

THE CURRENT STATE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE EDUCATION:
EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES FOR EDUCATORS TO TEACH FOR SOCIAL
JUSTICE

by

Ashley Rose Kinney

A Project Submitted to the Faculty of
The Evergreen State College
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the degree
Master in Teaching
2010

This Project for the Master in Teaching Degree


by

Ashley Rose Kinney

has been approved for

The Evergreen State College

by

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Leslie Flemmer". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above a solid horizontal line.

(Leslie Flemmer, Ph. D), Member of the Faculty

June 2010

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank those who advocate for socially just change, and work to make the world a more just and peaceful place. Also, educators who work hard to push the boundaries of the status quo to support their students, and their local and global communities.

On a more personal note I would like to thank my family and friends for helping me during these last two years. An enormous thanks to my cohort, faculty, Jen T.I, Rob, and all of the other educators who have supported and inspired me. And to my Habibi Oliver, where would I be without your cat cuddles?

"Dialogue cannot exist, however, in the absence of a profound love for the world and its people."
-Paulo Freire (1972)

Abstract

This paper examines the historical development and current literature concerning the fields of “social education”, including: human rights education, multicultural education, and moral education. In addition this paper addresses how this field relates to teaching for social justice in the classroom. This work is meant to provide an overview of current practices in this field and point out the best practices that schools, principals and other educators have used to teach social education. The research considered in this work relies primarily on published literature to find recommendations for best practices in curriculum development, pedagogy, classroom structure and partnerships with community and administration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	i
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction	1
Rationale	1
Limitations	6
Summary	8
CHAPTER 2: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	9
Introduction	9
Summary	13
CHAPTER 3: CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	15
Introduction	15
Schools Based on Social Justice	16
Mainstream Schools Teaching for Social Justice	27
Preservice Teachers Views on Social Justice	42
Teachers and Principals that Teach for Social Justice	51
Mainstream Teachers' Methods	58
Classes Within Mainstream Schools that Promote Social Justice	68
Social Justice Based Programs in Mainstream Schools	81
Summary	97
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION	96

Introduction.....	96
Summary of Findings.....	98
Classroom Implications.....	105
Further Research.....	108
Conclusion.....	109
APPENDIX:.....	113
REFERENCES.....	115

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In the United States, public schools are becoming increasingly diverse. Diversity among students extends beyond issues of race, class, ability, sexual orientation, and cultural background. In order to promote equity and justice within the classroom, students need to socialize with one another meaningfully across issues of diversity. They need to learn to identify biases and prejudices that harm or suppress others. Also, with the increases of technology, global communication is becoming an even more important skill. Anti-bias, multicultural skills will continue to become a vital part of our social world, both on global and local level.

This paper will focus on the themes of social education and why it is valuable for current educators to have skills and knowledge of the best practices in this field. Students need to master ways of dealing with conflict, advocating for rights, and working for social justice. Major aspects of this pedagogy include teaching skills to support social justice and empathy. According to Wiggins (2005), empathy is one of the six facets of understanding, allowing for a learner to see and feel what others see and feel. These skills are based around improving communication, and the understanding of the cognitive and emotional sides of others. They empower students, give them skills to advocate for themselves, and help combat inequalities that exist in our society (Kagan, 2009).

Rationale

School aged children are developing attitudes towards difference (i.e., race, gender, class, ability) from all areas of their life. It is important for

educators to teach and encourage accurate, non-judgmental views of these differences, and to foster inquiry and awareness of oppression within societal roles. These roles foster inequality and perpetuate racism, classism, sexism and other forms of misunderstanding. More specifically, cultural groups are often placed into identity-forming roles within the schooling system. This can limit or suppress the identity of the individual. These roles are learned and internalized by students often unintentionally propagated by people and structures within the schooling systems (Valenzuela, 1999). It is, therefore, a task of teachers to identify oppression in the schooling system, to reflect upon and mitigate their own prejudices and biases, to involve family and community members in order to provide culturally relevant curriculum, and to model and advocate for social change. This paper seeks to find best practices for teaching social justice education by reviewing research in this field.

How students understand themselves is largely influenced by how they understand their role in society. Teaching for social justice can build students' self-concept and understanding of self within the larger community context. Through listening and discussion of multiple perspectives educators can give all students a voice. This promotes critical and active citizenship. This becomes critical as our classrooms and schools are one of the first social settings students encounter. We must make it an honest and safe space, a space where the harsh realities of oppression can be discussed in a hopeful way. It is in this space that teachers can also find the interconnectedness of their classroom in the larger global community

The need for social justice education lies in the lack of accurate global perspective taught in schools. Inaccurate information or lack of information can lead to inaccurate views of difference. Such views can then lead to a fear, phobia, and negative perceptions. Then to perpetuate these societal inequalities, a lack of empathy and understanding towards human rights issues leaves students uninformed, and feeling powerless. It is important for educators to try to teach accurately and honestly about cultures, people, and the social issues that occur. As well as to model and base their curriculum around just, moral and actual lenses.

The information from the studies presented in chapter three will be used to explore what type of social justice and multicultural education practices work best in schools. This paper will also investigate the common attributes of successful schools that use themes of social justice and social education. Finally, these studies will show where educators have misconceptions and difficulties in their teaching. In turn, this may inform new teaching practices. The information explored in this paper could help promote structural and systematic changes towards more successful social justice themes within schools.

Controversies

There are no simple truths. Social education is a very controversial topic because it has to do with teaching values. Those against teaching values in school ask: whose values are worth teaching? The complexity of this situation is that values are being taught no matter what. There are underlining values within every textbook, lecture, activity and story. There

are values being promoting with not only what is said and taught, but with what is omitted. This paper explores how educators can be critical of their pedagogies and curriculum. By doing this, they can become advocates in the field of educating for social justice. It will look at current research in social education as it relates to the current practices in teaching for social justice. As for content discrepancies, students also learn values at home, on television and in their community. The goal is not to disregard this part of the students' life, but instead supplement it by focusing on common values and the rights that all human beings deserve.

Another argument against social education is the accuracy of cultural teaching practices (e.g., Is this an accurate portrayal of this culture?). Teachers, who are not equipped with tools, both curricular and knowledge, may inaccurately teach their students about issues surrounding social justice and multiculturalism. This is a legitimate point of view and an important driving force behind this paper.

Professional Literature

There are arguments within the professional literature on the innateness of empathy, how to teach pro-social behavior, and what it all even means (Berman, 1990). To establish what exists in the current profession literature this paper will cover the research of the major theories, practices and opinions. The professional literature section will begin with thoughts on moral development as it directly relates to social justice.

Kohlberg (1981) focused on the study of the development of justice and reason. He created the Six Stages of Moral Development.¹ Noddings (2005) refocused the area that Kohlberg began by adding care and relationships are just as important as reasoning when developing justice. Where Kohlberg would teach instructional moral dilemmas to his students to make them confront decision-making, Noddings would argue for connecting students to other people in real and experiential ways (Berman, 1990).

Daisaku Ikeda, in a forward to Noddings work, writes:

True education summons forth the innate goodness of humanity- our capacity for nonviolence, trust, and benevolence. It enables individuals to reveal their unique qualities and, by encouraging empathy with others, opens the door to the peaceful coexistence of humanity. (Noddings, 2005, p. ix)

Banks (2003) sees multicultural education² as a broad field with specific dimensions. When educators would like to examine their practices, he recommends using the interrelated dimensions as benchmarks which include: (1) content integration, (2) the knowledge construction process, (3) prejudice reduction, (4) equity pedagogy(5) and empowering school culture and social structure. These dimensions can show how well developed some of the social justice programs and educators in the research chapter of this paper.

¹ 1. Obedience and punishment orientation (*How can I avoid punishment?*)
 2. Self-interest orientation (*What's in it for me?*)
 3. Interpersonal accord and conformity (*Social norms*)
 4. Authority and social-order maintaining orientation (*Law and order morality*)
 5. Social contract orientation
 6. Universal ethical principles

² See appendix for the definition as in relations to social justice

Definitions³

Because this field has many complicated terms this paper will define them in this section. *Social education* is a broad term this paper uses to discuss the shared definitions within the fields of multicultural education, education that is multicultural, moral education, values education, peace education, human rights education, education for empathy, civics education, education on human difference, and how they are connected to social justice. Social justice in this paper refers to preparing students to look critically and challenge injustices and oppression based on race, gender, and difference. This is both on a local and global level. This paper discusses the term *global community* as feeling part of a community that encompasses all of the peoples of the world, and having attitudes that reflect acceptance and care for these peoples. *Mainstream* is used to describe a school or teacher that does not have specific values or goals based in social education that dictate their teaching and curriculum. For example, most public schools are schools are “mainstream” while a charter school is based on the foundations of teaching for social justice is not.

Limitations

This body of research has many facets and definitions of terms. This paper uses the terms of multicultural education, social justice education and human rights education interchangeably throughout depending on what the researchers in the paper’s definition of the terms are. The main focus,

³ For more detailed definitions of terms please see appendix for applicable definitions from Grants (2007) Dictionary of Multicultural Education

however, is what aspects of their theoretical framework or goal relate to my definitions of the terms.

There is an intense need for more quantitative research in this area, to expand transferability. Because it is a newer field and lacks multiple forms of research (especially quantitative), finding one solution that will work for all schools is a far off goal. It is important instead to focus on common successful themes within multiple areas of research. The research and literature in this paper is not by any means a comprehensive reflection of existing resources. This paper recommends that all persons interested in social justice education continue further research in this field.

Social education is a controversial topic. This paper is in no way supporting or promoting government involvement or control of moral or social values education by presenting these studies. Instead is broadening the conversation about current social education based programs that do exist in which schools and educators are currently teaching or have taught for social justice and human rights. All educators, like students, should be critical consumers of information.

When referring to the demographics of the studies, to stay true to the study itself, this paper uses the demographic breakdowns provided by the researcher(s). For example, some researchers say the participants are Euro-American, while others say white. To maintain accuracy, this paper has uses the exact word choice of each researcher.

Summary

As this paper seeks to examine current practices in social education, to shift education towards more non-judgmental views of difference, and to foster inquiry and empowerment within students, it is important to examine the historical background of this field. The next chapter will look at the evolution of social education in the United States to gain insight on the foundation of social education and the work of major theorists and activists.

CHAPTER 2: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The history of Western Civilization revolves around self-reliance and independence (Berman, 1990). When examining the historical background of social education or multicultural education in the United States, it is rather a history of deculturalization and cultural imperialism. A fight for land ownership and strong beliefs in the superiority of the Christian religion laid the ground work for viewing students as economic capital, and schools as the place to support this ideology. Proponents of multicultural education and education for social justice have always been fighting an uphill battle against the strong American beliefs based on assimilation and national interests. As movements for equal rights began so did a greater awareness of the importance of social education and multiple perspectives within the public school curriculum. The United States has now developed into a country with a greater awareness of our global interconnectivity and some are looking to social justice education to further global perspectives in education (Spring, 2005; Huerta, 2007).

The History

Beginning with a young America, colonists viewed education as a means of assimilation for those who were unlike them. They feared multicultural education⁴ and had impassioned beliefs in the deficit of the other (non-white peoples). Spring (2005) argues, “ The effort to change Native American Cultures was a prelude to future debate about multicultural education” (p. 12). The goal of the first American schools was to uphold the

⁴ ***Which could have been something as foundational as not fearing difference.***

status quo of the English colonists and impose their culture on others. The practice of sending Native American children to boarding schools began an atrocious process of further removing a culture from a whole cultural group (Spring, 2005). Boarding schools removed Native children from their homes, quite the opposite of what we now know of critical multiculturalism.

The common school movement brought forth by Horace Mann in the 1830's and 1840's laid some basic groundwork for a humanitarian effort to allow diversity in schools (Spring, 2005). Many proponents followed the argument that bringing students of many religions, social classes, and ethnic backgrounds together to be educated in common would quell hostility among these groups. It also afforded social economic fairness in that it allowed for schools to accept all who wanted to attend. However, the education that was provided was that of the dominant protestant Anglo view. This practice was to prepare children to obey authority and government to create a "good" society. This meant a "well ordered religious society" where the purpose of schooling was to instill those values in all of the students (Spring, 2005, p. 12), therefore, preventing a multicultural education. Some argued that:

The role of the common school [was to assure] the dominance of protestant Anglo American culture over other cultures in the United States... The common school reformers were primarily concerned that the United States did not become a multicultural society. (Spring, 2005, p. 96)

In terms of social justice, these early students were not being taught democratic ideals or how to be critical participants of society. Rather, they were taught to obey authority, and conform to a singular social and political ideology.

Fast forward one hundred years to a system more currently like our public education system today. We begin to see the formation of what is known as intergroup education. The focus of the concept of intergroup education was to emphasize interracial understanding and to find commonality across differences (Banks, 1995). Banks (1995) noted that the huge migration of people from rural communities to urban cities during World War II created immense tensions between cultural groups. The tensions came from a battle for jobs and housing.

World War II brought about human rights violations that put pressure on governments of the world to make human rights guarantees. Out of this came the United Nations whose main focus became Human rights (Gaudelli, 2004). The 1950's Cold War era opened up the idea of global education to try and not only compete with Russia for economic global power but also prevent a third world war. For example, anti-war movements spawned children's literature concerning peace and empathy. Stemming from American nationalist's interests, educational leaders pressured government for more international education to compete with global trends. Congress passed the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in 1958 mandating the teaching of foreign language, culture, math and science all for the purpose of national security ("Educating in Global," 2009).

Educational reform in the 1960's and 1970's was coupled with social movements of equality. African American and Ethnic studies were created in many post secondary schools, as well as peace and conflict studies, and human rights education. These movements called for schooling that represented the true diversity of our country (Banks, 1995). Public school

programs focused on cultural plurality, and were mainly implemented in racially diverse schools. Schools that were “doing well” or mono-cultural were seen as not in need of this linguistically focused or self-esteem focused curriculum (Vold, 1992).

From the late 1970’s to the present, educators, theorists and historians known as “social reconstructivists” formed ideas surrounding the belief that teaching social change revolved around changing the structural inequalities in our society. Their curriculum focused on issues of racism, sexism and many other forms of oppression. Their goals revolved around education and activism against these perpetuating systems (Vold, 1992). Paulo Freire, an educational theorist and author, published the profound work, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, in the early 1970’s. He stressed that teachers should give students the opportunity to take an active role in their learning while also implementing aspects of social justice to promote critical thinking (Carroll, 2009).

The 1980’s gave way to many new voices on the multicultural education front including Christine Sleeter and Sonia Nieto. During this time, foundations for tangible multicultural curriculum began to surface. Like all developing theories, critiques arose that made way for progress and development. Shelly Berman (1990), in an essay about developing social consciousness in education, noted some mistakes in the movements of this time. Berman delved more specifically into the cultural literacy and moral development movement. He pointed out that many of these movements were tied to self-realization, and only focused on helping the students think through social dilemmas rather than on how to take action in society. He

agreed that personal self-realization and morality are necessary parts of what he called, "Social Responsibility education" but more needs to be taught (Berman, 1990, p. 2). In the 1990's, more progressive education models began to form. The term "teaching for social justice" arose (Kraft, 2007). The focus surrounded "...fostering social consciousness in students, and teaching to encourage students to act for social change" (Kraft, 2007, p. 77). It is these voices that educators are left with today when asking questions about how to work for social justice in our current educational system.

Summary

Throughout history no one has been able to pin point one definition of multicultural education or education for social justice. It is still an evolving field. Bajaj (2004) noted that human rights education, for example, is only a field that has emerged in the past 15 years. The newness of this field and vagueness of these terms has left arguments centering on how these types of educational values are achieved. A long-standing debate between assimilation and ideals of valuing one's individual culture are still a part of our educational system today. The idea of assimilation is the belief that through shedding one's own culture and adopting those of the dominant culture we can create equality. The promise of assimilation offers misleading ideas of what racism is, and disregards the state of our current societal systems. Assimilation disregards the existence of inequality based on race and ethnicity.

Educators must look at our history as a way to gain understanding of where society has been and where it needs to go. This may entail the support

of paradigm shifts based on what the purpose of education is, to scaffold legislation that promotes justice, and to include multiple global perspectives within our public school system. To see how these shifts have already begun, the next chapter will review the current literature on the topic of social education keeping in mind how educators are currently teaching in these fields.

CHAPTER 3: CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter one gave an overview of the professional literature of the social education field and statement of limits for this paper. Chapter two took a look at the historical development of social justice and multicultural education. This chapter will explore the current literature with the purpose of finding best practices for teaching social justice education. Because this field is multifaceted, this collection of studies ranges in age of participants, location, and foci that cover the breadth of social education in the field, and how it relates to teaching for social justice. To improve clarity, the description of each study will include the school's information (as much as provided) and researcher definitions of terms or theoretical framework. The sites demographics, statistics, and location are important pieces to examine in this chapter because they directly relate to the transferability and credibility of the results. The definitions of terms and/or theoretical framework tell us what the author⁵ meant when discussing and/or referencing pedagogies, theories or beliefs.

In this chapter, the articles in each section re arranged chronologically from the earliest dates to the most recent. This is with the assumption that research and philosophies on these topics have evolved over a 30-year period and, therefore, the research based on these philosophies may have evolved as

⁵ We have come to a strange time in this subject area where like many philosophers, we must ask ourselves, can we find one true answer when studying the social world? When looking at the qualitative research that I have compiled and reviewed, we must keep in mind the paradigms of constructivist and interpretational beliefs that there is an interactive link between the researcher and his/her environment. Also, the emancipatory ideals that these realities are situated have individual political and social history that effect results (Jurs, 2008).

well. Also, in this field it is quite possible that later researchers have used previous studies to inform their practices.

Schools Based on Social Justice

Studies in this section focus on schools whose foundation and philosophies are based in those of social justice. Included are Swadener (1988), Smyth (2004), Kraft (2007), Carroll (2008). This section is relevant for the research question because it describes schools whose entire curriculum and beliefs are implemented in such a way to reflect concepts of social justice and multicultural education.

All of the schools in this section identify as being a school of social justice, peace, social responsibility, or multicultural education (e.g., schools who value some form of social education). What sets these schools apart from the other schools in these studies are that they are not implementing one specific program designated by the government or district, and they do not just have one class based on (the above) values. Instead they are schools from all over the world that are built on the foundations of social justice, multicultural education, or human rights. These schools are indeed unique, and often yield extraordinary results.

Elizabeth Swadener (1988) conducted a one-year ethnographic collaborative research project exploring ways in which elementary aged children learn values of diversity, conflict resolution and promoting peace. The school, Friends School, is a Quaker elementary school in rural Pennsylvania founded in 1930. The study was carried out using participant observation methods semi-structured interviews with children and teachers,

video taped activities, discussions, and classroom and playground interactions. Field notes were made on each visit. They were typed and re-copied.

There were 43 students that attended the school ages 5-11. Three students were African- American, one Indian-American, and two were Latino. Though socio-economic status was not provided in detail to the research, a note was made that the teachers said most students were from middle class families. The school's philosophy was based on peace and social responsibility. Being built on such principles influenced how the school functioned in all manners. It is this information that will be important for this chapter.

Swadener (1988) used for her theoretical framework the well-established "Sleeter and Grant paradigm of 'education that is Multicultural and social reconstructivist'" (p. 2). This paradigm includes gender, age, class, race, and exceptionality, and "...emphasizes preparing students to analyze and challenge oppression based on race, social class and gender in their school, local community and society" (p. 3).

Successful ways in which this school yielded results in promoting the themes of social justice or education that is multicultural to its students are the findings of this study. First, creating a community in the school was very important. One important part of that community was the emphasis on cooperation over competition. This meant creating a "a friendly place" by promoting buddy systems, referring to other students and members of the community as "friends" and collaborative activities built into the curriculum (p. 13). Structurally, this meant non-graded mixed age classrooms, a lot of

small group work, and consensus decision-making. Also, another important aspect of this community was respect for self-expression and appreciation of others. The teachers modeled respect and peace by valuing all ideas and feelings.

The curriculum of the school focused on current rights issues, the importance of non-violent social change and civil rights. They also studied famous “peacemakers” (p. 29) by reading books and discussing them.

The climate of the school modeled what they hoped the climate of the world should be. The activities and projects that the school did were situated in the context of peace and social justice education. Not only was the curriculum modeling these values, but also the communication style and community building at the school supported the students and faculty in their learning.

When looking at the strengths and weaknesses of this study, Swadener (1988) was well established in theoretical literature and previous studies. The dependability was strong, meaning when change was experienced in the study it was tracked and made explicit. Also, to add to the strength of the dependability, the researcher was clear in her study when the paradigm slightly shifted. The researcher discussed emerging trends or issues with the lead teachers at the school offering member checks for validity. The study lasted one year giving it prolonged and substantial engagement.

Smyth (2004) looked at a school with similar goals and the same student ages as Swadener (1988). The researcher’s site, however, had a much larger school size and different socio-economic status. The study was an ethnographic, empirical case study using interviews with the principal, the

school leadership team, teachers, chair of the governing counsel, and students. Observations took place over a period of 18 months.

The school, Hillsvie, was a public primary school in Australia, and included grades K-7. The school was referred to as a “self-managing” (p. 22). The researchers chose this site because its ideals and practices were based on social justice. The school itself had 367 students and 43 staff members.

The research had clear thoughts on what a socially just school was including: a concern for social injustices, a school that enacted democratic practices, a school that was community minded, and engaged in critical literacy’s (Smyth, 2004). The teachers at the school, on the other hand, had a difficult time defining social justice because they felt it was “at the center of everything they did” (p. 24). This was a common theme found in this field.

The teachers in this study seemed to be genuinely interested in the lives of their students and considered building bonds with them, of high importance. Because many of these students were coming from disadvantaged homes, the teachers saw “...sustaining a pedagogical mindset with which to counter the unequal opportunity structures” as part of their position as advocates of social justice (Smyth, 2004, p. 25).

Other features of this study examined foundations for success in a socially just school: valuing students fund of knowledge, promoting empathy, creating an emotionally stable community, and social learning. Some key ideas relating to these foundations include “ respect for all” (Smyth, 2004, p. 26), “creating the circumstances for the creation of social capital” (p. 27), and being positive and supportive.

As for the curriculum at Hillsvie, the authors of the study labeled six subthemes, which they deemed "...exemplified what it meant to pursue curriculum justice within the socially just school" (p. 28). These themes included: experiencing success, fostering optimism, broadening learning opportunities, curriculum rigor, empowerment and participation, and pedagogical flexibility. Pulled from the research were some common attributes of successful socially just schools that were observed in this study; meaningful and inclusive curriculum that was accessible to all students.

Smyth (2004) had the staff do member checks of the data to support internal validity. His study was well situated in historical theories and pedagogies. The length of this study (18 months) gives prolonged and substantial engagement. However, the researcher cautions that his results are only at an exploratory stage.

The critique of this study is not so much a critique but a further analysis of quantitative studies and the author's statements concerning the difficulty of portraying school realistically with pure data. There is slight concern with the credibility aspect of this study in regards to the procedures and decision-making for what data to include and exclude. It would have added to the validity of this study if the researcher had clearer transparency and detail rather than just selected data. The author is clear about the lack of space he has to include information, and the purpose for organization, but lacks a balanced data set. Most importantly Smyth (2004) gives a glimpse into a large school with diverse demographics and low socio-economic status that is still able to pursue its beliefs in social justice.

Kraft (2007) examined best practices of two small public schools in San Francisco committed to equity and social justice. In a qualitative ethnographic investigation, through participatory action research, which included: observations, interviews, and document analysis. One of the schools was newly forming while the other was well established. This allowed the author to see similar schools as different stages.

The first school studied, Urban Promise Academy, a new public middle school, was still in the beginning stages of pursuing its goals of a school-wide commitment to social justice. The school was founded in 1972 by a team of four teachers, in collaboration with parents and community members. The schools population was chosen by a lottery designed to reflect the local demographics.

Similarities of the schools found in many of these studies of successful social justice and multicultural-based schools include, small class sizes, democratic leadership, community involvement and a lot of effort put into curriculum development and implementation. Kraft (2007) states that there are many challenges to maintaining school such as these and details that the staff of these schools received a large amount of coaching, support, and professional development.

The curriculum was one of the most pivotal parts of the two schools. The students studied all of their academic pursuits through the lens of social justice. While in class the students discussed social issues including social justice, human rights, equity, race, class and gender. Pedagogical choices made by teachers included group projects, fishbowl forums, research and debates. It was important in these activities for students to think

independently, and critically consider multiple perspectives. The teachers' focused the curricula on topics and assignments that were culturally relevant to the student populations by including family interviews, personal reflections, and journal writing.

The teachers themselves modeled respect for diverse opinions and provided students with multiple perspectives. They valued close relationships with their students and were committed to building a classroom community based on the values of respect, honesty, equity and kindness. Most importantly, the teachers at these schools believed in teaching for social justice as ethnically necessary and important to all of the core content knowledge.

Carroll (2008), like Kraft (2007), used ethnographic research techniques to study students living in the United States. The researcher completed a mixed methods ethnographic study on a school in the Southwest United States. The study took place over one school year with approximately 80 hours of participant observation. Methods included: formal and informal interviews on paper and audiotape, document analysis, and a student questionnaire.

The site of the study, "PFMS" was a charter school for grades 6 and 7 with a capacity of 60 students. The student body population was two-thirds Caucasian and one third comprised of Hispanics, Native Americans and African Americans. The site also included students from diverse backgrounds and socioeconomic status'. It was funded on 501C3 money and is a non-profit organization. The school also had support from Turning Points Organization an organization that focused on getting students active in their

community and managing their own learning. The schools philosophy is based on social justice and community.

Caroll (2008) had a strong theoretical framework based in the community building ideals, and critical pedagogy of Freire, the funds of knowledge of Moll and Gonzalez, and pedagogies of empowerment by Gutierrez. These fundamental and influential theories give a glimpse into the lens Caroll used to guide his research at the site. He felt that teachers should view students diverse backgrounds as a benefit to the classroom, that teachers should “encourage them [students] to find their own voice and question dominant power relations” (p. 2), and that a strong school is one where “students can actively take part in their own learning while simultaneously implementing aspects of social justice to prompt critical thinking” (p. 2).

Caroll (2008) found the strategies in which the school promotes social justice include weekly community meetings where the students are able to purpose and vote on school policies (promoting democratic principles). These meetings allowed students to practice creating positive change “teaching them to be agents of change” (p. 8). Daily “Kiva Sessions” were held where the students, faculty and parents came together to do reflection and community building activities.

The teachers and administration valued strong relationships with the students, for example, first names were used in all interactions. The students and teachers took part in advisory where they invested in quality time to get to know one another. Caroll (2008) makes a clear case for the need of supportive administration and the need for teamwork between the administration, teachers and students. The core classes at this site “heavily”

integrated social justice into its daily activities with the exception of the Spanish class (p. 9). Electives were offered to strengthen community, for example, African Drumming where students practiced in unison.

Curriculum at the middle school included the use of socially provocative text and videos to promote discussion between the students on socially controversial issues. For example, a short video on the constitution was followed up with the questions: “Who were the people that wrote the constitution, were there any people left out” (Carroll, 2008, p. 9)? The teachers also expected students to think critically about their work, and organized activities that were often rooted in authentic experiences. For example, attending local protests, going on field trips around the local to homeless shelters and even going to Mexico to volunteer. The curriculum really valued authentic, provocative assignments and time for discussion and reflection on the assignments.

Carroll (2008) offered multiple forms of data collection for a stronger triangulation. The researcher spent one school year at the school for prolonged and substantial engagement, but to further the depth in seeing if the school is successful this paper would recommend a follow up study to strengthen the validity of this one. There is no evidence of member checks, however the multiple interviews and the length of this study still support the credibility. Also, Carroll clearly describes his data gathering and analysis procedures also strengthening this study's credibility.

As for the overall findings of Swadener (1988), Smyth (2004), Kraft (2007), Carroll (2008) many themes arise about social justice education in schools whose foundation lies in that value. By looking at the structure of the

school, the communication and relationships, as well as the curriculum we can see ties that link these strong and unique schools together.

The structure of the schools: All of the schools in the study could be considered small in size when looking at student body population to teacher/staff population. This could be an argument for low student to teacher ratio as a factor in educational success. Despite this fact, none of the studies explicitly listed this as imperative to the teaching of social justice in the schools. Instead, what was more important was the attitudes of the administration and teachers towards their goals. One important thread in all of these schools is the support of the administration or district that allowed these schools to have the freedom and tools necessary to create curriculum and community.

The communication and community building aspect was another important theme found in these schools. All of the studies described the relationships that teachers had with their students as extremely important to the success of the school. The teachers at these schools felt that having a strong teacher-to-student and student-to-student relationship, and school-to-community- bond was imperative for their success. Teachers built this in, in many different ways, including: small group activities, modeling respect, valuing all opinions, and having community meetings.

Curriculum content and practices were also very important to these schools, whose main teaching strategies seemed to be discussion, reflection and authentic experience based. Also, there was a focus on the social contexts that events and people are/were situated in. The schools all included what some may view as socially charged materials including the study of

“peacemakers” to, visiting a protest on immigration, to detailing out controversial issues in America History. The teachers gave their students power to problem solve, discuss, and take part in the social change of real issues occurring in both their local and global communities.

It is for all of the above reasons that these schools are exemplars for other schools trying to find ways to teach for social justice. These studies would suggest that schools whose structures were built on the theories of social justice have clear goals towards social justice that reflect in their practices and curriculum.

There are limits to the research presented in this section. The overall critique of these studies revolves around their transferability, or the ability for a teacher or educators to create these situations in their own school or classroom. As these are ideal school settings, when in fact most educators and schools do not have the opportunity to have small classroom sizes, develop their own curriculum and hire and maintain staff that fit with their values. It is because of this that for many of these studies the transferability is quite low. These schools, though amazing, are special exceptions to the standard of education. They often receive funding from multiple sources, have small class sizes, and have an immense amount of community support and involvement. This paper must acknowledge that schools without support, funding and resources may not be able to form, and successfully teach such social justice based values. We must also bring up the possibility of researcher bias with these studies. In qualitative research such as this the researchers have chosen specific locations with assumptions about the schools, as well as hopes to discover valuable information for their question.

For Kraft (2007), by going into to the two schools and asking the question how do educators teach for social justice, he may be blinded to the ways that they are not.

What this paper is purposing is that we take the core values from these articles, ways in which teachers can learn from these models to promote social justice in their own classroom. That is why the next section of this paper focuses on how mainstream schools around the world have implemented social justice, human rights, and/or multicultural curriculum through programs, classes, or particular pedagogical methods.

Mainstream Schools Teaching for Social Justice

This next section includes studies that examine if and how mainstream schools and preschools teach social justice, multicultural education, or the skills pivotal to those pedagogies such as empathy. The section includes studies from Swadener (1986), Cohen (2000), Johansson (2002), Nganga (2005), and Reid (2006). These studies describe how issues related to diversity and cultures are attended to in mainstream programs.

Swadener (1986) used qualitative ethnographic research including participant observation to examine two preschool centers in an Urban Midwestern U.S. community. The researcher used weekly observations throughout one school year that lasted 2-3 hours, field notes, and transcribed small group activities. All of the field notes were analyzed and the data was coded, categories emerged from here. The sites chosen for this ethnographic study were specifically chosen to include one “diverse” daycare center,

Center A; and one mono-cultural daycare center, Center B. Both centers had students ages 3.9 to 5.5.

Center A, the ethnically diverse center, had 43 children, and 3 teachers. Twenty five percent of its students were from outside the United States, 25% were ELL or bilingual. 6% were U.S born minority, and the rest were of Euro-American decent. Center B, considered the mono-cultural sample, included 14 students and many teachers, and support staff trained in EC/ECC⁶. Forty percent of the students had developmental delay⁷, 2 were from outside the U.S and the rest were of Euro-American decent.

The goal of this study was to build on the existing literature on preschool children and education in human diversity. Swadener (1986) described and analyzed formal and informal curricular activities dealing with aspects of human diversity such as race, ethnicity, gender exceptionality and human difference, as well as children's responses to these activities. Swadener uses the lens of "Education that is Multicultural" or, EMC. EMC is based in a commitment to the "fair presentation of cultural issues" but also issues of gender, class and exceptionality (p. 4).

Center A had small groups discussions on human diversity topics on 7 of the 18 observations. Swadener (1986) noted that these often built on students' prior knowledge and used props to explore the topic. The most common concept of multicultural education discussed was human difference. Three out of 36 activities dealt with racial, ethnic or cultural diversity. Teachers modeled the use of non-stereotypical language as well as a non-

⁶Early Childhood- Early Childhood Consultant

⁷ A lag in a child's development including: emotional, behavioral, cognitive or physical.

competitive attitude. Swadener found that children used less gender-restricted language later in the year, but over all, concluded that children's responses to what the center taught varied.

For Center B, Swadener (1986) noted very few activities that dealt with racial ethnic or cultural diversity. The researcher observed diversity curriculum on 16 out of 28 visits. Materials in the classroom, like books and posters, depicted racial diversity. Teachers used non-sexiest language and taught with materials that were free of gender-bias.

Swadener (1986) concluded that these two preschools' diversity issues were not often talked about. Though teachable moments were taken advantage of. The researcher also concluded that most preschool aged children had a basic understanding of human diversity. Teachers and staff cited lack of time, age appropriateness, and authenticity for reason why they did not include more "Education that is Multicultural".

These two mainstream preschools did have a small amount of multicultural education. It seems that human difference was the most common topic discussed at these sites. From the data gathered it would appear that gender bias curriculum is much easier to teach and more accessible to these early childhood teachers than race, or cultural bias.

These sites give a small glimpse into educators' hesitations for teaching education that is multicultural. If the educators had more support and resources they might feel more confident in teaching deeper issues related to education that is multicultural. In one area that they taught more often and used more resources and awareness with, gender bias, the students showed greater awareness.

Swadener (1986) increased the fairness of this study by including arguments against her purposed results. An example includes, young children are egocentric and cannot comprehend detailed concepts. It is because of this that they cannot avoid stereotyping. The researcher also improved her dependability by citing multiple studies with similar findings. The researcher included member checks with the teachers at the centers by discussing field notes immediately following her observations. A neutral party knowledgeable in childhood development did interpretations of sample observations. This was to promote stronger reliability. By looking at an ethnically diverse population as well as one with developmentally delayed students Swadener allows the transferability of this study to be increased. However, teacher to student ratio at these sites are worth mentioning because they are abnormally low when compared to a traditional public school. The ratio, approximately 3:5, may allow for more one on one and small group instruction. This must be considered when examining transferability of results. Concerning prolonged and substantial engagement, though observations took place over an entire school year (what is consider a valid time line for similar ethnographic studies) the researcher was only at the site for 2-3 hours a week. This does lend itself to noticing materials, classroom set up, and pedagogical style, but does not lend itself to keeping track of events, behavior and finding a pattern in these. This research would recommend more hours to be spent in observation to increase the strength of the study.

Cohen (2000) completed a mixed methods case study on Head Start programs nationwide, examining the services these programs offer to diverse populations. Further examined what type of multicultural material and

activities existed. He used the annual self-report survey of programs, and sent out additional surveys. Surveys were sent to approximately 2,000 head start programs and 1,413 were returned. There were site visits to 30 programs including 58 classrooms. These sites were chosen as the sample based on their diversity of children, families, staff, innovative classroom materials and curricula, as well as staff training in multicultural awareness.

Cohen's (2000) purpose for this study was founded in his observation of the increasing needs of an ever-growing diverse population. He felt that "...incorporating family differences and multicultural principles" into schools is paramount to meet these needs (Cohen, p. 14).

He found that the head start program had ten Multicultural principles:

1. Every individual is rooted in a culture.
2. The cultural groups represented in the communities and families of each Head Start program are the primary source of culturally relevant programming.
3. Culturally relevant and diverse programming requires learning information about the culture of difference group and discarding stereotypes.
4. Addressing cultural relevance in making curriculum choices is a necessary, developmentally appropriate practice.
5. Every individual has the right to maintain his or her identity while acquiring the skills requires to function in our diverse society.
6. Effective programming requires staff who reflect the community and families served.
7. Culturally relevant programming requires staff who reflect the community and families served.
8. Multicultural programming benefits all children by enabling them to develop and awareness of, respect for, and appreciation of individual cultural differences.

9. Culturally relevant and diverse programming examines and challenges institutional and personal biases.
10. Culturally relevant and diverse programming and practices are incorporated in all components and services. (ACYF, 1992)

Head start programs were encouraged to seek out more culturally representative materials, especially books. Parents often played a role in this area . Programs took their students on field trips to expose the children to different culture. Field trips included: Chinese shops, Museums of Mexican history, and ethnic dance performances. The classrooms observed had posters representing different ethnicities. They had a variety of multicultural books and tapes in Spanish, English and Vietnamese. Different prescribed programs claimed to be used by different sites that included a wide scope of multicultural curriculum: Living Together Peacefully, and Roots and Wings⁸. The most common artifact found in classrooms were dolls representing multiple cultures, next was music followed by food and books.

Researchers found that Head Start staff had different understandings of the meaning and approaches to multiculturalism. The programs varied widely in their approaches to the degree how multicultural curriculum was implemented. Cohen (2000) noted that very few programs use anti-bias or activist curriculum. Instead they used what James Banks referred to as “tourist curriculum” (p. 43). For example, during the Chinese New Year students made dragons and ate wontons. During Cinco de Mayo, the students ate quesadillas and played with a piñata. Cohen relates this to the

⁸ *I will not go into detail about these programs because the research does not. Instead I will detail the most common aspects of multicultural curriculum in the sites visited.*

lack of materials available and teacher training. Even though in some cases materials were available, Cohen found that teachers were unsure how to implement or use the materials and curriculum.

It seems that these head start programs were making an effort to include multicultural and culturally responsive curriculum into their classrooms, but did not focus on the human rights or social justice areas of those pedagogies. Even though materials may have been available, teachers lacked the necessary training and support. It is important to note that teachers did see the importance of getting parents and the community involved, as well as using authentic experiences such as field trips in their curriculum.

Cohen's (2000) research has strong credibility because it described the data collection process. It had multiple forms a data collection with both qualitative and quantitative methods. This process increased triangulation. He gave examples of each area of discussion and included charts and graphs as well as quotes and observations. This document, though extracted from a database, was not peer-reviewed. This is worth noting. Also, much of the data gathered for use in this study took place in the years between 1993 and 1995, which may be outdated compared to the Head Start programs today.

Johansson (2002) also studied preschools and how teachers encourage children to develop moral values. Through a qualitative life-world study Johansson observed daily interaction in 30 different preschools across Sweden. She also conducted interviews and fielded questionnaires. Johansson observed each preschool for three days on two different occasions.

Johansson (2002) used the theoretical perspective of the life-world, where the subject is viewed as inseparable from the world. She used the definition of empathy as "...an individual who experiences someone else's distress, experiences the same or similar emotional feelings" (p. 205). By using the life-world approach to view morality, Johansson felt that "...morality grows out of inseparable relations between subjects rather than being the results of an autonomous subject's logical reasoning" (p. 205).

The teachers in these sites often engaged the students in moral questions and guided them to show considerations for others. The major themes of morality taught were: having concern for others, understanding others emotional feelings, and understanding the consequences of actions toward others. They taught these concepts by explaining students' emotions to each other; engaging the students in conversation about one another's emotions, and helping students understand the connection between actions and emotions. The teachers believed that morality grew from compassion and they demonstrated the norms as models for the students.

Johansson (2002) found that pedagogues showed "...great engagement in the moral question" (p. 206), and focused on helping children show consideration for others. However, there were many different opinions about what consideration for others was, and how an educator goes about teaching these values. Johansson found that teachers focused on two main ideas: teaching the understanding of others, and setting limits and rules in the classroom to avoid conflicts.

The researcher presented arguments against her opinion, improving the fairness of the study. For example, she asked the question: Are children

born with morality vs. it being a learned subject. The multiple forms of data collection and a strong theoretical base making the credibility strong. The transferability is high for schools in Sweden because the participants are from 30 different schools from all over the country. However, the structure and legislation supporting these schools may be very different than those in other countries, making me caution the transferability to schools outside Sweden. The amount of time spent in the site seems minimal for a qualitative study. Six hours per school for this research, I would argue, is not prolonged or substantial engagement.

Nganga (2005) focused on early childhood programs as well, examining existing instructional strategies and curricula that address diversity. More specifically, culture and race in rural education programs. Using mixed methods research, her case study mailed a survey to 200 program administrators with a 50% return rate. The researcher focused on the Rocky Mountain region of the U.S. The early childhood education programs were both licensed and exempt, with responding administrators being mostly monocultural, monoracial, and female. The researcher also conducted in-depth interviews with five purposefully selected childhood educators.

Nganga's (2005) lens is based in the work of Dr. Sonia Nieto's competent culturally responsive teachers. Nganga wrote, "Culturally competent responsive educators are able to fully appreciate the link between culture and the manner in which people interact with others. As a result, competent culturally responsive teachers teach from the heart" (p. 4). She felt that rural communities with monoracial and monocultural communities

lacked culturally responsive teachers. She used these beliefs and theories to study these sites.

From these surveys, Nganga (2005) found a strong positive correlation between national accreditations and the availability of multicultural curriculum. There was also a positive correlation between federal funding and national accreditation. Forty two percent of the programs had written multicultural policies/ guidelines, but only 33% required teachers to follow those guidelines (p. 2-3). Forty one percent of the programs provided professional development activities. The most common supplies and resources teacher used included multicultural books, posters, pictures, dolls, drama, and musical items.

Based on these findings, Nganga (2005) called for more written, high quality multicultural curriculum, policies and guidelines to assist teachers in mainstream rural schools. She also argued that schools needed to recruit more multicultural and multiracial teachers. In addition they need to provide necessary professional development and bring the communities into the schools.

The connection between national accreditation and the availability of multicultural curriculum shows that having support, structure and standards is linked to more multicultural curriculum. However, the study is not clear about what those curricula involve. The positive correlation between federal funding and national accreditation tells me that schools with federal funding have more multicultural materials available. A majority of the schools did not require teachers to follow any sort of multicultural curriculum guidelines, and less than half offered profession development. Nganga (2005) makes it

clear what she feels is needed to improve the competent culturally responsive teaching in these schools. The key ingredients mentioned are very similar ones in studies of successful schools whose values are based on those of social justice.

This study is well based in literature and cites similar studies with similar findings. Nganga (2005) used mixed methods to provide for triangulation. Because this article was retrieved from an electronic educational database, but was an online submission, no peer review was noted. The transferability is higher because the sample size is large, but the results should be restricted the data to rural U.S schools in seemingly monoracial communities.

Reid (2006) used comparative study to compare mutli/intercultural education in Australia and the Netherlands. The researcher examined policy documents, research reports, and articles that focused on classrooms in these countries. Her purpose was to find the umbrella policies and curriculum, if any, dealing with multi/intercultural education.

Reid's (2006) theoretical lens lies in Sleeter and Grants Social Resconstructivist approach to multi/intercultural education. The researcher argues for reflective and democratic education and for the development of political literacy that links these struggles to issues of wider social justice, leading to social transformation.

Reid (2006) found that in Australia, their "multicultural education" has three essential features: Loyalty to Australia, acceptance of the Australian system, and mutual respect (p. 63). The Netherlands has a nationally backed "Community Harmony" program that has the theme "you + me = us" (p. 66).

Only schools with diverse populations teach multiculturalism as a separate issue. Teachers often saw this education as teaching for tolerance, empathy and communication.

Reid (2006) concluded that both countries incorporated anti-racism in their curriculum, but only Australia made it explicit. This often looked like anti-bullying campaigns or responses to violence. She notes that the schools are expected to provide multi/intercultural education, but there is no special subject area for it.

Reid (2006) calls for local responses to multicultural education rather than a “general toolkit.” She noted that there has been little research into the classroom practices in relation to multicultural education in these two countries (p. 67).

For Australia it seems that their main multicultural policies have the perspective of nationalism. In the Netherlands it seems that there is effort made to teach multicultural education; or at least emotional values necessary for social justice and human rights education, such as empathy and tolerance. Although both of the governments “expect” their teachers to teach multi/intercultural education, there is apparently a lack of structure and resources for these educators to teach quality multicultural education.

Reid (2006) had a strong base in similar studies and historical literature. The research did not include examples from the documents studied, which makes it difficult to track their interpretations to the source. This lowers the confirmability of this study because the data is not explicit. This study lacked clarity on triangulation, time spent studying, and exact data

examined. This made the credibility lower when looking at the transferability of this data.

In looking at these studies that revolved around how mainstream schools teach social education, we found some similarities and differences between schools and countries. Swadener (1986) concluded that in the participants' preschools, diversity issues were not often talked about (though teachable moments were taken advantage of). The researcher also concluded that most preschool aged children had a basic understanding of human diversity. Teachers and staff cited lack of time, age appropriateness, and authenticity for reason why they did not include more "Education that is Multicultural". These two mainstream preschools did have a small amount of multicultural education and human difference was the most common topic discussed at these sites.

In review of this section, Cohen (2000), who also looked at mainstream early childhood programs found that head start programs were making an effort to include multicultural and culturally responsive curriculum into their classrooms. However her study did not focus on the human rights or social justice areas of those pedagogies. Even though materials may have been available, teachers lacked the necessary training and support.

Johansson (2002) who also looked at pre-school age students and found that the participant teachers often engaged the students in moral questions which guided them to show considerations for others. The major themes of morality taught were: having concern for others, understanding others emotional feelings, and understanding the consequences of actions toward others. The teachers taught these concepts by explaining students'

emotions to one another, engaging students in conversation about one another's emotions and feelings, and helping students understand the connection between actions and emotions.

Nganga (2005) used mix methods research when looking at early childhood programs. She found a strong positive correlation between national accreditations and the availability of multicultural curriculum. There was a positive correlation between federal funding and national accreditation. The connection between national accreditation and the availability of multicultural curriculum showed that having support, structure and standards is linked to more multicultural curriculum. The positive correlation between federal funding and national accreditation tells me that schools with federal funding have more multicultural materials available. A majority of the schools did not require teachers to follow any sort of multicultural curriculum guidelines, and less than half offered profession development.

Finally, Reid (2006) looked at programs in Australia and The Netherlands. She concluded that both countries incorporated anti-racism in their curriculum, but only discovered that Australia made it explicit. This often looked like anti-bullying campaigns or responses to violence. She noted that the schools were expected to provide multi/intercultural education, but there was no particular subject area for it. For Australia it seemed that their main multicultural policies were rather that of nationalism. In the Netherlands it seem that there was effort made to teach multicultural education; or at least emotional values necessary for social justice and human rights education such as empathy and tolerance. Although both of the

governments “expect” their teachers to teach multi/intercultural education, there was a lack of structure and resources for these educators to teach quality multicultural education.

The researchers in all of these studies were strongly grounded in social justice and multicultural theories including those of Sleeter, Grant, Banks and Nieto. These frameworks allowed the researchers to search for high quality multicultural and social justice education within mainstream schools and programs. However, it seems that they did not find it.

The most common ways that mainstream programs provided multicultural or moral curriculum seemed to be through books, posters, dolls and other props. This could be tied to the lack of support, funding, and professional development. There was little evidence of human rights or social justice education. Mainly, the curriculum focused on moral education and education pertaining to human difference.

Many researchers have found that educators have different ideas of what multicultural education, and moral development education is (Cohen, 2000; Johansson, 2002). This could also be a cause for lack of structure and high quality curriculum. The next section will delve further into what preservice and mainstream teachers understanding of these pedagogies looks like.

Preservice Teachers’ Views on Social Justice

This section examines mainstream pre-service teachers assumptions and beliefs about teaching diversity, and social justice. Studies include Hyland and Noffke (2005), Clarke (2006), and Kelly (2009). This section is

important to the research question because these beliefs are directly related to the attitudes and approaches these educators use or are going to use, to teach themes of social justice and diversity in their classrooms. This section may also help pinpoint how to improve teacher education programs and teacher support to assist teachers in ways to educate for social justice.

Hyland and Noffke (2005) completed a qualitative action research project finding out how preservice teachers could improve teaching for social justice. They collected students' written reflections and assignments, completed observations of in-class presentations, and audiotaped focus group interviews (with 4-6 self selected pre-service teachers per group). The pre-service teachers were students of Hyland and her research partner Noffke. The researchers main focus was to see how their students (the preservice teachers) developed concepts of social justice (more specially marginality and privilege) within the course they taught. The study took place over a two year time period.

The participants included 198 pre-service teachers from two elementary social studies methods classes from University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and University of Delaware. The majority of the participants were between the ages of 19 and 21, female and white.

Hyland and Noffke (2005) situated their work in that of Gonzales and Moll (1995), Billings (1994), and Sleeter (2000). They focused on important characteristics of effective teachers. The most important being relationships with the local community, more specifically developing relationships with those in historically marginalized communities (Hyland & Noffke, p. 368). Before entering into the research they had strong beliefs that teachers need to

“understand and interrogate oppression... and fight for social justice”
(Hyland & Noffke, p. 379).

The researchers examined the data to find patterns in how preservice teachers saw themselves in relation to marginalized groups. They also examined how the students perceived social justice and social activism in their teaching . They coded the results using narrative and epiphanic analysis⁹.

Hyland and Noffke (2005) found that through structured assignments and community involvement, the preservice teachers developed respect for, knowledge of and relationships with members of historically marginalized communities. They identified the most influential assignments involved examining other peoples lives in a political and historical context, large group and small group discussions, and meeting people from historically marginalized groups in contexts that were designed and led by the people themselves.

Community involvement, class discussion, and examining experiences of others would be beneficial to students of all ages. Although this research gives a glimpse into the beliefs of these preservice teachers, what this study does not show is if and how these teachers will use these beliefs in their practice.

As for the strengths and weaknesses of this study, the researchers admit to their investment in the as the teacher educators of the participants. For precaution they changed the names of all of the students. This prevented

⁹ This is a form of data analysis where descriptions are of the thoughts and feelings of the participants. They are typically collected in an interview format.

them from knowing what class or university they were from. The researchers were clear with data that was not found and the amount of questions they still had surrounding the issues of social justice education and how it was studied, including: "Do we sully the authenticity of these events by making them objects of inquiry?" (Hyland & Noffke, 2005, p. 380). Because the researchers were also the teachers, this study must be seen as a small glimpse into some preservice teachers responses. The prolonged substantial engagement is high and there was a large sample group.

Clarke (2006) also studied preservice teachers beliefs towards social justice. The researcher used a mixed method research study to examine preservice teachers attitudes towards social justice, and how they taught it. Clarke did focus interviews, gave pre and post program questionnaires, and analyzed them using SPSS and Likert-Type scales. The participants were from a student cohort from a post-graduate teacher education program in Ireland. The cohort had 195 students, and 128 completed the questionnaire. Twenty two percent of the pre-service teachers were male, and 78% female. Sixty four percent had no previous teaching experience. A majority of the participants were under the age of 25.

Clarke's (2006) lens for this study was the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity. The foundation is based in an understanding and awareness that global relationships should be embedded in curriculum and teacher education. It is a view that focuses on the value of cultural diversity. Clarke looked at diversity through the scope of Lynch and Lodges definition of " the recognition model of social justice where there is respect for different identities, values and lifestyles and focuses attention on

the way in which socio-cultural and symbolic injustices are rooted in patterns of representation, interpretation and communication” (p. 373).

Clarke (2006) found that preservice teachers have high levels of awareness and sensitivity in relation to diversity. Fifty six percent of the subject agreed that schools are the main institution for promoting democracy. Approximately 75% agreed that “third world issues” should be taught within subject areas. All of the participants agreed that people of all races should have equal access to basic rights and freedoms. Over 80% of the subject agreed that development issues should be explored in the classroom.

Participants were asked to rank, in order of importance, their teaching goals. Individual student work and individual student development of academic achievement were ranked the highest; while fostering acceptably and involvement in current issues were ranked much lower.

From these results Clarke (2006) concluded that there was no relationship established between the participants teaching goals, and their attitudes toward diversity. Their pedagogical strategies were “...largely conservative and traditional” (p. 383). Clarke noted that in the classrooms multicultural material was plentiful, but multicultural activities were not taught. Instead there was a tendency to fall back on traditional pedagogical practices.

Teachers seemed to have a general interest and concern for issues of diversity, but are missing a key ingredient to actually turn their beliefs into classroom practices. Their priorities for their classroom focused around individual student achievement and did not include community building or social justice awareness.

This study was clear with its data collection process and evaluation. It cited similar studies with similar findings to increase triangulation. It had a strong base in social justice theories and referenced important authors and pedagogues in these areas, such as Nieto and Banks. Clarke (2006) concluded her study by generalizing the results to all preservice teachers; the external validity of this study is not strong enough for this generalization¹⁰.

Kelly (2009) also explored assumptions of preservice teachers on teaching for social justice. Kelly used individual interviews focusing her study on elementary school teachers in western Canada. Kelly, similar to Clarke (2006), believed that preservice teachers current views about what teaching for social justice would translate directly into classroom practices for social justice.

Kelly (2009) solicited volunteers from an elementary teachers program cohort. The researcher noted that participants prior to this study were taught by a teacher with a strong base in social issues education and, therefore, reflected more favor than a random sample toward the idea of social justice education.

Kelly's (2009) theoretical framework is grounded in the work of Gale and Densmore, and their anti-oppressive education. This pedagogy is presented in three parts. Part one: the role of teacher is one of critical analyzer. The teacher must be aware of institutional inequities and oppression based on gender, race, sexuality, class, ability age, etc. The teacher must attempt to offset oppressive powers. Part two: The teacher must have a

¹⁰ ***Only looking at one teacher education program, and only one cohort within that program.***

commitment to action to achieve their beliefs of social justice. They must create a classroom that is action-oriented in its stand on social justice. Part three: The teacher must understand that learning and teaching are social practices situated in social and historical context.

Kelly (2009) interviewed 12 volunteers for an hour-long semi-structured interview process. The researcher then interviewed eight of the 11 after the program. Eleven of the participants were Euro-Canadian, while one was Japanese Canadian. Eight were early elementary teachers and four were upper elementary teachers. The interview transcripts were analyzed and themes and patterns were established.

The results of her study showed that approximately half of the participants felt that elementary children are relatively uninterested in daily world events, that they are incapable of forming nuanced opinions and are unable to analyze political issues. The teachers believed that children entering kindergarten would understand concepts like fairness and inclusion; these are concepts Kelly (2009) felt were central to teaching social justice. All of the participants were supportive of the idea of teaching for social justice but "...their ways of conceptualizing this varied considerably" (p. 205). Most saw teaching for social justice as in the classroom as anti-bullying and acceptance of difference. Kelly (2009) recognized the newness in this area of study and called for more research regarding: how teachers create social justice curriculum in elementary schools, what social justice looks like in practice, and how children understand various equity related issues.

Kelly (2009) was transparent with the selection process and assumptions regarding the participants of the study, which increased

credibility. Also, to add to the strength of the credibility, member checks took place where the drafts were shared with the participants and dialogue was held concerning clarifications. This was a very small sample size that was compiled of subjects mostly the same age and sex. The transferability of this data to all preservice teachers is quite low.

In review this section visited preservice teachers views on teaching social education including issues of social justice. In the first study, Hyland and Noffke (2005) found that through structured assignments and community involvement the pre-service teachers developed respect for, knowledge of, and relationships with members of historically marginalized communities. They identified the most influential assignments involved examining other peoples lives in a political and historical context, large group and small group discussions. In addition, meeting people from historically marginalized groups in contexts were designed and led by the people themselves.

Clarke (2006) also studied preservice teachers and concluded that there was no relationship established between the participants teaching goals and their attitudes toward diversity. Their pedagogical strategies were "...largely conservative and traditional" (p. 383). Clarke noted that in the classrooms multicultural material was plentiful, but multicultural activities were not taught. Instead there was a tendency to fall back on traditional pedagogical practices. Teachers seemed to have a general interest and concern for issues of diversity, but are missing a key ingredient to actually turn their beliefs into classroom practices. Their priorities for their classroom focused around

individual student achievement and did not include community building or social justice awareness.

Kelly (2009) also looked at preservice teachers assumptions about teaching for social justice. The results of her study showed that approximately half of the participants felt that elementary children were relatively uninterested in daily world events, that they were incapable of forming nuanced opinions and were unable to analyze political issues. The teachers believed that children entering kindergarten would understand concepts like fairness and inclusion; concepts that Kelly felt were central to teaching social justice. All of the participants were supportive of the idea of teaching for social justice but "...their ways of conceptualizing this varied considerably" (p. 205). Most saw teaching for social justice as in the classroom as anti-bullying and acceptance of difference.

Though a majority of the pre-service teachers in these studies believed that education in social justice is important, what these studies seem to be showing us was that their conceptualizations as well as actual practices seem disconnected from this belief. This results from many things. For some it was a simplistic view of social justice education (revolving around acceptance of different or anti-bullying). Others were not equipped with the support or tools to bring their values into actual classroom practices and fell into the grooves of routine. What this section tells us is that many pre-service teachers have some knowledge of social justice education but the researchers, who have strong theoretical backgrounds and frameworks, are not seeing such frameworks transferred to their participants. Now that this paper has examined how preservice teachers view social justice and values education,

the following section examines how teachers and principals, dedicated to social justice, work within the contexts of mainstream schools.

Teachers and Principals That Teach for Social Justice

This section examines studies that focus on teachers and principals who are committed to teaching for social justice within their schools. This differs from the previous section because it is not about schools that value social justice. Instead it is individual teachers and principals within mainstream schools who are the participants. Studies include Stevenson (2007), Sleeter (2008) and Epstein and Olyer (2008). By looking at these teachers and principals as guides, we may be able to pinpoint ways in which they integrate their philosophies into mainstream school settings. We can also identify their difficulties.

Stevenson (2007) examined five different school administrators who self identified as promoting social justice and inclusive learning. He used qualitative data from five different case studies, interviews with the principals, staff, students, as well as members of the community. Interviews ranged from 30 minutes to two hours. Data was analyzed using process and coded memoing to identify themes.

The participants were from five different school districts in England. These were urban schools with diverse ethnic populations and were considered low income. All of the principals in this study had been their positions at their schools for two years or more.

Stevenson (2007) detailed the history of social justice in England's educational system from the government level. He identified a key point that

social justice, or the more popular term in this case, social inclusion, rarely have agreed upon definitions. He hypothesized that the lack of clarity and definition of these terms in relation to education is what has led to the lack of policy or strong supportive framework from the government.

The results of this study from Stevenson (2007) show that key features in leadership committed to social justice are that the educator must possess explicit values in concern to equity and inclusion. Also, they must be able to articulate their values to the school community. Ways in which this was evident from the participants in this study include: curriculum, teaching and learning, inclusive organization, hiring a nurturing staff, and mobilizing the support of the community to meet these education goals. The principals often noted, however, that issues of social justice were very complex and could not be solved easily. All of the participants had implemented zero-tolerance attitudes towards all forms of racism in their schools. The ethnic profile of the staff reflected the local community and the schools had links with the local community (Stevenson, 2007).

One particular problem highlighted in this study is that of standardized testing, national reports cards, and the commitment to social justice. Stevenson (2007) documented a few cases from these participants where because of their commitment to social justice, they have had troubles maintaining their status with the community. One principal, because of her commitment to social justice and inclusion, allowed many of the “troubled” and immigrant students into her school. This resulted in lower average standardized test scores and made the school “at risk.” The school then became unattractive to upper and middle class families (p. 777).

The participants of this study demonstrated their commitment to social justice through their policies and hiring practices. Effective principals were able to clearly articulate their values into ways that supported their school and community. The participants in this study still struggled with governmental policy and governmental support in the newer age of standardized testing.

Stevenson (2007) brings up arguments against his views, for example, that argue it is the role of educational leadership to place emphasis on performance and market success rather than values. This increased the fairness of this study. He sites others studies with similar findings as support. Stevenson was not clear with the data collected, or the process of collection making the credibility lower.

Sleeter (2008) also explored the difficulties of teaching social justice and democracy in an age of standardized testing. Through a qualitative case study the researcher observed two classroom teachers in California who were committed to teaching democratically. The researcher completed six hours of observation in each teacher's room, and completed an hour-long interview. Also, The researcher collected papers and documents from the participants. The teachers were both ESL classrooms. One was a 6th grade class and the other 2nd grade.

Sleeter (2008) used the theoretical framework of Paulo Freire for this study when talking about the democratic educator. Freire discussed that there was no single body of knowledge that everyone should know. Rather, the value lies in multiple ideas, diverse perspectives, and the ability for these viewpoints to be open to dialogue. Sleeter also sites Ravitch who asserts that

it is important for educators to have "...concern for the welfare of others and the common good"(Sleeter, 2008, p. 142) To have "concern for the dignity and rights of everyone...the value equity and human rights" (Sleeter, 2008, p. 142). The researcher also identified what they saw as an inhibitor of democratic education, Corporatocratic Education. This is where educators value teaching content and skills that are needed by the country and economy. This is a process where students are viewed as resources for global competition.

Sleeter (2008) found that the teachers felt it was their responsibility to empower students to be creative-independent thinkers and responsible citizens. Rita, the 2nd grade teacher, empowered her students by teaching them how to produce books. The teacher integrated standards and her philosophies, while supporting her students as writers and researchers. She also held student collaboration highly in both large and small groups. Rita challenged her students to question authority and critique the operation of the classroom. Rita encouraged her students to embrace their culture and reject the pressures to assimilate. She felt that it was very important for students to learn respect for family and community as well as engage with people different from themselves.

Nancy, the 6th grade teacher, had goals for her students and classroom surrounding citizenship preparation. She encouraged her students to debate, listen, think, and speak their mind (Sleeter, 2008). In her classroom, she had students work with controversial issues, to discuss them, and listen to others points of view. Sleeter (2008) acknowledged that Nancy was passionate about connecting outside issues of politics, democracy and social justice to issues in the students' lives (p. 152-53).

Sleeter (2008) identified that the participants found it difficult to teach these philosophies with the constraints of predetermined curriculum and standards. (p. 141-156). It was because they felt only “somewhat” (p. 152) integrated their philosophies in their classroom. Nancy identified distinct places in her teaching where her ideas conflicted directly with the curriculum to be taught. For example, the social studies textbook taught the students that the United States had the worlds best form of government (which she disagreed with). Another curriculum related anxiety of these teachers was that there was too much to be able to cover in one school year. The teachers identified principal support as important to their teaching.

This article continues the discussion on the ways teachers teach their philosophies related to democracy and social justice in the classroom. Though these two participants differed slightly in their practices, they shared common threads. They both felt that it was important to empower their students, teach them to think critically, facilitate the exploration of peoples different from them, and question social structures. Sleeter (2008) also identified difficulties in these teachers work, most prevalent being navigating the curriculum and standards requirements.

The most important section for credibility in this type of study is the member checks that took place. The participants reviewed the data for accuracy and interpretational validity before it was published. Sleeter (2008) was heavily situated in historical and theoretical literature surrounding this topic, giving it a strong foundation. This sample size is so small that the transferability is much lower.

The next study, Epstien and Olyer (2008) had a similar research design using a qualitative approach to focus on a 1st grade teacher's social action curriculum she used while teaching in a mainstream school. They used interviews, classroom observations, and audio-taped classroom events. They also collected students work. The teacher, Paula, had been a teacher for 34 years. The class in this study was a group of 1st graders from a New York Public School.

The theoretical framework Epstien and Olyer (2008) used for this study revolves around Social Action Curriculum. This is identified as curriculum that focuses on citizenship and social justice. It involved using social action projects where students worked with the community to explore societal problems. Students were encouraged to "...consider the relationships of social, economic, and political factors" in these societal problems (p. 415).

Paula enacted her philosophies in many different ways within the classroom. Some pedagogical choices included: Student-led decision-making, discussion of multiple viewpoints, and student reflection and evaluation of their outcomes (Epstien & Olyer, 2008). She established reasons for her students to take action. Within her curriculum Paula identified socio-historical understandings of current societal problems, developed activists and community organizations skills, and worked on community advocacy and solidarity with others (Epstien & Olyer, 2008). She used literature and songs that had themes of social justice within them (Epstien & Olyer, 2008). Her students often came into contact with people from marginalized situations. They met these people as heroes, not just victims. The researchers identify this as beneficial because it expanded the students understanding of

who is an expert. Also, it criticizes the thought of a single narrative to tell the story of the outside world. Overall, Paula made sure her curriculum built on her students' interests as well as needs. The largest difficulty Paula identified in her teaching was finding enough time to teach everything.

What is unclear in this study is how student achievement was affected by Paula's teaching philosophies, as well as what type of support or school Paula taught in. This made the transferability of this study delicate because it is difficult to generalize the ability of this one teacher and her philosophies without more information. Epstein and Olyer (2008) had multiple ways of data collection, and studied Paula's class for one school year which is considered prolonged and substantial engagement.

These studies (Stevenson, 2007; Sleeter, 2008; Epstein & Olyer, 2008) teased out some common attributes of principals and teachers who hold strong philosophies in social justice and democracy, and teach in mainstream schools. Some common best practices include: community involvement, equity and equality, inclusion, and social action. More specifically for the teachers, common classroom practices include: Students as critical thinkers and questioners, curriculum that includes multiple perspectives and is situated within historical and societal contexts of oppression. From two of the studies (Stevenson, 2007; Sleeter, 2008) this paper gave a glimpse into the difficulties of teachers and administrators who held strong values that conflict with the standards movements taking place in current society. Studies from both the United States and England identify mandated standards and curriculum as major speed bumps in their teaching. Sleeter (2008), and Epstein and Olyer (2008) identify time limits as a major inhibitor

to the teachers. Some of these teachers use specific methods to teach for social justice. The next section will examine some other methods that mainstream teachers' use within mainstream schools.

Mainstream Teachers' Methods

This section examines social education based in pedagogical methods that mainstream teachers in mainstream schools have added to their curriculum. Included are: Lundeberg (1995), Simon and Clarke-Ekong (1999), Gimmestad (2001), and Al-Jafar and Busselli (2004). All of these programs were added for a brief time to the site. Sometimes by the teachers and sometimes they were taught by the researcher through participant observation methods.

Lundeberg (1995) used qualitative action research to study an educator who used telecommunications to build multicultural perspectives within their classroom. The participants were third grade students from a rural elementary school in the U.S. The class was comprised of 24 students all of Euro-American decent. More than half were special education or chapter one. The teacher had four years of elementary teaching experience, a B.A. and Masters degree. He also had experience with telecommunications and problem-based learning.

This program linked a class of students in Russia to the class in the United States. Students in the U.S. were instructed to find an American fairy tale to read to their Russian partner. The retelling of these stories were hand carried to Russia, then the Russian students found the Russian equivalent of the fairy tales and sent fax summaries of these stories. The teacher then read

the Russian retellings out loud and discussed with the students the differences and similarities between the fairy tales. The goals of the method were to increase the students' knowledge of Russian and American culture through the use of fairy tales. Also to improve the students summarizing skills, to build multicultural perspectives through discussion, reflection and large group work.

Lundeberg (1995) found that the students became more aware of what was happening in Russia on a daily basis and developed global perspectives. After the activities 50% of the students were able to identify Russia on a map, compared with 11% on the pretest. The teacher's journal reflected that the students became involved in global news on a more personal level, caring about their pen pals and their families when dangerous things were reported in Russia. When asked about the feelings of a dangerous event happening in Moscow, 45% of students thought of their pen pals. The teacher reflected that he felt the students were more aware of the world around them and that the students were able to infer key parts of the culture from the stories in this activity. For example, they identified what types of foods were important to the culture.

Lundeberg (1995) reflected that teachers should facilitate understanding between cultures by setting up projects like this one, projects that encourage dialogue. He noted that the teacher who taught this method also worked hard on community building in their classroom, encouraged respect, tolerance, and presented multiple perspectives.

Constant journal keeping may have helped monitor for progressive subjectivity. Lundeberg (1995) held debrief meetings as a form of member

checks. The logic used to interpret the data was not explicit. There is little proof that the researcher was fair in his results because they seem to reflect his beliefs and feelings. The main form of data collection from the students was the use of large group interviews. This is not an accurate way to test students' knowledge because some students may speak more or less than others. Social factors weight too heavily into the results. Multiple confounding variables played into this study so how is it known for sure that the results were from this treatment when there are specific things about this teacher that make him different. Because this paper cannot answer this question, it is a critique of this study.

Simon and Clarke-Ekong (1999) examined how a hands-on method of teaching about human diversity worked in high school and middle school classrooms. Through a pretest/posttest quantitative study they investigated a multicultural education method of teaching through science. They used questionnaires for the pretest/posttest and measured the results with a Likert-type scale.

The participants were 187 high school and middle schools students from five different schools. Ninety-nine were from public school and 88 were from private. The grades involved were 6th-12th. Eighty were male and 107 were females. Twenty-nine students were African American, 137 were European Americans, 6 Hispanic, and 10 Asian.

The theoretical base of Simon and Clarke-Ekong's (1999) was in the work of Sleeter and Grant. They believed that a multicultural curriculum was about "narrowing the gap between 'us' and 'them' (p. 225). Their focus was on curriculum that could change student's attitudes towards inclusivity.

Simon and Clarke-Ekong argue, "...schools are society's second most important institution of socialization, after the family" (p. 25).

The curriculum was developed by the Center for Human Origin and Cultural Diversity (CHOCD) at the University of Missouri, St. Louis. It was developed as a model for new methods to teach multicultural education. Simon and Clarke-Ekong (1999) noted that the ideal environment for this method was a supportive, nonthreatening classroom that encouraged group participation, and had multiple opportunities for self-discovery.

The curriculum revolved around the study of human shared origin. The activities dealt with human bone formation, origin, and skin color (melanin). It was the goal of these tasks for the student to see that we all have common characteristics that make us members of the human family (Simon & Clarke-Ekong, 1999). It was the goal of the educators working with this method, to use science and common human traits to celebrate the likeness and differences of humans. They felt that this might transform the way the students thought about themselves and others.

This method involved hands on work in small groups to answer questions related to problems posed. Interaction between students and with materials was strongly encouraged. The goal was to get students to think critically in a self sustaining way. After the activities the students took part in-group discussion (Simon & Clarke-Ekong, 1999).

Simon and Clarke-Ekong (1999) found that there was significant progress in the area of content knowledge ($p < .05$). The students also made a positive change in their awareness ($p < .05$). Ninety percent of the students agreed that the content was important.

The authors concluded with statements about their lack of longitudinal knowledge. They were unsure of how this method will affect students in the long term (Simon & Clarke-Ekong, 1999). But they call for educators to instead of being passive observers, to become active researchers. It is necessary to navigate the complex area of multicultural educational policy.

This study showed a science class method for middle and high schools students that integrated inquiry, biology, and multicultural history. The students' knowledge of the content increased, but there is no way to know if their thoughts or ideas about difference, social justice, or human rights issues changed. This was a strong example of including human difference and multicultural ideals into science by using hands on group work and discussion.

Simon and Clarke-Ekong (1999) had a strong foundation in current literature, and historical theory in multicultural education. They did a pilot test and then revised it before beginning this study. They laid out their pre and posttest process. They had a high sample rate that ranged in age and sex diversity, but not ethnically. The pre and posttests were the same, making the instrumentation stronger. There was no control group to test against for issues like test-wise and experimental treatment diffusion. To make this study stronger there should be a control group, multifaceted data collection on others aspects of the students' thoughts, as well as results of the longitudinal effects.

Gimmestad (2001) also looked at ways to reduce prejudice in students, but through the use of dramatic plays. The researcher used a quantitative pretest/posttest true experimental design with a control group. There were

four sets of knowledge test and a Bogardus Social Distance Scale. There was 2-4 weeks in between the pre and posttests.

The participants were from two public schools in New York. The grade levels were 4-6. Seventy-nine percent of the students were Puerto Rican, 13% Black, 7% Asian, and 5% white. N=304 for the experimental group, and N=255 for the control group.

The plays that were used for this study included: *La Morena*, about a Puerto Rican family living in the U.S in the 1940's and their hardships in trying to gain acceptance; *Things of the Heart: Marian Anderson's Story*, is about the obstacles Marian Andersons faced while becoming a black concert singer; *Grand Street* is about a young Jewish boy who against his parent's approval, wanted to become an actor; *The Dance and the Railroad* is about Chinese railroad workers in America(Gimmestad, 2001, p. 46).

The dramatic play method involved the students reading and then describing the plays. They were asked to describe the sequence of events, the themes, characters, and to analyze the political, economic and socio-historical factors that contributed to the events in the play (Gimmestad, 2001). They were also asked to list contributions that each specific ethnic group had made. To promote empathy the students were encouraged to explore and understand the feelings of the characters in the play by acting out scenes. They were also asked if they, their families, or friends had ever felt the way the person in the play did, and to talk about those instances (Gimmestad, 2001).

The posttest results showed that students in the experimental group had an overall greater knowledge of Black, Jewish, Puerto Rican and Chinese

cultures, then the control group (Gimmestad, 2001). Also, as the student grade level increased, so did the scores. For the social distance scale, (where students detailed through yes or no answers how “close they would get with a person of a certain ethnicity”: 1) allow them to visit their country, 2) be a student in their class, 3) visit their home, and 4) be a relative) (Gimmestad, 2001, p. 47). A significant gain in yes answers were found ($p < .001$) (Gimmestad, 2001, p. 48). This researcher concluded that dramatic plays, along with curricular activities, are effective methods to reduce prejudice in this age group. The researcher also stated that the social distance pretest scores were very high, so the posttest scores were also very high.

Gimmestad (2001) cited many other studies with similar findings. The researcher explicitly added a note on minimizing threats against external validity such as Hawthorne and Halo effects by incorporating these plays into the school program as smoothly as possible. The control group checked for threats to the internal validity: maturation, history, testing etc. He prefaced possible problems with his results including social smarts, (i.e., the students know that they should not say rude things about other people so they don't answer honestly). A concern with this study is in the area of generalizability. The ethnicity of this population includes a majority of the ethnicities that were in the plays and being tested for in the distance scale. This study should be extended to other areas with a different ethnic makeup before it can be generalized to a majority of students.

Al-Jafar and Busselli (2004) also examined how literature can affect children's knowledge of culture. Through qualitative inquiry they used participant observation, interviewing and data collection methods to look at

how storytelling and fairytales can be used to promote cultural understanding and peace in young children. The participants of the study were students of a rural elementary school in the Midwestern U.S. They were ages 7-8 and were in 1st and 2nd grade.

Al-Jafar and Busselli (2004) related cultural understanding to fairytales by stating that they addressed universal themes encountered by many cultures. Stories specifically offer children ways to express themselves. Also during play, children get to experience freedom from structured activity, and are able to situate themselves in the world of others by hearing stories and connecting thoughts.

Al-Jafar (2004) narrated the Kuwaiti version of Cinderella to the students after introducing himself as Kuwaiti. Then he asked them questions about the differences and similarities found between this version and the American version of the story to see if the students had figured out the themes and story line. Lastly, the students worked in small groups to make up their own version of the story.

Al-Jafar and Busselli (2004) concluded that the children were able to see how fairytales from their own country were similar and different “in important ways from fairytales in other cultures” (p. 42). There was no data to support this however. How much can a researcher claim to find using just a feeling? The researchers do say that this activity would be a great starting point to exploring different cultures with children. The methodologies they used were clear, but scant. The results were unclear and not categorized or separated in a structured or coherent method. There were some historical gaps in their framework. The researchers mention “Arabic” people as

historically important storytellers and should extend this to other cultures such as American Indian peoples. Their conclusions do not match their results in a way that shows clarity.

Al-Jafar and Busselli (2004) cite other studies with similar findings. The researchers used three different data collection techniques to strengthen triangulation. Overall, the credibility and transferability of this study is non-existent. This is a perfect example of the difficulty of proving that a multicultural teaching method works with young children. It is important to include this study because it attempted to do what many researchers are calling for, and some could argue that it failed.

In review, this section examined methods mainstream teachers tried to implement social education in addition to their curriculum. Lundeberg (1995) reflected that teachers could facilitate understanding between cultures by setting up projects in telecommunications that encourage dialogue. He noted that the teacher who taught this specific telecommunications method also worked hard on community building in their classroom, encouraged respect, and tolerance, and presented multiple perspectives.

Simon and Clarke-Ekong (1999) looked at a hands-on secondary science class method that focused on human diversity. They found that there was significant progress in the area of content knowledge and the students also made a positive change in their awareness of other cultures. Ninety percent of the students agreed that the content was important. This study showed a science class method for middle and high schools students that integrated inquiry, biology, and multicultural history. This is a great example

of including human difference and multicultural ideals into science by using hands on group work and discussion.

Gimmestad (2001) studied the use of dramatic plays as a way to reduce prejudice in public schools. The posttest results showed that students in the experimental group had an overall greater knowledge of Black, Jewish, Puerto Rican and Chinese cultures, than the control group. Also, as the student grade level increased so did the scores. Gimmestad (2001) concluded that dramatic plays, along with related curricular activities, were effective methods to reduce prejudice this age group.

Al-Jafar and Busselli (2004) also examined how literature can be used as a form of social education within an elementary school. They concluded that the children were able to see how fairytales from their own country were similar and different “in important ways from fairytales in other cultures” (p. 42). The researchers do say that this activity would be a great starting point to exploring different cultures with children.

This section briefly shows methods mainstream teachers are using in mainstream classrooms to teach their students about diversity and inclusion. The results seem to be somewhat successful, though the studies are not very generalizable. It seems to be easier to measure and get successful results when dealing with pure content knowledge of other cultures and human diversity, rather than finding out how students’ views of difference and acceptance of other cultures, has progressed. Overall, it would seem that adding a few simple methods to a mainstream, undertrained teacher and school, might provide some positive results with some students. Within

mainstream schools there are classes focused around social and civic justice. We will examine those in our next section.

Classes Within Mainstream Schools that Promote Social Justice

The following section includes studies of classes that were based in social justice, democracy and human rights. Most take place in mainstream middle and high schools and focusing on civic education, global issues and human rights. Studies in this section include Brabeck and Kenny (1994), Gaudelli and Ferneskes (2004), Bajaj's (2004), Kepenekci (2005) and Bischoff and Mullino (2007). Though all of these classes vary in many ways, most show success in their findings. It is valuable to find the common themes in these classes, as well as investigate the social and political ideologies for which they are situated.

Brabeck and Kenny (1994) studied the effects an 8th social studies class called "Facing History, Facing Ourselves" or FHFO on students moral reasoning and empathy. Their theoretical framework sites that human rights violations are seldom mentioned in middle, high school or even college texts. The FHFO program was developed to respond to this. The program was developed with moral theorists such as Kohlberg and Arendt as guides. The program focuses on dialogue, critical reflection, and multiple perspectives. The class addressed current and past human rights issues. Its goal was to increase students "...human rights vocabularies, moral judgment and critical thinking" (p. 2). The students viewed films, engaged in class discussions, listened to guest speakers, examined historical documents, discussed

readings and wrote in journals that addressed issues of power, morality, justice and caring for others.

FHFO was a required class in human rights for all 8th grade students in the New England suburban public school studied. Sixty eight percent of the students at the school were white,¹¹ n=111 for cohort one and n=144 for cohort two.

Brabeck and Kenny (1994) used multiple instruments for group testing assessing moral reasoning and empathy including a Social Interest Scale, DIT, and Mehrabian and Epstein's Empathy Questionnaire.

Brabeck and Kenny (1994) found that the (FHFO) curriculum contributed to the development of moral reasoning in the students. This study presented an example of one human rights class for middle school students in the United States. The program itself seemed to have themes of knowledge, understanding and discussion about human rights violations both current and historical. More research should be done into the specifics of the program before recommending it to educators. However some pedagogical choices made in this class are student discussion, examination of human rights violations, viewing multiple perspectives, involving the community through guest speakers, and an emphasis on critical thinking (Brabeck & Kenny, 1994).

Brabeck and Kenny (1994) have a strong foundation in other studies that found similar results. The researchers state that a comparison group was not possible because it was a required course; so instead, they tested multiple

¹¹ *The study did not detail the demographics of the other students.*

cohorts in the pre/post test design. The instruments were piloted before official testing took place. Also, they were detailed very clearly, and well supported. They state their weakness, so transparency is high. But the weaknesses exist, hurting other areas of the study. There is a huge amount of missing data due to participant mortality. They felt that this reduction did not significantly impact the results. The generalizability of this study is lower because the lack of diversity in the participants. The lack of control group brings up multiple concerns with the validity. The researchers state, however, that they had alternative forms of DIT to reduce practice effects.

Gaudelli and Ferneskes (2004) also examined how students in a public school in the United States responded to a human rights curriculum. Through a qualitative action-research design they used a pre/post test survey, teacher pre and post interviews, teacher reflection, and student interviews. The location of this study was an affluent suburban high school on the East Coast where 87% of the students will continue on to college. There was Internet access for every student, hundreds of film titles, and multiple computer labs.

There are some important social justice related definitions that Gaudelli and Ferneskes (2004) used in this study that this paper will go over now. Global citizenship is defined within this study as “Contingent with a process of imagining the world in new ways that transcend a nation-state fixation while embracing peace, diversity, complexity, and temporal awareness” (Gaudelli & Ferneskes 2004, p. 3). They also use Hanvey’s¹² five interrelated aspects in developing global orientation: perspective

¹² Robert G. Hanvey is an author, educator and researcher. His work focuses around teaching global perspectives.

consciousness, knowledge of world conditions, cross-cultural awareness, knowledge of global dynamics, and knowledge of alternatives (Gaudelli & Ferneskes, 2004, p. 3). Finally, they cite the importance of Anderson, Nicklas and Crawford, “you are a human being, your home is the planet Earth, you are a citizen of a multicultural society, and you live in an interrelated world” as cited in (Gaudelli & Ferneskes, 2004, p. 3).

The course, comparative world studies, was developed for 11th graders to meet a world history / world cultures graduation requirement. It was based in Willard Kniep’s¹³ five themes, and four essential elements of social studies education: “Interdependence, change, culture, scarcity and conflict; the study of systems, the study of human values, the study of persistent issues and problems, and the study of global history” (Gaudelli & Ferneskes, 2004, p. 4). The course took place over eighteen weeks and met five days a week for eighty-four minutes. The course had three units: international human rights, global security, and tradition and change (Gaudelli & Ferneskes, 2004, p. 5). An important part of this course is the teacher’s ability to teach the human rights course how he or she best sees fit. There is no designed curriculum that teachers must teach so each teacher does teach a little differently. Generally, however, the students go over their schools student handbook to examine their rights then go from micro to macro rights within their state and country (2004).

The students also examine the evolution of human rights from The Code of Hammurabi all the way to Thomas Jefferson. The course ends with a

¹³ Kniep is Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Pacific University’s Institute for Ethics and Social Policy.

simulation of the U.N. Human Rights Committee's annual human rights violation hearings. The students research and build their own cases. The teachers encourage hopeful messages to their students to try to avoid having them reject the travesties they study (Gaudelli & Ferneskes, 2004).

Gaudelli and Ferneskes (2004) surveyed two different classes of students (N=43) in 2003 and (N=48) in 2000. To try to discover why students answered a certain way within the survey. The researchers interviewed the teachers and a stratified sample of students from those teachers' classes. They found that two thirds of the students had never studied human rights before. Most of the students seemed to show interest in the materials taught. Approximately 75% of the students stated that they were more concerned with human rights as a result of the class and 71% reported a willingness to advocate for victims of human rights. Within the student interviews, the participants seemed to be hopeful about their role as global citizens and wanting to do more to help.

Gaudelli and Ferneskes (2004) state that this action research project is so they can inform the wider public. They do not want to generalize about the curriculum rather, "...specify the implications of the practice" (p. 8). They also state their limits when understanding the longitudinal effects of the class on the participants' attitudes. They felt that the teachers would benefit from more professional development in the area of human rights. A particular teacher interviewed from this study labeled "veiling in the middle east" an "obvious" human rights violation (p. 10). This is an ignorant standpoint that clearly represents a western point of view. How in the world are we going to expect our students to move beyond this minimized view of history and

human rights issues if the human rights courses we are teaching them do not even model multiple perspectives? If human rights classes are continuing to be taught from a us/them perspective where the western cultures or white cultures know what's "right" for everyone else, we are not helping but hurting our students? The researchers state in their conclusion that "human rights education that is nationalistic will not help students embrace the humanity in all people." (p. 14).

This study details an innovative curriculum with promising results. The class itself seems to push students to be involved in examining and critically thinking about past and present human rights violations. It is based in strong social justice and goals like the study of systems, global interdependence and common human rights. This research is an example of why educators should be critical of their member development, and curriculum content surrounding multicultural themes. It is unclear how the teachers taught this program as well as how the texts were written. This class should be investigated more thoroughly before it is prescribed it to educators.

Gaudelli and Ferneskes (2004) have a strong foundation in theories and historical literature on human rights and development. They have a clear data collection and organization process. Though the authors cite their limitations, which increases their transparency, it is important to mention the participant school was in a rare location that lowers the transferability of the study dramatically.

Bajaj (2004) also looked at students' responses to a course in human rights but through a mixed methods quantitative/qualitative, pre/post experimental design study with a control group. The pre/post test was a

survey and from there students were selected at random for in-depth interviews. At the end of the course the students were given a four-page questionnaire. Eighteen months after the program, 12 students from the experimental group met for a follow up focus group discussion.

Bajaj's (2004) framework comes from The United States Agency for International Development (USAID). It defines civic education and introduces citizens to basic rules of democracy (i.e., democratic rights, practices, and values. It encourages responsible and informed political participants). Also, Baja references The Universal Declaration of Human Rights which states, "...imparting information about human rights and its function is fostering action" (p. 21).

The participants in the experimental group were a class of 36 8th graders in a public school in an urban slum in the Dominican Republic. They were ages 12-17. All of the students were of low socio-economic status. The country itself had seen authoritarian rule and quasi-democracy (Bajaj, 2004).

The class was based in international human rights principles and designed in consultation with education and human rights activist. The experimental group's teacher was given a one day training and taught 25 lesson that were 60-90 minutes long. The class curriculum taught human rights issues in the Dominican Republic through inquiry based learning (Bajaj, 2004). The content came from the local international human rights monitoring bodies. All of the lessons included guest speakers, interactive lessons, and time for discussion and reflection (Bajaj, 2004).

Bajaj (2004) found that 39% of the experimental groups knowledge of human rights increased. One hundred percent could explain what human

rights were. They were able to identify human rights violations in their local community. Students' responses to human rights violations scenarios indicated a sense of agency and ability to intervene in 3rd party conflicts. Within the school a report indicated that response to conflict nonviolently went up from 41% to 61%. All students in the experimental group responded that they would take action in read aloud factious human rights conflicts while only 33% of the control group responded that they would intervene.

Bajaj (2004) calls for more teacher training in human rights and critical pedagogy, as well as more quantitative research about the results of human rights curriculum. Bajaj also felt that specific human rights curriculum should be geared towards the specific communities' needs.

This is one class that seemed to have a positive effect on its students. Through guest speakers, interactive projects, discussion and reflection the students in the experimental group increased their knowledge of human rights and their desire to be action oriented in the field of social justice.

Bajaj (2004) increased the reliability of this research by citing other studies that found similar findings. The researcher detailed the results of the students through graphs as well as quotes. The study had a control group to check validity issues. Bajaj did state some limitations to her study including improving transparency. Bajaj stated that the surveys were not anonymous, which could skew the student's actual results. The control group selected was from near by schools, but the researcher was not sure if the match was close enough to the control group with respect to academic acceleration. It is possible that because this community had little, government services could have responded very well to the interactive lessons themselves no matter

what the content. Further studies would make the generalizability of this research stronger.

Kepekci (2005) also studied the effectiveness of a human rights class offered in high schools through a mixed methods study. They used content analysis method and asked teachers opinions on 12 open ended questions. The verbal data was then transformed into quantitative data. The participants were 71 volunteer teachers from Ankara, Turkey. Ankara being the capitol was chosen because of its diverse socio-cultural and economic communities.

Kepekci's (2005) theoretical foundation comes from the work of many other researchers. He defines human rights education as education that "...ensures human beings are made aware of the rights they own, learn to use and improve these rights at the highest possible level... such awareness enables people to respect the rights of others, and therefore, develop a sensitive towards violations" (p. 1). Kepekci (2005) discusses that human rights are the foundation for peace education. Peace education prepares students to take responsibility and action to "create a less violent and more just world" (p. 1).

Kepekci (2005) looked at 80 Civics and Human Rights high school teachers. Seventy-one of them volunteered. The teachers were asked to write their opinions to 12 open ended questions. These responses were then coded in predetermined criteria.

Kepekci's (2005) results found that 67% of teachers felt their coursework should be integrated into general classes. Sixty seven percent stated that the content in the textbooks do not match the level of the students. Many teachers wanted less information to cover and more time to teach

content closer to “real life” (p. 60). Only 12% of teachers found their current course sufficient. Those who found it insufficient said it was because of the lack of human right violations presented, and a lack of information on how those who have suffered violations could seek their rights. Forty three percent of teachers felt it was too difficult to teach content in such a short class period. The teacher has little to no way of judging if their human rights courses were effective. Some felt ill prepared and stated that they themselves need courses on human rights. The researcher called for human rights education to be a part of all general education, not just limited to a class. He also felt that along with the integration into general coursework there should be a class to provide special awareness to the field of human rights. He, like Bajaj (2004), discussed the difficulties if finding out if the human rights course was successful.

This study is particularly fascinating because Turkey is known for its controversial record of human rights violations. It is a militaristic country with restrictions on speech, press, and many other actions western are offered as “freedoms.” The results of the study seem congruent with a government implemented human rights course. We can also see parallels with other human rights courses such as too much information to cover in the short time allotted, lack of adequate curriculum, and support.

Kepenekci (2005) sites many similar studies. He states that the smaller sample size is appropriate when using qualitative research when using criterion mapping. Criterion sampling is based in choosing a select group of participants who have the wealth of information you need. In this study, the teachers had the most direct information Kepenekci was looking for.

Bischoff and Mullino's (2007) research was based on pedagogical practices in a religious education class contributing to social justice and peace. They use a qualitative action research design and analyzed the course through observation and anonymous student evaluations. The framework for this study is based in literature on peace education, human difference, and the development of values. Everding and Huffakers ideals of difference say, "human encounters with difference foster empathy by expanding people's experience and challenging their indifference" as cited in (Bischoff & Mullino, 2007, p. 156).

The participants in the study were from a class called Prophetic Pioneers in a religious school with 12 students. Bischoff and Mullino (2007) noted that the class focused on community building. The teacher focused on pedagogy that was engaging, active, contextual, challenging and encouraging. The class analyzed social systems, fostered imagination wonder and empathy, and inspired creativity.

The class looked at the lives of "prophetic pioneers" like Paulo Friere and Elaine Lawless (Bischoff & Mullino, 2007, p.160). The main goal of the curriculum was to engage in and learn about other works, stories and contributions on educational wisdom (Bischoff & Mullino). They found that the students responded well to the course agreeing or agreeing strongly that it helped them to appreciate and learn from others with different views. It encouraged respect for matters of race, gender and class.

Bischoff and Mullino (2007) urge educators to teach the value of human life, and to teach students tools of how to empathize with others and

inspire them to action. Their goal was to illuminate ways to cultivate a spirit of justice and peace within students.

This study showed that schools (very different from the large public schools in the first studies presented) have classes that relate to human rights and social justice issues. Some common themes were also present like the study of history, student discussion and reflection, as well as active and engaging pedagogy.

Bischoff and Mullino (2007) have a strong foundation in literature and historical theories and texts. The transferability of this study is quite low because not enough information is included about the students' school or class. However, the common themes that arise in reference to quality peace and social justice education transcend this small sample size. Similar to government implemented programs, this does not promote educators to blindly follow pre-packaged courses without first investigating their content.

In review the researchers in these studies seem to be calling for more teacher training in the area of human rights (Bajaj, 2004), Gaudelli and Ferneskes (2004), and Kepenekci (2005). So it can be generalized that all across the globe, in schools where just one human rights class is offered, most teacher do not feel, or do not seem to be prepared to teach them. Some of the classes and schools seemed to be better funded than others, but the collection of studies together represents multiple countries with students from varying socioeconomic, political and cultural backgrounds.

These classes mainly were offered to middle school, junior high, and high schools students. Some of them dealt with intricate human rights issues and attempted to tackle major themes around social justice. There were some

common themes within these classes that are important to mention as valuable to human rights and social justice education: discussions and activities revolving around important events and people in both the past and present of human rights; critical thinking and engagement of historical and current documents in relation to human rights; guest speakers, materials, and engaging activities. Classes are not the only way mainstream schools teach for social justice. Through grants and university partnerships, and government implementations many mainstream schools and preschools are attempting to integrate social justice or moral education based programs into their existing activities. This next section details some of these programs.

Social Justice Based Programs in Mainstream Schools

Included in this section are studies of both government and non-government mandated multicultural and social justice inspired programs. These are mainstream schools or preschools that have implemented a program to address diversity, inclusion, anti-bias, and other areas in the social education arena. Studies include Karrby (1974), Murray and Ahammer (1977), Sook-Kyoung and Lewis (1999), Cesar and Oliverira (2005), Carlisle, (2006) and Connolly and Fitzpatrick (2006). The studies identify successful and not so successful programs, how they were implemented, and their effects on the students.

Karrby (1974) completed a qualitative case study investigating how the Insight and Partnerships program affected preschools children in Sweden. Through interviews, observation, and questionnaires he looked at six preschools groups with 18 to 20 six year olds in each case study. Observations

were made before and after the exercises within the treatment, and interviews were done with the children before and after the program. This took place over a time period of 10-12 weeks.

Karrby's (1974) theoretical foundations were based in Kohlberg's model of social and moral development. The model begins with the child being egocentric, it is then from experiences and relationships that the child begins to develop a more "principle-oriented moral approach" (Karrby, p. 3). Though no specific age where this takes place is stated in this study. Karrby points out that Kohlberg believed when children can understand people's viewpoints and begin to generalize, then they will be able to "feel sympathy, and control their actions according to a system of norms" (Karrby, p. 3).

The program was designed to develop moral and social values related to democratic education in the students (Karrby, 1974). The program itself was a collection of suggestions and instructions for educators pertaining to games, activities, reading and conversations revolving around knowledge of self, knowledge of others and family experiences (Karrby, 1974). The program was set up by the government of Sweden as part of their goals to improve social education. The program's proposal elaborated that children at the senior preschool age have developed enough to learn "social and moral concepts such as fairness, good and evil, and right and wrong" (Karrby, 1974 p. 6).

Karrby (1974) identified that activities in this program were designed to increase the students' knowledge of people different from themselves, as well as insight into their own feelings. Specific pedagogies included partner

exercises, work towards a common goal, and conflict resolution through drama and puppets.

The results of the study showed that childrens' knowledge of sex roles and differences increased (Karrby, 1974, p. 10). Of the 18 small groups observed, 10 displayed a rise in "partnership behavior" (Karrby, 1974, p. 11). Karrby found through interviewing the teachers, that the way they implemented the program often reflected their own values. This lead to variations in how the program was taught from teacher to teacher.

This study shows ways in which pre-school children were being taught about moral values related to social justice in another country. During the time of this study, Sweden held social and moral education important for young students, this paper would have preferred a more recent article on the matter to see how the government has progressed in its legislation and implementation.

Karrby (1974) referenced multiple studies that cite similar findings in children's development of empathy, but did not have studies to support the findings from this program. The data collection process was not very clear; Karrby was not very detailed in how he retained his results, other than the type of collection. This paper would have liked to see the questions asked, pictures shown, stories told, etc. The fact that each teacher taught the program differently brings up concerns of multiple-treatment interference. How can we know what part of the program yielded these results?

Similar to Karrby (1974), Murray and Ahammer (1977) were also interested in the development of morals in young children. Murray and

Ahammer focused on how different methods in fostering altruism in kindergartners.

In a pre-test post-test, non-orthogonal, quantitative design, the researchers had 4 different groups receiving four different treatments, and two control groups receiving similar treatments, but with no altruistic aspects. The participants were 97 four and five year olds who attended six different preschools in Sidney, Australia. The program conditions took place for a half an hour per day, five days a week, for four weeks (Murray & Ahammer, 1977). The pre-test and post-test consisted of the same methods. The researchers examined cognitive role taking, social role taking, overt helping, sharing and cooperation. Some of the ways this data was measured include: Piaget's Three mountain task, verbal question and answering about stories, students willingness to help other children instead of playing with an attractive toy, and sharing candies with others (Murray & Ahammer, 1977).

The researchers developed four different training programs. Role Playing (RP) where the students took on other peoples' points of view in a structured activity. The second, Role Playing +Empathy (RP+E), was similar to role-playing but stressed emotional awareness. Third, Role Playing +Empathy +Helping (RP+E+H), added helping situations for the students to take part in. The fourth program consisted of a half-our of "standard T.V"¹⁴ (Murray & Ahammer, 1977, pp. 4-5).

Murray and Ahammer (1977) found that the three role-playing conditions resulted in a significant increase in the helping, sharing,

¹⁴ *Where shows such as I Love Lucy, and the Brady Bunch were played. These often showed pro-social themes.*

cooperation and cognitive role-taking areas of the posttest ($p < .001$) (p. 9). The researchers summarize their findings by identifying major areas related to the development of altruism in children. This included understanding that other people have feelings and perspectives that are different from yours, a concern for others feelings, a willingness to help others, and knowledge of how to help. They identified that most importantly their study showed that students at this age, with this program could be positively affected (p. 10).

This study exemplifies ways in which kindergarten aged children can learn about cooperation, helping, and feeling empathy for others, especially those different from themselves. The results showed us that these students were more likely to learn such values from role-playing exercises involving empathy and helping, rather than through watching T.V. or with no treatment at all.

Murray and Ahammer (1977) had clear progressive subjectivity where they were clear with their developing assumptions. When the focus of their study changed to new hypothesis, they detailed all of their new thoughts and procedures. The demographics of the students and schools in this study are not detailed which makes the exact generalizability unclear. The pre-test and post-test were the same which results in strong instrumentation for the study. Having control groups covered other validity issues, such as maturation and testing.

Also, looking at how a moral development programs in Australia affected young children, Sook-Kyoung and Lewis (1999) studied whether the gender role aspect of the Derman Sparks Anti-bias curriculum affected

children's levels of gender bias stereotyping, through a non-random, pretest/posttest, contrast/experimental design.

The participants were 17 four year olds in the experimental group and 18 four year olds in the contrast group. The students were separated into two ethnic groups: Asian Australian and Non-Asian Australian. Sixteen were Asian Australian and 19 were in the latter group. Each group had one female teacher trained in early childhood education and one untrained female assistant teacher. The schools were located in middle class suburban neighborhoods in Australia.

The curriculum's focus was to lessen gender role stereotyping. It involved many aspects, and activities including: showing students that it is fine for males and females to express their emotions, placing males and female students in leadership roles, and encouraging students to use non-sexist language (Sook-Kyoung & Lewis, 1999). In the classroom, pictures show "emotionally expression" males and females, imagines of "active girls along side the image of gentle boys" and pictures of men and women doing "non-stereotypical tasks" (Sook-Kyoung & Lewis, 1999, p. 125). Also books were provided to the students with female protagonists being independent and adventurous. Male protagonists were seen as being sensitive and gentle (Sook-Kyoung & Lewis, 1999).

To measure the results Sook-Kyoung and Lewis (1999) adapted the use of a Gender Role Scale. This was used for both the pre and posttest. Results showed that the students in the experiment group had a greater awareness of anti-bias gender roles than the contrast group ($p > .05$) (pp. 121, 129).

Sook-Kyoung and Lewis, (1999) state their limits and transferability by articulating that the results do depend on the subject's cultural background and home life. They also raised the question: is it right to teach values that differ from that of the home life of the student? They call for more research to be done on the effects of anti-bias curriculum in relation to race, and disability as well as the factors of time spent with the curriculum, and effects of curriculum over time.

This study presents a case whereby preschools students being exposed to an anti-bias curriculum displayed less anti-bias traits than the control group. This is hopeful because it not only shows that this particular group of students gained anti-bias knowledge, but at a young age, and within a mainstream preschool.

Before beginning the study, Sook-Kyoung and Lewis (1999) sent an interviewer to visit the locations for two weeks to get the children familiar with their presence. This helped against the novelty and disruption effect, which is especially common with young children. By no longer being seen as a novelty to the students, the interviewer is less likely to disrupt the treatment, as well as get honest answers from the participants for the pre and posttests. The pre and posttest were the same and clearly detailed in the study, making for strong instrumentation. The generalizability of this study is lower because the demographics of the students are dissimilar to those in most places of the world.

Cesar and Oliveira (2005) also investigated the impact of an inclusive curriculum. They focused on a school in Lisbon, Portugal. Using qualitative

action research, participant observer methods, they examined student narratives, conducted interviews, questionnaires, and analyzed documents.

The participants were 5th and 6th grade students ages 12-16 from a poor diverse school. Fifteen students from a school of 600 were chosen. All of these students had repeated grades, were low income, had low expectations of themselves, and no “life plans” (Cesar & Oliveira, 2005, p. 33).

The inclusive learning program was based in the understandings of respect for diversity and listening to all community voices (Cesar & Oliveira, 2005). According to Cesar & Oliveira (2005), “Confrontation with difference is how we can learn about the world that surrounds us... the promotion of inclusive schooling implies respecting and listening to the diversity that constitutes the populations of most of our schools” (p. 31). This was offered as an alternative to the current national curriculum. It was proposed by the teachers, but was constantly reformatted and rearranged by the students as members of the educational community (Cesar & Oliveira, 2005).

The teachers for this program were required to reflect on their practices and also had students reflect on their own learning (Cesar & Oliveira, 2005). The goals of the teachers were to empower their students and help them become active citizens. The teachers stressed tolerance and understanding toward all people (Cesar & Oliveira, 2005).

Cesar and Oliveira (2005) found that students liked being listened to and recognized as active members of the community, as opposed to a normal classroom where they felt that they were just following a random set of rules. The students said that the inclusive classroom made learning meaningful, and they felt they respected and accepted others more. The students reported

that they felt more like going to school and studying while in this program, and one student was even inspired to want to work with children in her future.

This study revealed a program that, after implementation, the students felt like part of the community and reported having more respect and acceptance of others. The goals of the teachers were very much goals towards social justice education. It was unclear in the results how they taught these goals or if the goals transferred to the students.

Cesar and Oliveira (2005) cited other studies with similar findings about the program. This added to the triangulation of their findings. The information in this study about the program is pretty vague. There is little to no information on the actual curriculum. The sample size was very small; the researchers only interviewed 5 of the 15 students who took part in the program.

Carlisle (2006) examined how the “Open Circles” program was working at Rodriguez Elementary School through a qualitative field based study. Carlisle used classroom observation, observation of staff and community meetings, surveys and interviews over a four-year time span. The major goal of the research was to try to connect the key principles of social justice education to academic improvement. The researcher’s definition of Social Justice Education stems from the philosophies of Friere and Cochran-Smith. They state that:

The conscious and reflexive blend of content and process intended to enhance equity across multiple social identity groups (e.g. race, class, gender, sexual orientation, ability) foster critical perspectives, and promote social action. (Carlisle, 2006, p. 57)

The Open Circles program was designed to heighten awareness of social justice issues and promote quality social relationships between students. Its focus was to address social justice issues as they came up in the class to try to merge the concepts naturally (Carlisle, 2006).

The site was Rodriguez elementary school in Massachusetts. It is characterized as an urban school with 90% of its student designated as low income. The school's population was approximately 900 students. The participants included the teachers and community members.

Carlisle (2006) found that teachers struggled with implementing and teaching this program. They felt that they needed more shared perspectives of what the principles of social justice were so when told to teach them, all of their curriculum would have shared understanding. Carlisle (2006) found that teachers who felt they were teaching "socially just pedagogies" were in fact teaching very different things. The teachers, however, overwhelmingly cared about what they thought was social justice, but in fact only taught simplified views of cultural difference (pp. 58-62). Carlisle (2006) also found that the teachers rarely spent time in the local community and did not work with parents.

This study shows the disparity between schools implementing a program they call socially just, but unfortunately the teachers all have different views and ideas about what that looks like within the classroom. This is another example of the need for educator training.

Carlisle (2006) had very high prolonged and substantial engagement in this study. There is some lacking clarity as to who exactly observed and took the surveys, as well as whom they observed and gave the surveys to.

Participant numbers, as well as hours spent observing, are also missing.

Carlisle (2006) calls for more research and tells the reader not to use this study as a single guide.

Connolly and Fitzpatrick (2006) examined how a government implemented program for inclusion effected preschool children in Northern Ireland. Through a quasi-experimental quantitative pre/post test design the researchers had random samples both in the control and experimental group of children ages three to six.

The program was a product of a partnership between The Peace Initiatives Institute based in the United States, and the NIPPA, or Northern Irelands Early Years Organization. It was founded to "...encourage young children to value diversity and be more inclusive of those who are different from themselves" (Connolly & Fitzpatrick, 2006, p. 264). The researchers detailed the history of Northern Ireland as it pertained to this peaceful education. This area has experienced prolonged conflict relating in many deaths and injuries. It was chosen for this specific study to try to test how this anti-bias curriculum affected areas with histories of conflict between the people.

Connolly and Fitzpatrick (2006) elaborated that the curriculum used short cartoons and pre-prepared teachers materials. It was developed to address specifically the issues of race, disability, and cultural differences. The cartoons were animated and had a common cast of characters. The episodes had "positive stories" (p. 268) about being different. The characters all represented a different "difference." The curriculum developed with the program involved: hand puppets of the characters, games, posters, and other

activities. The developers of the program felt that the educators needed more training on the curriculum because of the difficulty of teaching cultural diversity to young children. So a packaged curriculum was the only teacher support.

The cartoons were played for six weeks and the packaged curriculum was piloted for three weeks in five student groups. Connolly and Fitzpatrick (2006) estimated that a half an hour per day was devoted to the curriculum. Each student group was chosen strategically to try to accurately represent the diversity of the community. A total of 193 students took part in the study 105 in the intervention groups and 88 in the control groups.

Connolly and Fitzpatrick (2006) tested for results in three areas: student's ability to recognize instances of exclusion, student's ability to recognize how exclusion feels, and the students' willingness to be inclusive of those who are different. A significant change was found in the experimental group in the ability to recognize exclusion. Fifty-six children identified exclusion, compared to 26 in the pretest. The control group had little to no significant change. The control group showed no change, while the ability to recognize the child being excluded as sad rose in the experiment group from 44% to 67%. There was a 50% increase of children in the experimental group that showed a willingness to play with children different from themselves. While there was a 33% increase in the control group.

It is clear that this research is still in its beginning stages, but there are hopeful results. There were significant increases in the experimental group dealing with topics of difference and empathy. The students increased their knowledge and identification of others feelings, as well as recognized

situations where others would be feeling these feelings. For ages 3-6, this is extraordinary work. This paper would argue for more information about the exact curriculum taught, as well as the content of the cartoons.

The research cites other studies with similar findings. It is well established in historical literature and political elements. The authors are clear that this study is just the beginning of much needed research in this field. The pre and posttest were the same and clearly detailed in the study, making for strong instrumentation. Having a control group, checked for maturation and other validity concerns. The ethnic and racial diversity of the students, as well as the socioeconomic status were not mentioned in the study, which makes me cautious when assessing the generalizability. Their sample size is large, however, and representative of the local community, so it is possible to generalize it to young children in Northern Ireland.

In review, all of these programs seemed to be deeply rooted in the political and cultural situations of the country or areas in which they were implemented. I would not say one program or treatment is a cure all, instead, by indentifying common positive goals and pedagogical choices, I can tease out ways to teach for social justice that seem to have benefited previous students.

Karrby (1974) shows ways in which pre-school children are being taught about moral values related to social justice in Sweden. The results of the study showed that children's knowledge of sex roles and differences increased. Of the 18 small groups observed, 10 displayed a rise in "partnership behavior" (p. 11). Karrby found through interviewing the teachers that the way they implemented the program often reflected their

own values. This led to variations in how the program was taught from teacher to teacher.

Murray & Ahammer (1977) also studied the development of social values in early childhood age students. Their study exemplified ways in which kindergarten aged children could learn about cooperation, helping, and feeling empathy for others, especially those different from themselves. The results showed that these students were more likely to learn such values from role playing exercises involving empathy and helping, rather than through watching T.V, or with no treatment at all.

Also looking at how a moral development program affected young children, Sook-Kyoung and Lewis (1999) studied whether the gender role aspect of the Derman Sparks Anti-bias curriculum affected children's levels of gender bias and stereotyping. The curriculum's focus was to lessen gender role stereotyping. It involved many aspects and activities including: showing students that it is fine for males and females to express their emotions, placing males and female students in leadership roles, and encouraging students to use non-sexist language. Results showed that the students in the experiment group had a greater awareness of anti-bias gender roles than the contrast group.

Cesar and Oliveira (2005) also investigate the impact of an inclusive curriculum on elementary school students. Cesar and Oliveira (2005) found that students liked being listened to and recognized as active members of the community, as opposed to a normal classroom where they felt that they were just following a random set of rules. The students said that the inclusive classroom made learning meaningful, and they felt they respected and

accepted others more. The students reported that they felt more like going to school and studying while in this program. One student was even inspired to want to work with children in her future. This study revealed a program, that after implementation, the students felt like part of the community and reported to have more respect and acceptance of others.

Carlisle (2006) also researched an elementary school program. It was called the "Open Circles" program. Carlisle (2006) found that teachers struggled with implementing and teaching this program. They felt that they needed more shared perspectives of what the principles of social justice were so when told to teach them, all of their curriculum would have shared understandings. Carlisle (2006) found that teachers who felt they were teaching "socially just pedagogies" were in fact teaching very different things. The teachers, however, overwhelmingly cared about what they thought was social justice, but in fact only taught simplified views of cultural difference. Carlisle (2006) also found that the teachers rarely spent time in the local community and did not work with parents.

Connolly and Fitzpatrick (2006) examined how a government implemented program for inclusion effected preschool students. There were significant increases in the experimental group dealing with topics of difference and empathy. The students increased their knowledge and identification of others feelings, as well as recognized situations where others would be experiencing these feelings.

These studies included programs from all across the world that implemented multicultural/inclusion based programs in mainstream schools for ages 3-16. Key elements identified in preschool settings were the use of

games, literature, role-playing, teacher modeling, and posters displaying diversity and non-stereotypical roles in the classroom. We see some contradictions in the section over the role of television. In one study, Murray and Ahammer (1977) T.V shows with pro-social themes played little to no role in the development of pro-social behavior in students. However, in Connolly and Fizpatrick (2006), a television program coupled with curriculum, increased children's knowledge and understanding of others feelings, dramatically. What could account for these varying results? In the study done by Murray and Ahammer (1977), the shows played had mostly adult characters and were not "kids shows." Also, they were not written for the program with exact themes in mind. This is unlike the shows in Connolly and Fizpatrick's (2006) study that were written and developed with young children in mind and to teach them specific social norms.

The foundation was also laid out for social actions that researchers felt need to be developed in young children in relation to social justice. These include: awareness of ones own feelings, awareness of others feelings, and knowledge of how to be inclusive of those different from themselves.

Summary

This chapter focused on reviewing current research relating to teaching social education. The paper examined schools based in social justice, mainstream schools and how they teach for social justice, mainstream teachers' views, teacher and principals that are social justice advocates, mainstream teachers' methods, classes within mainstream schools that promote social justice, and social justice based programs tried out in

mainstream schools. The next chapter will briefly review the literature covered in chapter three. In addition it will examine themes to uncover the current state of social education, and effective strategies for educators to use within the classroom to teach for social justice.

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION

Chapter one reviewed the importance of social education, reflecting that school aged children are developing attitudes towards difference (i.e., race, gender, class, disability) from all areas of their life. In this chapter it was established that an area of importance for educators is to teach and encourage accurate, non-judgmental views of differences and to foster inquiry around oppressive societal roles. These roles can create inequality and perpetuate racism, sexism and misunderstanding. We focused on the role of educator as being involved in the community, having empowering relationships with their students, and modeling and advocating for social change. This paper detailed the many layers of social justice education. The basis of social justice education includes empathy, understanding, tolerance and acceptance of difference. The next layer is made up of, understanding social, historical and economic systems and hierarchies that perpetuate injustice. Finally the top layer is the willingness and understanding to take action. Using this knowledge, this paper has sought find best practices for teaching social justice education by reviewing research and evaluating it as a means for educators to gain access and insight into this field.

Chapter two reviewed the history of social education. We can only fathom that education for social justice has been around for as long as injustices have been taking place, and that moral education and education for human rights has taken many forms throughout history. It has, however, only become more structured into the public educational systems of the United States in the last hundred years. This chapter concluded after detailing the

history of social education that educators must look at history as a way to gain understanding of where society has been and where it needs to go. This may entail the support of paradigm shifts based on what the purpose of education truly is, and to scaffold legislation promoting justice and multiple global perspectives within our school system.

In chapter three it became clear that there are numerous of definitions for social justice, multicultural education, critical multiculturalism, human rights education, moral education, education for peace, and values education. Historically, there has been a lack of concrete, agreed upon definitions surrounding these sub groups of social education. Every researcher cited had a different name and/or definition for the values that they, or their participants held, in relations to what I am labeling as social education. This could be because the newness of the field, or that it is so multifaceted no one can place their fingers on a single meaning. No matter the cause of this perplexity the results are the same: a disconnect between theorists, government agencies, school districts, schools, teachers and students about what it means to effectively teach social education. This disconnect is further documented by the researchers in this chapter when they went to investigate a site. With strong foundations and theoretical frameworks in key theorists and historians in the field of social education, the researchers discovered the schools and teachers they were studying (that claimed to be teaching for these goals) were missing foundations or knowledge in these strong theories.

Chapter three however did offer some insight into the current practices from over six countries, in both public and private schools. What follow is summary of the findings from chapter 3, implications for classroom practice

(e.g., a synthesis between the studies in chapter 3 in search of best practices for social justice education)¹⁵ and a conclusion.

Summary of Findings

Schools Based in Social Justice

Studies in this section focused on schools whose foundation and philosophies were based in those of social justice. Included were Swadener (1988), Smyth (2004), Kraft (2007), Carroll (2008). This section was relevant for this paper because it described schools whose entire curriculum and beliefs were implemented through the lens of social justice and multicultural education.

As for the overall findings of Swadener (1988), Smyth (2004), Kraft (2007), Carroll (2008) many themes arose about social justice education in schools whose foundation was based in that value. By looking at the structure of the schools, the communication and relationships, as well as the curriculum, we can revisit patterns that link these strong and unique schools together.

The structure of the schools: All of the schools in the studies could be considered small in size when looking at student body population to teacher/staff population. This could be an argument for low student to teacher ratio as a factor in educational success. Despite this fact, none of the studies explicitly listed this as imperative to the teaching of social justice in the schools. Instead, most importantly were the attitudes of the

¹⁵ *Keep in mind that not all aspects of the school are realistically transferable to all schools, (like small class sizes), but they are important to mention as best practices because they could very well be an integral part of the schools success, and suggestions for further research.*

administration and teachers towards their goals. One important thread in all of these schools was the support of the administration or district. This allowed the schools to have the freedom and tools necessary to create strong curriculum and community.

The communication and community building aspect was another important theme found in these schools. All of the studies described the relationships that teachers had with their students as extremely important to the success of the school. The teachers at these sites felt that having a strong teacher-to-student, student-to-student, and school-to-community bond was imperative for their success. Teachers facilitated this in many different ways, including: small group activities, modeling respect, valuing all opinions, and having community meetings.

Curriculum content and practices were also very important to these schools, whose main teaching strategies seemed to be based in discussion, reflection and authentic experience. Also, there was a focus on the social contexts that events and people are/were situated in. The schools all included what some may view as socially charged materials including the study of “peacemakers” to visiting a protest on immigration, to detailing out controversial issues in America history. The teachers gave their students the power to problem solve, discuss, and take part in the social change of real issues occurring in both their local and global communities.

Mainstream Schools, How They Teach for Social Justice

Section two included studies that examined if and how mainstream schools and preschools taught social justice, multicultural education, or the

skills pivotal to those pedagogies, such as empathy. This section included studies from Swadener (1986), Cohen (2000), Johansson (2002), Nganga (2005), and Reid (2006). They described how issues related to diversity and culture was attended to in mainstream programs. The researchers in all of these studies were strongly grounded in key and profound social justice and multicultural theories including those of Sleeter, Grant, Banks and Nieto. These frameworks allowed reserachers to search for high quality multicultural and social justice education within mainstream schools and programs. However, what they found was scant.

The most common ways that mainstream programs provided multicultural or social curriculum seemed to be through books, posters, dolls and other props. The researchers felt there was a lack of authentic curriculum and teacher education. This could be tied to the lack of support, funding, and professional development. There was little evidence of human rights or social justice education. The researchers most commonly found themes of moral education and education pertaining to human difference.

Preservice Teachers' Views

This section examined mainstream preservice teachers' assumptions and beliefs about teaching diversity and social justice. Studies include Hyland and Noffke (2005), Clarke (2006), and Kelly (2009). This section was important to the research question because it can be assumed that these beliefs are directly related to the attitudes and approaches these educators used, and will use to teach themes of social justice and diversity in their classrooms. This section may also help pinpoint how to improve teacher education

programs and teacher support to assist teachers in ways to educate for social justice.

A majority of the preservice teachers in these studies believed that education in social justice was important. But what these studies seemed to illustrate was that their conceptualizations as well as actual practices seemed disconnected from this belief. This could result from many things. For some it was a simplistic view of social justice education (e. g. revolving around acceptance of different or anti-bullying). Others were not equipped with support or tools to bring their values into actual classroom practices and fell into the conventional routines. What this section proves is that many preservice teachers have some knowledge of social justice education but the researchers, who have strong theoretical backgrounds and frameworks, are not seeing congruent practices in the participants.

Social Justice Advocates: Teachers and Principals

This section examined studies that focused on teachers and principals who were committed to teaching for social justice within their schools. Studies included Stevenson (2007), Sleeter (2008) and Epstein and Olyer (2008). By looking at these teachers and principals as guides, it may be possible to pinpoint ways in which they integrated their philosophies into mainstream school settings.

These studies looked at some common attributes of principals and teachers who held strong philosophies in social justice and democracy, and who teach in mainstream schools. Some common, best practices include: community involvement, equity and equality, inclusion, and social action.

More specifically for the teachers, common classroom practices include: students as critical thinkers and questioners, curriculum that included multiple perspectives and is situated within historical and societal contexts of oppression. From two of the studies (Stevenson, 2007; Sleeter, 2008) we got a glimpse into the difficulties of teachers and administrators who hold strong values that conflict with the standards movements taking place in current society. Studies from both the United States and England identified mandated standards and curriculum as major speed bumps in their teaching. Sleeter (2008) and Epstein and Olyer (2008) identified time limit as a major inhibitor to the teachers.

Mainstream Teachers

This section examined social education based in pedagogical methods that mainstream teachers in mainstream schools have added to their curriculum. Included are: Lundeberg (1995), Simon and Clarke-Ekong (1999), Gimmestad (2001), and Al-Jafar and Busselli (2004). All of the programs researched in these studies were added for a brief time, and taught either by the teachers, or by the researcher through participant observation methods.

The results seem to be somewhat successful, though the studies are not very generalizable. It seemed to be easier to measure and get successful results when dealing with pure content knowledge of other cultures and human diversity, rather than finding out how students' views of difference, and how understanding and acceptance of other cultures have progressed. Overall, it would seem that adding a few simple methods to a mainstream,

undertrained teacher and school might provide some positive results with students.

Classes Within Mainstream Schools that Promote Social Justice

This section included studies of classes that were based in social justice, democracy and human rights. Most took place in mainstream middle and high schools and focusing on civic education, global issues and human rights. Studies in this section included Brabeck and Kenny (1994), Gaudelli and Ferneskes (2004), Bajaj's (2004), Kepenekci (2005), Bischoff and Mullino (2007). Though all of these studies varied in many ways, most showed success in their findings. It is valuable to find the common themes in the classes, as well as investigate the social and political ideologies for which they are situated. The researchers in these studies seemed to be calling for more teacher training in the area of human rights Bajaj, 2004; Gaudelli & Ferneskes 2004; Kepenekci 2005. It can be generalized that all across the globe, in schools where just one human rights class is offered, most teachers do not feel, or do not seem to be prepared to teach them. Some of the classes and schools seemed to be better funded than others, but the collection of studies together represented multiple countries with students from varying socioeconomic, political and cultural backgrounds.

These classes were mainly offered to middle and high schools students. Classes dealt with intricate human rights issues and attempted to tackle major themes around social justice. Common themes from these classes are important elements to human rights and social justice education: discussions, activities based upon understanding important historical events,

guest speakers and learning about human rights advocates from past and present, critical thinking and engagement of historical and current documents. Classes are not the only way mainstream schools teach for social justice. Through grants, university partnerships, and government implementations, many mainstream schools and preschools are attempting to integrate social justice or moral education-based programs into their existing activities.

Social Justice Based Programs in Mainstream Schools

Included in this section were studies of both government and non-government mandated multicultural and social justice inspired programs. The sites were all mainstream schools or preschools that have implemented a program to address diversity, inclusion, anti-bias, and other areas in the social education arena. Studies included Karryby (1974), Murray and Ahammer (1977), Sook-Kyoung and Lewis (1999), Cesar and Oliverira (2005), Carlisle, (2006) and Connolly and Fitzpatrick (2006).

The studies identified successful and not so successful programs, how they were implemented, and their effects on the students. These studies included programs from all across the world that implemented multicultural/inclusion based programs in mainstream schools for ages 3-16. Key elements identified in preschools setting were the use of games, literature, role-playing, teacher modeling, and posters displaying diversity and non-stereotypical roles in the classroom. There are some contradictions in the section over the role of television. In one study, Murray and Ahammer (1977), T.V. shows with pro-social themes played little to no role in the

development of pro-social behavior in students. However, in Connolly and Fitzpatrick (2006), a television program coupled with curriculum, increased children's knowledge and understanding of others' feelings dramatically. What could account for these varying results? In the study done by Murray and Ahammer (1977), the shows played had mostly adult characters, and were not "kids shows." Also, they were not written for the program with exact themes in mind. This is unlike the shows in Connolly and Fitzpatrick's (2006) study that were written and developed with young children in mind.

The foundation was also laid out for social actions that researchers felt needed to be developed in young children in relation to social justice. These include, awareness of ones own feelings, awareness of others feelings, and knowledge of how to be inclusive of those different from themselves.

Classroom Implications

Many of these studies are examples of the need for further research into this topic and I feel that the strongest example of best practices for the studies presented was in the Schools Based in Social Justice section. This section showed examples of schools whose very foundations were based in social justice, peace and multicultural education. So it is from them, that I am taking my categories, for classroom implications. I have broken them into four facets of best practices: The classroom, the teacher, administration and community, and curriculum.

The Classrooms

A low student to teacher ratio was exhibited in many of the schools that proved to have best practices. This could be an argument that smaller

class sizes are a factor in educational success. Researchers cited that Democratic classroom strategies were also often used: Swadener, (1988); Smyth, (2004); Kraft, (2007); Caroll, (2008); Bischoff and Mullino (2007).

The Teachers

Many of the studies described the relationships that teachers had with their students as extremely important to the success of the school, or class. Teachers who felt that having a strong teacher-to-student, student-to-student relationship, and school-to-community- bond was imperative for their success and showed more success in teaching for social education. These teachers sought to empower their students. They built this into their teaching in many different ways, including: modeling respect, valuing all opinions, having community meetings, giving students leadership roles, and allowing students to develop much of their own curriculum. (Swadener, (1988); Smyth, (2004); Kraft, (2007); Caroll, (2008); Bischoff and Mullino (2007); Brabeck and Kenny, (1994); Stevenson, (2007) and Sleeter, (2008).

Administrative & Community Support

One important thread that I saw in many of these studies was having the support of the administration, the district and community. By support I mean giving not just the freedom, but also encouragement, professional development opportunities, and structure to the schools and teacher. For some of the sites funding was very important and a necessary aspect for the school to teach at best practices. Almost all of the studies in the Programs and Methods sections were studying treatments that had been developed from grants or relationships with local universities. Additionally financial

and community support are important as well Swadener, (1988); Smyth, (2004); Kraft, (2007); Caroll, (2008); Bischoff and Mullino (2007); Stevenson, (2007); Sleeter, (2008); and Epstien and Olyer, (2008); Karrby, (1974); Sook-Kyoung and Lewis, (1999); Cesar and Oliverira, (2005), and Connolly and Fitzpatrick, (2006); Clarke-Ekong, (1999); and Gimmestad (2001).

Classroom and Curriculum

Curriculum content and practices were also very important to successful schools, teachers, and classes. The most prevalent successful pedagogical methods seemed to be discussion, reflection, and authentic experience based activities. Activities that engaged the students had some basis in prior knowledge and related to their lives. The teachers gave their students the power to problem solve, converse, work together in small and large groups, and take part in the social change of real issues occurring in both their local and global communities. This occurred through guest speakers, field trips, or research of the local area the curriculum connected the student to their community.

The most successful ways classrooms and curriculum often addressed specific human rights issues and social justice topics included: drama, literature, the study of narrative and historical documents, stories, and analyzing how they are situated in social and historical contexts, and curriculum that included multiple perspectives Brabeck and Kenny, (1994); Gaudelli and Ferneskes, (2004); Bajaj, (2004); Kepenekci, (2005); Bischoff and Mullino, (2007); Stevenson, (2007); Sleeter, (2008); Epstien & Olyer, (2008); Clarke-Ekong, (1999); Gimmestad, (2001).

Suggestions For Further Research

One thing cannot be denied, more than anything else, researchers stated that there was a lack of research in this area. They often called for longitudinal studies to see how a specific social education curriculum or classes would affect the participants in the long run. By completing more longitudinal studies it could be possible to not only see how students are affected, but also what values or thoughts they take with them from programs into their future lives. The researchers also called for more quantitative data to see if a school, teacher or curriculum was truly effecting the students, and if so, how. By using quantitative research methods in this area, it may also be possible to see results of large number of participants with varied age ranges and school contexts.

I would also call for more research because valid studies were difficult to find when investigating this topic. Aspect of future research I would like to see includes: strong validity, a focus on elementary age students, and detailed program or class descriptions. When researching a teacher, principal, classroom or school, researchers need to clearly identify the practices and content of the curriculum used so other educators can gain insight about how to implement these strategies into their own practices.

Simon and Clarke-Ekong (1999) contemplated that it is difficult to navigate the politics of social education, so teachers should also become researchers of the field. I feel that this is especially important when working with such a controversial and layered topic as social education. By becoming researchers and critical consumers of data, all educators can become informed of working with the best practices. There is no sure way to know if a

classroom practice or program will work until you investigate it and try it in your classroom. However, the more quality research on programs and classes out there will allow for successful themes and best practices to become more apparent and supported by data. (Swadener, 1988; Symth, 2004; Caroll, 2008, Reid, 2006; Clarke, 2006; Kelly, 2009; Carlisle (2006); Simon & Clarke-Ekong, (1999); Sook-Kyoung & Lewis, 1999; Connolly & Fitzpatrick, 2006; Bajaj, (2004).

Conclusion

Chapter one examined the reasons for a review of the professional literature regarding social education. It established that it is important for educators to teach and encourage accurate, non-judgmental views of differences, and to foster inquiry of the purpose and functioning of oppressive societal roles. It discussed the importance of the role of educator as being one where through involvement in the community and through empowering relationships with their students, they can model and advocate for social change. Chapter one also discussed the opposition to social education and gave the reader limitations for the literature review.

Chapter two explained the development of social education in the United States and concluded that educators must look at our history as a way to gain understanding of where society has been, and where it needs to go. This may entail the support of paradigm shifts based on what the purpose of what educations truly is and to scaffold legislation promoting justice and multiple global perspectives within our school system.

Chapter three reviewed the research of social education. The research

in Chapter three was organized into seven sections: Schools based in social justice, mainstream schools teaching for social justice, mainstream teachers views on teaching for social justice, teachers and principals as advocate for social justice, mainstream teachers methods, classes within mainstream schools that promote social justice, and social justice based programs in mainstream schools.

These themes were used to answer this paper's guiding goal: to find best practices for teaching social justice education.

Schools Based on Social Justice: found that there were many important aspects to the success of these schools. Support of the community and administration, and strong teacher-to-student/student-to-student/and school-to-community- bonds were two that stood out. Curriculum content and practices were also very important to these schools, whose main teaching strategies seemed to be based in discussion, reflection, and authentic experience. Also, there was a focus on the social contexts that events and people are/were situated in when studying social justice

Mainstream School Teaching for Social Justice: found that the most common ways that mainstream programs provided multicultural or social curriculum seemed to be through books, posters, dolls and other props. The researchers felt there was a lack of authentic curriculum, and teacher education. This could be tied to the lack of support, funding, and professional development. There was little evidence of human rights or social justice education. The researchers most commonly found themes of moral education and education pertaining to human difference.

Preservice Teachers' Views on Social Justice: found that many pre-service teachers have some knowledge of social justice education. However the researchers, who had strong theoretical backgrounds and frameworks, did not see such frameworks in the participants. Even the teachers who felt that they wanted to teach for social justice were not able to put their beliefs into action.

Teacher and Principals that Advocate for Social Justice: found some common attributes of principals and teachers who held strong philosophies in social justice and democracy, and teach in mainstream schools. Some common best practices included: community involvement, equity and equality, inclusion, and social action. More specifically for the teachers, common classroom practices included: students as critical thinkers and questioners, and curriculum that included multiple perspectives and were situated within historical and societal contexts of oppression.

Mainstream Teachers Methods: found that mainstream teachers seemed to be somewhat successful, though the studies were not very generalizable. It seemed to be easier to measure and get successful results when dealing with pure content knowledge of other cultures and human diversity, rather than finding out how students views of difference, and understanding and acceptance of other cultures have progressed. Overall, it would seem that adding a few simple methods to a mainstream untrained teacher and school may provide some positive results with students in social education.

Classes Within Mainstream Schools that Promote Social Justice: found that there were some common themes within these classes that are valuable

to human rights and social justice education: discussions, activities revolving around important events and people in both the past and present of human rights; critical thinking and engagement of historical and current documents in relation to human rights; guest speakers, materials, and engaging activities.

Classes are not the only way mainstream schools teach for social justice.

Through grants and university partnerships, and government implementations many mainstream schools and preschools are attempting to integrate social justice or moral education based programs into their existing activities.

Social Justice Based Programs in Mainstream Schools: found that key elements identified in preschools setting were the use of games, literature, role-playing, teacher modeling, and posters displaying diversity and non-stereotypical roles in the classroom. We see some contradictions in the section over the role of television. The foundation was also laid out for social actions that researchers felt needed to be developed in young children in relation to social justice. These include, awareness of ones own feelings, awareness of others feelings, and knowledge of how to be inclusive of those different from themselves. Freire believed that education could not be neutral, I agree. I will end with this call to action.

"Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system... or it becomes the practice of freedom, the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world."
(Freire, 1972, p. 34)

APPENDIX:

Definitions according to the dictionary of multicultural education
(Grant, 1997)

Social justice: concerns institutionalized patterns of mutual action and interdependence that are necessary to bring about the realization of distributive justice. Justice demands equality and fairness. Agency for change through social justice requires courageous action and strength of will in the pursuit of justice. The effective agent of social change needs to feel and taste the reality of injustice. Education for justice is education for collaboration, cooperation and community. In a multicultural and just society we need to cultivate within ourselves the virtues of tolerance and acceptance. (p. 247-248)

Oppression: An element of power and influence that serves to perpetuate inequalities and discrimination- sometimes overtly but more often concealed behind seemingly natural systems of stratification which define the worthiness of knowledge and how that knowledge is to be distributed. (p. 204)

Global education: Recognizes that Americans need to understand the complexity of global interconnectedness and develop skills in cross-cultural interaction if they are to make effective decisions in a pluralist, and interdependent world. Global educators focus as much on cultural universals (those things all humans have in common) as they do on cultural differences. (p. 127)

Multicultural education: Is a concept built upon the philosophical ideals of freedom, justice, equality, equity, and dignity. It prepares all students to work actively towards structural equality in the organizations and

institutions of the United States. It helps students to develop positive self-concepts and to discover who they are, particularly in terms of their multiple group membership. Multicultural education does this by providing knowledge about the history, culture and contributions of the diverse groups that have shaped the United States. (p. 78)

REFERENCES

- A., C., Ladson-Billings, G., & Grant, E. (1997). *Dictionary of multicultural education*. Phoenix: Oryx Press Phoenix, Az.
- Al-Jafar, A., & Busselli, C. (2004). The art of story telling for cross cultural understanding. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 1(36), 35-48.
- Bajaj, M. (2004). Human rights education and student self-conception in the dominican republic. *Journal of Peace Education*, 1(1), 21-36.
- Banks, C. A., & Banks, J. A. (2003). *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Berman, S. (1990). The real ropes course: The development of social consciousness. *Educating for Social Responsibility*, 1, 1-14.
- Bischoff, C., & Mullino, M. E. (2009). Cultivating a spirit for social justice and peace: teaching through oral history. *Religious Education*, 2(102), 151-171. Retrieved March 30, 2009, from the ERIC database.
- Brabeck, M., & Kenny, M. (1994). Human rights education through the 'facing history and ourselves' program. *Journal of Moral Education*, 3(23). Retrieved May 4, 2009, from the Ebscohost database.
- Carlisle, L. (2006). Principles of social justice education: The social justice education in schools project. *Equity & excellence in education; University of Massachusetts School of Education Journal*, 39(1), 55-64.
- Caroll, K. (2009). Building a learning community through curriculum. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 4(23). Retrieved March 30, 2009, from the ERIC database.
- Cesar, M., & Oliveira, I. (2005). The curriculum as a toll for inclusive participation: students' voices in a case study in a Portuguese multicultural school. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 20(1), 29-43. Retrieved February 3, 2009, from the ERIC database.
- Clarke, M., & Drudy, S. (2006). Teaching for diversity, social justice and global awareness. *European Journal of Teaching Education*, 29(3), 371-386. Retrieved February 17, 2009, from the ERIC database.
- Connolly, P., & Fitzpatrick, S. (2006). Addressing diversity and inclusion in the early years in conflict affected areas: A case study of the media initiative for children in northern ireland. *Journal of Early Years Education*, 14(3), 263-278. Retrieved January 8, 2009, from the ERIC database.

- "Education in global education-The development of global perspectives in U.S. education." *Science Encyclopedia*. (1st Ed.) Net Industries, 2009. *Science Encyclopedia*. Retrieved: 9 March 2009.
- Epstein, S. (2008). An inescapable network of mutuality: Building relationships of solidarity in a first grade classroom. *Equity & excellence in education; University of Massachusetts School of Education Journal*, 41(4), 405-416.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Gaudelli, W., & Fernekes, W. (2004). Teaching about global human rights for global citizenship. *Social Studies*, 95(1), 16-26. Retrieved May 4, 2009, from the PsycINFO database.
- Gimmestad, B. J. (2001). Dramatic plays: a vehicle for prejudice reduction in the elementary. *Journal of Education Research*, 76(1), 45-49.
- Grant, C., & Sleeter, C. (1997). *Turning on learning: five approaches for multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender, and disability -- Second 2nd Edition*. Upper Saddle River: Merrill.
- Huerta, G. C. (2007). *Educational foundations: diverse histories, diverse perspectives*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Hyland, N., & Noffke, S. (2005). Understanding diversity through social and community inquiry. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(4), 367-381.
- Johansson, E. (2002). Morality in preschool interaction: teachers' strategies for working with children's morality. *Early Child Development and Care*, 172(2), 203-221. Retrieved January 8, 2009, from the ERIC database.
- Joseph, G., & Cohen, R. C. (2000). Celebrating cultural and linguistic diversity in head start. *Washington D.C Office of research and Evaluation*, n/a, 2-64. Retrieved February 22, 2009, from the ERIC database.
- Jurs, S. G., & Wiersma, W. (2008). *Research methods in education: An Introduction (2nd Edition)*. New York: F.E. Peacock Pub, Inc.
- Kagan, S. (2009). *Cooperative learning* ([1993 ed.] ed.). San Juan Capistrano, CA: Kagan Cooperative Learning.
- Karrby, G. (1974). The socialization process. *School Research Newsletter*, 18. Retrieved February 17, 2009, from the ERIC database.
- Kelly, D. (2009). How young is too young? exploring beginning teachers'

assumptions about young children and teaching for social justice. *Equity & excellence in education; University of Massachusetts School of Education Journal*, 42(2), 202-216.

- Kepekci, Y. (2005). A study of effectiveness of human rights education in turkey. *Journal of Peace Education*, 1(2), 53-68. Retrieved May 4, 2009, from the PsycINFO database.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The Philosophy of moral development: moral stages and the idea of justice (Essays on Moral Development, Volume 1)* (1st Ed.), New York: Harper & Row.
- Kraft, M. (2007). Toward a school-wide model of teaching for social justice: An examination of the best practices of two small public schools. *Equity & excellence in education; University of Massachusetts School of Education Journal*, 1(40), 77-86.
- Lundeberg, M. A. (1995). Wandering around the world: building multicultural perspectives. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 36(4), 301-21.
- Mctighe, J., & Wiggins, G. (2005). *Understanding by Design (2nd Edition)* (ASCD). Alexandria, VA: Prentice Hall.
- Murray, J., & Ahammer, I. (2009). Presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Reach in Child Development: *Kindness in kindergarten: A multidimensional program for facilitating altruism*. New Orleans, LA.
- Nganga, L., & Kambutu, J. (2005). Multicultural educational experiences in rural education programs. Lessons from Early Childhood Education Programs. 2-14. Retrieved February 22, 2009, from the ERIC database.
- Noddings, N., (2005). *Educating citizens for global awareness*. New York City: Teachers College Press.
- Reid, C. (2006). Multi/intercultural education in Australia and the Netherlands. *A Journal of Comparative Education*, 36(1), 57-72. Retrieved March 30, 2009, from the ERIC database.
- Simon, K., & Clarke-Ekong, S. (1999). Effects of hands-on multicultural education program: A model for student learning. *Social Studies*, 90(5), 225-229. Retrieved July 2, 2009, from the ERIC database.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2008). Teaching for democracy in an age of corporatocracy . *Teachers College Record*, 110(1), 139-159.

- Smythe, J. (2009). Social capital and the 'socially just school'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 1(25), 19-33. Retrieved February 8, 2009, from the PsycINFO database.
- Sook-Kyoung, K., & Lewis, G. F. (1999). Children's gender role stereotyping: The effect of Asian and non-Asian Australian pre-school children on an anti-bias curriculum. *Early Child Development and Care*, 159, 121-134. Retrieved July 27, 2009, from the ERIC database.
- Spring, J. (2007). *The american school: from the puritans to No Child Left Behind*. New York City: McGraw-Hill Humanities/Social Sciences/Languages.
- Stevenson, H. P. (2007). A case study in leading schools for social justice: when morals and markets collide. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 45(6), 769-781.
- Swadener, E., (1988). Presented at the American Educational Research Association
Annual Meeting: *Teaching toward peace and social responsibility in the early years: A friends school case study*. New Orleans, LA
- Swadener, E., (1986). Presented at the American Educational Research Association
Annual Meeting: *Implementation of education that is multicultural in early childhood settings: A case study of two day care programs*. San Francisco, CA.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S. Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. New York: State University Of New York Pre.
- Vold, (1992). *Multicultural education in early childhood classrooms (Early Childhood Education Series (National Education Association))*. Washington D.C.: Nea Professional Library.