) describes how the study of dissent in the Mexican-American war can promote historical empathy, as constitutional critiques of the war transition effectively into “[a consideration of] the war from the perspective of Mexico and its people” (p. 59). This feature of a historical debate—the ability to move between competing perspectives and values—is vital for effective social studies instruction. Passe (1999) points out that “[teaching] children that choosing conflicting values is not always so simple, and that the choice needs to be discussed so that each individual can make his or her own decision.” Confronting value-laden issues as a central feature of a social studies education is harder and harder to accomplish in the current era (Mitsakos & Ackerman, 2009). If we are committed to helping students develop into critical, independent thinkers, we must seek out topics which provide the opportunity “to review fundamental issues of democracy that continue to shape
our political culture” (Barr, 2009, p. 203). The use of historical instances of dissent as instructional topics can equip teachers with a framework from which to do just that.

Teaching about Dissent in the Mexican-American War

What, then, makes the anti-war movement of the Mexican-American War useful to teachers? The development of “self-sustaining volunteer societies” (De Benedetti, 1984, p. 88) was an important feature of 19th century American cultural life. Many of these societies were dedicated to a variety of social causes—temperance, the abolition of slavery, the nascent women’s suffrage movement—but they coalesced over resistance to the Mexican-American War. Lawrence (2013) characterizes this movement as “the first moment of full-throated anti-imperialist critique leveled against the United States government by an ideological cross-section of its own citizens” (p. 56). It is difficult to gauge the reach of the antiwar movement, given the lack of national sampling or polling at the time—it is telling, however, that the annual meeting of the American Peace Society (the largest anti-war organization in the U.S.) drew the largest crowd in its history to its annual meeting in May 1848, when the war was arguably at its most popular (Ziegler, 1992, p. 113). The Mexican-American War dissent movement presents value to teachers in a variety of areas: its connection to the abolitionist movement, the prescience of its critiques regarding the war’s motives, the debate over executive authority, and the tactics which dissenters used to protest the government’s actions.

The anti-war movement was deeply motivated and passionate, even if the motives of those involved were disparate and, more often than not, at odds with each other. It was a truly national movement, though there were deep roots in New England. A substantial number of anti-war advocates were also strident abolitionists. However, other members of the movement were largely motivated by political factors (Whigs, for instance, ostensibly supported national expansion, but not this expansion, at this time, and certainly not while the Democrats were in charge). Because of this, viable political opposition was fractured. In fact, the idiosyncratic nature of this movement is one of the factors that makes it an absorbing topic of study today.

Members of the American Peace Society (APS) opposed the war largely on two grounds—how it had started, and why it was being fought. For the former issue, many critics lashed out at the alleged provocation of Taylor’s troops; in violating the disputed region, the 1846 APS Annual Report declared, the Polk administration had presided over an act of “unprincipled depravity” and “unmitigated sin” (Ziegler, 1992, pp. 112-113). The larger controversy, however, was over the motive for the war. Protesters saw the entire enterprise as little more than an unabashed land-grab on behalf of Southern slaveowners, an example of “pervasive materialism, grasping expansionism, and proslavery politics” (Lawrence, 2009, p. 373). Unsurprisingly, a large proportion of the American Peace Society’s members were also ardently abolitionist in stance.

The day after war was declared, the American Anti-Slavery Society met in New York City in opposition—one of its members, David Lee Child, stated that since Polk’s election, “we have seen a career of conquest commenced...for the extension of the horrors of personal slavery...The simulacrum of the Constitution remains, but the substance is perished” (Lawrence, 2009, p. 61).This attitude was fostered by the unique status of the war in American foreign and domestic policy; Crothers (2011) describes how the conflict was “both the United States’ first international war and its first war of choice,” one that “occurred not because it had to or
because it was forced upon the United States but because the nation both its leaders and its citizens chose to fight it” (p. 27). The outcome of the war—the gain of over one million square miles of land, over a third of the U.S. current territory (“James K. Polk and the U.S. Mexican War: A Policy Appraisal,” 2006)—proved to be, of course, a contributing cause to the Civil War, as the newly-won lands became the center of a national debate over the extension of slavery. In this, therefore, anti-war critics were prescient; and their foresight helps make the dissent movement of the 1840s a valuable teaching resource.

From a political standpoint, dissent to the war can provide an effective platform for debates over executive authority, both historically and contemporary. Many anti-war critics at the time condemned James Polk for his actions, especially in his overt role in sending troops into the disputed region. Many saw this as a clear violation of the Constitution’s separation of powers; the National Intelligencer newspaper, for instance, charged in August 1845 that Polk “will be MAKING WAR [sic], in the full sense of the word, on his own authority, and beyond all plea of need, and even without any thought of asking legislative leave” (Lawrence, 2013, p. 58). Whigs, in particular, used the image of a reckless, unrestricted executive as a club against Polk; and in this, the criticism leveled at the time would not be unfamiliar to modern audiences, as both a precursor to 20th-century internationalism and within the context of critiques of the 2003 invasion of Iraq (Crothers, 2011, p. 29). For instance, Ohio Senator Thomas Corwin, on February 11, 1847, called for a total defunding of the war, and did so in terms that are reminiscent of many complaints about more contemporary military endeavors—the miseries of war, he asserted, were the product of the “act and will of the President alone, and not by the act or will of Congress, th war-making department of the Government.” The attacks on the Polk administration’s foreign policy as a “toxic admix of bellicosity and incompetence” (Lawrence, 2013, pp. 59, 64) are not uncommon from contemporary criticisms of both the preeminence of the executive branch in contemporary military policy and the nature of modern war itself.

Westheimer (2009) proposes a three-step process for promoting democratic patriotism, one which is also potentially effective for teaching about dissent. First, teachers empower students to ask questions (rather than passively accept proffered conclusions). The second step is for teachers to provide context and information, including “competing narratives” (p. 320), to serve as a platform for subsequent analysis. Finally, Westheimer proposes that teachers “root instruction in local contexts, working within their own specific surroundings and circumstances” (p. 320).

In adapting this approach for teaching about the anti-war movement of 1845-1848, it would be more practical to begin with context and supporting information—what conditions led the U.S. and Mexico to consider war as a policy option? What events and choices contributed to that state? Were there alternatives that either side failed to consider, or that were ultimately impractical? Teachers can then help students create their own questions about both the war and the protest movement opposing it, which, when drawn from an engaging historical topic like the Mexican-American War, can be thoughtful and engrossing—was the war necessary? What are the conditions of a “necessary” war? Which state was more to blame for the outbreak of hostilities? Was the U.S. course of action legally, or morally, acceptable? Was the war, in short, worth its costs? And finally, Westheimer’s argument for “local contexts” can be contemporized to more modern conflicts—how was the Mexican-American war anti-war movement similar to other historical entities, such as the Vietnam-era student protests of the
late 1960s-early 1970s, or the isolationist movement prior to World War II? What could contemporary Americans learn from their counterparts of 1846, to avoid similar fates?

One fascinating area of exploration for students can be found in the various tactics available to those who did not support the war. The peace movement is probably most well-known for the civil disobedience of Henry David Thoreau (Chandler, 2006). In truth, Thoreau’s actions were little-known or noticed at the time, and had practically no impact on the debate over the war (Gross, 2005, p. 2). One tactic that was deeply-felt at the time, though, and the subject of great contemporary debate, was military desertion. Foos (2002) asserts that the Mexican-American War had the “highest rate of desertion of any American war” (p. 25). In New Hampshire, where anti-war sentiment ran high, citizens harbored deserters and actively obstructed military efforts to apprehend them (p. 23). Students may consider the prospect of conscientious objection to military service, following the three-step process outlined above. Teachers can help their classes explore the historical roots of conscientious objection, which date back to the American Revolution (Yoder, 2007). Students can consider questions about the nature of and motivation for desertion in the Mexican-American War, which can include cases that exemplify the oddities of war. This includes the Saint Patrick’s Battalion, also known the Batallón de San Patricio, a Mexican army unit made up entirely of Irish-Catholic U.S. military deserters (Hanson, 2003). Finally, students can consider contemporary applications of the question of desertion— is it permissible for soldiers to refuse to fight, when faced with the asymmetrical nature of warfare today (including the likelihood that such conflicts are rarely the result of a Congressional declaration of war)?

Another rich avenue of inquiry for teachers is found in the debate between moderate and radical anti-war activists, particularly within the American Peace Society. Mainstream APS members accepted the premise that some wars—not this one, but at least theoretically some—could be considered morally acceptable, such as a purely defensive conflict, with limited aims. A vocal minority of the APS (often referred to as “nonresistants,” a term they did not shy from) refused to support the war, or any war, in any way. Many talked seriously about the prospect of leaving the Union (whether individually or by state). Elihu Burritt, one of the nonresistant leaders, acknowledged that his position “may be imputed to fanaticism and ultraism,” but saw it as the only possible stance, given the demands of his faith: “It has come to this: that if the gospel forbids all war, then there never was, and never will be, a period when its demands were more imperative than now” (“A Chapter on the Mexican War,” 1847).

The nonresistants saw the Mexican-American War as a scheme to empower Southern slaveowners, and thus their presence was strongly felt among abolitionists. The Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, in decrying the war, saw the entire enterprise as the product of a government permanently tainted by southern interests, and labeled the Constitution “A ‘COVENANT WITH DEATH, AND AN AGREEMENT WITH HELL....AND SHOULD BE IMMEDIATELY ANNULED [sic]” (Ziegler, 1992, p. 99). Another nonresistant, Theodore Parker, framed dissent to the war as akin to the revolutionary spirit of the previous generation: “Men will call us traitors, what then? That hurt nobody in ‘76!” (“A Plea for Peace,” 1846). In criticizing motives for the war, Parker was unyielding: Theodore Parker, one of the strongest voices in dissent, was unyielding in his criticism of the war:
It is a mean and infamous war we are fighting. It is a great boy fighting a little one, and that little one feeble and sick. What makes it worse is, the little boy is in the right, and the big boy is in the wrong, and tells solemn lies to make his side seem right...this is a war for slavery, a mean and infamous war; an aristocratic war, a war against the best interests of mankind. If God please, we will die a thousand times, but never draw a blade in this wicked war. (“A Plea for Peace,” 1846)

As a topic for classroom debate, the positions within the American Peace Society—a debate over whether war, even in one’s defense, may be morally permissible—is a rich prospect for dynamic inquiry. With teachers’ guidance, students can wrestle with demanding questions: was the Constitution designed to protect or promote slavery? Was the war a violation of national ideals, or a just extension of the American republic across the continent? Is there a war worth fighting?

Another method teachers might adopt to address issues of dissent is the case-study. This method allows teachers and students to drill down in a specific event or aspect of the larger debate, and encourages students to use a wide spectrum of skills—“recognizing and evaluating facts, formulating and understanding arguments, applying criteria, and making judgments” (McDonnell, 2002, p. 68; Bryant, 2006). Barr (2009), in describing a case-study approach built around the Chicago Eight trial in the midst of the Vietnam era, describes the value of teaching events that “create permanent shifts in our national political consciousness” (p. 203). Barr’s method—to focus on one such event, set in the broader historical context in which it occurred—has the value of parsimony, and allows students to use such a topic to examine the larger tapestry against which it occurred. For instance, many Americans (a great number of whom supported the war) were distressed to hear that American troops were forcibly administering oaths of allegiance to Mexican villagers, thus “absolving” them of their loyalty to their home nation (Ziegler, 1992, p. 113). E.D. Mansfield (1849) echoed the thoughts of many Americans: “These occurrences are so remarkable in American constitutional history that they have attracted no small attention from the gravest and most intelligent minds” (p. 82). Students might be asked, in the form of a case-study scenario, to consider the nature of these oaths—to what degree might they be considered binding? Were they legal? Under what body of law? Did U.S. troops violate the rules of war—if so, which ones?

The instructional value of the Mexican-American War is often found in its connections to what we might term “more important” topics—the issue of slavery, the abolition movement, and eventually, the Civil War. But this topic’s value also can be found in its association with more modern (and thus for many students, more relevant) topics. This applies, for instance, to the protest movements of the late 1960s and early 1970s, and can include the various episodes of social and political dissent over recent decades—as recently as 2008, for instance, former Vice-President Al Gore invoked the Mexican-American War at the Democratic National Convention, in criticizing the United States’ occupation of Iraq (Lawrence, 2013, p. 75).

Obstacles and Considerations

In teaching dissent, educators can face the same obstacles they will encounter in dealing with any historical topic—finding available time, the demands of the curriculum, the necessity to address other topics in just as thoughtful a manner. De Benedetti (1984) proposes what is
most likely the simplest method of realistically including topics of dissent into a standard social studies course—to incorporate “aspects of the American peace tradition” (including its existence) into existing curricula” (p. 76). Another concern, less practical but no less vexing, is the difficulty in recreating the drama and tension of an event, the resolution of which is well-known. In truth, though, this may also be seen as a singular advantage. In teaching about dissent to the Mexican-American War, a teacher gains an effective tool of engagement for students who primarily believe anti-war sentiment in American history is a contemporary phenomenon, developing in response to the Vietnam Conflict but having little presence or import before that.

Beyond pedagogical concerns, though, there are other obstacles. The manner in which dissent is featured in a standard social studies curriculum (when it is featured at all) tends to create the impression that such movements are sideshows to the larger narrative, that they are little more than interregnums between preordained conflicts. As De Benedetti (1984) puts it, “recurring peace efforts broken by intermittent wars leaves citizen peace-seekers looking like naive losers, a cultural category not much valued in the larger American society” (p. 77). This is a serious impediment; but one that could be diluted, if the subject of dissent were effectively elevated by the teacher to an instructional standing roughly equal to the story of the wars themselves. It would also have the added benefit of showing students that wars are not, despite their prominent place in traditional historical narratives, inevitable.

Perhaps more important, though, is the very real possibility that teaching about dissent may provoke accusations that such topics are negativist, defeatist, or unpatriotic. This sentiment is probably derived, in some ways, in some ways, from the manner in which the Mexican-American War ended. The war was hardly without cost—nearly 13,000 American soldiers died (mostly from disease and exposure), and the conflict’s expenses ran to over $100 million (Johannsen, 1985, p. 42). Worse still, for American domestic issues, was the sectionalism and civil strife that began in earnest, with the addition of so much land to the Union (“James K. Polk and the U.S. Mexican War: A policy Appraisal,” 2006). On the whole, though, the war was perceived by Americans at the time as a great triumph. The popular view of the war was influenced by the exploits of figures like Zachary Taylor, whose presidential run in 1848 was fueled by his military celebrity. Americans looked on the war as a venue for the display of national virtue, as with the heroic death of Maj. Samuel Ringgold—mortal wounded at the Battle of Palo Alto, Ringgold refused to leave the field even after both his legs had been mangled, and became a national icon for his bravery. Newspaper accounts described his heroism and his “only regret, that he could not kill more Mexicans!” (“A Chapter on the Mexican War,” 1847). The war’s end, memorialized by new nationalistic rituals, helped cement the popular view of the war as both a unifying moment, a smashing American victory, and (from a historical perspective) mostly important in its role as a precedent to the U.S. Civil War (Crothers, 2011).

In teaching that a great number of Americans opposed the war from beginning to end, teachers may run afoul of this view; and, perhaps more likely, may encounter resistance from those who view dissent as a manifest lack of patriotism. This, of course, is spurious—a failure to address the contrary view of the Mexican-American War infers that there wasn’t one, when in fact a fear of both a standing army and the prospect of “military intrusion into civil affairs” was a powerful force in the pre-Civil War era (De Benedetti, 1984, p. 84). More than that, teaching about dissent in the Mexican-American War reflects what should be an underlying goal of social
studies instruction—a critical examination of historical events with the intent of making the world a better place. It stands to reason, for most teachers and students, that “a better place” includes the lessened likelihood of war. Passe’s (1999) argument that we need to teach students to choose among conflicting values doesn’t diminish our obligation to promote values we think empower a well-lived life. Teaching about how Americans, of good conscience, tried to stop a war they saw as immoral, is hardly unpatriotic—in truth, it reflects the values our republic holds most dear. Landman (2004), while acknowledging that “times of crisis understandably arouse a sense of heightened vigilance,” goes on to describe the responsibility of social studies educators in light of that vigilance—we should be we be “as vigilant in defending our democratic traditions of freedom of speech and freedom of belief as in responding to those who truly threaten our democratic ideals” (p. 279).

John O’Sullivan, the San Francisco journalist who coined the phrase manifest destiny in 1845, wrote an essay he titled “Territorial Aggrandizement” later that same year. In it, he signaled that the manner in which his concept of a national calling was being used carried serious implications—“Democracies must make their conquests by moral agencies...if these are not sufficient, the conquest is robbery” (p. 246). The fact that the figure most credited with the concept that eventually led to the Mexican-American War spoke out in caution about our national motives is fairly indicative of the complexity of the issue. It is also a strong endorsement of the topic’s value in social studies instruction.
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Participatory Democracy for Gifted Students: An Opportunity for Methods Instructors

Shawn Daley, Phil Teeuwsen, & Dirk Windhorst

This practice-based article offers an overview for teacher educators of a method designed to address issues of civics and gifted education. It suggests that Social Studies methods instructors might include the preparation and staging of a Democracy Conference in their curriculum in order to inculcate an understanding of how to best approach teaching local government through a participatory exercise as well as how to scaffold pedagogy for talented and gifted students.

The direction of school curricula toward Math and English/Language Arts in the wake of the standards movement has limited time devoted to Social Studies and has often meant that teachers are unable to fully engage civics as a stand-alone topic (Levinson, 2012). Instead, teachers often integrate civic education into history lessons, focusing more on theory and less on how to operate in a participatory democracy. While those lessons may address government organization they offer students little practical experience with navigating those structures. Significantly, this means that while students are nominally aware that they have civic duties, like voting, they rarely engage in actually performing those duties once they leave secondary school (Hess, 2013). Equally worrisome is the possibility that even if they understand their civic obligations, specifically voting, they may not be knowledgeable enough in how they fulfill those obligations (Hess, 2012).

A concurrent issue is the treatment of gifted students, who frequently languish in the secondary classroom. This is partly because of the sustained focus on students who are categorized as “at risk,” and partly because of a lack of training on the part of new teachers for how to effectively engage students classified as gifted (Landis & Reschly, 2013, Finn, 2014). Often, we find that teachers of varying experience levels are inclined to simply assign gifted students more reading or task them with tutoring struggling students as opposed to crafting appropriate work for their skill levels. Research has also shown that younger teacher candidates, like those the authors teach in their respective undergraduate programs, are predisposed against gifted students, often considering gifted programs elitist (Jung, 2013). Unless thoughtful corrective action is applied at the pre-service level, they will be ill suited to properly differentiate for gifted students. Arguably, the inability of civics teachers to successfully engage their gifted population should be concerning to democracies, as without proper instruction communities might lose future leaders that could reform or advance North American society through public service and civic stewardship.

In order to address some of the concerns mentioned above, a Democracy Conference concept was developed at an independent urban university in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, and
replicated successfully at a similar-sized private, urban university in Portland, Oregon. The authors believe, based on their experiences with their respective conferences, that teacher educators, teacher candidates, and local gifted students, all would benefit from the implementation of this approach.

**Basis in Theory and Policy**

What is democracy? The Greek roots of the word bring to mind the stirring conclusion of Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg address: “…that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.” One way to understand the meaning of democracy is to study the workings of present-day political and governmental institutions. To put it in Canadian terms, to what extent are political representatives responsible to the people they are elected to serve? Another way is to examine the meaning of democracy in the wider society: how democratic is the corporation in which I work or the school which I attend? John Dewey was interested in democracy in this broader sense. He believed that if democracy was experienced in all facets of a society—and most particularly in schools—then the political institutions would naturally follow suit because they would consist of representatives who had been educated in the democratic way of life.

It has been almost 100 years since Dewey first published *Democracy and Education* (1916/1966). To paraphrase the Tragically Hip, he was ahead by a century. For him, democracy and community were synonymous:

> Individuals do not...compose a social group because they all work for a common end. The parts of a machine work with a maximum of cooperativeness for a common result, but they do not form a community. If, however, they were all cognizant of the common end and all interested in it, then they would form a community. But this would involve communication. Each would have to know what the other was about and would have to have some way of keeping the other informed as to his own purpose and progress. (p. 5)

The process of collaborative deliberation is the ideal to which every democratic assembly aspires. If this communal approach to solving problems was consistently employed in schools, lifelong habits would develop in which each student would feel confident to make intelligent contributions and, in turn, follow and assess the contributions of others. Genuine discussion and deliberation in a group would occur to the extent to which the contribution of every individual was welcomed by each of the others. This presupposed a safe and inviting classroom in which everyone felt free to question. The presenter would be challenged to clarify her ideas, explain her reasoning, and justify her conclusions. This demanded an artful teacher who knew when to step in and when to step aside. Ideally, if a solution required the consent of the group, it would be acted on only after everyone agreed. No one would be intimidated by the authority of the teacher or by the fear of ridicule by anyone in the group. Is there a better way to prepare future participants in a democratic society?

Recent work by Hess (2009) continued to shed light on how we need to incorporate greater discussion of critical issues within classrooms. Yet, it is not enough for methods students to simply read about civic education, but it is instead critical for students to have practice through simulating civic learning experiences. A recent literature review posited that effective civic experiences come in three forms — character education, participatory or political
simulations, or service learning programs (Lin, 2013), even if modified. With character education typically addressed in elementary classrooms, and contemporary candidates entering our programs with a strong grasp of service learning, we believe this project zeroes in on a methodology underemphasized in our programs -- participatory democracy simulations. Thus by offering our conference strategy, we contend that we provide candidates a richer training experience through exposure to successful civics pedagogy.

**Conference Origins**

Gifted conferences are fairly common in Ontario and generally involve a partnership between local public school boards and faculties of education. The partnership provides gifted learners with unique programming and teacher candidates with valuable teaching experience. The idea of a conference for gifted learners at the Hamilton university began when a local Gifted Assessment Coordinator approached the university’s faculty wondering about the possibility of the university partnering with his team to offer a Gifted Outreach Conference for students in grades 7 and 8. Their first conference was held in 2011. The focus was on ‘hands-on learning’ and teacher candidates volunteered to lead workshops. Participation was viewed as a good way to gain experience and expand professional networks.

That first conference was successful enough that the faculty and local educators decided to hold another conference the following year. Given that some of the students who had attended the first conference would be returning for the second, it was decided that a different theme was needed. The lead professor had a keen interest in the educational philosophy of John Dewey, who, among other things emphasized the importance of democracy and the place of democracy in education. His colleague was planning to teach a social studies methods class that coming year and was looking for ways to provide his students with authentic ‘real-world’ performance tasks. Through their discussions, they decided that local democracy would be a good focus, and so democracy became the organizing theme of the methods course with the conference as the culminating project.

The Hamilton team presented this experience at an academic conference in the spring of 2014, where they met a professor from the Portland, Oregon, who was interested in trying to replicate the conference. Together they pondered if the democracy conference could be successful in a different context, thus encouraging further replication of the method. Both conferences were introduced as assignments early in the fall semester, with methods students aware that this was going to be a principal assignment for the term.

**Teacher candidate efforts**

In Hamilton, teacher candidates were introduced to the conference on the first day of classes. The conference was scheduled to take place at the very end of the semester. Preparation focused on three key areas: democracy and its relation to social studies, gifted learners, and finally the structure of the conference itself.

The course began with a focus on perspectives on teaching and learning social studies as well as how to develop and plan around clearly articulated goals. Since social studies is such a broad field representing diverse areas of study, teacher candidates need to learn how to articulate and plan around goals that will pull the subject together. The focus was narrowed to understanding how democracy is an important element of the Ontario curriculum. The class
examined the role of citizenship education, paying close attention to Clark and Case’s (2013) assertion “that citizenship has been recognized as the rationale or defining aim of social studies since its inception as a school subject” (p. 19). The conference was introduced and the class was informed that they would be developing workshops on democracy that would focus on significant local issues in the Hamilton area.

With this organizing theme in place, the class turned its attention to the students they would be teaching. It had been the experience at the previous conferences that the candidates were generally effective at planning learning experiences, but less prepared for adapting those lessons to gifted learners. To address this, members of the planning group, gifted educators with the Hamilton Public Board, were invited to speak about gifted learners in class. They spoke about their experiences with gifted learning, characteristics of gifted learners, and the types of activities that would engage these learners. The inclusion of these professionals into the process was crucial for two reasons. First, the candidates were able to plan with the learners in mind from the start. Second, the candidates were able to converse with these professionals and as such expanded their networks.

Finally, the team began to lay out the conference plans in more detail. The candidates were free to design the workshops in their own way, but all of them were given the specific task of guiding their groups towards the development of a five-minute presentation or pitch that would be given to the whole group of students at the end of the conference. In this presentation, students would tell their peers what their issue was, and why they should be elected to present it to Hamilton City Council. The large group would then use democratic procedures to discuss, debate and finally vote on the most important issue. In short, the students would learn about democracy by participating in democracy.

Some class time was devoted to the preparation of the conference. Given time constraints, it was decided to post workshop ideas on a Google Doc so that everyone, including our partners in the various school boards, could participate in providing feedback as the workshops were developed.

The Hamilton team has benefited greatly from the partnership that had developed over four years of working on this conference. This made the organization of the event relatively straightforward – all partners knew their roles within the process. Hamilton also has had the benefit of access to a large number of students. Schools and teachers have grown familiar with the conference and had many logistics covered in terms of transportation and supervision. By this iteration, teacher candidates could focus almost solely on their workshops and their students.

In Portland, project planning began in earnest in early November, with teacher candidates getting the better part of the month to organize. In this case, the instructor felt compelled to suggest critical jobs for the candidates to take in order to facilitate the workshop. Considering the conference had no fiscal support from the university, school of education or local gifted programs, the team had to manage the conference via local donations and the shoestring budget proffered by the instructor’s largess. The most pivotal decision may have been the creation of the role of project manager among the teacher candidate ranks, as that candidate maintained communication with her peers about the project and essentially curated the project until its completion. Because of a small class size, the methods instructor
occupied a school liaison role, which made sense partly because of his connections with local
gifted program coordinators.

The Portland (American) experience revealed several significant challenges that may
emerge during this planning phase. The Portland team found it important to allow the teacher
candidates to have the opportunity to operate with a degree of autonomy. The project
manager had to be given actual authority, so that her peers would respond to her requests. If
the methods instructor overruled that manager, or consistently interjected during the
manager’s presentations, her influence was muted and the project hampered. For some
instructors who are less familiar with project-based instruction, this may be a hurdle in the
early stages. Likewise, the Portland project required students to operate in fields they may not
always be familiar – from seeking donations to communicating with city hall about
participation. Yet, considering the extensive growth in the roles American school educators are
asked to play, teacher candidates appreciated the opportunity to expand their repertoire.

Many American school districts may also be challenged by the lack of a central office for
coordinating gifted programs. Unlike what was experienced in Hamilton, Portland gifted
education is a haphazard enterprise, with a central public schools office disseminating
responsibility for program planning to individual schools in the form of building-level gifted
coordinators. These coordinators are usually classroom instructors with no teaching release to
work with gifted students. Very often they have no additional training with gifted instruction.
They also are at the mercy of the school’s individual budget for any type of programming
expenses, and rely on support from the parent community in order to run events. So while a
free workshop at a local university would seem like a godsend, without any additional support
for busing or student lunches, or even a teaching release period to arrange student
participation, those coordinators may be unable to facilitate attendance with even a month’s
lead time. The Portland conference found itself with a relatively small number of attendees,
and most gifted program coordinators cited these issues as their reason for deferring. The
groups that did attend, interestingly enough, were brought by parent car pools as opposed to
district transportation.

The Conferences

The Hamilton and Portland conferences differed in terms of the number people involved.
As stated previously, the Hamilton group was running its fourth Conference and benefited from
pre-established relationships and a well-coordinated local gifted program. There were 25
teacher candidates leading 8 workshops. In total, 114 grade 7 and 8 students participated.
There were a number of teachers from the school in attendance as well, serving as chaperones
for the day. The Portland group was just starting out and as such was still just beginning to
develop local organization. There were 8 teacher candidates leading 5 workshops involving 48
gifted 6th, 7th, and 8th graders. Only 1 active teacher was present, but at least 10 parents
remained for the duration of the conference. The conferences convened at the university
campuses with the students arriving early in the morning to attend. The schedules for both
events are listed in the visual below, and were scaffolded to address the number of students in
attendance. Both conferences began with an overview and keynote address, “What is
Democracy?”
In Hamilton, the opening session consisted of a simulated exercise in democracy, facilitated by one of the authors in the guise of a legislative speaker. After giving a short introduction on the basics of parliamentary procedure, the purpose of which was to maintain conditions allowing for the free and fair exchange of differing views, the speaker asked the students to meet in their groups for an impromptu discussion. Their task was to frame a motion on the issue of school reform: “The one field in which each of you is an expert is the experience of school from the students’ point of view. Therefore, if you had the power to change anything in the present school system, what would it be?” After twenty minutes of discussion, the speaker called the assembly to order and invited individuals to present their motions. Two microphones were set up in the aisles of the auditorium. Ostensibly on behalf of her group, a student moved that schools should incorporate more hands-on learning in practical subjects such as sewing or cooking or woodworking. Later, it was discovered that her group had not agreed to this particular motion. This caused some discussion within the group - however, from a procedural perspective she had not broken any rule. This particular group learned almost immediately, through first-hand experience, about a perennial issue faced by all elected officials: to what extent is a representative bound to the wishes of the people that elected her? Nevertheless, as the whole assembly soon realized, once a motion is deemed procedurally acceptable, it must be debated and voted on before any other main motion is considered. Debate on this motion began, with the speaker ensuring that participants took their turns behind the microphones.

Thus, students received a taste of parliamentary procedure by engaging in a short debate; the speaker played both the role of chair and instructor, occasionally seizing a “teachable moment” to explain why and how something was done. One unintended benefit was pointed out later in the debriefing session by one of the teacher candidates: by observing the gifted students engage in these group discussions ahead of time, they felt better prepared to lead the subsequent workshops. They were able to get a sense of who their students were prior to working with them.

In Portland, the methods instructor offered an overview of Portland city government, which is a unique City-Commission system, the last in the United States among large cities. Here, the City Council holds legislative, administrative and judicial powers, a holdover from the early 20th century that voters have upheld even after repeated challenges. Interestingly, the instructor had jokingly included an image from the US television show “Parks and Recreation,” which farcically depicts the operations of a fictional Indiana town government. This proved to be fortuitous, as almost every student in attendance knew the program’s characters and their government roles. While the instructor felt fortunate to have stumbled onto this, he noted that it was somewhat telling that American students’ understanding of local government had been
shaped by a weekly sitcom. The morning session did not include the parliamentary procedures entertained by Hamilton.

Post-keynote events differed between the two locales. In Hamilton, the students were arranged into groups prior to arriving at the conference. The team had learned at the first conference that it was more efficient to do so rather than having the students select from options. The local issues the students focused on were important, however, the most important idea was Democracy, and they would participate in this regardless of which group they were placed. Time was a defining issue at the conference. The candidates needed to pull together a group of students who did not know each other, introduce the topic and work towards the development of a final presentation, all within ninety minutes.

When the groups reassembled, they took turns giving their five-minute presentations and fielding questions from the whole assembly. There was extensive engagement, and the conference progressed well until one school had a bus issue leading to the need for thirty students to abruptly leave the conference. The Hamilton team was faced with an issue about the vote, since the entire body was not present to cast their ballots. They had two options: have the vote at the end of the presentations as planned or have the students who left view a video of the presentations they missed and vote online. After presenting these options, a student immediately rose and motioned that the group delay the vote so that those who had to leave would have an opportunity to participate. The motion was seconded and was followed by a frank debate. Ultimately the students decided to delay the vote. The students had learned the value of the democracy as a decision-making procedure and the candidates learned once again that teaching involves flexibility and a keen awareness of unexpected, teachable moments. In the end, the students selected “Child Poverty” as the issue to be presented at the Hamilton City Council.

In Portland, the small number of middle school students in attendance permitted the teacher candidates to pair up to present their workshops. The Portland team, like Hamilton, also made the decision to select workshop topics ahead of time and assign the gifted students to one of these topics. Unlike Hamilton, Portland offered two workshop sessions before the final presentations and voting, a first to work on researching the topics, and a second to help the students prepare and practice a presentation. This functioned smoothly as many of the pre-service teachers were getting dual-endorsed in English/Language Arts, so they could incorporate lessons about effective speaking into their second workshop periods. The workshops also made ample use of technology, with the teacher candidates incorporating iPads, laptops, the Google Apps suite, and social media in order to investigate topics, which ranged from calling on city government to subsidize youth sports to asking the city council for help with starting school gardens.

When students were ready to present their pitches, parents who had remained throughout the morning to observe the proceedings unexpectedly volunteered to serve as a mock City Council, giving the students the opportunity to practice more realistically than presenting just to their peers, particularly when the parents asked more pointed questions about program budgets or community support behind an effort. The conference team later reflected that it was “somewhat horrifying, but then quite relieving” to see the students they worked with get stunned by a difficult question but then recover and offer a thoughtful
answer. It was also somewhat inspiring to see the parents want to be involved with the process, a scenario we hope can be replicated in future iterations.

Yet, the group was additionally dismayed that the students themselves did not participate as fully in the questioning period as what had transpired in Hamilton. Because presentations often went over their five minutes, student discussion was hampered by conference time constraints. Almost immediately after the presentations ended, students were prompted to vote for the top presentation via the PollEverywhere.com software program. The assembly chose the presentation on subsidizing youth sports to be forwarded to city council. To the surprise of the teacher candidates, many middle school students asked if they could volunteer to work with the winning team on the final presentation. Since the teacher candidates had internalized that the goal of their conference was to spur ongoing civic participation, they agreed that any student who wanted could participate in that final effort.

Lessons learned

Having run for four iterations in Hamilton, the conference has become an important component of the Social Studies methods course. It is a complicated project to pull off, but it is important, and we have learned a number of important things through this process.

The candidates gained a greater understanding on adapting their plans and preferred methods for the students they teach, growing in their understanding of gifted learners. They expressed amazement at how intrinsically motivated these children were and the depth of the questions they asked. They found themselves reconsidering their understanding of the teacher’s role in this setting; one candidate even remarked, “I stopped seeing them as kids.” This perspective was tempered by other observations of disagreements between students and minor clashes of opinions. The candidates realized that because these students are gifted they must adapt the way they should teach. At the same time, the gifted students are adolescents in an unfamiliar and dynamic social setting. That also means something about the way they should be taught. The candidates learned in a short time that lesson planning needs to consider content, learning style, and cognitive/social development. Participation in the conference was far more effective, the authors felt, then addressing this at a theoretical level.

The conference also taught about the unpredictability of the learning process. Professors espouse this concept in many classes, but the conferences force them to accept it in their own teacher-education practice. There are many aspects of the conference that are beyond the control of the professors. Student numbers are unpredictable, inclement weather might make it necessary to cancel the event, students could get hurt, transportation plans could fall through, and the list goes on. Yet, these are the things teacher educators ask candidates to prepare for in their own teaching.

The team also learned much about the value of partnerships through this conference. The authors’ experience has been that the conference has been a benefit to the teacher candidates, the gifted students, the faculty in Hamilton and the gifted teachers in the school boards. It has taken a number of years to establish working relationships, but the benefits have been great. The hope is that this is a valuable model for teacher candidates to see how important it is to bring local people and professionals into the classroom so that their students can get a broader perspective of the world they inhabit.
The Portland methods instructor had significant apprehension about implementing this conference. Having completed many project-based assignments before, he was concerned by several candidates in his small undergraduate methods class, who were already overcommitted to jobs, school work or family life. He pitched a swap to a different form of assessment but his teacher candidate roundly rejected that option in favor of completing the conference.

This ultimately proved fortunate, as the conference ended up more successful than he imagined it could be. From a teacher educator standpoint, he appreciated watching the undergraduate students collaborate on a significant experiential task. They were more engaged with the course content in having to configure the best topics and methodological approach to teach them. They also appreciated the challenge of working with gifted students. Many had previous experiences with urban schools with high special needs populations, so their practice in differentiation was rusty at best. Both during and after the conference, they remarked on how this opportunity was flexing a different part of their brain.

Yet as is common in working with undergraduates, not all components ran smoothly. Teacher candidates struggled mightily with any role they had to play outside of developing curriculum. While one candidate secured a significant donation of snacks, interactions with the community were fraught with challenges, from an indifferent city hall to uninterested local businesses (including the university catering service, which proved unhelpful in staging the event). The Portland team contemplated means to improve this for future conferences, although those solutions primarily required the instructor to work significantly harder in the early goings to establish partnerships.

Yet, the team believed the Portland conference proved successful at its core aims – fostering an understanding of local civic government, encouraging participation in that civic mechanism, and engaging gifted students effectively. As the author went from workshop to workshop, he was impressed with the student strategizing to address how they thought Portland’s unique city government would respond. It was particularly invigorating to see that “losing” team members wanted to remain tied to the effort, so much so that over the subsequent winter break emails poured in from middle schoolers inquiring about meetings. Finally, it was evident from post-conference discussion that the teacher candidates had seen an effective means of differentiating for this particular student subgroup, and that they try to replicate the results in their own future classrooms.

Conclusion

The authors recognize the inherent challenge of trying to schedule project-based opportunities within the typical methods class. Teacher candidates are often attempting to learn methods for a wide array of topics, and carving up a significant chunk of that time for this type of conference might be too difficult for programs with such limited time. Yet, simultaneously, the authors found that with proper scheming, this specific project provides an opportunity for teacher candidates in the Social Studies to develop and hone their skill in several distinct methodologies. First, they are implementing a participatory experience in civics instruction that researchers feel is vital to effective citizenship education. Second, they are tailoring this opportunity to address the needs of a population, gifted learners, that might not receive the support it deserves in the secondary classroom. Third, it provides teacher candidates an opportunity for experiential learning. They have a chance to experience project-
based learning not only as a participant but also as a neophyte teacher, thinking of the elements they would need to replicate these opportunities in their own classrooms. Since we believe all of these project results are critical stepping-stones for the teacher candidate, we plan to continue implementing the Democracy Conference in our communities, and encourage colleagues to contemplate similar ventures in their own classrooms.
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Engaging Students in Powerful Social Studies Teaching and Learning with Multimedia

Judy Lambert & Victoria Stewart

The National Social Studies Council has advocated for powerful social studies teaching and learning that is meaningful, integrative, value-based, challenging, active, and integrates technology. Incorporating multimedia technologies teachers can make learning more relevant, inquiry-based, multidisciplinary, and interactive, supporting the council’s position for powerful teaching and learning. Multimedia tools also offer students practice in critical thinking, creativity, deep exploration, and thoughtful reflection. This manuscript discusses three multimedia technologies: digital video, nonlinear multimedia presentations, and geospatial technology; offers relevant research and suggestions for use; and illustrates through classroom examples the power of these multimedia technologies to enhance the social studies curriculum.

Introduction

Teachers will confirm that when students enjoy and are interested in a topic, they are more willing to engage with classroom content. Promoting interest in academic content is important, as it has been proposed that interest is an important component in learning (Renninger, 1992). Unfortunately, many consider social studies irrelevant and unimportant when compared to other subjects (Chido & Byford, 2004; Ciborowski, 2005; Houser, 1995; Stetsen, & Williams, 2005; Zhao & Hoge, 2005). Because of this, there is little desire to teach or learn the subject (Pahl, 1994; Wade, 2002; Wolters & Pintrich, 1998), a problem that is particularly true in elementary grades where teachers are responsible for teaching multiple disciplines.

Perhaps one reason for such negative attitudes is reliance on transmission methods of teaching that are common in social studies classrooms. Investigations into students’ perceptions of social studies identified the classroom context, more particularly the methods used, as important to students’ perceptions (Chido & Byford, 2004; Zhao & Hoge, 2005). Descriptions of student experiences in these studies reinforced perceptions of social studies as “boring” when dominated by the teacher, text and workbook pages. On the contrary, students’ attitudes toward and interest in social studies were improved when teachers use technology in their classrooms (Akkerman & Admiraal, 2009; Bennett & Scholes, 2001; Boon, Fore, & Rasheed, 2007; Gehlbach, Brown, Ioannou, Boyer, & Niv-Solomon, 2007; Ioannou, Brown, Hannafin, & Boyer, 2009; Kaya, 2011; Romanov & Nevgi, 2007).

Improving student attitudes toward the social studies is but one reason for integrating technology in the social studies classroom. In its technology position statement, the National Council for the Social Studies [NCSS] (2006) called for the sensible infusion of technology to extend learning beyond what could be done without its use. This proposition suggests moving beyond traditional social studies practices, to creating new learning opportunities afforded only by new technologies.
NCSS Position Statements and Technology

In its position statement for powerful teaching and learning, NCSS (2008) maintained that “Teaching and learning in social studies are powerful when they are meaningful, integrative, value-based, challenging, and active” (p. 3). The statement also describes ways that technology is an integral component of powerful teaching. Such teaching emphasizes building skills students need to be successful in a constantly changing world. These skills include information gathering and analysis, inquiry and critical thinking, communication, data analysis and the use of technology. Students need opportunities to use these skills while learning concepts and themes in depth through reflective study. Teaching and learning that is integrative not only combines elements from across all social studies disciplines (e.g., history, economics, geography) but also draws from arts, sciences, and humanities and other academic content, requiring students to use reading/writing, communication skills, and technology to understand the complexities of social studies events and phenomena.

Challenging teaching engages students with multiple modes of expression, including regular writing, analysis of resources and documents, detailed study of topics, and disciplined inquiry. Inquiry in the social studies content may require teachers to engage students with content and concepts that are value-based. Value-based teaching enables students to think critically about values, policies, and make supported arguments and informed decisions; develop sensitivity to different cultures; and make commitment to social responsibility and action. Active teaching engages students in learning using hands-on approaches as well as their minds. Students learn to think and process what they are learning, work collaboratively, and construct their own meanings using a repertoire of strategies.

Keeping abreast of advances in technology, NCSS (2013a) revised its technology position to include the use of mobile technologies, online learning environments, and the use of social media in social studies. According to this statement, there will be 10 billion mobile devices worldwide by 2016. Furthermore, in a survey of parents, 78% reported that their children (ages 3-17) had access to portable computers, and 77% had access to a smartphone in their home (Grunwald Associates LLC, 2012). Ubiquitous and escalating technology growth demands that we integrate technology in social studies classrooms to help students build 21st century skills, develop digital media literacy, and understand the ramifications of how such technology is used to make political and economic decisions. These new skills require that teachers reconsider how best to prepare students for this digital age and provide guidelines to promote and model responsible digital citizenship. Engaging students in a digital world provides them with opportunities to become active and participatory citizens in a supportive and monitored environment.

Moreover, free access to a variety of sophisticated yet easy-to-use online applications makes publishing, creating and sharing ideas available to virtually anyone, thereby affording opportunities to use these technologies in support of deep learning. This paper will explain the benefits of three different multimedia technologies—digital videos, nonlinear multimedia presentations, and Google Earth—that hold potential to capitalize on the power of technology to enhance learning in the social studies. Authors make connections to recent research in the field as well as provide example projects as illustrations of powerful uses of technology in the social studies curriculum. The goal is to offer ideas and a rationale for teachers seeking to
extend learning beyond what could be achieved without technology in the social studies classroom while supporting learning that is “meaningful, integrative, value-based, challenging, active, and integrates technology” (NCSS, 2008).

Digital Video

Individuals and businesses are harnessing the power of digital video to share their perspectives, advocate for change, or as marketing or story-telling tools. Digital video typically refers to recording moving images and sound using a digital device such as a video camera (JISC Digital Media, n.d.). Digital recording capabilities, which are now standard on most computers, smartphones, tablets and other portable devices, can be used to capture and store video almost anytime and anywhere. Using video editing software such as iMovie or Windows Movie Maker, individuals can embed pictures, audio clips, animations, special effects, and short video clips to create original videos.

In addition to creating original new media, users have capabilities to modify existing media through remixing. Remixing refers to taking existing media, in this case videos from an Internet video site (e.g., YouTube), and adding those videos along with other elements such as text pop up text boxes, maps, and Wikipedia articles to create a “remixed” version of the video. Applications such as Mozilla’s Popcorn Maker allow one to remix videos. Creating original or remixed videos provides students with opportunities to interact with, think critically about, and reflect on a topic through a personal lens. When gathering relevant media to insert in their videos, students also must analyze, interpret, and then reconstruct content using their own perspectives and unique understandings.

In this way, digital video can encourage thoughtful reflection, creativity, and personal expression about important social studies topics, all characteristics of meaningful and challenging teaching (Hofer & Swan, 2006; Kelly, 2011; Mangum 2005; Shul, 2011). Kelly (2011) discovered the power of remixed videos when one of his students changed the music on a historical YouTube video about the Nuremberg trials. The music in the video reminded the student of Nazi propaganda films that had been shown in the class several weeks earlier. The student replaced the original music with the triumphant Mozart’s Requiem, which he thought to be more appropriate for the seriousness of the situation. Kelly suggested that in making the modification, the student illustrated “A new way of thinking about the nature of evidence and how evidence can and should be used of make sense of past events” (p. 372). The student altered a primary source to make a point about the past, an action that contradicted Kelly’s prior belief that history is built on a foundation of evidence drawn as closely as possible from primary sources. While initially uncomfortable with this kind of historical remixing, Kelly suggested that it might be time for historians to allow students to experiment with new forms of historical knowledge production. Such practice allows students to interpret concepts and illustrate their understanding of these concepts in powerful ways.

This example dovetails with descriptions provided in the Career, College and Civic (C3) Framework for Social Studies State Standards (NCSS, 2013b), suggesting that teachers “act as guides, facilitators, and disciplinary ambassadors” to encourage students to engage in investigative work, make sense of what they find, and ultimately, communicate their understandings using a variety of formats, including digital approaches” (p. 90). This use of digital video illustrates how powerful, value-based social studies teachers develop awareness of
their own values and how those values influence their teaching. According to NCSS (2008), these teachers assess their teaching from multiple perspectives and when appropriate, adjust it to achieve a better balance.

Hofer and Swan (2006) described how their students also were challenged more deeply about controversial advertising practices during elections as they created digital videos that included historical documents to support their reasoning. Students collected images and other media used in the 2004 U.S. presidential campaign as means of propaganda and explored how these could be edited and fabricated to advance a particular point of view. Students then created digital video commercials related to an important issue in the election and incorporated different forms of media to make a compelling case for their point of view. Digital video in this case extended learning by allowing students to go beyond the analysis of political stratagem by providing them with an artistic tool (integrative) to construct their perspective on a topic through production of video commercials (active) in support of a particular position (value-based). As described in these two examples, using digital video forces students to reflect, analyze, interpret, find evidence to support their claims about historical events, and construct their understanding in a new way.

The remixed digital video, “What Is So Important about Afghanistan?” illustrates many of the characteristics of powerful teaching and learning previously described (Lambert, 2013a). Given the assignment to critically analyze and evaluate a current issue of global concern, a student created this digital video to describe the role of Afghanistan in world conflicts. The student goes beyond detailing facts about Afghanistan to expressing their personal interpretation of how events surrounding Afghanistan are related to and influence personal freedom.

Figure 1. “What Is So Important About Afghanistan?” View online presentation: http://tinyurl.com/p2te776
The original video, which was produced in Microsoft’s Movie Maker application and uploaded to YouTube, was remixed using an online digital video creator, Mozilla’s Popcorn Maker (https://popcorn.webmaker.org/). The inclusion of poignant music, popup text boxes that focus attention on key points, external links to additional information, and relevant pictures illustrate the student’s ability to think critically about and develop an affective connection to the topic. The example also illustrates the transformative power afforded through technology to promote learning experiences beyond what could have been gained or expressed through reading about Afghanistan in a textbook.

**Nonlinear Multimedia Presentations**

Multimedia is commonly used in education, and is understood as the inclusion of different types of media including text, hyperlinks, graphics, primary documents, sound, music, and videos (Mayer, 2014). Multimedia software provides a platform to create interesting presentations embedded with a variety of media. Online multimedia tools come in many forms including slideshows, posters, and timelines, just to name a few. Linear multimedia, such as PowerPoint slides, progresses from one screen to the next and is commonly used by instructors during their instruction. This kind of multimedia merely requires viewing a presentation akin to turning the pages of a book. Conversely, nonlinear multimedia (NLMM) like that found on the Internet, offer viewers interactivity, control of progress, and choice in how they construct what they are learning through clicking hyperlinks. From the perspective of the viewer of an NLMM presentation, the ability to proceed through a presentation in the order that fits their personal needs provides advantages not only in learning, but in time management, and information retrieval.

Like when using digital video, when students develop nonlinear multimedia it requires them to use higher level thinking skills. When creating NLMM, students must identify and research a topic, evaluate essential and relevant information, and organize the information into manageable and coherent chunks. Students must also locate appropriate media to illustrate and support the facts, concepts, and interpretations that they are attempting to communicate, and then use nonlinear linking methods, such as hyperlinks, to give the concepts an organizational scheme and provide viewer navigation.

Research shows that utilizing multimedia in the social studies classroom holds potential to enhance learning, improve attitudes toward learning, and increase motivation and interest for learning (Ioannou et al., 2009; Kingsley & Boone, 2008). As part of the GlobalEd international project that comprised 15 countries, some students used online multimedia-rich simulations to learn about global warming while others used only online text (Ioannou et al., 2009). Students who used the multimedia experienced significant gains in knowledge and interest in social studies over their peers. This kind of project illustrates how social studies can be more powerful when it is active and makes use of technology to extend learning beyond the traditional classroom and typical textbook instruction.

In another study (Hernandez-Ramos & De La Paz, 2009), students who created multimedia presentations on westward expansion demonstrated improved historical thinking skills (i.e., ability to interpret history in light of claims made from primary documents), greater understanding of history, and significantly better attitudes toward learning history as compared to students in a control group who experienced whole class instruction and no multimedia.
Production of the multimedia projects allowed students to practice and demonstrate the historical thinking they had been taught by including quotes, citations and examples in the projects as evidence for their claims. As evidenced in the digital video discussion (Hofer & Swan, 2006; Kelly, 2011), these students also went beyond just presenting facts to interpreting them based on evidence. In meaningful and active teaching and learning such as this, teachers not only provide explanations and modeling, they also expand their repertoire of teaching strategies to allow students to analyze content using different learning modes (NCSS, 2008). Just as in digital video, when teachers ask students to create multimedia presentations, this gives students a reason to use the skills of analysis and interpretation a practical and powerful way.

An example of a nonlinear multimedia presentation, “Survival of the Fittest,” was submitted as part of an assigned task requiring students to research a topic, present and support an opinion related to a controversial World History topic using primary documents (Lambert, 2013b). “Survival of the Fittest” uses the online application Prezi (https://prezi.com/), and the presentation, which includes text, pictures, links to Internet sites, primary documents, stirring music, and embedded videos, allows the viewer to interact with the presentations as they choose. For example, the viewer has the option of watching the presentation in the order established by the creator, using navigational arrows at the bottom of the window, or by using the “autoplay” feature. Alternatively, viewers can click on any area of the presentation canvas to explore it more closely. When using any of these methods the canvas will automatically zoom in to a close up of the content represented on the canvas at that point, making it easier to focus on individual facts, concepts, or sources embedded in the presentation.

Different organizational options provided on prefabricated canvases include webs, hierarchal structures, storyboards, and “linear” paths among others. Much like static hard-copy graphic organizers, these canvases can be used to scaffold users thinking about the organizational structure of the material that they will present with the added benefit of movement between and among parts of the structure. Hence, student thinking extends from knowledge and comprehension of the content, toward analysis of content and disciplinary structures, and how to communicate their understanding.

In the example Prezi presentation, “Survival of the Fittest,” a student described the persecution of the Jews during World War II (Lambert, 2013b). The title of the presentation asks the viewer to consider if the persecution and death of the Jews was merely the survival of the fittest, as Hitler proclaimed. The student presents deep conceptual knowledge about the systematic persecution and killing of Jews, the euphemisms Nazis used to disguise their crimes, ghettos and concentration camps, liberation, and aftermath based on numbers of people killed. Finally, the viewer is taken to the last slide where the student, once again, asks a final probing question, “or is it just plain...Genocide?” This project gives evidence of the students’ ability to look at opposing sides, research and question claims, and form value judgments based on existing evidence. The multimedia technology provided the tools for affective expression, construction of information, inclusion of documents, and interesting presentation of an historical topic.
Another example of using multimedia in the classroom is Tiki-Toki (http://www.tiki-toki.com), a seemingly linear method of the timeline in a nonlinear fashion capitalizing on the affordances of NLMM. Using Tiki Toki, the viewer moves through a timeline using the scroll bar located at the bottom of the window or simply by moving the mouse inside the timeline window. In similar fashion to other NLMM, the viewer also has the ability to move to different points on the timeline as desired. Events on the timeline might include text, pictures, or embedded videos, and each event also includes a “more” button that can be clicked to provide additional information.

Similar to Prezi, Tiki-Toki timelines can be created collaboratively, and shared using an Internet link as well as embedding links to websites or blogs. An interesting attribute available using Tiki-toki is that timelines can be developed and represented in either 2D or 3D. When using 3D, the viewer is able to move through time, seemingly “strolling” past events, historical or others, stopping to view and learn more about the events included on the timeline. Such a representation may serve to help students come to understand and think about chronology differently, as they move “forward” in time and due to the 3D perspective they can view events that are still yet to come, but visible on the horizon. Such a view would be especially important when considering multitier timelines. This representation is very different than the flat linear multi-tier approach in which events are demarcated in lock-step order.

In the presentation, “Civil War,” a student displayed significant events related to this period on a timeline and explained how these events played a role in shaping the United States today (Lambert, 2013c). As when digital video is used, nonlinear multimedia requires students to research the topic, decide what to include and exclude, and determine how to best communicate information using a variety of supportive media. This active experience will engage students in what they are learning, provide the tools to develop a concept in depth, allow the inclusion of primary documents, and make social studies topics more personally meaningful.
Geospatial Technologies

Geospatial technology (GST) refers to equipment used in the visualization, measurement, and analysis of earth’s features, including GPS (global positioning systems), GIS (geographical information systems), and RS (remote sensing) (Cimons, 2011). These technologies are used in GPS (global positioning systems) navigation, homeland security, environmental protection, law enforcement crime response, emergency disaster management, public health tracking of disease, mapping, and location of water resources. Spatial skills, which are necessary for using GST, are employed in everyday life as we travel from one place to another, play games, solve problems, and look for hidden objects. Yet, these skills and technologies have not yet been widely introduced in the classroom and as a result, research addressing their potential for learning is scarce (National Research Council [NRC], 2006). However, there are many suggestions for how these skills and technologies can enhance the social studies curriculum.

When considering GTS applications in classrooms, practice with and reinforcing geographic knowledge and abilities is the obvious point of intersection. Certainly students can develop and use 2D mapping skills as well as spatial awareness using 3D map capabilities. However, researchers (Fitchett & Good, 2012; Milson & Alibrandi, 2008) have illustrated the integrative nature of GTS, describing, for instance, how GIS can engage students when conducting historical investigations and provide engagement in authentic investigations of community problems. Students can visualize the past using GIS maps and address current complex issues including demographic, political, and economic landscapes. They can explore geographic relationships among people, events, natural resources, and places on the globe and use the visual data to analyze and interpret historical events (NRC, 2006). Fitchett and Good (2012) described how GTS allows teachers to enact dynamic instruction that encourages social studies inquiry. Their students used GIS and geobrowsers such as Google Earth to analyze historical genocidal acts from a geographic perspective.

Lamb and Johnson (2010) provide numerous other ideas for using geospatial technologies in the social studies curriculum based on the applications’ capabilities to help
students visualize important issues and connect these issues to locations on the globe. For example, students can use Google Earth to analyze world population density, immigration, wars, and global warming. Further, virtual “visits” to historical sites such as Ancient Rome or Greece, famous landmarks, buildings, and battlefields can be explored using Google Earth and some are even available in 3D perspectives. Patterson (2006) describes how Google Earth could be used as a political education tool to engage students in the exploration of world issues and politically-oriented questions such as voting analysis, political ramifications of development, politico-historical context, and crime analysis.

Google Earth provides tools to create a tour of places on the globe by pinning placemarks at different locations and embedding media such as text, images, links to Internet sites, and videos on balloons that pop up at each location. Students can conduct research on the Internet and then embed relevant resources within Google Earth. In this last example of how multimedia can be used to extend classroom learning, students were asked to create a Google Earth tour that illustrated the significance of early exploration and world trade. The Google Earth project, “East India Trading Voyage” demonstrates the deep inquiry and critical thinking developed by a student while researching early trade routes and the impact of these on today’s world (Lambert, 2013d). This example illustrates the endless possibilities of integrating Google Earth with other disciplines.

Figure 4. "East India Trading Voyage.” Google Earth kmz file download: https://db.tt/m7IU5eYb.

Note: You must have Google Earth installed on your computer to open this file. You can download the software at http://www.google.com/earth/download/ge/agree.html

The “East India Trading Voyage” takes the viewer on a 3D ancient trading voyage from London, around the Cape of Good Hope, to Zanzibar, then to India, and then back to London.
(Lambert, 2013d). The text on placemarks is written in narrative form, thereby integrating language arts, and making the viewer of the project the captain of the ship. One of the placemarks in the project requires the viewer to use a built-in ruler to measure the distance from London to India and estimate the time it will take to travel the voyage, thus integrating math. Questions along the voyage ask the viewer to choose their cargo for trading; explain the importance of the route around the Cape of Good Hope; find out what dangers lurk in the waters near Madagascar; describe the importance of trade in Zanzibar and India; and examine the cultural, religious, and societal impacts of the Indian Ocean trade. This kind of project provides students practice in spatial and geographic skills by moving around on the globe while they learn, fosters a mindset of exploration, and offers a sense of reality and connectedness to learning in other disciplines. The project also helps students visualize what they are learning and relate concepts to places on the globe, and allows them to see their world from a more global perspective. When using Google Earth, learning is integrative as it allows students to examine human experience over time and space, connect with the past, and link to the present; as it combines social studies with math and language arts; and as it allows students to analyze content in a new mode of learning.

Summary

As content and pedagogical experts, it is the teacher’s role to promote student learning and to support abilities to communicate that learning using different methods appropriate to the topic and discipline. As evidenced in the aforementioned examples, enhancing the social studies curriculum with free online multimedia technologies allows teachers to engage students with content in ways that support deep, challenging, and meaningful learning. Producing multimedia presentations requires inquiry, research and information literacy, critical thinking, organization, and creativity, all skills that will more likely engage students in learning social studies in active ways and prepare them for work in the 21st century workplace. Furthermore, multimedia creation is integrative as students must write about a topic and find rich, supportive media and primary documents to build understanding of complex events with gathered resources. Multimedia also promotes value-based teaching as students interpret concepts and events in a personally relevant and meaningful way, with the support of different media, and form values based on evidence and their own interpretations of that evidence. Finally, using multimedia challenges students to actively engage in inquiry and exploration about social studies, processes that require the use of students’ hands and minds.

One of the most powerful ways that multimedia technologies can extend learning and make it more meaningful and value laden is in helping students make an emotional connection to important issues. Schul (2011) described the positive impact of student-created documentaries on the development of “historical empathy.” In brief, historical empathy refers to the ability to move beyond your individual perspective and consider the point of view and experience of others. However, Barton and Levstik (2004) suggest that historical empathy also contains an “emotional connection, in the form of care, a critical tool for making sense of the past” (p. 241). By reflecting on their feelings, experiences and beliefs, students are processing concepts in a personal way and making the topic interesting and relevant. Students can express their own feelings about what they are learning by including media that is meaningful to them.
To support student analysis of sources of any sort, teachers should and often do develop or locate analysis frameworks that support students’ development as consumers of content. Documents are available to support analysis of various media types, however, these fall short when promoting reflection in support of development of empathy. For instance, the Library of Congress, provides analysis tools to be used with various sources including, print, electronic, and sound. The documents guide teacher’s in developing student skills to observe, reflect, and question (http://www.loc.gov/teachers/usingprimarysources/guides.html). However, questions that challenge students to reflect on affective aspects, such as caring and empathy are absent from such frameworks. Hence, the challenge for teachers then is to support development of valuing, caring, and empathy to offer a more meaningful experience for students.

Thus it is clear that students cannot engage in such endeavors alone. According to Kellner and Share (2007), in order to prepare students to be active and participatory citizens in contemporary democratic society, new pedagogical approaches are required to support student development as both consumers and producers of media. Information mining and associated analysis and reflections required of deep thinking does not occur without careful planning and structured guidance, which is the role of the social studies teacher. Effective social studies teachers in the 21st century must become competent citizens in both the physical and digital worlds in order to support the same in their students. 21st century multimedia technologies can offer powerful teaching and learning opportunities that will be engage and interest today’s digital citizens in learning social studies. According to NCSS (2006), technological change is one of the few constants of the early 21st century, necessitating that social studies educators prepare digital citizens and rethink the type of social studies learning that will best prepare these citizens for 21st century living that is saturated with technology.
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Climate Change: How Does it Affect Me?

Steve Wohlmuth

This lesson plan focuses on an introductory classroom assignment that teachers can use in the classroom, which allows students to graphically illustrate scientific data from some of the leading scientists in the world, along with locally collected data in an effort to engage students to critically analyze data and make connections between human activities to climate change.

Climate Change
What Are Greenhouse Gases?

Some greenhouse gases occur naturally in the atmosphere, while others result from human activities (anthropogenic gases). Naturally occurring greenhouse gases include water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and ozone. Certain human activities, however, add to the levels of most of these naturally occurring gases:

**Carbon dioxide** is released to the atmosphere when solid waste, fossil fuels (oil, natural gas, and coal), and wood and wood products are burned.

**Methane** is emitted during the production and transport of coal, natural gas, and oil. Methane emissions also result from the decomposition of organic wastes in municipal solid waste landfills, and the raising of livestock.

**Nitrous oxide** is emitted during agricultural and industrial activities, as well as during combustion of solid waste and fossil fuels.

Very powerful greenhouse gases that are not naturally occurring include hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF6), which are generated in a variety of industrial processes.

Each greenhouse gas differs in its ability to absorb heat in the atmosphere. HFCs and PFCs are the most heat-absorbent. Methane traps over 21 times more heat per molecule than carbon dioxide, and nitrous oxide absorbs 270 times more heat per molecule than carbon dioxide. Often, estimates of greenhouse gas emissions are presented in units of millions of metric tons of carbon equivalents (MMTCE), which weights each gas by its GWP value, or Global Warming Potential.
Section 1:
Climate Change: Carbon Dioxide

During the past 200 years, humans have caused a remarkable change in the levels of atmospheric greenhouse gases. Since the 1960’s, direct measurements have been taken by scientific instruments to measure changes in the earth’s atmosphere. Using these measurements, scientists have noticed changes in the greenhouse gases, particularly carbon dioxide. In recent years, scientists have used the deep ice cores from Antarctica to determine carbon dioxide measurements in the geologic past. This was done by examining bubbles containing the trapped atmosphere in the polar ice. Scientists have been able to examine ice that is 650 000 years old in Antarctic. These measurements were done by the European Project for Ice Coring in Antarctica (EPICA) and release to the scientific community in November 2005 (Brooks, 2008).

QR Code: Web Link: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zoTXbXsC69k

Question 1a. Line Graph

Using the data provided, construct a line graph to illustrate the carbon dioxide levels measured by the European Project for Ice Coring in Antarctica Team (EPICA). (PPM = Parts per million) and CO2Now.org. Put the time on the (X) axis and the carbon dioxide levels on the (Y) axis. Title and Label graph (10pts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In thousand of years ago (tya)</th>
<th>Carbon Dioxide Level (ppm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today (0)</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 1b.

Using the data above, determine the percentage change for the following time periods. (11pts) Global Carbon Dioxide Level (PPM) * Math to first decimal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(TYA)</th>
<th>PPM</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PPM</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PPM</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PPM</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and CO2Now.org

Question 1 c.

Construct a list four (4) anthropogenic gas sources/locations admitted in your community or region? (4pts)

1. ______________________________
2. ______________________________
3. ______________________________
4. ______________________________

Question 1 d.

Detail a management strategy to reduce (1) one of the anthropogenic gas sources in your community. (2pts)

__________________________________________________________________________
Section 2:
Climate Change: Temperature

Global sea level and the Earth’s climate are closely linked. The Earth's climate has warmed about 1.5°F during the last 100 years. As the climate has warmed following the end of a recent cold period known as the "Little Ice Age" in the 19th century, sea level has been rising about 1 to 2 millimeters per year due to the reduction in volume of ice caps, ice fields, and mountain glaciers in addition to the thermal expansion of ocean water. If present trends continue, including an increase in global temperatures caused by increased greenhouse-gas emissions, many of the world's mountain glaciers will disappear. For example in Iceland, about 11 percent of the island is covered by glaciers (mostly ice caps). If warming continues, Iceland's glaciers will decrease by 40 percent by 2100 and virtually disappear by 2200 (Poore, Williams, & Tracey, 2000).

Question 2a. Line Graph

Construct a line graph to illustrate the annual global surface temperature anomalies (land and sea) from 1880 to 2013. Put the Years on the (X) axis and the temperature on the (Y) axis.
Title and Label graph (10pts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Temperature in Celsius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>+0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>+0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>+0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>+0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>+0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>+0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Climatic Data Center (NOAA), 2013
Questions 2b.

What implications do increased temperatures globally have on natural disasters such as hurricanes, floods and droughts? (Internet Research) (4pts)
QR Code Link: Web Link: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CQUMPRIxES8

Section 3:
Climate Change:
Anthropogenic Sources

Question 3a. Bar Graph

Using the following data below, construct a dual bar graph to illustrate the top ten carbon dioxide contributors globally. Title and Label graph (10pts)

The Top Ten Carbon Dioxide Emission Nations: 1999 and 2013
MMT = Million Metric Tons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2992</td>
<td>7031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>5682</td>
<td>5461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>544</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Question 3b.

Using the table above, calculate the percentage change between 1999 and 2013. (5pts) *
Math to first decimal.
Question 3 c. *(think for yourself)*

Which four countries had the largest increase in percent between 1999 to 2013? *Why have these countries emission level increased so much? (3pts)

____________________________________________________________________________________

Question 3d (think for yourself)

Why are most of the top 10 countries reluctant to participate in a major emission reduction agreement? (2pts)

____________________________________________________________________________________

Taking Action

Question 3e.

What are (5) things that could be done by each person or household to reduce greenhouse gas emissions? *(Online Research)* (5pts)

Web Link: QR Code Link:
http://www.davidsuzuki.org/what-you-can-do/reduce-your-carbon-footprint

1. ____________________________________________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________________________________________
4. ____________________________________________________________________________
5. ____________________________________________________________________________

Section 4:

Climate Change: Disappearing Arctic Ice

For the ten consecutive year, scientists using satellite data have tracked a stunning reduction in arctic sea ice at the end of the northern summer. The persistence of near-record low extents leads the group to conclude that Arctic sea ice is likely on an accelerating, long-term decline.

Question 4 a.

Using the data table on the next page, determine in percent how much of the arctic ice cap has been lost from 1979 to 2013? (2pts)

__________________________________________
Question 4b. Line Graph

Using the data below, construct a line graph of Arctic Ice cover (average for January) from 1979 – 2020. Title and Label graph (10pts) QR Code Link: Web Link: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UVzCOoQY28Y

IMPORTANT: When indicating time on the (X) axis, extent the year to 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Linear regression X values</th>
<th>Millions of square miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4c.
On the graph using a line of best fit, predict the Arctic ice cover to the year 2020. Use a dashed line of best fit from 2013 to 2020. (2 pts)

Question 4d. (Bonus)
Using linear regression, what would be the area of Arctic Ice cover in 2020?

Question 4e. (Bonus)
Using linear regression, in what year (calendar year) will the Arctic Ice cover disappear or reach zero cover?

Section 5:
Climate Change: Sea Level Rise and the Global Conveyer Belt
Over the last 100 years, the global sea level has risen by about 17.5 cm. Sea level change is difficult to measure. Relative sea level changes have been derived mainly from tide-gauge data. In the conventional tide-gauge system, the sea level is measured relative to a land-based tide-gauge benchmark. The major problem is that the land experiences vertical movements (e.g.
from isostatic effects, neotectonism, and sedimentation), and these get incorporated into the measurements (United Nations Environmental Programme, 2006). The major concern is what would happen if the Greenland and/or the Antarctic Ice Sheet melted? Experts predict if the Greenland Ice Sheet melts that global sea level will rise 7 meters. This melting of the Greenland Ice Sheet also may have profound impacts on the Atlantic/Arctic Ocean water. The mixing of fresh water and salt water could affect the stability of the thermohaline in the Atlantic and Arctic and could also disrupt the “Global Conveyer Belt”.

5a. Using the map of Florida provided, color code the areas affected by coastline sea level rise into the future. You will need four color pencils to complete this question. Use one color for each sea level change. Start at the current Florida coastline, determine the progression of sea level change overtime.

Source: Geology.com, 2015
5b. Given the predicted change in the future, how would you advise or consult local authorities? Outline a mitigation plan for the State of Florida. Consider short and long term options. Use an atlas, highway map to predict which communities, towns and cities that could be potentially impacted by rising sea levels. (5pts)

Section 6
The Impact of Sea Level Rise: Kentville, Nova Scotia CANADA

6a. Using the map of Kentville provided, colour code the areas affected by coastline sea level rise over the next 400 years. You will need two colour pencils to complete this question. Use one colour for each sea level change. Start at the banks of the Cornwallis River and using the contour lines determine the location of each 200/400 years of sea level change. Note: The mean average height of Cornwallis River is 5.7 meters. (8pts)

Coastline Predictions: Nova Scotia Department of Natural Resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Predicted Sea Level Change in Meters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2211</td>
<td>4 m + 5.7 m = 9.7m (10m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2411</td>
<td>8 m + 5.7 m = 13.7m (14m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6b. Given the predicted change over coming centuries in question 5b, how would you advise or consult local authorities? Outline a mitigation plan for the town of Kentville. Consider short and long term options. (5pts)
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Apps for Social Studies: A Review

Review by Jessica Bray who is currently enrolled in Concordia University’s Masters in Teaching Secondary Education program, seeking endorsements in Social Studies and English Language Arts.

Software developers have continued to create educational programs to use on mobile devices. For Social Studies educators, there has been a wide assortment of Apps, although many are arguably versions of textbooks with extensive multi-media, such as the Timeline programs that review the Civil War and World War II. Many more are mere games couched in a historical era with little to no educational value. Two Apps were released in the past year that seem to defy both of these categories, Frontier Heroes (Elementary level) and The Underground Railroad (Secondary level). This review will examine both Apps and their prospects for integration in a Social Studies classroom.

Frontier Heroes

Frontier Heroes, produced by A&E Television Networks, is a free app that allows students to explore United States history while working their way through various tasks, earning stars and unlocking facts in order to level up. The game contains six levels, with each level focusing on a different historical era. The player begins in Early America with the Native Americans, moves through The Colonies, The American Revolution, The Frontier, The California Gold Rush, and completes the game at “The Land of the Free.” Each level contains five mini games. For example, in Early America, a gamer must use the touch screen to complete tasks such as shooting a bow or grinding maize.
This app targets ages nine to eleven, and an elementary educator could integrate this app into their classroom in several ways. If students are on a one-to-one tablet ratio, a particular level could be used as the motivator to a lesson or unit. Young students may benefit from exploring various aspects of an era through games, and then as the lesson progresses, connect information back to their gaming experience. For example, students could connect information about The Boston Tea Party to their own experience of throwing crates off a boat as fast as they could. If the class has limited tablets, this game could be incorporated into rotating stations, or available as an option during choice time.

While this app could be a fun addition to a primary grade social studies lesson, the facts that pop up are not really integrated into the game itself; students do not need to know or even read the information in order to progress to the next level, and therefore it is only internal.
motivation that would cause the student to pause and read, unless the teacher provided a required question and answer assignment sheet. In addition, it is not an option to have the facts or the instructions read aloud by the game, possibly making it challenging for lower level readers to acquire the full educational value.

Overall, because it is a free app, it could be worth installing on available tablets as a fun way for young students to begin to explore eras and characters in U.S. History, but the full educational value will, for the most part, depend on student interest and teacher scaffolding.

The Underground Railroad: Journey to Freedom

The Underground Railroad is an App sponsored by the National Geographic Society that targets grades six through ten. It is a first person interactive “choose your own adventure” game, where the player takes on the persona of a slave attempting to escape to freedom using the Underground Railroad. As the player is forced to make decisions regarding their route, the player must contemplate information or anecdotes provided by either primary sources, such as maps, posters, and pictures; various fictional characters such as fellow slaves or slave owners; or historical figures such as Harriet Tubman, Thomas Garrett, William Still, and Frederick Douglass. With careful consideration, the player can successfully make their way north to freedom. However, if a wrong decision is made, they may be caught and their journey comes to an early end.

The one immediate shortcoming of this app is that it is not free. However, the price is relatively minimal at $1.99 – is this economical enough for a teacher with a tight budget to purchase?
This reviewer would say yes. The game incorporates both cognitive and affective learning objectives. Primary sources and historical figures are used throughout the game, and several of the choices involve either assisting your fellow man, or moving forward and ensuring your own safety. Possibly the best feature of the app is the supplementary materials provided by National Geographic. A website that can be accessed through the app’s iTunes page supplies timelines, maps of various escape routes, key vocabulary with complete definitions, and an easily downloadable pdf game-based educator guide for teachers. This guide provides background information on The Underground Railroad, as well as suggestions for teachers on how to set up for independent play, group play, and whole class play, therefore making it possible to purchase only one version of the app. The guide also provides activity ideas and sample discussion questions that are organized into before, during, and after game play, and as if this wasn’t convenient enough, National Geographic has connected these activities directly to Common Core State Standards. The game took this player approximately 40 minutes to complete, but the game does have the option to save and return later.

Even without supplementary material this game has a high educational value. Unlike Frontier Heroes, historical facts are an integral part of the player successfully moving forward. The game does an excellent job of keeping stakes high and involving the player; anxiety and fear of making the wrong choice force the player to carefully read and/or listen to facts and information that are supplied along the way. Overall, this app is an excellent tool for an educator teaching about The Underground Railroad.