FALL/WINTER 2021/2022 | VOLUME 41 | ISSUE 1 |

social studies JOURNAL

A PUBLICATION OF THE PENNSYLVANIA COUNCIL FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES

social studies
JOURNAL

Volume 41, Issue 1, Fall/Winter 2021/2022

Editor: Jessica B. Schocker
Associate Editor: Sarah B. Brooks

Guidelines for Manuscripts

Aims and Scope

The Pennsylvania Council for the Social Studies seeks to publish manuscripts in the *Journal* that focus on any of the following:

- Creative ways of teaching social studies at the elementary, secondary, and higher education levels
- Research articles
- Explanations of new types of materials and/or equipment that directly relate to social studies teaching, particularly those developed and/or implemented by teachers
- Explanations of teacher developed projects that help social studies students and teachers work with community groups
- Reviews of books and other media that are relevant to the teaching of social studies
- Analysis of how other academic disciplines relate to the teaching of social studies

Instructions for Authors

All manuscripts must adhere to the following formatting guidelines. Manuscripts that do not meet the guidelines will be returned to the author without going out for peer review. The editors of *Social Studies Journal* accept submissions on a rolling basis. However, calls for manuscripts are issued for both regular and special issues.

- Type and double-space submissions using 12-point font and one-inch margins
- Include any figures and/or images at the end of the article
- Authors are responsible for obtaining copyright permission for all images
- Average manuscript length is between five and fifteen pages, though exceptions can be made on a case-by-case basis
- Follow guidelines of the current *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*
- Do not include author name(s) or other identifying information in the text or references of the paper
- Include a separate title page that contains the title of the article, author(s) name(s), institution(s), and email address(es)
- With submission email, authors must attest that the manuscript is original, not under review elsewhere, and not published previously
- Papers must be submitted as Word documents to the editors at: editors.ssj@gmail.com

Journal Information

Social Studies Journal is a biannual publication of the Pennsylvania Council for the Social Studies. The *Journal* seeks to provide a space for the exchange of ideas among social studies educators and scholars in Pennsylvania and beyond. The editors encourage authors both in and out of Pennsylvania to submit to the *Journal*.

All manuscripts go through a blinded peer-review process. In order to encourage and assist writers, the reviewers make suggestions and notations for revisions that are shared with the author before papers are accepted for final publication. The editors encourage authors in both K-12 and higher education settings to consider submitting to *Social Studies Journal*.

PCSS Membership and Publication Information

Membership in the Pennsylvania Council for the Social Studies is currently free. Correspondence about membership should go to Executive Secretary, David Trevaskis: david@leapkids.com.

The *Journal* is currently available for free, open access on the Pennsylvania Council for the Social Studies website: www.pcssonline.org. Correspondence about editorial matters should be directed to the editors at: editors.ssj@gmail.com.

Social Studies Journal (ISSN 0886-86) is published biannually. Copyright 2010, Pennsylvania Council for the Social Studies, indexed by the Current Index to Journals in Education and listed in Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Education. The Pennsylvania Council for the Social Studies is a non-profit organization under IRS Code 501(c)(3). A copy of our financial statement is available upon request from the Executive Secretary. Documents and information submitted to the Pennsylvania Department of State, Bureau of Charitable Organizations, PO BOX 8723, Harrisburg, PA 17105 are available from that address for the cost of copying and postage.

From the Editors

We are excited to share the Fall/Winter 2021/2022 issue of *Social Studies Journal*, a publication of the Pennsylvania Council for the Social Studies. This year, 2021, proved to be another challenging time. While work and life continue to occur during what is becoming a baseline of high stress, we are regularly impressed with the perseverance and humanity of educators. Sarah and I, too, have had to adjust to increased workloads and responsibilities; as such, this is our first issue of *SSJ* published since the Fall 2020 issue. We appreciate the patience of our authors, readers, and the PCSS board.

This issue of *SSJ* features an editorial article, three manuscript articles, and two book reviews. The editorial is written by myself (Jessica) and my colleague Justin De Senso about Critical Race Theory in schools and what social studies teachers should know. As a teacher and scholar of CRT for well over a decade, I've gotten more questions about that theory in the past year or two than in my entire career combined. I hope this editorial is helpful for any teachers who are overwhelmed by the current climate surrounding CRT and schools.

Next, Lauren Colley's article shares her research on how students form connections with the agency of people in the past and how this will prepare students to understand situations in the present. Understanding human agency is as poignant as ever, and we are confident our readers will appreciate her research, findings, and suggestions. The third article is written by Lightning Jay and a team of scholars from Penn and Temple about bringing students into teacher professional development. Their innovative and impactful experiment has implications for teacher preparation as well as classroom practice. Erin Casey and colleagues explore how preservice teachers feel about teaching "tender topics" (specifically: bullying, divorce, death, and poverty) to children during read-alouds. Much debate exists over what sensitive content young children should be introduced to and at what age, and Casey et al.'s study represents an important contribution to that discussion.

Two book reviews round out this issue of *SSJ*. First, Christine Woyshner reviews John Rudolph's 2020 book *How we teach science, what's changed, and why it matters*, exploring how Rudolph articulated the relationship between science and citizenship. With continued calls for interdisciplinary learning, this review is timely. Second, Jennie Burke offers her review of Adrienne Wright's 2019 book *Hector: A boy, a protest, and the photograph that changed Apartheid*. While Dr. Burke echoes other scholars who praise the content, goals, and style of Wright's book, she is critical of the use of the actual photograph of Hector (dead, his body is carried by a teenager) on the back cover of the book. She raises important

questions about developmentally appropriate content and when the use of graphic images crosses the line from creating awareness of widespread issues of racial injustice to objectification of Black bodies. We encourage our readers to carefully consider Dr. Burke's review along with other reviews of *Hector*, as we know that entertaining diverse perspectives makes us better teachers and learners.

Before wrapping up this note, I must share two important announcements. It is the end of an era at *SSJ*. Sarah Brooks, Associate Editor, is stepping down from her role with the *Journal*. Sarah has elevated *SSJ* during her four years as Associate Editor. She helped to inspire our current publication format, recruited important articles and scholars for our review board, and inspired me to be a better editor. Sarah has one of the keenest and most thoughtful editorial eyes of anyone I've ever worked with. It was truly a pleasure to work with Sarah, and the mark she has left on *SSJ* will be ever present. Please join me in wishing Sarah well with her future endeavors. I look forward to including her scholarship in a future issue of *SSJ*.

I am thrilled to announce that *SSJ* is welcoming two new Associate Editors to our team: Stephanie Schroeder and Mark Kissling from the Pennsylvania State University. Both Mark and Stephanie have contributed articles to *SSJ* in the past and have shown a deep commitment to teaching and scholarship. We are so lucky to have them! Together, the three of us are excited to share a call for an upcoming special, themed issue of *SSJ*, so please stay tuned for that announcement which is forthcoming.

Sincerely,
Jessica B. Schocker, Editor
Sarah Brooks, Associate Editor

WHAT SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS NEED TO KNOW ABOUT THE CRT DEBATE

Jessica B. Schocker, Penn State Berks
Justin M. De Senso, Penn State Berks

"How do I know what books I'm allowed to keep in my classroom?" "I want to teach my students to care about social justice; how can I do that without getting in trouble?" "I am worried I'll get fired if I try to teach about race, racism, or diversity." These are some of the questions and concerns we hear from teachers and preservice teachers lately.

It has been over a year since President Donald Trump – via Manhattan Institute Senior Fellow Christopher Ruffo – introduced Critical Race Theory to the public, igniting a culture war fueled by disinformation and moral panic (The Hill, 2020; Wallace-Wells, 2021). In a June 18, 2021 editorial, Trump called CRT "ridiculous left-wing dogma," "immoral," "psychological abuse," and "a program for national suicide." Months earlier, state legislatures and school boards across the US passed resolutions and assembled task forces to ban CRT and similar race-conscious content from K-12 classrooms, what Idaho Lt. Governor Janice McGeachin called "one of the most significant threats facing our society today" (Office of the Idaho Lt. Governor, 2021). In our home state of Pennsylvania, representative Russ Diamond sponsored House Bill 1532, another iteration of anti-CRT grievance. Millions of Americans now rage against CRT at school board meetings, in Facebook groups, and in other organized spaces. Nearly every day, pundits are addressing the issue on cable news, and op-eds and podcasts are released, attempting to explain the anti-CRT mayhem in communities across the country (see, for example: Barbaro, 2021; Crenshaw, 2021; Fortin, 2021; Kendi, 2021; PBS NewsHour, 2021).

Amid all this public attention, misunderstanding, and unrest, social studies teachers are left to teach in the breach with more questions than answers – and perhaps with more pressure than they have ever experienced. Scholars across disciplines have begun to identify some of these challenges. See, for example, Crew (2021), Gallagher et. al, (2021, Green (2021), and Zewude and Sharma (2021). Throwing one's hands up is no doubt tempting, especially with all the other challenges educators face. The last thing teachers need is more resistance, more unnecessary stress as they prepare their lessons, police mask placement, navigate emergent pandemic challenges, and stay whole and healthy all the while.

In this editorial, we situate ourselves and then offer two concrete suggestions for social studies teachers and teacher educators who do not have much experience with CRT and want to understand how it intersects with teaching and learning.

Situating the Authors

We are professors at Penn State University who developed and co-teach a general education class on Critical Race Theory. The CRT class is a general education, interdomain class in humanities and social sciences, and it is cross listed in the disciplines of Education, Criminal Justice, and Sociology. Justin is

faculty in English and African American Studies; his research centers on the experiences of Black police officers. Jessica is faculty in Social Studies Education and Women's Studies; her research explores methods for teaching race and gender through Black women's history. Both of us are white, which means that while we are teachers and scholars of race and racism, there are limits to our knowledge. We acknowledge that place and power of our whiteness in the classroom and in the scholarly world. We designed a general education class in CRT after lamenting for years that our students needed a "Race 101" class as a prerequisite to develop and practice racial literacy.

Over the course of the past six years, we have worked together not only in designing and co-teaching the CRT general education class, but also in developing workshops for K-12 teachers who are interested in learning to teach about race and racism with primary sources, thanks to a grant by the United States Library of Congress. We also co-founded the Social Justice Collaborative at Penn State Berks, a group of faculty, staff, and students committed to the work of justice on and off campus. We currently head the Certificate in Social Justice, which provides concentrated study in the broad field of justice studies.

Suggestions for the CRT-Curious Social Studies Teacher

Immerse yourself in the literature. CRT cannot be reduced to a soundbite. If you want to learn what CRT is (and what it is not), do not go to Twitter, Facebook comments, or local school board meeting livestreams on YouTube. We recommend starting by reading some of the founders of CRT such as Derrick Bell (1989, 1992), Kimberlé Crenshaw (1995), Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic (2017), and Mari J. Matsuda (1987). Read about how these scholars define structural determinism, intersectionality, color-blindness, interest convergence, re-visionist history, representation, and other key ideas in CRT. As with any theory, these scholars do not always agree, and knowledge is constructed. That is, how scholars study and understand race is shaped by their academic training, the questions they ask, who they are, and their lived experience. So, expect your learning of these foundational constructs to be messy and to take time. While we appreciate the popularity of newer texts such as Kendi's (2019) *How To Be An Antiracist* and DiAngelo's (2018) *White Fragility*, these books are best read after building context.

After reading the founding CRT literature, we recommend reading and considering specific applications to the field of education. While many teachers read the classic works of Gloria Ladson-Billings (1995) and Geneva Gay (2000) when learning about culturally relevant pedagogy and culturally responsive teaching in their teacher education programs, there is a vast body of literature available (and continuing to grow) that more deeply explores how CRT applies to education. See, for example: Gloria Ladson-Billings' (2021) edited collection: *Critical Race Theory in Education: A Scholar's Journey*.

When we teach the undergraduate CRT class, we introduce the key tenets of CRT in the second week of class and then spend subsequent weeks studying each in more depth. Although all the tenets overlap (one cannot really understand

how structural determinism explains systemic racism, for example, without revisionist history), we try to focus on one tenet at a time for clarity. When we teach structural determinism, for instance, we assign a chapter from Delgado & Stefancic's (2017) textbook along with supplementary texts such as primary source documents illustrating redlining practices (Library of Congress, 2019), a documentary about how redlining impacted Black GIs (California Newsreel, 2015), an investigative report on disparate health outcomes for Black and white mothers and babies (Villarosa, 2018), an investigative report on health and life outcomes by zip code (Khazan, 2018), and a chapter from Richard Rothstein's (2017) book, *The Color of Law*, showing how state policies led to de jure segregation. We then ask students to apply their understanding of structural determinism to each of the supplementary texts. It is through this robust synthesis that students begin to fully grasp the tenets of CRT.

In our undergraduate class, students work in groups with the support of their professors to apply CRT concepts and make connections across a variety of texts. If you are researching CRT on your own as a K-12 or preservice teacher, we encourage you to find a group of teachers who are interested in forming a professional learning community. Although background reading and thinking takes a significant amount of time and intellectual labor, it is a necessary first step. Do not expect that your professional learning community will reach consensus on all issues. CRT scholars do not provide nor preach uniform solutions to racism. Rather, CRT provides a framework to reveal the historical and societal roots of how race structures our lives, as well as how to recognize the humanity of all involved. Above all, we encourage you to welcome disagreement and diverse viewpoints while staying grounded in a shared commitment to facts, inquiry, and empathy.

Consider CRT a helpful tool for developing curriculum. Rather than assuming CRT must be avoided at all costs, we encourage you to lean in. Although CRT as a subject is rarely or never taught in any K-12 schools, it can and likely does already inform the planning and practices of schoolteachers (such as what content is chosen, what resources/books are used, etc.). Many of the arguments against CRT suggest that teachers are "indoctrinating" students by teaching them "hate America" and believe that white people are born inherently racist (Barbaro, 2021; CNN, 2021; Lang, 2020; PBS NewsHour, 2021). This is simply not true. After studying the literature, we recommend above, we believe most will agree that CRT is both a method and a lens through which to understand what race is, how race works, and its place in society, past and present. A thorough, evidence-based examination of redlining, for example, does not require us to agree on how (or if) the United States of America should make reparations to Black people today; it simply invites us to deliberate with a keener understanding of the historical and sociological intricacies at work. We acknowledge that CRT has been misused by a rare few, but that should not discount most teachers and scholars who employ CRT in valuable ways. We have found from experience that CRT can prepare schoolteachers to better navigate challenging conversations and lessons with children and adolescents.

Most of the teachers we work with express the desire to teach inclusive and representative history and the values of (and limits to) participatory citizenship. Two of CRT's key pillars, revisionist history and counterstory, suggest that teaching history from the perspectives of traditionally minoritized groups has the power to humanize and enrich how we understand our shared past – and that race and racism continue to maintain social hierarchy and injustice in the present (King, 2020; Love, 2020; Santellano et. al, 2021; Yosso, 2005). If you are teaching history that is outside of the master narrative, relying on primary sources, and centering the experiences of traditionally marginalized groups, you are already teaching with CRT methods and values. CRT offers ways to make the teaching of history more whole, honest, and representative, however ugly some of these truths may be. We argue that students can better and more completely love their country (if they want to) when they see it more completely. Further, CRT does *not* require students to ascribe to groupthink, agree on all points, or become a specific kind of social activist. To the contrary, CRT encourages students to resist oversimplifications, embrace the dissonance required for real learning, and build empathy for the perspectives of others, past and present.

While it is tempting to try to extinguish the fire by saying simply, "CRT isn't in schools," we do not believe that argument is helpful (or honest). Consider the following example. Most elementary school teachers are not teaching Einstein's Theory of Relativity. However, we likely agree that most elementary school teachers refer to concepts such as gravity. Does this mean that elementary school teachers are teaching the Theory of Relativity? The same principle can be applied to CRT. Teaching about the role of Black people in the United States military, for example, is a form of Revisionist History; does that mean we are "Teaching CRT?" No. But it does mean that CRT is one of many theories that inform the professional practice of teachers.

Conclusion

We live in a moment when recognizing each other's humanity is paramount. Behind every Facebook comment and every poster outside of a school board meeting is a human being. While we do not recommend that teachers fall prey to the alarmist rhetoric surrounding CRT in schools, we do recommend they become informed. Teachers need to be ready to respond to concerned parents from an informed and empathetic place, and to have conversations with their colleagues and administrators about how best to move forward. Even though anti-CRT voices will often sound the loudest, it is informed, evidence-based teaching that can both overcome the noise and honor what we see as a fundamental promise of CRT – the promise that only a full accounting of our past and present will bring us closer to our American ideals.

References

Barbaro, M. (Host). (2021, November 16). The School Board Wars, Part 1. In *The Daily.* The New York Times.

Bell, D. (1987). *And we are not saved: The elusive Quest for racial justice.* New York: Basic Books.

Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The*

permanence of racism. New York: Basic Books.

California Newsreel. (2014). *Race: The power of an illusion – how the racial wealth gap was created* [Video]. Vimeo. https://vimeo.com/133506632

CNN. (2021, July 6). *Why parents say they worry about critical race theory*. [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.come/watch?v=X2gQeV18mOk

Crewe, S. E. (2021). Critical race theory – uncomfortable but necessary tool for change. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 57(3), 416-418.

Crenshaw, K. (1995). (Host). (2021, September 2). The insurgent origins of critical race theory (No. 39). In *Intersectionality Matters!* The African American Policy Forum. https://souncloud.com/intersectionality-matters/39-looking-back-to-move-forward-the-insurgent-origens-of-critical-race-theory

Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2017). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York: New York University Press.

DiAngelo, R. (2018). *White Fragility: Why it's so hard for white people to talk about racism*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Fortin, J. (2021, November 8). Critical race theory: a brief history. *The New York Times*. https://nytimes.com/article/what-is-critical-race-theory.html

Gallagher, J. ,Blaisdell, B., Howard, C., & Harris, J. A. (2021). Navigating contentious times in rural education. *Theory & Practice in Rural Education*, 11(2), 1-14. https://doi.org/10/3776/tpre.2021.v11n2p1-14

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Greene, L. S. (2021). Critical race theory: Origins, permutations, and current queries. *Wisconsin Law Review*, 2021(2), 259-268. https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/wlr2021&i=271

Kendi, I. X. (2021, July 9). There is no debate over critical race theory. *The Atlantic*. https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2021/07/opponents-critical-race-theory-are-arguing-themselves/619391/

Kendi, I. X. (2018). *How to be an antiracist*. New York: Random House.

Khazan, O. (2018). Being black in America can be hazardous to your health. *The Atlantic*. https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2018/07/being-black-in-america-can-be-hazardous-to-your-health/561740/

King, L. J. (2020). Black history is not American history: Toward a framework of black historical consciousness. *Social Education* 84(6), 335-341.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice*, 34(3), 159-165.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2021). *Critical race theory in education: A scholar's journey*. New York: Teacher's College Press

Lang, C. (2020, September 29). President Trump has attacked critical race theory: Here is what to know about the intellectual movement. Time. https://time.com/5891138/critical-race-theory-explained/

Library of Congress. (2019, April 15). Real estate industry: A resource guide. Retrieved November 18, 2021, from https://guides.loc.gov/real-estate-industry-sources/introduction

Love, B. (2020). *We want to do more than survive: Abolitionist teaching and the pursuit of educational freedom*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Matsuda, Mari J. (1987). Looking to the bottom: Critical legal studies and reparations. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review*, Vol. 22, 324-399

Office of the Idaho Lt. Governor. (2021, April 8). *Idaho Lt. Governor Assembling Task Force to Examine Indoctrination in Idaho Education Based on Critical Race Theory, Socialism, Communism, and Marxism* [Press release]. https://lgo.idaho.gov/press-release-idaho-lt-governor-assembling-task-force/

PBS NewsHour. (2021, June 24). *Why Americans are so divided over teaching critical race theory* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4JbdKWsHeLI

Rothstein, R. (2018). *The color of law: A forgotten history of how our government segregated America*. New York: Liveright.

Santellano, K., Higuera, K., & Arriaga, F. (2021). Latina educators in sociology: Combating Trumpism with critical

pedagogy. Sociology of Race and Ethnicity, 7(1), 134-140. https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649220977569

The Hill. (2020, September 17). Trump RAILS *AGAINST Critical Race Theory in Schools* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jyhq1gPCY-w

Trump, D. J. (2021, June). A plan to get divisive & radical theories out of our schools. *RealClearPolitics.* https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2021/06/18/a_plan_to_get_divisive__radical_theories_out_of_our_schools_145946.html

Villarosa, L. (2018, April 11). Why America's Black mothers and babies are in a life-or-death crisis. *The New York Times Magazine*. https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/11/magazine/black-mothers-babies-death-maternal-mortality.html?smid=url-share

Wallace-Wells. B. (2021, June). How a Conservative activist invented the conflict over critical race theory. *The New Yorker.* https://www.newyorker.com/news/annals-of-inquiry/how-a-conservative-activist-invented-the-conflict-over-critical-race-theory

Yosso, T. (2005). *Critical race counterstories along the chicana/chicano educational pipeline.* New York: Routledge.

Zewude, R., & Sharma, M. (2021). Critical race theory in medicine. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 193(20), E739-E741. https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.210178

About the Authors: Jessica Schocker is Associate Professor of Social Studies Education and Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies at Penn State Berks. She can be reached via email at jbs213@psu.edu. Justin De Senso is Associate Teaching Professor of English and African American Studies at Penn State Berks. He can be reached via email at jxd367@psu.edu.

"PROVING A POINT:" UNDERSTANDING STUDENTS' USE OF HISTORICAL AGENCY AND THE INTENTIONALITY OF THE PAST

Lauren Colley, University of Cincinnati

"A study of historical agency potentially enhances both students' historical explanations for social change and their capacities as agents of social life," (den Heyer, 2003, p. 413).

In 2017, the day after the inauguration of former President Donald Trump, over half a million people gathered in Washington, D.C. in protest of Trump's divisive campaign and disparaging comments about women and minorities (Stein, Hendrix & Hauslohner, 2017). Since then, The Women's March has continued to mobilize and defend the organization's unity principles that include civil rights, reproductive rights, environmental justice, immigrant rights, disability rights, worker's rights, ending violence, and LGBTQIA rights (Women's March, 2021). Recently, the Women's March has mobilized alongside 90 other organizations to march in every single state on October 2nd, 2021 to defend reproductive rights in light of the Supreme Court's unwillingness to block H.B.8 from Texas, a law that banned abortions after the detection of a fetal heartbeat. (Manchester, 2021). Although the Women's March has created a momentum of social activism amongst its base of followers, the success of these marches rests on the shoulders of the many men, women, and non-binary activists who have historically took their protests to the streets.

Feminist historians have credited contemporary feminist movements as evolving from a long line of foremothers and have long studied the ways in which women have organized socially and politically (Scott, 1996). However, there continues to be an underrepresentation of women and gender related topics across social studies curriculum, standards, and teaching (Hahn et al., 2007; Schmeichel, 2011; Winslow, 2013; Woyshner, 2002; Woyshner & Schocker, 2015). When left unexamined, K-12 students are left to question not only the connections between today's marches and the past, but the reasoning and agency of feminists in the past. Historical agency, a conceptual tool often employed by historians, helps scholars in the present to decipher the choices of people in the past, along with the contexts, consequences, and affordances and constraints of those choices. Thus, by studying how students employed historical agency as a conceptual tool, this study provides insight into the ways in which historical agency can be a rich tool for social studies educators to use to allow their students to make meaning of the actions and decisions of people in the past. Specifically I asked: how do high school seniors employ historical agency while examining historical photographs from the second wave feminist movement (1960s and 1970s)?[1] Results revealed that participants focused on the intentionality of the actors

[1] The second-wave feminist movement, also referred to as the Women's Liberation Movement, was a movement for women's equality within U.S. society that occurred in the historical context

and used numerous context clues from the photographs to connect with their own emotions and actors' choices. Participants were also able to see that these historical actors operated within various social and structural challenges and limitations and painted a complex picture of an actor's decision making. The results of this study encourage teachers, educators, and researchers to provide more opportunities for students to form connections with the agency of the people in the past in order to better understand how these same challenges and limitations impact people's choices in the present.

Why Historical Agency?

Barton (2010) referred to historical agency as the "who did what and why" of history (p.1). Although this definition is simple, it refers to the choices of individuals or groups, the challenges of those choices, and the consequences of their actions. Although long used by historians, den Heyer (2012) pointed out that there is a lack of educational research that examines the complexities and dimensions of historical agency, in particular its connection to historical understanding and social change. Social studies researchers have argued that most K-12 students conceptualize historical agency in terms of individuals and nations, and without the intricate understanding of the complexities of the social and cultural constraints involved in their decision-making (Barton, 1997, 2010; Peck et al., 2011). This lack of understanding around the complexities of decision-making is troubling given that as Seixas (1993) pointed out, without employing historical agency, "students cannot see themselves as operating in the same realm as the historical figures whom they are studying, and thus cannot make meaning out of history" (p. 303). By not understanding historical agency students not only do not grasp the actions of actors in the past, but it also prohibits students from seeing the past as more than a series of inevitable events and by seeing the actors within the constraints and affordances of their decision making.

Understanding the complexity of the ways in which historical actors have resisted or acted is particularly important with topics such as gender and feminism. Gender, sexuality, issues of power, the patriarchy, and white supremacy inherently influence the actions and decisions of a historical actor (Cott & Faust, 2005). And yet most of the studies on students' conceptions of historical agency focus on white male perspectives (Barton, 1997, 2010; Lee & Ashby, 2000; Peck et al., 2011). Furthermore, Wills (2005) contended that too often, school history perpetuates collective memory and that for classrooms to deal properly with the actions of individuals in the past, they must begin to critically examine traditions of "remembering," which have typically silenced the voices and experiences of women and minorities.

Researchers have argued that studying historical agency helps students make meaning of the past, helps to move students towards understandings of historical significance and helps students to see the past as connected to human volition instead of a set of pre-determined

of the Civil Rights Movement and the Gay Liberation Movement of the 1960s and 1970s.

events (Seixas, 1993; Seixas & Morton, 2013; Whelan, 2001). This study used an operationalized definition of *historical agency.* When referring to *historical agency,* this study refers to an individual or groups of individuals in the past (actors) that chose to act (actions) in the context of structures, limitations, and constraints, while facing the intended and/or unintended consequences of their actions. This definition was formed through the consideration of various research and theory that informed what this larger study called the 5 C's of agency, namely: choice, context, consequence, category, and concept (Colley, 2017). Each of the 5 C's represents not only how other researchers have used the term in previous research, but also attempts to capture the body of research on the ways K-12 students either understand historical agency, or what they miss when attempting to understand this concept. For this particular manuscript, I will focus on the use of choice, context, and consequence.

Choice. One of the most missed aspects of agency by students of history, choice refers to the intentionality of historical actions and the tension of the contexts of these choices. Bandura (2001) described agency as the ability to make things happen by one's actions and explained that the "core features of agency enable people to play a part in their self-development, adaptation, and self-renewal with changing times" (p. 2). These core features, namely; intentionality, fore-thought, self-reactiveness, and self-reflectiveness, all influence how human agents are able to act within their lives and involve a level of conscious and informed action. Barton (2010) noted that students often overlook the concept of choice when defining agency, which therefore "removes choice from the stage of social action" and makes it difficult for them to understand the tension between choice and circumstance that is "at the core of historical understanding and democratic participation" (p. 34-35). This tension is what Johnson (2003) described as the difference between the causes and the consequences of historical agency and what Aya (2001) argued helps to explain the reasoning between a historical event and social change.

Context. The context of agency refers to the societal structures, conditions, limitations, and constraints on both the actors and the actions and often reflects the larger historical context of the time. Barton (2010; 2011) pointed out that previous research suggests that students in the U.S. think of history in terms of actions from individuals while ignoring the societal and historical contexts of those same actions. Barton (2010) continued, "students' sense of historical agency, then, often reflects a view of "great men" (or at least willful individuals) as the primary forces in history" (p.12). However, in a study with students in Northern Ireland, Barton (2001) found that students there were capable of using various cultural tools to understand the societal contexts of historical change, instead of relying upon theories of individually driven change or of change equaling progress. Still, the need for fully understanding the historical context of agency is important as the actors and their actions are set in the context of larger "structures, mentalities, conditions, and constraints beyond the actors themselves" (Peck et al., 2011, p. 255).

Consequence. Connected to the intentionality of choice, consequences of agency can be both intended and unintended and can also be the products of historical context. In a study on students' constructed narratives of Canadian history, Peck et al. (2011) found that Canadian students made a strong connection between the vision and intentionality of one historical actor (Macdonald) and his intended consequence, the creation of Canada. Still, the other individual agents that were named lacked the same explicit notion of intentionality and consequence that students awarded to Macdonald. Furthermore, Johnson (2003) argued that while historians see agency in the various acts of individuals, there are differences in the causes and consequences of those actions.

Thus, for this study, in order to investigate how students made sense of the aspects of historical agency such as choice, context, and consequence, I asked: in what ways do 12th graders employ historical agency as an analytical lens in examining historic photographs from the second wave feminist movement (1960s and 1970s)?[2]

Methods

This study was part of a larger project conducted during the 2014-2015 academic school year at Diana Prince High School.[3] Located within commuting distance from a mid-size metropolitan area in the upper South, Diana Prince High School was home to 955 students, of which 90% were white during the 2014-2015 academic year. Students within this state complete a survey course of U.S. history in their junior year, thus, high school seniors were specifically asked to volunteer. Of all the seniors in the school, 17 joined the study. Using purposive sampling, I grouped participants into pairs for the historical thinking photograph activity and the interview (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). Table 1 shows a participant summary by partner group. All demographic information was self-identified/described on the student questionnaire and are reported as written.

Data and collection procedures. Data were collected in three different phases: a student intake questionnaire, a historical thinking photograph activity, and an open-ended interview. For this particular line of inquiry only the data from the photograph activity and interview were utilized.

*Historical thinking photograph activity***.** Working in their partner groups, high school seniors analyzed a series of historical photographs from the second-wave feminist movement of the 1960s-1970s. Using a series of guided questions (Appendix) they utilized historical agency to form their own interpretation of the actors within the photographs. The photo-elicitation method incorporated into the research interview was particularly helpful because it prompted the participants by stimuli other than just the research questions themselves (Rose,

[2] The second-wave feminist movement, also referred to as the Women's Liberation Movement, was a movement for women's equality within U.S. society that occurred in the historical context of the Civil Rights Movement and the Gay Liberation Movement of the 1960s and 1970s.

[3] Pseudonyms have been used for all potentially identifying information.

2007). From an initial set of 12 photographs, I chose six images because of their ability to stimulate discussion regarding both gender and agency (Colley, 2017). The photographs represented various historical actors, including males, females, various ages of actors, and children of different races. Students worked together to analyze the photographs using the questions situated on the 5 C's of agency allowing them to talk historically and "negotiate meaning" with one another (Levstik & Barton, 2011, p. 24).

Open-ended interview. About one week after the historical thinking photograph activity, I interviewed each partner group to elicit information about their reasoning and thinking. I used a combination of grand-tour and probing questions (Yin, 2011) that I chose based on the pilot study (Colley, 2017). Each interview was recorded and transcribed at a later date.

The photographs. Because the photographs cannot be included due to copyright, Table 2 outlines a brief description of each photograph and the caption that was provided to students. For more information about these photographs and the ways in which they elicited conversations around gender and feminism see Colley (2019).

Data analysis. Due to the present study being grounded in naturalistic inquiry, data analysis was an inductive and iterative process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I used a five-phase cycle of analysis (Yin, 2011) to compile, disassemble, and reassemble data across questions, individual participants, and photographs. Through constant comparison, I interpreted the data and categorized them into codes, and then placed these codes into broader thematic categories for my claims. Data were constantly re-read, coded, and categorized throughout the analysis process.

Results

Participants viewed the historical actors within the photographs as having a larger purpose than just protesting or marching. They focused on the intentions of the historical actors, signaling that they were comprehending a commonly missed aspect of historical agency: choice. Participants used the context clues (e.g., appearance, emotions, caption, background) from the photographs as well as their own emotional connection with the photographs to discuss this intentionality. Furthermore, participants also viewed these historical actors' choices as operating within a context of social and structural challenges and limitations. In the end, these participants painted a complex picture of the intentional choices these particular men and women in the photographs might have taken.

Having something to prove: Understanding choice. Throughout the photograph activity, 15 of the 17 participants saw the actors in the photographs as having something to prove. Most often, this "something" was a goal of equality, the fight for equal rights, or the fight against sexism and gender norms. When examining the Miss America photograph, Jenna, Ariana, and Ben decided that the woman in the photograph was making a statement by throwing her bra in the trash:

> Ariana: What do you think they are doing? [Historical Thinking Question #2, Appendix]

> Jenna: Burning her bra, well throwing it away at least.
>
> Ariana: Trying to make a statement…that girls shouldn't have to live up to the lifestyle.
>
> Jenna: The expectations, expectations are a fraud…
>
> Ariana: Describe what you think are possible reasons for their actions.
>
> Ben: Being comfortable. *Proving a point.* [emphasis added]
>
> Ariana: I like that.
>
> Interviewer: What point do you think she was trying to prove?
>
> Ben: That there shouldn't be a double standard, anybody else can do the same things she can do.
>
> Jenna: And she looks so confident about it.

Others used the same language for the actions of individuals. Jessica described the LA Times photograph by saying "I guess she's trying to *prove a point* of like, we're the same people, but why do females get the more difficult but less paying jobs while the men get the easier and better paying jobs?" [emphasis added] Austin and Sam described the same photograph and explained:

> Sam: She's smiling…while holding that poster showing the jobs that typical women would choose, and typical men would do. Kind of just saying we shouldn't be, have just one group of jobs to do. We should be able to pick whatever we want.
>
> Austin: I agree, it's showing the different jobs for male and to female.
>
> Sam: No reasons, I guess, just to *prove a point*. [emphasis added]
>
> Interviewer: What kind of point do you think they're trying to prove?
>
> Sam: Even though I'm male, I could be a waitress, a salesclerk a typist whatever. If I'm a female, I could be a lawyer, engineer, I don't have to do these jobs because I'm a certain gender.

The concept of proving a point, carried on throughout each photograph's analysis. Matt viewed the woman in the Miss America photograph as "breaking the cookie cutter mold of what women were at the time" while Skylar saw the woman as "wanting to tell people that she doesn't have to go, she doesn't have to wear what other people think she should wear." Meanwhile, Talia viewed the woman in the LA times photograph as protesting "because she wants to be able to get a job that she wants." But when it came to the image of Cindy Sherman, none was more outspoken than Russ. He explained:

> Okay, I'm just going to bring this one out. I feel like this is kind of symbolic saying that she doesn't need a man to fix all of her problems. She can get things on her own. She can do things on her own. She's independent. Let's say, the third shelf up, how if I was taller than her and how she's struggling to get it, but she's still able to get it. She doesn't need help. I just feel that's kind of symbolic.

When asked what he thought Cindy Sherman was doing (historical thinking question #2, appendix), he responded again:

> I feel like she's doing exactly what I said, *proving to people*, that 'hey I'm independent. I don't need you solve all my problems.' I'm not saying that her

> problems are solved or that she doesn't want a man, I'm just saying that she doesn't necessarily need one to get along in life because back in the day, they [women] always depended on the man. [emphasis added].

Each time that these participants viewed these men and women in the photographs as trying to prove a form of equality, of gender equity, or of equal opportunity, they saw the historical actors as completing these actions with an intention in mind. The men and the women in the photographs were protesting because they wanted to *prove a point*. There was a clear choice, with a clear intention in mind.

Utilizing emotion to uncover intention: Examining context. Participants used the contextual clues within the photographs and the captions in order to analyze what the actions were or what was going on at the time of the photograph. They also used emotions of the actors (or within themselves) as contextual clues to uncover the intentions of why the actors in the photographs were taking these actions. During the interview process, participants opened up about what they were thinking about while answering these questions during the exercise.

> Ariana: *They all looked happy*. They're all, I think, trying to prove a point. They're trying to show the government and people that everyone should have the same rights, no matter what the thing is, education, paying bills, or anything like that. They should all be treated equal, and *they all seem like they are proud* of what they are doing [emphasis added].
>
> Ben: They're all fearless people that just have to stand up for what they believe in.

Utilizing the emotions that Ariana and Ben thought were embedded in the photograph (e.g. happy, proud) and they also attempted to explain what that meant for the historical actors (e.g. proving a point, being fearless). They weren't alone in using the emotional cues within the photographs to help bring meaning to the actions in the photographs. Jessica explained that during this process she "was trying to picture myself in that person's shoes or like in that group to get the feeling of why they wanted to do that" while Alex said she looked at "the little things like facial expressions, words that were on their posters" to cue her responses. Matt also explained that he "was looking at the photo to see their emotions, to see what they're doing, and how they looked like, their body language." While they were noticing the emotions of the people in the past, they were achieving historical empathy in order to gain insight into why these people made these choices. When responding in the interview about what they were thinking about when answering the question about why the individuals were taking the actions they did, Skylar and Madison explained:

> Skylar: About why they stood up? I was thinking about *how brave they were* to really, because I know some people are like 'oh gosh, women, stop!" they were just trying to change something that needed to be changed.
>
> Madison: I was thinking about *how unselfish they were*, because this was a thing that went on for some years. The older women might not even get to see the right to vote, or the right to be equal, but they were fighting for their daughters and their granddaughters. Just the fact that they were willing to *go through all this judgment*

> for those who were coming in the future was pretty inspiring to me [emphasis added].

Skylar and Madison were thinking not only about the intentions of the men and women in the photographs, but also about the challenges they faced, the intended and unintended consequences of their actions, and about what that meant for future generations. By utilizing the emotions of the actors or their own emotional responses to the photographs, participants began to uncover that these historical actors were making decisions for themselves.

Examining social and structural challenge: Describing consequences. Participants were quick to notice the extent of social challenges these actors might have faced within the historic photographs. Participants explained that the actors in the photographs would have faced discrimination, judgment, and name calling, for standing up for their rights and for standing against the traditional gender norms. Thirteen participants identified being discriminated against as one of the biggest challenges or limitations facing the individuals in the photographs.

When examining the LA Times photograph Sam explained, "the challenges they faced from doing something like this was discrimination from the people, that still didn't believe what they were fighting for was right." Meanwhile, Jenna commented that the woman in the Miss America photograph was "discriminated against, just because she didn't want to wear a bra" and Ariana chimed in, "yeah discrimination and name-calling."

Many of these participants also brought up the perceived judgment that these historical actors would have faced for taking the actions they did. Jessica thought that the men in the abortion photograph would have been "criticized by others" and Madison thought that the boy teammates who were not pictured in the Hoboken photograph would have "from this moment on…always be negative towards the women." Skylar explained that for the woman in the Miss America photo, "one of her challenges...[is] being judged probably" while Ellen discussed that "you had probably had people that disagreed."

Participants also described that they thought the historical actors would have faced harassment or actual name-calling. When examining the LA Times photo, Ellen explained that she thought "I'm sure they had guys that walked by and maybe said mean things" to which Matt added "yeah, harassed them a little bit." Russ described the same photograph saying that there was probably "a lot of booing" and "probably a lot of rejection saying that they shouldn't be doing this." Sam thought that maybe the men and women in the anti-ERA photograph got "a lot of negative words being said to them or just having people in general bring them down."

Still, none of the photographs brought up discussion of challenging gender norms, quite like the image of the woman throwing her bra in the trash at the 1968 Miss America Pageant. As Jenna pointed out with the woman in the Miss America photograph, "I mean she's doing it at a pageant, so I'm thinking she's just like, 'Forget dressing up like a Barbie doll and wearing these nice fancy dresses, let's go braless and have fun'." Madison viewed the photograph in similar ways explaining that "if we didn't look at the

actual physical limitation for a bra, just coming off, then it [the challenge] would probably just be *society's idea of the woman*." [emphasis added] Meanwhile, Matt thought that she might "get looks" and that "people are going to want to stop her and be like, 'you're indecent' and 'it's inappropriate'." When pushed on what was indecent, Matt explained "the population that was like, look, you need to be modest in public."

At other times participants noted the structural challenges that might have faced these historical actors. Laws, religion, or structural gender inequalities were all cited as possible challenges the actors in the photographs could have faced when making these choices to act.

Several participants explained that the men and women protesting the ERA amendment in front of the White House probably faced the challenge of cops or jail time because of the context of the White House. Jenna explained that "some of them probably got thrown in jail… or some riots broke out" while Russ said, "it being in front of the White House, there'd be the police, things like that." Austin also agreed and said, "they probably risked going to jail because it's right in front of the White House and security is heavy there." Others, however, pointed to laws, religion and other structural barriers as the main challenges these men and women faced.

When describing what the girls in the Hoboken photograph faced, Jenna explained:

> I mean, the segregation laws, all that stuff, had just passed to be completely abolished or whatever. So, it had to be hard to make the team as a girl, and it must have been hard to make the team as a Black person. That had to be hard. You had the *whole world against you* [emphasis added].

Madison and Skylar argued that the biggest limitation in the abortion photograph was religion. They described:

> Madison: the challenges faced would probably be all the traditionalists who are saying that abortion is just wrong.
>
> Skylar: Yeah
>
> Madison: That it's not supposed to happen, God didn't want it this way.
>
> Skylar: Yeah, they'll probably use religion and the Bible.

And when analyzing the LA Times photo, Matt explained that a challenge would be "getting job equality" and Ellen added "yeah, actually getting hired as the male jobs." With regards to this same photograph, Madison said, "the challenge can be seen just from the fact that they didn't have equal rights from the beginning" and Talia explained that "going up against a giant communication device, like the LA Times…would be really difficult." These participants are noting that even though this woman might have been called names, or discriminated against, that there were larger and broader structural challenges that she was facing. These larger structural challenges were what was responsible for the lack of gender equality in the first place and would therefore be a large barrier to overcoming this inequity. Whatever the challenge, participants were clear that the actions of the past did not happen within a vacuum, that they were intentional actions made with intended and unintended consequences, and that

these actions, came with an onslaught of social and structural barriers to overcome.

Discussion

When describing the choices, contexts, and consequences faced by the historical actors in the historic photographs, participants were discussing how their own interpretation of issues of power, equality, gender, sexuality, and white supremacy were all influencing a person's actions (Cott & Faust, 2005). Whether it was participants' interpretation that the historical actors were "proving a point" of equality or that by making these choices the actors faced social and structural challenges influenced by social ideas of gender, power, and the patriarchy, the entanglement within participants' analyses was clear. And although these results showcase the connections that participants made between historical empathy and agency and between their understanding of choices and consequences, participants still utilized overgeneralizations that stopped them short of fully embracing the nuances of power structures and societal structures that affect an actor's choice.

Making connections. Reading affect—emotion—in the photographs appeared to help participants attend to the intention of historical actors. In doing so, participants also displayed a form of historical empathy. Barton & Levstik (2004) explained that although historical empathy remains a much-debated concept in the research literature, consensus has arisen over the concept's meaning that: "empathy involves using the perspectives of people in the past to explain their actions" (p. 208). Using these perspectives, however, involves more than just recognizing their point of view; it involves the ability to "contextualize their [historical actors] actions" (Barton & Levstik, 2004, p. 208). Lee and Shemilt (2011) also argued that historical empathy was not a process, so much as an achievement: "It is where we get when, on the basis of evidence, we reconstruct people's beliefs and values in ways that make social actions and social practices intelligible" (p. 48). From that perspective, participants analyzing the Miss America pageant photograph for example were using evidence (deductions related to emotions and other contextual clues in the photograph) to reconstruct the subject of the photograph's beliefs and values (to "prove a point") in a way that made her social action (throwing her bra in the trash) make sense as a reasoned choice. The idea that she was "rebellious" or "scandalous" only further fits the argument that she was intentionally trying to prove her point, of being, as Madison put it, "no longer restricted".

As opposed to viewing the photographs as snapshots of moments in time, participants thus attempted to decode the messages in the photographs. Participants viewed the photographs as "carefully constructed spaces, using symbols and allusions to convey complex messages" (Card, 2004, p. 116). They identified the young girls in the Hoboken photograph, for instance, as being "role models" and "bringing confidence to other women or girls to follow." Participants also spoke at length about how the woman's action of throwing her bra in the trash and Cindy Sherman's reaching for a book symbolized larger messages about women's independence and breaking gender norms. They were thus not only using context clues, but also

were making inferences based on the symbolism and complex message they believed the photograph was capturing.

References to discrimination or name-calling suggest that participants also identified the various social challenges faced by historical actors that were standing up for a cause such as women's rights. Participants described how these historical actors faced these social challenges because of the very fact that they were challenging traditional gender norms. The ways in which these participants made these connections to the challenges facing these historical actors clarifies that they thought there were risks, and/or consequences involved with taking action.

Making overgeneralizations. Participants discussed a variety of ways in which the actors were making intentional choices, as they were "proving a point" or "breaking the mold." However, at no point did participants choose to discuss what caused these actors take these actions. Although they hinted at possible causes through their discussion of the challenges and limitations facing the historical actors, at no point did they question the actual event or action itself or suggest alternative actions. In this way, participants were using "assumptions and the fallacy of over-determination" by being able to "construe 'actions' as having event-like outcomes" (Lee & Shemilt, 2009, p. 136).

This limited conception of history assumes this history is moving as "a one-way street of over-determined landmarks on the route from 'then' to 'now'." (Lee & Shemilt, 2009, p. 137). The problem with this level of historical thinking is that, as Lee & Shemilt (2009) pointed out, it limits students' ability to see causation as anything beyond a sequence of determined events because they struggle with seeing the breadth of possible causes in history. This was particularly true for these participants who never once expressed that the actions of these individuals were *not* responsible in generating success for the women's rights movement of the 1970s and instead overgeneralized that all of these actions were justifiable and helped create progress. Participants struggle with causation suggests they were missing what historian Edward Ayers (2003) calls the "essence of the story" (p. xix). Ayers (2003) explained:

> Simple explanations, stark opposites, sweeping generalizations, and unfolding inevitabilities always tempt us, but the miss the essence of the story, an essence found in the deep contingency of history. To emphasize deep contingency is not to emphasize mere chance, all too obvious in a war, but rather the dense and intricate connections in which lives, and events are embedded (p. xix).

By overgeneralizing participants struggled to connect the historical actors in the photographs to the "deep contingency of history" that illustrates how lives and events are connected.

Implications and Conclusion

By using discipline-specific methods (primary source analysis) and discipline-specific conceptual tools (historical agency) participants were able to generate an understanding of the choices, context, and consequences that affect the agency of people in the past. The exercise revealed that participants could reason about the choices that actors made,

the possible reasons for these choices, and the consequences that faced the actors when these decisions were made. Although participants over-generalized and did not reach a full conceptual understanding of causation, this study serves as an example of what teachers, teacher educators, and researchers can do to help to scaffold students' learning and use of historical agency.

Furthermore, having student's analyze historic photographs can be a beneficial strategy for elaborating upon the humanness of history (Barton & Levstik, 2004). As Callahan (2013) argued, "the purpose of teaching students to think critically about historical photographs is not to produce scores of historians, but rather to develop civically competent citizens" (p. 78). These historic photographs provided a space for participants to use their photograph analysis in order to unpack historical agency, while also attending to the broader historic and civic issues of gender and feminism. In a packed curriculum, brief historical thinking exercises like the one used in this study, can become powerful learning opportunities for students that help students develop content, skills, and civic readiness.

Lastly, as social studies curriculum continues to be a political battleground over issues of the inclusion of social history topics (e.g., current policies being written to ban critical race theory and the teaching of divisive issues), studies like this one, point to the intellectual as well as ethical benefits of inclusion. Having students consider the historical agency of those in the past and use agency as a conceptual lens to investigate topics in history, provides them with a set of historical thinking tools for discussing similar issues in the present. By using historical agency as a conceptual tool, teachers, educators, and researchers can provide opportunities for students to form connections from the multitude of historical perspectives and experiences of the past and their current manifestations. Understanding topics such as gender equity and feminism within the social studies requires students to not only dissect these concepts, but to engage with the reasons that actors, past and present, feel compelled to march for them.

References

Aya, R. (2001). The third man: or agency in history; or, rationality in revolution. *History and Theory, 40*(4), 143-152. ttps://doi.org/10.1111/0018-2656.00186

Ayers, E. L. (2003). *In the presence of mine enemies: War in the heart of America 1859 1863.* W.W. Norton and Company.

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: an Agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1), 1-26. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1

Barton, K.C. (1997). "Bossed around by the queen": elementary students' understanding of individuals and institutions in history. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 12*(4), 290-314. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315088815-8

Barton, K.C. (2001). A sociocultural perspective on children's understandings of historical change: comparative findings from Northern Ireland and the United States. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(4), 881-913. ttps://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038004881

Barton, K.C. (May, 2010). New Zealand students And historical agency. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Denver.

Barton, K.C. (2011). Agency, choice and historical action: How history teaching can help

students think about democratic decision making. *Citizenship Teaching & Learning, 7*(2), 131-142. https://doi.org/10.1386/ctl.7.2.131_1

Barton, K.C. & Levstik, L.S. (2004). *Teaching history For the common good.* Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Callahan, C. (2013). Analyzing historical Photographs to promote civic competence. *Social Studies Research and Practice, 8*(1), 77-88.

Card, J. (2004). Picturing place: what you get may Be more than what you see. *Teaching History,116*, 16-20.

Colley, L. M. (2017). Judging on their looks: Understanding pre-service social studies teachers' conceptions of historical agency and gender. *Journal of Social Studies Research,* 41(2), 155-177 DOI: 10.1016/j.jssr.2016.08.002

Colley, L. M. (2019). (Un)restricting feminism: High school students' constructions of gender and feminism in the context of the historical struggle for women's rights. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 57(3), 426-455 https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2019.1593268

Cott, N.F. & Faust, D.G. (2005). Recent directions In gender and women's history. *Magazine of History, 19*(2), 4-5. https://doi.org/10.1093/maghis/19.2.4

den Heyer, K. (2012). Mapping the shadow: bringing scholarship and the teachers together to explore agency's shape and content in social change. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 40*(3), 292-323. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2012.705680

Hahn, C. L., Bernard-Powers, J., Crocco, M. S., & Woyshner, C. (2007). Gender equity in social studies. In S. Klein (Ed.), *Handbook for achieving gender equity through education* (pp. 335–357). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Johnson, W. (2003). On agency. *Journal of Social History, 37*(1), 113-124. https://doi.org/10.1353/jsh.2003.0143

Lee, P. & Ashby, R. (2000). Progression in historical understanding among students ages 7-14. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: national and international perspectives* (pp. 199-223). New York University.

Lee, P. & Shemilt, D. (2009). Is any explanation Better than none? Over-determined narratives, senseless agencies and one-way streets in students' learning about cause and consequence in history. *Teaching History, 137*, 42-49.

Levstik, L.S. & Barton, K.C. (2011). *Doing history: investigating with children in elementary and middle school.* Routledge.

Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.

Manchester, J. (2021). Women's March to hold nationwide events to respond to Texas abortion law. *The Hill.* https://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/570769-womens-march-to-hold-nationwide-mobilization-event-to-respond-to-texas

McMillan, J.H. & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research In education: Evidence based inquiry.* Pearson.

Peck, C., Poyntz, S., & Seixas, P. (2011). Agency in students' narratives of Canadian history. In L. Perikleous & D. Shemilt (Eds.), *The future of the past: Why history education matters* (pp.253-282). Association for Historical Dialogue and Research.

Rose, G. (2007). *Visual methodologies: An Introduction to the interpretation of visual materials.* Sage.

Schmeichel, M. (2011). Feminism, neoliberalism, And social studies. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 39*(1), 6–31. doi:10.1080/00933104.2011.10473445

Scott, J. W. (1996). *Feminism and history: Oxford readings in feminism.* Oxford University Press.

Seixas, P. (1993). Historical understanding among adolescents in a multicultural setting. *Curriculum Inquiry, 23*(3), 358-374. https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1993.11076127

Seixas, P. & Morton, T. (2013). *The big six historical thinking concepts*. Nelson Education.

Stein, P., Hendrix, S., & Hauslohner, A. (2017). "Women's marches: More than one million protesters vow to resist President Trump." *Washington Post.* https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/womens-march-on-washington-a-sea-of-pink-hatted-protesters-vow-to-resist-

donald-trump/2017/01/21/ae4def62-dfdf-11e6-acdf-14da832ae861_story.html
Whelan, M. (2001). Why the study of history Should be the core of social studies education. In E.W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems and possibilities* (pp.43-56). State University of New York.
Wills, J.S. (2005). "Some people even died": Martin Luther King, Jr., the civil rights movement and the politics of remembrance in elementary classrooms. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 18*(1), 109-131. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390412331318397
Winslow, B. (2013). Clio in the classroom: The State of women and women's history in the middle and high school curriculum...and perhaps a way forward. *Journal of Women's History*, *25*(4), 319–332. doi:10.1353/jowh.2013.0045
Women's March. (2021). Mission and principles. https://womensmarch.com/mission-and-principles
Woyshner, C. (2002). Teaching the women's club movement in the United States history. *The Social Studies, 93*(1), 11–17. doi:10.1080/00377990209599874
Woyshner, C., & Schocker, J. B. (2015). Cultural parallax and content analysis: Images of Black women in high school history textbooks. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 43*(4), 441–468. doi:10.1080/00933104.2015.1099487
Yin, R.K. (2011). *Qualitative research from start to finish.* Guilford Press.

About the Author. Lauren Colley is Assistant Professor of Integrated Social Studies Education at the University of Cincinnati. She can be reached via email at: lauren.colley@uc.edu.

Appendix

Historical Thinking Photograph Exercise Question Matrix

Aspect of Agency	Historical Photograph Analysis Questions
Choice	1) Who is in the photograph? 2) What do you think they are doing 3) Describe what you think are possible reasons for their actions.
Context	4) What is the date and location (if given) of the photograph? 5) Describe anything else that you think might be going on at this time or at this location that you think could be affecting the individuals.
Consequence	6) What do you think the effects of these individuals or groups' actions were? 7) Do you think they faced challenges or limitations to their actions? Describe or list these challenges or limitations. If you don't think they faced any, describe why not. 8) If you were in this photo, what actions would you have taken?
Category	Using the post-its, describe how influential you see these actions in creating social change. Number the images from 1-6 with 1 being the one you think was *the most influential* and 6 being the one you think was the *least influential*
Concept	Follow-Up Question: Based on your investigation of these photographs, do you think feminism *really* created change? Why or why not?

Table 1

Participant Summary By Partner Group

Pseudonyms of Partner Group Members	Gender	Race	US History Course Taken
Ariana	F	Hispanic	General US
Jenna	F	White	General US
Ben	M	White	General US
Russ	M	White	General US
Lindsey	F	White	General US
Matt	M	White	General US
Ellen	F	Mixed	General US
Sam	M	White	AP US
Austin	M	White	General US
Alex	F	Hispanic	General US
Jessica	F	White/Ukrainian	AP US
Timmy	M	White	AP US
Usher	M	White	AP US
Nikki	F	White	AP US
Talia	F	White	AP US
Madison	F	White	AP US
Skylar	F	White	AP US

Note. Gender, race, and course were all self-identified.

Table 2

Photographs In Depth

Photograph Name Identifier	Why The Photograph Was Chosen	Photograph Description	Caption Available to Participants
Miss America Photograph	During pilot, this image provoked discussion over gender, the identity of feminists, and of rebellious actions.	A woman is throwing her bra away in protest at the 1968 Miss America Pageant.	*An unidentified woman drops a bra into the trash at 1968 Miss America Pageant.* [photograph].
A Woman's Choice	During pilot, this image provoked discussion about the males in the photograph and about a woman's right to choose.	Two men marching, holding a sign, which says "Abortion a woman's choice."	*International Women's Day march down State Street, Chicago. 1974.* [photograph].
Anti-ERA	During pilot, this image stirred up conversation over whether the ERA had passed and about why these particular men and women would have opposed the ERA.	Various men and women protesting against the ERA holding signs signaling various reasons of opposition including, females in the draft.	*Demonstrators Opposed to the ERA (Equal Rights Amendment) in Front of the White House*, February 4, 1977. [photograph].
Hoboken	This image was added after the pilot to represent a younger population, as well as to highlight actions beyond protests and marches.	Young girls of mixed races are sitting on a sign that says "downtown boys club" while holding baseball gloves.	*Little League tryouts in Hoboken, NJ, April 1974.* [photograph]. Two years after NOW (National Organization of Women) won lawsuit (NOW v Little League Baseball Inc) forcing the team to permit girls to try out.
Cindy Sherman	This image was added after the pilot to represent a woman competing an everyday action to signal the various forms of agency.	Cindy Sherman is reaching for a book on a tall shelf, while looking over her shoulder as if someone is watching her.	*Untitled film still #13 (self portrait). 1978.* Sherman, Cindy. (photographer).
LA Times	During pilot, this image sparked conversation over her attire and physical appearance and about whether or not she was a true feminist.	A woman holds a picket sign showing the jobs of interest listed for men and for women.	*NOW (National Organization of Women) members picket Los Angeles Times, 1969*, [photograph].

BRINGING STUDENTS INTO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Lightning Jay, University of Pennsylvania
Andrew O. del Calvo, University of Pennsylvania
Jenni Conrad, Temple University
Andrew J. Schiera, University of Pennsylvania
Timothy Patterson, Temple University
Abby Reisman, University of Pennsylvania

Last summer, we invited students to participate in a teacher professional development around facilitating discussion in social studies classrooms. Initially intended as a short-term fix to pandemic-era online teacher preparation, the experience changed the way that our research team thought about learning and authenticity in professional development. This article tells the story of our journey.

The Impetus

In early 2020, our research team, a collaborative effort between researchers at the University of Pennsylvania and Temple University, received funding to study and support social studies teachers' development as facilitators of discussion. Our longitudinal project begins working with teachers in their preservice year, studying their skillset for enacting high-quality discussions in secondary classrooms and their perception of themselves and their role as teachers. We then follow them through their first two years in the profession to understand how their thinking and teaching change over time. Between each school year, we offer participating teachers a week of professional development (PD) in discussion facilitation. Here, we share our lessons from our first summer PD with teacher participants, which fundamentally shifted our collective view on developing professional knowledge.

Our shared commitment to discussion, as evidenced by our team name DISCUSS [Developing Identities for Supporting Conversations and Understanding Social Studies], stems from its difficulty and complexity. Most social studies teachers understand that classroom discussions are a valuable, even essential, practice (Cuenca, 2021; NCSS, 2013). Yet research shows that even when most teachers *think* they're teaching through discussion, they're actually giving students limited opportunities to really talk and learn through extended dialogue (Cazden, 2001; Nystrand et al., 2001; Saye & SSIRC, 2013). Our research suggests that teachers' instructional decisions during discussions are deeply bound up with how they understand themselves, their students, and the aim of social studies learning (Reisman, Enumah, & Jay, 2020). Our ultimate goal in this project is to develop teachers' skills for enacting discussion and their familiarity with various frameworks for understanding social studies. But this year we were faced with a particular challenge. The preservice teachers we were working with had spent their entire year online. Just a few weeks before the start of school as teachers of record, they had never led a discussion with students in a physical classroom.

The Structure and The Kids

Drawing from the literature on practice-based teacher education (Grossman et al., 2009) we planned for teachers to spend the first three days of PD observing representations of discussion, identifying the salient components of effective dis-cussions, and then planning for their rehearsals, which would occur on the fourth day.

That's when the kids came in. In a departure from most of the literature on rehearsals with teachers, we decided to plan a "rehearsal day" with *actual students*. We planned to bring in a group of 50 students, 9th-12th grade, from all over Philadelphia to provide teachers real feedback on their discussion facilitation.

We structured rehearsals so that students were broken into groups of 10 and paired with three novice teachers. Each teacher had the opportunity to lead the group in a 45-minute text-based discussion, receive feedback for 15 minutes, and observe their peers teaching different lessons to the same group of students. Our initial planning conceived of the rehearsal day as an opportunity for teachers to develop "muscle memory" practicing discussion facilitation moves. As our planning and design progressed, however, students' knowledge and experiences steadily migrated to the center of our conceptualization. This shift to genuinely centering students and their experiences in PD, to position them as drivers of teachers' learning, transformed the PD.

The Operation

Planning the rehearsal day, we faced three major challenges. We needed to recruit students to join PD, ensure that they had a safe, joyful, and intellectually stimulating experience, and find a way to make their participation instructive to our teachers. Finding students proved to be the easy part of recruitment. Our universities had longstanding partnerships with schools and community organizations, which enabled us to reach principals, teachers, and community members who could recommend students that might be eager to join us. The challenge lay in messaging the goals of the PD and students' roles in clear and compelling language. We tried a variety of pitches: Students could come discuss interesting social studies topics! They could meet students from other schools! Tour a college campus! We even offered a stipend, paying students for their expertise the same way PD sessions often reward expert consultants. What mattered most, however, was students' investment in teaching and learning. When we polled participating students about why they decided to join, the most frequent answer was, "I think it would be a great opportunity to talk to other students and teachers about what makes good teaching." Having made the promise to give students the chance to give meaningful feedback, we set out to make sure that we delivered a caring and empowering experience.

As we designed the PD, we were acutely aware that we assumed an obligation of care for any students we recruited (Noddings, 2005). Our concern for students extended beyond the normal obligations of educators to children. Discussions, after all, are inherently unpredictable. Both content and process

have the potential to be educative or miseducative (Hess & McAvoy, 2015; Parker, 2006). Participating in discussions within inequitable societies holds particular risks for students already marginalized in schools (Hlavacik & Krutka, 2021; Gibson, 2020). Further, we were asking students to engage in this uncertain and vulnerable work with classmates they had never met before and novice teachers who were trying out new instructional techniques.

We created two sets of guard-rails. First, we built extensive preparative time into the PD. Knowing that thoughtful lesson planning takes a lot of time, especially for novices (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; Grossman & Thompson, 2008), we allotted considerable time for teachers to draft and revise their lessons. To further minimize the risk to students, we made sure experienced teachers oversaw novices' interactions with children. Members of our research team gave feedback on every teacher's plans. More importantly, we presented the sessions as "rehearsals" not "lessons" and made exceedingly clear to students that the teachers sought their feedback. Drawing upon literature on instructional rehearsals, we told teachers and students that research team members would be "pausing" the discussion *in medias res* to give teachers chances to reflect on their pedagogical decision-making and consider next steps in the very moment of enactment (Kazemi et al, 2016; Kelley-Petersen et al., 2018). These pauses not only gave teachers a chance to catch their breath amidst the uncertainty of a discussion (Stroupe & Gotwals, 2018), they were also an intentional mechanism allowing experienced members of our team to interrupt any unsafe situations that might arise.

The final challenge was making all this effort worthwhile by ensuring that students could give teachers powerful feedback. We started from the premise that our model (Appendix A) inverts the typical relationship between the teacher and the student. Normally, the teacher supports the students' learning. In our case, it was exactly the opposite – the students were explicitly at the professional development to support the learning of the teacher by giving them feedback. We supported students to enter this new, largely unfamiliar role in three ways. We provided principles of impactful feedback, such as making comments specific and actionable (Flushman, Guise, & Heeg, 2019) (e.g., moving away from "That lesson was pretty good," and towards, "I liked the lesson because the first question you asked made me really think about what the document said"). We had students practice giving feedback on a video of instruction prior to beginning the rehearsals. And we asked the novice teachers to share what students' feedback meant to them. A critical part of this preparation involved encountering students' previous experiences with feedback. A number of students shared experiences with their feedback going unheard. Positioning students as knowl-edgeable required that we acknowledged the harm caused by students' experiences of having their voices marginalized. Our apologies, teachers' insistence that they sincerely wanted feedback, and the follow-through to have teachers publicly reflect upon and acknowledge students' comments were essential steps towards addressing negative past experiences

and rebuilding students' trust and willingness to share.

The Observations

Rehearsals were a resounding success. Teachers raved about them and students left saying, "If you're doing this next year, I'm definitely coming back." Students' knowledge was at the center of this success. Teachers were taken aback by the specificity and helpfulness of the student feedback. One teacher related being, "pleasantly surprised by how detailed the student feedback was," and how "thoughtful" students were in their critiques. Another remarked that because students "knew...they're never going to see me" again, they "could just be straight up" and provide honest feedback without any possibility of repercussions. We were particularly encouraged to hear teachers looking forward to using student feedback in their real classrooms. One teacher said the structures we used in the PD "could definitely run in…[her] classroom" and that she hoped to integrate them into her classes because students need to be "heard" and their feedback makes her teaching better. Spurred by this feedback, teachers considered strategies that would allow them to continuously "readjust" their vision so that it "works for kids."

Students expressed a similar enthusiasm for the day. While a few were energized by the content they covered ("I've got to look up more about Watergate!"), most students valued the sense of being trusted and heard. "Thank you for considering students' opinions and providing space for those to be shared," wrote one on their feedback slip. "This should be mandatory for all teachers across the globe after every quarter or semester," wrote another. A third student said the PD had inspired her to give feedback to her future teachers and make change in her school.

Our understanding of teacher and students' experiences at PD is filtered through our broader research into the relationship between teachers' instructional decisions and their self-perceived identities. Through this lens, we see teachers not simply having a productive experience in PD, but growing to understand themselves, their peers, and their students. The instructional moves that teachers practiced, like asking compelling open questions and orienting students towards text and toward one another (Reisman et al., 2018), are more likely to become part of teachers' routine practice if they are invested in being the sort of teacher who inspires thought-provoking classroom discussion. The participants in our PD showed signs of developing along this path as they evaluated and honed their facilitation skills. For many, pauses in rehearsals were a rare opportunity to not only observe their peers teaching, but to hear those peers' thought processes. One teacher shared that he started self-consciously mimicking the way a peer walked between groups of students, continually provoking their discussions. Another told her friend, "I totally redesigned my [lesson's] launch after seeing you." This direct experience of being part of a group of teachers committed to their development, of sitting with students who were metacognitive about their own learning and insightful about instruction, and of putting ideas into practice left participating teachers excited about future discussions and left those of us on the research team excited about future PDs.

As we look forward to our next opportunity to bring students into PD, we hope to refine our approach. One tension that we still need to resolve involves striking the appropriate balance between challenge and support for teachers. Even with multiple days at our disposal, some teachers felt rushed as they prepared for the rehearsals. Multiple teachers described aspects of the preparation as "stressful," and one said that planning her lesson was "really stressful. I had to spend so much time on it the evening before." Of course, students noticed that teachers felt crunched. They noted that "We sped through topics extremely fast because of time, so it felt like we couldn't go very deep" and "I wish we had more time." Some of this rushed feeling is likely a simple matter of miscalculation on our part. Newer teachers need more support and time creating lessons than we anticipated, and future PDs could be recalibrated to offer more coaching. At the same time, some of the stressful feelings teachers experienced were likely bound up in the authenticity of the enactment. Facilitating discussions is hard, and for most of these teachers this was their first attempt at teaching a face-to-face lesson with secondary students. We might have allayed anxiety by lingering in the planning stage, but we may have also missed some of the benefits of enactment. Some degree of struggle is likely productive, fueling reflection and growth. Finding the right balance will take work, reflection, and further collaboration with the teachers at our PDs.

The Considerations

Placing students at the center of our PD was a revelation for us. While we initially saw it as a short-term fix to the problem presented by pandemic-era teacher preparation, we are now excited to incorporate it into our future PDs. We found that bringing students to PD created an unprecedented level of authenticity for our participants. It allowed them to try out critical new pedagogies in realistic ways within the safe confines of PD. It surfaced the real emotions of teaching, allowing us to join in their joy and support their frustrations and fears in situated, specific, and time-sensitive ways. And, most importantly, it recentered our discussions of teaching on students. The students were the stars. Their gentle and thoughtful feedback not only suggested useful pedagogies for our participants, but also sent these new teachers into the school year with an image of students as knowledgeable and committed to their own learning.

We recognize that our experience in this PD was the product of unusual circumstances. Grant funding allowed us to be extra generous to students, our participants were particularly primed for an in-person experience after a year online, and we were able to create unique pairings such that each of the participants and students were meeting for the first time during our PD. Schools or districts with limited budgets, experienced teachers, and a smaller pool of students to work with might be daunted to attempt incorporating students into PD. At the same time, educators have experience being creative. Middle school teachers might work with high school students, a free lunch and the chance to help their school might be enough to entice students to sign up, and aligning PD with broad district-level instructional goals might help teachers buy into the process.

For us, placing students at the center of PD became a way to practice what we preached. We wanted teachers to embrace a student-centered responsive pedagogy. Having students lead knowledge-sharing practices during PD allowed teachers to feel the benefit of that style of teaching. We are excited to continue experimenting with this PD approach and hope that others will join us.

References

Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Heinemann.

Center to Support Excellence in Teaching. (2017). Discussion Rehearsal Task Card. CSET. https://docs.google.com/document/d/1xgGH0dRs65qfwrLi4bVuD_IXicWOMnvTcQ0sJvh9CFQ/edit

Cuenca, A. (2021). Proposing core practices for social studies teacher education: A qualitative content analysis of inquiry-based lessons. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *72*(3), 298-313.

Fantilli, R. D., & McDougall, D. E. (2009). A study Of novice teachers: Challenges and supports in the first years. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *25*(6), 814–825.

Flushman, T., Guise, M., & Hegg, S. (2019). Improving supervisor written feedback: Exploring the "what" and "why" of feedback provided to pre-service teachers. *Issues in Teacher Education, 28*(2), 46-66.

Gibson, M. (2020). From deliberation to counter narration: Toward a critical pedagogy for democratic citizenship. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *48*(3), 431-454.

Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E., & Williamson, P. W. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record*, 111(9), 2055–2100.

Grossman, P., & Thompson, C. (2008). Learning from curriculum materials: Scaffolds for new teachers? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *24*(8), 2014–2026.

Hess, D. E., & McAvoy, P. (2015). *The political classroom: Evidence and ethics in democratic education.* Routledge.

Hlavacik, M., & Krutka, D. G. (2021). Deliberation can wait: How civic litigation makes inquiry critical. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 1-31.

Kazemi, E., Ghousseini, H., Cunard, A., & Turrou, A. C. (2016). Getting inside rehearsals: Insights from teacher educators to support work on complex practice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *67*(1), 18-31.

Kelley-Petersen, M., Dutro, E. A., Ghousseini, H., Kloser, M., & Monte-Sano, M. (2018). Rehearsals as examples of approximation. In P. Grossman (Ed.), *Teaching core practices in teacher education* (pp. 85-106). Harvard Education Press.

NCSS. (2013). The College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies State Standards: Guidance for Enhancing the Rigor of K–12 Civics, Economics, Geography, and History. NCSS.

Noddings, N. (2005). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Nystrand, M., Gamoran A., Carbonaro W. (2001). On the ecology of classroom instruction: The case of writing in high school English and social studies. In: P. Tynjälä, L. Mason, & K. Lonka (Eds.), *Writing as a learning tool: Integrating theory and practice* (Vol. 7) (pp.57-81). Springer.

Parker, W. C. (2006). Public discourses in schools: Purposes, problems, possibilities. *Educational Researcher, 35*(8), 11-18.

Reisman, A., Enumah, L., & Jay, L. (2020). Interpretive frames for responding to racially stressful moments in history discussions. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *48*(3), 321-345.

Reisman, A., Kavanagh, S. S., Monte-Sano, C., Fogo, B., McGrew, S. C., Cipparone, P., & Simmons, E. (2018). Facilitating whole-class discussions in history: A framework for preparing teacher candidates. *Journal of Teacher Education, 69*(3), 278–293.

Saye, J. W., & the Social Studies Inquiry Research Collaborative (SSIRC). (2013). Authentic pedagogy: Its presence in social studies classrooms and relationship to student performance on state-mandated tests.

Theory & Research in Social Education, 41(1), 89–132.

Stroupe, D. & Gotwals, A. W. (2018). "It's 1000 degrees in here when I teach": Providing preservice teachers with an extended opportunity to approximate ambitious instruction. *Journal of Teacher Education, 69*(3), 294-306.

About the Authors. Lighting Jay is a post doctoral researcher at the University of Pennsylvania and can be reached at lightjay@upenn.edu. Andrew O. del Cavo is a doctoral student at the University of Pennsylvania and can be reached at delcalvo@upenn.edu. Jenni Conrad is a postdoctoral researcher at Temple University and can be reached via email at jconrad@temple.edu. Andrew J. Schiera is a Senior Instructional Coach at the University of Pennsylvania and can be reached via email at schiera@upenn.edu. Timothy Patterson is an Assistant Professor of Social Studies Education at Temple University and can be reached via email at timothy.patterson@temple.edu. Abby Reisman is an Associate Professor of Teacher Education at the University of Pennsylvania and can be reached via email at areisman@upenn.edu

Acknowledgement: The writing of this article was supported by a grant from the James S. McDonnell Foundation, grant # 220020590. The authors would like to thank Andrea Terrero Gabbadon for her work making the summer institute and this article possible.

Appendix

Rehearsal Protocol (Revised 08/11/2021)

***Adapted from CSET–**
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1xgGH0dRs65qfwrLi4bVuD_IXicWOMnvTcQ0sJvh9CFQ/edit

Why rehearsals?
Rehearsals provide an opportunity to "try-out" practices and get feedback from peers in a low-stakes, supportive community. This can be particularly helpful with discussion where there are so many things happening at once.

What will be rehearsed?

- A 20-25 minute segment of a discussion.
- One particular arrangement for discussion (e.g., Socratic seminar, Structured Academic Controversy, Fishbowl, etc.).

*If you'd like to try something else let us know.

What should I prepare?

- Diagram of the seating set-up, including presenter's position(s)
- Pick a topic for your discussion
- A specific learning objective
- A full lesson plan that you could teach (but remember **you're just going to teach a 40 minute segment**, focusing on a **25-min** discussion).
- 1-3 *adapted if needed* sources/texts (this could include images, short film clips, songs)– *remember students will have about 6-7 minutes to prep.* ***No more than*** **400-500 words of text.** It may also be helpful to include source notes.

Rehearsal Roles:

1. **Presenter:** *person bringing the instructional activity to rehearse and is responsible for bringing lesson plans, student handouts, readings, all materials necessary for carrying out the lesson with students.*

2. **Facilitator(s) (1-2 group members depending on attendance):** *observes the rehearsal and acts as the "expert." They will be chosen by the presenter. They can press the "pause" button 1-3 times if necessary during the rehearsal to flesh out aspects that are unclear or could use* ***immediate polish.***

3. **Students:** *participating in the rehearsal and the debrief. Be yourselves.*

4. **Other Roles**
   a. Note taker (from research team): *keeps the groups notes during discussions*
   b. Time keeper: *make sure protocol stays on-time. Adjusts timing w/ group*

*See "Rehearsal Plan" on next page

Rehearsal Plan Protocol

Time	Activity
15	**Establishing Norms (Just first rehearsal):** the facilitators from Group 1 will facilitate a norm-setting activity that establishes key discussion expectations for effective, equitable dialogue.
5	**Context and objectives**: *rehearser(s) presents the following questions to the group....* **1.** What background knowledge do we need to be able to access the content? *Be specific here. Just give us the context we need to be able to engage with the documents (are there important vocabulary, background knowledge, etc.?)* **2.** Learning objective: What are hoping students get out of this? **3.** What specifically do you want feedback on?
10	**Document Review:** Students orient themselves to the documents/artifacts. Students should complete enough of the activity that they will be able to effectively participate in instructional activity.
25	**Discussion:** Presenter(s) launches and runs the discussion. Facilitator may pause the discussion 1-3 times to provide immediate "polish."
3	**Processing:** Everyone takes time to process their thoughts about how the rehearsal went. Students and Facilitator(s) take time to think, jot down clarifying questions, "Glows" (what was great) and "Grows" (what could have been better) for the Presenter(s). **Think about:** o What was said and done during the discussion? What did students learn and experience? o What did the discussion reveal about what students think and how they think? o Where might the teacher take this lesson next? o If this teacher led this same discussion again, what could they do differently to make it stronger?
17	**Debrief: Run by Team Member** **1. 1st Thoughts (3-5 minutes):** *presenter reflects on the experience thinking about both areas of Glow and Grow (esp. related to the presenter's goals?) Remind the group of specific feedback goals.* **2. Glows (popcorn) (1-minute MAX each):** each member says at least one thing that they thought was awesome about the instructional activity 1. "It was cool how you…" 2. "When you…it really…" 3. "I never thought about…and when you… it inspired me to think about…" 4. "I love it when teachers do…" **3. Grow (popcorn for building) (1-minute MAX each)**: each member says at least one thing that they thought could be improved upon from the lesson 1. "Have you thought about…? 2. "Next time, maybe you could…" 3. "I struggled with…" 4. "I wished that we had…" 5. "I think maybe if you…." 6. I find it frustrating when teachers do…" **4. 2nd Thoughts (3 minutes):** *presenter reflects on feedback, identifying 3-5 things to put in their "Backpack" and take with them....*

BULLYING, DIVORCE, DEATH, AND POVERTY: SOCIAL STUDIES PRE-SERVICE TEACHER CANDIDATES' EXPERIENCES IN PRESENTING TENDER TOPICS THROUGH READ ALOUDS TO CHILDREN

Erin M. Casey, University of Oklahoma
Shaylee Chester, University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma
Emily Spivey, University of Oklahoma
Kathryn VanDehei, Clinical Mental Health Counseling

Although issues such as bullying, divorce, death, and racism are common difficulties that children can face on a regular basis, teachers might feel unprepared to help early childhood-level students understand and deal with them. The practitioner journal, *Young Children*, published by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and available to its more than 60,000 members (teachers, parents, and researchers in early childhood education), offered guidance on this issue in an article by Mankiw and Strasser (2013). The authors defined *Tender Topics* as those "that are difficult to explain or discuss with children" (p. 84) and identified issues such as bullying, death, disabilities, and homelessness as ones the students in their classrooms might be familiar with or encounter in some places or times in their lives. The article represents one of the first and few publications in the prominent journal addressing the presentation of seemingly stressful everyday life issues with children. For teachers, helping students understand or process any one of these topics can seem like an overwhelming task, but it is imperative that they rise to the challenge. "It is important to view Tender Topics not as problems, but as subjects that are part of the everyday lives of children and families" (Mankiw & Strasser, 2013, p. 85). Familiarity with such issues allows children to better understand themselves, peers, and others (Bishop, 1990), which could then lead them to be more justice-oriented, democratic citizens who might work toward alleviating injustice and inequality (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Increased comfort with these topics might also lead students to be more willing to investigate issues critically and consider multiple perspectives and solutions.

The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) National Standards for the Preparation of Social Studies Teachers mandated that pre-teacher candidates (PTCs) be able to prepare their own K-12 classroom students to be advocates for an inclusive and equitable society and to "engage learners in ethical reasoning to deliberate social, political, and economic issues" (NCSS, 2018, p. 22). To work toward this objective, teachers must consider and develop children's understandings of the sociocultural assets and qualities they and their classmates bring to the classroom, as well as those of people in their larger community, even if those qualities might seem stressful in nature to discuss.

Among the methods teachers might use in the classroom to deepen or grow students' understandings about social, political, and economic issues is the reading aloud of multicultural children's literature (Gopalakrishnan, 2010), which can introduce and expose children to diverse issues. Reading quality children's literature aloud is one practice recommended for teachers to use when covering Tender Topics, but teachers and

PTCs must be self-assured of their abilities to do so as their confidence affects children's responses and understandings (Mankiw & Strasser, 2013). There is a scarcity of literature on PTC emotions surrounding the presentation of Tender Topics or topics which might cause uncertainty when discussing through read-alouds in the classroom.

The purpose of the study reported on here was to examine PTCs' pre and post-reading experiences and their emotions connected to conducting Tender Topic read-alouds to first through third grade children in field experience classrooms. We wanted to examine 1) which Tender Topics PTCs chose and why; 2) PTC's pre/post-reading emotions (concerns, enthusiasm, overall feelings); and 3) whether PTCs found the reading aloud of books on Tender Topics to be valuable for themselves and their students.

Tender Topics

Seemingly difficult life issues, termed *Tender Topics* by Mankiw and Strasser (2013) include bullying, family diversity, homelessness, disabilities, and incarceration and are a part of students' everyday lives. The article published in *Young Children* (Mankiw & Strasser, 2013) provides the foundation for this study, though the concept of Tender Topics has been labeled with various names by other researchers. Evans et al. (1999) used the term *sensitive topics* to explain issues which "cluster around sex, race, and religion, areas of historical cultural conflict and taboo" (p. 220). Warren (2002) referred to *hot moments* and Lyman (2012) spoke of "those life issues that are usually avoided in early elementary school and by our society at large – sex, death, homosexuality, drugs" (p. 122). Kimmel & Hartsfield (2019) deemed topics to be *controversial* when dealing with critical social issues that may be challenged based on their content or language. Other researchers have identified race (Bolgatz, 1995; Husband, 2012), gender diversity (Ryan et al., 2013) and war (Suzuki et al., 2015) as issues simultaneously necessary and difficult for teachers to address based on their perceived stressful nature. Though the topics may be uncomfortable (Williams et al., 2012), it is imperative for young children to have space to dissect their thoughts with trusted adults. Sala and Valios (2017) labeled topics such as "solitude, death, absence, mourning, identity and sexism" as *taboo topics* that often go unaddressed in schools. Difficult or Tender Topics may represent the lived experiences of children in all classrooms, and teachers retain the responsibility for ensuring meaningful coverage.

Addressing Tender Topics in Classrooms Through Children's Literature

Teachers must acknowledge that these difficult subjects exist in the lives of children and are their responsibility to address in developmentally appropriate ways; however, they need and will benefit from tools and support to best engage with their students. Research suggests that teachers can prepare themselves for tough classroom conversations by researching the topics beforehand (Mankiw & Strasser, 2013) and setting aside specific time for discussion (Hendricks et al., 2014; Sutterby, 2015). Using diverse children's literature, teachers can facilitate conversations about Tender Topics in

approachable ways. Tschida & Buchanan (2015) suggested seeking texts that are grade level appropriate, connecting concepts to the curriculum, and showcasing multiple perspectives on a topic. When choosing texts, teachers should consider the population of their class and the surrounding community to ensure representative books are selected (Mongillo & Holland, 2017). Books can mirror events and qualities of the lives of children and provide them an opportunity to explore social issues in a safe environment (Meléndez, 2015; Norris et al. 2012).

Support for addressing Tender Topics using children's literature comes from research on critical literacy and bibliotherapy (Bowen, 2007; Lowe, 2009; Mankiw & Strasser, 2013). Suzuki et al. (2015) explain, "While many adults instinctively wish to shelter children from the harsh realities of life…realistically written literature on difficult topics helps children" (p. 57). Bibliotherapy is "the art of using literature to help individual or small groups of children understand specific difficult experiences," and critical literacy "requires thoughtfully examin[ing] the language of the text and illustrations to think about meanings and to explore social issues that apply to their own lives" (Mankiw & Strasser, 2013, p. 85). Meller et al. (2009) explained that "critical literacy consists of high-quality children's books that prompt children to think and talk about social issues that impact their daily lives" (p. 102). Books should be evaluated for biases, overt and subtle messages, and representation of diversity (Meléndez, 2015). When selecting a book to contribute to conversations on social issues, Meller and colleagues (2009) cited Harste (2000), and stated the book should include one or more of the following: addresses differences instead of ignoring them, gives voices to those who have been silenced by exploring history, discusses actions that can be taken on important social issues, and explores society's *us vs them* mentality while also not simplifying the solutions to complicated social issues through *happily ever after* endings. "Books that meet such criteria lend themselves to critical read-alouds providing opportunities for children to critique the text and question the status quo" (Meller et al., 2009).

Picture books can help children to identify with the characters and better understand their own experiences with each topic, but providing children access to Tender Topic literature alone is not sufficient. The use of critical literacy processes through read-alouds helps children develop background knowledge on a topic, create interest in high-quality literature, increase their comprehension skills, and promote critical thinking. Educators can begin to understand the children's values and attitudes on the topic when engaging children in conversations on the perceived meaning of the text by asking and answering questions and listening to the children's responses. Mankiw and Strasser (2013) stated, "read-alouds are one way to start conversations, giving children a chance to ask questions and discuss their thoughts" (p. 85). Although the book selection is important, Meller and colleagues (2009) reported that it is not the book itself that qualifies the read-aloud as critical literacy but the conversations that surround the stories. When selecting critical questions, educators need to consider the book selected, students in the class, school and

community values, and individual experiences.

Mankiw & Strasser (2013) stated that creating an environment where children can engage in critical conversations on Tender Topics is an important step in the development of students' critical thinking skills. Educators can help create this open environment by viewing Tender Topics not as barriers to teaching but as happenings in our everyday lives which require time to process. When critical literacy is taught in preservice teacher education programs, engaging in implementation in classrooms is more likely to occur (Norris et al., 2012).

Pre-Service Teacher Candidates and Tender Topics

While "researchers encourage teachers to tackle sensitive topics, practitioners may avoid them because addressing sensitive topics poses multidimensional challenges for elementary educators" (Winkelaar, 2016, p. 29). James (2008) posited that mentor teachers pass this sentiment on to PTCs in their care as they use "a discourse of protection [that] allows preservice teachers to avoid engaging difficult…questions that make them feel uncomfortable" (p. 172). Discomfort with a sensitive topic dissuades PTCs from engaging in conversations around the topic (Schmitt et al., 2007; Williams et al., 2012). PTCs who remain comfortable throughout their educational career fail to engage in critical pedagogies which will support discussing Tender Topics once they begin teaching. Additionally, while in a teacher education program, PTCs are often given few opportunities to practice having conversations centering around Tender Topics with students in field placements, even when they had been taught or advocated for in coursework (Demoiny, 2017). Thus, teachers find themselves unprepared to ask questions and facilitate discussions with students in their own classrooms (Demoiny, 2017; Williams et al. 2012).

Perceived barriers by PTCs also affect the coverage of Tender Topics. PTCs have reported concerns with parental approval, topic appropriateness for children, and administrative support (Demoiny, 2017; Kimmel & Hartsfield, 2018; Norris et al. 2012; Schmitt et al., 2007). Social studies teacher education necessitates meaningful experiences to propel future teachers to utilize Tender Topics in their classrooms. When given opportunities to examine biases and critically evaluate texts, PTCs reported increased confidence in their future abilities to use high-quality children's literature to discuss various Tender Topics, highlighting the importance of these experiences occurring prior to entrance into the teaching field (Mongillo & Holland, 2017; Nganga, 2020). Understanding PTCs' experiences and emotions connected to the process of ideological alterations, will aid teacher educators in better knowing how to promote this important practice as a part of the social studies classroom experience.

The Assignment

In this study, the researchers designed a classroom assignment they hoped would introduce PTCs to a variety of Tender Topics and lead them through the process of discussing them with children. Twenty-four female PTCs (23 white and 1 Black) between the ages of 19-

22 in a required course, Early Childhood Social Studies Methods, participated in this study at a research-intensive university located in the southeast United States. As part of the program experience, the PTCs observed and taught 12 hours per week in a public first, second, or third-grade classroom for a total of 15 weeks. This field experience was their first opportunity to directly teach children in a classroom as a part of their program.

The course instructor first introduced research and pedagogy regarding Tender Topics, steps for literature selection, and procedures on how to present a text through a read-aloud in class. In-class examples of Tender Topics books included: military deployment, divorce, cancer, death, bullying, homelessness, family diversity, poverty, and incarceration, based on categories provided by Mankiw and Strasser (2013). The instructor also facilitated student discussion over Mankiw and Strasser's (2013) guidance about the importance of considering the children's ages, developmental levels, individual needs, and familial contexts as they created the read-aloud experience. At this time, PTCs were given a reflection journal which provided a framework for each of the assignment steps and prompted them to reflect upon and respond to the experiences they were having through all the stages (i.e. Topic Selection Stage, Research Stage, Personal Connections Stage, Literature Selection Stage, Discussion Question Creation Stage, Before Read-Alouds Stages 1 & 2, After Read-Alouds Stages 1 & 2).

After consulting with their field experience mentor teachers about what topics might best address the student and classroom needs, PTCs chose a Tender Topic and then accessed and reviewed at least three scholarly research articles on the considerations of presenting that particular topic to young children. In addition to researching the topic and considering developmentally appropriate practices, Mankiw and Strasser (2013) suggested teachers explore their own personal experiences, feelings, and possible biases in connection to the topic before presenting it to children. PTCs were encouraged to do this through specific prompts in the reflection journals connected to the assignment. Over the course of several weeks, participants were allowed to discuss their progression regarding the assignment with classmates, the instructor, and the field experience mentor teacher as they worked through the preparatory stages and coordinated a schedule to present 2 or 3 read-alouds in the field experience classroom. The read-alouds took place in weeks 10 through 12 of the field experience placement. Throughout this period, PTCs reflected upon their feelings on the assignment before and after each read-aloud by elaborating on the experience in response to open-ended questions in the reflection journal.

Tender Topics Chosen by the Pre-Service Teacher Candidates

Eighteen PTCs chose the topic of *Bullying*, 2 chose *Death*, 2 chose *Race*, 1 chose *Divorce,* and 1 chose *Poverty*. Four themes emerged as reported reasons for topic selection: *inspired by personal reasons*, *inspired by classroom events*, *inspired by current news events*, and *mentor teacher directive*. Some PTCs noted that the main reason for their topic choice was that the issue was something that had affected

them as children, and they desired for young children to better understand the issue. One participant comment exemplifies this theme: "This topic is personally important as I was bullied in elementary school, and I understand what it feels like to not be able to talk about it in the classroom." Some noted that they had witnessed issues regarding the topic in the field experience classroom and wanted to address it through the Tender Topic read-alouds. One participant wrote, "I chose this topic because several of the children at my placement have had experiences with grief from loss." Another wrote, "I chose bullying as my topic because bullying has been an ongoing issue in my placement classroom."

Some PTCs said that current events had affected their choice. One explained, "I chose this topic because I am engaged to an African American man, so I have first-hand experience on how people today seem to see minorities and the effect it has on a person." Another explained, "I chose this topic due to the recent current events taking place in society. The students in my class had been very concerned with the recent school shooting." Finally, some said there was direct instruction from the field experience mentor teacher about what topic needed to be presented. One participant wrote, "After I discussed all the different topic areas we had talked about in class, my mentor teacher was only comfortable with addressing the topic of bullying. So that's why I had to choose it."

Pre-Service Teacher Candidates' Feelings About the Read-Aloud (Pre-Reading)

Overall, PTCs said they were both concerned but excited before conducting the read-alouds. Specifically in regard to their concerns, three main themes emerged over all the PTCs chosen Tender Topic areas: *concerns surrounding the heaviness of the Tender Topic*, *concerns surrounding children's responses*, and *no concerns or worries*. Many of the students noted their nervousness because of the stressfulness of the topic. One participant's explanation underscores this theme, "I am especially nervous because I am covering the concept that pulls at the heartstrings and is currently being experienced by many of the students in my placement class." Specific to topics of bullying and race (and racism), PTCs were concerned that addressing topics would inspire these acts in the classroom and were worried students would point out other students who have used bullying or racist behaviors. One student who was preparing to speak about race explained her concerns regarding children's responses: "I'm worried about talking about skin color specifically because my classroom is made up of only white and African American children from very diverse backgrounds. My biggest worry is that someone will say something disrespectful, and I won't know how to respond." On the topic of death, one PTC reported concerns surrounding answering questions regarding the afterlife and how to remain unbiased in discussions. She wrote,

> I am intimidated by the questions that students may ask or comments they make about where people go after they die. Hopefully, they are able to stay focused on the earthly coping methods and realities of permanent death. I do not want the students to ask me where the people go or

> anything because every religion has a different faith.

A few students said they did not have concerns prior to conducting a read aloud.

PTCs also expressed excitement before the readings: *excitement related to teaching the Tender Topic*, *excitement related to discussions the read-alouds would inspire*, and *excitement for the chance to develop strong PTC/student relationships due to the readings*. Some PTCs, while feeling concerned and nervous, also felt excited to address the topic and hold discussions with children about them. In regard to discussing the tender topic of death, one explained, "I'm looking forward to helping children find better ways to deal with grief and sadness in their lives." Another participant explained, "I'm interested and excited to see how the students will react to something that is very different from the things they normally would do and the books they would normally read." PTCs were also excited about the possibilities the read-aloud sessions had to facilitate and foster a bond between themselves and the children.

Pre-Service Teacher Candidates' Reflection After the Read-Aloud

Twenty-two PTCs reported the experience of discussing Tender Topics through read-alouds as a positive one. PTCs' reflective journals revealed their *positive emotions* and *decreased nervousness* resulting from the read-aloud. The majority of the participants felt happy and at ease at the end of the readings because they had gone well. Some comments illustrating these themes were:

> During the read aloud, I found myself getting nervous at first because of the discussion we would have once the book was finished. Once I started the discussion, I became more comfortable. The students were actively participating and excited to answer the questions. It was great.

> I was nervous because the book is a heavier topic. After the reading, I felt much better because the students all responded really well to the topic. They were willing to talk about and be open. I was really pleased and happy with the discussion that had taken place.

Themes that emerged concerning the value of the read aloud experience were: *more confidence in addressing Tender Topics with students in the future*, *importance of discussing Tender Topics with children,* and *more prepared to become teachers.* PTCs noted that because of the experience, they believed they could and would be more assured of their ability to read about and discuss issues considered Tender Topics in their future classrooms. One participant wrote, "this was a valuable experience for me because it got me out of my comfort zone a little bit, but not too much. It allowed me to dip my toes into the water for read aloud's, which I liked." They also stated that they believed addressing Tender Topics in early childhood classrooms to be a necessity because of the benefits the process offered for children. One wrote, "it was valuable because it allowed me time to see and help the students make connections between the literature and their own experiences." Finally, PTCs noted they felt more confident and better prepared to be teachers as a whole because of this experience. One wrote, "this was a valuable experience for me as a teacher candidate because I feel like it prepared

me the most for the things I am going to experience in my own classroom."

Two PTCs did note disappointment in the experience, not because of the factors related to Tender Topics but due to other issues. One stated disappointment because she thought she should have been given more time to conduct discussions in the field experience classroom by her mentor teacher, and the other cited disappointment with her book selection, feeling she could have chosen better quality stories.

Discussion

This study found most PTCs felt nervous or hesitant before conducting the Tender Topic read-alouds. This emotion might have been expressed due to the PTCs' uncertainty of children's responses when presenting the read-alouds as "perceptions alone are sufficient to induce an emotion" (Pekrun et al., 2007, p. 22). After completing the assignment, PTCs reported a substantial increase in positive emotions regarding addressing Tender Topics and viewed this as a valuable experience that they would use with their future students.

As PTCs began to choose their Tender Topics for the assignment, we, the researchers, were dismayed that so many students (18) chose bullying as their topic. Our speculation as to why this happened is that bullying might be perceived as a more acceptable topic to address since it might be a more common issue that teachers and schools are willing to discuss with children. Still, we believe the results of this study provide insight that could be generalized to other Tender Topic issues and the experiences PTCs could have regarding them.

The opportunity to build strong PTC/student relationships through this practice was found in the study. "Secure and reciprocal attachments are important for students to engage in their relationships with teachers, peers, and subject matter and develop healthy self-concepts and senses of well-being" (Cornelius-White, 2007, p. 115). Tender Topic discussions allow for authentic engagement opportunities to take place within the classroom setting through critical literacy.

PTCs' experiences with Tender Topics impacted their overall feelings of preparedness as a teacher and value and appreciation of the topics addressed. Continual exposure and conversation are both valuable and necessary for PTCs and students in the classroom. Bickmore (1999) states: "If we want children to be safe in the long run, and if we want them to learn, then the risky road of facing conflict and sensitive issues must be taken" (p. 21).

Mankiw and Strasser (2013) stress "it is not necessarily the topic that makes conversations difficult, but who we are as individuals that determines our comfort level in addressing these subjects" (p. 85). This requires the personal examination of self prior to implementing the Tender Topic read-alouds. In future studies, examining potential unknown biases beyond what this study's reflection journal prompted may further deepen understanding regarding the dynamic range of biases one can possess and critically investigate issues surrounding these. Doing so should more directly impact the emotions felt and critical literacy responses and read-aloud lesson creation surrounding the Tender Topics. Derman-Sparks and Edwards (2020) echo this by stating, "deepening your

knowledge of the dynamics of bias, fear of differences, and institutional inequity in the society at large and in your own life provides insight into your role as an early childhood educator in countering prejudice and discrimination" (p. 19). PTCs having the opportunity to examine themselves more thoroughly prior to discussing Tender Topics will further prepare them for their future careers as early childhood educators. "The early childhood profession exists as part of the larger society and is not immune to the biases that are built into its complex world" (Derman-Sparks & Edwards, 2020, p. 9).

PTCs must be self-assured of their abilities to present Tender Topics as their confidence can impact children's responses and understandings (Mankiw & Strasser, 2013). Understanding PTCs emotions regarding the presentation of Tender Topics may help teacher educators better prepare PTCs to engage in the practice and assignment creation. Allowing PTCs to complete the assignment through inquiry learning (where they were able to choose and investigate their topic) might have lessened their feelings of nervousness and concern. PTCs and already practicing teachers should learn that nervousness about presenting Tender Topics is typical but can be overcome with ensuing benefits. Failure to share this information might lead nervous PTCs and practicing teachers to avoid addressing social, political, and economic issues with their future and current students through Tender Topic presentation in social studies instruction. Young children must have these opportunities and experiences to be better prepared for their roles towards as future democratic citizens to fight for equality and justice and democratize evidence.

References

Bickmore, K. (1999). Why discuss sexuality in elementary school? In W. J. Letts IV & J. Sears (Eds.), *Queering elementary education: Advancing the dialogue about sexualities and schooling* (pp. 15-26). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bishop, R. S. (1990). Windows and mirrors: Children's books and parallel cultures. Keynote address at *The Reading Conference*.

Bolgatz, J. (2005). Revolutionary talk: Elementary teacher and students discuss race in a social studies class. *The Social Studies, 96*(6), 259-264.

Bowen, D. N. & Schutt, M. (2007). Addressing sensitive issues through picture books. Curriculum and Instruction Faculty and Staff Scholarship. Paper 16. Retrieved from http://encompass.eku.edu/ci_fsresearch/16/

Cornelius-White, J. (2007). Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research Association 77*(1), 113-141.

Demoiny, S. B. (2017). Are you ready? Elementary preservice teachers' perceptions about discussing race in social studies. *Multicultural Education*, *24*(2), 25-33.

Derman-Sparks, L., Edwards, J. O., & Goins, C. M. (2020). *Anti-Bias education for young children and ourselves*. NAEYC.

Evans, R. W., Avery, P. G., & Pederson, P. V. (1999). Taboo topics: Cultural restraint on teaching social issues. *The Social Studies, 90*(5), 218-224.

Gopalakrishnan, A. (2010). *Multicultural children's literature: A critical issues approach.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Harste,J.C. 2000. Supporting critical conversations in classrooms. *In Adventuring with books: A booklist for pre-K-grade 6*, 12th ed., ed. K.M. Pierce, 507-54. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Hendricks, N. L., Jee, E. H., & Robbins, T. E. (2014). *Talking with children about potentially sensitive topics: Birth, sex, death, and Santa.* Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/psycdsp/46/

Husband, T. (2012). "I don't see color": Challenging assumptions about discussing race with young children. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 39*, 365-371.

James, J. (2008). Teachers as protectors: Making sense of preservice teachers' resistance to interpretation in elementary history teaching. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 36*(3), 172-205.

Kimmel, S., & Hartsfield, D. (2019). "It was . . . the word 'scrotum' on the first page": Educators' perspectives of controversial literature. *Journal of Teacher Education, 70*(4), 335-346.

Lowe, D. F. (2009). *Helping children cope through literature*. Retrieved from http://forumonpublicpolicy.com/spring09papers/archivespr09/lowe.pdf

Lyman, K. (2012). AIDS—You can die from it. In L. Christensen, M. Hansen, B. Peterson, E. Schlessman, & D. Watson (Eds.), *Rethinking elementary education* (pp.121-126). Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.

Mankiw, S., & Strasser, J. (2013). Tender Topics; Exploring sensitive issues with pre-k through first grade children through read-alouds. *National Association for the Education of Young Children*.

Meléndez, L. (2015). Preschool through grade 3: Using children's books as a social studies curriculum strategy. *YC Young Children, 70*(3), 48-53.

Meller, W.B., Richardson, D., & Hatch, J.A. (2009). Using read-alouds with critical literacy literature in K–3 class- rooms. *Young Children 64*(6): 76–78. Retrieved from http://www.readingrockets.org/article/using-read-alouds-critical-literacy-literature-k-3-classrooms

Mongillo, G. & Holland, K. (2017). Elementary teachers' perspectives on the use of multicultural literature in their classrooms. *Language and Literacy, 18*(3),16-32.

NCSS Teacher Standards (2018). Retrieved from https://www.socialstudies.org/sites/default/files/media/2017/Nov/ncss_teacher_standards_2017-rev9-6-17.pdf

Nganga, L. (2020). Analyzing children's literature for hidden bias helps preservice teachers gain pedagogical practices in critical multicultural education. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 34*(1), 93-107.

Norris, K., Lucas, L. & Prudhoe, C. (2012) Examining critical literacy: Preparing preservice teachers to use critical literacy in the early childhood classroom. *Multicultural Education, 19*(2), 59-62.

Pekrun, R., Frenzel, A. C., Goetz, T., & Perry, R. P. (2007). The control-value theory of achievement emotions: An integrative approach to emotions in education. In P. A. Schutz & R. Pekrun (Eds.), *Emotion in education* (pp. 13–36). Elsevier Academic Press.

Ryan, C., Patraw, J., & Bednar, M. (2013): Discussing princess boys and pregnant men: Teaching about gender diversity and transgender experiences within an elementary school curriculum. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 10*(1-2), 83-105

Sala, R.T., and Valios, V.C. (2017) Children's literature and taboo topics: Approaches to Kitty Crowther´s work. *International Journal of Language and Literature, 5*(2), 121-131.

Schmitt, R., Armstrong, L., & Everett, T. (2007). Teacher resistance to critical conversation: Exploring why teachers avoid difficult topics in their classrooms. *The National English Readers Association, 43*(2), 49-55.

Sutterby, J. A. (2015). Introduction. In J. A. Sutterby (Ed.), *Discussions on Sensitive Issues (Advances in Early Education and Day Care)*, vol. 19 (pp. ix-xi). Emerald Publishing Group Limited. doi:10.1108/S0270-402120150000019016

Suzuki, T., Huss, J., Fiehn, B., & Spencer, R. M. (2015). Realities of war: using picture books to teach the social effects of armed conflicts. *Multicultural Education, 22*(3-4), 54-58. Retrieved from http://www.caddogap.com

Tschida, CM., & Buchanan, L.B. (2015). Tackling controversial topics: developing thematic text sets for elementary social studies. *Social Studies Research and Practice, 10*(3), 40-56.

Warren, L. (2002). Managing hot moments in the classroom. De Bok Center for Teaching and Learning, Harvard University. Retrieved from https://www.elon.edu/u/academics/catl/wp-content/uploads/sites/126/2017/04/Managing-Hot-Moments-in-the-Classroom-Harvard_University.pdf

Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(2), 237-269.

Winkelaar, J. (2016). Elementary teacher candidates' practical reasoning: Engaging with case-based pedagogies about sensitive topics in a social studies methods course. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Minnesota. Minneapolis, MN.

About the Authors. Erin Casey is Assistant Professor of Early Childhood Education in the Department of Instructional Leadership and Academic Curriculum at the University of Oklahoma. Erin can be reached at ecasey@ou.edu. Shaylee Chester is the Director of Child Development Center & Instructor of Early Childhood Education at the University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma. Shaylee can be reached at schester@usao.edu. Emily Spivey is an Early Childhood Education Doctoral Candidate and Instructor in the Department of Instructional Leadership and Academic Curriculum at the University of Oklahoma. Kathryn VanDehei is a Clinical Mental Health Counselor. Kathryn be reached at km.vandehei@gmail.com.

SCIENCE EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP: A BOOK REVIEW

Christine Woyshner, Temple University

In the past five years, the scientific community has faced unprecedented skepticism from the American public. Climate science and the Covid-19 pandemic are just two areas which faced a suspicious public and lack of federal support. How did we get here? What is the history of public attitudes toward science, and how does science education shape both science learning and public perception of the work of scientists? What is the relationship between science education and citizenship? These questions are addressed in John Rudolph's new book, *How We Teach Science, What's Changed, and Why It Matters.*

In this book, Rudolph reveals how the main goal of science education—educating citizens in a democracy so they could make informed decisions that benefit the nation and humankind—has evolved over time and has emphasized the teaching of both method and content. In this extensively researched and highly readable book, Rudolph outlines four eras of science instruction in American schools. The first is the mid-19th c. to the 1880s, which science was taught as information, to provide utilitarian knowledge. He establishes how the lab method was promoted and implemented in schools during this time. During the Progressive era, and lasting until WWII, the second era of science instruction, the laboratory method came under fire as educational leaders recast learning science as a focus on the abilities for individual students to learn to solve problems. The third period, from WWII to the 1970s, saw the development of science as a research enterprise, which was concerned with public perception. Finally, Rudolph describes the fourth era of science instruction which started in the 1970s and is still with us today as science as a form of literacy for economic development, although the emphasis on educating the public was carried forward.

In this review, I address each of the four eras that Rudolph outlines and comment on the relationship between science and civic education. For the first era, the mid-19th century until the 1880s, Rudolph draws on sources from Chicago Exposition of 1893 to reveal science education at this time and what the advancements were. In the mid-nineteenth century, science and scientific developments were very much part of the public discourse through lyceums and newspapers. The average citizen could learn about new scientific notions through reading and attending lectures, with the understanding that an informed public would generally support new developments in science.

For this first era, I would like to have seen Rudolph pay closer attention to the women's club movement, which was a major source of education in various areas for women in the late nineteenth century. A readily available source are the publications of club women. For example, the Society to Encourage Studies at Home was led by noted chemist Ellen Swallow Richards, who was head of its Science section starting in 1879. Richards founded the Women's Lab at MIT, which existed from 1876-1883, when it closed. In this role she encouraged women to enter the

science fields and she oversaw the teaching of classes in chemistry, biology, and minerology. It would be worth pursuing what women learned in these courses, as well as by reading her books, *The Chemistry of Cooking and Cleaning* (1882; with Marion Talbot) and *Food Materials and Their Adulterations* (1885). (See: https://www.britannica.com/biography/Ellen-Swallow-Richards)

During the Progressive Era, the second phase, Rudolph outlines how popular the laboratory method became in schools, which later gave way to the scientific method. Problem solving was the main goal of the scientific method. As high schools were constructed at a "frenetic pace," (p. 36), new textbooks incorporated lab work into instruction and scientists pushed for pedagogical reform through the summer workshops they held for teachers to train them in the new methods. However, with the findings of the various NEA curriculum committees during these decades, which culminated in the Committee for the Reorganization of Secondary Education's "Cardinal Principles" report in 1918, the focus on preparing young boys and girls for the duties of life countered the emphasis of the laboratory methods. Laboratory methods were considered too rigorous, and the curriculum was revised to focus on students' needs and interests. Thus, problem solving as an essential skill for students in a democracy became the focus of science education. This turn away from laboratory methods to individual problem solving formed the beginning of the divide between lay persons and the scientific community as the "growing American scientific research community was moving even deeper into itself and away from what the public generally knew and understood" (p. 78-79).

The focus on individual reasoning brought about the introduction of the scientific method in schools. This discussion proves to be the most provocative, as Rudolph digs into the popularity of the scientific method. With the introduction and embracing of the scientific method in schools, science was seen as a way of reasoning. In the 1930s, as science fairs were introduced in schools, they reflected "problem-based teaching" (p. 98) instead of the replication of scientific method that had previously been embraced in schools. General science at this time was viewed as a way of teaching problem solving. As it relates to civic education, Rudolph writes that the main goal of the scientific method was to promote the ability for students to think and solve problems in their immediate environments. He concludes Chapter Five by explaining the methods of science were for the "individual citizen or for society to use, to be applied outside of the domain of science proper" (p. 117).

The heyday of the scientific method ended around 1945, ushering in the third era, which Rudolph describes as the development of science as a research enterprise. At this time, the scientific method was viewed as not leaving "room for students to experience the nuances and creativity of scientific work. The very idea of some singular method was antithetical to the complexities of science." (pp. 129-130). With the life adjustment curriculum falling out of favor in the 1960s, the inquiry method—across the curriculum—was favored in schools which sought to "remake high school science education in this new age of science" (p. 141). While Sputnik propelled political leaders to

dedicate more money to curriculum development, from which social studies benefited, "the scientists who had stepped up to remake the curriculum were more interested in promoting greater public understanding of what science was. Their target was the students who would ultimately hold the reins of power over scientists and the scientific enterprise in their future role as United States citizens" (p. 142). In other words, an informed public during this era voted in legislators who passed the National Defense Education Act, which funded the training and education of scientists and engineers. Moreover, those scientific leaders worked to impress the public and government funders that science needed to be free from restriction to advance knowledge rapidly.

The fourth era, which we are currently in, focuses on scientific literacy. Concerned that science had been "pushed to the margins" starting in the 1970s, scientists began to cultivate a new effort to promote science in the schools. The focus of science education thus turned to consider what scientific knowledge would prepare the average citizen for living in "'tomorrow's world'" (p. 182). Scientific literacy was thus defined as both knowledge of content and the process of drawing conclusions. In this new curriculum emphasis, public understanding of scientific methods was central. Moreover, the new science curriculum was important in economic innovation for global competition. Clearly, *A Nation at Risk,* published in 1983, helped propel this new urgency for science education for the citizenry.

Rudolph's book, meticulously researched and elegantly written, is a must read for social studies educators. It makes explicit the connection between scientific knowledge and understanding for an informed citizenry. In a world where school subjects are too neatly confined to their particular silos, *How We Teach Science* reminds us that content areas are interrelated in real life, and they reinforce one of the central concepts in social studies: interdependence.

References

Rudolph, J. (2020). *How we teach science, what's changed, and why it matters.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

About the Author: Christine Woyshner is Professor of Education at Temple University. She can be reached via email at woyshner@temple.edu.

THE POWER AND DANGER OF A PHOTOGRAPH: A BOOK REVIEW

Jennifer Burke, Millersville University of Pennsylvania

Hector: A Boy, a Protest, and the Photograph that Changed Apartheid is Adrienne Wright's debut picture book about the deadly student protest that occurred in South Africa on June 16, 1976. Wright is both the author and illustrator of this book published by Page Street Kids. The picture book is done in the style of a graphic novel in three sections, each from a different point of view.

The first point of view represented is that of Hector Zolile Pieterson, a 12-year-old boy living in the all-black township of Soweto under apartheid. Hector is described as an ordinary boy who loves soccer and Bruce Lee movies. Hector goes to school on June 16 to discover that no one is going into school because there is a protest occurring outside. The protest is a response to a new law passed by the white government requiring segregated black schools to teach half of their lessons in Afrikaans. This new legislation upset many students because they were accustomed to learning in English and saw English as an international language. Wright stated in her prologue, "Black township students described Afrikaans as 'the language of the oppressor.'" Hector finds himself in the middle of the protest when the police start firing on the protestors.

The narrator then changes from Hector to his sister, Antoinette. She is attending the protest and finds Hector immediately before the shooting. She tells him he should not be there and they must get him home, but they are separated as they try to run for cover from the bullets. The narrator changes again to Sam Nzima, a photojournalist who captures many images of the protest and then police violence. Police attempt to destroy his film, but he has hidden some film in his sock. One of the images in that roll of film is of Antoinette running alongside a teenage boy who had scooped up her lifeless brother in his arms. This same photograph was on the front page of *The World* newspaper the next day. In the "After the Photograph" section Wright asserted, "Sam's photograph became a powerful symbol, opening the world's eyes to the racism and violence of apartheid and provoking change in South Africa."

The field of elementary social studies education has an affinity for high quality children literature that addresses historic events and social studies themes. In many ways *Hector: A Boy, a Protest, and the Photograph that Changed Apartheid* fits the bill. The narration from the three points of view of the single event is compelling for the reader and could lend itself nicely to a cross curricular English language arts lesson on perspective/point of view. The frame-by-frame illustrations in the style of a graphic novel will likely appeal to young learners. Teaching about how students stood up to a racially oppressive system aligns with multiple National Council for the Social Studies themes including (2) Time, Continuity & Change; (5) Individuals, Groups, & Institutions; and (6) Power, Authority, & Governance.

This book has already received much praise. In 2020 the American Library Association named it the Notable Children's Book in the middle readers category. Children's Africana Book Awards selected it as 2020's Best Book for Young Children, and it was included in Kirkus Reviews BEST OF 2019 in the middle grade biography category.

I was eager to publicly acclaim this book as well. The attributes of the book that I have already mentioned make me adore it, but I am deeply conflicted about the use of the actual photograph that is at the heart of this story.

Perspective matters. To situate myself in this critique, I offer that I am an assistant professor in a teacher preparation program and a white middle-aged mother of four sons, who is a passionate advocate for elementary social studies education. I am not opposed to teaching students, even young students, about hard history. As a mother, I have taught my own children about topics such as oppression, racism, and violence when they were in kindergarten. As a teacher, I have taught lessons on racism, segregation, and enslavement to second graders. As a college professor I push preservice teachers to use primary sources with students to show them actual history. Yet, I take issue with the decision to place the actual photograph of Hector on the back cover of *Hector: A Boy, a Protest, and the Photograph that Changed Apartheid*. In this photograph, Hector is dead in a teenage boy's arms.

While I believe children should learn about upsetting parts of history, I am saying that there are problematic aspects to intentionally showing a dead child to other children. What message are we sending to children when we show them this image? Situating the viewing of Hector's body with the multiple public deaths of black individuals murdered by police points to a disturbing trend. Media coverage of Hector's death prompted civil action, much like Emmett Till's death in 1955 and the spread of the murder of George Floyd on social media that brought international attention to the Black Lives Matter movement. What does this mean to children who are reading the book? Are we telling children that murder is not that sad when it leads to a larger good?

Patricia Kuntz reviewed *Hector* for *Africa Access*. She wrote, "The cartoon format of the picture book lends itself well to upper elementary students who are learning about the world. The illustrations incorporate many cultural features not described in the text. The muted colors tone down the explosive nature of the photo." I wonder if toning down a deadly situation is necessary. Muted colors do not distract from the actual black and white photograph containing a murdered child. If you choose to read this book with children, consider how this book might inadvertently tell children that forcing people to look at slain black bodies makes people around the world care more about systemic racism. William C. Anderson (2015) wrote in an article for Truthout, "Dead Black people are not ornaments to be put up and taken down for every activist need, purpose and point. Treating those who have come before us as such might reinforce our objectification and further cement our disposability in public consciousness." I would argue that Hector's body was objectified to make a point about the brutality of life under apartheid, both in 1976 and in this children's book. The photograph has historical significance, but do we want to continue this objectification in our classrooms?

I caution educators in their use of photographs that depict violence and suffering. In a 2002 *New Yorker* story on photographs of war, Sontag (2002) argued "The problem is not that people remember through photographs but that they remember only the photographs … that the photographic image eclipses other forms of understanding—and remembering. … To remember is, more and more, not to recall a story but to be able to call up a picture." Educators must situate Hector's life and death within the larger historical context if they want to mitigate the limitations of their

students only recalling the picture. *Hector* is not a book that ought to be used in isolation. Teachers can show other primary sources of South African apartheid, such as the ones found here from PBS Learning Media: https://witf.pbslearningmedia.org/resource/2e34f9e7-1338-4502-82c3-957d0fa1143b/life-under-apartheid/

Another important issue that this book raises is agency. This is an element that does not get addressed in this book, but teachers must grapple with if they are going to use this book with students. In the author's note, Wright thanked Hector's mother Dorothy Molefi and sister Antoinette Sithole for sharing their stories with her. They had the choice to participate in the book, but they did not have a choice to have their loved one's body shared on the front page of the newspaper. In this case, I contend that having a choice is a form of agency, and agency matters when sharing the news of death. Emmett Till's mother had a choice when she decided to have an open casket at the public funeral of her 14-year-old son.

Hector's mother, Antoinette, and the teenage boy who carried Hector, Mbuyisa Makhuba, were not given a choice when their photograph was captured, nor when it was released to the world. Makhuba was only 18 at the time, but the harassment that he endured by police after the photo was released caused him to go into permanent exile. Lives were invariably altered because of the public use of this image. Sam Nzima, the photographer, had agency when he gave the photo to *The World* to publish, but he lost so much because of that choice. He was threatened by police after the release of the image, and he never worked as a photojournalist again. It could be argued that sharing their stories is a way of honoring the hardships of these individuals, but I cannot help but wonder if this book is honoring or further exploiting. The book does not address agency. Who has choices and who does not? What power does any individual have over their own lives or even their own deaths? Discussion of these questions could be possible with older students, but not with younger children.

In his photo essay, *Black Lives as Snuff* Rasul Mowatt (2018) asked, "In our righteous zeal to call out police brutality, racism, and White supremacy, have we erred in our use of these images to tell a truth? To tell a story of suffering? To be a call for action?" I fear that a teacher who selects this book for students, especially considering the powerful and disturbing photo that it revolves around, might make the mistake that Mowatt identifies. I do not recommend using this book in isolation, nor with younger learners. With older learners it could be incorporated thoughtfully into a larger historical discussion about the sanctity of black lives and the continued lack of respect that governments show to black bodies. I am not convinced that elementary children can properly process the issues of agency, dehumanization, and state sanctioned death, which arise when you read them this book and show them the image of twelve-year-old Hector.

References

Anderson, W. C., (2018, April 8). From lynching photos to Michael Brown's body: Commodifying black death. *Truthout*. Retrieved December 17, 2021, from https://truthout.org/articles/from-lynching-photos-to-michael-brown-s-body-commodifying-black-death

Kuntz, P. (2020). Review. Africa Access, retrieved December 17, 2021 from http://africaaccessreview.org/2020/01/hector-a-boy-a-protest-and-the-photograph-that-changed-apartheid/

Mowatt, R.A. (2018). Black lives as snuff: The silent complicity in viewing black beath. *Biography*, *41*(4), 777-806. doi:10.1353/bio.2018.0079.

Sontag, S. (2002). "Looking at war: Photography's view of devastation and death." *The New Yorker*, 9 Dec., Retrieved December 17, 2021 from https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2002/12/09/looking-at-war.

About the Author. Jennifer Burke is Assistant Professor of Education at Millersville University of Pennsylvania. She can be reached via email at: Jennifer.Burke@millersville.edu.