

DISCUSSIONS OF SOCIAL JUSTICE IN CONFLICT EDUCATION

By

Steve Rollert

A Project Submitted to the Faculty of
The Evergreen State College
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the degree
Master in Teaching
2007

This project for the Master in Teaching degree

by

Steve Rollert

has been approved for

The Evergreen State College

by

Sonja Wiedenhaupt, Ph.D., Member of the Faculty

date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would to first acknowledge Dr. Sonja Weidenhaupt for her wild patience and integrity. Her mentorship aided me every step I took in the research of this literature review and for her nurturing perseverance I am enormously indebted.

The fruits of Dr. Weidenhaupt's work were planted by Dr. Anita Lenges, my first advisor who pointed me toward John Goodlad's and Walter Parker's research at the University of Washington. The seeds for this project were first given to me by Dr. Scott Coleman who supported my interest in Dewey's legacy for teaching social justice in the classroom. Gery Gerst guided me towards the appropriate school at which I can implement the findings of this literature review in the classroom.

The staff of the Masters in Teaching Department fed me and gave me access to the graduate studies department on the weekend. I want to first acknowledge the continuing quality of their work in this their year of personal loss and suffering. Maggie Foran the first person I would see in the office made sure the coffee was hot and Loren Petty reminded me to laugh. My Graduate Assistantship was all the richer for having these two people in my life and I will miss them.

Weaving all the differing strands of my Masters in Teaching education together was Dr. Sherry Walton who forged the 2005-2007 cohort and crafted the most supportive learning community I have ever known. I hope she continues to teach her students that they will overcome what obstacles lay in their path to learning.

There is only one page for acknowledgements and so all the members of the cohort must believe that I love each and every one of them for having the courage to teach. Because of their commitment the Wallball experiment was successful. My other peers in the Social Justice Collective, the Wednesday Night Seminararians and The Masters in Teaching Volleyball team all enhanced my social education.

My earlier cohort from Reed College supported my decision to get a Masters Degree. Knute Sears generosity made my education as a teacher a reality, as he has with other teachers in Oregon and Washington who believe in social justice. Morgan Long and Grant Raddon gave me wise advice and counsel.

My natal culture of New England shaped my earliest dreams of becoming an educator. My mother and father and brothers all continue to believe in the renewal learning provides for our democratic experiment that is America. Doug Clopp lives this vision of social justice by ensuring Maine continues its great legacy of leading the nation in the spirit of Margaret Chase Smith.

In the dark I see the starr that beckons me towards a calling.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE.....	i
APPROVAL.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Rationale.....	3
Controversy in the Research.....	8
Definitions of Key Terms.....	11
Limitations of Research.....	13
Limitations of Paper.....	13
Statement of Purpose.....	14
Summary.....	15
CHAPTER 2: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.....	18
Beginnings of Social Studies.....	20
Dewey’s Issues-Based Curriculum	23
Nationwide Distribution of Issues based Curriculum.....	25
Controversial Public Issues.....	31
Harvard Social Studies Project.....	34
Taba Projects.....	37
MACOS Controversy.....	39
Summary.....	43

CHAPTER 3: CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	45
Classroom Climate.....	48
Political Tolerance.....	66
How Teachers Present CPI in the Classroom.....	85
Discussion in Controversial Public Issues.....	100
Deliberative Discussion.....	120
How Social Justice Was Taught.....	132
Conflict Education.....	138
CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSION.....	150
Summary of Findings.....	158
Political Tolerance.....	160
How Teachers Present CPI in the Classroom.....	162
Prompting.....	163
Classroom Implications.....	174
Implications for Further Research.....	177
Summary.....	179
REFERENCES.....	184

List of Tables

Table 1.....	78
Table 2.....	114
Table 3.....	115

CHAPTER ONE

“The true starting point of history is always some present situation with its problems.”

- John Dewey

My interest in revisiting John Dewey’s writing in this era of No Child Left Behind stems from my preparation for teaching in a democratic classroom and my personal beliefs concerning learning, teaching and schooling. For the fourth time in last 100 years, there is a national debate between traditionalists and progressives over the restoration and renewal of standards in public education (U.S. Department of Education, *No Child Left Behind*, 2002). My interest in the role of social studies in this new crisis in education is the reason I sought a social studies endorsement and chose to be a teacher.

It is important to understand the background of past debates over curriculum in social studies in order to reflect on the current national conversation between students in their classrooms and their communities beyond. I believe the effort of promoting democratic classrooms is justified by the seriousness of the central question within social studies concerning present and future students: How can social justice be taught?

One solution for teaching about social justice in a social studies classroom is the presentation, prompting and deliberation of multiple stances on controversial public issues concluding with peer mediation in conflict resolution. The literature review will demonstrate how to integrate effective methods of teaching controversial public issues, so

students can resolve conflict within their lives and communities. The research for the literature review revealed that John Dewey's intellectual legacy has informed and shaped research on how to teach about controversial public issues. Dewey (1916) created a social studies curriculum based on public issues as a founder of the Progressive Educational Association. This literature review will explore how this initial public issues curriculum transformed into a controversial public issues curriculum culminating in peer-mediation programs for conflict resolution. The interaction between controversial public issues and conflict resolution are referred to as conflict education in the research literature. This term will be used as an umbrella term for both controversial public issues (CPI) and conflict resolution throughout this review.

Considering contentious public policy issues in a public school social studies curriculum is by its nature controversial. Through using methods and techniques compiled to aid the greater cognitive skills of students, a teacher can be labeled a reactionary by the community, the PTA, their principal and peers. Due to the current wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, political tension in public school communities has been exacerbated. Patriotism both in and out of public schools brooks little dissent. In the brief time I have been observing in schools, I have witnessed social studies curriculum reprioritized as a means towards greater political socialization on behalf of the students. However, how social studies has been taught in the United States has shown that the current refocusing of social studies as the conduit through which students are imbued with civic awareness and moral certitude does not engage students and will not in the future (Evans 2004). Controversies have greeted public schools in the United States, and administrations have shown a particularly conservative resiliency. Tyack and Cuban

(1995) have called this conservative resiliency, “the grammar of schooling,” which has deflected most attempts at curricular reform especially in social studies. As the gap between the richest and poorest citizens widens, students need to be taught the skills to effectively discuss social justice issues within their schools so they can be expanded into their communities.

Rationale

My desire to involve students in transformative educative experiences that are personally engaging and socially relevant inspired me to research this topic. Explicitly teaching students how to confront controversial issues publicly and work towards their resolution, enables classroom strategies such as deliberative discussion to communicate the aims of social justice (Evans & Saxe, 1996). Yet a common definition of social justice is not widely accepted, and the meaning of the term social justice is still contested (Regenspan, 2002).

It is evident in the National Council of Social Studies (NCSS) standards as well as in the writings of Nieto (1993), Lewis (2003) and Moses (2001) that social justice is definable, desirable and possible. Two scholars who have defined social justice are John Rawls and Iris Marion Young (1990). Rawls (1971) focused on distributive justice, while Iris Marion Young (1990) focused on processual justice. Rawls’ (1971) definition of distributive justice was the manner in which social goods and citizenship are distributed in society. Young (1990) believed social justice to be processual and defined as decisions about distribution and the power relationships between dominant and subordinate groups. These two definitions of social justice can be seen as two sides of the same coin.

Relational justice emphasizes decision inputs, or the decision making process itself, while distributive justice highlights decision outputs or the results of the decision making process. Both definitions of justice extend the processes of democratic decision making across diverse communities which makes teaching social justice an inherently multicultural project (Longres & Scanlon, 2001). The dialogic interplay between these two definitions of social justice is the role of a teacher in a social studies classroom. This role can only be successful, if the teacher knows how to facilitate discussions of controversial public issues and conflict education that gives students the political efficacy to define their own goals of social justice.

Educators who teach for social justice from a fixed stance may lose sight of how the definition of social justice differs within diverse groups of students. The teacher is confronted with how to make discussions about social justice relevant to every student in the classroom, without imposing their own perspective. Shaver (1977) offered one solution to this delicate balancing act that required millions of intricate moves. Shaver (1977) authored an article called “Needed: A Deweyan Rationale for Social Studies,” that asked the following important question to be considered in this literature review. “How can each of us rationalize the influence (of social knowledge), so that the unexamined elements in our frames will not be applied or imposed in counter-productive ways?”(Shaver 1977, p. 345). Shaver believed social studies needed an operating rationale and that a Deweyan rationale was the solution.

Rationales vary in their level of sophistication, yet are uniformly important for teachers in the classroom because they affect what happens to students on a daily basis. Shaver (1977) believed social studies teachers suffered from this confusion between

social knowledge and the unexamined elements, or biases, more than teachers in other disciplines precisely because social studies teachers are not prompted, “to think about either the purposes or the processes, the ends or the means of education” (Shaver 1977, p. 346).

One teacher who discovered this Deweyan rationale in her classroom was Igoa (1995). Igoa described her transition from graduate school to teaching in a public school classroom as a personal and professional transformation. Igoa was helpless when confronted with how to structure the learning of her immigrant students in their classroom. This classroom climate of helplessness was transformed, once Igoa socially responded to a dialogue with each of her students. This changed their relationship from one of mutual dependence and helplessness, into the interdependent strength of their learning community.

What I sensed during the first few days of teaching the entire day was a feeling of collective helplessness and hopelessness. They were exhausted. I was exhausted. As I looked across the room at the global reality of children from all corners of the world, I knew I needed to find out who was there and where they came from so I could prepare the curriculum. As the children worked quietly, I met with each student for a one-on-one dialogue. It was a profoundly rich experience (p.125).

Igoa’s (1995) transformation was described by Dewey (1916) in the chapter on “Education as Growth,” in “Democracy and Education.” Dewey investigated what helplessness amounts to for the young learner and rejected the dualistic thinking that considered helplessness only in relation to independence. Noting that children

possess excellent faculties for social discourse, Dewey regarded learning as exercising the most acute social responsiveness (1916, p.43). By valuing the social component of learning, Dewey showed how dependence, from a social standpoint was an attribute, a power rather than a weakness, due to interdependence. To Dewey, interdependence allowed all animals to maintain the plasticity that was necessary for learning from experience and applying that learning to future demands. By maintaining their plasticity, humans modified their actions learned from prior experiences and developed dispositions. Dispositions were the root stock from which socially relevant and positive habits of learning flourished. Public education possessed the unique responsibility of culturally educative dispositions.

The school cannot immediately escape from the ideals set by prior social conditions. But it should contribute through the type of intellectual and emotional disposition which it forms to the improvement of those conditions. (p.136)

For Dewey (1916), the mission of schooling lay in improving economic freedom for all people throughout the world by creating culturally educative dispositions. Dewey understood the school itself could not be an agent of change, but that students desired the social skills necessary to effect positive social changes they believed were relevant to their communities.

Social conflict is inherent to a pluralistic society, but conflict education is not utilized by teachers as a learning opportunity for a diverse body of students (Goodlad, 1984, Parker, 1991). Instead, the study of conflict education has been used as a rationale for achieving consensus through citizenship and social studies (Florida Legislation 2006). In order to avoid the conflict that necessarily emanates from such a diverse group of emerging adolescents, a mythical, and mystifying past was presented to students as an example of future political unity that will be demanded of them (Stotsky, 1990, Ravitch & Wiener, 2007). Progressive teachers work beyond a meliorist stance, by using controversial public issues to incorporate the dynamism of differing views while challenging student's perceptions of themselves and their communities (Vavrus, 2001). Teachers model how to discuss and deliberate about conflict so their students learn how to resolve conflict. This dialogic perspective views learning as a mutable and electric process, which invites inclusion and directed multiple voices, through emergent experiences and perspectives. From a dialogic stance, knowledge is flexible enough to be reconstructed to adapt to the new challenges presented to students in the United States and world.

Teaching controversial public issues invites up the multiple voices and views in classroom dialogue, so all learners can inspect the lenses through which they perceive one another. The delicate nature of controversial issues means teachers of social studies disagree. Studying this conflict and what is needed for its resolution is a tentative step towards teaching students the skills necessary to deliberate about social justice in their communities.

Recent controversy between Walter Parker (1992) and James Leming (1992, 2003) illustrated the conflict over the applicability of teaching controversial public issues to increase students' personal feelings of political efficacy. Leming (1992) believed the conflicts within the teaching profession over teaching CPI were symbolic of larger, national political positions. Leming desired resolution to this conflict through teachers' acknowledgement of the two political extremes of traditionalism and progressivism. When teachers revealed where they were on the political continuum, they could more easily work at building common ground. Leming (2003) saw controversial public issues as symptomatic of a divisive politicized format that would result in lack of teacher accountability with diverse populations of students.

However Parker (1992) believed the issues between teachers over the relevancy of CPI to social studies should be clarified. Parker believed the intellectual leadership of a classroom resides not in the teachers' influencing the thinking and doing of their students, but in the identification of the learning community's needs within the classroom climate. Parker framed teachers as facilitators of a dialogic enterprise, not as occupants with a fixed stance on a particular issue. The teacher as facilitator of dialogic interplay is a revaluing of Shaver's (1977) Deweyan rationale in social studies discussions as expressed in the concept of parallel practices.

Regenspan (2002) argued that Dewey's early work (1899) described the interweaving of theory and practice and that a revaluing of his early work is beneficial for teaching about social justice. She believed this revaluing of Dewey represented a critical link to the school and community which provided the means for students to discover social justice. Parallel practice represented the parallel connections of teaching and

learning at the points where theory and practice meet. Regenspan described most teachers as practicing laissez-faire discussion formats that demonstrate no planned outcomes that are relevant to the students for their relationship to a larger social world. Regenspan conceived of parallel practice as a way for teachers and students to commit to learning about social justice responsively.

Regenspan's (2002) definition of social justice and classroom equity grew from Rawls (1971) view of distributive justice. Regenspan wanted to become an educator in order to personally contribute most directly to a better society. When reflecting on her teaching within the elementary classroom and teacher education programs at State University of New York (SUNY) Binghamton about social justice, Regenspan started to see her own situation differed within the scholarship of other self-identified progressives. As Dewey (1916) had witnessed eighty-two years earlier, Regenspan was shocked to discover that most of the professors she had thought were her colleagues-in-arms were focusing on the evidence of social inequity in schools, as a substitute for a vision of the quality of life in schools that social equity would make possible. Regenspan began to reevaluate her reasons for teaching and realized it was such a vision, with the tools to enact it, that her students demanded from her in both their elementary and graduate classes. Regenspan defined parallel practice elegantly.

If we were trustworthy as teacher educators, we would act with our students exactly the way we expected them to act with their students

(Regenspan, 2002, p. 238)

Dewey's vision increasingly directed Regenspan not only in the work she did with her graduate students, but the work they did with their students in their classrooms.

In his early work, Dewey (1899) argued that the way students were expected to learn was antithetical to their humanity. Most students regardless of age were not engaged by thinking in the abstract, but instead wanted to make and do in a context in which they have the power to think about what, why, and for whom, they were making and doing. Dewey identified the elementary grades as the starting place for this type of parallel practice.

Dewey's (1916) greatest legacy in social studies teaching, grew from his belief in the relevancy of social justice. Dewey believed that social progress lay in the process of constructing instruments used to determine truth. The realization of that objective "truth" was primarily through sensed experimentation. Dewey's legacy has a role in these politically polarized times in which a national dialogue is most desperately needed. The controversies in social studies between modern conceptions of history to post-modern conceptions of the social studies, need clarification. Dewey's (1916) issue-based curricula valued the dialogue from which more than two perspectives were expressed. Dewey wrote while living in both modern and post-modern periods and his ideas of the construction of knowledge as process oriented relied on age-old methods and techniques as well as radical reappraisal.

Dewey (1916) himself was not a pluralist or a relativist. He believed value not to be an artifact or social construct, but a contextually defined quality that existed in action. As described in his most influential philosophical piece, Dewey (1896) believed psychological stimulus and reaction to be inseparable, and the isolation of one from the other a fallacy of modern psychology. Dewey's essay (1896) created the foundation for what would later be termed social behaviorism by early American social scientists and

what will later be described as attitude by political socialization researchers. This is important to remember when teachers first begin introducing discussions in class about controversial public issues. The value of teaching about social justice lies in the action that exists in the discussion. This dialogic action is a mutable and contextually defined quality that grows from the teacher's structuring of discussion, and classroom climate. Social studies teachers should care about using controversial public issues formats because CPI format possesses the best practices for the teacher and represents the best emergent classroom based assessments for students (Washington State, 2005).

Definition of key terms

Social justice includes a vision of society in which the distribution of life chances is genuinely equitable and all members are physically and psychologically safe and secure—a society in which individuals are both self-determining (able to develop their full capacity) and interdependent (committed to interact democratically). Social justice involves actors who have a sense of their own agency as well as their responsibility toward others and society as a whole (Adams, Bell and Griffen, 1997).

Conflict - Johnson and Johnson (1995) defined conflict within teaching controversial issues as something that exists whenever incompatible activities occur. An activity that is incompatible with another activity is one that prevents, blocks, interferes with, injures or in some way makes the second activity less likely or less effective. Conflict exists within controversy insofar as it resides in attempts to resolve their disagreement.

Controversy - Johnson and Johnson (1979) defined controversy as what exists between two people when one person's ideas, information, conclusions, theories or opinions are incompatible with another person and the two people seek to reach an agreement.

Controversial Public Issue - the confrontation, discussion and deliberation of relevant and counter posed social positions on a culturally divisive issue.

Controversial Public Issues - will be abbreviated at points in this paper as CPI as it is known among social studies teachers. CPI is not a catchall category for personal agendas or hot button topics. Educators must first vet a topic to see if it has merit to be considered an entry point to larger community concerns and social objectives. Social studies teachers struggle with this constantly, as demonstrated by Hess's (2006) treatment of Intelligent Design at the behest of one school board member.

Value analysis has a two part definition as a strategy in CPI. The first part consists of students using logical thinking and scientific investigation to identify value issues, and the second part consists of the rational, analytic processes in interrelating and conceptualizing these newly discovered values. A value-analysis approach focuses directly on taking multiple perspectives in controversial public issues.

Conflict resolution education is schooling that develops skills integral for citizenship and models these skills both in and out of classroom environments. Peer conflict mediation, which can be seen as a type of service learning, since it comprises not only instruction, but the construction of active learning for students, is the type of conflict resolution education considered in this literature review.

Limitations of research

The limitations of research in this literature review were determined by the lack of peer-reviewed research on strategies for teaching about social justice. While research on multicultural strategies for the classroom abounds there remains precious little research on strategies for teaching about social justice (Longres & Scanlon, 2001). The strategy most closely oriented towards teaching students how to discuss issues of social justice is controversial public issues format and conflict education. Recent research (Makler, 2000, Regenspan, 2002) on classroom equity, anti-racism and gender imbalance do no more than identify the social injustice of disproportionate power relationships in the classroom. They identify problems in the classroom that are symptomatic of our society.

Limitations of Paper

Unlike the rationales for inquiry in subjects like physics that seem unified, social studies offers no such solace to its practitioners. As a discipline social studies is fraught with competing claims, political agendas and conspiracy theories, that are all manifest in explicit and public terms. The lack of such a unified canon or necessary set of skills is often used by the critics of social studies instruction as evidence of the unreliability of social studies as a discipline and felt by its proponents most powerfully through the jealousy exhibited by “physics envy.” The absence of a unified front represents the myriad responsibilities social studies teachers have. State mandated values of citizenship are only one of the many subjects and skills. A teacher using a controversial public issues curriculum must collaborate with other professional educators, parents, community members and the schools administration to research the issues affecting all members.

There will not be complete agreement within these groups, but such efforts are necessary for fostering goodwill and trust and preventing accusations of operating with a hidden agenda.

There is a temptation by authors of a political bent to organize plans for creating a more socially just society when they are concerned with issues of social justice. This literature review is not concerned with the infinite ways a more socially just society can be achieved. Those aims, however laudable, are well outside the scope and focus of this paper. Similarly, when considering the immense production of great minds devoted to fostering just societies it is outside the boundaries of time and effort to consider all of Dewey's works collectively or attempt to sum up his thought for easy re-packaging. It is the sincerest hope that this paper will not be evaluated as another researcher misreading in the long tradition of misunderstanding Dewey and his accomplishments in social theory.

Statement of Purpose

This literature review describes Dewey's issue-based curriculum as the predecessor to the controversial public issues strategies that teach students the skills necessary for democratic dialogue about social justice. The skills of democratic dialogue are built upon the teachers' and students' construction of classroom climate. Within an open classroom climate there need to be multiple views that are encouraged and the reception of these views by the class is modeled by the teacher.

Because of the research completed for this literature review, I have learned the strategies to build an open classroom climate in social studies. I have learned discussion

formats which will enable me to teach my students the importance of interdependency as a support for multiple voices. I intend to show my students they have the skills necessary to share their perspectives on social justice both within and beyond school.

Summary

Social conflict is inherent to a pluralistic society. Mystification of the conflicts inherent in the experiment of democracy obscures the relevancy of social studies to students' lives. To demonstrate the relevancy of social studies to students' we must consider an issues base curriculum that was first created by Dewey (1916). The legacy of Dewey's public issues curriculum was the controversial public issues format. It personally engaged students in discussing controversial public issues, so that the class could work cooperatively towards resolving conflict both within and outside the classroom. This process of confronting social issues and working towards their resolution is known currently as conflict education. Conflict education is an effective format for teaching students to discover for themselves what constituted social justice.

Social justice is both distributive and processual. These two aspects of social justice are interrelated and are two sides of the same coin. The coin is the currency of democratic decision making, which represents social justice as essentially a multicultural exploration. In order to realize the social justice inherent in classroom equity, teachers can use a Deweyan rationale so that the unexamined elements of their personal lenses will not be thrust upon their students in counterproductive ways. Igoa (1995) experienced the social justice inherent in the equity of her classroom when teaching her students. When faced with a classroom climate of helplessness, she transformed the learning

community by socially responding to her students and engaging them in personal dialogue.

Igoa's (1995) engagement in dialogue with her students was an example of what Dewey (1916) saw as the social responsiveness of children. This responsiveness is a display of flexible social discourse which develops dependency into a stronger social bond. The revaluing of the Deweyan rationale has most recently been emphasized by Regenspan (2002) who believed the interweaving of theory and practice when linked with teaching and learning involved a parallel practice that teachers and students would use to be more social responsive and learn about social justice.

Chapter two is an overview of Dewey's (1916) defining contributions to controversial public issues research in social studies. The history of controversial public issues will be framed within Dewey's contributions. Count's speech, Shaver's (1977) creation of a Deweyan rationale, Goodlad (1979, 1984,), Newmann and Oliver (1970, 1985, 1990) and Parker (1991, 1996, 1999, 2001, 2003) have all structured their research on the renewal of social studies in the public schools from teaching controversial public issues.

This paper recognized other authorities on the history of controversial public issues such as Kliebard (1996) and Evans (2004). Kliebard (1996) traced the impact of the Teacher's College Progressives of the 1930's. Evans (2004) situated the intellectual ferment of that place to the resulting modern and post-modern controversies in controversial public issues. Both Kliebard (1996) and Evans (2004) have acknowledged the inspirational influence of Dewey (1916) in social studies as the founder of modern conceptions of social justice in the school curriculum. This history of CPI is provided so

that the seven themes in CPI and conflict education research as presented in chapter three have a background

Chapter Three is a critical treatment of peer-reviewed research on controversial public issues in both public and private schools, nationally and internationally, that examined how teachers can construct discussions about social justice. Research questions in this chapter center around how Dewey's (1916) philosophy guided researchers in their search for strategies to teach social justice. For Dewey, the teacher was not a "magistrate" but a facilitator.

At the Center for Educational Research in Seattle, Goodlad and Parker (1991, 1999) spearheaded the use of "grounded theory" to construct the foundation for an explanation of teacher's conceptions of discussion as a model of teaching. Grounded theory was employed in ethnographies in which detailed description of teacher's pedagogy in practice generated data from which "grounded hypothesis," (Strauss 1990) were constructed. Some of the researchers in this literature review (Larson, 2000, 2003 Hess, 2002, 2005, Beck 2003) have built upon Parker's (1991) work by examining how teaching prompting and discussion in CPI can encourage the dialogic processes necessary for understanding social justice.

Chapter 2 – The History of Controversial Public Issues

In training a child to activity of thought, above all things we must be aware of what I shall call “inert ideas”-that is to say, ideas that are merely received into the mind without being utilized, or tested, or thrown into fresh combinations. In the history of education, the most striking phenomenon is that of schools of learning, which in one epoch are alive with the ferment of genius, in a succeeding generation exhibit merely pedantry and routine. The reason is that they are over laden with inert ideas. Education with inert ideas is not only useless: It is above all things harmful – Alfred North Whitehead (1922 p.45)

This chapter will provide the historical background to answer how Dewey’s legacies of issues-based curriculum led to the creation of a CPI curriculum in public school social studies. Social studies had barely been acknowledged as an academic discipline when Dewey started teaching. There were few examples of social studies curriculum when Dewey constructed his issue-based social studies curriculum. This curriculum and Dewey’s philosophy of education were challenged by colleagues Walter Lippman, and George Counts at Columbia University. The relevancy of Dewey’s issues-based curriculum withstood these challenges, and Dewey’s issues-based curriculum became nationally accepted due to his other colleagues at Columbia the Rugg brothers. However Dewey’s ideas as packaged by the Ruggs were deemed too threatening during the Second World War. Dewey’s legacy lay moribund until Hunt and Metcalf reopened Dewey type of inquiry. Hunt and Metcalf (1968) believed Dewey’s belief in the democratic experiment was best taught through investigation of the closed areas of society. These closed areas consisted of lower forms of culture that did not belong to socially acknowledged dominant cultures. These other alternative cultures had not been

considered in social studies texts until then. These subcultures of street life would be one example of this. Hunt and Metcalf (1968) believed these closed areas that operated with their own norms were useful microcosms for framing controversial issues for students in high school. Hunt and Metcalf's study provided the impetus for Federal investment in research culminating in the New Social Studies. The New Social studies focused on Dewey's work but soon became too politicized after the most ambitious project MACOS drew the wrath of politicians. In the aftermath of The New Social Studies, researchers revisited Dewey's moral imperative in learning and combined that with new advance in cognitive psychology. These contributions in cognitive psychology by Festinger (1964) and Kohlberg (1970, 1975) together with the classroom based research in CPI from Oliver and Newmann (1970) inspired Engles and Ochoa (1988) to reformulate CPI into a developmental framework, which would take into consideration how the brain learns during controversy.

John Dewey, in his lifetime influenced many educational philosophers while remaining uniquely himself. Throughout his life, Dewey (1933) believed that ethical decision making on public and private matters of social concern should be taught in the social studies. Dewey believed this was the common rationale for social studies education- the preparation of democratic citizens for the democratic experiment. At the core of democratic citizenship lay not only the acquisition of information and construction of knowledge related to social life and public policy, but ethical decision making on public and private controversial issues of social concern. Dewey shared these concerns with his peers George Counts, Harold Rugg, and Walter Lippman, who were influenced directly by Dewey at Teacher's College at Columbia University. The future

advocates of this Deweyan, issues-based curriculum evolved into the controversial public-issues based curricularists (Evans 2004). More recently educators such as Hilda Taba, Fred Newmann and Walter Parker continue Dewey's original objectives in social studies instruction; the teaching of the cognitive tools that are the life skills students will need in order to pursue the goals of social justice. Past professors and current contributors to social change have revered Dewey as their touchstone especially when academic skirmishes became politicized battles.

The Beginning of Social Studies

Humanists had worked hard in the 19th century to create a story of the United States. Prior to the American Civil War there was 22 fields of history, 11 of geography, and 6 of civics. The values taught in these fields mirrored the nationalistic priorities of loving god, country, and family, in that order. By the end of the 19th century, history involved studying from the Greek and Roman myths to the heroes of the American Revolution (Saxe, 1991). By the beginning of the 20th century, history was such a hodge-podge of disparate subjects, which a reordering of the discipline was called for by academicians who searched for a more scientifically coherent method of inquiry. This movement proceeded at a glacial pace through curriculum by committee.

The initial attempt at forming a high school curriculum of social studies began with the Committee of Ten as designated by the NEA. The new concerns over electives in high schools and college entrance requirements pushed the NEA to select a national commission (Evans, 2004). Led by Charles Eliot, President of Harvard and William Torney Harris of the U.S. Office of Education, the committee considered the proper limits of subject disciplines, methods of instruction, and college admission requirements.

But its central reason for existence was an expression of the industrial era's desire for standardization and authority to direct a curriculum. Its subcommittee was referred to as the Madison Conference and was appointed to develop curricula for each discipline. This committee included university, college and high school teachers including Woodrow Wilson (Kliebard, 1996). The fact that powerful white men created this group was an understatement; these were the most academically respected men in the nation. Its recommendations included minimal use of lectures, wise use of textbooks, recitation as a supplement to reading and parallel readings in literature, poems, novels and biographies with an emphasis on the chronology and development of the Anglo-Saxon race (Keels, 1988).

Overall the Madison Conference had some important contributions. It led to the founding of the American Historical Association in 1884 and the eradication of enforced classical subjects through the dismissal of a hierarchy of subjects in history and the introduction of history into secondary schools (Kliebard, 1996). However, the language of the committee's report and charges of its elite status led to yet another smaller committee that was appointed in 1896 from an extensive survey of secondary schools. The Committee of Seven (Committee of Seven, 1900) furthered the original intent of the Madison Conference and introduced the block system of teaching history.

Approaches to creating a national curriculum of social studies were suggested by Dewey and forwarded as early as 1901, but did not receive formal recognition until 1916 with the report from the Committee on Social Studies. Created as part of the Commission on the Re-organization of Secondary Education (CRSE) and sponsored by the National Education Association (NEA), the committee's recommendations in 1916 were important

and had lasting effects on the introduction of social studies into public schools. The recommendation comprised of developing a 12th grade Problems of Democracy course, which was to look at actual problems, issues and conditions of vital importance to society and of immediate interest to the pupil. . . as they occurred in their several aspects, political, economic and social (Committee of Seven, 1900, p.98). The report found in other words, the suggestion is not to discard one social science in favor of another. . . but to study actual problems or issues or conditions as they occur in life (Committee of Seven, 1900). The report advocated the collaboration of the new history of James Harvey Robinson with the reflective pedagogy of Dewey. Both of these authors were liberally quoted in the report and both authors stressed a thematic treatment of these issues in depth with an emphasis on more recent history (Evans, 2004). The committee directed students to possess “the habit of forming social judgments only on the basis of dispassionate consideration of all the facts available ” (Committee of Seven, 1900, p.45) Yet because the committee made few direct mandates on how societal problems were to be studied in the Problems of Democracy course, teachers continued to follow traditional methods, instead of engaging students into reflective inquiry (Cuban, 1984). Social progressives viewed this course as the most significant early manifestation of the problems approach in school curricula.

Following the recommendations of the Committee in 1916, reactions from various disciplines were indicative of the forces that would work against issue-centered curriculums (Kliebard, 1996). In 1919, a report that echoed the earlier committee’s findings issued by the American Historical Association (AHA) supported the aims of the Problems of Democracy course, yet the AHA refused to adopt the report (Evans 2004).

Later in 1920, the committee of the American Sociological Society also endorsed the curriculum in American Problems with the caveat that it be focused primarily on sociology and economics as the disciplines best suited to development of self-reliant thinking by students (Finney, 1921). Continuing such sectarianism, the American Political Science Association in 1921 made a strong statement against such isolated problems supporting instead a comprehensive and systematic study of governmental organizations and functions (Munro, 1922). The compromise of 1916 had succeeded by placing social studies within the curriculum of public high schools in the United States. While U.S. History remained unchallenged as the core subject of social studies, now the new adherents of the listed disciplines would begin to carve out their own turf.

Dewey's Issues-based Curriculum: Teacher's College

Disciplinary boundaries prevented the 1920's from being a period of great growth for the problems approach of teaching social studies. Enrollment in the Problems of Democracy was measured for the first time in 1928 with over 1 % of public high school students in grades 9-12 enrolled at the start of the school year (Evans, 2004). Teachers were hesitant to adopt new means of teaching without adequate instruction and textbooks outlining the pedagogy. Classroom materials were not available to facilitate the change. Problems of Democracy didn't have a text until 1922, seven years after the CRSE recommendations in 1916 (Evans, 2004). Many of the opponents of the problems approach preferred to maintain the dominance of the social science disciplines and feared the negative impact interdisciplinary and trans-disciplinary studies would have on their control within their respective departments. As a reaction to such internecine skirmishing,

a group at Teacher's College, Columbia University organized a social studies roundtable. A letter was drafted to the NEA noting a "lack of agreement about subject matter," (Kliebard, 1996, p. 69) and the first organizational meeting of the National Council of Teachers of Social Studies (NCTSS) was founded in 1921. In the organization's constitution, the social studies were defined to include history, government, economics, geography and sociology. This definition of social studies as a list of subjects determined the organization's direction as a consensus organization. The birth of the NCTSS was a direct result of the Compromise of 1916 and the prioritization of social studies over history as the choice of progressives such as Dewey. Yet that prioritization of social studies as the discipline that included history came at great cost for Dewey because critics began to emerge and challenge the relevance of a problems approach to teaching social studies.

The first critique came from Dewey's former colleague at Columbia, Walter Lippman. Lippman's theory interwove three intellectual traditions: democratic realism, individualism and free market theory. Lippman (1922, 1925) argued that the loss of local community detracted from the ability of individuals to make informed public policy decisions. Lippman believed the quick expansion of social and scientific knowledge combined with the complexity of modern society hampered the general public's chances of comprehending social issues. Only the elites had the resources to understand the complexity of modern society, and they created public opinion in order to manipulate the masses. Lippman believed the current class situation in America differed from the past class dynamics. In America's democratic past, decisions arose from the collective action of informed citizens. Lippman believed the elites manufactured public opinion through

their control of media outlets. This manufactured public opinion replaced the informed public consent .

Dewey (1929) believed Lippman's analysis of social and political problems to be cogent, but to be essentially undemocratic. Dewey's modern view of education did not negate the past contributions of classical or enlightenment philosophers in education such as Plato and Rousseau. Unlike Lippman, Dewey (1916) refused to believe the failure to implement participatory democracy was not equivalent to a compelling argument to abandon the democratic experiment.

Nationwide Distribution of Issues Based Curriculum

Even though Americans had experienced the boom and bust cycle of capitalist industrialized economies in the past, the Great Depression was the perfect storm of unemployment, fear and economic collapse. Teachers were often the victims of its most devastating effects; however, social studies, and particularly the analysis of social problems, gained great attention during this time of social upheaval (Evans, 2004). While other progressive educators fought over the limelight, the faculty at the Teacher's College of Columbia University held up social studies as a means to build a new social order. Critics especially in the Hearst media, labeled faculty at Teacher's College consisting of John Dewey, George Counts, Harold Rugg "educationists," but these professors referred to themselves as social reconstructivists (Evans, 2004).

In a 1932, during the height of the Great Depression, George Counts delivered a bold speech in which he rallied teachers to "build a new social order." Count's call to arms was the first explicit argument for education for social transformation (Stanley,

2005). This effort Counts coined “reconstruction” and it amounted to no less than a radical, fundamental redistribution of economic and political power in the United States. Since elite groups held the political and economic power in the United States, Counts knew the realization of a truly democratic social order could not happen unless the capitalist economy of the United States was eliminated. Counts (1932) viewed the efforts of the social progressives to develop a theory of social welfare a failure. Count’s believed the social progressives had to abandon their philosophical relativism and construct a comprehensive theory of social welfare that could be imposed so that educators could fulfill their professional obligation. Social studies teachers were given the privilege, according to Counts, to teach the values of constructing this fundamental reconstruction of economic and political power in the United States.

By the end of the 1930’s Dewey had moved completely into Counts camp of the social reconstructivist’s camp. Dewey had also become a critic of progressive education by the Rousseauists such as Kilpatrick (Lyberger, 1991). In “Education and Experience,” Dewey (1938) had criticized these child-centric teachers for allowing too much freedom under the aegis of progressivism and for straying too far from the aims of issues based curriculum. But Dewey would not side with Count’s for too long. Although Dewey agreed with Counts that education had a social orientation and that schools influenced the course of future life, he began to disagree that schools were at odds with the construction of a new social order. Schools really share in the building of the social order of the future depends on the particular social forces and movements with which they ally, (Dewey & Childs, 1933).

Unlike Counts, Dewey was committed to an educational method, not a specific social outcome. The prediction of the outcome was not as important as providing the conditions under which the method of intelligence could be applied (Stanley 2005). Indoctrination was unnecessary to Dewey (1937) because the application of the method of intelligence would show the means to improve society.

Those supporting indoctrination rest their adherence to the theory, in part, upon the fact that there is a great deal of indoctrination now going on in the schools, especially with reference to narrow nationalism under the name of patriotism, and with reference to the dominant economic regime. These facts unfortunately are facts. But they do not prove that the right course is to seize upon the method of indoctrination and reverse its object, Dewey (1937 p. 58).

Dewey foresaw that any attempt to inculcate a preconceived theory of social welfare was antithetical to education for democracy. Both Lippman and Counts from their opposing camps declared that the past democratic social order should be, or had been, radically repositioned (Evans, 2004). Dewey did not believe the democratic experiment should be replaced precisely because experimentation is the method through which experience is implemented in learning. Replacing democratic experimentation for Dewey halted any opportunities for the United States to evolve socially. Teachers had to continue experimenting in the classroom to locate the solutions to present social problems. Interestingly, Dewey would not be responsible for the curriculum used in his Problems of Democracy course. Instead, the Rugg brothers distributed it nationally.

Young Harold Rugg had decided during his first years at Teacher's College that improving teacher education would not work. Endeavoring to improve the student's

choice of resources instead, Rugg (1939) compiled an entire social studies curriculum that was issues-based and that presented each unit in a problem solving format culminating in a senior level course termed “The American Problem.” At first, the project stalled, when the team of educators, while working with the Lincoln School, could not get the curriculum accepted. Luckily, this changed when Rugg’s older brother Earle joined him at Teacher’s College to earn his doctorate. Earle had earlier convinced his younger brother to switch from teaching civil engineering to teaching history. Their combined experience with middle school students convinced them to develop materials for use in junior high. The middle school curriculum for social studies the Rugg brothers taught previously was difficult for the students to master; this was due to the jumbled nature of the early integration of social studies into a junior high format. So the brothers Rugg saw a need for a well-constructed curriculum which would have a decent rate of adoption for national distribution (Evans, 2004). The Ruggs assembled a group of doctoral students to create guiding principles for expanding the pamphlet series into a textbook and curriculum. This doctoral team combined scientific inquiry, with the work of frontier thinkers or artists and writers who regularly submitted work to leading literary journals. Originally planned to cover grades 3-12, the textbook grew into a junior high textbook. These Rugg textbooks were distributed widely and combined social studies into an integrative and interdisciplinary interpretation of modern civilization.

The brother Rugg’s achievement represented the first unification of social studies under a rubric of issues-based curriculum. In many respects, the 1930’s epitomized the progressive dreams of public education (Evans, 2004).

The rise of fascism and communism in Western Europe during the 1940's began to exert fear in the United States that public education was not adequately educating students on the virtues of democracy (Evans, 2004). Districts and administrators began to be placed under greater scrutiny. Social studies teachers who used Rugg's Problems of Democracy curriculum within their classrooms were transferred or dismissed as being too radical (Evans, 2004). Many public school administrators became reluctant to risk casting the American way of life in a problematic light. By the dawn of World War II, mounting cultural pressure resulted in the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) announcing a committee to judge the political and economic attitudes expressed by social studies texts. By February of 1941, the American Legion and other "patriotic" groups joined the chorus of outrage at Rugg's textbook series and other problems-centered texts.

In those times, the political climate was ripe for super-patriotic hype. The decade of the 1940's witnessed business associations and right-wing groups attacking liberal texts and maintaining a tremendous amount of pressure on publishers (Fitzgerald, 1979).

Surprisingly these pressures did not stem the growth of classrooms offering the "Problems in Democracy" course or the sales of Rugg's textbook. From the 1934 teacher subscriptions of 3.49%, The Problems of Democracy Course had grown to 5.24% by 1949, and correspondingly so had the share of U.S. history within social studies from 17.34 in 1934 to 22.81 percent by 1949 (Evans, 2004). Yet World War II and the early Cold War period cast a dark shadow over progressive educational efforts on the Eastern seaboard.

On the West Coast Dewey's issues-based curriculum research teaching was not denounced it was refined. At Stanford, Quillen and Hanna (Evans, 2004) oversaw the

Stanford Social Education project. Social studies teachers chose between an 11th grade U.S. History course or a 12th grade problems of democracy course using one of three approaches: issues based, topical, or chronological. The issues based curriculum mirrored Dewey's method of inquiry into areas of public concern that could be resolved through searching for solutions to the issue from among alternatives. The Stanford evaluators administered a pre-test and post-test at the beginning and end of the school year to compare the student's critical thinking skills as well as their knowledge and commitment to a number of social attitudes. In their conclusions, Quillen and Hannah (Evans, 2004) found that seniors exposed to an issue based curriculum as compared to matched students in classes that used a topical approach, made significant advances in critical thinking, study skills, library use, research skills and content knowledge. Students in the issues group also showed more progress toward consistency and certainty in their views than the topical group did. However for the juniors the differences between the issues based students and the topical and chronological groups was not as apparent, with neither group significantly improving in critical thinking. In junior high the chronological group showed more growth on content knowledge tests, yet the issues based students seemed more confident of their political views. Quillen and Hannah's research proved Dewey's issues based social studies curriculum brought results. Quillen and Hannah's study was the positive contribution issues based educators were looking for to inspire further research while they weathered a storm of criticism during the cold war.

Controversial Public Issues

Yet in spite of the success of Ruggs' Problems in Democracy Course, there was little respite for them. Ruggs' curriculum was denounced by John T. Flynn who charged that a group of progressive educators had "set out to introduce into social science courses of our high schools a seductive form of propaganda for collectivism- chiefly on that type we call socialism" (Kliebard, 1996, p. 78). Airing his acerbic insight in Reader's Digest in 1951, Flynn cited a string of quotes from Counts to Rugg (1939) to support his red baiting thesis.

Other critics railed against what they perceived was an anti-intellectual agenda in progressive education. Arthur Bestor (1953) discovered an evil axis of administrators, professors and bureaucrats who had diverted education from its root in the scholarly disciplines to lower standards of education throughout the nation. Bestor demanded social educators replace the term "social studies" in favor of the more academically challenging "social science."

All of the post World War II curriculum projects in social studies were not created entirely in response to cold-war concerns, but with cold-war anxieties in mind. Projects that were completed during this time mirrored this entrenched mindset, with roughly two-thirds firmly emplaced within one discipline, and a third remaining interdisciplinary. Of this third, many were issue-centered, with the most imaginative and thoroughgoing analysis presented by Hunt and Metcalf (1968). Their curriculum was based entirely on issues-based social studies curriculum for high school students and has been perennially cited since its publication in 1955. In the wake of Rugg and darkness of the McCarthy Era and the Red Scare, Hunt and Metcalf championed Dewey's idea of reflective thought

as the core of democratic citizenship. As Dewey (1933) had earlier, Hunt and Metcalf (1968) argued that the reflective reconstruction of beliefs helped students clarify and preserve the integral ideas the United States was founded on. Hunt and Metcalf believed reflective thought was initiated when students were offered opportunities for critical examination of the closed areas in American society. These closed areas were used as forums where conflict between core values and beliefs and actual behaviors were investigated in classroom instruction. Hunt and Metcalf (1968) designed a curriculum that focused on the “problem” areas of society, with focus on particular “closed areas,” appropriate to the given community. By drawing attention to societal problems that social studies teachers could confront in the classroom, Hunt and Metcalf’s (1968) curriculum challenged teachers and administrators to view issues-based curriculum more broadly, beyond the schoolyard. In addition to history, data from anthropology, sociology and psychology was used to draw more relevant parallels. Like Ruggs, Metcalf and Hunt (1968) stopped just short of calling for a total new coursework for social studies. But unlike the Ruggs, Hunt and Metcalf emphasized the confrontation of controversial issues by teacher and their students as an effective means of teaching social studies. Hunt and Metcalf used both local and global examples to give more concrete examples to students of issues that may have seemed to them, in Dewey’s language, obfuscated by classical referents.

Hunt and Metcalf’s (1968) work inspired university programs to apply for Federal monies to use social scientists to study students in public school classrooms. Although such top down theorizing would prove ultimately to be beside the point, Hunt and Metcalf’s greatest contribution was the multi-disciplinary studies they advocated for

setting themes in issues-based curriculum. This emphasis on multi-disciplinary data to inform themes would inspire other researchers at universities such as Harvard, ushering in the New Social Studies Movement.

Among the brilliant projects that proliferated the academic firmament one star shown singularly. Shirley Engles (1960) penned an article that emphasized Dewey's contributions to researching classroom pedagogy. Engles began his affiliation with Indiana University, where he would establish himself as one of the leading proponents of a problems-oriented curriculum currently designated as issues-centered education. Engles' thought was based on (1) issues and problems relevant to the lives of students, (2) evidence found in the individual social sciences, the humanities, and other disciplines, (3) citizenship education, (4) social criticism and (5) decision-making found support in higher education, but was not considered mainstream thinking by teachers in public and private schools. Engles dedication and persistence in communicating his beliefs made a number of inroads in the instructional strategies and curriculum theories espoused by the National Council for the Social Studies. In "Decision Making: The Heart of Social Studies Instruction," Engles argued for social studies to be concerned with creating citizens who can reach quality decisions on public and private matters of social concern. Engles linked this decision making to the greater life skill of weighing facts and principles in balance in order to synthesize all available information. Like Dewey (1916), Engles believed knowledge that represented a retelling of events was miseducative for students. Engle recast the foundations of issue-centered instruction in the social studies to include the moral imperative of developing questioning in group discussion.

The impact of Engle's essay on pedagogy in issues-based curriculum was comparable to the symbolic weight Sputnik carried orbiting earth. Engle deemed the social sciences not relevant to the intellectual and moral development of students in high school. Students should be taught instead how to make informed decisions that recognized values formation as a central concern of social studies instruction. A quarter of a century later Engles re-emerged with Ochoa (Engles & Ochoa, 1988) to synthesize a critique of the Radical revisionists with the psychological research on conflict and controversy from Johnson and Johnson's work.

The Harvard Social Studies Project

McCarthy's downfall heralded the influx of federal grants dedicated to social studies research in CPI. For the first time social studies researchers had their projects underwritten without political interference. The way was paved for Engles' ideas on CPI to be evaluated within a public school setting. The largest of these projects in the New Social Studies were located at Harvard University. Oliver and Shaver (1966) published their findings from Harvard's experimental curriculum project that attempted to develop student thinking and decision making in a way that fit logically with content selected for study. The first phase of their project was derived from an analysis of the needs of society. The units described an issues centered approach to the social studies curriculum in which the perennial legal-ethical issues of public policy were emphasized. Shaver and Oliver chose to explore public controversy to encourage the student to find their own voice and to defend it from his or her peers.

The first phase was conducted from 1956-1961 and involved two years of planning and pre-testing and two years of implementation and evaluation of a 10-unit experimental curriculum. The setting was a two-year U.S. history sequence in a suburban junior high school. Four units were taught in the seventh grade, and six problem areas between which current topics and historical data were linked were taught the following year (Parker, 1991). The study's key strength was its comprehensive philosophical premises which derived from Dewey.

Shaver and Oliver (1966) demonstrated that students used reflective inquiry to create higher cognitive reasoning skills. The curricular content of the Harvard Social Studies Project emphasized in-depth study of public issues laden with value-conflicts. Drawing upon Myrdal's (1944) American Creed for the identification of core democratic values, Oliver and Shaver recognized the need students have for addressing conflicts between competing values in the creed.

In the second phase of the Harvard project the approach was taken to the high school. That phase was reported by Levin, Newmann and Oliver (1969) and Newmann and Oliver (1970). Situated in a suburban senior high school noted for innovation, the experiential social studies curriculum was implemented and evaluated over a three-year period. The aims of the experimental curriculum were to teach high school students of average ability to clarify and justify their positions on public issues (Levin, Newmann and Oliver, 1969). The scope of the experimental curriculum centered on five problems areas: use and control of violence, standard of living, priorities and privileges, dissent and change and the tension between civic life and privacy. These problem areas of study had all the hallmarks of Hunt and Metcalf's (1968) research. These insights and observations

about classroom discussions were later extended by Newman and Oliver (1970). Oliver teamed up with Newman and explored how clarifying two separate legitimately held viewpoints could lead to value analysis. In addition to using the deliberative discussion of public issues he had developed earlier with Shaver, Oliver and Newman's new approach emphasized the clarification of two or more legitimately held points of view as they bear on public policy issues, while emphasizing dialogue between the teacher and students. Newmann and Oliver (1970) examined the effects of using CPI on students for three years in a senior high school and for four years in a junior high school in middle-class Boston suburbs. The researchers compared the experimental group to a control group and the evaluators concluded that CPI junior high school students were better suited to analyze argumentative dialogues. Better yet, the time spend in CPI didn't reduce the amount of traditional content the students learned.

The senior high school students in the Harvard project focused on controversies arising from enduring issues such as equality, morality and responsibility. Both nonfiction and fictional case studies were used to simulate discussion about conflicting values. The high school students in the Harvard project performed better than the comparison group of equal ability on the concept assessment developed for the study called the Social Issues Analysis test (SIAT).

The Harvard Social Studies Project was the first longitudinal attempt to place Dewey's philosophical rationale and a CPI based curriculum together for instruction and assessment in the public school classrooms (Evans, 2004).

The Taba Projects

A unique, though not unrelated program of research of the New Social studies Movement was also underway at San Francisco State College (Taba 1963, 1966, 1967) The Taba curriculum projects shared a number of similarities with those at Harvard. The first similarity was the prioritizing of the description and development of student reasoning. The reasoning processes of interest in both projects were matched to the selection and organization of content in the experimental curriculum. These were the most important contributions of the Harvard and Taba projects. Second, both projects were comprehensive. The curriculum in each was grounded in a theory of curriculum development, built with current literature and evaluated with measures that were logically related to the curriculum theory (Parker, 1991). The third attribute was that neither project dismissed the critical role of values in building social studies knowledge. Although the Harvard projects went further emphasizing value commitments and conflict as the foundation of democratic life, and thus the analysis of CPI in a democracy, Taba considered three value tasks as integral to the social studies curriculum: exploring feelings, considering approaches to solving disputes among persons and groups and analyzing values. The fourth attribute was that both projects used the heterogeneity of the public school classroom to their benefit. For Levin, Newman and Oliver (1969) the diversity of the classroom reflected the heterogeneity of civic life and made the former an appropriate training ground for the later. For Taba, heterogeneity in classrooms caused the products of thinking and valuing to be richer and more powerful than otherwise would be possible. Ultimately, both the Harvard and Taba anticipated the future contributions of cognitive psychology by regarding learning as a constructive activity

rather than a responsive one. Yet Taba's project went beyond the Harvard project by elaborating a constructive approach for learning social studies (discovery learning).

Taba, Levine, & Elzey (1964) identified three obstacles that hindered critical thinking in social studies. The first was that thinking remained hazy and ill-defined. The second the misunderstanding that higher-order thinking did not occur until a sufficient content had been gathered. This misconception alone accounted for the superficial coverage of surveys which actually inhibited learning. The third obstacle held that good thinking was a by-product of certain subjects. This was deemed wrong for two reasons. First on constructivist grounds, children did not learn ideas by memorizing them as regurgitated end products of someone else's thinking, but by discovering them themselves. Dewey (1902) had written of this in terms of psychologizing the subject matter for learners, rather than imposing upon them the already digested world of adults. Second the assumption was spurious, because it required an acceptance on faith that memorizing Latin or the steps in math processes constituted better intellectual training than "memorizing cake recipes, even though both may be learned in the same manner and call for the same mental processes" (Taba, Levine, & Elzey, 1964, p.2)

At the time, Taba's research was the most well-reported study at the elementary level in social studies which dealt with objectives concerning students' cognitive development that were carefully articulated with objectives concerning student mastery of a limited number of ideas in a curriculum. Taba's emphasis on the cognitive development of elementary students and her de-emphasis on disciplinary mastery as the route to intellectual training were not heeded by the cognitivist Jerome Bruner. Bruner's ambitious project at Harvard, abbreviated as MACOS, stressed disciplinary mastery by

the students of other cultures. Bruner (1960, 1971) believed the structures of the academic disciplines were the entry points for teaching an issues-based curriculum in public schools. Even though Bruner used anthropological content, he neglected to apply the anthropologist's analytic frame to the practical setting of the school in the local community. The result was the cessation of federal funding for social studies research and the end of the New Social Studies Movement.

The MACOS Controversy

Many projects in the New Social Studies Movement were influenced by the contributions of the cognitive psychologist Jerome Bruner. Bruner's personal project, "Man a Course of Study" (MACOS) was Harvard's best-known social studies research. MACOS used ethnographic sources teach elementary and middle school students, what is human about human beings (Evans, 2004). Yet Bruner failed to acknowledge Dewey's attention to schools as public institutions with social lives and value within themselves. Shaver (1977) critiqued Bruner from an issues-based perspective, by reminding him of Dewey's role of the teacher: The question is not, who is influenced by his/her frame of reference? But how can each of us rationalize the influence so that the unexamined elements in our frames will not be applied or imposed in counter-productive ways? Shaver's critique of Bruner would form the basis of his future article, "Needed a Deweyan rationale for social studies."

In the fall of 1970 a fundamentalist minister and father in Florida grabbed headlines by condemning MACOS as "hippiy-jippy philosophy," and linked it to "humanism, socialism, gun control and evolution." This was the opening conservative

critics were waiting for and pounce they did. The John Birch Society, the Heritage Foundation and conservative columnist James J. Kilpatrick criticized in chorus. Even the Council for Basic Education that had been an early supporter of the New Social Studies reforms joined in. The federal funding behind the MACOS drew Congressional inquiry. Congressman John B. Conlan of Arizona charged that thousands of parents across America view MACOS as a dangerous assault on cherished values and attitudes concerning morals, social behavior, religion and our unique American economic and political lifestyle (Evans 2004, p. 176). Conlan called for an end to federal funding of the project. The project that had started out as hopeful as the brothers Rugg's Problems of Democracy textbook had, never recovered.

The fall of MACOS as Harvard's flagship social studies research project gave Oliver, Shaver and Newman's (1966) previous research more attention as researchers looked into value-analysis as a method through which CPI could be taught. The American ethnocentrism of public school students had not been sufficiently confronted before the students themselves were presented with the multiple perspectives of pre-industrial cultures from around the world. MACOS had taught, in its failure, that professors who created curriculum for public secondary high schools and did not acknowledge the power of the cultural lenses through which students learned would do so in the future at their own peril. If the more important moral motives of learning were not taken into account by teachers, in conjunction with the life of the school, the ensuing controversy would prove too political.

Noting this inherent weakness in the MACOS, researchers turned towards the work of Kohlberg (1970) in developmental cognitive moral reasoning. Kohlberg had

been influenced by Festinger's research into cognitive dissonance, and how distress caused by the confrontation of one's opinion with another's influenced student's thinking in classrooms. Kohlberg was particularly interested in Festinger's research which indicated that people changed their attitudes if they took a public stand on a topic they had been actively involved in assembling, in contrast to one they were simply exposed to (Hoveland, Janis & Kelly 1966, Rosenberg, Verba and Converse 1970). This was due to Kohlberg's fascination with what he believed were the attractive attributes of superior moral reasoning. Kohlberg postulated that a superior moral code was sought after by many people when faced with a difficult decision. Kohlberg's explanation shed much light for issues-based theory, by showing how schools tended to be too preoccupied with virtuous acts, and too little concerned with the moral motives as social intelligence. As developmental cognitivists, both Festinger and Kohlberg's theories were directly applied to a public issues-based format for teaching by Engles and Ochoa. Engles and Ochoa, used these contributions in cognitive psychology from Festinger and Kohlberg to strengthen their argument for moral ethical decision making as the cognitive skill emphasized in CPI. Using Newman and Oliver's (1970) research on value-analysis, Engles & Ochoa (1988) further reformulated the methods and rationale of public issues-based curriculum. In addition, Engle and Ochoa (1988) combined these theoretical insights with Piaget to reformulate controversial public-issues curriculum. To Engle & Ochoa, (1988) Piaget's research further supported their belief that students from ages 11 and older can exhibited intellectual readiness to participate in the type of reflective process Dewey (1933) had wrote of. Students needed to be provided by their teacher with opportunities to hypothesize, collect and evaluate data, draw conclusions and make

decisions. Additionally Piaget demonstrated that conflict was an essential component of development. Without conflict, educative experiences did not induce cognitive growth.

Engle and Ochoa (1988) also relied heavily on Johnson & Johnson's more recent research that redefined controversy as a psychological construct that was triggered in the learner's brain. Johnson & Johnson illustrated how controversial issues were defined developmentally as a process. Johnson and Johnson defined conflict within teaching controversial issues, as something that existed whenever incompatible activities occur. An activity that was incompatible with another activity was one that prevented, blocked, interfered with, injured or in some way made the second activity less likely or less effective. Conflict existed within controversy, insofar as it resided in two people's attempt to resolve their disagreement. Johnson and Johnson defined controversy as what existed between two people when one person's ideas, information conclusions, theories or opinions are incompatible with another person and the two people seek to reach an agreement. The psychological process, by which controversy sparked learning according to Johnson and Johnson, reinforced Engles and Ochoa's (1988) belief in the applicability of Piaget (1955). For example, when a student realized that other conclusions about the content in the classroom were different, that student challenged and contested their earlier conclusion. This underlying disequilibrium in the student's brain motivated an active search for information by the student, which some researchers called epistemic curiosity (Berlyne 1971). Johnson and Johnson's (1985, 1988) work reinforced the defining hypothesis, from a developmental psychological perspective, that controversy aroused conceptual conflict and determined classroom climate. In their later study of two types of different academic conflict in the classroom controversy and debate, Johnson & Johnson

(1988) found that non-handicapped students worked more collaboratively with handicapped students in a structured controversial discussion, than in a lesson plan centered on debate. These later findings corroborated the earlier work they had published as well as Piaget's (1955) work on the transition from one stage of cognitive reasoning to another.

Johnson and Johnson (1985) described this transition as a higher cognitive and moral form of development that lead to a reduction in egocentric reasoning. Interpersonal controversies, arguments and disagreements in a safe classroom climate resulted in an increased search for the greatest number of perspectives in order to interdependently achieve goals. In their later study Johnson & Johnson (1988) verified Berlyne's hypothesis that "participation in controversies," promoted the open minded incorporation of opposing information into a student's position and the changing of one's attitude toward an issue. Piaget's (1955) and Festinger's (1964) work as supported by Johnson & Johnson's (1985) research presented Engle and Ochoa (1988) with proof that cognitive dissonance was vital to engaging student's reflective processes and present in a discrepant event. Engle (1960) built on his earlier work in decision-making and with Ochoa (1988) now advocated a new re-appraisal of Dewey's philosophy of reflective decision-making based on evidence supplied by developmental cognitive psychology and developmental moral reasoning.

Summary

A critic of the Problems of Democracy issues-based approach to curriculum, Ross C. Finney, predicted in 1914 that issue centered approaches would be too liberal and near the fringe of radicalism. To a certain extent Finney (1920) was correct. His critique predicted a series that was repeated in succession in the 20th century. Whenever a societal

crisis loomed on the horizon and threatened to undermine the teaching of American values in social studies, fear and distrust greeted any discussion deemed controversial. This boom/bust cycle made the timing of a Problems of Democracy curriculum or any other issues-based curriculum all the more urgent for progressive educators, who felt they could not miss the opportunity to urge the next generation of students to reform society. Dewey's legacy of issues-based curriculum survived these cycles and inspired the creation of a controversial public issues curriculum in public school social studies. Researchers such as Hunt and Metcalf (1968), Oliver & Shaver (1966), and Taba (1963, 1966, 1967) revised issues-based curriculum to be controversial public issues. Engles and Ochoa with the contribution of Festinger and Kohlberg research further revised Dewey's original curriculum to include aspect of cognitive and socio-moral development. The researchers, reviewed in Chapter 3, benefited from these insights to construct new strategies in CPI such as value-analysis and deliberative discussion. Teachers now use conflict to teach the value behind multiple contrasting views and encourage dialogue to create a positive classroom climate. The students' dissent and diversity are now seen as part of the learning process and teachers encourage these responses by facilitating the dialogue. Controversial public issues and conflict resolution education content have seemed threatening to some, but to committed teachers have been interwoven in the fabric of pluralist democracy.

CHAPTER 3: CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The debates that went into the making of American society concerned not just institutions or governing principles, but the capacity of humans to sustain those institutions. Whatever the disagreements were over other issues at the American Constitutional Convention (in Philadelphia in 1787), the fundamental question sensed by everyone. . . was whether the people themselves would understand what it meant to hold the ultimate power of society and whether they had enough sense of history and destiny to know where they had been and where they ought to be going. (Goodlad, 1979)

As outlined in Chapter 2, Dewey's legacy of issues-based curriculum heavily influenced the formation of controversial public issues in social studies in public education. The studies in chapter three are grouped into headings and subheadings which detail the progression of themes in the research on controversial public issues based formats in social studies at public schools. This literature review ordered the studies in this thematic manner to examine the range of effective strategies related to CPI as they have been researched over time.

This literature review starts with considering the prelude to CPI in social studies research; political socialization. The first section of Chapter 3 on CPI is the identification and analyses of classroom climate. The second section then analyzes how political tolerance and the role of value-analysis aid in developing moral cognitive reasoning in CPI. The third section describes the correspondence of teachers' pedagogy and their actual classroom practices in CPI. The fourth section showed how discussions in CPI operate. The fifth section displayed how deliberative discussions function. Section 6 determined what methods teachers have used to teach for social justice. The final section, described how controversial public issues have evolved into an enlarged disciplinary field now known as conflict education.

This literature review has chosen to focus on these seven sections to describe the evolution of research in CPI and the most current insight researchers now have into the complementary roles controversial public issues and conflict education occupy. The research in this chapter reflected a thirty-seven year evolution of controversial public issues into a larger discipline called conflict education. CPI started as an in class social studies methodology and has grown into curricular and extracurricular projects in city school districts nationwide. This progression from controversial public issues to conflict education is the realization of Dewey's earlier vision of "little publics" which perpetuated the democratic life of America. Researchers such as Engles, and Parker (1991) have constructed strategies for teaching the discussion necessary for the dialogue that sustains little publics. This dialogue is the democratic discourse that Dewey believed was integral to the perpetuation and refinement of the democratic experiment in the United States.

Shirley Engles influenced the researchers who investigated whether conflict education was a viable methodology for teaching social justice. Engles twice inspired two separate generations of educational researchers to redouble their efforts on teaching higher cognitive models of discussion, particularly in decision-making. The researcher most influenced by Engles, who continued this Deweyan tradition, was Walter Parker of the University of Washington. Many of Parker's past graduate students such as Carole Hahn, Patricia Avery, Anna Ochoa, Diane Hess and Katherine Bickmore have revised effective CPI strategies in the classroom and incorporated a wider, more inclusive community context. Previous research that addressed political socialization, classroom climate, political tolerance and other approaches of evaluating CPI are now conjoined

with a new emphasis on social justice, peer mediation and peace building in conflict education.

Social studies educators have remembered Dewey's (1916) assertion that the environment was a potent element of education, and that intellectual freedom and exchange should be central elements of civics instruction. Political scientists first studied Dewey's emphasis on the student's learning environment in the early 1960's as "classroom climate" (Litt, 1963). Classroom climate was relevant to the question being considered here "how to teach social justice in the classroom?" because it has been identified as the environment necessary for students to positively confront controversial public issues. Both the teacher and the students created the classroom climate in which the learner seeks to integrate the arrival of new and potentially disequilibrating information with previously accommodated thoughts. Like the weather, this environment is greater than the sum of its parts and the actors within it. The development of the student's political views over the course of their total years of schooling can be viewed as the arc of a day from dawn to sunset. There will be many moments through a student's schooling when the student will be in the dark and feeling oppressed by the environment, while other students may feel expansive and willing to stretch into the airy openness. These feelings of contraction or expansion, the first political scientists termed "closed" or "open." A closed environment is one in which the learners opinions do not circulate freely, but are curtailed by the teacher, fellow students, or the social environment of the school. An "open" environment is one in which students feel comfortable enough to issue an opinion on the content as it is being evaluated in class.

Classroom climate was of particular interest to a group of researchers at the University of Michigan, who were dubbed the Michigan School. The Michigan school coined the term political socialization to describe the development of student's political attitudes from elementary through secondary schooling. Much of the research of the Michigan School found that student's participatory attitudes did not seem to be affected by their teachers. The Michigan school comprised academics such as Wahlberg (1968a, 1968b, 1968c,) Ehman (1969) and Jennings (1968), who were intrigued with the development of a student's political attitudes in public schools. These researchers' political socialization studies laid the foundation for the future studies of classroom climate and its relationship to CPI. During that time a monumental review of political socialization research (Patrick 1967) suggested that "perhaps high school political education programs would have greater influence upon the formation of democratic attitudes if they were conducted in an atmosphere more conducive to inquiry and open mindedness" (p. 45). This statement is important to remember as this paper reviews the research on classroom climate and the relationships between discussions of controversial public issues and student's political attitudes.

Classroom Climate

Researchers to be considered in this literature review, which investigated the necessary conducive atmosphere for classroom climate, are Ehman (1969), Goldenson (1978), S. Long (1980), Hahn and Tocci (1990), and Blankenship (1990). This section is relevant for my master's project question because it describes what has been identified as the most effective social environment in the classroom for using CPI.

Classroom climate was defined earliest by Ehman's (1969) research in a controversial public issues format in social studies. Ehman's study of a randomly stratified sample of 334 10-12th graders in a Detroit high school searched for empirical evidence on the connection between discussions of controversial public issues and attitudinal outcomes.

Ehman searched for the classroom environment constructed by the teacher that would be the most effective in promoting oral and written consideration of the problems facing democracy in U.S. history. Ehman's questionnaire included scales developed at the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center (SRC) to measure political cynicism, political efficacy, political participation and sense of citizenship. In addition to that, Ehman devised a Classroom Climate scale which aligned measured variables that related to adolescent political attitudes and classroom climate. Ehman built the scale on questions he asked of students. The questions concerned whether most of their teachers used controversial public issues, discussed both sides of an issue or took a neutral position and whether students felt free to express their opinions. The reliability coefficients for scores on the cynicism, efficacy, participation, citizen duty and climate scales were .87, .91, .90, .93 and .86 respectively.

Ehman reported that Detroit high school students described their classroom as more open on the classroom climate scale through exposure to CPI in their classes, which were linked to the modeling of democratic discourse. Students who attended additional social studies classes also scored higher on a political efficacy scale. Levels of cynicism about student's own personal political efficacy remained small in these open classroom

climates. However, the magnitude of the relationships was small, the highest Eta and Beta coefficients were .25 and .21 for political participation and classroom climate.

Expanding his analysis to the next stage, Ehman (1969) divided his sample into closed and open-climate subgroups and looked at the political attitudes of African-American and White students separately within each subgroup. Interestingly Ehman found that in a comparison of African-American and white students from a closed classroom climate, both sets of students reported low levels of political efficacy, participation and citizen duty when presented with CPI. African-American and white students respectively had negative correlations with a sense of citizenship duty of (-.39, -.52), efficacy (-.20, -.32) and participation (-.30, -.66). In addition white students in those closed classrooms expressed relatively high levels of political cynicism (+.45) whereas there was no significant correlation (-.05) for African-Americans. Controversial public issues content presented in a biased and closed atmosphere evidently was related to negative outcomes. Long and Long (1975) followed up Ehman's (1969) study about the potential for CPI in constructing classroom climate. Long and Long (1975) sampled 588 students in 3 Illinois communities. Long and Long (1975) dispensed a questionnaire with a two-item Controversial Issues Index which asked students how frequently controversial content was discussed in social studies classes and how willing they thought their social studies teachers were to have controversial opinions advocated or discussed in the classroom.

Long and Long (1975) found negative correlations between frequency of controversial issues discussion and student's personal, political sense of efficacy. With regards to cynicism and trust, small positive correlations were found between scores on

the Controversial Issues Index and political cynicism. Long and Long (1975) found negative correlations between controversial issues discussions and a sense of political efficacy $\Gamma = -.24$ for junior high students and $-.27$ for senior high school students. Long and Long (1975) also found slightly positive relationships between reported participation in controversial issues discussion and political cynicism, $\Gamma = .08$ for junior high school and $.13$ for senior high school students.

Long and Long's (1975) methodology didn't measure whether students perceived their teachers as maintaining neutral or objective positions or whether students felt comfortable expressing their opinions. Although two-thirds of each group said their social studies teachers expressed their personal views in class, there was no mention of how their teachers expressed their views. This may have influenced the outcome of their study since how teachers expressed their personal views in CPI would have a direct impact on whether students perceived the climate of the classroom as welcoming to their own opinions.

Goldenson's (1978) study was the first to replicate Ehman's (1970) research. Like Ehman (1970), Goldenson (1978) investigated whether high school social studies have any effect upon the students' political beliefs and whether CPI had any effect upon classroom climate. Goldenson (1978) assembled an experimental group and a control group and through a three week curriculum unit gathered student's attitudes and opinions. Data collected in the context of two field experiments at two high schools in blue-collar communities near Minneapolis St. Paul. The students in the study, who were seniors, were randomly assigned to their social studies classes. Students took the questionnaires in their regular classrooms. To preclude any chance that students would anticipate a

perceived right answer, administrators of the test clearly specified that the questionnaire was not a test. The pre-test was administered 45 days before the CPI curriculum was covered in the experimental classes. The questionnaires assessed student's responses to seven paragraph-length descriptions of specific civil liberties cases. The paragraphs consisted of case-studies that gave as much context to the respondent as the respondent would have received in response to the news or interpersonal discussion.

The CPI curriculum was designed to expose students to topics related to freedom of speech and the press, freedom of religion, search and seizure, and due process of law. In the experimental group, students organized research projects which involved talking with community members such as police and lawyers to evaluate different sides of these controversial issues.

Goldenson (1978) found that the experimental student group experienced change in their political beliefs as seen in their support for civil liberties. Conversely, the control group that had not used the CPI curriculum became less supportive of civil liberties. A teacher's pedagogy that was conducive to an open climate worked with the treatment to enhance personal political efficacy in the experimental group. Specifically a teacher's credibility was related to student's attitude changes. Credibility was operationally defined as students judging their teachers to be fair, knowledgeable, concerned, interesting and understandable. In the experimental group, students who rated their teachers high on the credibility scale were even more likely to have undergone attitudinal change. Between February and April, close to 20% more students in the experimental group had undergone supportive attitude change due to presentation of controversial public issues in comparison to the control group.

In Goldenson's (1978) methodology students were "randomly" assigned to control statistically significant differences between groups according to socio-economic statuses. Goldenson's self-report questionnaire influenced possible outcomes of his research. For example, students who self identified as having a certain level of SES could not have realized the privileges they were accorded due to their status. No pre-test was administered to the control group due to "administrative problems," which were not specified. Due to the lack of a pre-test it was difficult to chart the difference between the experimental and control groups over the time of the research.

Long (1980) researched whether the prior sociopolitical orientations of students could account for the efficacy of CPI curriculum in the classroom climate. Long measured the effects of a person's personal characteristics on their responses to seven political alienation measures. Long's (1980) student sample consisted of 64% girls, 36% boys and 45 % African-Americans 11% whites and 44% Hispanics. The data was assembled from a written questionnaire that was self-administered by a random sample of the 269 students in two public inner-city high schools in Hartford Connecticut. The grade level of the sample showed 29% of the students were freshman, 17% were sophomores, 26% were juniors and 28% were seniors. In the sample, 23% of the students earned an A grade point average, 53% had a B average, 22% earned C's and 3% earned D's or F's. The parents of the children in the sample size had 40% with grade school education levels, 35 % were high school degrees and 25 % that had attended or graduated from college. Long's (1980) questionnaire identified seven dimensions among the responses; political powerlessness, political discontentment, political cynicism, political detachment,

political hopelessness, elitism and democratic deficiency. Long believed these seven dimensions of political disaffection were interrelated.

Long (1980) was particularly interested whether the seven dimensions of political alienation in his study could be accurately mapped with a smaller number of dimensions. Long (1980) found that the most powerful predictor of political alienation in the systems oriented variant and the individual oriented variant was the perception of powerlessness. Four out of five students agreed that the functioning of government is too complex for them to understand. One out of two students evidenced dissatisfaction with public policy. Student's feelings of distrust were most pronounced with regard to the ethics of political leaders. This perception of the conduct of politicians distanced adolescents from the political system. Adolescents subsequently actively rejected that political system and the values it symbolized. From the student's responses, Long surmised, they were particularly disturbed regarding inequality and injustice.

Overall there were no statistically significant correlations between personal attributes (i.e. gender, grade point average) on levels of political alienation. Long (1980) discovered the perception of systemic discrimination on racial and economic grounds and political alienation were the two variables adolescents typically manifested in their political beliefs. Adolescents exhibited fundamental, firm beliefs in democratic principles. From the students responses to Long's (1980) research it would seem that they were particularly disturbed regarding inequality and injustice. Long noted that this expression of dissatisfaction meant students had been taught a critical perspective of democratic theory, the "if you aren't outraged than you're not paying attention" phenomenon so widely seen on bumper stickers. However Long (1980) disregarded the

following resultant issue for classroom climate: if such cynicism was present in the classroom, was student alienation being increased instead of confronted by teachers who accelerate their student's feelings of helplessness by creating closed environments with students who developed political alienation?

Together, Long and Long's (1975) work supports Ehman's (1969) conclusion that attention alone to controversial issues by the teacher was not sufficient to produce positive civic attitudes in students, an open supportive classroom climate in which issues are discussed was the necessary condition. Goldenson (1978) discovered CPI did cause a change in student's personal beliefs of political efficacy especially when the teacher's credibility was reported to be high. Long (1980) research uncovered no link between the prior political orientations of students and the classroom climate in CPI. All of these studies Ehman's (1969), Long and Long's (1975) and Goldenson's (1978) research Long's (1980) measured how race pertained to classroom climate in CPI.

To examine what impact SES had on one student's perceptions of classroom climate. The next set of studies will consider how the variables of race and SES in students influenced the teaching of CPI in global studies.

Hahn and Tocci (1990) compared the race and SES of students from five different countries including the United States. Hahn and Tocci investigated whether the perceived classroom climate was affected by the race and the SES of students in differing national public school systems. Hahn and Tocci (1990) used value analysis to search for the relationships between perceived classroom climate and secondary student's attitudes of political interest, political efficacy, political confidence and political trust/cynicism.

Hahn and Tocci (1990) mailed questionnaires to 1,459 students in social studies classes in the United States, the U.K., West Germany, Denmark, and the Netherlands. The experimental group participated in a semester long treatment in which value analysis was used in CPI. The control group had no curriculum using value-analysis in CPI. Students were sampled from 50 classes in 21 different secondary schools in these five countries. For the most part, the schools were located in small cities; no truly inner city or truly rural schools were included. The age of the students were from 13-18 no vocational schools were included. The questionnaire measured the extent to which students perceived their classes to be characterized by an open climate four scales were used. The Political Interest, Political Efficacy, Political Confidence and Political Trust scales were adopted from the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center. These scales were pilot tested with a group of secondary school students in the U.K. and then translated into Dutch, Danish, German and American English. All items were reviewed by at least two citizens in the countries where they were to be used prior to delivery to the students A five point Likert scale was used for responses from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree.

Two groups were formed to create a control group and an experimental group. Hahn and Tocci (1990) located no perceived differences between the experimental group and the control group in the terms of perceived classroom climate U.S., Denmark and the Netherlands. Teachers were given free rein to select whatever issues they wanted for discussion, as long as they were issues over which citizens disagreed. Hahn and Tocci (1990) found that there were statistically significant differences between the five nations in the study ($p < .001$). Students in Denmark perceived the classroom climate to be the

mostly open followed by students in West Germany and the United States. In these samples female respondents reported slightly higher perceptions of open classroom climate than did males. The mean responses for females was 3.68 with a standard deviation of .62 , the mean responses for males was 3.6 with a standard deviation of .65. Hahn and Tocci (1990) believed this was not a meaningful enough difference on the interaction of gender in classroom climate and believed additional research would be warranted in the differences between men and women in classroom climate before any conclusions could be drawn.

Hahn and Tocci's (1990) methodology showed where reliability measures were the highest there were the strongest correlation between classroom climate and political attitudes of students according to race and SES. For example correlations were the strongest in the United States where reliabilities were highest. Reliabilities in non-English speaking countries were low due to the translation of the questions into English on the questionnaires and phrased for the first time in those particular contexts. Hahn and Tocci (1990) noted differing results by country could have been influenced by translation differences. There was also a very high "mortality" rate for the teachers who administered the study Among the group of teachers used to implement the study, one Danish teacher moved to a new job, a British teacher went on maternity leave, another moved and one Danish teacher asked the school office to mail the post-tests and they never arrived. Three teachers one in Denmark, one in the United Kingdom and one in Germany forgot to administer post-tests to the comparison group. Finally, one set of Danish questionnaires arrived after the analysis was complete. Hahn and Tocci (1990) admitted that they were unable to examine the effects of classroom climate, value-

analysis lessons, and controversial issues by race and socio-economic level. In all five countries there was a low to moderate correlation between responses on the Classroom Climate scale and each of the five scales measuring political attitudes.

Despite the critique of Hahn and Tocci's (1990) research, their findings highlighted the value of continuing to study CPI as it was taught in cross-national contexts within a global perspective. More importantly, Hahn and Tocci (1990) found that the use of value-analysis as a strategy in CPI only once a week in one class over a school term, did not affect students' civic attitudes. This infrequent use of value-analysis did not change personal political attitudes any more than the inclusion of controversial public issues in a closed classroom climate would.

Blankenship's (1990) research would expand Hahn and Tocci's (1990) research linking global perspectives on education with research on political socialization. Blankenship studied the relationships between classroom climate and global knowledge, global attitudes and political attitudes of students in high school international studies classes. These differences consisted of student global knowledge and global and political attitudes and the differences between classes that were perceived by students as more open, from classes perceived by students as being less open.

Blankenship's (1990) sample consisted of 202 students in grades 9, 10, 11 and 12. The majority were in grades 11 or 12 approximately 2/3rds of the students were white N= 134 and African-American students constituted 27.23% n=55 of the sample and Asian students 6.44% (n=13). The sample was balanced between males and females 55.45% and 44.55% respectively. Students in the 14 classes all used the Great Decisions series from the Foreign Policy Association as their core materials for the global perspectives

class. Teachers were required to keep a log recording type and duration of instructional strategies used in the class. Classroom observations and student's perceptions were reported by the researchers and recorded on the classroom climate scale.

Students responded to a series of 69 statements measuring political attitudinal change on a six point Likert scale. Responses to the attitude questionnaires and knowledge test were analyzed to determine their degree of correlation with student perceptions of classroom climate. Blankenship (1990) tested the following hypotheses from the previous research on controversial public issues: perceptions of an open climate are positively correlated with political attitudes of efficacy, confidence and interest

Blankenship (1990) offered his own definition of global knowledge and global attitudes that consisted of student knowledge of important people, places, movements, issues and concepts relating to international events. These definitions Blankenship used for political attitudes were the same as those used by Ehman (1970). Political efficacy, was defined as the belief that citizens can determine decisions made by the government and that the political system was responsive to its citizens. Political confidence was defined as the personal feeling one can influence larger decision-making by the government. Political trust was defined as the collective feelings of citizens that government is trustworthy and productive. Blankenship relied on Hahn's definition of classroom climate as "the degree to which students feel free to discuss controversial issues openly.

Blankenship (1990) found that perceptions of an open classroom were positively correlated with global knowledge ($r = .147, p < .05$). These positive correlations lead Blankenship to accept his first earlier hypothesis. Blankenship's second hypothesis

predicted that student's perceptions of an open classroom would be positively correlated with global attitudes. The inter-scale correlation of ($r = .321, p < .05$) leads to the acceptance of the hypothesis. Blankenship's third hypothesis in Part A predicted that student's perceptions of an open classroom climate would positively correlate with political efficacy, political confidence and political interest. The inter scale correlations indicated a moderate relationship between perceptions of an open classroom climate and political confidence ($r = .338, p < .05$) and open classroom climate and political confidence ($r = .309, p < .05$) and between perceptions of an open classroom climate and political interest ($r = .239, p < .05$). Part b of hypothesis 3 predicted no correlation between classroom climate and political trust. This hypothesis is rejected according to a weak, but statistically significant relationship ($r = .14, p < .05$).

A comparison of the means of the classroom climate scale, the global knowledge test and each of the attitude scales by race showed intriguing findings. African-American students in the sample perceived classroom climate to be significantly more open than did white students in the sample. Blankenship (1990) explored the relationship of classroom climate and global knowledge, global attitudes and political attitudes by gender and race. There appeared to be a more open perception of classroom climate by females than by males. The mean score for males on the classroom climate (4.530) was higher than means reported by males on other attitude scales in this data set. Of the sample set, males appeared to have a greater knowledge of global issues than females, as indicated by responses on the global knowledge test. When data was examined by race only, blacks and whites were included. Asian students were dropped from analysis because of the small size of the group $n=13$.

The methodological implication of Blankenship's (1990) study lay in the demographic content of the student body which came from three large school systems in one metropolitan area. Additionally, only 48% of the students enrolled in this course in the area during the spring of 1989 completed the questionnaires and there was no way for Blankenship to determine if those responses were representative of the total population. The course selected for study was also an elective course for 12th grade students only. These factors influenced the generalizability of the study and its outcomes cannot be extended to students who do not voluntarily take such a course. Like many studies of controversial public issues, Blankenship's study relied on correlation analyses which limited any causal inferences from the data.

Blankenship's (1990) study had important implications for teaching controversial public issues. His study confirmed that students simultaneously developed positive global and national attitudes. An open classroom climate was related to students demonstrating political confidence, political efficacy and political interest related to national politics. In a course designed specifically for the purpose of examining controversial international/global issues, student developed positive political attitudes that make them participatory citizens in a democratic society. Blankenship's research drives a wedge into criticism from Leming (1992) that teaching national history and social issues would suffer at the expense of teaching global controversial issues.

Blankenship's (1990) final exploratory research question focused on identifying characteristics which seemed to distinguish classes that are perceived as "more open" from classes perceived by students as being "less open." Blankenship used the teacher's logs completed in the sample in a period of 2-4 weeks.

Classrooms observations by the researchers showed that activities labeled as “lectures” were treated by the teachers in the same way as activities they labeled “lecture/discussions.” During the classes documented in the logs, the teachers spent most of their time engaged in lecture/discussion activities (an average of 47.9% of instructional time, ranging from a low of 30.9% to a high of 61.5%). This was an important finding for student’s perceptions of an open classroom climate, since the teacher who reported spending the least amount of time in discussion with students was perceived by the students as having the “least open” classroom climate and the teacher reporting the highest percentage of time devoted to lecture/discussion had the “most open” classroom climate score. The lack of opportunities for students to learn in CPI format based social studies classes was problematic not only for Blankenship, but for Kahne (2000) as well.

Kahne (2000) studied social studies classes that presented students learning opportunities to discuss CPI and how it affected classroom climate. Kahne examined the opportunities to learn democratic schooling that students received in middle school and high school social studies classrooms in inner city Chicago. The majority of the students sampled were students of color. All of the 135 observations of the 8th-10th grades 35 teachers were observed taking place over a three year period from 1994-96. Kahne identified five prominent frameworks that linked curricular strategies to the preparation of citizens for participation in a democracy. Rubrics were then created that reflected these conceptions and used to code 135 social studies classrooms in Chicago. This research also assessed the impact of the 8th grade mandated constitution test.

Kahne (2000) found that students received few learning opportunities when controversial public issues were not introduced. When teachers provided students with

CPI more opportunities and an increasing variety of them, significantly more opportunities for higher order thinking occurred. In addition, when 8th grade teachers were preparing students for the state-mandated constitution test (the state requirement linked to civic goals), they provided less opportunities related to developing citizens, than when they focused on other 8th grade curriculum. Only 12% of the classrooms engaged the students in higher order thinking for a substantial part of the lesson. In only 7.4% was deep disciplined inquiry evident. Students had opportunities to identify social problems in 8.1% of the classes. These bleak results were consistent across all grade levels.

In 80.7 % of the lessons no controversial public issue was identified. The most common topics of the identified problems were violence. The other topics were a scattering of historical events abolitionists, Egypt's Pharaoh, civil rights, the Holocaust, the Middle East and the Million Man March in which no alternative positions were presented. There were no perceived political biases in the teaching of any of these topics. However, class-discussions were common element of high scoring lessons on the rubrics. Kahne (2000) coded the written description of instructional activities. Two raters independently scored one third of the observations on each of the five rubrics: Higher Order Thinking, Deep and Disciplined Inquiry, Experiencing Citizenship, respect for Diversity and Examining and Responding to Social Problems. The inter-rater reliabilities of the rubric scores were .71, .60, .85, .88, and .80 each. When evaluating the remaining observations, if the readers were unclear how to rate a particular lesson that lesson was set aside and discussed with the group. In the correlations among rubrics, the strongest relationship existed between opportunities to experience citizenship and opportunities for higher order thinking ($r=.605$). Focusing on controversial public issues and opportunities

to experience democracy as a way of life did not undermine an emphasis on higher order thinking. Opportunities for higher order thinking were more prevalent when students are offered those opportunities. Kahne (2000) found that focusing on a diverse array of controversial public issues did not distract students from the more fundamental mission of social studies to prepare students for citizenship.

Ironically, inspection of the means presented show that scores on higher order thinking were significantly lower when teachers were preparing students for the state mandated Constitution Test ($p < .05$). Additionally, students had fewer opportunities to experience democracy when teachers were preparing students for that state mandated Constitution Test, than when they were teaching students other topics ($p < .05$) means of scores on the other rubrics did not differ ($p > .10$). In short, when teachers respond to the state mandated testing policy they provide fewer rather than more opportunities to develop as citizens.

Kahne (2000) used rubrics to quantify learning opportunities. This method of data collection neglected potential information that could have shown how more classroom opportunities could be provided. The findings from this project would have had greater impact, if combined with some qualitative assessment of classroom practices or the motivations that drive them. These variables are extremely important and how teachers and their students' experience them should be taken into account.

In spite of this critique, Kahne et al. (2000) found that a great classroom climate was not enough there must be higher order thinking engaged in order for CPI to work and that higher order thinking came from discussion and analysis. They also discovered that classes that used a CPI based format did not undermine an emphasis on higher order

thinking. The strongest relationship of all the variables was between the opportunities to experience citizenship and opportunities for higher order thinking!!

Summary of classroom climate

In conclusion to the section on classroom climate, Ehman (1969), Long and Long 1975, Long (1980), Goldenson (1978), Hahn and Tocci (1990), Blankenship (1990), and Kahne et al. (2000) discovered relationships between classroom climate and controversial public issues in social studies. Ehman's (1969), Long and Long's (1975), Long's, (1980) and Goldenson's (1978) studies determined that students who perceived encouragement by their teachers to investigate controversial public issues developed political attitudes associated with participatory citizenship. These studies showed relationships between perceived positive classroom climates and teacher and student interaction with a CPI social studies format nationally. To examine whether similar results would be found in other countries with different racial and gender compositions, this literature review analyzed the international studies on different racial and gender compositions by Hahn and Tocci (1990) and Blankenship (1990). Internationally there were moderate correlations between an open classroom climate as determined by the teacher and tolerant political attitudes as displayed by the students. Blankenship (1990) then examined whether students could accommodate international controversial public issues without compromising local issues as well. Students were able to consider international issues, without having to forsake attention to their domestic, local issues as well. According to Blankenship's (1990) research, women displayed more of an open perception of classroom climate than men did. Open classroom climates also seemed to be correlated to

teachers who spent more time pursuing discussion in the classroom than teachers who just lecture or practice recitation techniques. The types of discussion that were the most effective for teaching CPI will be discussed later in chapter 3. Kahne (2000) research findings supported Blankenship's research on the potential for learning opportunities in CPI. In both of their studies, when students examined controversial public issues opportunities for students to use higher order thinking skills increased and a positive open classroom climate was achieved.

Political Tolerance

As was covered in the earlier section on classroom climate, the construction of an open classroom climate in a CPI was caused by greater encouragement by the teacher of the students developing political attitudes. An open classroom climate consisted of students that developed the capacity to view society and social conflict from a complex group perspective.

The research of Eyler (1980) and Breslin (1982) studied adolescent and emergent political tolerance by using Kohlberg's (1969, 1970) theory of cognitive moral development as observed in controversial public issues in the classroom. Both Eyler (1980) and Breslin (1982) found a significant positive relationship between the application of democratic norms in CPI and Kohlberg's developmental stage theory of cognitive moral reasoning. One effective strategy for teaching students to develop political tolerance for their peers in a discussion of CPI, within an open classroom climate was value-analysis. Hahn and Avery (1985) studied the effectiveness of teaching

value analysis. Avery (1988) evaluated value-analysis as a means of improving students' cognitive moral reasoning and political experiences and found it effective.

Eyler (1980) searched for an empirical link between principled political thinking in CPI social studies classes and the stages of Kohlberg's (1970, 1975) developmental cognitive moral reasoning. Eyler (1980) believed the development of tolerance by students in CPI was important for four reasons outlined earlier in Kohlberg's stage theory. The first reason was the foundation of socio-moral perspective provided an explanation for the rejection of the legitimacy of political conflict in early adolescents and adults. The second, there existed empirical evidence to connect political and moral thinking. The third, the cognitive processes associated with civic tolerance in political science research were similar to experiences and processes that have been associated with attainment of principled thinking in moral development research. The fourth and most important reasons if these variables were linked then the implication for finding the most effective strategy for teaching CPI in school and community settings would be immense. Concisely stated, Eyler (1980) sought to establish an empirical link between the political tolerance taught in CPI and Kohlberg's cognitive developmental approach.

Eyler (1980) defined principled thinkers as individuals that generated effectively a tolerant response to a new and threatening context for controversy which depended upon the socio-moral elements present in the person's cognitive processes. Eyler measured principled thinking by using Rest's Defining Issues Tests (DIT) to identify sub samples of subjects who rarely selected principled responses as the key consideration in resolving an ethical dilemma and those who often did. Rest's (DIT) was widely used to measure where a person was located on Kohlberg's moral stage construct. Eyler also used moral

dilemmas that were identical or similar to Kohlberg's frequently used dilemmas. Rest's (DIT) used a P score, (P stands for principled), which was a unit of measurement that correlated moderately with Kohlberg's methods of scoring structured open ended interviews. The P score for any given subject increased with age and education.

Eyler (1980) tested two hypotheses. The first, that principled thinkers will be significantly more likely to consistently apply principles of democracy such as majority rule and minority rights to specific cases involving such issues than non-principled thinkers. The second, which principled thinkers would be more likely to accept political conflict as desirable and legitimate, than non-principled thinkers. Because Kohlberg's (1969, 1970) theory held that the more complex a socio-moral perspective, the greater the capacity an individual had to appreciate conflict and question authority, Eyler expected to find that principled thinkers will be more likely to endorse active citizenship than non-principled thinkers.

Eyler (1980) studied a sample of 135 college freshman and sophomores with a median age between eighteen and nineteen years of age. These students were from a small, private teacher's college and were representative of the college in their distribution of disciplines. Two-thirds of the sample size was female and almost all were pre-service teachers.

Test-retest reliability was reported at .81 where the initial range of scores was great to .65 where initial scores were more similar (Eyler citing Rest, 1977). Since respondents chose rather than generated responses, the DIT yielded high P scores for individuals who were already occupying a more developed stage according to Kohlberg. Eyler (1980) believed this was acceptable for her research since the tolerance exhibited in

a stage four socio-moral perspective were already adequate enough to allow the individual to extend procedural protections to unpopular groups.

Of the 135 respondents, 25 subjects placed in the high scoring group and 34 placed in the low scoring group; 15 questionnaires were discarded due to lack of data. The median range of the high P score or “principled” thinking group was 19/20; the median for the low scoring group was 18/19. The gender ratio was about the same in both groups.

Eyler (1980) then compared the findings from Rest’s DIT test to the responses generated from items on the questionnaire relating to support for procedural elements of the democratic creed, for example majority rule and minority rights. Students were then presented with items in which these general principles were applied to specific actions or groups. Five items related to majority rule and six items for minority rights with an item about censorship added. Eyler found in comparison of the results of the two groups on the specific majority rule items, that both groups supported the general items on the questionnaire, but the principled group was significantly more likely to enact four of five of the specific applications of the principle. Eyler found that principled thinkers who possessed the capacity to comprehend the workings of conflict and consensus within a society showed a statistically significant ($p < .05$) likelihood to understand the value of conflict. Eyler also found that the differences between groups in the tolerance of minority rights while not as great as the difference between groups in the majority rule category was still significant.

Eyler (1980) did not comment on the role of race in her research. Another weakness of her study is that the generalizability of college students to students within the larger context of public school in the United States was restrictive.

The importance of Eyler's (1980) research to the Master's project question resided in her validation of her two hypotheses, The first, that principled thinkers will consistently apply principles of democracy such as majority rule and minority rights to specific cases involving such issues than non-principled thinkers was found to be correct. Eyler measured students with previous political experience that had confronted genuine political conflict and resolved that conflict effectively. Eyler's second hypothesis, that principled thinkers would be more likely to accept political conflict as desirable and legitimate than non-principled thinkers was also found to be correct. Principled thinkers who possessed the capacity to comprehend the complexity of simultaneous conflict and consensus within a society were better suited to become active citizens in a participatory democracy ($p=.03$). Eyler's research observed outcomes that empirically linked moral growth with political tolerance. In view of the Master's paper question Eyler showed that students in the specific setting of an open classroom did support the democratic procedural norms of CPI when confronted with differing views, as long as those students possessed the capacity to comprehend conflict and consensus within society.

Due to the stated results of what constituted an open or closed classroom in Eyler's (1980) study, this paper turns to Breslin's (1982) research using the same system of measurement that Eyler (1980) did, but with greater measurement of the classroom climate. Both Eyler (1980) and Breslin (1982) were interested in how tolerance in a socio-moral perspective as defined by Kohlberg interacted with political experience.

Breslin's (1982) research evaluated to what extent individuals who enjoyed an open classroom climate were more tolerant of peers with differing opinions. Breslin also wanted to discover to what extent were individuals who reached a "principled" level of moral reasoning were more tolerant of other group's civil liberties, than those who have not developed beyond the conventional level. Breslin (1982) sampled a stratified group of 1,006 post-primary 17 year old seniors from Catholic and Protestant schools in Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic. Northern Ireland students N=530 and Irish Republic students N=476. Her research was well situated for determining whether there was a link between tolerance in a socio-moral perspective and political experience of conflict. Breslin's research was undertaken in Northern Ireland during the sectarian violence there between Roman Catholics and Protestants. These groups were kept segregated in different schools to mitigate the effects of the violence. The students who completed the questionnaire provided demographic information, data on their level of tolerance, moral reasoning and their familiarity with discussion of controversial public issues. Breslin's (1982) expectations given Kohlberg's theory of moral development with regards to controversial issues were as follows. 1) Northern Ireland students (both Protestant and Roman Catholic) would obtain lower moral reasoning and tolerance scores than a comparison group in the Irish republic, 2) Northern Ireland Roman Catholics would register lower moral reasoning and tolerance scores than the more economically secure and politically dominant Protestant group in Northern Ireland, 3) where violence was most extreme in Northern Ireland, student's political tolerance would be lower than in non-violent areas of the province, 4) there would be no difference in political tolerance

between Catholics and Protestants in the Irish republic. Protestants there are in the minority and are not targets of discrimination and enjoy high social status and respect.

Breslin (1982) measured student's tolerance by assigning scores to their choices of decision from among the four alternatives following each dilemma. This measure gave the students 17 controversial political, social and moral issues. The students then completed a Likert-type frequency check on these items and indicated their familiarity with both sides of the controversial public issue. Breslin's (1982) central hypothesis that a high level of moral reasoning was related to tolerance was statistically significantly supported by the collected data. What was really notable was that the two groups did not differ significantly on variables such as parent's education or father's occupation, innate intelligence or schooling. But the variables did differ on one variable positively related to moral reasoning, the discussion of controversial public issues. Catholic students scored significantly higher on this variable ($p < .01$) and Breslin believed it was the controversial public issues experience which contributed to their higher moral reasoning scores. What was unexpected from Breslin's viewpoint was that students from the most violent areas had the highest tolerance scores. Although there was no significant difference between the scores of political tolerance of Catholics and Protestants in the Republic, there was a significant difference between the two groups in Northern Ireland ($p < .03$).

Breslin (1982) found that the same mechanisms for development of an open classroom climate, confrontation and personal resolution of controversial issues also created a supportive environment for moral development. Breslin's research also confirmed that the discussion of controversial public issues was directly related to tolerance for others and moral reasoning. She believed so strongly in this relationship that

she thought the present curriculum should be restructured, to integrate CPI within the school districts of Northern Ireland. Although the British Humanities Curriculum Project had already been incorporating CPI into their curriculum, the real extent of the differences which both Protestants and Catholics possessed throughout Ireland would only be explored through CPI.

Breslin's used the Likert Scale which was not the most sophisticated of instruments to measure tolerance within a socio-moral context. Breslin also used no pre-test or post-test to measure the lasting effect of using a controversial public issues format for teaching social studies. Measurement of the duration of the effect of using CPI would have been of great use for further research.

Breslin's (1982) work showed the relationship between CPI in an intractable political climate with political tolerance and the efficacy CPI possessed as a methodology to increase moral reasoning.

Hahn and Avery (1985) used value analysis as a means of discussing controversial public issues in the classroom. Value analysis has a two part design; the first assists students use logical thinking and scientific investigation to identify value issues and the second part helps students use rational, analytic processes in interrelating and conceptualizing their values. Value-analysis approach focuses directly on the decision making process in matters of controversial public issues. So far in this literature review, the research has suggested that controversial public issues discussions presented in an open and supportive atmosphere by the teacher promoted positive political attitudes and opportunities for learning. National as well as international studies showed that CPI worked along the lines of race and gender irrespective of the type of school Hahn and

Tocci (1990), Blankenship (1990). Hahn and Avery (1985) believed the values-analysis approach actively encouraged an open climate and began the study if the high level questions used in value-analysis discussions may improve students' reading comprehension and political attitudes.

Hahn and Avery (1985) studied the impact of controversial news articles on value analysis discussion and its relationship to students' political attitudes and reading comprehension. This model of value analysis required students to identify a problem or issue, identify alternatives solutions or positions and hypothesize about the consequences of alternatives and decide on the requisite course of action.

Hahn and Avery (1985) sampled 15 intact secondary United States history classrooms from a metropolitan county school district. The classes were selected randomly using a table of random numbers and assigned to one of three groups, a value-analysis group, reading only group and a control group. Individual students were excluded from the test if there was a failure to complete the pre-test and post-test, absenteeism, or extremely low reading ability. The final two groups comprised 197 students for reading comprehension and 240 students for CPI. The age differential ranged from 10-12th grades. The majority of the students belonged to the 11th grade. The number of males and females represented in the study was equal. A cloze test, which measured reading level according to grade, and a political attitudes scale, were employed in a pretest/posttest design.

Hahn and Avery's (1985) research found statistically significant differences between the experimental group and the control group that read the articles, but did not discuss the related controversy within the article. It was possible that the results were

attributable to the socio-economic level of the students, rather than the classroom climate. The classes were not randomly stratified; most students possessed higher SES than others. Even though the classes were randomly assigned to treatments, the five classes in the control group were located in high SES areas and those students scored the highest on the reading tests. Students from the reading only group were from low to middle class economic areas, and the students in those classes had the lowest reading scores both before and after the treatment. The value analysis group contained one class from a high SES neighborhood and three schools in a low SES area, in which students scored mid-range on the reading tests.

Although Hahn and Avery's (1985) research revealed the effects of students' SES in reading comprehension from value-analysis, it was possible that this was influenced by their method of determining the SES level of students rather than to treatment. Assessment of the treatment revealed two teachers failed to administer the post-test in reading comprehension. Additionally, the use of a set of convergent questioning by teachers unfamiliar with the technique may have elicited only lower level cognitive responses. Subsequently, the outcomes for this research may show students' considerations of other positions and value in a discussion may not be sufficient to promote positive political attitudinal change.

Hahn and Avery's (1985) implementation of a new type of value-analysis as a method of teaching CPI, did cause the classroom teachers difficulty in implementation. Hahn and Avery's field note described the teachers' failure to demonstrate value-analysis before the fifth week of the study! This time lag shortened the length of the treatment period, but provided an unexpected clue as to why the value analysis group did not show

greater results in the cloze test for their reading ability. When the observer's notes were reexamined, classes that possessed successful implementation of value-analysis technique at the beginning of the treatment period showed actual mean gains in reading comprehension that were greater than any other class in the sample! There were significant differences between the groups that read controversial issues and the control group.

The implications of Hahn and Avery's (1985) research to the Master's project question should be seen in light of value-analysis. Hahn and Avery believed their study described value-analysis as a means of teaching CPI that was effective and that there was great need for further research in the effects of using value-analysis in CPI. Hahn and Avery also believed any future research using value-analysis, should give teachers extensive practice in the strategy before the treatment was implemented. Hahn and Avery also realized the importance of SES differences in the student samples and that future studies should control for these differences.

Avery (1988) heeded the implications of her earlier study with Hahn (Hahn & Avery 1985) and investigated value analysis as a means of teaching CPI in a follow up paper. Avery (1988) expanded her earlier question (Hahn & Avery 1985) to encompass the relationship between political tolerance and age, gender, race, political experience, cognitive moral reasoning and perceived threat. In order to clearly delineate the boundaries of this increased cast of variables, Avery (1988) clarified the definition of political tolerance. Unlike the earlier studies of tolerance (Eyler 1980, Breslin, 1982) Avery (1988) used no manufactured ideas of tolerance (eg. the tolerance of certain groups such as communists or atheists to dissenting opinions); rather Avery (1988) determined

the individual's least liked group and then ascertained the student's tolerance for that group. Avery's reconceptualized political tolerance by refining the definition. The majority of earlier political tolerance studies had used the U.S. Bill of Rights as their standard against which they measured a student's conceptualization of political tolerance. Avery (1988) expanded the measure of a student's political tolerance to include the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations 1978). The Universal Declaration of Human Rights possessed most of the rights found in the U.S. Bill of Rights and also included the right to an education and the right to employment.

Avery's (1988) measurement of political tolerance was two-fold. Respondents were first asked to choose their least liked socio-political group from a list of 13 groups. Then 12 statements based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights were shown to the students, and they were asked whether they would be willing to extend these rights to their least-liked groups. The statements were then followed by a five point Likert scale that ranged from "strongly agree" to strongly disagree". The reliability was estimated by Cronbach's Alpha at .86. The confidence intervals based on political tolerance were established and compared for the following variables: cognitive moral reasoning (high and low) and perceived political threat (high and low).

Table 2

Means, standard deviations, sample size and 95% confidence intervals for political tolerance by perceived threat and cognitive moral reasoning (Avery 1988)

		Cognitive moral reasoning				Perceived threat	
	Low		High		Low		High
Statistics							
Mean	38.3		42.1		42.2		35.5
S.D.	8		8.8		7.3		9.2
N	107		108		120		132
C.I.	36.8- 39.9		40.5- 43.8		40.9- 43.5		34.0- 37.1

Avery (1988) found statistically significant differences in political tolerance for the variables of cognitive moral reasoning and perceived threat. There were not statistically significant differences between either younger or older students, or black and white students. Women in Avery's study exhibited significantly greater tolerance than did males. As was found in the earlier research mentioned above, Avery discovered adolescents demonstrating a higher level of cognitive moral reasoning, were significantly more willing to extend basic rights to their least-liked socio-political group, than were students displaying a lower level of cognitive moral reasoning.

A useful critique of Avery's (1988) study would include addressing additional questions about perceived threat. Avery did not address whether a perceived threat acted as an overwhelming obstacle to tolerance, or what factors might reduce that threat. Avery could have also specified what kinds of threat would have an effect on tolerance. There was a lack of statistically significant age differences between younger and older students which limited the age range of Avery's sample.

Avery's research demonstrated that socio-moral development was linked to political tolerance and that political tolerance of the students' most threatening group did not vary according to age and race. There was statistically significant variance between women and men, with women possessing greater political tolerance than men.

Bickmore (1993) shared Avery's (1988) definition that tolerance required a direct encounter with something potentially intolerable. Bickmore (1993) expanded upon Avery's consideration of value-analysis as a method of inquiry. Bickmore called this expansion inclusive learning. Inclusion in learning involved participation in face-to-face confrontations of conflicting ideologies or viewpoints. Like value analysis in the personification of opposing sides, inclusion in learning focused on including participants to be involved in CPI by encouraging open and public resistance to the teacher's point of view. Bickmore's inclusive learning was a natural outgrowth of Avery's (1988) definition of political tolerance and was particularly powerful because it focused on total participation as the pre-requisite for true class discussion. This type of risk the teacher endured was a type of modeling that the students used to see themselves as democratic decision makers.

Bickmore (1993) observed for one year in four public high school classrooms in two economically and ethnically diverse districts in San Francisco. Observations were supplemented with interviews. Within each school, Bickmore sought teachers who were doing CPI and had extensive teaching experience. Bickmore looked for teachers along two intersecting dimensions of the amount of conflict presented in the curricular content, and amount of conflict allowed or encouraged in the pedagogical process. She observed each teacher's class during two regular class periods. Every two-three weeks, she conducted informal interviews with teachers, during this time her notes and observations were available to the teachers for critique. In December at the half-way point, each teacher was given a report and asked to comment on the observation of the interactions in class.

Since Bickmore (1993) was the only observer in this research, her study could have benefited from having other observers who could assemble other perspectives in order to construct a more holistic set of data. Additional observers would have also assisted Bickmore in interviewing the subjects. It would have been of great help to know what strategies in CPI these teachers planned for as they were presenting controversial public issues in their social studies classes. The time intervals between the interviews were too long for teachers to have reflected upon their implementation of a strategy and its outcome.

Bickmore (1993) found that even in the most engaging class, only 60% of the students actually participated. Of those that participated, the same top students were among the representative sample. Bickmore observed lower status or culturally different students had particular trouble with controversial public issues. Bickmore (1993)

believed that these findings demonstrated the weakness and strengths of a CPI approach when it was framed as a classroom equity issue. One weakness of a CPI approach was that students with more cultural capital have role models outside of school to practice dissent. While immigrant students and students with lower SES have few role models, if any, for practicing dissent. Bickmore (1993) observed when students with low SES contributed their experiences of conflict and tolerance, students with higher SES viewed those contributions as a challenge and the conflict made for a negative classroom climate.

Keedy, et al. (1998) researched the extent to which nine students developed historically grounded perspectives in CPI by engaging in an inclusive socio-moral discussion. This micro-ethnographic study constructed and verified its themes through interview, observation and students surveys. The research spanned the entire 1991-92 academic year and the interviews were of nine students (n=9) chosen by the teacher, RG, that were racially and intellectually representative of her class. Nine students were the maximum the researchers could interview due to time.

Keedy et al. (1998) used a constant comparative analysis, in which data were analyzed, and identifiable themes were constructed for each student consisting of definitions of analysis. Keedy et al. constantly rearranged their understandings of new experiences, to reflect the student's emerging perspectives toward the course content and peer influence. The survey was coded which enabled the synthesis of survey data with observation and interview data. The researchers defined moral debate as an exchange of student perspectives over the civic capacity of US institutions to help make wise choices on behalf of all citizens.

Keedy et al. (1998) found that seven students out of the nine demonstrated identifiable personally constructed views of history. They did not see history as value free chronologies. Yet, out of the sample, only one student's sense of history was historically grounded; the other perspectives were based in references to contemporary issues. Most evidence of moral debate was limited to two occurrences over 24 classroom observations.

Keedy et al. (1998) believed their findings were interrelated. Students with little historical grounding had little inclination towards collective, ethical critique. Students' exchanges of diverse historically grounded perspectives with moral issues were not a classroom norm, the result of a closed classroom climate. Keedy et al. had three reasons that explained why only one student had a sufficiently grounded historical perspective. The first reason, was that teachers assumed the traditional role, and remained the director around whom students could maintain safe interactions by studying content and avoiding controversy. This was a traditionalist example of old style (closed) classroom climate. The second reason was that students preferred to regurgitate, not interpret facts. Students repeated the text to avoid the risk of presenting their different perspectives to unappreciative peers. The third reason was student classroom interaction was predominantly teacher-student, rather than student teacher or student-student.

Keedy et al. (1998) surmised students' motivation for meaning making was shut down by student socialization largely because of the two following classroom norms. The first classroom norm was that of intense student competition in which only a few students were expected to win. The second classroom norm was the pedagogy of knowledge transmission. Classroom participants avoided constructing collective meaning making for fear of failure in their peers eyes. Teachers also felt constrained by community invective

about their work and could not proceed without a parallel feel of failure similar to their student's anxiety. Keedy et al. methodology did not measure what criteria teacher's used to determine community censorship. This influenced Keedy et al. research outcomes and the conclusions that the literature review can surmise from their research.

The researchers grounded their study in a constructivist understanding that knowledge is constructed both cognitively and cooperatively through public discourse. Correspondingly Keedy et al. (1998) believed adolescents wanted to develop higher cognitive moral reasoning skills (citing Kohlberg & Gilligan 1972) and were far more disposed towards moral debate with an issue-based curriculum to achieve that desired goal. Keedy et al. (1998) determined that if controversial public issues within the nature of the role of the U.S. government could be framed first within a contemporary context and then mapped backward to an analysis of historical events students would examine the past for moral precedents to provide insight on current dilemmas. This use of CPI in a moving back and moving forward manner can show history to be a dialectical process.

Summary of Political tolerance and value-analysis

In conclusion to the section on classroom climate, Eyler (1980) Breslin (1982) and Avery's (1988) work all examined value-analysis as a strategy in CPI that facilitated cognitive moral development. All three studies focused on measures that assessed an individual's level of political tolerance when confronted with the perceived threat of another group. What all three studies found to varying degrees was that higher levels of cognitive moral reasoning were associated with increased tolerance. This theoretical link implied that instructional strategies such as the value-analysis method of CPI provided an effective means through which student's understanding of basic human rights may be

increased. Breslin's (1982) research specifically showed that the discussion of controversial issues in the classroom was positively related to tolerance, and that students who witnessed modeled tolerant behaviors were more likely to display tolerant attitudes themselves. Hahn and Avery's (1985) research demonstrated value-analysis as an effective strategy for teaching students' reading comprehension. Avery's (1988) study identified a link between the development of cognitive moral reasoning and political tolerance. Studies in this section on value-analysis demonstrated an empirical link between principle political thinking and developmental cognitive moral reasoning in classes that focused exclusively on CPI. Hahn and Tocci's (1990) research showed how value analysis as a strategy was not efficacious when applied once a week. The infrequent use of value-analysis did not result in a change in personal political efficacy. What Eyer's (1980) Breslin's (1982) and Avery's (1988) research showed together with Hahn and Tocci's (1990) was that political tolerance was increased through value analysis strategy in teaching CPI, but only when the strategy was applied consistently throughout a course. When applied consistently throughout a course, students used both domestic and international content knowledge in CPI.

The conclusions that Avery (1985) noted about teacher modeling and its effect upon students political tolerance were later investigated by Bickmore (1993). Bickmore (1993) focused on how students of color were integrated into a discussion of controversial public issues. Like Avery (1988), Bickmore (1993) used the same wide range of variables, age, race, gender within an international perspective on human rights. Bickmore's investigation of the effects such variables as gender and socio-economic class have on global perspectives would be more narrowly considered within CPI.

Bickmore was interested in another form of CPI other than value analysis which could prove more efficacious. Keedy et al. (1998) determined that if controversial public issues within the nature of the role of the U.S. government could be framed first within a contemporary context and then mapped backward to an analysis of historical events students would examine the past for moral precedents to provide insight on current dilemmas. This use of CPI in a moving back and moving forward manner can show history to be a dialectical process.

How Teachers Present CPI in the Classroom

As we have discussed earlier, classroom climate fostered political tolerance when value-analysis was used as a strategy in controversial public issues. Although many studies have pointed to the importance of teacher construction of a beneficial classroom climate, this literature review has yet to consider how teachers modeled attitudes and ways of handling conflict in the classroom. How teachers currently model CPI and what have been observed, as the most effective strategies used by teachers in CPI to communicate the goals of social justice will now be considered

When students were prepared for participation in CPI, they learned various means of confronting conflict in the classroom. Most of these lessons in CPI were not transmitted directly; rather students learned the intended and non-intended lessons from a range of models the most important being their teachers. Students saw controversial public issues as personally relevant to their education, because learning how to deal with controversy gave them experience with future encounters with conflict. Students learn about conflict daily through the everyday business of schooling. Towards this goal, this

literature review turns to the research of Evans, (1988, 1989 1990). These studies consisted of thorough first hand observations of teachers in their classroom conducting CPI formats in social studies. Research that contained observations and interviews of teachers using CPI were relatively rare. This research displayed insightful perspectives into how teachers conceived of themselves as participants in the teaching of CPI within the classroom climate and as communicators of social justice. The most influential study in this section on teacher facilitation was the work of Parker et al. (1991). This research charted a new direction in the classroom practices of CPI that other researchers such as Rossi (1995), Parker and Larson (1996) and Larson (1997) would follow.

The most current, research into teachers' personal pedagogy in CPI was that of Evans, (1988, 1989, 1990). The first of Evans three studies (1988) was concerned with how a teacher's curriculum influenced their student's conceptions of CPI in the social studies. Evans second study (1989), searched for the impact of a teacher's personal pedagogy on their students. The third and final Evans' study (1990) tested teacher's descriptions of their own classroom performance with the observations of researchers. From these three studies (1988, 1989, 1990), Evans showed a progression from a teacher's choice of curriculum, to the pedagogical aims that underlined its delivery to the students in a CPI classroom.

In his first study, Evans (1988) uncovered the impact teachers curricular choices have on their students. To accomplish this he interviewed and observed at the three high schools of three U.S. history teachers. Three student informants were also chosen at random to amount a sample size of nine $n=9$. Each student was from the upper third, the middle third, and the lower third of the class based on the previous quarters grades. Evans

interviewed teachers before they were observed. An interview guide structured the questions the teachers were asked about their conception of history. Students were interviewed for 20-30 minutes after each observation and asked how the teacher and the class formed their conceptions. Data was analyzed by categories of informants using content analysis. Patterns and themes that emerged were compared across these two groups.

Evans (1988) found all of the teachers who had been interviewed had different conceptions of history. Teacher conceptions shaped the social studies curriculum and student conceptions were influenced in turn. Teacher's conceptions of history had a significant impact on their planned curriculum and the transmitted content. However the outcome of these teachers' strategies resulted in poorly formed student conceptions centered exclusively on content knowledge, its relevance and requirement in class. All nine students interviewed said history showed a belief in progress, and agreed it was possible to make generalizations from history. Several students said the past can be usefully compared with current situations.

Evans (1988) found that students who used value-analysis not only identified with their teacher's conceptions, they shared them. Data identified a teacher using CPI as having the greatest impact on his students' conceptions of change. This teacher, Mr. Adamson, taught a CPI social studies class that featured students using value analysis. Adams taught CPI in social studies as a method for understanding contemporary problems. Adamson's entire class spoke openly of their belief in their political efficacy. Adamson involved his students in his personal search for learning the best method for

communicating the goals of social justice. His students retained a sense of political efficacy by noting citizens created change.

In sum, Evans (1988) study displayed how teachers transmitted their conceptions of social studies and of social justice to their students. Evans methods of selecting student informants at random from the upper-third, middle-third and lower-third of the class roll based on the previous quarter's grades did not constitute the best representative sample. Schools with students of color were marginally represented. The first school had no students of color, the second school had approx. 10% students of color and the third school had 30% students of color. Students of color were not represented well across the three sites. This limited Evans' construction of a diverse demographic background from which outcomes could be generalizable. The conclusions of Evans' (1988) study suffered from this paucity of data on the types of students the teachers were influencing with their use of CPI in social studies.

Evans second study (1989) searched for the impact teacher's pedagogy would have on their students. Evans started with World History and American History classes. Based on his earlier study (1988), Evans developed a survey questionnaire and mailed it to all secondary school history teachers in six counties of central and eastern Maine (n=160). The primary directive of the questionnaire was to generate potential interview subjects. The return rate for 71 questionnaires was 43%. Data was analyzed for patterns of teacher response and preliminary teacher typologies were then developed. Their concepts of history were cross-tabulated with their background information. Evans selected 30 interview subjects. Interviews lasted about 50 minutes and probed the teacher's pedagogical philosophy the methods of inquiry used in class and a description

of the informants teaching style. Frequency analysis then formed a preliminary typology of teachers. Survey responses were scored between 0-6 for each respondent in each typology and informants were included in interview summaries on the basis of their survey scores.

Evans (1989) found that 11.3% of the teachers fit the “storyteller” model, these teachers believed only in cultural transmission. The storyteller shared history to give the students clues to their identity. There was a slight tendency for beginning teachers (those with five years or less under their belt) to be focused on this type of content oriented approach. Evans second typology was that of the “scientific” historians who comprised 18.3 % of the sample group and had a positivistic view of history. The scientific historians believed history was a form of scientific inquiry. These teachers traced the roots of their pedagogy back to the 19th century historians and the recent resurgence in the New Social Studies movement. The scientific historians focused on inquiry and used primary sources in their classes. Most of these teacher’s influences were from past history professors. This group’s political orientation was shaped more by formal study in school and less by family than the storyteller. The scientific historians protected their neutrality in CPI by maintaining a scientist’s detachment from moral questions.

Evans’s (1989) third typology was teachers who he termed relativist reformers. This group comprised 45.1% of the sample size and believed the past was used to outline the boundaries of current controversial social problems. These relativist-reformers self described themselves as social reformers and held similar visions of social justice. These teachers were influenced by Dewey’s (1933) teachings and felt their students will have to react to certain feelings, and needed to reflect upon these feelings, when making

important decisions in their life. CPI was the preferred method of inquiry with this group and all mentioned provocative teachers they had in high school or college. Interestingly, of the entire sample size, the more experienced teachers tended to be relativists and possessed over 5 years of experience. Curiously, disciplinary background also did not seem to be as strong a factor for relativist reformers as with the other typologies. Evans (1989) fourth typology was the “cosmic philosophers” who comprised 2.8% of the sample size. The cosmic philosophers were meta-historians and tended to have the most extensive educational backgrounds. The remainder of the sample size amounted to 22.55% and Evans termed these teachers “eclectic” because they had no pedagogical orientation or philosophy of education.

Evans’ (1989) method of research for constructing their four typologies of teachers did not include observations. In addition teachers also self-selected the typology they belonged to. Because of this Evans (1989) could not generate a random sample that reflected the status of teacher conceptualizations in a generalizable way. The outcome of this was that teachers who submitted more than one response were placed in a catch-all category called “eclectic.” This resulted in a large percentage (22.5%) of the total sample size being placed into a typology with no meaning attached to it.

Evans (1988) earlier conclusions about the teaching of history as a potent forum for imparting values was substantiated by this second study (1989). Teachers’ choice of material did have a significant impact on the curriculum. Evans (1989) demonstrated that teachers of the relativist/reformer typology were the most likely to hold similar views of social justice. The relativist reformers used CPI to generate involvement in the democratic experiment.

In his third study, Evans, (1990) searched for correspondence between teacher's articulations of their classroom pedagogy and their classroom performance. These teachers represented the five typologies generated in his second study (1989). Evans observed five high school teachers and their students and their five representative classrooms that lasted 8 periods each. Evans (1990) drew on data from three primary sources; interviews with teachers, observations of classrooms and interviews with students. The teacher most representative of each typology was selected from an original sample of 30 teacher interviews. Six student informants were selected from each site at random, two students from the upper third, two students from the middle third and two students from the lower third of the class roll based on the previous semester's grades. Student interviews lasted 30 minutes and investigated their knowledge of their teacher's teaching style, student knowledge of their teacher's political beliefs and student's political attitudes. The interviews were conducted after classroom observations and follow-up interviews with teachers were completed. Each student interviewed spent 6-7 months in their teacher's class. Data were also analyzed by analysis of interview transcripts, field notes and transcripts of class sessions. Data were coded according to pre-planned categories of informants and organized by relevance to the original research questions. The rapport that Evans had with the teachers he generated grounded theory from was rich and provided much self-reflection for their individual pedagogies. Evans (1988, 1989, and 1990) was critical of his use of the data and frequently searched for underlying themes and lenses he might have employed.

Evans (1990) considered the research from his three studies and concluded that teacher's transmitted conceptions of history only had an impact on the social studies

curriculum in some cases. Of the four representative typologies of the storyteller, scientific historian, relativist/reformer, cosmic philosopher, and the eclectic, only Evans' observations of the storyteller and the scientific historian matched their descriptions of their teaching methods. The storyteller and the scientific historian had clear methodological objectives and were effective at meeting those pedagogical goals. The other typologies, the reformer, cosmic philosopher and the eclectic had lower levels of correspondence between their avowed methodology and their performance in class.

In general, teacher's conceptions of history influenced their choice of content material but not their student's beliefs of history. Even though student's reported that they had learned that history helped solve problems and avoid past mistakes, few students were given help in applying those ideas. Similar events from different eras were not given full exploration and even less discussion or deliberation. Most students conceded that their beliefs about society had not changed over the course of the class. If Evans' typologies represented accurately the practitioners of social studies, then the lack of teacher consonance contributed to what Dewey (1938) termed the miseducation of students. Soberly Evans described most of the teachers in his study as assisting and sustaining student apathy. The eclectic who seemed interested in making it through each day, socially reproduced accepted meanings and institutional objectives.

Evans' (1990) search for a direct link between a teacher's political ideology and their student's conceptions of social studies was fruitless. This was due to his method that posited a teaching strategy for each typology he constructed. Because Evans was looking for a causal relationship, a one to one match between the type of teacher and the strategy used to teach, he overlooked some important findings. Although the reformer/ relativist

tried to improve social inequities through teaching for social justice, he failed. This was evidenced by the teacher's own view of his pedagogy, which he admitted was unexamined and unarticulated. On the other hand, the scientific historian was clear about the method he was using and his conception of history corresponded to the means with which he taught. Even though the relativist/reformer was teaching for social justice, the scientific historian with their dedication to their method came closest to the realization of Dewey's goals (1933). The conclusions one can draw from Evans' three studies (1988, 1989, 1990) was that the difficulty of effective discussion centered teaching might have caused the relativist reformers to have so little correspondence between their use of CPI and their students conception of history and of political efficacy. Although the relativist/reformers succeeded in teaching their students to be more analytic and to ask reflective question about themselves and their own lives, Evans believed the majority of teachers who were miseducative largely outweighed their efforts. Evans studies (1988, 1989, 1990) taken together, clearly describe teachers who teach for social justice in need of a coherent, correspondent method of teaching CPI for effective discussion centered teaching.

Teachers who constructed a curriculum based on controversial public issues in social studies have a double challenge; how to integrate past events in history, and society with unfolding events. Current public issues frequently become more relevant to students lives and interest when newspapers and media outlets considered them noteworthy. Nelson et al. (1994) researched how social studies teachers integrated present unfolding controversial public events within their classrooms. Nelson et al. found that social studies teachers' defined controversial public issues as important events as

they were unfolding. Nelson et al. examined how high school and middle school social studies teachers folded Gulf War I in their perceived instruction objectives in CPI.

At the end of the 1990-1991 scholastic school years, Nelson et al. (1994) mailed a survey instrument entitled “The War in the Gulf and the Social Studies Curriculum” to 250 middle and high school social studies teachers in Maine and 100 members of the Illinois Council for the Social Studies.

The questions involved in the survey were related to demographic characteristics of teachers and teaching strategies employed to involve students. In addition to these questions, 50 % of the survey contained a modified form of the Social Studies Preference Scale (SSPS), these questions measured the theoretical orientation of social studies teachers. Survey return from Maine totaled 104 and from Illinois 20 which represented an aggregate return of 35% .71% (n=88) of the respondents were males, 29 (n=36) were females. 66 % (n=82) had taught for eleven or more years. 62% (n=77) self-identified as teaching in a rural area, 20% as suburban, and 18% as urban.

Nelson et al. (1994) measured reflective inquiry on a scale represented as R1. This measured the 57 teachers in the sample who like Dewey defined reflective inquiry as an active consecutive and careful search for answers that are designed to fulfill an important human need (Nelson et al. citing Barr, Barth & Shermis, 1977). Indeed the one dimension in which R1 teachers differed from their colleagues was the amount of time they devoted to Gulf War I in class. Teachers whose pedagogical beliefs were more consistent with reflective inquiry theory provided more class time to the war in the months of November 1990 to December 1990, January 1991 to February 1991 and March 1991 to April 1991 at ($p<.05$), ($p<.01$) and ($p<.001$). This was compared with teachers

low on an R1 scale over the same time intervals. Interestingly the R1 orientation appeared to enable teachers to change their course plans to deal with controversial public issues on interest and importance to their students.

Nelson et al. (1994) found that 92% of the responding teachers reported interrupting their planned curriculum to study the Gulf War. Of those teachers 72% indicated they devoted one or more class periods per week to the subject. However with six possible exceptions, Gulf War I never became the sole topic of study in these classrooms. Of the teachers sampled 72% rated discussion, as the most important strategy they used in teaching students about the war, yet over 50% of these teachers did not involve their students in debate or research.

Nelson et al. (1994) believed social studies teachers' reliance on discussion prevented students from engaging in their own inquiry. Social studies teachers were reluctant engage with their students for fear of seeming disloyal or unpatriotic. Nelson et al. reported their reliance on discussion represented a half-hearted attempt to appear flexible enough to tailor their curriculum to a controversial public issue, only when it supported the larger curricular goals of the school. Teachers avoiding the library for research, as well as an over-reliance on television and print journalism also evidenced this.

Nelson et al. (1994) found that social studies teachers certainly used discussion time to talk, but the depth of the inquiry was unclear. Students reflected on data gathered from the news, but not on data researched from the library. Like the teachers from Evans studies (1988), (1989), (1990), the teachers surveyed by Nelson et al. (1994) had no

concrete method for using a discussion in CPI which engaged their students learning in an individual or social manner.

Evans (1990) and Nelson et al.'s (1994) research has shown how teachers' conceptions of how they teach what to incorporate into CPI can lead to students' poor conceptions of history in which content coverage both past and present resulted in sporadic use of any strategy for teaching CPI. What effort was used to promote discussion was done purely by the teacher as a defensive posture.

In his research Rossi (1995) evaluated an in depth value analysis approach to teaching CPI which challenged the learner to be more prepared to struggle with their disequilibrium and challenged the teacher to view the dialogue of classroom interaction to be more unpredictable and less subject to his or her control. Rossi (1995) researched the social interaction of a CPI discussion that used Oliver, and Newman's (1970) value analysis model as the basis for the class. In particular, Rossi (1995) wanted to identify what practical teaching dilemmas teachers faced in prompting during a CPI discussion.

Rossi's (1995) classroom in which the value analysis model of CPI was taught was composed of 26 students (14 female and 12 male) from mostly white, middle and upper middle class families. Rossi (1995) was a participant observer in the classroom and he shared his notes with the teacher and constructed an interpretive case study from those notes. The selection of students for Rossi to interview was not random, but was controlled by the teacher. One female and two males were chosen from different academic levels and from differing economic strata. Data collection in total consisted of four interviews with the teacher, two interviews with three students and one interview with two other students. All interviews were semi-structural guided by a small number of

open-ended, descriptive and structural questions. The length of each interview with the teacher was 60 minutes while each student interview lasted 30 minutes. Two units each of three weeks duration were observed for a total of six weeks. Students were interviewed about the character of classroom interaction in relation to the prompting by the teacher.

Rossi (1995) carefully triangulated his study. All the memos he addressed to the teacher were critiqued for confirming and disconfirming aspects of observed behavior. Additionally, Rossi wrote a series of vignettes and shared these with the participants. Rossi (1995) found that the students interviewed reported a more tentative and skeptical disposition toward knowledge and two themes underlined that disposition. This disposition towards knowledge occurred in a classroom where knowledge was organized around authentic questions and authentic contexts. Secondly, the discussion occurred in a classroom where discourse extended beyond lecture and recitation.

Rossi (1995) emphasized that authentic questions and authentic contexts served as organizing features of CPI. The teacher fell into what Rossi termed 'the director's dilemma' which was the expectation of the students to set the agenda for the classroom discussion on a timely basis, while providing them a constant flow of sources to use for that discussion. This position portrays the teacher as a dilemma manager.

Rossi (1995) noted the teacher wondered whether 10th graders handled the levels of abstraction he called for. However Rossi (1995) believed the existence of teaching dilemmas was not a sign of failure, but of implementation of CPI with students and a natural outcome of their beliefs, the reality of social interaction and outside contextual factors. The theoretical guidelines of constructivist and in depth issue-centered learning

theory confront powerful practical teaching dilemmas that can uncover obstacles that are part of the hidden curriculum of a school, its culture and administration.

As Evans witnessed in his studies (1988, 1989, 1990) of teacher's conception of their pedagogy, teachers personal conceptions of unified theories of history that were imposed upon students met with poor results. Nelson et al. (1994) showed that social studies teachers maintain flexibility in their planning by using CPI as a method of control over unfolding events. Rossi (1995) showed how value-analysis in an in depth manner could be used to remedy the pitfalls teachers fell into when implementing CPI as seen in Evans and Nelson et al.'s work.

Many critics of Dewey's issues -based curriculum as it has evolved into CPI have asserted (Leming, 1994) that high school students were unprepared developmentally for the reflective thinking required in value-analysis strategy in CPI. This critique of developmental preparedness did not address what type of development student would have to attain in order to be ready for value-analysis in CPI. Debates about development frequently ascribe to the development of a content area and disciplinary coverage by the teacher, rather than any type of development on the part of the student. As was seen in the earlier research in this chapter, the use of value-analysis in CPI was a strategy for aiding the socio-moral development of students' political tolerance. Political tolerance was discovered to be present in higher levels in students who had greater amounts of prior political experience than in student who had less political experience. Ironically the students with higher amounts of political experience were typically from lower SES, but were denied the chance to share their funds of knowledge with a classroom consistently.

This happened in two ways. The first had to do with peer competition, particularly among students who had practice with dissent from higher SES. The second way involved the classroom climate. If teachers did not encourage the sharing of opinions and were not perceived as credible then the climate was considered by the students to be closed. The central ideas of this section in chapter three of this literature review pertain to using CPI as a strategy for teaching about social justice in the following way.

Social studies teaching and learning was conceptualized around students questioning their own culture and experience, an investigation of the past that questions its traces and theorizes its legacy and import for the present. The dialectical strategy of value-analysis was used to engage socio-moral development. Its function was of a tool in increasing political tolerance among students on an individual basis. The increasing of political tolerance while important was not sufficient to teaching students about social justice. Perhaps students need the structure and strategies to generate their own questions. Once these individual questions can be generated the students start a learning process independent of the teacher as a controller, but dependent upon the teacher as a facilitator. The role of the teacher as a facilitator in the students' generation of their own questions will now be considered in this literature review.

Students have to generate their own questions in order for more complex forms of discussion to take place. More complex forms of discussion rely upon students' constant generation of questions and role switching. This ability is inherent to children as Dewey (1916) noted in *Democracy and Education*.

But observations show that children are gifted with an equipment of the first order for social intercourse. Few grown-up persons retain all of the flexible and sensitive ability of children to vibrate sympathetically with the attitudes and doings of those about them. In attention to physical things (going with incapacity to control them) is accompanied by a corresponding intensification of interest and attention as to the doings of people. The native mechanism of the child and his impulses all tend to facile social responsiveness (1916, p.43).

Their facility in constantly testing and experimenting was dependent upon their conception of interdependency. For this reason many researchers in CPI have undertaken research into the applicability of CPI in the Elementary grades and have found children quickly learn deliberative discussion techniques with controversial public issues without reducing the content of the issues discussed to interpersonal matters.

Discussion in CPI: learning from skilled teachers

Parker et al. (1991) believed prompting elicited responses from students to think critically during considerations of controversial public issues. Parker recognized in order for a teacher to teach social justice in a social studies classroom, there has to be an effective method in which to teach it. In addition to an open climate in the classroom and an understanding of the political tolerance the students may or may not possess in the class there has to be a coherent form of discussion for both students and teachers to use dialogically.

Parker et al. (1991) sampled 45 students from a suburban public middle school in the Pacific Northwest. All were in grade 6, 22 were female, 23 were male, eight were

Asian, one was black and the remainder were white. At the beginning of the school year, the school assigned students randomly to social studies classes. Students were instructed to write a four paragraph essay on a current controversial public issue. Each paragraph has a different purpose. Parker et. Al. (1991) then used content analysis techniques with which five categories were derived.

The sample group was divided into an instructed group (n=24) and a prompted group (n=21). The instructed group was given six hours of instruction on dialogical reasoning over eight social studies class sessions each lasting 45 minutes. Dialogical reasoning was taught not as a skill, but as a strategy for use in CPI as well as in school and in life. The goal related benefits of using dialogical reasoning were also explained. This benefits instruction encouraged the students to metacognitively know the skill. Students were led through a series of involve and debrief lessons which engaged them in dialogical activity while asking them to reflect on that activity. The prompted group received no direction in dialogical reasoning and stayed with the original curriculum. When the instructed group completed its unit on dialogical reasoning, the prompted group was given instruction by the teacher on only the vocabulary that would be used in the directions of the writing task. A four paragraph essay was then administered to both the instructed group and the prompted group. Students had 45 minutes to complete the task and all finished on time.

Parker et al. (1991) examined differences between the two groups for the five categories of interest, supporting arguments, multiple counterargument, empathic counterargument and dialogical conclusion. Scores on the school districts composition

tests were used as a covariant, thus controlling for differences in writing ability. A statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) was found for the first category only-supporting arguments. The effect size in this category was .74. With only a ten minute briefing, along with prompting provided on the reasoning measure itself, a group of 24 sixth grade students produced dialogical reasoning on a public issue about which they had some general knowledge. The reasoning they produced was as good as the reasoning produced by a similar group of students who had the advantage of high-quality instruction.

Parker et al. (1991) believed the research outlined two possibilities. The first, that that students were found to reason well without having been instructed directly. The second, that the task for social studies teachers should be to prompt the production of reasoning rather than just instruct it.

Of course Parker et al.'s (1991) method with its dependent variable of the four paragraph essay may not have been a sensitive enough tool to measure the differences between the two groups. There was also no measurement of their prior knowledge of reasoning that the students may have employed.

Parker et al.'s (1991) findings cast doubt on the underlying assumptions of present efforts to teach value-analysis. Earlier research in this literature review considered the teachers' role as one of providing direct instruction on thinking skills. Those researchers assumed *a priori* the skills in value-analysis had to be learned from the bottom up. Parker et al. believed that it may not be necessary to develop scaffolding from the bottom up as is used so often (albeit loosely) by social studies teachers when talking

about their pedagogy. Direct instruction was an inappropriate- an unnecessarily blunt instrument for the task at hand that was to get students to use the skills they have. Direct skills also lacked authenticity because real skills required a context in which skills use was both necessary and purposive. In teaching controversial public issues, as in learning social studies, much needed information was missing. Students who would exhibit mastery with the sufficient information present in formal logic problems were stymied and frustrated on what constituted relevant information to consider. Such terrain in CPI was multi-logical having many disparate strands of reasoning. Parker et al. believed eliciting reasoning in CPI discussions therefore was not problem solving, so much as constructing a strategy.

Parker et al.'s (1991) findings suggested an interesting possibility that the task for social studies teachers in facilitating discussions may not be to provide instruction on reasoning, so much as to prompt its production. Dialogical reasoning was used in a thought-provoking curriculum that didn't train students; so much as it required them to use their method of inquiry for the work at hand. The dialogical reasoning in CPI invited multilogical synthesis in which argument, clarification, analyzation, analogizing and exploring others perspectives were all necessary to complete the task at hand. Parker et al. (1991) believed CPI involved modeling on the teacher's part, but it also involved reminding students that authentic contexts were multi-layered and not one-dimensional.

Parker and Larson, (1996) investigated teachers' conceptions of classroom discussion to discover what influenced teacher's conceptions of prompting in discussions. Parker and Larson selected three teachers who taught U.S. history in the same 26 year old

high school in a middle class suburb. The principle nominated each of the three teachers on the basis that they all used “discussion” frequently. Data were of three types responses to interview, responses to a think aloud task and observations from classroom teaching.

Teachers were given five vignettes of classroom interaction and told to choose which one was most like their own pedagogy. The teachers then compiled five ideal types into a progressive order from most like their classroom discussions to least like their classroom discussions. The teachers then sketched on a seating chart, which interaction directions they thought would be achieved by such a discussion.

Parker and Larson (1996) discovered that teachers have many different conceptions of discussion in relation to classroom control and each type of discussion has its own purpose and level of involvement with the objectives of CPI. Parker and Larson found that social studies teachers had five different conceptions of prompting in classroom discussion. There was discussion as recitation, discussion as teacher-directed conversation, discussion as open ended conversation, discussion as posing challenging questions, and discussion as application. The three crucial determinants of how teachers conceptualized and used discussion were discovered to be; maturity level of the students, classroom climate, and lesson objective.

Parker and Larson (1996) discovered introducing students to controversial public issues necessitated using differentiated conceptions of prompting in discussion. Parker and Larson found that social studies teachers still classify recitation as discussion, but this is not their only conception of discussion. Teachers determined what prompting would be

used with a recitation discussion, versus a conversation-style discussion, and what types of students would allow for what kinds of social interaction.

Parker and Larson's (1996) method of data collection; responses to an interview schedule, think-aloud task, and observations of classroom teaching was from teachers in a middle-class suburb all of whom had twenty years plus experience teaching social studies and all of whom possessed Master's Degrees. Parker and Larson acknowledged the homogeneity of their sample and promised the next companion study would examine two urban high schools in which the social studies curriculum was differentiated. This outcome prevented any generalizability for students of color in differentiated classes in social studies. To their credit, Parker and Larson authored this study as only the first in a series of companion studies. They believed the future research should concentrate on two urban high schools in which U.S. history curriculum was differentiated between honors, basic, special education and on a 12th grade senior problems course in which discussion was treated as part of the curriculum, taught as a method of public discourse, rather than only implemented as an instructional method.

Parker and Larson's (1996) research was important to my Master's Question because their findings showed that when teachers controlled progressively less of the conversation the more open ended a CPI discussion became. When asked about whether the discussions in CPI were open for any topic that students wished to discuss, all the teachers quickly added that the value of an open ended conversation was the freedom students have to discuss a subject in any manner they want not necessarily to talk about any topic they wish to speak to. The open dialogic interplay between the students and teacher created the necessary classroom climate for CPI to be used.

Larson (1997) expanded on his earlier study (Parker & Larson 1996) by examining six teachers with the same methodology as used in his previous work with Parker. Larson (1997) investigated social studies teachers' use of CPI in the classroom, and compared those in suburban middle class schools with those in inner-city schools. Teachers at the suburban high school taught either regular track or honors classes. Teachers at the urban high school taught either low track regular track or honors classes. Larson gathered data comprised of responses to an interview schedule and responses during a think aloud task. In the interview teachers spoke directly about their conceptions and definitions of discussion, describing the mental image that came to mind when they heard the term classroom discussion. In the think-aloud exercise, teachers notions of ideal discussions were evoked by composing vignettes each a paragraph long. The teachers were asked to order the vignettes from the ones most like the discussion to the one's least like the discussion.

Larson (1997) gleaned six types of discussion from these nine interviews: discussion by recitation, discussion as teacher directed conversation, discussion as challenging questions, and discussion as guided transfer of knowledge to the world outside of the classroom, discussion as practice at verbal interaction. There were also five variables that influenced the choice of discussion: student diversity, lesson objectives, age and maturity of students, sense of community in the classroom and the interest level of students. Larson's study provided empirical support for models of classroom discussion.

The important implication of Larson's (1997) study for the Master's project question was that teachers believed their role as facilitators of the classroom discussion to

be critical to the success of the discussion. This was particularly the case with the two of the most complex forms of discussion; discussion as challenging questions, discussion as a guided transfer of knowledge to the world outside of the classroom. Discussion as practice at verbal interaction required the least amount of teacher control, but the most amount of skill on behalf of the teacher. Unlike the other forms of discussion the teacher only modeled discussion, the teacher did not control the flow of the responses or conversation through probing questions.

Larson's (1997) method of data collection for his research was identical to that of his earlier study with Parker (Parker & Larson 1996). Unlike their earlier study, Larson (1997) found that student diversity was a great influence on teacher's choice of discussion technique. This probably stemmed from Larson investigating a more diverse population with the inclusion of an inner-city school to his sample. However, as with the earlier study with Parker (Parker & Larson 1996), there was no demographic information regarding the teachers. Larson has identified student diversity that teachers recognized when choosing the type of CPI discussion format, yet has not identified how a teacher's race, ethnicity or gender would effect students' engagement in discussion.

Hess (2002) searched for secondary teachers who were comfortable in their use of CPI discussions to teach their students to participate effectively in such discussions. Hess followed Shulman's (1983) advice that good cases be studied because they allow us to learn from the possible, not only the probable. To locate good cases Hess (2002) evaluated recommendations from professional development leaders of CPI discussion workshops/institutes and discussion researchers. Other experts who had observed these teachers verified the recommendation.

Like Larson (1997), Hess (2002) noted much of the research done on issue-centered social studies curriculum took for granted that the definition of discussion was a mutually agreed upon definition, when in reality it varied wildly. Hess (2002) was influenced by Evans' (1988, 1989, 1990) Rossi's (1995) and Larson's (1997) work. Hess studied under Walter Parker at the University of Washington Graduate Program in Education, as did Larson, (1997) and their common interest in delineating classroom discussions in CPI dovetail with each other. Hess (2002) described CPI discussions in the teacher's classes. She introduced six propositions that came out of her research, and then expressed theoretically what effective teaching of CPI discussions entailed.

The grounded theory format Hess used was a four stage process to analyze the data and generate initial theory through the four steps of transcription, coding and developing, compilation of biographies and integration of categories and their properties. The data was then shared with the teacher who was invited to critique the report. These critiques were later folded into the research. In the first stage, Hess (2002) used three methods of data collection; open-ended interviews, field notes from observations and audio tapes and classroom artifacts such as assessments rubrics and preparatory readings. In the second stage, Hess compared and contrasted the conceptions and practices of secondary social studies teachers who taught their students to participate more effectively in CPI discussions. In the third stage Hess used the data to compile six propositions and noted how the propositions critiqued and complemented the existing research on CPI in classroom in which social studies was taught. In the fourth and final stage, she analyzed what she expected to see but did not and theorized about the practices of secondary school teachers who effectively use CPI in discussions. Each teacher's methods in using

CPI were exhaustively described before the next teacher's methods were introduced for comparison.

Hess' (2002) first subject of the three teachers was Joe Parks, who had taught middle school and high school social studies for 22 years. Joe constructed his own curriculum at the New Horizons School where he taught. Joe's strategy was the Socratic seminar in which he presented the students with a primary document. Students handed in a ticket upon entering class, which they needed to gain entrance to the small groups work. Students who did not hand in a ticket could not contribute and had to sit as observer and take notes on the discussion. Students worked with primary documents to analyze Constitutional Law. The Constitutional Law cases considered were "controversial" in their respective historical eras. Each seminar of Joe's ended with a debriefing in which the students were required to participate. After most seminars, students were required to write a paper about the issues in the text. His principal who occasionally sat in as a participant and as a facilitator taught this strategy of discussing CPI in Joe's classroom to him.

Hess (2002) then examined Elizabeth Hunt, and her 8th grade social studies students, who participated in nine CPI discussions. Shortly thereafter there was a school shooting, and Hunt used a current event to showcase a CPI discussion based on gun control. Hess noted that Hunt used the Public Issues Model developed at the Harvard Social Studies Project in the 1960's by Oliver and Shaver (1974). This type of CPI model involved using selected issues to bring to the forefront issues that occurred between core democratic principles while definitional, ethical and factual treatments of the material were used. Three days before the discussion, Hunt distributed articles on gun control

geared toward students reading levels. Students had to read the articles and create a chart listing arguments for and against placing more limits on gun control. By completing this assignment students were able to participate in the discussion in an informed way. Students formed a fishbowl structure. Students participated in the inside of the fishbowl while students on the outside listened.

The third and final case study in Hess' (2002) research was of Ann Twain. Ann Twain's students participated in a town-hall meeting style while a first year teacher Ann used the Town Hall method to teach her students about CPI discussions. She showed footage of the class from a year before who had completed the course. A week before the Town Meeting format, Ann's students received a packet of material on affirmative action. After a class period of didactic instruction on the material, Anna and her students crafted the roles. Ann ended the Town Meeting with pair/share, in which students who didn't have a chance to contribute participated. Ann discussions occurred on Friday, so her debriefing didn't happen until the following Monday.

From the similarities that Hahn noticed in these teachers use of different strategies to teach CPI, she drew the following six propositions. 1) Teachers teach for, and not just with discussion, Discussion was both a desired outcome and a method of teaching students critical thinking skills, social studies content and interpersonal skills, 2) teachers work to make the discussions the students form, 3) teachers selected a discussion model and a facilitator style that was congruent with their reasons for using discussion and their definition of what constituted effective discussion, 4) decisions about whether and how to assess student's participation in CPI discussions posed a set of persistent dilemmas for teachers, the most significant of which was a tension between authenticity and

accountability, 5) teachers personal views on CPI topics did not play a substantial, visible role in classroom discussions itself. However, teacher's views strongly influenced the definition and choice of CPI for discussion, 6) teachers received support for their CPI discussion teaching from school administrators, the overall culture of the school and the schools mission. Thus their CPI discussion teaching was aligned with and not in opposition to what is expected in the school.

Hess' (2002) data collection didn't include any student input. Hess' grounded theory methodology of teachers' practices heavily influenced what outcomes for students could be garnered from this research. The conclusions that this literature review can draw from such research were limited in respect to the effectiveness of these teachers' practice in CPI on student performance. Effective strategies in CPI for teaching students would have to be assessed and there was little comparative work done by Hess on what method should be used to comparatively rate each of these teachers' strategies. Hess acknowledged the impact of this conclusion by including a section on assessment.

Hess' (2002) research was relevant for this literature review, because it focused on whether teachers should consider their personal positions on a controversial public issue as the determinant for what students will consider in social studies. This was especially relevant given what has already been discussed about the effectiveness of prompting as a strategy for discussion. Hess was concerned with how the teacher negotiated their personal position on a public issue with their decision of what topic to facilitate for CPI discussion. Hess found teachers' personal views did not play a substantial role in choosing the focus and type of CPI discussion. Hess found that

teachers' personal views on a controversial public issue were not what were efficacious to their practice as skilled discussion leaders.

In their research, Hess and Posselt, (2002) explored how students could be taught to be more effective participants in CPI discussions. They sampled two classes of 10th grade students from required social studies. Hess and Posselt framed their study from questions that were composed through identification of what was least understood by students about CPI discussions. The questions they constructed were as follows. How do secondary social study students experience CPI discussions? What factors account for students' experiences? How do student's race, gender and preferred classroom communication style influence how they experience class discussions of CPI? Do students improve in their ability to participate effectively in CPI discussions during the course that focuses primarily on such discussions?

The 10th grade class was unique, because it was required for graduation and since its teachers had developed a formal process to assess and grade their student's discussion skills. 46 students participated in the study 27 from one teacher's class and 19 from another Both classes had a fairly even gender split 22 females and 24 males overall and the racial mix was 4 African-Americans, 1 Asian-American, 1 Hispanic 1 Japanese foreign exchange student and 39 whites. All were either 15 or 16 years old.

Hess and Posselt (2002) analyzed five types of data that consisted of pre-post questionnaires, classroom observations, and interviews with students and teachers, videotapes of the scored discussions, classroom artifacts, handouts, and student work. After reviewing student's responses to the first questionnaire, Hess and Posselt selected a smaller group of 12 students for more intensive study. Hess and Posselt then chose 6

students from each of the two classes to achieve gender balance, the same racial proportion as in the total sample, a variety of academic achievement levels, and a range of participation.

Over the course of 90 school days in the semester, Hess and Posselt (2002) observed 53 class periods, took extensive notes, and videotaped 21 of the class sessions. Portions of the tapes were then transcribed to capture every statement. Each of the 12 students received 1-3 interviews. Raters viewed each discussion and reviewed transcripts of the focus students' participation. Student and teacher interviews were then coded.

Although half of the students held a positive view of CPI, nearly half of them at the beginning of the study believed it was unfair to assess them on their participation in class. Additionally student's perceptions of their peers had a greater influence on their affective response than did their teacher's behavior.

Hess and Posselt (2002) found after the study was conducted that 64.7% of the students indicated that if a teacher based part of their grade on participation in discussion, students would be prompted to participate.

Table 3 Statistically significant changes from Pre- to Postcourse Questionnaire (<.05 level) by Class (Hess & Posselt, 2002)

Group	Question Number and Description		Mean	Effect size	P-Value				
Smith's class	9. I speak in class discussions	Pre	2.44	.0901	0.014	Always 0.0%	Often 56.3%	Sometimes 43.8%	Never
		Post	1.88			31.3%	50.0%	18.8%	
Smith's class	32. It is fair for a teacher to base a part of a student's grade on the quality of their participation in class discussions	Pre	1.71	0.733	0.029	Agree 29.4%	Disagree 70.6%		
		Post	1.35			64.7%	35.3 %		

Hess and Posselt (2002) then compared the pre and post course questionnaire results on a number of categories: gender, race, which class the students were in, student's age and their self-reported previous academic success. All statistically significant changes that occurred pointed to increased appreciation for discussion. One example were female students who at the end of the course reported that they were more likely to speak in discussions and less likely to say they were afraid of classmates thinking their ideas unworthy of consideration.

Table 4 Statistically significant changes from pre- to post course Questionnaire (<.05 level) by Gender (Hess & Posselt 2002)

Group	Question number and description					
Females	9. I speak in class discussions	Pre	Always 11.8	Often 23.5%	Sometimes 47.1 %	Never 17.6%
		Post	11.8%	52.9%	29.4%	5.9%
Females	I am afraid that my classmates will think my ideas are unworthy of consideration	Pre	Always 5.9%	Often 23.5%	Sometimes 58.8	Never 11.8%
		Post	11.8%	0.0%	47.1 %	41.2%
Females	38. Feeling that the teacher cares about me as a person	Pre	Would cause you to speak more 66.7%	Would have no effect 55.6%		
		Post	44.4%	33.3%		
Males	24. I enjoy class discussions	Pre	Always 15.0%	Often 20.0%	Sometimes 55.0%	Never 10.0%
		Post	30.0%	35.0%	30.0%	5.0%
Males	28. Every student in a class has the responsibility to contribute to class discussions occasionally	Pre	Agree 65.0%	Disagree 35.0%		
		Post	95.0%	5.0%		

Additionally Hahn and Posselt (2002) discovered that the variables that most influenced student's verbal participation were knowledge about the topic, interest in the topic and recognition from classmates. A possible confound may have existed between the need to know content about a topic before discussion and one important theoretical base for discussion; that students talk in order to learn.

In conclusion, a majority of the students believed they had a responsibility to contribute to class discussions occasionally, that verbal participation was an essential skill, and that students should be taught how to participate effectively in discussions.

Hess and Posselt (2002) combined the collection of their quantitative data with the case study work of three students. This combination of quantitative gathering and qualitative analysis created a compelling research study and provided an excellent example for future researchers in controversial public issues. Hess and Posselt (2002) also did a great job to avoid gender imbalance in their study unlike other researchers. The findings from their composite quantitative and qualitative data were as follows. Students had a positive attitude about classroom discussion, even though they disagreed about whether oral presentation should be required and whether assigning grades for discussion participation was fair, 2) students disagreed about which issues are their least and most favorite, 3) the behavior and perceptions of peers strongly influenced student's views of classroom discussion, 4) student's attitudes about a controversial issue discussion course were linked strongly to how much value they place on discussion in generally and, more specifically, to whether they believe a connection existed between learning how to discuss such issues and that are valuable in the world beyond school.

The range of preferences of controversial public issues from the students suggested that teachers should be cautious about involving students in the selection of issues. Students studied three very controversial topics (juvenile crime, physician assisted suicide and free-speech) and students possessed strong opinions about whether they liked these topics for discussion or not. In sum, teachers who believed their students would choose identical controversial public issues to discuss, if given the option, were disappointed.

Importantly Hess and Posselt (2002) found that students tended to favor issues (such as juvenile crime and free speech) that were most relevant to their emerging lives. More than 30% of the students, selected physician assisted suicide as their favorite issue for discussion, because of the clear and compelling moral conflict that it presented. Moreover, students who knew little content about an issue ended up liking the very issues that they initially knew the least.

Hess and Posselt (2002) addressed earlier questions on assessment (Hess, 2002) by evaluating how the students were assessed for their participation. Hess and Posselt (2002) tried to construct a sample population proportionally similar to the larger school population, but were unable to obtain parental consent from parents of all of the students in the CPI classes taught. This smaller than planned for student sample influenced the outcome of the study due to the demographic composition of the students studied. The study groups consisted of 4 African-Americans, 1 Asian American, 1 Hispanic, 1 Japanese foreign exchange student and 39 white students. Due to this critique, the conclusions that this literature review can draw from such a research sample was that the

racial background of students had not been adequately analyzed in this research on discussion in CPI.

Summary of Discussion in CPI

In conclusion to the section on discussion in CPI, Parker et al. (1991) described how value-analysis redirected students scaffolding as a strategy in CPI discussions. Parker et al. believed prompting in value-analysis discussions was just as efficacious as direct instruction. However prompting was more effective if the goals of having students' generate their own questions were the reason for the discussion. Prompting opened the door for students to dialogically investigate other's perspectives and achieve a synthesis of those differing views. By examining teachers' reasons for discussion, Parker & Larson (1996) described 5 different conceptions of prompting in discussion that used three separate determinants for choosing. Parker and Larson (1996) ultimately found that teachers who controlled less of a discussion fostered more of an open classroom climate. Larson (1997), noted teachers used six types of discussion in CPI dependent on five variables Larson's research acknowledged the importance of student diversity to teacher's choice of discussion format. Hess' (2002) observed teachers who used only one type of CPI strategy for discussion and which was chosen based on the teacher's personal definition of what constituted effective discussion. Hess and Posselt (2002) discovered students could be more effective in CPI discussions if their student had a method of being assessed for their in class performance. This section was important to the Master's question of this literature review, since the research on discussion strategies in CPI showed a movement away from value-analysis as a teacher directed strategy in CPI to

types of discussion that were teacher facilitated. Teachers who were willing to forego control of the discussion flow were rewarded with a more open classroom. Teachers still exhibited control over the choice of topics for consideration in CPI discussions, but they did not weigh personal political choices to reach those decisions. In short, these researchers who evaluated exceptional social studies teachers, found no relationship between the teachers' choice of content for CPI discussions and their political views. Student benefited most from CPI discussions in which their teachers presented the discussions as assessment for their performance in the class.

However, the enduring critique for the research considered in this section on discussion in CPI, was that the researchers had not analyzed student samples that possessed the diversity found in the United States beyond the borders of some schools. Of all the researchers only Larson (1997) acknowledged student diversity as a variable that exerted some influence on the teachers' choice of discussion technique in CPI. The applicability of discussion as an effective strategy in teaching political tolerance in CPI will only apply so far as the tools can measure. These tools have to be constructed from research that takes into account the diversity found in public school classroom. Hess (2002) research did acknowledge the need for these tools of assessment in discussions strategies in CPI. Yet in her later research (Hess & Posselt, 2002) these tools of assessment could not be evaluated against a diverse student sample for their consistency of standard measurement.

Deliberative Discussion in CPI

The following section will focus on deliberation discussion strategies for teaching CPI that have been used successfully in the elementary grades. The importance of this research on deliberative discussion for this literature review lies in the priority this strategy has been given in recent years by researchers building a revitalized curriculum for teaching CPI. Researchers such as Evans, Newman, and Saxe (1996) have emphasized that students now need to learn deliberative discussion skills to improve their discourse in CPI within social studies classrooms. Deliberative discussion skills metacognitively engaged students in authentic dialogical reasoning and reserved the teacher's role to that of a facilitator. The following research by Angell (1998), Brice (2002) and Beck (2003) showed that deliberative discussions construct political tolerance and foster a sense of justice and community. These studies also demonstrated deliberative discussions were effective forums for teaching elementary students to consider CPI as a means to understand justice in their learning communities. One doesn't have to be endorsed to teach elementary social studies to comprehend the importance of knowing how to effectively introduce CPI to students who may have never had any positive classroom climates in their previous social studies classes or learned even the most basic discussions skills. A secondary social studies teacher cannot assume that the students in their class will be literate in matters of expressing their views on public policies any more than they could assume a student to read at their expected grade level.

Even though social studies have been in the elementary school curriculum for over half a century, it is presently far from universal in elementary schools, and when evident was given meager attention at best. The studies in this section, Ochoa et al.

(2001), Angell (1998), and Beck (2003), evaluated how CPI was taught in elementary school social studies. In Angell (1998) and Beck's (2003) research, CPI provided an essential opportunity for children to consider local and global issues in social studies. These issues were brought into a local perspective through children's daily interactions with others. Brice (2002) research in the secondary grades supported the relevancy of Ochoa et al. (2001), Angell (1998) and Beck's (2003) studies on the importance of introducing CPI in the elementary grades through his examination of global issues.

Ochoa et al. (2001) conducted a study of whether teachers with no prior training in CPI, unintentionally used strategies in CPI in their practice. They wanted to learn whether these teachers emphasized controversial public issues in their choice of content and whether these teachers involved their class in the structured discussions necessary to evaluate multiple perspectives.

Ochoa et al. (2001) selected a predominantly white, college town, where they observed classes with three teachers who were chosen by their principals. The teachers taught classes in grades one, three and five. They were all working on Master's Degrees. The first and third grade teachers had 14 and 20 years teaching experience respectively and the fifth grade teacher was in his fourth year of teaching. Each teacher was observed for 8-10 hours during class time. The teachers were then interviewed an hour before and after each class session. All the observers had prior teaching experience including supervision of field experiences. Two training sessions were held with the research teams. The observers reviewed and discussed the questions until it was clear common themes emerged. The research team met four times to review the common teaching patterns as well as the teaching practices related to the model. The auditor reviewed their

categories independently of the research assistants to see if and how well our categories matched the data collected. This auditor evaluated inter-rated reliability.

Since the principals chose the teachers to be observed, random sampling was never used. There were very few students of color in these classroom as well as children with visible disabilities. The treatment of gender was present, but not treated in depth.

Ochoa et al. (2001) found that elementary social studies teachers did not unconsciously use a CPI method to deliver their curriculum. Controversial public issues were presented as early as third grade, and were used very effectively in fifth grade. Veteran teachers, who had not recently graduated from teacher training schools, were not familiar with CPI. The “newer” teacher, who did use CPI, ensured an open classroom climate, alternated questioning girls and boys in the classroom and avoided bias. The teachers who did not use CPI, exhibited tight classroom control over their students. Their grip over control interfered with their classrooms possessing the open classroom climate necessary for learning discussion skills and controversial public issues. Although these teachers’ goals were not contradictory to the goals of CPI, their materials did not engage the students in any controversial public issues.

Angell’s (1998) longitudinal research in a Montessori over a three-year period had three objectives. The first was to test whether students could be taught parliamentary procedure as a type of tool for deliberation in a CPI format in social studies. The second objective was to observe whether these new skills offered practice in democratic processing skills and political tolerance. The third, and following objective was to discern whether these democratic processing skills and political tolerance would foster a sense of justice and community.

Angell (1998) conducted the study with regular class meetings with a mixed-age upper elementary class over a three-year period, with students from fourth, fifth and sixth grades. During the first year of study, the class comprised 8 students the first year, which grew to 13 the second year, and 20 students by the third year. Of those students, three were members of the class throughout the study, and seven were members of the class for two years. There was much diversity among the students academically; four were diagnosed with ADD, several had learning disabilities, and a few worked above grade level in all subject areas. The students represented a normal range of abilities as assessed by the IOWA Test of Basic Skills. Of the 20 students in the class during the third year, five were Asian American, one African-American and one Hispanic the rest were Caucasian. Two students were learning English as a second language and the girl to boy ratio was 2-1 in the class each of the three years. Most students were from middle to upper class families and most lived with their parents.

Angell taught students the structure of parliamentary order and invented democratic procedures to achieve their group norms. Most of these processes continued after the first year and did not abate. This was due to the core group of eight students who had returned for subsequent years and became the leaders, maintaining the classroom climate and its principles of justice. Angell (1998) administered a questionnaire to the students that asked students to list problems that had been discussed in class council during the year indicating what discussions had been most useful. List rules that had been made, indicating that they were deemed important and those they thought were unnecessary. Explain whether or not they felt that the classroom climate was sufficiently safe to permit them to speak freely during meetings. Give suggestions for improving the

parliamentary council. Angell selected four deliberations from different months of the second and third years for text analysis and comparisons with deliberations of the first year.

Angell (1998) was the recorder for class council meetings from which she compiled the data consisting of the minutes of 216 meetings. Angell checked the veracity of her transcriptions through audio recordings of the meetings frequently. To provide a third source of data to analyze, Angell's subjects were given a short survey about their parliamentary class council. Angell (1998) interviewed five students individually during the first month after the 1996-1997 school term ended.

Angell (1998) found that of the 76 class council meetings that were conducted the first year, students made 100 motions. Seventy-seven of those motions passed unanimously and another fifteen were passed by majority. Half of the motions were related to personal behavior and the other 58 were related to classroom regulation.

Analysis of the 216 meetings suggested the student's implicit goals were self-definition and consensus building, two examples of collective decision-making and deliberation used to achieve classroom climate and political tolerance.

The methods of Angell's (1998) research that stemmed from her role as the sole researcher who was responsible for the entire note taking and transcribing influenced the outcomes. Since there was neither an inter-rater, nor video or audio recordings during the research, data collection and verifiability would be hard to achieve. Angell's privileged position as a teacher/researcher who had studied the same group for three years also influenced the outcomes that remain from this research. Angell's research possessed conditions that did not typically occur in public schools. Due to the limited data

collections and verifiability and the low probability of creating similar research conditions the conclusions this literature review can draw from Angell's research was limited. Angell did acknowledge this by dedicating similar future to public school settings. However there was also the issue of Angell's student sample which contained only seven students of color for the 28 total sampled. Although there were many students with various learning accommodations included, which was rarely acknowledged, the student sample had a large majority of white students that impact the conclusions the literature review can draw from the research.

In sum, Angell's (1998) research on parliamentary procedure demonstrated that elementary students in a private school used deliberative discussions in CPI to construct dialogues about social justice. Angell's (1998) longitudinal research on deliberative discussions measured how CPI over time perpetuated the classroom climate necessary for communicating about social justice as it related to students' learning.

Brice (2002) investigated whether high school students used deliberative discussion to consider controversial public issues and construct collective dialogue about social justice. Brice described the deliberative discussion in CPI through identifying emergent forms of discourse moves, textual relationships and participatory norms that groups constructed. A classroom discussion of controversial public issues in global studies, at a Hartford Connecticut high school comprised juniors and seniors. The subjects were four male and two female students (n=6), who were academically able and literate, except for one Japanese exchange student, and an at-risk student Mike, who had difficulties with writing. Brice collection of data included audio, video and written field notes, copies of written work, copies of texts discussed and interviews with students. The

five aspects of the discussion which were studied were; the task as assigned, the intended purpose of the task, group and task roles negotiated among group members to complete the task, the oral, written assigned and emergent texts and the nature of the democratic discourse in discussions. The goals permitted thick description, triangulation and the generation of grounded theory through the constant comparative method.

The groups coded discussion excerpts were selected on the basis of the following:

1. The group consistently engaged in sustained, focused discussion
2. The group effectively applied the thinking skills fostered in the course curriculum
3. The group has well established social norms of participation that enabled them to move from discussion the assigned task to actually engaging in it.
4. This can be seen through ventriloquating as Bahktin (1986) used it. The use of exploring voice and social register through the texts discussed

Brice (2002) discovered the most fertile classroom climate in the deliberative discussion strategy was one in which students use their own language to talk with others. Deliberative discussion did not necessitate the assigning of task roles to group members (e.g. leader, reader, scribe) so that equal participation was guaranteed. In contrast to other forms of discussion in CPI, Brice (2002) found that imposed roles hindered the group's ability to negotiate the relational issues important to deliberative discussion.

The teacher set the structure of the deliberation, but did not dictate how the group had to proceed with the task. The deliberative discussion generated the procedures through its own constructed norms for participation.

Brice (2002) small sample was not clearly related proportionally to the population of the high school. There was no description of what comprised "an

increasingly ethnically diverse population,” (Brice 2002 p. 70). More importantly the methods Brice used to analyze the group’s construction of norms of participation involved no inter-raters or critiques of his data after it was collected. Like Angell’s (1998) research, Brice’s (2002) research data collection was not verified, before theory was constructed from the data. This heavily influenced the outcome of the study, since Brice’s analyzed transcription of deliberative discussions, but did not contrast them with the student’s interviews

Brice’s (2002) research described the rich discourse that occurred in deliberative discussions that resulted in the construction of participatory norms for the purposes of exploring other perspectives. The evolution of ideas and the views that expressed them from this discourse worked best when group roles were not assigned. Brice (2002) believed the group members engaged multiple perspectives that at times were in conflict with one another. This conflict was not inter-personal, but disagreements over ideas situated within the positive classroom climate. The structure of deliberative discussion with the teacher as facilitator have students the flexibility to use their own language to fluidly construct and cast off roles that expressed differing and sometimes conflicting views.

Beck (2003) used a mixed methods study in which questioning patterns were coded from two fourth grade classrooms in two suburban schools between Tacoma and Seattle. Of the sample size 36% of the students lived below the poverty line and 34% were ethnic minorities. Both schools had white populations around 70%. Beck worked with the classes for 2 months. Throughout 12 sessions Beck taught these teachers how to use the steps plus roles (Herrenkohl & Guerra, 1998) format. This format involved

problem solving steps and rotating audience roles. Students follow steps to address a controversial public issue by deliberating in small groups. The teacher designed the controversial public issue. The remaining students form an audience and assume roles of questioning the small group's reports. These roles legitimize the audience members' right and responsibility to evaluate how closely the small group follows the process and challenges the small group's thinking when necessary. The function of the steps-Plus-roles strategy in deliberative discussion is to scaffold in a social setting supporting students as they learn to use what small group reports as thinking devices to the large group. The curriculum used by Beck (2003) was the We the People series by the Center for Civic Education. The curriculum set the stage for a readers-theater approach in which the student's acted out problems of government and the establishment of rights. Following the play the students met in small groups and discussed the issues. To make this problem deliberative, the teacher told the students there was a shortage of substitute teachers, and that they would have to construct rules, that would govern the discussion for the following days work. Small groups were used to deliberate the two rights the student's needed for their day of self-rule. The small groups consulted and reported their collective decision back to the large groups.

Beck (2003) attached lapel microphones to teachers that recorded the students working in small groups when the teacher moved around the room. Videotapes and audiotapes of the classes were recorded with another centralized microphone and were used in addition to the teacher's microphone. Teacher and student presentations were transcribed afterwards. Teachers were also personally interviewed and consulted daily regarding their goals, impressions and observations at the beginning and conclusion of

the research. Teachers selected a group of students to be interviewed four times during the study. Student impressions were compared with the researchers, a type of student themed grounded theory. All of these interviews were audio taped and transcribed as well. Beck (2003) used five coding categories developed by Huberman and Miles' (1994) iterative data reduction, data display and drawing and verifying conclusions. The categories identified were: identifying the speaker, challenging the speaker, seeking agreement, other goals/ permission to do something and understanding procedures.

Beck (2003) coded student initiations as, seeking understanding, challenging, or seeking agreement. Their categories were considered examples of substantive student engagement. Student's initiations coded as other or understanding procedures were considered participation but not engagement. Understanding the issues students raised during deliberation required speech code theory. Speech codes are woven in four ways; pattern of speaking, meta-communicative vocabularies, explanations of communicative conduct and rituals by which emotion and objective are made explicit

Beck (2003) cited Philipsen's (1992, 1997) categories and used them to group the classroom transcripts and interviews and analytic memos written throughout the study.

With the patterns that emerged, Beck created a set of propositions from each case (of the two classrooms) and from those propositions created plausible hypotheses (Beck citing Ball 1997). Beck (2003) found that during initial instructional periods teachers modeled high percentages of teacher talk; however the difference between instructional settings at the beginning and reporting sessions at the end of the study was noteworthy. In the final three reporting sessions, students initiated 66-91% of the talk. When students took on the roles of the teacher; this different participant structure was resulted in higher

rates of student participation and engagement. When students were taught to use steps-plus roles, student engagement increased exponentially while teacher control of the discussion dropped correspondingly. These results mirrored the results of the Herrenkohl and Guerra study (1998). Beck (2003) demonstrated that the steps-plus-roles format increased student participation and engagement and performed beyond the disciplinary confines of elementary social studies instruction.

Beck (2003) encountered substantial impediments to testing the applicability of the steps plus roles format in elementary settings. Beck only found two teachers to participate after contacting 22 principals, this may have influenced his complete lack of interest in identifying the demographic composition of the students sampled in his research. The most detailed Beck was about his student sample was the reporting of the ethnic minorities of the district (34%) and the proportion of students (36%) who live below the poverty line. The actual schools from which Beck drew his sample were reported as having similar demographics. How similar or to what degree was never elaborated upon. Curiously, Beck noted that the white population of students at each school was in the ballpark of 70% with approximately 20% of the minority population composed of non-Asians. Those left 10% of the remaining population without any designation save that of being considered Asian by default. Beck concentrated so heavily on interacting with the instruction of the teachers in the steps plus roles format, that the conclusions this literature review can draw from his research were that the steps and roles deliberative discussion strategy in CPI did work, but for an unidentifiable student population.

Introducing problem solving steps and audience roles to as a strategy in CPI encouraged students to interact in deliberative discussions. Beck (2003) observed the student prosocial deliberation over controversial public issues. The students used roles to manipulate the social environment and prompted their peers with questions that made issues manageable.

In conclusion to the section on deliberation, the research of Ochoa et al. (2001), Angell (1998), Brice (2002) and Beck (2003) described how deliberation and decision-making were accomplished effectively in elementary and secondary schools. These researchers also observed how both private and public school students worked with controversial public issues to expand political tolerance without forsaking the emotional safety of the classroom climate. Deliberative discussion required the students to conceptualize and then prompt a future outcome that would occur if the group adopted various solutions. Beck (2002) cited Dewey's observation that in these cases thought runs ahead and foresees outcomes, and thereby avoids having to await the instruction of actual failure and disaster (1994, p.28). Deliberative discussion also required of the teacher that the teacher both model deliberative discussion skills and intervene when students were pressured to abandon a minority opinion. Angell's (1998) research showed that students' inclination to uncritically accept the modeling of their peers, pointed to a need for students to develop political tolerance for minority positions. This was similar to what will be seen in Beck's (2003) research. Not only was it necessary for the teacher's role in this regard to be clearly delineated and interventionist, it was also imperative on a curricular and collective school level that peer leadership be developed that created the skills for conflict resolution and a foundation for socio-moral development in the future.

However as with the critique from the previous section, this section on deliberative discussion skills surveyed research that used monocultural student demographic samples on which to base their work. Angell's research measured a student sample of seven students of color out of 28 totals. Brice (2002)'s research worked from a unproportional sample of the student body of the school. Beck (2003) did not even properly identify the demographic composition of his student sample.

Deliberative discussion offered potential as an effective strategy for teaching students to communicate about the social justice in majority rule and minority rights. In deliberative discussion the teacher as facilitator modeled discussion skills that were then used by small groups to construct participatory norms. This literature review will now consider how social studies teachers were taught to model and communicate about social justice.

How Social Justice Was Taught in Discussions

There were few peer-reviewed studies of teacher's conceptions of social justice. Research for this literature review located only two studies that specifically addressed the instruction of social studies teachers in strategies for teaching social justice in the public school. Makler (1994) and Lewis (2001) both found that social studies teachers in their training for teaching and while teaching were not taught strategies for teaching social justice and subsequently did not teach strategies of communicating the goals of social justice to their students.

Makler's (1994) research focused on teacher's conceptions of justice as a construct or topic of study. Four main questions framed in Makler's (1994) study.

1. How do social studies teachers conceptualize justice?
2. How justice is part of their curricula how is it presented?
3. Did teachers believe that they taught about justice in their curricula?
4. Did male and female teachers conceptualize and teach about justice in significantly different ways? If so what did these differences look like?

Makler (1994) interviewed 18 social studies teachers to ascertain their ideas of social justice. She let the teachers choose the place, day and time of the interviews. Two were at the office, two were at home and the 14 other were in the teacher's classrooms.

Interviews lasted one hour long. Recorded and transcribed by an aide, each teacher was sent a transcript of his or her interview to make any changes, deletions, additions or corrections. All but two returned corrected transcripts; those two said the transcripts were sufficient. Topics for each answer were coded and filed. Categories were taken from teacher's expressions of their concerns and labeled using their own terminology. Charts were compiled with generative themes emerging from discussions of justice. Responses were also coded for gender.

Makler (1994) contacted the state director of the law related education program (LRE), for information about whether justice was part of the Oregon State social studies curriculum. Makler also consulted the Oregon Common Curriculum Goals for Social Studies, viewed school district curriculum guides and interviewed the social studies specialist for the Oregon Department of Education.

Makler (1994) selected her sample of teachers from a list of all social studies teachers with law-related training in Oregon and from those who had served as cooperating teachers for prospective teachers at Lewis and Clark's Masters in Teaching

program where she was a faculty member. Many of the participants in Makler's study, she personally knew and had participated with in LRE workshops. She also broadened the sample to include middle school social studies teachers.

Makler (1994) interviewed 16 high school teachers 10 male and 6 female and 2 female middle school teachers (n=18). Two high school teachers were African-American males. 8 of the teachers held undergraduate degrees from private liberal arts colleges and 10 from large state universities. 11 held master's degrees and five were currently enrolled in master's degrees programs. Three teachers with a standard license did not have a Master's degree nor were enrolled in a graduate program. Makler selected all her subjects and noted this. She perceived no recognition of personal bias or lenses by choosing the subject from among her friends in her academic community. These were peers she had chosen on the basis of their knowledge of law related education.

Makler (1994) found three dominant themes; justice as right or wrong, justice as fairness and justice as an ideal or standard. Although 18 teachers claimed to include some notion of justice in their curricula, none taught a unit or lesson focused on an explicit examination of either a specific or general construct of justice; instead, they described lessons that focused on injustices such as mistreatment of minority groups in U.S. history. When asked to identify topics concerning justice in their classrooms, most teachers cited lessons about injustice and the oppression of vulnerable groups. Only three teachers (all male) were able to name a specific theory of justice. All teachers preferred to let students raise issues of justice.

The content knowledge of other societies and the acknowledgement of the pluralistic conceptions of justice in modern industrial societies made teachers reluctant to

judge the merits of different concepts of justice. This reluctance on the part of the teachers created tension between the teachers and students in class. A consequence of this tension was that students shoulder the burden for both describing controversial public events that involve issues of justice and for constructing strategies to communicate notions of injustice and justice. One of the teachers whom Makler (1994) interviewed concisely described this predicament between students searching for the means to learn about the goals of social justice and teachers unable to discover a strategy for framing issues of social justice. Greg Bond believed social justice was the controversial public issue that he could not teach due to personal discomfort.

No, I have not always done it. . . That didn't happen at the middle school where I worked, because I never felt comfortable in that basically white, middle class community in terms of dealing with that as an issue. . . It just so happens that I was a good teacher and most of the kids liked me-to the chagrin of their parents. Because their kids had never had a black teacher, I mean a really black teacher with an Afro. . . Even after being there 11 years, in terms of sort of overtly teaching justice there, I wasn't comfortable with that. . . To teach about justice explicitly, I had to find my comfort zone first.

[pause] It was a gradual change (1994 p. 256).

All of the teachers Makler (1994) interviewed desired to construct a climate safe enough for their students to discuss controversial public issues and analyze the value behind differing opinions. Makler concluded from her interviews that social studies teacher's education in strategies for teaching social justice was insufficient.

Makler (1994) also prided herself on being on the board of the Rethinking Schools magazine! It was telling this irony was overlooked in this research even though she cited it in her conclusion to Teaching for Justice in the social studies classroom (Makler, 2000). Makler's (1994) methods of research would have been more effective if an inter-rater or third party would have been used to cull her data. The outcome of this lack of triangulation was that her findings were only preliminary and more fittingly designated as a pilot study. Unfortunately there was a great need for research that explored the relationships between the use of CPI in the social studies classroom and its effectiveness as a strategy for teaching about communicating the goals of social justice. The only conclusions that this literature review can draw from her method was that Makler had not appropriately considered her own lenses that she brought into her research. Makler was surprised and disturbed that her subjects did not communicate their own judgments about social justice to their students in discussing controversial public issues. Makler's concern emphasizes a key point in using CPI in the social studies classroom to teach students about social justice, the role of the teacher's personal views on justice and how their life experience shaped their advocacy for social change. Lewis (2001) also shared this concern and seen in her research that evaluated pre-service teacher's perceptions of social justice. Lewis was particularly interested in how the educational/life experiences of the college students affected their perceptions of social justice. Lewis (2001) evaluated whether participation in an undergraduate social foundations course influenced these students' perceptions of social justice and what students learned about the connection between teaching and social justice.

Lewis (2001) demographic sample size consisted of ten white, middle class pre-

service teachers who were enrolled in a sophomore-level Foundations of Education survey course (n=10). Each participant wrote a short essay entitled “what is social justice?” The essays were reviewed and then questions were posed to the participants throughout the 15-week semester. The participants responded to the questions and at the end of the semester a 90-minute audio taped interview with each participant was done. Because the research consisted of white, college students the results were not generalizable for future research containing variables such as race or grade level in public schooling.

Lewis (2001) found that although many pre-service teachers were able to analyze critically and question the American educational system, they were not prepared to explore their own capabilities for advocating for change within the public schools. Lewis discovered that when pre-service teachers were confronted with the impact of the State of Georgia’s legislation restricting the role of teachers in the public school system, pre-service teachers had only an emergent awareness of their future roles. Lewis believed one 15 week course was insufficient to raise the consciousness of these future teachers and model for them how to become agents for change.

In conclusion to the section on how social justice was taught, Maklers’ (1994) and Lewis’ (2001) research demonstrated the lack of skills teachers possessed to communicate about social justice within the public school system. In Makler’s study (1994) when teachers were confronted and challenged to describe how they operationalized teaching social justice in their classrooms and curriculum, only three had just pre-conceived ideas. Similarly Lewis (2001) found that pre-service teachers when confronted with the impact of the State of Georgia’s recent legislation on public school

teachers, had only an emergent awareness of their potential for teaching about social justice. As Makler (1994) and Lewis (2001) showed, social justice was not just a concept that was easily transmitted to teachers of their students. However Makler's (1994) study did uncover an important dilemma. All the teachers she interviewed preferred to let their students raise issues of social justice in class. Yet teachers were reluctant to judge the merits of different concepts of justice. This resulting tension between teachers and their students caused students to take the initiative for both describing controversial public events that involve issues of justice and for constructing strategies to communicate notions of injustice and justice without any scaffolding. Teachers were unable to provide scaffolding for their students desire to learn about social justice, because of the personal unfamiliarity and risk associated with teaching social justice as a controversial public issue. Makler's (1994) interview with Greg Bond concisely described this predicament between students searching for the means to learn about the goals of social justice, and teachers lacking familiarity with presenting social justice as a controversial issue. Teaching students what social justice is can be accomplished by giving students the discussion skills in a controversial public issue format to teach their peers how to analyze the value of competing claims on social justice.

Conflict Education: CPI and Conflict Resolution

Conflict flourishes throughout democratic life. Public schools were created to show students' new understandings beyond the approaches to conflict they witnessed in their communities and peers' groups. When teachers embed conflict into learning opportunities, then students can practice conflict resolution in a manner that will help

them to become effective nonviolent actors in a society with varying conceptions of social justice. Social justice and peace can be taught, but only if teachers and students alike confront the human differences that prevent peacemaking from becoming a reality.

The research in this section incorporated the most recent studies of the interdisciplinary evolution of controversial public issues into conflict resolution. The study of controversial public issues together with conflict resolution was known as “conflict education.” The implementation of conflict education in elementary social studies programs, while recent was not as new as the extracurricular programs this paper will consider later. The research used in this section was from Bickmore (1997, 1999, 2001).

Bickmore (1997) studied the conflict inherent in controversial public issues to display the breadth of possibilities for vibrant conflict education in public schools. Bickmore (1997) compared and contrasted two of her own qualitative studies; one extracurricular and the other curricular. The first frame was of special training workshop sessions that treated conflict resolution. The second frame was of more diffuse, but sustained conflict resolution social studies class.

Bickmore (1997) sampled a large midwestern school district that constructed teams of urban students who were seen as potential leaders among their peers. Students trained other students to be peer conflict mediators in an anti-violence project. Bickmore logged 60 hours of observation of this program between January 1992 and June 1993. Pupils came from each of two elementary schools and one middle school in the same city district. Each team included 25-30 students from one school. The groups were mixed

with designated students that had positive or negative peer leadership potential. These guides also represented the ethnic and gender diversity of the district's school population. The student trainers worked in three teams of four, training each school team in separate rooms. Two professional teachers participated in each training room. These adults were asked to step out of their roles as authority figures and learn along with the students. Students' pairs were asked to work out publicly in pairs controversial topics. The two sets of pairs minimize embarrassment that may be felt.

The second frame consisted of two teachers from Northern California who were committed to teaching conflict resolution. Bickmore (1997) observed their classrooms for 140 hours from 1989-90. CPI was integrated into the social studies in three different ways. First, teachers brought in current events as analogies that illustrated human conflicts at other times and in other places around the world. History was organized around in depth problems such as Federalism, slavery. Thirdly, active participation by all students was emphasized. Discussions, written work and exams all grappled with historically grounded perspectives on social problems. The teachers used convergent questioning to clarify and check understanding. The workshops were seen more effective in this regard, yet the workshops were no substitute for the depth and range possible in a social studies classroom. The classes did have some students who were not participating; the workshops enjoyed 100% participation.

Bickmore (1997) found when a teacher modeled and respected evaluations of contrasting opinions, students took advantage of the opportunity and practiced conflict management skills. These teachers' open classroom climates encouraged dissent, with the teacher's perspective for the end goal of encouraging discussion and engagement. The

irony in this truth was that the teacher maintained their open classroom climate and protected the political tolerance of their students by encouraging and withstanding criticism of their positions of authority.

Bickmore (1997) discovered that teachers reported that the program allowed them to be much more flexible and responsive to student needs and interests than they had been earlier as academic advisors. The most profound impact of the anti-violence project was on the peer mediators themselves. The effect in schools was twofold. The new skills student's acquired were used to keep peace in school (thus enhancing school leaders' ability to wield their authority) and also broadened students' opportunities for leadership by taking responsibility for handling problems which contributed to power sharing within the school culture.

When Bickmore (1997) compared the two programs she found two important outcomes. The first, if students were not involved in conflict education, there was no meaningful learning opportunities for them to understand conflict resolution. The second, education for conflict resolution, changed students' beliefs of their roles in their social environment above their interpersonal skills. Bickmore measured the learning opportunities in both programs and discovered all the students had the chance to participate in internalizing conflict resolution skills and to try new roles with their peer reference groups.

Since Bickmore (1997) was the only observer of these two programs her method of collecting data did influence the outcome of the study. Because there were no inter-raters and the dialogue was not coded it was not clear whether all of the individuals practiced involvement in the workshops equally. Bickmore's study described student

engagement in conflict resolution, but did not assess the students' length of retention of the specific behavioral outcomes.

Bickmore's investigation (1997) did demonstrate how schools remain the laboratories of democratic education Dewey (1916, 1933, 1938) envisioned them to be. These laboratories of conflict education determined and refined student's conceptions of social justice. Bickmore (1997) noted modeling was important in the study, but the modeling came from other students, who were the emergent peer leaders.

Conflict education has broader future applications for CPI curricula in social studies. Bickmore (1999) continued to study conflict education in her research that investigated extra-curricular activities. Bickmore (1999) evaluated how conflict education prepared students for democratic citizenship in pluralistic contexts. Conflict education was a prime example of a thematic focus that connected school subjects to one another and to the "real" lived democratic life as Dewey would phrase it. These were the most necessary developmental skills taught students in social studies. These models of deliberation and discussion were applied immediately and were the building blocks of understanding negotiation, power relationships and social structures.

Bickmore (1999) used grounded theory and a subset of it known as dynamic objectivity, which was a form of knowledge that grants to the world around us its independent integrity, but does so in a way that remains cognizant of, indeed relies on, our connectivity with that world.

In Bickmore's (1999) study, social studies were focused on the concept of conflict interlaced with instances of global and personal problems. The solution to these meta- and micro-conflicts was conflict resolution. Both micro and macro issues were used

ranging from the Hutu-Tutsi conflict in Rwanda and Zaire to the bullying and exclusion conflicts on the school playground.

Bickmore's (1999) study sample was taken from a combined grade four and five class in an urban, public school. Well over half of the 33 students were recent immigrants with diverse languages abilities and cultural backgrounds. The class included 24 students (73%) in grade four and 9 students (27%) in grade five who had been with the same teacher the previous year. The class was heterogeneously grouped in terms of achievement. The class had 14 girls and 19 boys. More than 2/3 thirds of the children were first or second generation immigrants.

Bickmore (1999) observed more than 30 hours of classroom lessons including the 18 hours she co-taught or assisted with Ms Alison. After class, Bickmore met Ms. Alison for 12 hours of dialogue analysis, discussion and joint planning. Ms. Alison taught the same group of students, the following year, in grades five and six, and together they held a follow-up debriefing a year later. Bickmore investigated how children developed their capacities to handle the concept of conflict, while at the same time pursuing curricular objectives especially in language and the social studies. Bickmore also determined whether CPI presented too difficult a developmental challenge to young learners than interpersonal topics.

Bickmore (1999) found that children were able to handle complex political and international conflicts. In fact, their conceptual sophistication for handling interpersonal conflicts seemed to be enhanced by their work making sense of these inter-group conflicts, in the context of social studies and across the curriculum. The *concept* (italics the authors) of conflict was initially unfamiliar to most of the students. However the

experience of conflict was familiar and in the passage below one can see that some of the students were beginning to connect their *experiences* with the concept. This was a classic example of what Dewey (1916) called interlinking of experience with education.

Bickmore observed (1999) when students brainstormed drama skits in assigned heterogeneous small groups depicting conflicts over meeting people's needs, students chose and presented the skits that were not interpersonal. The skits depicted the content of controversial public issues in social justice. When drawing pictures, the students all chose social conflicts, rather than small-scale interpersonal conflicts. Students picked the significant aspects of social justice education to portray. Local, family and home concerns were not necessarily simpler, or more accessible, to diverse young students than broader social concerns.

Rather than creating controversy the relevance of this curriculum to some students real experiences appeared to give several quieter and newly arrived immigrant students a reason to speak up, and their confident/settled peers a reason to listen, to what they had seen.

Bickmore's study (1999) which took place in an urban public school, possessed low generalizability, since it was not designed to substantiate the success of a conflict education curriculum in terms of students' learning outcomes. Instead, Bickmore's (1999) research demonstrated that diverse students engaged in learning opportunities in ways that encouraged future experimentation and research in conflict education research. Bickmore (1999) showed that teaching students about conflict resolution was a beneficial method for showing more advantaged SES students how to avoid simplistic analyses of school conflict that blamed and marginalized "violent" individuals and ignored

underlying social problems. In this way, the impact CPI discussions heightened the higher cognitive capacities necessary for identifying a problem, conducting a critical discussion and collectively sharing in a decision determining an action. Peer mediation gave many opportunities to students for reflective action, while highlighting the ways gender, race, economic inequality and other factors influenced the abilities that diverse students brought to the classroom and community as a whole. Conflict resolution highlighted this distribution of classroom equity, since conflict and control in school and society were so often linked with gender and racial identities.

Bickmore's (2001) research examined the notions of citizenship embodied in the contrasting ways one peer mediation model was used in six different elementary schools in the same urban school district. The training and program guidance for the elementary schools in Bickmore's study was provided by the Center for Conflict Resolution at the Martin Luther King Magnet School High School in the Cleveland Public School District in Ohio, USA. The winning against violent environments (WAVE) mediation program operated at King for 15 years and conducted training sessions in local and district schools for about 12 years. Through the efforts of the director of WAVE, peer mediation was added to this CPS district as an alternative to traditional discipline measures. In the fall of 1995 it was institutionalized, expanded and renamed the Cleveland Center for Conflict Resolution (CCR). New part-time positions were created for each of the district's 120 schools. The district charged the schools with training teams of peer mediators, and their advisors, and assisted them in establishing extracurricular conflict mediation service programs in their schools. Student peers operated in cadres (instead of a whole class approach) that were small groups that worked together in their own schools.

Using observations, and interviews with administrators, programs advisors, other teachers, peer mediators and other students at each school in May, June and September, Bickmore (2001) collected data that was additionally supplemented with follow-up meetings with programs trainers and advisors. Bickmore chose the six schools for two reasons. The first, because their mediation programs had grown enough to develop noticeable adaptations to their own school cultures and the second, since these schools contrasted sufficiently as examples of varying approaches to citizenship education. The six schools Atlantic, Browncroft, Dixon, Clover, Ellison and Fairview were examined and their peer mediation programs compared.

Bickmore (2001) found that four of 25 students who were negative leaders showed the most marked change in attitude and skill development as the program began. One was dismissed from the program, and the others were not allowed to continue due to concerns about their workload. The students that the peer mediation program (WAVE) served so well, as usual, were those who were not allowed to maximize its potential. Even academically successful students were generally discouraged from mediating conflicts during class time. All six programs were squeezed by the pressure of centralized curriculum and especially by standardized testing. Especially during the winter when such tests were administered, the peer mediation efforts at the schools effectively ground to a halt.

Bickmore's (2001) methodology for her research did not allow for student outcomes from peer mediation to be appraised. Bickmore's research presented primarily adult perspectives on peer mediation and did not include any of the interviews that were supposedly done in the course of her research.

Bickmore (2001) noted the strengths of peer mediation lay in its applicability to gender related conflict. Disciplinarians in schools notice behavior more associated with boys such as physical fighting and disruption, rather than the equally hurtful behaviors associated with girls such as covert mockery or exclusion. However a weakness of some peer mediation programs was that mediators often helped adults limit the autonomy of the students by functioning like prefects within a closed climate of 19th century monitorialism. In this prefectural role the mediators could then become reinforcers of existing implicit and explicit hierarchies. Nevertheless CPS's conflict resolution program was unique, because its mediation program was available district wide at a variety of grade levels and emphasized leadership and training by the urban students themselves.

As a Canadian educator, Bickmore (2001) was in a perfect position to compare the peer mediation programs of North America with those of Canada. The schools in this study were typical of North American mediation programs that were staffed, but not supported in their classrooms unless it occurred during lunch or recess. Most staff members viewed the peer mediation program as a privilege and not a necessary program. One principal in Bickmore's study explained peer mediation as one of the "intermediary steps on the way up to my office." It was unfortunate that advisors and other staff at two of the schools that actively engaged these "negative leaders" had to at their own risk

Bickmore (2001) found that by definition democracy required collective decision making in which any citizen had the power to influence some of the rules by which he or she was governed. The critical discussion and problem solving necessitated by CPI helped students develop citizenship relevant capacities for autonomous thought. Peer mediation taught the power relationships in schools and the handling of problems

associated with them, as a purposeful environment (analogous to the classroom climate) in which students learned their individual and group roles in practicing social justice and about themselves as members of political communities. Yet peer mediation was still relatively new and relegated to the periphery of the school curriculum. Bickmore (2001) demonstrated a strong case for more inclusion of peer mediation into what was considered in the U.S. core curriculum. Bickmore convincingly showed that these programs delegated a certain amount of power to negative leaders and allowed them to retain their peer influence, but then redirected it. Peer mediation gave students a structure to confront problems and resolve conflict in which students learned social justice by practicing social justice as politically efficacious members of a political community.

The research in this literature review so far has described CPI as a classroom based lesson format for the social studies. The opportunities to actually practice the discussion skills taught in CPI in setting beyond the classroom were never described. Bickmore who had studied controversial public issues has seen the potential conflict resolution education had and some of its shortcomings. The largest of the shortcomings of conflict resolution education was the inattention such peer mediation strategies achieved in the classroom. Peer mediation taught the useful life skills students needed, but gave them no time to reflect and appraise the value of the differing perspectives they had been exposed to. On the other hand, conflict resolution education utilizes the same skill sets that students are learning in CPI, but in an environment more relevant to their lives in a participatory democracy. Bickmore realized the complementary affects both CPI and conflict resolution education has to offer the other. Bickmore's research samples were taken from students of color and from diverse backgrounds, but in none of her

studies were students' outcomes of the conflict education resolution program assessed. As this literature review described in the earlier research on deliberative discussion in the elementary grades, much of the usefulness for choosing these early stages in students' development to research was for the opportunity to assess these students over time as they moved through their socio-moral development. Since Bickmore did not assess the student's learning of peer mediation strategies in conflict resolution education, it was difficult to predict what the outcomes for these programs would be over time.

CHAPTER FOUR

Moreover, the majority of human beings still lack economic freedom. Their pursuits are fixed by accident and necessity of circumstance; they are not the normal expression of their own powers interacting with the needs and resources of the environment. Our economic conditions still relegate many men to a servile status. As a consequence, the intelligence of those in control of the practical situation is not liberal. Instead of playing freely upon the subjugation of the world for human ends, it is devoted to the manipulation of other men for ends that are non-human in so far as they are exclusive.

But it also helps define the peculiar problem of present education. The school cannot immediately escape from the ideals set by prior social conditions. But it should contribute through the type of intellectual and emotional disposition which forms to the improvement of those conditions. (Dewey, 1916 p.136)

The history of Dewey's issues –based curriculum and how it evolved into controversial public issues as presented in chapter 2 is an illuminating background from which to view the teaching of CPI in social studies today. Dewey's (1916) concern with the lack of economic freedom would be conceptualized today as social transformation, one of the goals inherent in social justice. The consideration of controversial public issues in a social studies curriculum grew from Dewey's belief that the democratic life was an ongoing project, not an accomplished mission. Democratic life was an experiment then as much as investigations into biomedicine or nano-technology are now. To Dewey (1938) the classroom was the laboratory within which experience and education were dynamically combined to make learning relevant and realistic.

Hunt and Metcalf (1968) evaluated whether learning how the closed areas of society could make learning more relevant and realistic for students. It was Hunt and Metcalf's work that proved that public issues were more relevant to students when the issues proved controversial. These closed areas were fertile ground for airing core values

and differing opinions that nurtured reflective thought. Avery (1988) investigated the similarly closed areas of threat in her study on value-analysis.

Engles and Ochoa's (1988) re-evaluation of controversial public issues had a strong impact on how research is considered today in CPI. Engles' prioritization of CPI, centered on issues and problems that were relevant to the lives of the students. These priorities were seen in the work on prompting by Parker et al. (1991), Beck (2003) and Brice (2002). The work of the Harvard social studies project Oliver and Shaver was still being carried forward by Breslin (1982), Hahn and Avery (1985) and Avery (1988) in their value-analysis studies.

Hilda Taba's (1966, 1967) research in introducing children to controversial public issues was perpetuated by Ochoa et al.'s (2001) research as well as Angell (1998), Brice (2002) and Beck (2003). Taba's (1966) believed children in elementary grades constructed meaning instead of responding to it, and therefore needed to learn how to explore feelings, consider approaches to solving disputes, and analyze values. These were areas of research for Ochoa et al. (2001), Angell (1988), Brice (2002), and Beck (2003). Taba, Levine, and Elzey (1964) also identified the belief that good thinking was disciplinarily based was wrong. Taba's contributions were overshadowed by Bruner's advocacy of the academic disciplines as entry points for teaching issues based curriculums. Bruner's (1960, 1971) personal project MACOS ended due to this.

Critics have charged that Dewey's issues-based curriculum should not present students with the consideration of social justice. Conservative critics of the Ruggs' Problems of Democracy curriculum and Bruner's MACOS project at Harvard perceived the differing viewpoints in controversy to be threatening to their children's moral

education. The socio-moral development of students was indeed something to be watched closely, and in order to do so, Dewey (1916) provided clarity about what to look for. Dewey had considered this problem and placed it at the forefront of his philosophy of thinking in education.

The educational moral I am chiefly concerned to draw is not, however, that teachers would find their own work less of a grind and strain if school conditions favored learning in the sense of discovery and not in that of storing away what others pour into them; nor that it would be possible to give even children and youth the delights of personal intellectual productiveness-true and important as are these things. It is that no thought, no idea, can possibly be conveyed as an idea from one person to another. (1916, p.159)

This commitment to identifying what educational morals continue to be relevant in controversial public issues was observed in the research of Breslin (1982), Hahn and Avery (1985) and Avery (1988). These researchers using a value-analysis strategy in teaching CPI found it increased political tolerance.

Unfortunately social studies teachers still believe that their conception of history can be transmitted to their students through their method of teaching. Evans (1988, 1989, 1990) described how teachers assumed their conceptions of content were transmitted and how that continued to mystify their own students about what learning was. Dewey believed teachers too often followed a method that commanded students to think out a situation, instead of presenting to the students actions and experiences that are similar to them and with which they already some experience.

The desire to become an educator in order to personally contribute most directly to a better society was examined in great depth by Regenspan (2002). Reflecting on her own commitment to teaching her graduate students at SUNY Binghamton about social justice, Regenspan started to see her own situation in class in the scholarship of other self-identified progressives. Regenspan was shocked to discover that most of the professors she had thought were her colleagues-in-arms, were focusing on the evidence of social inequity in schools as a substitute for a vision of the quality of life in schools that social equity would make possible. Her colleagues were more concerned with identifying injustice than with discussing social justice. Regenspan began to reevaluate her reasons for teaching and realized it was such a vision and the tools to enact it, that her students demanded from her in their graduate classes.

Makler (1994) also assumed that most social studies teachers she personally knew before interviewing believed they were teaching with social justice in mind. After interviewing them about their definition of social justice, Makler realized her peers had no evidence of discussing social justice in their classroom practice. Reflecting back on her epiphany six years later (Makler 2000) wrote of the second phase of her (1994) study in which she observed the same 18 teachers she had interviewed previously. Makler (1994) selected one man and one woman who described them as explicitly and overtly teaching about issues of justice in their curricula. Although the teachers used a mix of whole-class discussion, small-group work, direct instruction and participatory activities such as debates and mock-trials, in each class they learned more about injustice and problems with the U.S. government, than they did about justice or the relationship of justice to the ongoing construction of a pluralist democratic society in the U.S.. When

Makler (1994.) analyzed selections of student's homework she found that students had showed an increased understanding of legal concepts, specific cases and the operation of the courts and the legal systems, but no conception of social justice.

When Makler (1994) first began her research she believed that justice was a cultural universal and expected everyone to share my idea of justice. Makler (2000) was surprised when she realized her colleagues and her students believed social justice was too abstract an idea and that it was pointless to believe it could ever exist. When one of her former students from Lewis & Clark's Graduate Program in Teaching asked Makler for her advice about how to do this thing called teaching toward justice, she reminded Makler in the same breath not so be so concerned about influencing teachers: we wont necessarily follow what you suggest, you know! (Makler, 2000, p. 36). That was a personal revelation for Makler that took her months to comprehend and resulted in her book, a compilation of essays from contributors from Rethinking Schools.

Social justice has been used as a blanket term by teachers without any commonly agreed upon definition. For example, Brown versus Board of Education was generally assumed as an example of social justice, but treating social justice as based in events disregards much larger issues. As an example of the Supreme Court mandating radical social transformation, Brown has no par within the 20th century or perhaps in the history of the Supreme Court.

Yet, this perspective flawed, especially if one asks for whom was social justice achieved. As Hess (2005a.) showed in her informal poll of high school social studies teachers, some teachers felt overwhelmed by students who did not believe that the United States used to possess segregated schools. These teachers reported (Hess, 2005) that their

white students viewed the African American students, who attended a school nearby, as not forced to attend the school *by law* (author's italics). These students viewed the Supreme Court's decision in Brown as a sophisticated distinction between *de jure* segregation and *de facto* segregation. These students simultaneously believed that Brown was a grand achievement because it called for the end of state sanctioned segregation, while they acknowledged the local segregation in their communities. The teachers did not confront these students with the complexity of Brown and its legacy, because that directly confronted their privilege relative to the African-American students, in less funded schools. Teaching Brown versus Board of Education as an example of social justice did not challenge the students' prior lenses of race. The students' conception of the *de jure* and the *de facto* binary opposition was in turn left intact and thus condoned by the teacher.

When confronting social studies teachers about why and how they teach Brown, Hess (2005) witnessed the socio-moral modeling that drove their teaching for social justice. I teach Brown because it is such a clear example of how a democracy, when it works the way it is supposed to, can make progress. It is obvious to my students that segregation was wrong and that the court was right, few things in our history are just so manifestly good (Hess, 2005). From this teacher's view, one may wonder whether the iconic status that these teachers hold Brown in, may also promote anti-racist convictions within racially privileged students. To that teacher Brown functioned much more powerfully as a moral example of a national redemptive narrative of social justice, as an idea that was easily transmitted.

Celebrating *Brown versus Board of Education* perpetuated a belief in a positivistic outcome of American Legal jurisprudence. The flaw with teaching controversial public issues through consideration of Supreme Court decisions was a twofold perception; the first that when the subject has been decided by the court it has ceased being viewed as controversial in society in general, and the second the conception of social justice as part of a false dichotomy such as good/bad, just/unjust. The NAACP has held conferences about whether school desegregation was a failed policy, and the debate was far from over. To treat *Brown* as a past, static event and non-controversial was inauthentic and detrimental to their students' education. Presenting *Brown* and its legacy as non-controversial downplayed the role of race in U.S. society as well as misleading social studies students. Viewing *Brown* as an example of social justice was a miseducative experience, as Dewey (1938), would term it.

This literature review has shown that teaching social justice as a process was done effectively through confronting students with controversial public issues and resolving the ensuing clash of multiple perspectives through conflict education. Like Dewey (1938), proponents of conflict education such as Bickmore (1997) rejected the either/or proposition embodied in binary oppositions as false dichotomies. Teachers used conflict education to inform students of a process beyond conceptions of successful/failed. Teachers should use methods such as CPI and conflict education to discuss issues in public schools. As Gutmann (1999) noted schools have a much greater capacity than most parents and voluntary associations for teaching children to reason out loud about disagreements that arise in democratic politics.

Teachers do rise to the challenge of using CPI and conflict education to evaluate the resegregation of American public schools. In Northwestern High School in Maryland, students prompted by their teacher spent the spring of 2003 creating an oral history project on school integration and resegregation in their county from 1955-2000. The class composed entirely of students of color interviewed an African American who had been the first to desegregate a White school in 1956, now a civil right lawyer, he had sued the county to instate busing and teachers. The course teacher, Peter Levine, explained to Hess (2005) that the goal of the project was to help the students see history as a story of communities making difficult decisions. This teacher had chosen to present Brown to his students not in a meliorist perspective, but as part of an ongoing controversy from decision through legacy about social justice.

While many public school teachers felt they do not have the same rights of tenure or free speech that their peers at the university level do, they still enjoy the support of some school administrations. There are some teachers who believe their school administration may fear adding controversy to the curriculum as an invitation to generate controversy where there was none to begin with. This has been shown to not be automatically the case. Using controversy in a public school curriculum regardless of the grade level reflected the presence of controversy and conflict in their life and prepared students for the resolution of it.

In conclusion, Chapter 2 told the story of the politically powerful interests and infighting that had kept a unified curriculum of CPI from being implemented into the social studies in the United States (Ross, 2005). This lack of a unified theory, of what constituted a controversial public issue, of what tools could be constructed to help

students work and other questions have obscured Dewey's role in constructing an issues-based curriculum which was intended as a means of teaching social justice. Past critics of CPI (Leming et al. 2003) and current researchers skeptical of the examination of the inner workings of conflict education in the classroom, share this critique in common. Conflict education and especially controversial public issues doesn't seem to be a discipline, as much as a profession (Leming, 1989). That critique could be useful for some who consider a field of study to emanate outwards from a center like the proverbial pebble in the pond, yet in the pluralistic world in which students learn, it is not an illustrative metaphor.

Summary of Findings

Chapter Three was structured along the research themes of classroom climate, political tolerance and value analysis, correspondence of teacher's pedagogy and actualized practice, discussion in CPI, deliberative discussion, how social justice is taught and conflict education. The research on classroom climate displayed the necessary preconditions for controversial public issues to be presented within a social studies classroom and curriculum.

Ehman (1980), Long (1980), Goldenson (1978), Hahn and Tocci (1990), Blankenship (1990), and Kahne et al. (2000) discovered unambiguous evidence about classroom climate and controversial public issues in social studies. Long's, (1980) Ehman's (1980) and Goldenson's (1978) studies determined that students who perceived encouragement by their teachers to investigate controversial public issues developed political attitudes associated with participatory citizenship. Goldenson (1978)

investigated whether the addition of controversial public issues had an impact on classroom climate. He found that CPI did have an impact on classroom climate particularly if their students deemed the teacher credible. Long (1980) examined students' prior political attitudes as determinants of classroom climate. Long (1980) found no correlation between the sampled student's personal attributes and the differing political attitudes. Hahn and Tocci (1990) took Long's (1980) research to an international level and looked for the relationship between classroom climate and political attitudes in five European nations. Blankenship (1990) then considered whether students could accommodate international controversial public issues without compromising local issues as well.

These studies showed what constituted a beneficial classroom climate for CPI, and how the teachers and students roles in that classroom climate interacted. Both national and internationally there were moderate correlations between an open classroom climate as determined by the teacher, and tolerant political attitudes as displayed by the students. Students were able to consider international issues without having to forsake attention in their domestic, local issues as well. According to Blankenship's (1990) research, women displayed more of an open perception of classroom climate than men did. Open classroom climates also seemed to be correlated to teachers who spent more time pursuing discussion in the classroom than teachers who just lecture or practice recitation techniques. Kahne (2000) surmised students' motivation for meaning making was shut down by student socialization largely because of the two following classroom norms. The first classroom norm was that of intense student competition in which only a few students were expected to win. The second classroom norm was the pedagogy of

knowledge transmission. Classroom participants avoided constructing collective meaning making for fear of failure in their peers eyes.

Political Tolerance

The next studies of Eyer (1980), Breslin (1982), Hahn and Avery (1985) and Avery (1988) investigated the contributions of socio-moral cognitive development to an open classroom climate through value-analysis. Eyer (1980)

Breslin (1982) discovered that the most persecuted groups in Northern Ireland, Catholic youth, exhibited higher political tolerance as compared to the Protestant youth involved in the study. Breslin believed the identification of differing views of a controversial public issue created a supportive atmosphere of political tolerance that fostered socio-moral development. Students with prior political experiences of what were found to be the most tolerant of other's opinions.

Hahn and Avery (1985) measured how value-analysis as a strategy in CPI contributed gains in reading comprehension. Unlike Ehman's work (1980) in which he led the classes in value-analysis, Hahn and Avery (1985) instructed the classroom teachers how to lead a value-analysis discussion. Hahn and Avery found significant gains in the reading comprehension of the students who participated in CPI in the classroom.

Using the same methodology, Avery (1988) refined the definition of political tolerance to include engagement with another individual's potentially threatening position on a controversial issue. Students were confronted with acknowledging their most hated group and challenged with extending an enlarged version of human rights to that same group as well. Avery found no differences in political tolerance according to

race, but there were differences according to gender. Avery found that students with the most political tolerance and experience of conflict were most likely to enter into negotiation with an open perspective. Social studies taught without CPI did not contribute to the political tolerance of students.

Bickmore (1993) compared students with low SES with students with high SES and found students with low SES possessed equal or higher levels of political tolerance as students with higher SES. Bickmore learned that the students with higher SES tend to monopolize CPI discussions, especially ones attempting to solve problems of inclusion. Bickmore believed this was due to modeling outside of school. Students with higher SES have more role models outside of school to learn dissenting opinions from than students of color and others from low SES backgrounds did. Divergent questioning was found to limit the contributions of lower status students to political tolerance in an open classroom climate. Lower SES students struggled in CPI due to their challenges with divergent questioning strategies from their teachers.

Bickmore (1993) also discovered if a teacher was not practiced at the use of divergent questioning, than the teacher may not feel secure enough to allow students to challenge their views. A teacher who cannot endure a challenge from their students will lose their credibility. When this loss of credibility occurred lower SES students were left exposed to the dissenting peer culture which now questioned those students right to challenge them.

When these findings are synthesized, value analysis discussion in CPI was shown to have increased socio-moral cognitive development of political tolerance regardless of the threat posed by another group.

Keedy et al. (1998) showed how a student's motivation for making meaning was shut down through knowledge transmission pedagogy and intense peer competition that created a fear of failure. However, Keedy et al. believed moral reasoning supported students' emergent learning since adolescents were engaged by cognitive moral reasoning more complex than their own. Students need moral debate to circulate perspectives, so that a community of learners can share varied viewpoints of common interest. This type of cognitive moral development as has been seen in descriptions of political tolerance and classroom climate is nurtured by recognizing mutual interest as an agent of social control. As Keedy et al. noted a type of moral cognitive processing must occur simultaneously as students are considering a controversial public issue. This is the type of parallel processing was noted by Dewey and is necessary for teaching students about social justice.

How Teachers Present CPI in the Classroom

Evans, (1988, 1989, 1990) observed that teachers who bring their ideological stances to class in presentations of controversial public issues influenced their student's conceptions of social studies. Evans' research (1988, 1989, 1990) was concerned with whether a teacher's personal political views transmitted through CPI a method of understanding social justice. Evans found that teachers' political views that corresponded to their method of teaching CPI resulted in a poorly formed and hazy view of history as "progress." Nelson et al. (1994) discovered that teachers who integrated current emerging events into their planned CPI format used discussions to exert control in order to seem flexible. Rossi (1995) examined how an in-depth treatment in social studies was

organized. Rossi found that authentic questions and context distinguished these classes from other forms of discussions.

Prompting as a Tool

Parker et al. (1991) found that teachers, who were not as successful at influencing their student's engagement in CPI, did not use prompting as part of their class discussion. Prompting was a tool of dialogical reasoning that was used by teachers to scaffold their students through value-analysis in CPI. Metacognition was an authentic means for students to use the tools they were given to approach tasks they received little or no direct instruction.

Parker and Larson (1996) investigated what conceptions teachers had of discussions and whether teachers had more than one. Like Nelson's (1994) study, Parker and Larson (1996) found one overarching conception of using controversial public issues in discussions and that was for the teacher to maintain control.

Larson (1997) searched for the underlying cognitive processes of teachers in discussions and found 6 principles and five influences that pointed to the diversity of teacher's conceptions of discussions with CPI. Larson's research found teachers viewed their role as leaders to be critical to discussion.

Hess (2002) observed teachers who were comfortable and familiar with the use of CPI format in social studies discussions. Hess found that the teachers were effective facilitators who taught their students to participate in CPI discussions. Hess discovered that teachers only used one type of CPI model for discussion at a time. Hess' (2002) findings supported Evans' (1988, 1989, 1990) results that teachers decide through a

personal definition of what to teach. Hess and Posselt (2002) explored how students were taught to be more effective participants in CPI discussions. Hess and Posselt surmised that students were more effective participants when their grade in the class was based on participation. Hess and Posselt also showed that teachers had to choose their topic carefully and could not rely on their students to decide.

Students at the elementary level were assumed to not be mature enough for CPI Ochoa et al. (2001), yet strategies such as deliberative discussions engaged students' metacognitive abilities. Deliberative discussion in CPI, Angell (1998), Brice (2002), and Beck (2003) particularly the steps-plus-roles format, gave students practice in political tolerance that fostered a sense of social justice within the learning community.

Angell (1998) found deliberative discussion furthered students' goals of self-definition and consensus building. These were two examples of the collective decision-making and deliberation used to achieve classroom climate and political tolerance in a discussion of controversial public issues. Additionally, Angell found that the mixed ages in the classes facilitated the type of moral reasoning Kohlberg (1975) typified in a developmental scale of cognitive moral reasoning. Angell (1998) type of discussion as a strategy in CPI was successful and made personally relevant the political tolerance students learned while deliberating.

Angell (1998) believed the legal-historical curricular goals were controversial. However as has been seen in Ochoa et al.'s research (2001) historical "controversies" were not as engaging to students in the teaching of CPI in social studies. Angell's (1998) findings were similar to Beck's (2003) research. Both Angell (1998) and Beck (2003) found not only was it necessary for the teacher's role in deliberative discussions to be that

of a facilitator and interventionist, it was also imperative on a curricular and collective school level, that peer leadership be developed that created the skills for conflict resolution and a foundation for moral development in the future.

Brice (2002) believed deliberative discussion was central to students' learning the discourse of a democratic society. Brice's (2002) findings echoed Rossi's earlier findings that the best setting for this was one in which students used their own language to engage in dialogic talk to mutually share issues of importance to them and to society. Like Parker et al.'s (1991) study, the students in Brice's (2002) project constructed and negotiated their own procedures for working with the text. Brice's research provided further evidence that deliberative discussion drew normally reticent students into discussion formats. Beck (2003) highlighted the role of what-if questions as divergent questions that exposed assumptions and flaws in other students' argument. However even though student's assumptions were exposed, these were not in conflict so much as examples of cognitive dissonance. These student's assumptions would have been in conflict, if the context were authentic. Because the question discussed was one in which their community had a stake, unlike an issue described as such in the history of Supreme Court Law. Within the context of the situation experience and education come to the fore and skills are developed. Developing skills from a historic example of something was contentious at best. Evans' (1988, 1989, 1990) descriptions of history teachers' use of history was an example of this. Beck (2003) viewed his research on problem solving steps and rotating audience roles a natural outgrowth of prompting that Parker et al. (1991) wrote of.

Makler (1994) research discovered how teachers teach for social justice. When confronted and challenged to describe how they operationalized teaching for social justice in their classrooms few if any possessed pre-conceived ideas. Similarly Lewis (2001) found that future teachers had only an emergent awareness of their role as pre-service teachers in the public school system. As Makler (1994) and Lewis (2001) research showed, social justice was not just a “concept” that was easily transmitted to students. Neither Makler’s (1994) study, nor Lewis’ (2001) research showed any sustained relationship between teacher’s conceptions of social justice and a demonstration of a method with which to accomplish the task.

Bickmore (1997) believed CPI was enacted in students’ lives through conflict education in public schools. Most importantly, Bickmore (1997) found that CPI, and conflict resolution are interdependent. Both CPI and conflict education had to be taught together in order for either to be considered personally and socially relevant to the students. CPI was a worthwhile risk as a difficult method of teaching, because the student’s understandings of their interpersonal skills went beyond a technical proximity and fully involved in the social environment. Bickmore demonstrated how schools were again the laboratories of democratic education Dewey (1933, 1938) envisioned them to be. These laboratories of conflict education determined and refined student’s conceptions of social justice. Bickmore (1997) noted modeling was important in the study, but the modeling came from other students, who were the emergent peer leaders.

Bickmore (1999) found that elementary students were able to handle complex political and international conflicts. In fact, their conceptual sophistication for handling interpersonal conflicts was enhanced by making sense of inter-group conflicts, in CPI and

conflict resolution education. The *concept* (italics the authors) of conflict was initially unfamiliar to most of the students. However the experience of conflict was familiar and in the passage below one can see that some of the students were beginning to connect their *experiences* with the concept. This was a classic example of what Dewey (1916) called interlinking experience with education.

Teaching students about conflict resolution was the best way to show higher SES students how to avoid simplistic analyses of school conflict that blame and marginalize violent individuals by ignoring underlying social problems. In this way the impact CPI discussions have in the social studies curriculum can have an effect in the higher cognitive capacities necessary to identify a problem, conduct a critical discussion and collectively share in a decision about action concerning it.

Peer mediation provided many opportunities to students for reflective action while highlighting the ways gender, race, economic inequality and other factors influence the abilities that diverse students would inevitably bring to the classroom and community as a whole, conflict resolution highlight this paradox because conflict and control in school and society were often closely linked with gender and racial identities.

Bickmore (2001) found that by definition democracy required collective decision-making in which any citizen has the power to influence some of the rules by which he or she is governed. Peer mediation taught about the power relationships in schools and the handling of problems associated with them as a purposeful environment (analogous to the classroom climate) in which students learned something about social justice and about themselves as members of political communities. Yet peer mediation was still relatively new and relegated to the periphery of the school curriculum. Bickmore demonstrated a

strong case for more inclusion of peer mediation into what was considered in the U.S. core curriculum. Bickmore convincingly showed that these programs delegated a certain amount of power to negative leaders and allowed them to retain their peer influence, but redirected it.

Hess' (2002) Bickmore (1997, 1999, 2001) studies were not designed to substantiate the success of this curriculum in terms of students' learning outcomes, but to show how low SES students and students of color engaged in learning opportunities in ways that should encourage future experimentation and research in this area.

Future teachers in training should use controversial public issues and conflict resolution together as both an in class and out of class educative experience which will teach students political tolerance and a means of communicating about social justice. Of the strategies in CPI described in this literature review each occupies a different place in social studies instruction according to the socio-moral development of the students involved. Each grade level from elementary through secondary needs differing social scaffolding to meet different cognitive challenges.

Deliberative discussion as a strategy in CPI was found to be very effective at motivating elementary students to accept higher moral standards of group participation than they would individually adhere to. Prompting worked well for middle schools students while value-analysis was effective for secondary students. These recommendations are however an outline and cannot address each classes' demographic composition. The research base of CPI was not wide enough to support generalized student learning outcomes, except for white, middle class students. However, these recommendations can provide an outline of the teacher's role in these different strategies

in CPI and conflict resolution education that can prove useful. Beginning teachers especially should realize that CPI strategies generally rely upon the experience of the teacher in facilitation, not upon the teacher's content level education or familiarity with an authoritarian role. Researchers such as Kelly (1986) and Hess (2005b.) give excellent examples from experienced teachers about the teacher's role in facilitation.

Kelly (1986) believed a teacher's purposive ideological stance was a poor substitute for demonstrative modeling of facilitation, because it presupposed an elegant transfer of the teacher's enthusiasm to the student's development of tools of inquiry. Kelly identified and critiqued four positions educators assumed in handling controversial issues in the classroom. Kelly referred to these positions as exclusive neutrality, exclusive partiality, neutral impartiality and committed impartiality.

While Kelly (1986) believed there was some debate over what should be included in the curriculum of the schools, the position of exclusive neutrality seemed both untenable and undesirable. The tradition of Evans (1988, 1990) scientific historians that scientific methodologies represent value-free truth and technologies- a tradition known as positivism- has been dismissed by philosophers and scholars alike (Apple, 1971, Habermas, 1971).

Kelly (1986) defined exclusive partiality as the intent to induce students into accepting as correct a particular position on a controversial issue through means that consciously or unconsciously precluded sufficient presentation of competing points of view. The New Left insisted that the commitment to human emancipation obligated the consciousness raising of the uneducated. This position, most commonly advocated as the position from which to teach students for social justice, has some underlying

philosophical weaknesses. On moral grounds, the practice of exclusive partiality supersedes students human dignity, by violating the Kantian imperative to treat people as ends in themselves, not merely as means to someone else's ends (Griffiths, 1998). For example, Kohlberg believed exclusive partiality undermines the students' identity as moral agents. Since ought implies can, (Kohlberg, 1970) moral agency assumes that students have the necessary freedom and ability to control their own beliefs and behaviors. If students cannot progressively reconstruct their prior learning in light of new experience, they can never act as guardians of their own lives (Dewey, 1916, Newman, 1985). Students need to realize their personal political efficacy and direct their newfound capacity toward the public interest.

Neutral impartiality to Kelly (1986) was the position most educators especially those in graduate schools profess. Kelly dissected the six different explanations for why neutral impartiality may exist in varying degrees within one individual. The first is the public service orientation of teaching that traces its roots to Plato. Teachers are paradigmatic models of civic virtue that live in Spartan rigor but possess spiritual riches. The second explanation was that the dominant philosophy of the nation was liberal pluralism that viewed human diversity as a social good. Western European Christian Socialist democracies advocate liberal pluralism in terms of social justice. Social justice in those countries is defined by the efficacy of procedural mechanisms that permit diverse and competing interests fair opportunity for voice. The third explanation for neutral impartiality was political prudence; by not taking a stand a teacher does not risk their livelihood. The fourth explanation of neutral impartiality is of the ethical relativist (Common, 1985). These teachers believe their central moral responsibility is to aid

students in developing a personal code of ethics with which they can make crucial decisions. The sixth and final explanation is of the rationalist teachers who instruct their students to make judgments based on the merits of an argument.

The stance of neutral impartiality possesses the good intent of encouraging student contributions in conflict education. Yet this stance can backfire when students who are asked to become vulnerable and take risks by expressing personal views resent the nominal facilitator who controls the action by deliberately avoiding an opinion. If this happens, the silence of the teacher is deafening and students may feel misled, manipulated and denied the opportunity to compare their perspectives and refine their advocacy skills with an expressive, responsible adult.

Kelly's (1986) fourth position that a teacher can take in the classroom is that of committed impartiality. This stance while at first sounding contradictory was Kelly's ideal position for a teacher, committed impartiality, and entailed two tenets. The first was that teachers should state their own views on controversial issues. Second the teachers should foster the pursuit of truth by insuring competing perspectives get a fair hearing through deliberative discussion. The position of committed impartiality was the most authentic for conflict education in practice when teacher's praise oppositional viewpoints, push students to critique the teacher's point of view, publicly engage in self-critique or mimic students who mock them. There was no inherent contradiction between expressing one's commitments and maintaining a norm of impartiality. Kelly (1986) found three persuasive reasons for committed impartiality in conflict education.

The first reason was that of a personal witness. The idea of the personal witness was meant to acknowledge the power of personal modeling and the imperative of the

accompanying personal integrity that goes with it. Conscious of teaching by example these teachers attempted to live exemplarily lives, but failing to do so forthrightly address their imperfections, and ironically display a distinctively human achievement.

The second reason (Kelly, 1986) is the notion of democratic authority. This is in alignment with Dewey's philosophy of the teacher that allowed their students to access the authority of democracy by repeatedly challenging the validity of those founding ideas. The teacher coaches students in the process of being their own democratic authorities free from sanction in the laboratory of the classroom.

Kelly's (1986) third set of reasons for the practice of committed impartiality in conflict education was rooted in developmental research. Adult-youth relationships most associated with youthful social development are known as collegial mentors, (Kelly citing Conrad and Hedin, 1981). The teacher as a collegial mentor believes the student can make contributions to the learning process of the class. Collegial mentors personally witness the student's growth and honestly share their personal feelings on relevant matters. For Kelly, the teacher as collegial mentor, builds trust and respect with students and the class by committing to impartiality.

Hess (2005b.) identified four approaches to CPI that display how teachers' political views influence their teaching. These four approaches were denial, privilege, avoidance and balance. Teachers who dispute that an issue was actually controversial use denial. Teachers that fall into this category do not believe an issue is controversial because they have examined it and feel they already possess the truth about the issue. Hess cited the example of a teacher who was member of Amnesty International who could not bear to present her students with the issue of the death penalty. She wanted to

include the death penalty into her curriculum but could not due to her embarrassment for living in the United States, a nation that supports the death penalty. The second of Hess' approaches was privilege. This approach involved teachers who believed an issue was controversial, but wanted to privilege a particular perspective. Hess knew a teacher-activist working on a number of social justice issues designed to achieve equality and liberation in a true sense. This teacher taught a lesson about sweatshop labor that was designed to counter the brainwashing his students received from the biased media. He believed globalization was a genuine issue, but struggled with whether it was ethical for himself to purposively and explicitly create an ideological curriculum. He wanted to speak truth to power, and encouraged his students to consider what side they are on. His approach to teaching CPI led him to question whether there was any real difference between teaching for social justice, and stacking the deck so far toward his own perspective that he was in fact indoctrinating his students.

Hess (2005b) found many teachers who believed an issue was controversial but would not include it in their curriculum. Hess interviewed a teacher who avoided teaching the Supreme Court decision *Roe vs. Wade*, because as a staunch Catholic her personal belief that abortion was a sin caused her to fear that she could not approach the issue fairly. She could not reconcile her strong views with teaching her students in a pedagogically perceived neutral fashion. The fourth perspective according to Hess is the balanced approach. Hess described it as having its flaws, although on its face it may appear appealing to many educators, school administrators and some members of the general public. Two teachers whose course Hess observed, believed there was genuine controversy about a topic in the community outside of school and treated it as a

controversial issue in the classroom as well. When parents complained about the nature of the material, the teachers explained how they went to great lengths to ensure that students had analyzed the value of each differing perspectives on the issue. One teacher summed up her position succinctly:

Students have the right to whatever opinion they want, whatever perspective they want to take, but they need to understand both perspectives to intelligently take a position on the issue. I also argue that if they know the other side's position they can be more effective in their advocacy for their side. (Hess, 2005b.)

Kelly's (1986), Bickmore's (2004) and Hess' (2005b) research showed that teachers in conflict education who modeled committed impartiality presented an example of a fully functioning adult to their students. This type of stance acknowledges the power of modeling while affirming the power of thoughtful reasoned convictions.

Classroom Implications

The most commonly evidenced critiques from an evaluation of this research in CPI and conflict education was found in researchers' student samples. Students from low SES backgrounds were not accounted for in most of the sample in the research reviewed. Students of color were also not sampled in the majority of research especially research on CPI in the elementary classroom. Since students from low SES backgrounds and students of color were under-represented in the majority of this research, the outcomes of the research reviewed were unclear especially as it would pertain to assessment. This was especially glaring in the elementary studies that presented opportunities for potential longitudinal studies (Ochoa et al. 2001).

Researchers also commented of the obstacles that state mandated testing presented for teachers who used CPI. The greatest obstacle was the loss of time researchers found teachers had to consider CPI due to required periods for testing (Hess, 2002). Even if the school year were lengthened to include the entire year state mandated testing would still present a large obstacle to social studies teachers. State standardized assessments in social studies did not have the sensitivity to diversity that classroom based assessments do. If there was a greater body of developmental, longitudinal studies in CPI starting with the elementary grades then perhaps more emphasis would be placed on classroom based assessment. Until then, CPI and conflict education as strategies in the social studies will not be implemented. Ironically, until Washington State requires the passing of the social studies WASL, then administrators will view social studies as a sidelight to the more important state requirements for math, science, reading and writing. In the mean time, social studies teachers will be redirected to help students in WASL tested areas first and watch the time allocated to teach social studies skills whither away. Of course teachers can interweave reading and writing within social studies in an interdisciplinary manner, but if teachers are instructed to concentrate on power standards, what will they do when their class is helpless when presented with a discussion?

Regenspan (2002) after witnessing the helplessness of her graduate students when confronted with their lack of the skills to construct a vision of social justice became committed to an idea of parallel practice.

If we were trustworthy as teacher educators, we would act with our students exactly the way we expected them to act with their students (2002, p. 238).

Regenspan (2002) identified this idea of parallel practice with the focus on social justice in John Dewey's (1899) early work. Dewey's vision increasingly directed Regenspan not only in the work she did with her graduate students, but the work they did with their students in their parallel practices. Parker (1991) also focused on the type of teaching Dewey (1933) wrote of as parallel practices, as a dialogic movement.

Parker et al. (1991) have demonstrated the efficacy of prompting in controversial public issues. Such a style of questioning in CPI possesses the dialogic interplay of a parallel practice. Similarly Engle and Ochoa (1988) witnessed students develop thinking skills such as interpreting, analyzing and evaluating, discussions through probing divergent questioning. Students become active learners by organizing information as it becomes shared and arrive at their own defensible answers to communicate to others. The four different kinds of useful probing questions delineated by Engle and Ochoa (1988) are:

1. Definitional questions (What does that mean?)
2. Evidential questions (“What reasons can you give for your belief?”)
3. Speculative questions (“What if that had not happened?”)
4. Policy questions (“What should be done?”)

It was important for teachers to use these probing questions in divergent and convergent questioning strategies for their choice of discussion. As explained by Hess (2002) all the teachers in her study taught both for and with discussion in mind. Committed teachers helped students become better contributors of classroom discussion by using CPI and the use of CPI assisted students in learning important cognitive skills.

The future of democratic education is in helping students develop greater political tolerance and collective deliberative decision making capabilities toward unfamiliar and subordinate social groups Bickmore (1997, 1999, 2004). Explicit peace building citizenship education was reflected in confronting public issues of race, and socio-economic conflict and shaping the countervailing perspectives through social scaffolding for equity and human rights protection. Peace building is a form of equity building and focuses on a pragmatic form of social justice that emphasizes creating justice rather than drawing attention to injustice.

Implications for Future Research

Larson (2003, 2005) authored two provocative inquiries into the uses of threaded discussion in lieu of or with the use of CPI in the classroom. Like Bickmore (1993) Larson (2005) was interested in ideas of inclusivity and inclusion in the use of CPI but in the written online forum of the Internet. Larson (2003, 2005) showed how Engles and Ochoas' (1988) four different types of use prompting questioning could be integrated within an online discussion. Although Larson (2003) didn't think threaded online discussions could supplant face-to-face discussions of controversial public issues, he believed a combination of both face-to-face conversation and threaded discussions to be complementary. Larson (2003, 2005) thought the best sequence for a class may start with a threaded discussion in which the students have a chance to present their ideas and think about issues in their own time while responding to a larger number of their classmates' feedback. A face-to-face discussion can then take place that would allow for the teacher and students to respond more in depth the topic and develop verbal skills. Differing

viewpoints presented during the verbal discussion could then be reviewed through a threaded discussion. A final debriefing would allow the students to present their findings to the class. This sequence would be optimally run over the course of three days.

Larson noted (2003, 2005) threaded discussions have the potential to provide for additional opportunities for students who would otherwise feel vulnerable, especially in a closed classroom climate, to the judgment of their peers. In this regard threaded discussions have great potential for broadening the inclusivity of participants in CPI discussions.

There has been some other research Merryfield (2000) on the use of threaded discussions to promote equity and cultural diversity within CPI discussions in the classrooms, but it has been confined to graduate students. One area then of unanswered aspects of CPI would be investigation into the use of threaded discussions to promote inclusivity. As a skill set text messaging has been socialized into the digital generation through cell phones as well as computers. Threaded discussions offer a rare bridge across the digital divide for this reason because students are familiar with the strategies and flow of threaded discussions without necessarily having an access to a computer at home.

Online conversations do have the capability of improving what Barber (1989) termed our conception of public talk. Online conversations and computer-assisted models in particular also have a lot of potential as research tools. Current students will continue to challenge teachers with the acuity of their increased visual learning processes.

Researchers would do well to begin to probe into the rapid progress visual learning has accomplished in the last decade as the explosion of video dexterity and Sylvan Learning centers have supported and met the demands of new tools for conceptualization. Visual

mapping of class discussions would be a valuable asset for any class to breakdown the conversational patterns in classroom discourse. The visual tracing of controversial public issues in conflict education discussions could especially benefit from such a display in summative debriefings.

Summary

Teaching social justice requires a commitment to preparation. This preparation consisted of not only models of injustice, but also a preparation for building the private and public tools to assemble dialogue about social justice. Only when these models are cooperatively constructed in an open classroom climate can developmental cognitive moral reasoning occur. This experiment in the moral dimension of democratic life requires students with greater political tolerance that can later model as peer development. The discussions that can result from these experiments are best modeled by the teacher and then left to the students in a deliberative framework to decide. The teacher's role is that of facilitator and while crucial to the format should not be domineering. Instead the teacher will act in some regard, as a proxy for the challenges politically intolerant students will level against their more tolerant peers. Students provided with dissenting models will challenge the views of politically tolerant students who probably will have more experience in conflict as the persecutor and the persecuted. However students with more experience with conflict (e.g. urban students and immigrant populations) do not necessarily know how to share their experiences with the class. It is ironic but true that students with higher SES often will practice dissent in order to provoke other students' responses. This is analogous to teachers prompting their students

for their metacognitive knowledge. The economic and political capital of the higher SES student and the more authoritative teacher are only leveraged when the student or teacher uses their questioning to construct a dominant position. This type of scaffolding is miseducative.

The imposition of a dominant position will necessarily cause a backlash either actively or passively expressed. For the teacher to model a politically tolerant perspective in social studies, the teacher must foster all challenges and perspectives (within the limits of personal and emotional safety of the class) to their position. To teach from a position of a social justice is to teach defensively and with control in mind at all times. Questioning strategies reflect this. As Angell (1991) cited Torney-Purta and Lansdale's (1986) research that teacher's questioning styles had a strong correlation to creating the climates in which discussion could occur. Teachers who asked convergent questions generated more participation in the way of guesses from the students about the correct answer. However little action between students subsequently occurred and attention levels were correspondingly low. The teacher was perceived as the controller of knowledge and that may have created the type of passivity McNeil (1986) reported. To support her belief Angell (1991) cited a study by Grossman, Dugan and Thorpe, (1987) which pointed to divergent questioning as encouraging students to share ideas and value the process of interdependence.

Teachers' personal preferences determine what controversial public issues should be considered in a social studies classroom. It was naïve and developmentally presumptive to believe students would be able to choose relevant controversial issues. The issues affect the students' lives and community should be evaluated first before the

teacher makes an informed decision. The use of Supreme Court cases in Law Related Education (LRE) was not sufficient for a controversial issues format in social studies. Introducing students to the legal system of this nation's democracy, using LRE did not teach students a personally relevant conception of justice. Students need prompting to use their metacognitive resources and cooperatively view the differing perspectives of other people's children. Teachers scaffold for their students models the students have tools to work with. These are models of socially relevant issues that encompassed race, gender ethnicity and nationality are presented. Authentic questions have to be posed by teachers who facilitate model listening, deliberation and collective decision-making.

Additionally teachers have to ensure that these models find their way into the community in which their students reside. It was not enough to cover social justice in class any more than it was to cover the progress of the American industrial age. The real potential of controversial public issues as a unifying force in secondary social studies curriculum lay in students using their dialogical skills in their emergent community lives. Students have to verify for themselves their place on the spectrum between majority rules and minority rights. This verification includes both the cognitive models for discussion and the developmental moral reasoning with the political tolerance of a classroom climate. If students discuss and deliberate about human rights in school, they will have a model with which to apply social justice within their communities.

Teachers research communities about their local issues to provide a relevant perspective with which the students can begin to form their own opinions. Bypassing controversial issues to avoid the acrimony of some community members only undermined the teacher's credibility in the eyes of their students and distanced the

teacher from using relevant content from the community. If a controversial issues based format in social studies was to be relevant to students it needed to be supplemented with conflict resolution strategies such as peace building. This type of conflict education can start in elementary grades when students first experience interpersonal conflict.

A teacher in class can present a controversial public issue from an international or national perspective as an entry point for an in-depth discussion/deliberation about the differing roles within that conflict. This created entry points for students who have experience with conflict, but do not have a means of sharing that experience with their peers. These students who are often marginalized due to race, nationality, language, or SES often have advanced political tolerance they could share in a discussion.

However, students who have more experience with dissent; due to the modeling of dissenting opinions will challenge the accounts of other students who have more experience with conflict. Discussions and deliberations with assigned, but rotating roles bring conflict education into the immediate lives of the children. Children experience conflict and wish for education in conflict. This education was not limited to the social studies but can be used as an entry point for many subject areas including the languages, sciences, art and yes even math (eg. logocentrism).

Communities could enter in to a social contract with their schools that the controversies that embroil them will be used as content for the schools and the schools will teach their children socially relevant methods such as peace building to create resolution within their community. This social contract could allow the little publics of school cultures (Dewey 1916) to work within a larger district objective of building

extracurricular peer mediation programs for peace-building. The future political leaders of tomorrow do not have to be actors or athletes first. They can be negotiators, peace builders and esteemed delegates of social justice.

REFERENCES

- Adams, M., Bell, L., & Griffen, P. (1997). *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook*. New York: Routledge
- Angell, A.V., (1998). Practicing democracy at school: A qualitative analysis of an elementary class council, *Theory and Research in social education*, 26, 149-172.
- Appel, M. (1971). The hidden curriculum and the nature of conflict. *Interchange*, 2, 27- 40.
- Avery, P. (1988). Political tolerance among adolescents. *Theory and research in social education*, 16, 183-201.
- Avery, P. (2002). Teaching tolerance: what research tells us. *Social education*, 66, 270-275.
- Barber, B. (1989). Public talk and civic action: Education for participation in a strong democracy. *Social education*, 53, 355-356.

Beck, T.A. (2003). If he murdered someone, he shouldn't get a lawyer: Engaging young children in civic deliberation. *Theory and research in social education*, 31, 326-346.

Bestor, A. (1953). *Educational wastelands: The retreat from learning in our public schools*. Urbana, IL: Illinois University Press.

Bickmore, K. (1991). Learning inclusion/inclusion in learning: Citizenship education for a pluralistic society. *Theory and research in social education*, 21, 341-384.

Bickmore, K. (1993). Conflict matters: Teaching about peace in the social studies curriculum. *Thresholds in education*, 26, 25-33.

Bickmore, K. (1997). Preparation for pluralism: Curricular and extracurricular practice with conflict resolution. *Theory into practice*, 36, 3-10.

Bickmore, K. (1999). Elementary curriculum about conflict resolution: Can children handle global politics? *Theory and research in social education*, 27, 45-69.

Bickmore, K. (2001). Student conflict resolution, power sharing in schools, and citizenship education. *Curriculum inquiry*, 31, 137-162.

- Bickmore, K. (2004). Discipline for democracy? School districts' management of conflict and social exclusion. *Theory and research in social education*, 32, 74-96.
- Bickmore, K. (2005). Teacher development for conflict participation. *International journal of citizenship and teacher education*, 1, 20-34.
- Blankenship, G. (1990). Classroom Climate, global knowledge, global attitudes, political attitudes. *Theory and research in social education*, 18, 363-386.
- Breslin A. (1982). Tolerance and moral reasoning among adolescents in Northern Ireland. *Journal of moral education*, 11, 112-127.
- Brice, Lynn (2002). Deliberative discourse enacted: Task, text and talk. *Theory and research in social education*, 30, 66-87.
- Bruner, J. (1960). *The process of education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Bruner, J. (1971). The process of education revisited. *Phi delta kappan*, 52, 131-156.
- Cazden C. (1988). *Classroom discourse*. Portsmouth. N.H.: Heinemann
- Committee of Seven (1900). *The study of history in schools, report to the American historical association*. New York: Macmillan

Common, D.L., (1963). Teacher authority in the social studies classroom: Erosion of a barren ground. *Theory and research in social education*, 12, 25-38.

Counts, G. (1932). *Dare the schools build a new social order?* New York: John Day

Cuban, L. (1991). History of Teaching in Social Studies. In J. Shaver, (ed.) *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp.138-166) New York: Macmillan.

Dewey, J (1896). The reflex arc concept in psychology. *Psychological review*, 3, 357-370.

Dewey, J. (1899). *The school and society: The child and the curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: The Free Press

Dewey, J. (1929). *Experience and nature*. New York: Dover

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. Boston: D.C. Heath

Dewey, J. (1937). *Education and social change*. *The Social Frontier*, 3, 236-250.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Education and experience*. New York: Touchstone

Dewey, J. (1964). The need for a philosophy of education. In R.D. Archambault (Ed.)
John Dewey on education: Selected writings. New York: Random House (The
Modern Library) 3-14.

Dewey, J. (1985). Democracy and Education. In J.A. Boylston (Ed) *Democracy and
education: The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899-1924*, vol. 9 Carbondale, Ill:
Southern Illinois University Press

Dewey, J. & Childs, J.L. (1933). The social-economic situation and education. In
William H. Kilpatrick (Ed.) *Educational Frontier*, New York: D. Appleton-Century
p. 318-319.

Ehman, L. H. (1969). An analysis of the relationships of selected educational variables
with the political socialization of high school students. *American educational
research journal*, 6, 559-580.

Ehman, L.H. (1970). Normative discourse and attitude change in the social studies
classroom. *The High school journal*, 54, 77-83.

Engles, S. (1960). Decision making: The heart of social studies instruction. *Social education, 24*,301-304.

Engles, S. & Ochoa, A., (1988). *Education for democratic citizenship*. New York: Teachers College Press

Evans, R. W. (1988). Lessons from History: Teacher and student conceptions of the meaning of history *Theory and research in social education, 16*, 203-225.

Evans, R.W. (1989) Teacher conceptions of history. *Theory and research in social education, 18*, 210-240.

Evans, R. W. (1990). Teacher conceptions of history revisited: Ideology, curriculum and student belief. *Theory and research in social education, 18*, 101-129.

Evans, R. W. (2004). *Social studies wars: What should we teach the children?* New York: Teacher's College Press

Evans, R. and Saxe, D.W. (1996). *Handbook on Teaching Social Issues*. National Council for Social Studies

Eyler, J. (1980). Citizenship Education for Conflict: An empirical assessment of the relationship between principle thinking and tolerance for conflict and diversity.

Theory and research in social education, 8, 11-26.

Festinger, L. (1964). *Conflict, decision and dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press

Finney, R.L. (1920). Tentative report of the committee of the American Sociological Society on the teaching of sociology in the grades and high schools of America.

School Review 36, 261

Fitzgerald, F. (1979). *America revised*. New York: Vintage Books

Goldenson, D.R. (1978). An alternative view about the role of the secondary school in political socialization: A field experimental study of the development of civil liberties attitudes. *Theory and research in social education*, 6, 44-72.

Goodlad, J. (1979). *What schools are for*. New York: McGraw-Hill

Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school: Prospects for the future*. New York: McGraw-Hill

Griffiths, M. (1998). Toward a theoretical framework for understanding social justice in educational practice. *Educational philosophy and theory*, 30, 151-167.

Grossman, D., Duggan, S.J. & Thorpe, S.D. (1987). International content, instructional strategies and classroom climate: classroom observations of global education. Paper presented at the third annual conference of the international network for Global education, Janus Pannonius University, Pecs, Hungary

Guttman, A. (1999). *Democratic Education*. (rev. ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and human interests*. Trans. Jeremy J. Shapiro. New York: Beacon Press

Hahn, C.L. & Avery, P.G., (1985). Effect of value analysis discussions on student's political attitudes and reading comprehension. *Theory and research in social education*, 13, 47-60.

Hahn, C. L. & Tocci (1990). Classroom climate and controversial issues discussions: A five nation study. *Theory and research in social education*. 18, 344-362.

Herrenkohl, L. S. & Guerra, M.R. (1998). Participant structures, scientific discourse, and student engagement in fourth grade. *Cognition and instruction*, 16, 431-473.

Hess, D. E. (2002) Discussing controversial public issues in secondary social studies classrooms: learning from skilled teachers. *Theory and research in social education, 30*, 10-41.

Hess, D. E. (2004). Discussion in social studies is it worth the trouble ? *Social education, 68*, 151-155.

Hess, D. E. (2005).a. Moving beyond celebration: Challenging curricular orthodoxy in the teaching of brown and its Legacies. *Teacher's college record, 107*, 2046-2067.

Hess, D. E. (2005) b. How do teacher's political views influence teaching about public issues ? *Social education, 69*, 47-48.

Hess, D. E. (2006). Should intelligent design be taught in social studies courses? *Social education, 70*, 8-13.

Hess, D. & Posselt, J. (2002). How high school students experience and learn from the discussion of controversial public issues. *Journal of curriculum and supervision, 17*, 283-314.

Horton M. & Friere, P. (1990). *We make the road by walking: conversations on education and social change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press

- Hoveland, C.I. Janis, I.L. & Kelly, H.H. (1966). A Summary of experimental studies of opinion change, In Marie Jahoda and Neil Warren (Eds.) *Attitudes* Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books
- Huberman, A.M., & Miles, M.B. (1994). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of qualitative methods* (pp.428-444) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hunt, M.P. & Metcalf, L.E. (1968). *Teaching high school social studies*. New York: Harper and Row
- Igoa, C. (1995). *The inner world of the immigrant child*. New York: St. Martin's Press
- Jennings, Michael Kent & Niemi (1968). Patterns of political learning. *Harvard educational review*, 38, 443-467.
- Johnson, D.W., & Johnson R.T., (1979). Conflict in the classroom: Controversy and learning. *Review of educational research*, 49, 51-69.
- Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R.T. (1985). Classroom conflict: Controversy vs. debate learning groups. *American educational research journal*, 22, 237-256.

- Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R.T. (1988). Critical thinking through structured controversy. *Educational leadership*, 45, 852-867.
- Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R.T. (1995). *Creative controversy: Intellectual challenge in the classroom*. Edina, Minn: Interaction Book Co. 3rd Edition
- Kahne, J. (2000). Developing citizens for democracy ? Assessing opportunities to learn in Chicago's Social Studies Classrooms. *Theory and research in social education*, 28, 311-338.
- Keedy, J. L., Fleming, T. G., Wheat, D. & Gentry, R. (1998). Students as meaning makers and the quest for the common school: a micro-ethnography of a U.S. history. *Classroom journal of curriculum studies*, 30, 619-645.
- Keels, O.M. (1988). Herbert baxter adams and the influence of the american historical Association on the early social studies. *International journal of social education*, 3, 67-89.
- Kelly, T.E. (1986). Discussing controversial issues: Four perspectives on the teacher's role. *Theory and research in social education*, 14, 113-138.
- Kliebard, H.M. (1996). *The struggle for the american curriculum, 1893-1958*. London: Routledge

- Kohlberg, L., (1970). Education for Justice: A Modern Statement of the platonic view. In N.S. and T.R. Sizer (Eds.) *Moral education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Kohlberg, L., (1975). The just community school: The theory and the Cambridge Cluster School Experiment. In *Collected papers from the Center for Moral Education*. ERIC Document reproduction Service ED 223 511
- Larson, B., & Parker, W.C., (1996). What is classroom discussion? A look at teachers' conceptions *Journal of curriculum and supervision, 11*, 110-126.
- Larson, B. (1997). Social studies teacher's conceptions of discussion: A grounded theory study. *Theory and research in social education, 25*, 113-136.
- Larson, B. (2000). Classroom discussion: A method of instruction and a curriculum outcome. *Teaching and teacher education, 16*, 661-677.
- Larson, B. (2003). Comparing face-to-face discussion and electronic discussion: A case study from high school social studies. *Theory and research in social education, 31*, 348-366.
- Larson, B. (2005). Considering the move to electronic discussions. *Social education, 69*, 162-166.

Leming J. S. (1989). The two cultures of social studies education. *Social education*, 53, 404-408.

Leming J. S. (1992). Correct but not politically correct? A response to Parker. *Theory and research in social education*, 20, 500-506.

Leming, J.S. Ellington, L. & K. Porter eds. (2003). *Where did the social studies go wrong?* Dayton, Ohio: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation

Levin, M., Newmann, F.M. & Oliver, D.W. (1969). A law and social science curriculum based on the analysis of public issues. (Final report) Unpublished manuscript, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Lewis, A. (2003) *Race in the Schoolyard*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press

Lewis, J. (2001). Social Justice, Social Studies and Social Foundations. *The Social studies*, 189-192.

Lippman, W. (1922). *Public Opinion*. New York: Harcourt Brace

Lippman, W (1925). *The Phantom Public*. New York: Macmillan

- Litt, E. (1963). Civic education, Community Norms and political indoctrination. *American sociological review*, 28, 69-75.
- Lockwood, Allan & Harris, D., (1985). Reasoning with Democratic values: Ethical decision making in united states history. New York: Teacher's College Press
- Long, Samuel (1980). Urban Adolescents and the Political System: Dimensions of Disaffection. *Theory and research in social education*, 8, 31-43.
- Long, S. & Long, R. (1975). Controversy in the classroom: student viewpoint and educational outcome. *Teaching political science*, 2, 275-299.
- Longres, J.F. & Scanlon, E. (2001) Social justice and the research curriculum. *Journal of social work education*, 37, 447-463.
- Lyberger, M. B. (1991). The Historiography of social studies: Retrospect, circumspect and prospect, In J. Shaver (Ed.) *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning*, New York: Macmillan Co.
- Macintosh, P. (2000). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in Women's Studies. In Anne Minas Belmont (Ed.) *Gender Basics: Feminist perspectives on women and men*, 2nd ed. Ca: Wadsworth

Makler, A. (1994). Social studies teachers' conceptions of justice. *Theory and research in social education*, 22, 249-280.

Makler, A. (2000). "What does justice look like ?" In A. Makler & R. S. Hubbard (Eds.), *Teaching for justice in the social studies classroom: millions of intricate moves*. (pp.87-99). Portsmouth N.H.: Heinemann

Massialas, B.G. (1996). Criteria for Issues-centered Content selection. In R.W. Evans and D.W. Saxe (eds.), *Handbook on Teaching Social Issues* (pp.45-67) Washington D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies

McNeil, L. (1986). *Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge*. New York: Routledge

Merryfield, M., (2000). How can electronic technologies promote equity and cultural diversity? Using threaded discussion in graduate courses in social studies and global education. *Theory and research in social education*, 28, 507-512

Moses, R.P. & Cobb, C. E. (2001). *Radical equations: Math literacy and civil rights*. Boston: Beacon Press

- Munro, W.B. (1922). The study of civics: A report made to the American Political Science Association. *Historical outlook* 12, 43-56.
- Myrdahl, G. (1944). *An american dilemma*. Vols 1& 2. New York: Harper & Brothers
- Nelson, L., Pooler, A., & Drake, F., (1994). Treatment of the Gulf War by secondary social studies teachers *The Social studies*, 85, 76-82.
- Newmann F. (1985). The radical perspective on social studies: A synthesis and critique. *Theory and research in social education*, 31, 1-18.
- Newmann, F. & D.W. Oliver (1970). *Clarifying public controversy: An approach to teaching social studies*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Nieta, S. (2003) *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*, Boston: Allyn & Bacon
- Ochoa, A.S., Morton, M.L., Autry, M. M., Johnstad, S., Merrill, D., (2001). A search for decision making in three elementary classrooms. *Theory and research in social education*, 29, 261-289.
- Oliver, D.W. & Shaver, J.P. (1966). *Teaching public issues in the high school*. Boston; Houghton Mifflin Co.

- Oliver, D. W., Newmann, F.M. & Singleton, L.R. (1992). Teaching Public Issues in the secondary school classroom. *The Social studies*, 83, 240-250.
- Parker, W. (1990). Assessing citizenship. *Educational leadership*, 48, 33-39.
- Parker, W. (1992). Back to the melting pot? A response to Leming. *Theory and research in social education*, 20, 493-499.
- Parker, W. (1996). *Educating the democratic mind*. Albany: SUNY
- Parker, Walter (1991). Achieving thinking and decision-making objectives. In J. Shaver (Ed.), *Social studies in handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp.51-84). New York: MacMillan Co.
- Parker, W.C., McDaniel, J.E.& Valencia, S.W. (1991)a. Helping students think about public issues: Instruction versus prompting. *Social education*, 41-44.
- Parker, W. C. & Zumeta, W. (1999). Toward and aristocracy of everyone: policy study in the high school curriculum. *Theory and research in social education*, 27, 211-222.
- Parker, W. & Hess, D., (2001). Teaching with and for discussion. *Teaching and teacher education*, 17, 273-289.

- Parker, W.C. (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life*. New York: Teachers College Press
- Patrick, J.J. (1967). Political socialization of American youth: Implications for secondary school social studies. National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, DC.
- Passe, J. & Evans, R.W. (1996). Discussion methods in an issues-centered curriculum In R.W. Evans & D.W. Saxe (Eds.) *Handbook on Teaching Social Issues*, Washington D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies
- Piaget, J. (1955). *The child's construction of reality*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
- Poplin, M. & Rivera, J. (2005). Merging social justice and accountability: Educating Qualified and Effective Teachers, *Theory into practice*, 44, 87-92.
- Prothro, J. and Grigg, C. (1969). Fundamental principles of democracy: Bases of agreement and disagreement. *Journal of politics*, 22, 276-294.
- Ravitch, D., & Wiener, J., American History 101: Do contemporary politics belong in a course on U.S. History ? retrieved January 29, 2007 from Slate <http://www.slate.com/id/2118427>
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

- Regenspan, B. (2002). Toward parallel practices for social justice focused teacher education and the elementary school classroom: learning lessons from Dewey's critique of the division of labor. *Teaching and teacher education*, 18, 577-591.
- Rosenberg, M.I., Verba, S. & Converse, P. E., (1970). *Changing attitudes on the war: some practical theory in Vietnam and the silent majority: The dove's guide*. New York : Harper and Row
- Ross, E.W., (2005). Social studies: Wrong, right or left ? a critical response to the Fordham Institute's where did social studies Go wrong? *Social studies*, 96, 139-143.
- Rossi, John (1995). In-Depth Study in an Issues-Oriented Social Studies Classroom. *Theory and research in social education*, 23, 88-120.
- Rugg, H. (1939). Curriculum design in the social sciences: What I believe." In James Michener (Ed.), *The Future of Social Studies*, Curriculum Series, No. 1 Washington D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies
- Saxe, D.W. (1991). *Social studies in schools: A history of the early years*. Albany: State University of New York Press

- Shaver, J.P. (1977). Needed a Deweyan rationale for social studies. *High School Journal*, 60, 345-352.
- Shaver, J.P. (1991). *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning*. New York: MacMillan Co.
- Shaver, J.P. & Strong, W. (1976). *Facing value decisions: Rationale building for teachers*. Belmont California: Wadsworth
- Shulman, L.W. (1983). Autonomy and obligation: the remote control of teaching. In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy*, (pp. 484-504). New York: Longman
- Stanley, W.B. & Nelson, J.L. (2005). Social Studies and the social order: Transmission or transformation? *Social education* 282-286.
- Stotsky, S. (1990). Connecting reading and writing to civic education. *Educational Leadership*, 72-73.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory, procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications

- Taba, H. (1963). Learning by discovery: Psychological and educational rationale. *Elementary school journal*, 63, 308-316.
- Taba, H. (1966). Teaching strategies and cognitive functioning in elementary school children (Cooperative research project No. 2404). San Francisco: San Francisco State College
- Taba, H. (1967). Implementing thinking as an objective in social studies. In J. Fair & F.R. Shaftel (Eds.) *Effective thinking in the social studies, 37th yearbook* (pp. 25-49). Washington D.C. National Council for the Social Studies
- Taba, H., Levine, S., & Elzey, F.F. (1964). Thinking in elementary school children (Cooperative research project No. 1574). San Francisco: San Francisco State College.
- Torney-Purta, J. & Lansdale, D. (1986). Classroom climate and process in international studies: qualitative and quantitative evidence from the American schools and the world project. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA
- Tyack, D & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: a century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press

United Nations. (1978). Human Rights: Compilation of international instruments Sales
No. E.78.XIV.2

U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.) No Child Left Behind. Retrieved July 8, 2006 from
<http://www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml>

Vavrus, M., (2001). Deconstructing the multicultural animus held by monoculturalists
Journal of teacher education, 52, 70-77.

Walberg, H.J. (1968) a. Personality correlates of factored teaching attitudes. *Psychology
in the schools, 4, 67-74.*

Walberg, H.J. (1968) b. Teacher Personality and Classroom Climate. *Psychology in the
schools, 5, 163-169.*

Walberg, H.J. (1968) c. Structural and Affective Aspects of Classroom Climate.
Psychology in the schools, 5, 247-253.

Washington State (2005). Social Studies Classroom based assessment: Causes of conflict
from Washington Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction

Whitehead, A.N. (1922) *Principles of relativity with Applications to physical science.*
Oxford: Cambridge University Press.

Young, I.M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.