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ABSTRACT

Toward a Framework of Inclusive Social Studies:
Obstacles and Opportunities in a Preservice Teacher Education Program

Dennis Joseph Urban, Jr.

This study explores how one secondary social studies teacher education program prepares prospective teachers for inclusive education. Drawing on theories of democratic citizenship education and Disability Studies in Education, inclusive social studies envisions a socially democratic educational setting that fosters the development of a community of learners, attempts to balance the unity and diversity of democratic citizenship, and adopts a curriculum that is flexible, participatory, and accessible to learners of all abilities. Addressing the dearth of research on the intersection of social studies and inclusive education, as well as the limits of what we know about how prospective social studies teachers are prepared for inclusive schooling, this study answers the research question, How does a preservice social studies teacher education program help prepare prospective teachers for inclusive social studies? In addition, I explore preservice teachers’ prior knowledge of and beliefs about disability, inclusion, and democratic citizenship, as well as the teaching and learning that take place within a social studies teacher education program.

Over the course of one semester, I employed an instrumental case study design using an introductory questionnaire, multiple interviews and observations, and documents
to explore preparation for inclusive social studies in a teacher education program at a New York college. Participants in the study included nine preservice teachers (four undergraduate students and five graduate students), the social studies program director and methods course instructor, and two special education instructors.

Major findings indicate that normative structures of contemporary schooling, especially in the current era of standards-based educational reform, have hindered preparation for inclusive social studies, as they run counter to its constituent elements of democratic citizenship education and inclusive education. Although undergraduate and graduate social studies methods courses emphasized knowing and implementing democratic citizenship education, fostering a classroom community of diverse learners, and creating a flexible curriculum for students of all abilities, students in these programs frequently clung to narrow conceptions of democratic citizenship and inclusion. The intransigence of their prior knowledge and initial beliefs was influenced in part by their own experiences in social studies classrooms, both before and during their time in the program, as well as the persistence of ableism and the stigmatizing effects of disability in education. Theoretical and pedagogical incongruence throughout the program, coupled with a lack of critical reflective space, also resulted in students feeling unprepared to teach inclusive social studies.

Obstacles to inclusive social studies included students’ apprenticeships of observation, the persistence of the traditional special education paradigm, the limits of diversity education in addressing disability, and the lack of space for critical reflection. Opportunities for inclusive social studies, or areas in which there was some consistency
and consensus across the disparate components of the program, focused on fostering
classroom communities of learners and creating flexible, differentiated curricula. This
study has implications for research, practice, and policy in the areas of inclusive
education, teacher education, and democratic citizenship education.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This study investigates how one teacher education program in social studies prepares prospective teachers for inclusive education. Inclusive social studies requires not only the integration of students with disabilities into general education classes, but also the creation of flexible social studies curricula and democratic social environments that allow all students to succeed. Although social studies education in the United States purports to teach for and about democratic citizenship, research on social studies has all but ignored a growing presence of students with disabilities in the social studies classroom. Moving toward a theory of inclusive social studies, this study seeks to explore the theoretical consonance between inclusive schooling and democratic citizenship education, and the ways in which these concepts manifest in a social studies teacher education program. According to Grossman (2008), inclusion and democratic citizenship “share a common ethos and language based on concerns for human rights…and a sense of community,” but their discourse communities remain disconnected (p. 45). Preparation for inclusive social studies requires that preservice teachers learn to teach students of all abilities a version of democratic citizenship education that embraces and fosters inclusion.

Addressing the paucity of research on the intersection of social studies and inclusive education, and the limits of what we know about how prospective social studies teachers are prepared for inclusive schooling, I carried out a case study of one social studies teacher education program to understand what preservice teachers learn, and what teacher educators teach, about democratic citizenship education for students of all
abilities. Over the course of a semester, I explored this problem through a survey of undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in a preservice social studies teacher education program; interviews with a select group of nine students and three instructors; observations of required undergraduate and graduate social studies methods courses; and analysis of program documents and artifacts, including program descriptions, student demographics, course syllabi and textbooks, course handouts, and student coursework.

In an attempt to begin closing the gap between social studies and inclusive education research, the principal question that guided this investigation was,

- How does a preservice social studies teacher education program help prepare prospective teachers for inclusive social studies?

The subsidiary questions that I explored were,

- What prior knowledge and beliefs do students in a preservice social studies program have about disability, inclusive education, and democratic citizenship?

- How and what do instructors teach about inclusive social studies in a social studies teacher education program?

- How and what do students learn about inclusive social studies in a social studies teacher education program?

This study adds to the literature on social studies education, inclusive education, and teacher education. First, social studies research has neglected disability and inclusive education, despite the decades-long presence of students with disabilities in mainstream social studies settings and the theoretical similarities between democratic citizenship and
inclusion. Second, research on inclusive education is too often situated within a special education framework, and does not always consider the subject-specific implications of inclusion. Finally, this study looks at the instantiation and impact of recent New York State requirements that preservice social studies teachers complete coursework and observations in inclusive education. In order to frame the ways in which the current study provides an original contribution to these three fields of inquiry, this chapter lays out the problem statement, defines terms and concepts that are salient to the study, and discusses the significance of the study.

**Statement of Problem**

According to the National Council for Social Studies (NCSS, 2001), one of social studies education’s principal goals is to help students develop the “knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to assume the ‘office of citizen’ in our democratic republic.” The challenge of enacting citizenship education, which itself is a contested concept, becomes more difficult in a pluralistic democracy, as social studies teachers struggle to balance diversity and unity in our multicultural nation-state (Banks & Nguyen, 2008; Parker, 2003). Although there have been studies on inclusive curriculum, diversity, and democratic citizenship as they relate to social studies education, very few of these have included students with disabilities. This oversight leaves an unfortunate gap in social studies research, especially since more than six million children with disabilities between ages six and twenty-one, or 10 percent of the student population, receive special education and related services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
These students are required to take social studies classes and, indeed, to become citizens. Additionally, with more than 75 percent of students with disabilities spending most of the school day in general education classrooms and a majority graduating with regular high school diplomas, social studies educators have a responsibility to teach the fundamentals of democratic citizenship to students of all abilities (U.S. Department of Education, 2009).

The move toward inclusive schooling requires not only the integration of students with disabilities into general education classes, but also the creation of a flexible, universally-designed curriculum and a democratic social environment within which all students can succeed. For social studies scholars, teacher educators, and classroom teachers whose goal is citizenship education, inclusive education requires a version of democratic citizenship that normalizes difference, balances unity and diversity, fosters student agency, and emphasizes the shared path of democracy (Parker, 2003). This study seeks to explore the relationship between inclusive education and democratic citizenship education in a preservice social studies program and to theorize a more inclusive version of democratic citizenship education for social studies researchers and teachers to realize in practice.

Inclusive education and democratic citizenship education demand the full acceptance and participation of all members of society, and each cannot realize its full potential without the other. According to Grossman (2008), these concepts “share a common ethos and language based on concerns for human rights…and a sense of community,” but their discourses remain disconnected (p. 45). Although it has been
misappropriated by special educators as a means to advocate the identification and placement of students with disabilities in mainstream educational settings, inclusive education, as defined within a Disabilities Studies in Education (DSE) framework and within this paper, “seeks to resist and redress the many ways in which students experience marginalization and exclusion in schools…. Inclusive education is not just about students with labeled disabilities, but rather is fundamentally about all students, and more significantly, about the cultural practices of schooling” (Baglieri, Bejoian, Broderick, Connor, & Valle, 2011, p. 2128).

Inclusive education is not simply about access, placement, and accommodation for students with disabilities. As Slee (2001) argues, it is not a technical issue: “Inclusion speaks to the protection of rights of citizenship for all” (p. 173). Additionally, inclusive schooling focuses on more than “educational outcomes as attainments”; it works toward a “form of education which will be participatory and democratic in itself” (Cummings, Dyson, & Millward, 2003, p. 49). In other words, inclusion speaks to broad notions of democratic citizenship, transcending the standardized learning and assessments that have come to dominate contemporary schooling.

Although citizenship education is a broad goal of public schooling in general, it is specifically the province of social studies education to cultivate the skills, knowledge, and dispositions that students need to learn and live in a democratic society. Social studies scholars, however, have not adequately addressed the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education settings or the relationship between democratic citizenship and inclusive schooling. For example, in the most recent Handbook of
Research in Social Studies Education (Levstik & Tyson, 2008), there is no mention of students with disabilities or inclusion. Additionally, over the past two decades, only a handful of studies about teaching students with disabilities have been published in major social studies journals (Dieker, 1998; Donaldson, Helmstetter, Donaldson, & West, 1994; Hamot, Shokoohi-Yekta, & Sasso, 2005; Lintner & Schweder, 2008; McFarland, 1998; Sheehan & Sibit, 2005; Steele, 2007; Stufft, Bauman, & Ohlsen, 2009; Taylor & Larson, 2000; Van Hover & Yeager, 2003) and there has been only one edited volume on the subject (Lintner & Schweder, 2011). All of these studies, despite their overtures toward inclusion, are situated within a traditional special education framework that identifies deficits and tests interventions for acquiring content knowledge without addressing the broader democratic aims of inclusive education (Gallagher, 2006; Slee, 2001).

Bickmore (1993), a social studies scholar, defines inclusion as “the operational extension of citizenship to the diverse generation of young people now in high school” (p. 342). Too often, though, the voices of persons with disabilities have been absent from citizenship discourses, as the normative ideology of ability is at play in citizenship education as it is in other fields (Bérubé, 2003; Meekosha & Dowse, 1997). Moreover, persons with disabilities have only recently—at least legally, with the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990—attained civil rights in America (Fleischer & Zames, 2001). As Erwin and Kipness (1997) state, “children with disabilities need to make meaningful decisions…just as typically developing children do” (p. 58). Inclusive education provides a voice for students with disabilities, a historically marginalized group, within the social context of schooling. Ignoring the theoretical consonance and
pedagogical potential of democratic citizenship and inclusive education, however, “citizenship educators and advocates of inclusion have either spoken past each other, or have not communicated or articulated their arguments” (Grossman, 2008, p. 35).

In general, research on citizenship education reveals that narrow, assimilationist notions of democratic citizenship have persisted in social studies practice, though these approaches are insufficient for inclusive schooling (Grossman, 2008). In their review of literature on the topic, Abowitz and Harnish (2006) critique the “pallid, overly cleansed, and narrow view of political life in Western democracies promoted by dominant discourses of citizenship in K-12 schooling” (p. 654). Westheimer and Kahne’s research (2004) also reveals a myopic “conception of citizenship embedded in many current efforts at teaching for democracy” (p. 237), which is exacerbated by an emphasis on personal responsibility instead of democratic participation and social justice. Parker (1996a) argues that these “narrow conceptions” of citizenship education date back to the framing of the U.S. Constitution and the “longstanding difficulty negotiating the tension between unity and diversity,” a diversity that also includes students of varying abilities (p. 110). Inclusion, though, necessitates a multidimensional approach to democratic citizenship education “that embraces individual differences, multiple group identities, and unifying political community all at once” (Grossman, 2008, p. 39). However, recent federal- and state-mandated increases in standardized testing have resulted in an even narrower social studies curriculum and, as a result, a greater emphasis on traditional, academic renditions of citizenship education (Onosko, 2011; Vinson, Ross, & Wilson, 2011).
Federal legislation concerning special education and inclusion requires that all students be educated in the “least restrictive environment,” and school districts expect most students with disabilities, when provided with proper accommodations and support, to master the same skills, content, and assessments as general education students. The New York State Education Department (NYSED, 2009), for example, states that students with certain disabilities, which I address below, “must attain the same academic standards as their non-disabled peers...[and] receive the same informational base that will be required for proficiency on statewide testing programs and diploma requirements.” Additionally, because “the social studies educator has the responsibility for teaching and supervising a diverse group of students,” including those with disabilities, the State’s social studies curriculum guide provides examples of accommodations and offers alternate assessments for students with disabilities (NYSED, 2009).

State requirements for passing standardized social studies exams in order to graduate from high school, however, rest on narrow, academic ways of thinking about citizenship, and promote social studies education as an accumulation of subject content and skills. In a pilot study I conducted, collaborative teachers who taught inclusive social studies indicated that their main goal was to prepare students for the New York State Regents exam in Global History and Geography. Their focus on history content and basic academic skills influenced the instructional roles they assumed in an inclusive social studies classroom (Urban, 2010). State standards, however, often function as an “uncertain lever” for educational reform, and a host of other intervening factors can influence social studies teachers’ instructional decisions (Grant, 2001). The New York
State standards carry no guarantee that social studies teachers are adequately prepared for inclusion.

To remedy this concern, New York State has recently implemented new special education requirements for teacher candidates in all subject areas. By the 2012-13 school year, the State Education Department expected over 60 percent of all students with disabilities to spend at least 80 percent of the school day inside regular classrooms (NYSED, 2011). To prepare general education teachers for these changes, New York State requires that

All teacher education programs include three semester hours of study for teachers to develop the skills necessary to provide instruction that will promote the participation and progress of students with disabilities in the general education curriculum. In addition, for traditional programs, 15 of the 100 hours of introductory field experience is required for the initial certificate, and for programs that lead to Transitional B Certificates, 6 of the 40 hours of required introductory field experience must focus on understanding the needs of students with disabilities (NYSED, 2010, p. 2).

One wonders, though, whether this is merely an additive approach, in which content about special education and disability is added to existing programs without fundamentally changing the programs themselves (Ladson-Billings, 1999), or if it amounts to a purposeful integration of content and practice that prepare social studies teachers for inclusive schooling, and for a democratic version of citizenship education that might help foster inclusion. This study attempts to understand how, or whether, these requirements prepare prospective teachers for inclusive social studies.
Definitions and Key Concepts

Social Studies as Democratic Citizenship Education

This study assumes that the principal objective of social studies education is to teach for and about democratic citizenship in a pluralistic society, and, therefore, the terms “social studies education” and “citizenship education” will often be used interchangeably. Throughout this paper, however, it will become clear that democratic citizenship education is an essentially contested concept that has divided social studies scholars and educators into various factions, since there is little consensus on the definition of “citizenship” or “what it means to be a ‘good citizen’” (Evans, 2004, p. 2; Gallie, 1956).

I adopted Parker’s (1996a, 2003) conceptualization of social studies for advanced democratic citizenship. According to Parker, there are three types of citizenship. Traditional citizenship education emphasizes the transmission of values, knowledge, and skills about United States history and government. Progressive citizenship education, while not altogether eschewing this knowledge base, promotes greater student agency, practice, participation, and action. Yet both of these forms of citizenship, which dominate civic education in the United States, “minimize social and cultural heterogeneity” and distance matters of race, gender, class, and ability (Parker, 1996a, pp. 111-113). To accommodate and reflect the diverse needs of students in inclusive social studies classes, one would need to move beyond traditional and progressive notions of citizenship education. Advanced democratic citizenship education takes seriously the idea of popular sovereignty and student agency in the classroom; views democracy as an ongoing, shared
path rather than as an accomplishment; and fosters difference and diversity as essential components of American democracy (Parker, 1996a). To be sure, this advanced stage of democratic citizenship may not be fully realizable in social studies classrooms, but it is a goal toward which teachers and teacher educators should strive.

In many ways, inclusive education represents a rendition of advanced democracy. Students with disabilities, a historically marginalized group, become more than just spectators in American democracy. Inclusive education, discussed more fully below, realizes a broader democratic citizenship, one that allows for a “variety of shared undertakings and experiences” (Dewey, 1916, p. 84). Furthermore, this conception of citizenship education helps teachers negotiate the tension between pluralism and unity. Although inclusion embraces the socially shared experience of education, it also requires teachers to accommodate students’ abilities and to bridge individual differences, group identities, and unifying communities.

**Special Education**

In line with the theoretical framework of Disability Studies in Education and recent studies on inclusive schooling, I attempt to draw a distinction between special education and inclusive education. Special education relies on segregationist, medical approaches to teaching students with disabilities. According to Slee (2001), “The field of special education has drawn from medicine and psychology first to establish, and later to modernize, discourse of the ‘backward child’ or ‘slow child’ as a subject for diagnosis and segregated educational treatment” (p. 170). This model of schooling has resulted in a number of problems, from overrepresentation of students of color to lack of educational
progress among students assigned to segregated classrooms (Sapon-Shevin, 2007). When traditional special education appropriates “the discourse of inclusion to deploy old assumptions about disability based upon quasi-medical pathologies of defectiveness to…capture new clients,” the concepts of special education and inclusive education are conflated, and “the focus for inclusive education is narrowed to the traditional constituency of special education.” For preservice teachers, this has meant “[becoming] familiar with the range of syndromes, disorders and defects that constitute the population of special educational needs students” (Slee, 2001, pp. 167-168). This is an approach that does not constitute a purposeful integration of disability studies into existing teacher education curricula, or a fundamental shift in conceptions about teaching students with disabilities.

Within a special education framework, inclusion is usually mistaken for mainstreaming, whereby students with certain disabilities are simply placed “in regular classrooms with their chronological peers for certain classes, activities, or portions of the day.” Children with disabilities are expected “to fit into the existing classroom structure” (Sapon-Shevin, 2007, pp. 4-5). Moreover, the overriding goal in special education and mainstreaming is to “overcome” or “fix” the disability (Hehir, 2007). Inclusive education, on the other hand, begins with the assumption that all students are full members of the educational mainstream, with all aspects of schooling—“pedagogy, curriculum, classroom climate”—undergoing modifications “to make the environment educative and welcoming for all students” (Sapon-Shevin, 2007, p. 6).
Inclusion and Inclusive Education

For purposes of this study, the terms “inclusion” and “inclusive education” are used interchangeably—a semantic approach employed by many scholars writing about this topic (Artiles, 2003; Artiles, Harris-Murri, & Rostenberg, 2006; Baglieri & Knopf, 2004; Baglieri et al., 2011; Dyson, 1999; Grossman, 2008; Oyler, 2006; Shapiro, 1999; Slee, 2001; Zindler, 2009). Although there is disagreement among scholars about the meanings of these terms, I adopt the definition presented in Baglieri et al. (2011),

That (a) asserts that inclusive education is fundamentally about all learners (rather than just about disabled learners), (b) is fundamentally about striving to make all learners’ experiences with schooling inclusive and participatory rather than exclusionary and marginalizing (rather than just being concerned with where particular learners are physically placed), and (c) is concerned with aspirations for democratic and socially just education, and therefore fundamentally concerned with interrogating the cultural practices of schooling (rather than just seeking to prescribe procedural, techno-rational definitions of inclusive schooling to be implemented) (p. 2128).

In this model, inclusive education speaks to the democratic potential of schools to meet the needs of all students (Slee, 2001).

Going beyond the mere integration of students with disabilities into general education classes with their non-disabled peers, inclusive schooling requires the construction of flexible curricula and democratic classroom environments. Regarding this last point, inclusive education prepares students to become “contributing members of society,” improves student learning, helps students develop relationships and friendships with peers, facilitates the acceptance of individual differences, and supports equality and equity for all students (Shapiro, 1999, pp. 24-25). Consequently, inclusion attends to students’ multiple identities to create a caring classroom community (Sapon-Shevin,
In addition, inclusive curriculum is not “a slowed-down, watered-down version of general education…[but] a systematic, purposeful approach to teaching students with [and without] disabilities” achieved through the cooperation and collaboration of general and special educators (Heward, Cavanaugh, & Ernsbarger, 2004, p. 336). Flexible teaching strategies that incorporate differentiated instruction and Universal Design for Learning benefit all students, not just those with disabilities (Sapon-Shevin, 2007). Moreover, inclusive schooling works against medical models of disability, which focus more on student deficits than on students’ diverse range of abilities.

**Students with Disabilities**

As defined by the federal government, students with disabilities are those ages six through twenty-one who receive special education and related services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (P.L. 101-476). Amended in 2004, IDEA originated in 1975 with the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142), which mandated,

> Children could no longer be excluded from public education solely on the basis of their handicap; they were entitled to identification, diagnosis, and classification procedures…; they were ensured the right to the Least Restrictive Environment, an instructional setting that was as close to that established for their regular education peers as feasible; they were granted the right to receive an education that was appropriate for their needs and abilities…; and they were guaranteed due process of law in all aspects of implementing those rights (Osgood, 2005, p. 105).

This study is concerned with students who have a broad range of disabilities and are identified as requiring Individualized Education Plans (IEPs). For a variety of reasons, not all children with disabilities are classified as such. More importantly, “disability results not from an individual’s bodily, sensory, or cognitive difference *per se*, but from
social interpretations of that difference,” often understood as impairment (Broderick, Mehta-Parekh, & Reid, 2005, p. 196). Therefore, those without disabilities—for example, students of color or those whose first language is not English—may be classified as disabled. The broader concept of disability that guides this study is explained fully in the theoretical framework.

Although students with all types of disabilities are included in mainstream academic settings, this study will focus on preservice teachers’ preparation for educating students with disabilities who spend approximately 80 percent of the school day in general education classrooms. Currently, this constitutes more than half of all students classified under IDEA. This study will be limited to disability types whose frequency in the general education classroom is greater than 50 percent, as these are the disability classifications that secondary social studies teachers are most likely to encounter. The broad disability classifications, which I explain below, that meet these criteria are specific learning disabilities, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, visual impairments, and developmental delay (U.S. Department of Education, 2009).

1. *Learning disabilities*, the “fastest growing disability category,” affect at least five percent of the total public school population (Waber, 2010, p. 5). Students with learning disabilities constitute nearly half of all students aged six to twenty-one who receive special education services under IDEA, making it the largest disability category (U.S. Department of Education, 2009). Shapiro (1999) writes that learning disabilities “affect the manner in which individuals with average or above average intelligence receive, retain and express information” (p. 308).
According to the National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities (NICHCY, 2009), a specific learning disability is “a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, that may manifest itself in the imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculations” (p. 4).

2. *Speech or language impairments* are communication disorders “such as stuttering, impaired articulation, a language impairment, or a voice impairment that adversely affects a child’s educational performance” (NICHCY, 2009, p. 4).

3. *Other health impairments* “means having limited strength, vitality, or alertness, including a heightened alertness to environmental stimuli…due to chronic or acute health problems such as asthma, attention deficit disorder or attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, diabetes, epilepsy, a heart condition, hemophilia, lead poisoning, leukemia, nephritis, rheumatic fever, sickle cell anemia, and Tourette syndrome” (NICHCY, 2009, p. 4).

4. *Visual impairments*, including blindness, adversely affect students’ performance, even with vision correction (NICHCY, 2009).

5. *Developmental delay* occurs in “one or more of the following areas: physical development; cognitive development; communication; social or emotional development; or adaptive [behavioral] development” (NICHCY, 2009, p. 2).

There are limits in attempting to enumerate the disability classifications that prospective teachers might encounter. Such a list, no doubt, excludes disability types that might appear in the inclusive social studies classroom. Moreover, the labeling and classification
of students often run counter to Disability Studies models of inclusive education, and can lead to stigmatization and prejudice (Shapiro, 1999). But, because teachers must, for both legal and pedagogical reasons, adhere to IEP requirements and provide instructional adaptations to accommodate students with disabilities, it is important to identify those disabilities that appear with the greatest frequency in inclusive settings.

**Significance of Study**

This study addresses the problem statement above by analyzing the intersection of three broad areas of inquiry: social studies education, inclusive education, and teacher education. Although the purported aims of social studies education and inclusive education are democratic in nature, each must contend with educational trends that place a premium on content delivery and standardized testing and that make democratic schooling more difficult to enact (Bejoian & Reid, 2005; Vinson, Ross, & Wilson, 2011). As a result, citizenship education is usually defined in narrow, academic terms, and “inclusion” is typically a sobriquet for “special education.” Considering these challenges, this study asks how a teacher education program prepares its students for inclusive social studies, a democratic endeavor, vis-à-vis normative structures of schooling that often work against democratic education.

Social studies scholars have long ignored disability and inclusion. The few studies that appear in social studies publications focus on content acquisition, or frame disability as a diversity or multicultural issue. This is problematic because research on content acquisition in inclusive social studies typically resides in a special education paradigm
that seeks to test curricular interventions for students with disabilities, but it does not explore what makes social studies education unique. In this way, research on social studies and students with disabilities ignores the implications of democratic citizenship, and is no different from research on inclusive science education or inclusive math education. This study explores how, or whether, a social studies teacher education program teaches about the relationship between democratic citizenship education and inclusive education, and how preservice teachers make sense of these hitherto discrete, but conceptually related, areas of inquiry. Moreover, this study addresses more practical concerns about preparing teachers pedagogically for the growing presence of students with disabilities in social studies classrooms.

When research on social studies education does not outright exclude discussion of students with disability, it typically includes disability as one among many other forms of diversity. Although I began data collection with the assumption that the absence of disability from literature on democratic citizenship education was akin to the exclusion of issues of race, gender, or class, the data made clear that disability was different. Students with disabilities have had a history of marginalization and discrimination based on their identity, and the stigma of disability ran deep in many of the study’s participants. To be sure, disability culture is a source of pride for many people around the world, but participants in this study sought to distance themselves from the label, and to compensate by detailing ways in which they had overcome their disability. What is more, among those without disabilities in the study, there was a fear that inclusion would “slow down” the pace of instruction and have a negative impact on the overall academic integrity of
the course. This is a testament to the influence of standardized testing and curriculum standards on attitudes toward inclusive education, and perhaps to the incompatibility of these concepts.

Although inclusive education is theoretically situated within a discourse of democratic education, scholars have neglected the implications of teaching and learning about inclusion in the subject-specific context of social studies, whose purpose is democratic citizenship education. This study investigates several facets of the relationship between inclusive education and democratic citizenship education: how they are conceived, taught, and learned in a teacher education program. Moreover, by advancing an original framework that combines democratic citizenship and Disability Studies in Education, this research seeks to transcend the traditional special education paradigm that misinterprets inclusive education, and aims to explore inclusion’s broader democratic potential.

Finally, this study investigates the ways in which a social studies teacher education program addresses the certification requirement that teachers “develop the skills necessary to provide instruction that will promote the participation and progress of students with disabilities in the general education curriculum” (NYSED, 2010, p. 2). To date, there is not a single study that explores the impact of this New York State mandate, something that this study accomplishes by analyzing coursework and fieldwork related to preparing teachers for inclusive social studies. Additionally, the study provides space for preservice students and instructors to engage with and reflect critically upon complex issues of democratic citizenship, inclusion, and disability—critical space that teacher
education programs do not always afford their students. Lacking this reflective space, students remain unaware of the discursive contexts that allow special education frameworks and narrow conceptions of democratic citizenship education, which run counter to this study’s framework of inclusive social studies, to persist.
CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section I introduce a framework of inclusive social studies, which draws on theories of democratic citizenship education and Disability Studies in Education (DSE). Following the theoretical framework, I review relevant literature on social studies education and teacher education with respect to this framework of inclusive social studies. Finally, I include gaps in the existing research where my study makes an original contribution.

Theoretical Framework: Inclusive Social Studies

For case studies, a well-developed theory is not only important for guiding the research design, data collection, and data analysis, but can also provide for “analytic generalization, in which a previously developed theory is used as a template with which to compare the empirical results of the case study” (Yin, 1994, p. 31). This study adopts a theoretical perspective that advances a social conception of democratic citizenship and recognizes the fact that students with disabilities are often absent from citizenship discourses. Below I discuss a theoretical framework of (1) democratic citizenship education that encourages student agency, emphasizes the shared path of democracy, and balances unity and diversity (Parker, 1996a, 2003), and (2) DSE that problematizes normative assumptions about (dis)ability, recognizes students with disabilities as a historically marginalized social constituency, embraces a social interpretation of disability that “challenges the view of disability as an individual deficit that can be
remediated,” and fosters inclusive educational communities (Gabel, 2001, p. 7). Highlighting the similarities between these discrete discursive communities, I attempt to distill a theoretical framework of inclusive social studies that balances the unity and diversity of democratic citizenship; adopts a curricular vision that is flexible, participatory, and accessible to learners of all abilities; and envisions a socially democratic setting that facilitates the development of a community of learners.

**Democratic Citizenship Education**

Democracy is a concept of affiliation for innumerable groups, movements, and governments—after all, few people want to be considered undemocratic. This study adopts Dewey’s insights about democracy: that it is “more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience” (Dewey, 1916, p. 87). This definition of democracy goes beyond mere political participation, or learning about and for political participation. “It is,” according to Dewey (1927), “the idea of community life itself” (p. 148). This conjoint activity, however, does not simply come about of its own accord. Rather, democratic communities must be “appreciated” and “sustained,” for “the clear consciousness of a community life, in all its implications, constitutes the idea of democracy” (Dewey, 1927, p. 149). Moreover, as Gutmann (1987) contends, “the democratic ideal of education is that of conscious social reproduction,” which, in accordance with principles of “nonrepression and nondiscrimination” and with consent of all citizens, “focuses on practices of deliberate instruction by individuals and on the educative influences of institutions designed…for educational purposes” (p. 14). In order to nurture this broad but purposeful conception of democracy, Parker (1996a,
2003) argues for an “advanced” version of citizenship education that encourages student participation, views democracy as an ongoing path, and embraces pluralism and individual difference as essential components of democracy.

The first of Parker’s advanced ideas about citizenship is student participation, or citizenship education that is both for and through democracy. According to Biesta (2007), education for democracy involves preparing students for participation in a democratic society, an outcome that is by no means guaranteed, regardless of the teaching methods employed. Education through democracy, however, confers agency to the students through an emphasis on process and participation in schools (Biesta, 2007). Parker (2003) maintains that participatory citizenship takes seriously the notion of popular sovereignty, “emphasizes forms of public agency beyond voting, and requires, in turn, a kind of democratic education that would form, or at least inform, such activity” (p. 24). This participatory approach to citizenship education requires that students learn about history, society, and democracy, but it also demands that students deliberate on public issues and learn to identify and solve problems as a form of active citizenship (Parker, 2003).

Parker’s second advanced idea of citizenship education views democracy as an ongoing path, a journey that manifests itself in the social context of the classroom, the school, or, more broadly, the public sphere. According to Dewey (1927), “democracy in this sense is not a fact and never will be” (p. 148). Although it must be fostered, democratic citizenship is not something that is taught, learned, or accomplished. Channeling Dewey, Maxine Greene (1993a) writes, “Democracy is forever incomplete; it is founded in possibility,” and it is the educator’s responsibility to allow “potential
learners to order their lived experiences in divergent ways…to give them a voice” (pp. 218-219). This idea takes on even greater meaning for students, like those with disabilities, who for so long had been denied a voice in mainstream classrooms. Parker (2003) lists the minimum qualities of democracy as a shared path as: (1) a sense of mutuality, (2) practical judgment and intelligence, (3) a shared knowledge of history and civics, (4) a shared knowledge of “civic know-how” and deliberative skills, and (5) a desire for social justice (p. 23). Educators cannot foster democratic dispositions, however, without recognition of the diverse reality of American society and the many differences among students within their own classrooms.

The third element of “advanced” democratic citizenship education embraces pluralism and difference as hallmarks of democracy. Narrow conceptions of citizenship education have minimized cultural heterogeneity and assimilated different groups into a dominant American culture. Drawing on Dewey’s notion of democracy as conjoint, associated living, Parker (2003) argues that advanced democratic citizenship fosters diversity “as a democratic necessity” (p. 26). This approach rejects the “neutrality” premise of democratic citizenship—a premise that is indifferent to race, gender, class, religion, sexual orientation, or ability—which may actually reproduce inequality by perpetuating the status quo and viewing group differences as deficits. On the other hand, pluralism must avoid essentializing group identities, for “reification of group difference can impede the creation and maintenance of the larger public” (Parker, 2003, p. 28). Advanced democratic citizenship, then, must balance political and social unity with group and individual differences.
Parker (2003) contends that “schools are potentially rich sites for citizenship education,” as they provide curricular and civic spaces for purposeful democratic citizenship education (p. 41). In order for this form of democratic citizenship education to manifest, however, schools must be conceived in terms of their “social significance” for “community life” (Dewey, 1990, p. 14). Education that is not democratic cannot prepare students for the demands of democratic citizenship education in a pluralistic society. Moreover, as an educational reform conceived with democratic aims, inclusive education holds great promise for the teaching and learning of democratic citizenship education. Rather than simply providing modifications and accommodations for students with disabilities, inclusion requires a social setting that fosters the democratic participation of all students. According to Baglieri and Knopf (2004), “a truly inclusive school reflects a democratic philosophy whereby all students are valued” (p. 525). Like Parker’s rejection of assimilationist approaches to diversity, advocates of inclusive education see difference not as impairment, but instead as natural and normal.

Unfortunately, citizenship educators have not fully engaged the democratic potential of inclusive schooling (Grossman, 2008). Within a Disability Studies in Education (DSE) framework, citizenship education views people with disabilities as a social constituency who should have access to the full benefits of democratic citizenship. Disability Studies shifts the focus away from individual deficits and defects, and toward a conception of full citizenship that does not “distill bodily, intellectual, and social diversity within the [school] community” (Danforth, 2006a, p. 341). Furthermore, inclusive education is a continuous “struggle against exclusion and oppression…[and] a
struggle to affirm the rights of all to access, participation, and success in education” (Slee, 2011, p. 151). Like democracy, it is an ever-unfinished journey.

**Disability Studies in Education**

Until relatively recently, students with disabilities, not unlike persons with disabilities in general, had been denied access to the rights and privileges of full citizenship. Throughout United States history, people with disabilities “have been viewed variously as menaces to society needing control, as children to be pitied and cared for, and as objects of charity” (Griffin, Peters, & Smith, 2007, p. 338). During the nineteenth century, disability was thought to be associated with immorality and, as a result, efforts in special education reflected a Christian moralist tone, with some people advocating that students with disabilities be “institutionalized for life” or sexually sterilized (Giordano, 2007, pp. 15-17).

Following the Supreme Court case of *Brown v. Board of Education* and the success of the African-American civil rights movement, however, persons with disabilities began to organize for equal treatment under the law. The federal government responded with the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-112) and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142), but a comprehensive law protecting those with disabilities would not arrive until 1990, with the Americans with Disabilities Act (P.L. 101-336). Thomson (1997), whose work documents social and cultural representations of disability in American history, contends that this “landmark civil rights legislation acknowledges that disability depends on perception and subjective judgment rather than on objective bodily statuses” (p. 6).
Even with the passage of civil rights legislation, though, disability has been used
to exclude many groups of minority students from mainstream educational settings.
According to Reid and Knight (2006), a prevailing “ideology of normalcy” privileges
white, Eurocentric “conceptions of knowledge and decorum” and considers inferior the
dialects of African Americans and Latinos (p. 18-19). As a result, students of color,
students in poverty, and immigrants are more likely than their white counterparts to be
classified as learning disabled (Reid & Knight, 2006). Ferri and Connor (2005) write that
both race and ability have been used historically to exclude and segregate students who
do not fit predefined notions of normalcy. In addition, the authors argue, “racialized
notions of ability functioned to uphold segregated schooling and justify the use of special
education as a tool of racial resegregation” (Ferri & Connor, 2005, p. 453). Race, class,
etnicity, and disability have been used to exclude students from full citizenship, as
schools have been more interested in maintaining existing power structures than in
reflecting the diverse nature of American society. Because the lines of demarcation
regarding normalcy and ability have often been employed to exclude and stigmatize
certain members of society, scholars have come to see disability as dependent on “social
(rather than biological) constructions” (Ferri & Connor, 2005, p. 469).

Disability Studies is a critical discourse that stresses a social interpretation of
disability, an approach that is essential in order for students with disabilities to be
recognized as fully integrated members of the educational community. The scholarly
field of Disability Studies in Education (DSE) “promotes the importance of infusing
analyses and interpretations of disability throughout all forms of educational research,
teacher education, and graduate studies in education” (Gabel, 2005, p. 1). In this framework, disability is more than an individual deficiency to be diagnosed and corrected, and research does not seek to “develop and test professional interventions that attempt to cure or ameliorate deficits in specific areas of human functioning” (Danforth, 2008, p. 46). Rather than viewing disability as an innate individual deficit, the social interpretation considers disability experiences as collective social, political, cultural, and educational issues, taking into account the historically marginalized and excluded experiences of persons with disabilities (Gabel, 2005). Moreover, DSE brings students with disabilities from the margins and treats them as fully included members of society, promoting “democratic participation” to counter “the destructive consequences of ‘Othering’” (Reid & Knight, 2006, p. 18).

In the age of inclusive education, defined broadly as a school-wide initiative for equity and equality for all students, educators must recognize students with disabilities as a social group—as fully integrated, participating citizens in American society. By viewing disability as both a constituency and a concept, DSE “problematize[s] a range of unexamined attitudes, beliefs, and assumptions” people hold about students with disabilities (Ware, 2001, p. 108). Stigmas, stereotypes, perceived inferiority, and other “identity threats” have been proven to “impair a broad range of human functioning” among various social groups (Steele, 2010, p. 15). Questioning educators’ conceptions of disability, this framework addresses the ongoing stigmatization of students with disabilities, which can result in a “form of social quarantine” and a denial of education and democratic citizenship (Brown, 2010, p.186; Goffman, 1963). Moreover, a DSE
approach critiques the traditional special education paradigm that is often reified in
normative school settings and practices, a paradigm that seeks to identify and classify
deficits in students, and to treat and cure individuals with disabilities (Pugach, 2001;
Ware, 2005).

**Toward a Theory of Inclusive Social Studies**

While terms like “democratic citizenship” and “inclusion” have contested
meanings in the field of education, both aim to extend learning opportunities to all
students so they may contribute to the classroom community and participate
meaningfully in the broader social sphere. Parker’s (1996a, 2003) framework provides a
starting point for the type of citizenship education that suits our increasingly diverse
democratic republic, one that emphasizes the shared path of democracy and encourages
student deliberation and participation. But in most literature on citizenship education,
there is little consideration of the unique circumstances of students with disabilities along
the unfinished journey toward inclusive education and democratic citizenship: their
shared history of oppression, their recent attainment of full citizenship and civil rights,
their gradual integration into mainstream educational settings, and their continued
struggles with stigma and ableism. Additionally, while the goals of democratic
citizenship education align closely with those of inclusive schooling, there also needs to
be consideration of multilevel, differentiated, and universally-designed instruction, which
“offers a wide range of learners opportunities to acquire skills, explore content, and
develop conceptual understanding” (Oyler, 2006, p. 13).
Unfortunately, what little research exists on social studies and students with disabilities is situated within a traditional special education paradigm, which aims to test interventions for students with disabilities to learn basic skills and content. This is hardly sufficient for the democratic aims of inclusive education, which, like democratic citizenship, is more than simply “a place or a service” but is a “mode of associated living” (Oyler, 2011b, p. 206; see also Dewey, 1916). That is why social studies educators and scholars must consider a more inclusive form of democratic citizenship, which incorporates a social interpretation of disability, challenges normative conceptions of both disability and citizenship, and recognizes the promise of citizenship education in the age of inclusive schooling. What is more, teacher educators must think about what these issues mean for the next generation of social studies teachers, who must attempt to balance the democratic goals of citizenship education and inclusive education with the increasingly undemocratic, content- and test-driven realities of standards-based schooling. What follows is a review of relevant literature on social studies education and teacher education, in light of the preceding theoretical framework.

**Social Studies, Citizenship Education, and Students with Disabilities**

Although inclusion seeks to realize a vision of democratic education that allows students access to knowledge and social settings that they had previously been denied, much of the research on inclusive social studies rests on traditional, rather than progressive or advanced, conceptions of democratic citizenship education. At a minimum, social studies education in an inclusive environment must provide curriculum
access for students with disabilities through instructional accommodations and
differentiated instruction, whereby “teachers select methods through which each
individual may learn as deeply…as possible” (Baglieri & Knopf, 2004, p. 527). The
existing literature does cover this aspect of citizenship education, albeit in a way that
ignores the potential of recent, more inclusive developments in Universal Design for
Learning (Minarik & Lintner, 2011). But inclusive social studies requires teachers,
teacher educators, and scholars to go beyond the mere transmission of content and skills.
Building on Parker’s (1996a, 2003) model of advanced citizenship and the definition of
inclusive education that Baglieri et al. (2011) articulate, inclusive social studies education
should foster a community of learners within the classroom and school; allow for student
participation, deliberation, decision-making, and action; and embrace difference and
diversity as essential elements of democracy, incorporating content and skills that reflect
this orientation.

**A History of Citizenship Education for Students with Disabilities**

Historically, citizenship education for students with disabilities has rested on
certain assumptions about disability and about appropriate instruction for students with
disabilities. Social studies curriculum trends that emerged for special education students
during the early twentieth century were largely modeled after the life adjustment
movement, emphasizing efficient, functional objectives “to improve individuals and
society through training geared to future experience as a home member, a worker, and a
citizen” (Urban & Wagoner, 2009). Early perceptions of persons with disabilities had a
significant influence on the type of citizenship education offered to special education
students. Although they did not explicitly label it “social studies,” special educators enacted a version of citizenship education whose goal was to forge useful, law-abiding citizens.

The efficiency movement during the Progressive Era shaped early renditions of social studies and citizenship education for students with disabilities. Special education classes developed around this time aimed to enhance students’ “contributions to the economy and society” (Osgood, 2000, p. 141). This trend continued through the 1920s, as evidenced by Inskeep’s (1926) book *Teaching Dull and Retarded Children*, which endorsed goals such as social living, getting and holding a job, and efficient use of leisure time. What emerged from the Progressive period would eventually evolve into the life adjustment movement, which took hold after World War II and was “based on principles of functionality and…touted as necessary for life in a ‘democratic’ society” (Urban & Wagoner, 2009, p. 331). For students with disabilities, this version of citizenship education usually manifested as teaching for economic self-sufficiency, home and community life, and obedience to the law (Curtis, 1991).

By the 1980s, as special education moved toward mainstreaming and inclusion, public schools were intent on developing civics curricula suited for students with disabilities. During this time, even as students with disabilities were gradually mainstreamed in general education settings, citizenship education for special education students still relied heavily on the life adjustment curriculum that had all but disappeared from mainstream social studies by the late 1950s (Stroud, 1976; Evans, 2004).
As the responsibility for educating students with disabilities shifted from the realm of special education to general education, social studies professionals were sluggish to respond to the realities of inclusion. It seemed citizenship educators and researchers had not recognized that “the inclusion of students from diverse backgrounds in the process of becoming full and active (democratic) citizens is an essential goal of social studies education” (Bickmore, 1993, p. 375, emphasis added). In a review of literature and curricula about social studies and students with disabilities, Curtis (1991) found “a general pattern of simplified courses that are of questionable validity as citizenship education, particularly if the primary purpose of social studies instruction is the development of informed citizens” (p. 171). This pattern is borne out by recent literature on social studies for students with disabilities, a body of research that continues to rely on traditional notions of citizenship education that are insufficient for inclusive schooling in a pluralistic democracy.

**Content-Based Learning for Traditional Citizenship Education**

Recent research on social studies and special education has stressed pedagogical interventions to facilitate the acquisition of social studies content and skills for students with disabilities. With an emphasis on the transmission of values, knowledge, and skills about United States history and government, this research is situated in the traditionalist camp of citizenship education, which “minimizes social and cultural heterogeneity,” ignores student choice and participation, and distances matters of race, gender, class, and ability (Parker, 1996a, pp. 111-113). The literature on social studies for students with disabilities stresses the transmission of content knowledge and basic social-science skills
(Marshak, Mastropieri, & Scruggs, 2011), such as reading comprehension (Harniss, Caros, & Gersten, 2007; Kinder, Bursuck, & Epstein, 1992), expository writing (De La Paz, 2005), map and chart reading (Brigham, Scruggs, & Mastropieri, 1995), historical reasoning (Ferretti, MacArthur, & Okolo, 2001), and civic knowledge (Hamot, Shokoohi-Yekta, & Sasso, 2005; Hollenbeck & Tindal, 1996). While the content and skills that these authors highlight may be an important foundation for democratic citizenship education, these studies do not explore the potential for citizenship education in an inclusive environment by embracing difference and fostering student participation, nor do they resonate with the broader, social aims of democratic citizenship education.

Along this line of research, studies on teaching historical understanding to students with and without disabilities aim to incorporate greater student agency and participation into social studies, but they remain within the traditional camp of citizenship education. Historical thinking emphasizes the interpretative nature of history and the critical thinking skills that students need to understand myriad sources of information. For example, in their study of teaching for historical understanding in inclusive classrooms, Ferretti, MacArthur, and Okolo (2001) implemented a strategy-supported project-based learning (SSPBL) curriculum model to teach content about U.S. westward expansion and concluded that “students with disabilities can understand authentic historical practices and meet the demands of rigorous curricula” (p. 67). Additionally, De La Paz (2005) tested a self-regulated strategy development (SRSD) model to investigate students’ ability to reason historically and to construct argumentative essays. Rather than completing a multiple-choice content test, students wrote essays that were rated
according to length, persuasiveness, number of arguments, historical accuracy, and historical understanding. These studies demonstrated that students with disabilities could learn the skills associated with historical reasoning, but they did not explicitly explore how these skills relate to citizenship education within and beyond the classroom.

Barton and Levstik (2004) maintain that “history’s place in the curriculum must be justified in terms of its contribution to democratic citizenship…[which] is a journey more than a destination” (p. 40). History should be a “key to understanding the present,” but this cannot take place if history is taught as an alien, ready-made discipline, “divorced from present modes and concerns of social life” (Dewey, 1916, pp. 213-14). Research on teaching all students to think historically moves beyond mere content acquisition and toward the development of skills that might translate into the active, participatory citizenship that progressive citizenship education desires, but these outcomes cannot be assumed.

Currently, only two studies on civic competencies of students with and without disabilities in inclusive settings exist; yet even these studies do not advance a theory of democratic citizenship that fosters diversity, participation, and inclusion. Hamot, Shokoohi-Yekta, and Sasso (2005) tested and interviewed over 500 students (32 with disabilities) “to explore and describe knowledge of selected civic competencies as found in students of inclusive social studies classes and how they acquired this knowledge.” The authors defined civic competence as the “knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to function as responsible citizens,” including information about government processes and officials (p. 34). Because students with disabilities did not perform as well as their
general education peers on the civic competency test, the authors concluded that inclusion “does not necessarily address the knowledge base of disabled students as well as it does for non-disabled students” (Hamot et al., 2005, p. 42).

In a similar study of civic content, Hollenbeck and Tindal (1996) analyzed students’ abilities to demonstrate their knowledge about various law concepts. After using graphic organizers to teach about civil, juvenile, and criminal law, the authors found significant differences between general education students and LD students on the multiple choice test, but only small differences in scores on the extended essay assessment. The authors concluded that students with disabilities were socially and politically disadvantaged because of their lack of civic knowledge. However, this knowledge base does not guarantee the “standards of participation necessary to live in a democratic society,” as they claim (Hamot et al., 2005, p. 43).

Most of these studies indicate willingness on behalf of social studies researchers and educators to provide students with disabilities access to content knowledge that, before the age of inclusion, they had been denied. None of the existing research on social studies for students with disabilities, however, examines the relationship between citizenship education and inclusion. Nor does it theorize an advanced version of citizenship education that embraces and fosters inclusion. While this research is an important foundation for understanding how social studies educators might accommodate students with disabilities, it is limited because it does not address the ways in which social studies educators, or prospective educators, understand and conceptualize the relationship between democratic citizenship and inclusive education.
**The Special (Social Studies) Education Paradigm**

Although the research on social studies and students with disabilities may pay lip service to inclusion and democratic citizenship (Slee, 2001), it remains within a traditional special education paradigm. Many of these studies continue to rely on a medical model of disability, which seeks to “develop and test professional interventions that attempt to cure or ameliorate deficits in specific areas of human functioning” (Danforth, 2008, p. 46). Whether stated explicitly or referenced implicitly, research on content acquisition aims to test interventions or find “treatments” for “symptoms” and “deficits” in students with disabilities (Brigham, Scruggs, & Mastropieri, 1995; Curtis, 1991; Horton, Lovitt, & Bergerud, 1990; Kinder & Bursuck, 1993; Lederer, 2000; McFarland, 1998). Traditional special education research for any subject area—to be sure, in this research paradigm, literature on social studies education is no different from research on math or science for students with disabilities—rests on a model of “prevention/treatment/remediation/measurement” rather than providing “a critique of the normative practices, beliefs, and assumptions about disability outlined in the bulk of the traditional special education literature” (Ware, 2005, pp. 104-107).

Pugach (2001) calls for a reorientation of special education research in a qualitative direction to reflect the interpretive nature of inquiry and the democratic potential of inclusive schooling. According to Danforth (2006a), “The challenge to disability researchers and theorists is to spend less time worrying about attempting to represent ‘the way things are’ and more time working…to create greater equality and dignity in public schools” (p. 340). Only after researchers and practitioners address
traditional conceptions of citizenship education and special education can they begin to create greater equity and equality for all students and to move toward inclusive democratic citizenship education.

**Inclusive Democratic Citizenship Education**

A social studies classroom in which students with disabilities are merely physically present does not guarantee an inclusive, democratic social setting for learning (Zindler, 2009). Although inclusive classrooms facilitate “opportunities [for all students] to work with one another and share ideas informally,” educators must work to create such an environment (Hyland, 2006, p. 68). According to Zindler (2009), students with disabilities need support from their teachers “to benefit from the social opportunities in an inclusive setting” (p. 1978). To help develop social relationships within the classroom, teachers may employ heterogeneous cooperative learning and explicit social skills instruction, but these carry no guarantee of increasing social capital for this historically marginalized group. For example, in her analysis of social networks within a classroom, Zindler (2009) found that careful teacher planning, cooperative learning groups, and social skills instruction contributed to a more inclusive classroom, in which students with disabilities “became increasingly popular as a whole across the year…but it was also clear that they had formed their own social networks within the margins of the class” (pp. 1986-1988). Teachers must experiment with different pedagogical approaches to work toward fostering democratic communities of learning in the classroom.
Some research done in an elementary social studies classroom demonstrates how teachers can forge democratic learning communities in their inclusion class. Observing the practices of a skilled social studies teacher, Alleman, Knighton, and Brophy (2007) describe techniques for creating a classroom community. By making home-school connections, the teacher focused on the cultural universal of “family,” to which all students can relate. To help students establish their own “ideal classroom,” the teacher had them write a “class pledge,” a set of rules and principles on which they agreed. The goal was to connect activities in the classroom to real-world decisions students will one day make. After three weeks of creating her classroom community, the instructor began to teach about social studies using cultural universals, or “domains of human experience that have existed in all cultures, past and present” (Alleman et al., 2007, p. 168). According to the authors, this approach worked well in inclusion classes because it was motivational, promoted empathy, and “[made] it easy to attend to diversity in natural and productive ways” (p. 169). Integrating student agency, democratic processes, and attention to difference, these practices hold promise for encouraging advanced ideas of democratic citizenship at an early age.

Service learning in inclusive settings also provides opportunities for students to engage in advanced levels of democratic citizenship education. According to Dymond, Renzaglia, and Chun (2008), “service learning is a form of pedagogy that enables students to meet their educational goals while providing service to the community.” For students with disabilities in inclusive settings, service learning “increases their visibility as contributing members of society…and provides a vehicle for connecting students to
socially significant projects.” Additionally, service learning meets the goals of advanced
democratic citizenship by incorporating “planning and preparation, action, reflection,
celebration, and student assessment and program evaluation” (p. 20-21). Similarly,
Parker’s (2003) curriculum allows for student agency in identifying and selecting public
problems, and provides opportunities for students to deliberate over social issues and to
formulate solutions.

Research on literacy strategies in inclusive social studies classrooms demonstrates
the potential for promoting democratic skills and behaviors for all students. For example,
that teachers who utilized children’s personal narratives as a learning technique—and
who believed students with disabilities were capable of creating, learning, and making
sense of written text—were successful in fostering “literate citizenship” for all students in
inclusion elementary classrooms. For primary and secondary social studies classrooms,
Jacobowitz and Sudol (2010) argue that teachers must expand their literacy strategies in
order to teach for democracy. Grounding their research in democratic theory as well as
constructivism, the authors offered criteria and suggestions for content area literacy. For
example, students could construct meaning from text and develop understanding by using
background knowledge, employing “collaborative problem solving” and “creative and
imaginative thinking,” and “evaluating[ing] their ideas, decisions, and solutions in terms of
their consequences and impacts on others” (Jacobowitz & Sudol, 2010, p. 68, emphasis
added). By applying “democratic content literacy strategies” in the classroom, social
studies teachers can “ensure that students are armed with the necessary skills to
participate actively in a democratic society” (Ibid., p. 71). Their emphasis on democratic dispositions, coupled with the curriculum enhancements and interventions detailed in this and other research on social studies and students with disabilities, can move teachers toward more advanced conceptions of citizenship education.

Inclusive democratic citizenship education requires that all students have the ability to deliberate and participate in the classroom, with the hope that these skills and dispositions will translate into socially responsible citizenship beyond the classroom. Research on self-determination for students with disabilities has potential for exploring the relationship between inclusion and democratic citizenship, but this extensive body of research seems to emphasize personal responsibility and advocacy instead of participatory citizenship (Cobb, Lehmann, Newman-Gonchar, & Alwell, 2009). Self-determination is “the idea of being a ‘causal agent’ in one’s life” and incorporates skills of “self-regulation, self-knowledge, self-reflection, problem solving, goal setting, self-monitoring, and decision-making” (Marks, 2008, p. 56). Although this literature is couched in democratic language and recognizes persons with disabilities as a historically oppressed and segregated social group, it relies more on a narrowly interpreted personally responsible version of citizenship (Marks, 2008; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). To be sure, this represents a step in the right direction insofar as “self-determination is a reexamination of educators’ perspective regarding the ability of individuals with cognitive disabilities to make informed choices” (Vakil, Welton, & Ford, 2010, p. 7-8). But individual responsibility must be taught within the context of the larger community, and more research is needed on the potential for self-determination to translate into
citizenship education and prepare students with and without disabilities “to participate in a broader society” (Vakil, Welton, & Ford, 2010, p. 8).

Education for democratic citizenship must work to “extend the promise of democracy to previously excluded individuals and groups” and to promote “participatory parity” for all students (Bérubé, 2003, p. 56). This endeavor is unlikely to succeed if prospective teachers do not learn how to foster inclusive, democratic classroom environments. Although the literature on social studies and students with disabilities takes some steps toward inclusive social studies, much of this literature is still situated in a special education framework. The current study seeks to understand the ways in which inclusive social studies is addressed in a teacher education program in light of New York State’s requirements for general education teacher preparation. Therefore, one must look at the literature on teacher education as it relates to social studies and inclusive education.

**Teacher Education for Inclusive Social Studies**

As students with disabilities increasingly make up greater proportions of the overall public school population, prospective teachers must be prepared to educate all students in general education settings. Teacher education is a social process, one in which prospective teachers’ prior knowledge and understandings mesh with their current educative experiences, such as coursework, fieldwork, and interactions with fellow students, instructors, and cooperating teachers. Over a decade ago, Segall (2002) noted, “There is relatively little [research] that critically describes or assesses teacher education programs or…the teaching/learning interactions that take place in them” (p. 6). While
new trends in teacher education research have filled this gap in the literature, the field remains barren in terms of studies detailing how subject-specific teacher education programs prepare teachers for inclusive schooling. The present study seeks to understand how prospective teachers learn and construct meaning about social studies, citizenship education, and inclusion in a preservice social studies program.

**Learning to Teach**

Research on teacher education has undergone significant changes over the past generation. Before 1975, most teacher education studies were psychological, attempting to link teacher preparation with definite outcomes, such as professional knowledge, course grades, teacher behavior, and knowledge of students (Clift & Brady, 2005). During the 1960s and early 1970s, teacher education research largely consisted of experimental studies that sought to determine the most efficient ways to educate prospective teachers to perform a predetermined set of actions (Zeichner, 1999).

According to Cochran-Smith and Fries (2005), there have been three distinct shifts in teacher education research, each shift reflecting the “political and professional contexts of the time” (p. 70). From the late 1950s to the early 1980s, teacher education was viewed and researched as a “training” problem. From the early 1980s to the early 2000s, concerns about public education, following the publication of *A Nation at Risk*, reframed teacher education as a learning problem. The goal was to “produce knowledgeable professional teachers who were learners, leaders, and school reformers” (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005, p. 83). Finally, since the mid-1990s, teacher education has been constructed as a policy problem, accompanied by greater demands for empirical evidence.
about teacher education (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005). Cochran-Smith (2005) maintains that this demonstrates a “linear view of the impact of policy” to improve teacher education, as policymakers have questioned the efficacy of traditional models and argued that alternative routes “could increase teacher supply while maintaining…teacher quality” (p. 6).

Recent trends in teacher education policy, however, ignore the reality that learning to teach is a complex social endeavor, and that teachers construct understandings about teaching within social contexts. Teacher education begins long before teachers enroll in formal teacher preparation programs. The teacher socialization process recurs throughout childhood and adulthood, and is based on life experiences, personal and social identity, interaction with subject matter, and the “apprenticeship of observation,” or what prospective teachers have experienced from their own teachers (Lortie, 1975; Zeichner & Gore, 1989). Like students of all ages, preservice teachers enter their formal education “with preconceptions about how the world works,” and learning entails an engagement with their existing knowledge base and understandings (Donovan, Bransford, & Pellegrino, 1999, p. 10). Teachers’ prior knowledge and previous experiences must be addressed so that prospective teachers do not “unconsciously cling to ineffective practices” (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005, p. 33).

Feiman-Nemser (2008) conceptualizes learning to teach around four themes: learning to think like a teacher, to know like a teacher, to feel like a teacher, and to act like a teacher. For the first theme, teachers must be afforded opportunities to examine their pre-existing beliefs in light of new understandings. For the second, teachers must
learn subject matter, pedagogy, curriculum, cognition, and the broad purposes of schooling. The third theme is personal, and requires teachers to engage with their identity, emotions, and intellect. Finally, the fourth involves integrating the previous three themes “into a principled and responsive teaching practice” (Feiman-Nemser, 2008, p. 699). It is important to note that learning to teach is not solely an individual growth; rather, it occurs within a broad matrix of social and cultural situations. The current study examines how the various aspects of one teacher education program, including coursework and fieldwork, combine with students’ prior understandings and experiences to create meaning out of inclusive social studies.

**Teacher Education and Special/Inclusive Education**

Responding to federal and state mandates, teacher education programs currently include special education as part of their general education requirements. The collaboration between general and special education faculty in schools of education “range along a continuum and may include fully integrated programs…, a combination of dedicated special education coursework and integrated content, or…a single course requirement in special education” (Pugach, 2005, p. 550). The collaboration between special education and general education at the preservice level has remained consistent for over 35 years, and it typically involves integrating special education courses and content into the general teacher education curriculum (Pugach, Blanton, & Correa, 2011). There has been little effort to bridge the separation between special and general teacher education or to reform fundamentally the nature of preservice programs to address the needs of all students (Rice, 2006b). Pugach et al. (2011) explain,
Beyond the obvious problem of adding courses in special education to existing programs as a stand-in for collaboration, or responding to the pressure to act by quickly launching multiple certification programs, there will have to be willing partners on both sides who are committed to viewing the problem together and engaging in the level of ongoing collaboration that will lead to meaningful levels of reform (p. 195).

By adopting an additive approach instead of advancing an inclusive vision of preparing preservice teachers, programs reinforce the normative, dualistic ways of thinking about general and special education. This renders moot the philosophical underpinnings of inclusive education and perpetuates the segregationist beliefs and attitudes that historically have marginalized students with disabilities.

Although real collaboration between general and special education at the preservice level is still a work in progress, prospective teachers generally have positive attitudes towards inclusive education, a trend attributable to the fact that many current preservice teachers have gone to school with students with disabilities or have experienced inclusive education in their fieldwork (Berry, 2010; Gately & Hammer, 2005; Pugach, 2005). Preservice teachers are also, however, anxious about their abilities to teach in inclusive settings (Berry, 2010). This anxiety may be connected to experiences in teacher education programs (Pugach, 2005). General education faculty, although supportive of inclusion, report having limited knowledge about disability and about accommodating students with disabilities, a reality that may have a negative impact on preservice teachers (Gately & Hammer, 2005). In addition, while the additive approach (i.e., requiring a single special education course for graduation and/or certification) to preparing general educators for inclusion is not ideal, an introductory course on special or
inclusive education can result in greater enthusiasm and less anxiety about inclusion among preservice teachers (Shippen, Crites, Houchins, Ramsey, & Simon, 2005).

Research shows that teacher preparation programs rarely address the institutional and “cultural barriers that obscure alternative understandings of disability” (Ware, 2005, p. 105; see also Gallagher, 2005). Perhaps this is because many programs treat disability as another in a long list of diversity markers, which prevents deeper understandings of disability and the relationship it might have with other forms of identity (Pugach, 2005). Although research on teacher education for diverse student populations continues to grow, teacher education programs have struggled to integrate issues of diversity and multiculturalism. In her review of research on the topic, Ladson-Billings (1999) found that most programs simply add content or a course on diversity instead of “changing the philosophy and structure of the teacher education programs” (p. 221). In other words, teacher education for diversity continues to be relegated to segregated courses and content (Brown, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Martin & Van Gunten, 2002; Segall, 2002). What is more, when disability is situated within a diversity framework, especially one as limited as this research suggests, there is little space to critique the ways in which disability differs from other forms of diversity—something the present study seeks to address (Artiles, 2003; Pugach, 2001; Pugach & Seidl, 1998).

Employing a DSE approach to preparing prospective teachers for inclusive education could help teacher educators address the persistence of ableism in all levels of education. Ware (2001, 2005) describes using a humanities-based disability studies curriculum in (critical) special education with prospective and in-service teachers, as well
as with college faculty, to “interrupt the contradictory subtexts in pedagogy and practice” and contrast special education’s emphasis on “cure, care, and remediation...[with] reflection, transgression, and emancipation” (Ware, 2001, p. 109). Rice (2006a) concludes that disability studies in teacher education courses can result in “micro changes, such as attitudes and interactions toward the disabled,” and allow for the repositioning of disability that makes inclusion possible (p. 263).

In a promising step toward preparing teachers for inclusive education, Oyler (2006, 2011b) and her colleagues have organized an Elementary and Secondary Inclusive Education program that challenges normative notions of difference and disability, merges special and general education, blurs the false binary between theory and practice, and allows prospective teachers to reflect upon and critically evaluate their experiences. Facilitating a Preservice Inclusion Study Group, Oyler (2006) collected data from weekly one-hour meetings of the preservice teachers involved in the study. From their discussions emerged themes of inexperience, equity, level appropriateness, normalcy, labeling, and belonging (Hamre & Oyler, 2004). The students involved in this inquiry-based, constructivist project were able to arrive at a more complex vision of disability, one that moved beyond the medical model and problematized notions of normalcy (Oyler, 2006).

The project has since evolved into a preservice elementary and secondary program that eschews best-practice approaches, adopts an inquiry-oriented approach to curriculum design, and embraces social justice as a pillar of inclusive education (Oyler, 2011b). The program allows students to analyze their own assumptions about ability,
learn “multilevel instruction” approaches, such as Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and adopt a Critical Special Education stance that aims to move students with disabilities from marginalized “squatters” to fully-participating “citizens” in the classroom (Oyler, 2011b, p. 209). Finally, although the instructors have direct experience teaching students with disabilities, this program makes “no distinction between special education faculty and general education faculty,” making it a truly collaborative effort in preparing students for inclusive schooling (Oyler, 2011b, p. 214). Absent some level of collaboration between special education and general education departments, and adequate space for students to reflect critically upon their experiences, teacher education programs will continue to be theoretically and practically disjointed, sending mixed messages about inclusive education and possibly obstructing efforts toward democratic citizenship education.

**Teacher Education for Inclusive Social Studies**

Recent reviews of teacher education in social studies indicate a general shift toward exploring coursework and field experiences of preservice teachers, with many studies attending to issues of diversity and democratic citizenship education. This research, however, tends to rely on self-studies or action research, which have their limitations (Adler, 2008). Nonetheless, some of the literature provides context for this study, specifically regarding teachers’ beliefs and learning. Several recent studies on teacher education have addressed “the difficulty of changing the previously held beliefs of preservice teachers and the possibilities, through a variety of experiences, in changing those beliefs” (Adler, 2008, pp. 337-338).
Angell’s (1998) research on preservice teachers demonstrated the difficulty of changing candidates’ beliefs. But an individual’s willingness to change her beliefs, coupled with theoretically consistent messages throughout the teacher education program, could have a positive influence on student learning and belief restructuring. According to Wilson and Saleh (2000), traditional teacher education models can result in discrepancies and philosophical fissures between theory and practice. Finally, Dinkelman’s (1999, 2000) research showed the importance of critical reflection in teacher education as a promising step toward democratic education. Although these studies did not examine how social studies teacher education translates into actual teaching (Clift & Brady, 2005) or address the specific topic of inclusive social studies, they demonstrate some obstacles to and opportunities for learning in preservice social studies programs.

While there has been much written about preparing teachers for inclusive education, very few of these have been subject-specific. According to Thornton (2005), teacher education in social studies should focus on aligning subject matter with method preparation. As curricular-instructional gatekeepers, teachers have broad latitude to interpret and apply what they learn in their preservice programs (Adler, 2008; Thornton, 2005). Therefore, researchers need to understand not only the social studies content and teaching methods presented in teacher education programs, but also how preservice teachers learn, understand, and apply subject matter and methods. Although social studies scholars have begun to examine social studies in inclusive classrooms (see Lintner & Schweder, 2011), none of the literature addresses teacher education for inclusive social studies directly; nor do these studies address the theoretical potential for linking inclusive
education to democratic citizenship education. The lack of studies combining social
studies and inclusive education in the context of teacher education constitutes a
noticeable gap in the literature, one that this study will begin to close through a case
study of a social studies teacher education program.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

To conduct my research on inclusive social studies in a teacher education program, I employed an instrumental case study approach. In this chapter, I discuss my rationale for this qualitative research design, which is informed by the qualitative tradition described in Denzin and Lincoln (1998), Creswell (1998), and Marshall and Rossman (2006), and the case study designs detailed in Stake (1995) and Yin (1994). Next I explain the research design itself, including the role of the researcher, the setting and participants of the study, and procedures for data collection and analysis.

Rationale for Qualitative Research

Qualitative research is a form of naturalistic inquiry that allows the researcher to study and interpret issues and phenomena in various settings. According to Creswell (1998), qualitative inquiry explores “a social or human problem” in which “the researcher builds a complex, holistic picture…and conducts the study in a natural setting” (p. 15). Qualitative research holds that reality is socially constructed, and questions positivist assertions of universal truths and the generalizability of situationally-constrained investigations (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998). Additionally, the researcher emphasizes the context of the study and allows meaning to emerge from the research and its context (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). In short, qualitative researchers “seek answers to questions that stress how social experience is created and given meaning” (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, p. 8). To answer such questions, they “draw on multiple methods that respect the humanity of the participants in the study” (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 2). The
qualitative researcher also recognizes that he is “an instrument of data collection,” an instrument whose own personal biography and experiences affect the study (Creswell, 1998, p. 14; Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

Although social studies research has embraced qualitative inquiry (see Levstik & Tyson, 2008), special education literature, which still dominates the discourse on disability and inclusion, has not fully explored its potential. Pugach (2001) explains,

> It is the longstanding commitment to experimental research in special education and the general reluctance to view the naturalistic paradigm as worthy that hinders special education researchers from readily taking on issues involving race, class, culture, and language within the framework of inquiry in special education (p. 450).

Moreover, in a DSE framework, “qualitative research…has the potential to strengthen the stories we choose to tell about individuals with disabilities [and] about the practice of special education” (Pugach, 2001, p. 442). Because qualitative research acknowledges that experiences are socially constructed, it allows researchers to explore how participants construct knowledge about complex issues like disability, democratic citizenship, and inclusive education.

Critiquing the traditional special education research paradigm, Gallagher (2006) argues that “despite the appearance of neutrality and objectivity, the practice of science and the application of the scientific method, are interpreting activities—interpreting in the sense that once one moves beyond the barest depiction, in an agreed on language, of physical movement in time and space, it is all interpretation” (p. 102). The same can be said for social studies education, which, although principally concerned with citizenship education, is contingent on a number of contextual factors that reveal the nature of
democratic citizenship. Qualitative inquiry emphasizes and interprets the context in which research is conducted. As a result, I was able to investigate how students in a specific social studies teacher education program learned about and conceptualized citizenship education as it related to inclusion.

This qualitative study is in line with recent constructivist studies on teacher education because it seeks to understand how prospective teachers learn and construct meaning about social studies, democratic citizenship, and inclusive education. Teacher education is not a linear process, whereby prospective teachers receive information and apply it in practice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993). Rather, learning to teach is an interactive endeavor and, as a result, teachers make meaning about teaching and learning within social contexts. Furthermore, teacher education begins long before enrollment in formal teacher preparation programs. It recurs throughout childhood and adulthood, and it is based on life experiences, personal and social identity, interaction with subject matter, and the “apprenticeship of observation,” or what prospective teachers learn from their own teachers (Lortie, 1975; Zeichner & Gore, 1989).

According to Richardson (1999), “Constructivism refers to the belief that human knowledge is constructed…within the minds of individuals and within social communities” (p. 146). Moreover, it affirms learning as “a meaning-making process in that new information must be mentally engaged” (Gallagher, 2005, pp. 143-148). By adopting a constructivist view of teacher education, qualitative researchers can probe how prospective teachers make meaning of essentially contested and politically charged notions, such as democracy, citizenship, inclusion, and disability, which are “appraisive,”
internally complex, and subject to “considerable modification in the light of changing circumstance” (Gallie, 1956, p. 172).

**Instrumental Case Study Design**

With the goal of understanding how a teacher education program prepares preservice teachers for inclusive social studies during a semester of coursework and fieldwork, I conducted an instrumental single-case study of a local social studies teacher education program. Qualitative case study designs allow researchers to make a detailed description of a “bounded system,” such as a site, a group, a program, an activity, an organization, or individuals (Creswell, 1998; Marshall & Rossman, 2006). According to Yin (1994), “a case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p. 13).

The phenomenon that I explored—inclusive social studies—was inseparable from its context. What the participants learned about social studies and inclusion was influenced by their prior knowledge and their experiences in a particular teacher education program; and it was couched in their conceptions, and the teacher education program’s philosophy, of social studies as citizenship education. Therefore, my research topic required an instrumental case study approach: the case served as an instrument to illustrate the phenomenon of teaching and learning about inclusion in a preservice social studies program. I was interested in this particular case because it was “instrumental to understanding something else” (Stake, 1995, p. 3). In other words, the case itself did not
have intrinsic value, but provided a general, albeit not necessarily generalizable, understanding of the issue I wished to explore.

Although I studied only a single case, I adopted an “embedded case study design” that allowed for multiple units of analysis within a single teacher education program (Yin, 1994). The contextual reality of qualitative inquiry and the constructivist nature of teacher education required a focus on the subunits within a particular program. While this case study took place in one social studies teacher education program at a local university, it included students enrolled in both undergraduate and graduate programs. I also examined students who were enrolled in dual certification programs for social studies and special education. The goal was not to compare and contrast the undergraduate and graduate programs. However, by observing undergraduate and graduate methods classes and interviewing students and instructors from both programs, I focused attention on the subunits and how they related to the broader program itself, which was both the larger unit of analysis and the context of the study (see Table 1).

**Table 1: Embedded Single-Case Study Design (Yin, 1994)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case and Context</th>
<th>Social Studies Teacher Education Program at Franklin University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Studies Program Track</strong></td>
<td>Undergraduate Program (B.A.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>Students: - Social Studies Certification - Dual Certification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Role of the Researcher

Because of the interpretive and contextual nature of qualitative inquiry, and the shifting theoretical and epistemological assumptions about how people learn and transmit knowledge, researchers must recognize their personal biases and prejudices and the impact these have on their research. My own experiences with social studies and inclusion came from my roles as a full-time social studies teacher of collaborative/inclusive classes and as a doctoral student in social studies education at Teacher College, Columbia University. When I began teaching high school social studies in 2003, I had very little knowledge of how to teach students with disabilities in the general education setting. As a graduate student enrolled in a preservice social studies education program at Teachers College, Columbia University, I had taken only one course on special education. This class, “Dis/abilities in Context,” provided little practical information about teaching inclusion, but it did introduce me to the field of Disability Studies and important works on the history of disability in the United States (Fleischer & Zames, 2001), social and cultural representations of disability (Thomson, 1997), and students’ and teachers’ attitudes toward students with disabilities (Shapiro, 1999).

Although I appreciated the new perspectives this class afforded me, I felt ill-prepared to teach collaboratively, alongside a special education teacher, the inclusive social studies class to which I was assigned during my first year of teaching. I had no knowledge of special education, inclusive education, IEPs, differentiated instruction, or collaborative planning and teaching. And I quickly learned—after a cursory glance at the young, newly-hired, inexperienced group of subject teachers that would be co-teaching
inclusive courses—that these classes were among the most challenging and least desirable to teach. In other words, those with limited education and experience were charged with teaching inclusion and collaborating with special education teachers.

Having taught inclusive social studies for the past ten years, I find it rewarding and enjoyable. Students with disabilities are integrated into all my classes, and those with more severe learning disabilities are included in classes that I co-teach with a special educator. But inclusive schooling requires more than integration. For example, I continue to notice that many of my fellow teachers have negative opinions of students with disabilities, as if these students are pariahs and co-taught inclusion classes are to be avoided at all costs. This speaks, I believe, to the continued prejudice toward students with disabilities and persistent ableism in education, despite legislative efforts to create more inclusive learning environments.

This also begs the question of whether or not pre- or newly-certified teachers are adequately prepared to meet the challenges and fulfill the promises of inclusive schooling. In the student teacher seminar that I taught at Teachers College, I made sure to address inclusive education throughout the semester, and I dedicated one full class to teaching about inclusive social studies and differentiated instruction. But was this enough? And how do other instructors, other classes, other programs, and other colleges and universities prepare prospective teachers for inclusive education? How do their experiences in teacher education programs, as well as their own lives and learning experiences, help to shape their understandings of teaching all students in inclusive
settings? Additionally, how might their conceptions of social studies inform their notions of inclusion, and vice versa? I hope this study can begin to address these issues.

**Research Design**

**Context of Study**

I conducted my case study at Franklin University\(^1\), a comprehensive university that included undergraduate and graduate degrees in many academic programs. Founded in 1935, Franklin University is located in the New York City suburbs. It employs nearly 1,200 faculty members and enrolls a student body of about 12,000 students, which includes full- and part-time undergraduate, graduate, law, and medical students from 46 states and 68 countries (Franklin University Web site, 2011). Franklin’s School of Education has 20 undergraduate degree programs and over 50 graduate programs. By conducting my research at Franklin University, I had access to a college of education that graduates many social studies teachers who live and work in the New York metropolitan and suburban areas, and who teach diverse student populations at the middle- and high-school levels.

I chose Franklin University because it represented a fairly typical case, and because I had access to several subgroups within the social studies program (Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Yin, 1994). Although convenience was a factor in choosing Franklin University—I had previously worked with the school’s social studies program director—it did not sacrifice the credibility of the site as a viable research location. Accredited by the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)—which is in the process of

---

\(^1\) Pseudonym
merging with National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) to become the largest teacher education accreditation organization—Franklin University represented an ideal location to conduct research to contribute to the fields of social studies, teacher education, and inclusive education. According to its principles and standards for teacher education programs, TEAC accredits programs that display evidence of teacher candidate learning in subject matter, pedagogy, metacognition, “caring and effective teaching,” multiculturalism, and technology. Additionally, programs must demonstrate faculty commitment to teaching, learning, and research, as well as a total institutional commitment to teacher education (TEAC, 2009). Finally, I chose Franklin University as part of a “stratified purposeful” sampling strategy, which allowed me to analyze subgroups within the broader context of the study: a social studies teacher education program (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

The subgroups that I examined were undergraduate and graduate degree programs in social studies teacher education that led to New York State certification in secondary social studies and, for some students, dual certification in social studies and special education. Each program in social studies combined coursework and field experience, including classroom observations and student teaching, to prepare prospective educators to teach social studies in grades seven through twelve (see Table 2). Additionally, program requirements were consistent with New York State learning standards and National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) standards. According to the college Web site, the undergraduate and graduate programs were

Designed to blend on-campus preparation with field experiences in a variety of school settings, culminating in full-time student teaching.
Literacy, multicultural education, and information technology are integrated throughout all aspects of the program (Franklin University Web site, 2011).

Both the NCSS and New York State social studies standards, which this teacher education program endorsed, emphasize the importance of teaching knowledge and dispositions necessary for civic competence in our increasingly diverse democracy (NCSS, 2010; NYSED, 1996). Finally, to satisfy a New York State requirement, all students took one special education course and spent 20 hours in “educational settings to work with students who have special-needs or disabilities” (Franklin University Web site, 2011).

Table 2: Franklin University: Secondary Social Studies Education Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Bachelor of Arts</th>
<th>Master of Science in Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States History (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European History (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Western History (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States History (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European History (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Western History (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon admission, students must have a minimum of 36 credits of history and social studies content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Courses (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Methods Courses (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Methods (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Elective (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching Seminars (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Courses (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Methods Courses (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Methods (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Electives (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching Seminars (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Teaching Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School (grades 7-9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (grades 10-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School (grades 7-9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (grades 10-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State Teacher Certification Examinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Sciences Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Teaching Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Specialty Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State Teacher Certification Examinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Sciences Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Teaching Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Specialty Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although program tracks were similar in their goals and teacher certification requirements, each served a different student population and, collectively, they provided access to a broader cross-section of the preservice teachers (see Table 2). Undergraduate students pursuing a B.A. in Social Studies Education co-majored in secondary education and a specific social science, such as history, geography, or anthropology. In addition to 36 hours of social science coursework, students took 31 hours of education coursework. All undergraduates were required to take the same social studies methods class (“Teaching of Social Studies”) and the same special education class (“Inclusion: Meeting Special Needs in PreK-12 Programs”), courses they typically took during their junior or senior year. Graduate students in the M.S.Ed. program in social studies entered with at least 36 social science credits, and completed 37 credits in social studies and education. Typically a one-year program, the M.S.Ed. degree required students to take social studies methods (“Instructional Patterns for Social Studies”) and special education courses (either “The Exceptional Child” or “Inclusion in Today’s Schools”) during the fall semester. For each program track, students also recorded at least 100 hours of classroom observation and participation, and completed one semester of student teaching in middle school and high school.

I chose to observe and select volunteers from the social studies methods courses because they represented the closest thing to a holistic view of Franklin’s social studies program. The subject-specific methods course “has traditionally been regarded as a cornerstone of teacher education programs,” and is one that “most social studies teachers are likely to have in common” (Thornton, 2005, p. 97). According to the Web site
descriptions for both the undergraduate- and graduate-level social studies methods courses, they focused on “instructional planning, teaching methodologies, materials, classroom organization and assessment in secondary (grades 7-12) social studies.” In addition, these classes required classroom observations in both middle and high schools. All of the students enrolled in these methods courses had already taken a general teaching methods course and a social studies course on global history and geography. As a result, they could marshal information from these previous courses during our interviews and in their coursework. Furthermore, all students enrolled in the methods courses I observed had either taken or were currently enrolled in their required special education class.

The methods courses provided a space for me to examine “interaction among instruction, student response, and learning within and, often, outside the methods course” (Clift & Brady, 2005, p. 313). The requisite middle- and high-school social studies observations provided students with an opportunity “to establish connections between their university and school learning as well as to trouble the relationship between them” (Segall & Gaudelli, 2007, p. 78). Through a combination of direct and indirect data collection methods, as well as an examination of the “social, political, or cultural contexts” of the methods course, I was able to understand the impact of a particular teacher education program (Clift & Brady, 2005, p. 313). In the field of social studies, research has demonstrated the impacts of methods courses on preservice teachers’ beliefs and practices, especially in the area of democratic citizenship education (Adler, 2008; Clift & Brady, 2005; Cutsforth, 2010).
Participants

Participants in this study included undergraduate and graduate students who had matriculated in the preservice social studies teacher education program at Franklin University. On the first day of the fall 2011 semester, I distributed a questionnaire (Appendix A) to students enrolled in the undergraduate and graduate sections of the required social studies methods classes (“Teaching of Social Studies” and “Instructional Patterns for Social Studies”). I gave students the option of completing the survey and asked if they would be interested in participating further in the study, which they indicated by checking a box on the questionnaire and providing their contact information. All 24 students enrolled in the social studies methods classes, 10 undergraduate students and 14 graduate students, participated in the survey. Of these, 16 students indicated a willingness to participate further in the study, which meant sitting down for a series of three interviews and submitting all of their coursework from the methods class.

Based on students’ responses to the questionnaire, their backgrounds, and their willingness to take part in the research project, I identified nine students, four undergraduates and five graduates, to participate in the interviews and to submit coursework for analysis. When choosing participants, I made sure to include a cross-section of students of diverse ages, genders, racial identities, abilities, and student statuses. I also ensured that all students had taken, or were currently taking, their required special education course. The 16 students who wanted to participate further in the study were between 20 and 26 years old, and all but four were white. It just so happened that most of the students who were willing to participate in the study were seeking or
planning to seek dual certification in social studies and special education. I did, however, attempt to balance these participants with those only working toward secondary social studies certification. In addition, I chose participants who had a range of viewpoints on citizenship education and inclusive education. Table 3 lists and describes the student participants in my study. Finally, although participation was voluntary, students who took part in the entire study—questionnaire, interviews, focus group, and coursework submission—received a $50 Visa Gift Card.

**Table 3: Student Participant Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name*</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Special Education Certification</th>
<th>Self-Identified as Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seema</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* I used pseudonyms for all study participants.

** During interviews, these participants revealed that they had been classified as students with disabilities at some point in their lives.
Along with the student participants, I interviewed the director of the social studies program, who also taught both social studies methods courses, and two instructors of the required special education classes, one of whom was the director of the special education program (see Table 4). By interviewing instructors, I gained a better understanding of what they taught about social studies, inclusion, and disability, and how they conceptualized these issues. In addition, interviews with instructors allowed me to analyze what was taught versus what was learned in the teacher education program.

Table 4: Faculty Participant Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Name*</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Years as Teacher Educator</th>
<th>Relevant Courses Taught</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Stern</td>
<td>Social Studies Education</td>
<td>22 years</td>
<td>Teaching of Social Studies</td>
<td>Weekly informal discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Patterns for Social Studies</td>
<td>One formal interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Hollingsworth</td>
<td>Counseling, Research, Special Education, &amp; Rehabilitation</td>
<td>31 years</td>
<td>The Exceptional Child</td>
<td>One formal interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Gregory</td>
<td>Counseling, Research, Special Education, &amp; Rehabilitation</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>Inclusion: Meeting Special Needs in PreK-12 Programs</td>
<td>One formal interview (phone)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* I used pseudonyms for all study participants.

Negotiating Access and Gaining IRB Approval

I negotiated access to the site and participants “through formal and informal gatekeepers” of the university (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 74). I contacted the
director of the social studies program at Franklin, whom I have known for almost 10 years, and who indicated an eagerness to participate in the study. I began the IRB process during the spring of 2011. First, I completed the requisite online courses for conducting research with human subjects. Then, I submitted a proposal, through the director of the social studies teacher education program, for IRB approval at Franklin University. After obtaining approval from Franklin University, I submitted my proposal for IRB approval at Teachers College. My proposal was approved for expedited review on September 1, 2011 (see Appendix E). When I began my study in September 2011, all participants received and signed informed consent forms, in which I explained what the project involved and guaranteed full confidentiality of their responses (see Appendix F).

Data Sources and Collection Procedures

Case studies rely on multiple sources of rich, contextual data (Creswell, 1998). To address this study’s questions about inclusive social studies, data collection consisted of a student questionnaire, course observations, interviews with students and instructors, and document analysis (Seidman, 1998; Stake, 1995; Yin, 1994). What follows is an explanation of and rationale for each data source and how it contributed to the study.

Questionnaire

The first stage of data collection involved a questionnaire (Appendix A), which allowed me to gather information from a large group of students in the program. After obtaining consent from participants, I distributed the questionnaire in social studies methods classes on the first day of the fall 2011 semester, which allowed me to introduce
the study to undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in the social studies education program. Although I gave the questionnaire to all students in the class, they were able to opt out by not completing the survey if they chose not to participate. The questionnaire included a series of structured questions, which used a five-point Likert scale, and open-ended questions. It was divided into three main sections, addressing students’ attitudes, beliefs, and understandings about the teaching and learning of social studies, social studies as citizenship education, and inclusive education. I also asked questions about students’ academic statuses and demographic information, so I could include a diverse cross-section of the student population in the interview and document collection phases of the study.

When writing the questionnaire, I consulted Kennedy, Ball, and McDiarmid’s (1993) suggested questions for exploring preservice teachers’ ideas about teaching and learning. I also consulted Mendez’s (2003) survey about prospective secondary history teachers’ beliefs and attitudes toward inclusion and students with disabilities. Before finalizing the questionnaire, I piloted it in social studies teacher education classes at Teachers College to ensure that the questions yielded useful data, and I made appropriate adjustments.

Although the questionnaire was limited in usefulness due to its reliance on participants’ self-reporting, it provided avenues for “delving into tacit beliefs and deeply held values” during interviews with students (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 125). In addition, the questionnaire served as a vehicle for soliciting volunteers to participate in a series of in-depth interviews. Of the 16 students who agreed to participate further in the
study, I chose nine preservice teachers whose responses represented a range of opinions about social studies and inclusion, and who constituted a diverse cross-section of the student population. Specifically, I was interested in selecting participants from both ends of the Likert scale on questions concerning the nature of social studies (questions 8, 9, 10, and 11), inclusion (questions 17 and 18), social studies for students with disabilities (questions 7, 27, and 28), and the relationship between democratic citizenship education and inclusion (question 20). I also looked carefully at responses to the open-ended questions (12 through 16) about social studies as citizenship education to choose participants who had varied conceptions of citizenship education.

**Observations**

During the fall 2011 semester, I conducted 20 naturalistic observations of the required undergraduate and graduate social studies methods courses—10 observations in each section. According to Marshall and Rossman (2006), observations are fundamental to qualitative inquiry and are “used to discover complex interactions in natural social settings,” such as a classroom (p. 99). For case studies, observations provide the researcher with a greater understanding of the case and the context, which are inseparable (Stake, 1995). Using an observation protocol that included both descriptive and reflective comments (see Appendix B), I gathered a careful record of activities, events, and participants’ interactions “to provide a relatively incontestable description for further analysis and ultimate reporting,” and I detailed the context and physical setting of each observation “to develop vicarious experiences for the reader” (Stake, 1995, pp. 62-63; see also Creswell, 1998). In addition, although I adopted the role of peripheral observer, I
occasionally took part in class activities at the request of the course instructor, establishing rapport with students and participants (Adler & Adler, 1998).

Observations of the methods courses provided insight into what instructors taught (or did not teach) about social studies and citizenship education, inclusion, and students with disabilities, and the contexts in which students learned (or did not learn) about these things. Students in teacher education programs construct knowledge and understanding in social contexts, building on prior knowledge and experience through coursework and fieldwork. The interactions, events, activities, lectures, and discussions that took place in the required methods classes provided a greater understanding of how and what students learned in a social studies teacher education program. By carefully recording actions and interactions, utterances and silences, and explicit and implicit curricular decisions, I collected useful data about how the program prepared its students for inclusive social studies.

**Interviews and Focus Group**

During the fall semester, I conducted a series of three in-depth, semi-structured interviews with each of the nine preservice social studies teachers, and one in-depth interview with each participating instructor. In planning the interviews, I adopted Seidman’s (1998) three-part model for in-depth interviewing, the last interview being a focus group with all of the student participants (see Appendix C). To explore students’ existing attitudes and beliefs about inclusive social studies, as well as what they learned and how their perspectives changed throughout the fall 2011 semester, I conducted interviews in the beginning, middle, and end of the fall term.
The first round of interviews, held in late September, focused on the preservice teachers’ background experiences with, beliefs about, and attitudes toward teaching, social studies education, students with disabilities, and inclusive schooling. Addressing the main and subsidiary research questions, the first interview explored students’ conceptions of social studies and democratic citizenship, their experiences with diversity and disability, and their attitudes toward teaching in inclusive settings. The second round of interviews, conducted midway through the semester, in late October, focused on what students were learning about teaching inclusive social studies in their social studies methods course, their required special education course, and the required observation/field placements. I also highlighted some of the themes I was noticing during my observations, such as differentiated instruction, diversity, and community.

The third interview, which took place at the end of the semester, in mid-December, was a focus group—a collective discussion with all participants from the first two rounds of interviews. This allowed participants to interact with one another and to raise issues in a social setting that might go unexplored in one-on-one interviews (Kitzinger, 1995; Marshall & Rossman, 2006). In line with my constructivist assumptions about learning to teach, the focus-group method presupposed “that an individual’s attitudes and beliefs do not form in a vacuum” (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 114). Moreover, the focus-group setting allowed for a supportive, socially-oriented environment in which participants expressed their opinions, introduced ideas, and offered different points of view in a generative discussion. During the focus group session, “participants [were] asked to reflect on the meaning of their experience” (Seidman, 1998,
p. 12). Student participants reflected on how their teacher education program prepared them for inclusive social studies.

In addition to conducting interviews with preservice teachers, I interviewed course instructors to gain a better understanding of how the teacher education program helped prepare students for inclusive schooling. I developed separate interview protocols for the social studies methods class instructor, Professor Stern, who was also the social studies program director, and for the special education course instructors, Professors Hollingsworth and Gregory (see Appendix D). Although I had been conducting informal interviews with Professor Stern throughout the semester, in the form of weekly post-observation discussions, my formal interview, which took place in mid December, focused on his teaching experiences, his conceptualization of inclusive social studies, and his approaches to preparing future teachers for inclusive social studies. I also touched upon many of the themes he introduced in his weekly methods course lessons. My interviews with Professors Hollingsworth and Gregory, which took place in January, focused on how their classes helped to prepare prospective teachers for inclusive education, as well as their thoughts of the nature of disability, special education, inclusion, and democratic citizenship.

For all interviews, I used open-ended, semi-structured interview protocols similar to Creswell’s (1998) example. I tape-recorded all interviews to ensure accuracy and to better enable transcribing the interviews for analysis and coding. Although there are differences of opinion regarding this approach—Seidman (1998) recommends tape recording while Stake (1995) does not—I think converting the interviews into written text
helped facilitate a closer, more careful analysis. Seidman (1998) explains the benefits of tape-recording interviews: “Each word a participant speaks reflects his or her consciousness,” and, therefore, should be recorded verbatim (p. 97). In addition, interview recordings allowed me to preserve my original data, to check for accuracy, and to demonstrate accountability (Seidman, 1998). Because transcribing tape-recorded interviews or feverishly writing while participants speak can let “context and innuendo” slip away (Stake, 1995, p. 66), I took ample notes on participants’ body language, verbal inflection, utterances, and prolonged silences while the tape recorder ran. After all, a recording device should not be a “substitute for listening closely throughout the course of the interview” (Yin, 1994, p. 86). Finally, I hired a professional assistant to transcribe all interviews, and I checked the transcriptions for accuracy.

**Documents and Course Artifacts**

My fourth source of data consisted of documents and course artifacts collected during the semester, including program descriptions and requirements, course handouts, social studies and special education course syllabi and textbooks, and student coursework. I also acquired a syllabus from one of Professor Stern’s previous methods courses to ensure he was not tailoring his teaching to my study. Documents are important for qualitative studies “because the information provided may differ from and may not be available in spoken form” (Hodder, 1998, p. 111). According to Yin (1994), documents provide a number of strengths for case studies, including stability, reviewability, unobtrusiveness, exactness, and breadth. Because they were not created as a result of the
study, documents can be used “to corroborate and augment evidence from other sources” (Yin, 1994, p. 81).

A thorough content analysis of documents and artifacts allowed me to describe, interpret, and understand the teaching and learning of inclusive social studies in a fairly unobtrusive way (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). At the beginning of the semester, I requested a syllabus from each social studies and special education class instructor and acquired the assigned textbooks. This allowed me to keep pace with all of the courses and to know what was expected of the students. Each week I collected course handouts, including classwork, project assignments, and sample assessments. In addition, at the end of the semester, all of the students participating in the study forwarded me their methods coursework, which included homework assignments, projects, and the final exam.

A content analysis of the course syllabi, textbooks, and assignments for the social studies methods class allowed me to understand explicit and implicit messages about teaching social studies to all students in inclusive educational settings, and about the ways in which the program conceptualized social studies. I was also able to corroborate data from observations and interviews with instructors and students. By analyzing the same documents from participants’ required special education classes, I learned how and what preservice teachers were taught concerning inclusion and disability. In addition, because I did not observe the special education classes, these documents helped reveal the teaching and learning that took place in those courses. Finally, the participants’ coursework provided information about what and how students learned about inclusive social studies in their methods course.
Methods of Data Analysis

Since “there is no particular moment when data analysis [formally] begins” (Stake, 1995, p. 71), data analysis was ongoing throughout the study, and the patterns that emerged from the questionnaire, observations, interviews, and course artifacts helped to inform subsequent observations, interviews, and document analyses. Qualitative research is an iterative process, or “a succession of question-and-answer cycles,” and interim analysis allowed for adjustments and additions to data-collection instruments (Huberman & Miles, 1998, p. 186). This study adopted the data analysis spiral that Creswell (1998) developed, which included collecting and managing data; reading and memoing; describing, classifying, and interpreting data; and representing and visualizing data. Marshall and Rossman (2006) offer some additional procedures along this spiral, including “immersion in the data” and “searching for alternative understandings” (p. 156).

Although the emergence of meaning and analytic categories from the data was largely an inductive process, my theoretical framework of democratic citizenship education and DSE informed the design and interpretation of my study, and thus facilitated the instrumentality of my method. After all, “the theory-data boundary is permeable,” and data is always gathered and interpreted by a researcher who holds certain theoretical assumptions (Huberman & Miles, 1998, p. 190). Below I describe the stages of analysis that occurred throughout and after data collection. With each stage, I considered its relation to my broader theoretical framework and my research questions about teaching and learning for inclusive social studies in a teacher education program.
Data Management

I collected data between September 2011 and January 2012, and I stored the data, after careful labeling, as both physical files in a cabinet and as digital files on a password-protected computer. After each classroom observation, I placed the notes and handouts in binders, which I stored in a locked file cabinet. Shortly after each round of interviews, I hired a professional assistant to transcribe digitally recorded interviews. I checked each transcription for accuracy and stored digital copies of both the recordings and the transcripts on my password-protected computer, and I stored physical copies of the transcripts in a locked file cabinet. Although I did much of the coding by hand, I employed NVivo research software to help with coding and analysis of digital data, such as interview transcripts and student coursework.

Data Reading and Memoing

After organizing and transcribing data, I immersed myself in the data, reading and rereading the transcripts and documents several times (Creswell, 1998). After each observation and interview, while it was still fresh in my mind, I followed Marshall and Rossman’s (2006) suggestion of writing analytic data memos. These notes helped me interpret what I had just seen, heard, and read, as I jotted down “short phrases, ideas, or key concepts” that later informed the categories that emerged from the data (Creswell, 1998, p. 144). Although the themes and categories emerged over time through inductive analysis, they were also be informed by my research questions and theoretical framework. Specifically, I looked for evidence in the questionnaires, interview
transcripts, field notes, and course artifacts that related to democratic citizenship education and inclusive education.

**Classifying, Coding, and Interpreting Data**

I immersed myself in the data by reading and rereading observation notes, interview transcripts, questionnaires, course documents, and analytic memos to identify salient categories and themes. According to Marshall and Rossman (2006), the emergent “categories should be internally consistent but distinct from one another” (p. 159). For case studies, Stake (1995) identifies two strategies for data analysis. Typically used for intrinsic case studies, direct interpretation allows a researcher to extract meaning from an individual instance. Instrumental case studies rely more on categorical aggregation, which requires the researcher to combine data and look for patterns (Stake, 1995).

I used line-by-line inductive coding of the data transcripts, notes, and documents to generate codes (Miles & Huberman, 1984). The theoretical framework of inclusive social studies guided my initial deductive categories of democratic citizenship education and inclusive education, and my inductive categories were subsets of these broader themes. My first round of categorical aggregation resulted in chunks of data related to democratic citizenship education, such as knowing democracy, doing democracy, creating a community of learners, and teaching and learning diversity. I also developed categories related to inclusive education, such as disability and identity, disability and stigma, ableism, inclusion as a place, differentiated instruction, and special education. During a second round of coding, I identified additional themes that were not immediately obvious within my guiding framework of inclusive social studies, such as
Universal Design for Learning, reflection and critical reflection, disability and/as
diversity, and apprenticeship of observation. After I interpreted the salient patterns and
themes that emerged from the data and considered alternative explanation for the results,
I presented a written report of the study.

**Triangulating Data**

In order to verify conclusions, confirm findings, and eliminate threats to analytic
validity, I used data source and methodological triangulation (Huberman & Miles, 1998;
Stake, 1995). By conducting and analyzing at least three interviews with each student
participant and 10 observations of each course, I engaged in data source triangulation,
which allows researchers “to see if the phenomenon or case remains the same at other
times, in other spaces, or as persons interact differently” (Stake, 1995). Moreover, my use
of multiple data sources, such as questionnaires, interviews, observations, and course
artifacts, facilitated methodological triangulation, creating a complex matrix of meaning
among and between the different pieces of evidence.

**Representing Data: Writing the Narrative Report**

Once I had interpreted, coded, and synthesized data, I wrote a final narrative
report, my dissertation, which answered the main and subsidiary research questions
(Creswell, 1998). My aim was to present a final product that explored how preservice
social studies teachers were prepared for inclusive education, to situate these findings
within a tradition of qualitative inquiry and a theoretical framework of democratic
citizenship education and DSE, and to theorize a relationship between citizenship
education and inclusion that had implications for research and practice.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

According to the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE), citizenship education in the United States often emphasizes traditional themes, such as United States history and government, rather than contemporary problems and social justice (Levine & Lopez, 2004). This trend is no accident; rather, it is evidence that “citizenship education, generally, is authorized by dominant cultures who seek the continuance of their members’ social status, social vision, and self regard” (Parker, 2008, p. 66). Generally speaking, normative conceptions of schooling, especially in the current era of high-stakes testing, can hinder democratic education and its constituent elements, such as democratic citizenship education and inclusive education. As a result, the goals of democratic and inclusive education can be incongruous with the practices and pedagogy that manifest in schools and in teacher education programs (Oakes, Quartz, Ryan, & Lipton, 2000). Thus, teacher education for inclusive social studies can be difficult to realize. This chapter analyzes the complexities of teaching and learning inclusive social studies at Franklin University by asking, *How does a preservice social studies teacher education program help prepare prospective teachers for inclusive social studies?*

**Teaching Inclusive Social Studies: A Portrait of Pedagogy**

Despite its purported goal of citizenship education—or, perhaps *because* of this goal, given the traditional, conservative ways in which it has been enacted—the field of social studies has been marked more by continuity than by change over the past century,
echoing broader themes of constancy in teaching practices over time (Cuban, 1993; Thornton, 2008). In many ways, Franklin University’s social studies program director and methods class instructor, Professor Stern, enacted a teacher education curriculum designed to counteract dominant, traditional conceptions of citizenship education. By fostering student participation, community, and diversity, Stern employed a pedagogy that countered prevailing practices in schooling and social studies education that seek to undermine democratic citizenship education.

Professor Stern’s pedagogy spoke to the limitations of citizenship education as teacher-centered content delivery, what Freire (1993) referred to as the “banking concept” of education. Stern presented a version of a democratic citizenship education that went beyond academic and traditional conceptions and resembled something closer to Parker’s (1996a, 2003) progressive or advanced models of citizenship education. Although grounded in the study and teaching of United States history, Stern’s methods classes emphasized a participatory, student-centered approach to learning social studies, which included teaching and fostering a democratic community of learners and addressing the complexities of diversity and difference in the classroom.

In addition, Professor Stern’s approach to preparing students for inclusive social studies reflected his understanding of the theoretical consonance between democratic citizenship education and inclusive education. Often, educators’ negative attitudes toward disability, their narrow conceptions of inclusion, and their unwillingness to design accessible curricula can serve as barriers to inclusive education (Shapiro, 1999). In an attempt to help prospective teachers develop more democratic and inclusive methods for
teaching social studies, Professor Stern addressed all of these issues. Moreover, his conception of inclusive education went beyond the mere placement of students classified with disabilities into certain classrooms, as it often referenced diversity, community, and differentiated instruction. This vision was sometimes at odds with the normative special education paradigm presented in students’ required special education courses.

This section focuses on how and what Franklin University’s social studies education program taught about inclusive social studies. Stern’s pedagogy often ran counter to prevailing normative conceptions of democratic citizenship education and inclusive education, but students’ special education coursework and program fieldwork reinforced these normative conceptions. Drawing on interviews with instructors and students, observations of the graduate and undergraduate methods classes, and course documents and artifacts, this section includes “interactions among faculty, students, and content during class time…[and] various instructional strategies used by faculty, the nature of instructional discourse, and representations of content” (Grossman, 2005, p. 426). I also discuss various tasks or assignments that “focus students’ attention on particular problems of practice and introduce them to ways of reasoning or performing” (Ibid.).

**Knowing and Doing Democratic Citizenship**—“I’d like teachers to see active citizenship as a primary goal in their teaching.”

In many ways, Professor Stern was a product of the social and political activism of the 1960s. Involved in community organizing and the anti-war movement, Stern had not planned on becoming a teacher. He explained,
My father asked me, “What are you going to do for a living?” and I said, “Well, I’m going to be a revolutionary.” He said, “Well, what’s your backup plan?” So I decided at the time I’d get my teacher credentials so I had a backup plan to earn a living. I student-taught but there were no jobs at the time and I got a fellowship to graduate school…. So eventually, I mean, I guess by 1974 I got a full-time teaching position in East New York, Brooklyn, where we were doing community organizing. That’s how I became a social studies teacher. But at the same time I was studying history, because if you’re going to change the world you have to understand it.²

With four decades of social studies teaching experience, and more than 20 years as a teacher educator, Stern’s approach to social studies education reflected his beliefs about democratic citizenship, his life experiences, and his professional education. As a historian, Stern believed in the potential of historical thinking for democratic citizenship education. As a self-described activist, however, he understood that citizenship education goes beyond the study of history; it involves student participation, deliberation, and praxis.

Professor Stern’s pedagogy represented an activity-based approach to teaching social studies. In an interview, he explained,

I’m also a strong advocate of activity-based teaching. You know, that goes by different names at different times, but the idea that what we want students to do, is we want them to become historians. We want them to become social scientists. We want them to analyze documents because we want them to be able to reconstruct them and understand the past. And…if they become literate in that way, that’s something they can transfer to all

² Because I recorded and transcribed all interviews, interview excerpts are verbatim. Unless I deemed them essential to the data analysis, I removed utterances and verbalisms (such as “um,” “like,” “you know,” etc.) without notation. In all other cases, I denote removed and edited text, including noncontiguous material, using ellipses. I indicate additions or substitutions to the text using brackets, and for clarifications I use parentheses. Finally, when there is more than one speaker, I include the speakers’ names in the block quotes.
subject areas.

In more than half the lessons I observed, Stern referenced “historical thinking,” a process that emphasizes the interpretive nature of history and the critical thinking skills that students need to understand multiple sources of information (see, for example, VanSledright, 2002). In the social studies profession, scholars and practitioners have sought to distinguish between a “social science” approach, which traditionally focuses on transmitting or allowing students to uncover disciplinary knowledge, and a “social studies” approach, which is “organized around the needs of society…[and] students” (Thornton, 2005, pp. 2-3). But these approaches need not be mutually exclusive, as Stern himself noted on the first day of methods class, when he informed his students that he would be showing them a “process-based, social studies” approach to history, whose aim was to help students “become active citizens in a democratic society.” Although history as a master narrative and collective memory can undermine attempts at democratic citizenship education, history as a process by which we come to understand present issues and problems can complement it.

According to Dewey (1916), the study of the past must be framed by the present, and Professor Stern seemed to subscribe to this philosophy. On the first day of methods class, Stern divided the students into groups, distributed newspapers to each, and asked them to choose five significant articles and to write the headlines on poster board. These present-day headlines provided the class with salient themes and questions that would guide the methods class and could serve as overarching themes for a high school United States History course. Examples of essential questions included,
- What is the responsibility of the federal government?
- Do the benefits of technology outweigh the negative consequences?
- Can the United States become a more just society?
- Should the United States be the world’s police force?

Stern compared this student-centered thematic approach to teaching United States history to what many students had encountered in their own social studies classes: a teacher-centered, content-based approach. He distributed a *New York Times* article (Veale, 2000) with a sample multiple-choice quiz about United States history content. His point was to demonstrate that a social studies course could be organized around student interest and present-day issues and still address the historical content and process in a meaningful way (Dewey, 1916). What is more, he often incorporated counter-narratives to critique the dominant canon of Western history: a canon of “official knowledge” that is usually presented as neutral and value-free, but that often “empowers some groups while disempowering others” (Apple, 1993, p. 222; Banks, 1993a; Segall, 2006; Zinn & Arno, 2004). Surely, Stern’s approach was a marked departure from traditional conceptions of citizenship education, which emphasize the transmission of historical knowledge and which some social studies methods instructors still employ (Slekar, 2006).

Stern used the New York State social studies guidelines, specifically the United States History and Government course, to frame a methods curriculum aimed at fostering democratic participation. Further, his lessons often addressed advanced principles of democratic citizenship education while also reviewing content that New York State
requires teachers and students to know for the high school Regents Examinations
(NYSED, 1996). I asked Stern about the relationship between promoting active
citizenship and teaching the required New York State courses, such as Global History and
United States History. He explained,

**Professor Stern:** In New York State [social studies] standards, standard
number five is citizenship. And the idea in New York State is we’re
teaching kids to be active citizens in a democratic society. That was
always my primary goal; I was preparing kids to be active citizens in a
democratic society.

**Dennis:** So what’s the relationship then between, say, a U.S. history class
or a global history class and democratic citizenship?

**Professor Stern:** What we’re doing in class is we’re looking at the origins
of democracy, the origins of liberty…. We’re also looking at how ordinary
people have organized to transform society.

As both a teacher and teacher educator, Stern addressed what Parker (2008) has referred
to as “knowing and doing” democratic citizenship education: “that democratic citizens
need both to *know* democratic things and to *do* democratic things” (p. 65). In an
interview, one of his undergraduate students, Dave, remarked, “I think he teaches more of
a democratic approach.” For example, Stern explained to students how he follows his unit
on the Civil Rights Movement with a “Freedom March” through segregated suburban
areas to demonstrate the persistence of racial and economic inequality. While these
concepts were present in many of the sessions I observed, two lessons in particular stood
out for their emphasis on democratic enlightenment and engagement (Parker, 2008).

Although he made clear his opposition to standardized testing, Stern did not
believe that the reality of a state social studies exam should undercut creative and
student-centered pedagogy. Standardized exams do not dictate how or what teachers
teach, although they do influence decision-making and gate keeping (Grant, 2001). To
prove this point, Stern utilized the Document Based Question (DBQ) portion of the August 2011 United States History and Government Regents Examination (NYSED, 2012) to teach about, for, and through democratic citizenship. This particular DBQ asked students to discuss the expansion of democracy in United States history, and provided eight documents related to the denial and expansion of suffrage based on race, age, gender, and wealth. He began the lesson by asking the class to brainstorm ideas about democracy, and the class discussion focused mainly on voting rights, as did the DBQ documents, signaling the dominance of political definitions of democracy.

After a brief discussion, Stern showed the class an image from the Occupy Wall Street protests (a wave of populist protest over economic inequality that erupted early in the semester) in downtown Manhattan and wrote the following words on the board: “The U.S. has never really been a democracy.” Underneath this statement, he made columns for “strongly agree,” “somewhat agree,” “neutral,” “somewhat disagree,” and “strongly disagree.” Stern asked students to choose a position, divided the class into teams based on their opinion of the statement, and told them to create position papers for a debate using the DBQ documents and current events articles. He explained to students that he was teaching democratic ideas of “listening and respect for the ideas of others,” of deliberation and debate, alongside New York State-mandated skills, content, and exams.

In a similar lesson, Stern organized a “democratic dialogue” about the Occupy Wall Street movement. During this session, students were expected to hand in their current events assignment, for which they had found 10 articles related to the current state of the U.S. economy, and wrote brief summaries along with their views on the
issues and how they would teach about them in a high school classroom. Stern explained that he was organizing a “class dialogue” based on their current events assignment and their level of agreement or disagreement with statement about Wall Street (History is a Weapon, n.d.). Students divided themselves into teams based on their positions, and they drafted and delivered speeches and rebuttals, drawing on current events, history, and personal experiences. To ensure that all students in the class participated, Stern said, “Those who didn’t speak will give the rebuttal.” Immediately after the lesson, he took the students “backstage” to hold a debriefing and reflection session (Grossman, 1991). He asked, “What were the goals of this lesson?” Students mentioned encouraging multiple perspectives, maximizing student participation, analyzing current events and relating them to history, and articulating understandings of a particular topic. As in the previous lesson, Stern mentioned the importance of “listening and responding” in helping students engage in “civic discourse” and “democratic dialogues.”

Each of these lessons demonstrated Professor Stern’s attention to teaching preservice teachers the “knowing” and “doing” of democratic citizenship education (Parker, 2008). In other words, he wanted teachers to educate students for democracy—focusing on knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to democratic living—and through democracy, allowing them to participate in “democratic life itself” and perhaps dissolve the false binary between school and society (Biesta, 2007). Clearly, there was a knowledge base and skill set that Stern wanted preservice teachers to learn through these exercises. During the first lesson, he addressed content related to United States history, limits on democracy in America, and the New York State Regents exams. At the same
time, students learned techniques for organizing discussions and debates surrounding issues of democracy. In the second lesson, the current events project and democratic dialogue promoted an understanding of populist movements, both past and present, and recent economic issues. But, as the students noted, the lesson also allowed students to practice “civic discourse” as a community of learners, listening and responding to multiple perspectives and ensuring that everyone took part in the conversation about issues relevant to their lives.

Fostering a Democratic Community of Learners—“I try to get kids to respect each other in the class as part of a community.”

On the first day of class, Professor Stern explained to both methods sections that he aimed to foster a “classroom community” of learners, an idea that involved students “working together” and “respecting each other’s ideas” in order to “get them active in a democratic society.” He related the same idea to me in our end-of-semester interview, and this notion of classroom community was present in nearly all his lessons as part of his activity- and project-based approach to teaching. “According to the educational philosophy of community of learners,” Matusov (2001) writes, “the students and the teacher have collaboratively shared responsibility and ownership for guidance and learning” (p. 383). One cannot simply teach about communities of learning, but must work to develop them, as Stern did on the first day of his methods classes; for example, students helped identify salient themes in American history in the newspaper headline activity. Moreover, this approach rested not only on constructivist theories of learning,
but also on assumptions about democracy as an ongoing path and classrooms as
democratic, caring environments (Dewey, 1927; Greene 1993a; Noddings, 1992).

Democratic classrooms are not the default mode for education, but classrooms
have potential for nurturing democratic citizenship and an inclusive educational
environment (Parker, 1996b; Zindler, 2009). Professor Stern worked toward that goal by
developing and modeling a community of learners in his methods classes. Two days after
the tenth anniversary of the September 11 terrorist attacks, for example, Stern engaged
the class in a motivational activity about the attacks, in which they discussed a photo of
the event, listed what they knew about the events shown in the photograph, and described
how it affected them. During the post-activity reflection—which is something Stern did
after each activity—a graduate student said, “You made it okay [for me] to share my
opinions.” Stern responded, “John Dewey discusses this, creating a democratic learning
environment. How can we create that climate?” Several students responded that Stern
“got everyone involved” and that he “walked around the room” and spoke with students
as they worked in groups. Moreover, during these collaborative activities, Stern made a
point of sitting with the students and not standing over them. By sitting beside and with
student groups, listening to what they contributed, and making sure each student got
involved, Stern let students know that he was there to guide them: to work with them, not
to lecture them. This also sent a message about shared authority in the classroom, which
helped to nurture a community of contributing learners instead of a group of obedient
listeners.
Teaching students to take responsibility for and ownership of their learning—through cooperative group work, activities, and projects—and helping them to guide themselves promoted a democratic community of learners (Dewey, 1990; Matusov, 2001; Rogoff, Matusov, & White, 1996). To be sure, Stern did not allow students to frame their inquiry for the semester, as he had a clear path for the course on the syllabus. In this way, Stern’s approach was student-centered in execution but not in conception. Students were not left to themselves to design and direct the course. After all, there were New York State requirements for teacher certification, and Regents exams for which all high school students—and their teachers—must be prepared. Nevertheless, Stern’s syllabus and weekly lessons were theoretically consistent with his views on democratic citizenship education.

Stern regularly modeled his “community of learners” approach and required the preservice teachers to use student-centered methods in their own lesson plans. For example, for their culminating project, students worked in groups to create a full unit plan with an introductory rationale that addressed New York State and NCSS standards and to write 12 lesson plans that used an “activity-based” format. During at least four methods class sessions, Stern allowed groups to work together on their unit plan assignments, while he walked around the room and sat with each group to help guide them. In this way, by both modeling a student-centered approach and providing space for prospective teachers to address these methods, Stern fostered a community of learners through shared focus, objectives, and communication (Matusov, 2001).
Underlying Stern’s desire to create a community of learners in his methods classes was a strong ethic of caring. According to Noddings (1992), caring is a relation that requires attention, or “engrossment,” on behalf of the carer, and “reception, recognition, and response” on the part of the cared-for (p. 16). Although Professor Stern demonstrated care in all of his lessons, one episode was particularly illustrative of his care-oriented approach to fostering a classroom community. During one mid-semester graduate methods class, as students were sharing their fieldwork experiences, one student was visibly upset, explaining, “I have a special ed student who just sits in the corner and does nothing.” She did not know how to connect or engage with this student, and Stern asked at what time of the day she taught this student. It was one of her morning classes. Stern responded, in a calm, measured, and thoughtful voice, “Tomorrow, ask if he had breakfast,” implying that students living in poverty often miss their most important meal of the day. Stern then explained that when he taught high school, he would often bring snacks for students whose families could not afford breakfast. The graduate student was visibly touched, as she appreciated Stern’s caring approach to her teaching dilemma and to her student’s needs. In this short episode, Stern modeled a caring relation for the methods class; engaged in a reflective dialogue about teaching and learning; allowed for the student to be the cared-for and, potentially, the carer in her student teaching placement; and encouraged her to work towards being a better teacher (Noddings, 1992). Moreover, Stern’s response indicated his understanding of the complexities of disability and diversity, and of how special education classification can depend on any number of issues, including race and poverty (Reid & Knight, 2006).
The Complexities of Unity, Diversity, and Disability—“Community means there are going to be diverse people, and that includes people with disabilities.”

Connected to Professor Stern’s attempts to foster a democratic community of learners in the classroom were his ideas about American pluralism, which he viewed as essential to teaching democratic citizenship. Although research has shown that teacher education programs tend to segregate topics on diversity rather than infuse them into the program, Stern, as both methods instructor and program director, integrated issues of diversity throughout the course and social studies program (Ladson-Billings, 1999; Melnick & Zeichner, 1995). On the methods syllabus, Stern indicated that one of his course objectives was to “explore teaching techniques and strategies for connecting with students from diverse cultural backgrounds and with different performance histories in school.” In other words, he was not simply going to teach about diversity. Instead, by drawing on students’ own experiences, placing student observers and teachers in ethnically diverse schools, and emphasizing past and present issues related to diversity in the United States, Stern aimed to foster a classroom community that valued difference.

Though many teacher education programs are culturally homogenous, including the one I studied at Franklin University, Professor Stern often drew on students’ diverse experiences and perspectives to teach about pluralism (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). According to Greene (1993b), democratic communities thrive when they are attentive to difference and multiple perspectives. As we have already seen, one way in which Stern fostered a classroom community was by drawing on students’ ideas through democratic dialogues. In addition, to demonstrate the diversity of perspectives in classroom, Stern
would acknowledge and ask for participation from students who represented historically marginalized social and cultural groups. In discussions about racism in America, for example, Stern would invite comments from nonwhite students. During a lesson on the current economic downturn, he would encourage discussion from students of all socioeconomic backgrounds. Though this type of interaction ran the risk of embarrassing certain students and essentializing their cultural backgrounds, Stern’s caring relationship with the students facilitated this type of dialogue and helped them understand American pluralism. Seema, a graduate student who participated in the study, commented on Stern’s approach:

> What he does is he purposely, and he takes permission and he asks student beforehand, he picks on those students with diverse backgrounds…. I think that’s very important not only for a college classroom environment, but especially for a high school classroom environment, because you want to reiterate the concept of diversity.

Stern’s approach might not work with novice teachers, and he cautioned students, “You never want to stigmatize a person.” But, instead of simply assigning readings on diversity and having students write an essay (which he also did), he tried to demonstrate that classrooms comprise all sorts of people, and that people’s experiences, not stand-alone lesson plans, were the most poignant teaching tools.

In addition to drawing on students’ diverse perspectives and experiences, Stern often placed observers and teachers in school districts with historically marginalized student populations. The suburbs surrounding Franklin University are culturally and racially segregated, and many of the preservice teachers in the program grew up in white, affluent areas (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). Stern understood the importance of providing
prospective teachers with experiences involving diverse student populations (Garmon, 2004; Hollins & Guzman, 2005). But he was quick to point out that he did not place students in these schools merely for the sake of diversity. He explained, “I primarily work with city schools or suburban minority schools. So what they do is they see what’s possible with good teachers in these settings.” Though he did not clarify what he meant by “good teachers,” Stern believed that placing prospective teachers with skilled teachers was as important as providing them with diverse experiences. There was evidence, however, that the pedagogy espoused and practiced in these settings was not consistent with the activity-based approach Stern advanced in his methods class, as student observers often witnessed teacher-centered, lecture-based social studies lessons.

Professor Stern also integrated issues of diversity throughout the methods course by emphasizing the complexities and contingencies of American pluralism, both past and present. Because he used the New York State Regents curriculum on United States history as a backdrop for the course, or perhaps despite this fact, Stern was able to incorporate the pluribus of E Pluribus Unum into every lesson. For example, early in the semester, Stern assigned an activity entitled, “When Does American History Begin?” Students had to choose from a number of dates, including 20,000 BCE and 1619 CE, the dates when, respectively, the first Native Americans and the first Africans arrived on the continent. He used this activity not just to demonstrate the interpretive nature of history, but also to weave in histories of traditionally marginalized groups. During another session, Stern took undergraduate, graduate, and middle school students on a Slavery Walking Tour of Manhattan, an experience that was preceded by an interactive Internet
activity on slavery and the making of New York. Moreover, during the DBQ and debate on democracy in America, Stern set up a temporary limitation on who could speak in the class to teach a broader point about gender discrimination. He said, “Let’s be originalists: only the guys get to speak.” This rule lasted only a short while, as the majority of both methods classes was female, but, by opening up a discussion of privilege and power, Stern helped the class understand the concept of denying full citizenship to certain groups based on their race, gender, age, or social class (Oyler, 2011a).

Professor Stern’s lessons sometimes touched upon the complexities of and relationships between continued discrimination based on race, class, and disability. In our interview at the end of the semester, Stern noted, “One of my goals as a teacher is to create a sense of community, and community means there are going to be diverse people, and that includes people with disabilities. And what I try to get kids to do is to respect each other in the class as part of a community.” In fact, Professor Stern often couched his discussions of disability and inclusion in terms of diversity and community, drawing on the same principles that guided his teaching of democratic citizenship. In his methods classes, he explained to students that ability, whether actual or perceived, is often linked to a host of factors, such as race, ethnicity, and social class. Preceding the aforementioned interaction in which Professor Stern counseled a graduate student about the connections between poverty and ability, he had been discussing the range of student abilities they would encounter as student observers and student teachers. He said,

Special education doesn’t mean stupid. The student might not even have a learning disability. Special ed is an umbrella term that includes physical and learning disabilities. [Students nod their heads in agreement]. Both
ESL (English as a Second Language) and special education depend on many social, cultural, and economic factors.

Stern would often discuss students with disabilities in connection with English language learners or students in poverty, as ability is often connected to other diversity factors. He did, however, have a tendency to conflate issues related to disability with the challenges facing English language learners and students in poverty. To be sure, all of these diversity factors play a role in how, or whether, children learn in traditional academic settings (Banks & Banks, 2004). But, there was a risk in attending to disability simply as another form of difference under the umbrella of diversity education, because it denied discussion and explication of what makes disability unique; did not address underlying and alternative assumptions about disability; and contributed to the reductionist “misconception of disability as diversity” (Artiles, 2003; Pugach, 2001, p. 447; Pugach & Seidl, 1998).

Professor Stern’s vision of inclusive education was connected to his ideas about creating a democratic community of learners in which all students, regardless of ability, can learn and succeed. On the final exam, Stern defined “inclusion” as “containing students from different social and economic backgrounds, with different levels of preparation and interest, and including students who had previously been programmed for…special education classes.” In this way, inclusion was tantamount to creating a classroom community of learners, drawing on and attending to student diversity as an essential component of democratic citizenship. Stern also recognized that inclusion involved all students, not just those with disabilities, and that teachers must work to
create inclusive learning environments within their classrooms. This partly explains why Stern did not address inclusion and disability as discrete topics, but instead integrated them into his broader pedagogical vision. This approach to teaching about disability and inclusion, however, did result in missed opportunities for students who were not attuned to the same philosophical framework guiding Stern’s methods.

When I asked Stern about his understanding of inclusive education, he related it to his teaching in New York City, where “a regular social studies class is an inclusive class. You have a range of kids in a regular class. I define it as kids with a wide range of academic performance.” Here, Stern reemphasized his view of ability and academic performance as dependant on a variety of social and economic issues, a view influenced by his experiences working in urban schools with high poverty rates. In addition, he acknowledged that disability classification in schools was often determined by student behavior and literacy.

In his methods classes, Stern reminded preservice teachers that there would be a range of abilities in their social studies classes. During an activity, for example, he would require students to “organize this activity for different ability levels.” He said, “It depends on the class, which might have high ability or low literacy levels. Use your judgment.” Also, on several occasions, Stern explained that grade level did not necessarily dictate ability level, and that teachers should design curricula that are adaptable and accessible to a “broad range of students—you want to make sure they understand [what you’re teaching.]” To ensure students could access the social studies
curriculum, Stern provided preservice teachers with the tools to forge a flexible, differentiated curriculum that all students could access.

**Curricular Curb Cuts: Differentiated Instruction and UDL—“Well, what I try to do are lessons on diverse material.”**

Professor Stern’s activity-based approach to teaching social studies demonstrated a commitment to differentiated instruction and student-centered pedagogy. He would begin a lesson by modeling an activity and follow it with a reflection session, inviting students “backstage” to discuss his lesson (Grossman, 1991). When I asked him how these methods helped prepare teachers for inclusive education, he explained,

> Well, what I try to do are lessons on diverse material, using songs to teach about the civil rights movement, the museum gallery walk, using pictures to teach about immigration. The Irish famine lesson where we looked at differentiated texts, teaching the same material with different kinds of text, so that no matter who the kids were they could read it. Those are the specific areas that, where I tried to focus on [inclusive education].

To make learning accessible to all students, Stern employed differentiated instruction, which “is a philosophy of teaching purporting that students learn best when their teachers effectively address variance in students’ readiness levels, interests, and learning profile preferences” (Tomlinson, 2005, p. 263). This approach was consistent with the shared goals of inclusive education and democratic citizenship education (George, 2005).

Stern’s differentiated methods and materials intersected a broader curriculum design approach called Universal Design for Learning (UDL), which aims to “increase flexibility in teaching and decrease the barriers” that limit student access and learning (Hall, Strangeman, & Meyer, 2003, p. 2). UDL assumes that all educational environments are inherently heterogeneous, and that curriculum must allow all students opportunities
for access, participation, and progress (Hitchcock, Meyer, Rose, & Jackson, 2002; Rose & Gravel, 2010). This curriculum movement, which began in 1984, originated with a movement for universal design in architecture. For example, curb cuts, designed to assist those in wheelchairs, “also ease travel for people pushing strollers or riding skateboards, pedestrians with canes, and even the average walker” (Hitchcock et al., 2002, p. 9). UDL functions as a curricular curb cut, since it helps all students and is not simply a burdensome modification of existing instructional methods and content for students with disabilities (Broderick et al., 2005).

Professor Stern’s methods course incorporated key concepts of UDL through multiple means of representation, expression, and engagement (CAST, 2012; Hall et al., 2003; Pawling, 2011; Rose & Gravel, 2010). Table 5 details some examples of UDL principles evident in Stern’s pedagogy. Noteworthy in his approach to teacher education was the careful alignment and blurred distinctions between subject matter and teaching methods (Thornton, 2005). Much of the differentiated and universally designed curriculum that Stern used in his methods courses was easily transferable to the secondary social studies classroom. That is why each mini-lesson ended with a debriefing period, during which Stern and his students reflected upon the lesson and its application in the classroom. Additionally, it was Stern’s commitment to preparing teachers for real-life teaching situations in inclusive environments that contributed to his critique of the required special education classes.
Table 5: Examples of Universal Design for Learning in Stern’s Methods Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UDL Principle</th>
<th>Examples from Methods Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple Means of Representation</strong></td>
<td>- Students designed an activity sheet with rewritten and/or adapted documents from Zinn and Arnove (2004) (assignment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In pairs, students edited a <em>New York Times</em> article for use in an inclusive High School class (observation 9/20).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Professor Stern presented examples of differentiated text: edited, adapted, and rewritten versions of Anne Hutchinson’s trial (observation 9/20).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Professor Stern took students on a walking tour of the history of slavery in Manhattan, which was preceded by an interactive Web site activity (observation 10/25; field trip).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Professor Stern gave a mini-lesson on using music and song in social studies classes (observation 10/25).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Professor Stern modeled a “Gallery Walk” about the transformation of the United States during the 1920s (observation 11/8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Professor Stern modeled a lesson on Irish immigration that included a discussion of present-day immigration issues followed by multiple sources of information, such as songs, poems, newspapers, personal correspondence, and images (observation 11/8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Professor Stern distributed portions of a curriculum on the Irish Famine that included differentiated text (observation 11/15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Professor Stern distributed portions of a curriculum guide on “Slavery and the Law” to provide examples of differentiated instruction, noting that teachers can incorporate these in various ways, depending on the class (observation 11/22).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Professor Stern assigned portions of an economics book in which the lessons were differentiated (Heintz &amp; Folbre, 2000), including an image, a graph, and written text for each economic theme (observation 12/6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple Means of Action and Expression</strong></td>
<td>- Students created and presented a Tree of Liberty poster, which represented their understandings of American history and society (assignment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Students performed a rap, poem, interpretive dance, or song that explained the main ideas of their Unit Plan (assignment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some students performed portions of the differentiated texts of Anne Hutchinson’s trial (observation 9/20).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Professor Stern arranged students into a classroom assembly line to model methods for teaching about industrialization (observation 10/18).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- During class discussions and debates, students engaged in written and oral expression (multiple observations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Following the 1920s “Gallery Walk,” students had the option of presenting a rap or a poem to the class to summarize the lesson (observation 11/8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- During discussion/debate on Occupy Wall Street, some students stood to deliver portions of a speech by Mary Elizabeth Lease (observation 11/15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Students engaged in a role-play activity about the Civil Rights march in Selma in 1965 (observation 11/22).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple Means of Engagement

- In groups, students created a Unit Plan that required differentiated teaching approaches (assignment).
- In groups, students chose five significant newspaper headlines to frame study of American history (observation 9/6).
- Students practiced a “writing buddies” approach for peer reviewing and editing (observation 10/11).
- For many assignments and activities, students worked in groups and regulated their own progress (multiple observations).

Source: Adapted from CAST (2012b) and Pawling (2011).

Special Education and the Normative Tradition—“You don’t need a whole class on special ed laws and all the different syndromes.”

Whereas Stern prepared students for inclusive education by differentiating instruction and fostering a classroom community of diverse learners, the special education program took a different approach. Teacher education programs in New York State require prospective educators to complete a single course to prepare them “to promote the participation and progress of students with disabilities in the general education curriculum” (NYSED, 2010). At Franklin University, preservice students chose from three courses, one undergraduate and two graduate. Rather than teaching the purposes and methods of inclusive education, the courses “adopted a ‘disability of the week’ approach…focused on traditional categories of disability,” which is common among introductory special education courses at colleges and departments of education” (Pugach, 2005, p. 551). Although these courses introduced students to the IDEA mandates that the preservice participants were legally obligated to learn and know, their emphasis on laws and categories of disability demonstrated persistence of traditional special education, the medical model of disability, and the divide between special and general education. What is more, instructors in both departments seemed to adopt these
course requirements uncritically, missing an opportunity to engage students in the ways in which this ostensible preparation for inclusion actually perpetuated the normative special education paradigm.

Aiming to provide preservice teachers “with a basic understanding of the entire field of special education,” according to the syllabi, the requisite special education courses presented a medical model of disability and placement-based conceptualization of inclusion. Because they were not methods courses, they focused on students knowing and implementing laws related to special education, understanding various types of disabilities, reflecting on issues related to diversity, inclusion, and collaboration. When I interviewed special education professors Hollingsworth and Gregory, they each defined disability in terms of “impairment,” “inability,” and “reduced capacity,” and viewed inclusion as a less restrictive placement along a continuum of services offered to students with disabilities. The course textbooks, both introductory surveys about special education, framed the weekly lectures and PowerPoint presentations (Friend, 2010; Smith & Tyler, 2010). These were followed by various assessments, including multiple-choice exams, presentations on disability categories, observation reflection papers, and research projects.

This type of instruction presented knowledge as objective, not constructed, and differed significantly from Stern’s student-centered pedagogy. Unlike in Professor Stern’s class, there seemed to be few opportunities for students to take part in classroom discussion as a community of learners, as the instruction was largely teacher-centered and the assessments were fact-based tests, projects, and presentations. In addition, the special
education courses reflected the current state of education in general, with an emphasis on objective, testable knowledge. Coupled with the pathologized definitions of disability and a placement-oriented conception of inclusion, these ideas did little to overcome the many barriers to inclusive schooling.

However, the special education instructors did discuss the importance of inclusion and its relationship to democratic citizenship. Professor Gregory, for example, remarked that one of his main goals as a teacher educator was “to get students to realize that inclusion is essential,” but his definition of “promoting children with special needs in the general education classroom for the entire school day” sounded more like mainstreaming than inclusion. Hollingsworth provided a broader definition of inclusion, with physical, instructional, and social components, wherein the “child becomes part of the social fabric and social community of that school, of that classroom, of the community at large, and that’s the part that’s the hardest because that’s changing mindsets.” Hollingsworth’s multipronged conception of inclusion seemed to align philosophically with inclusive schooling, as it moved beyond mere placement of students with disabilities in the general education classroom. Although there was some truth to the “disability of the week” criticism that Stern and others leveled against this single-special-education-course model of preparing prospective teachers for inclusive education, the complexities and challenges of teaching about disability were evident in the special educators’ responses (Mutua & Smith, 2006; Pugach, 2005).

I pressed Hollingsworth a bit further about whether there was a difference between special education and inclusion, since the former seemed more prevalent in the
courses offered at Franklin. His response, that “the answer should be no, but today the answer is yes,” pointed to the persistence of a special education model of teaching and teacher education: special educators learn one set of skills and general educators learn another. He believed that it should not be this way, but Pugach (2005) raises the question, “Is it reasonable to expect general teacher educators to deliver instruction that may be outside their teaching experience and expertise?” (p. 566). Perhaps that is the wrong question to ask. Instead, teacher education institutions might consider models of teaching and learning that encourage greater collaboration between these areas of expertise, so that the dual model of general education and special education can move toward one of inclusive education.

Preparing prospective teachers for inclusive social studies requires lessons in and experience with democracy, community, diversity, and flexible curriculum. Professor Stern’s pedagogy embraced many of these practices, but it often met resistance from the normative constructs of schooling that student participants encountered in their own educational experiences, in their fieldwork, and in their special education coursework, which were powerful socializing factors on the preservice participants. Teacher identity is often shaped by contradictory messages that preservice students receive from prior understandings, program coursework, and fieldwork. As Segall (2002) states, there is a “complex relationship between the knowledge student teachers are given and the knowledge they produce” (p. 7). But students need to be given opportunities to reflect critically upon these contradictory messages and complex relationships, opportunities not typically afforded in teacher education programs. By providing students the necessary
space to explore complexities of democratic citizenship and inclusive education, I was able to examine the ways in which normative discourses of schooling shaped participants’ conceptions of inclusion and democracy, and how they functioned as obstacles to learning inclusive social studies.

**Learning Inclusive Social Studies: A Focus on Teacher Candidates**

Learning to teach takes place within a complex matrix of prior understandings, social interactions, formal and informal curriculum, and educational fieldwork. Students’ prior knowledge, beliefs, and socialization influence what, how, and whether they learn in a traditional preservice teacher education program (Darling-Hammond and Baratz-Snowden, 2005; Donovan, Bransford, & Pellegrino, 1999; Feiman-Nemser, 2008; Lortie, 1975; Pajares, 1992; Zeichner & Conklin, 2005; Zeichner & Gore, 1989). Therefore, teacher educators must consider prospective teachers’ experiences “as a major source of our understandings of what teaching is and…should be” (Griffin, 1999, p. 14). Because teacher education candidates have undergone 16 years of schooling, learning to teach occurs “through a slow, unwitting process involving imitation,” and reflects the type of teaching they experienced as children and young adults (Lortie, 1975, p. 64).

In this study, participants’ “apprenticeship of observation” was often reinforced by their program experiences outside of Professor Stern’s methods class, including classroom observations and special education coursework, which marginalized Stern’s pedagogy of inclusion and democracy and bolstered normative discourses of schooling. Drawing on data collected from an introductory questionnaire, interviews, observations,
and student coursework, this section presents an analysis of how, why, and whether students learned inclusive social studies during their time at Franklin University.

**Narrow Conceptions of Citizenship Education—“I wanted to become a social studies teacher due to my love of history.”**

Michelle considered herself to be a history nerd. Shy and soft-spoken, she was a junior in the undergraduate social studies program and was the youngest participant in the study. When we sat down for our first interview, Michelle mentioned that she could only stay until 5:00, because she had a history club meeting. Her love of history, the main reason she decided to teach social studies, was inspired by her high school American history teacher, who made history “fun.”

He got us all involved. We would put on acts during his class, which is fun. There’s one I specifically remember like the “Birth of a New Nation,” where I think he put someone in a diaper, like he made it out of paper and stuff at one point. It was just so much fun.

She spoke of this episode on two separate occasions, during our first interview and during the focus group session, demonstrating the impact that this particular teacher had on her understanding of social studies education. Asked to elaborate on the importance of learning history, Michelle responded,

I feel it’s so a student can understand the past and how it relates to the future, what’s going on now. You know, how things in Europe back in the early 1900’s affected how we are here today in America. So I feel that it relates to everything.

It made sense that Michelle mentioned European influences on America, as she is a second generation Greek-American that “keeps close to the traditions.” In addition, her interpretation of social studies as history education seemed to adopt a “collective
memory” approach, wherein the teacher delivers to students a body of “official knowledge” about the past, or a corpus of information that dominant norms, and state and federal departments of education, deem legitimate social studies content (Apple, 1993; Segall, 2006; Seixas, 2004). For many students in the program, their association of social studies with history began at an early age and was reinforced by what they learned from their coursework and fieldwork in the program. What is more, their conceptions of citizenship education were more concerned with issues of content knowledge than with democratic participation.

Michelle was not alone in defining social studies education as the teaching and learning of history for cultural literacy and competent citizenship. In fact, eight of the nine student participants mentioned history as a reason to teach social studies, demonstrating the persistence of a history-centered conception of citizenship education. Since many of these students were products of the New York State education system, which mandates two standardized history exams in high school, this perception of social studies education was not surprising. Matt, a graduate student in the program, explained that he enjoyed history and believed in its importance for social studies education.

I just think it’s important for people to know where you came from and to know your background, your history of your family, I guess, and just the history of America and where you’re born…. And it’s the most interesting subject to me.

While most social studies educators would agree that history education provides an important foundation for citizenship education, history should not be taught for its own sake, as “history needs justification” (Barton and Levstik, 2004, p. 26). It must go beyond collective memory, beyond being “interesting,” as historical knowledge per se does little
to promote broader democratic principles of participation, deliberation, and associated living.

Participants’ history-centric notions of social studies education were often reinforced by what they observed in their fieldwork. For example, Kate, an undergraduate student and history major, discussed observing a lesson about the War of 1812.

Well, what I saw today is not how I would run my classroom. Not to say the teachers were bad teachers, but I just felt like you’re pretty much telling the class that they obviously didn’t get the point of the War of 1812. Why don’t you explain it to them in a way that everybody can understand? Because something’s not clicking. Why don’t you make it a point to make differentiated instruction for that student because something’s obviously not right? They have the notes right in front of them but that student’s not making the connection in their head.

While she did not question the curriculum content, a series of facts, or official knowledge, about United States history, Kate did express concern about the pace at which the teacher proceeded, leaving some students excited about “flying by” and others, one student in particular, completely lost. The emphasis was on breadth, not depth. This approach to teaching social studies, covering United States history content at breakneck speed, bore little resemblance to the deliberative, participatory process of democratic citizenship education that inclusive social studies requires.

Some student definitions of democratic citizenship did transcend history education, but they still focused on knowing democracy rather than doing democracy. During our discussions about social studies and democratic citizenship, students’ focus on content was indicative of the type of social studies they experienced as students and witnessed as observers, one in which “official” historical knowledge was standardized, delivered, and tested, not constructed and critiqued (Apple, 1993). For many participants,
it was not just knowledge of history that translated into democratic citizenship, but also an understanding of United States government, the Constitution, and citizens’ rights and responsibilities. One graduate student, Matt, explained,

> I would say it’s knowing what your rights are and knowing what your privileges are, and knowing policies and how it would affect you. Yeah, I guess being able to know what you can and can’t do in your own society, just knowing about what your constitutional rights are….

Like other participants, Matt tended to tie knowledge of historical facts to an understanding of constitutional rights and responsibilities—components of traditional citizenship education (Parker, 2003; Westheimer and Kahne, 2004). Rather than emphasizing participation and community as ways of learning democratic citizenship, this conception focused on the knowledge, skills, and values that inform students’ rights and responsibilities as law-abiding citizens in a democratic society.

> Some participants did go beyond traditional, political orientations of citizenship, incorporating ideas about community and diversity. Seema, a graduate student, modified her original political definition of citizenship and discussed the idea of classroom community.

> I feel as if the classroom is the place where they should be given that type of concept—you know, since you’re living here now, you are part of the community, you are part of the society, and the society is an American society. So, the only place you get that type of an upbringing is within the classroom and you are encouraged to be a part of the community.

Seema’s broader conception of democracy as more than a system of government or political orientation had implications for fostering democratic paths within the classroom, which connected to Parker’s (1996a, 2003) and Dewey’s (1916) understandings of
democracy: that it is conjoint, associated, community living, and not simply preparation for future citizenship.

There was evidence, however, that Seema’s and others’ notions of democratic citizenship were still developing. On her final exam, Seema wrote that the “ultimate goal” for students in social studies classes is to become “social activists.” But, during the focus group, Seema and others mentioned that this “active participation” would manifest “through voting.” Similarly, Alicia said that students become “active democratic citizens by exercising their right to vote in national elections,” while Lisa, another graduate student, discussed students’ awareness “of their government and actively participating in that government through voting.” Matt discussed how individual rights, such as freedom of speech, allowed students to express their views and engage in discussion both inside and outside the classroom.

Although these conceptions of democratic citizenship encouraged student participation, they still placed a premium on personal rights and responsibilities (Parker, 1996, 2003; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Participants’ dualistic thinking about the subject and method of social studies—i.e., learning about democratic citizenship but not through democratic citizenship education—can be attributed partly to their own schooling and what they observed in their fieldwork. In fact, there seemed to be a theoretical and methodological disconnect between the social studies education that Professor Stern envisioned for the program and taught in his methods classes and the teacher-centered approaches to social studies education that students observed in local schools.
Doing Citizenship Education? —“We learned social studies out of a textbook and we took notes.”

Kate never had to take a Regents exam. A lifelong resident of New Jersey, she had been unfamiliar with New York State’s standardized testing regime before coming to Franklin University, where she was a senior undergraduate. When I asked her why she wanted to become a social studies teacher, she responded, “I love history and I’m really good with explaining things to people and helping people. I can just really break down a lot of information for people.” As a student who struggled with reading and writing, and who had a classified learning disability, Kate did not like social studies in high school because she “had to read a lot.” She explained,

I remember it was a lot of textbook work. We always had to read so much and it was never fun. That’s the way we learned Social Studies, out of a textbook, and we took notes. We didn’t do any fun projects ever, really. I’ve learned so many different things through [Professor Stern] and my classes here than what I remember experiencing in the classroom when I was younger.

Kate’s formal schooling taught her that social studies education was about delivering history content to students. Even though she did not enjoy this mode of teaching as a high school student, Kate believed she could do a better job of breaking down the material for her own students. Still, the objective remained the same: the teacher delivers information and the student receives information. Moreover, despite the absence of a standardized social studies exam in New Jersey, there was an emphasis on teacher- and textbook-delivered content. What Kate and other participants experienced as social studies students themselves, and what they continued to observe in local schools during their program fieldwork, helped to explain why Franklin University’s teacher
education program could not transform the “grammar of schooling” to which participants were accustomed, despite Professor Stern’s attempts to promote democratic models of citizenship education (Tyack & Tobin, 1994).

Having been exposed to the banking concept of education their entire lives, participants often did not recognize the limits it placed on their ability to process and implement alternative, student-centered models of social studies education (Freire, 1993). During my interviews with participants, they recalled their own experiences as social studies students in classes dominated by teacher lectures and seemingly endless note taking. Matt lamented, “I feel like when I was in high school most of the teachers kind of just sat there and talked for 40 minutes or I was writing notes for 40 minutes.” Others discussed the “overhead projector” as their social studies teacher’s closest companion. Even those teachers who made history “fun” and “interesting” still relied on teacher-centered approaches. Seema discussed how Stern’s approach differed from what she experienced as a student.

When I was in school I felt as if all there was was lecturing and note taking and that’s it…. [Stern’s] way of approaching a class and teaching a class is…harder because you really have to take your time and find an activity…. That takes away from lecturing time, basically.

Although she recognized the importance and challenges of Stern’s activity-based approach, Seema admitted that it would compromise lecture and note taking, the default mode for many social studies teachers. Moreover, Seema and other students did not understand why Stern emphasized student-centered and activity-based approaches, which suggested a theoretical disconnect between Stern and his students, making it difficult for
students to learn and implement more advanced models of democratic citizenship education.

Participants’ fieldwork—100 hours of observation in secondary schools—seemed to reinforce this teacher-centered apprenticeship of observation, further demonstrating the theoretical incongruence between their methods class and field placement pedagogy. During the focus group, Dave said, “Out of the hundred hours I observed, I have seen one time where they weren’t straight lecturing.” At that point, I asked the other eight participants, “Are you all seeing these teacher-centered, lecture-based lessons in your observations?” They all nodded in agreement. The lack of theoretical and practical articulation between social studies coursework and fieldwork was a major obstacle to participants’ learning for inclusive social studies (Darling-Hammond, 2006a). This disconnection between what participants learned in methods class and what they observed in secondary classrooms also shed doubt upon Professor Stern’s claim that he placed students with “good teachers,” especially when these teachers’ methods undermined his own pedagogy.

Although participants included student-centered pedagogy in their unit plans, as Stern required, many doubted its efficacy. During the focus group, Dave raised this concern, stating,

Everywhere I go, the teacher’s sitting up in the front of the classroom lecturing. So, it’s like, we just got great insight from [Stern] but then we’re going to get in the real world…. The fact is that we all are in New York State and we all have to do our Regents [exams] and listen to our boss.

Most of the participants agreed, and some chuckled because they had similar ideas and experiences. Moreover, Dave touched upon the notion that teacher education coursework
did not represent real-world teaching, that there was a disconnect between Stern’s approach and social studies in secondary schools. Seema remarked that Professor Stern was “preaching the project approach,” but questioned whether these methods were always practical. Kyle and Alicia reminded the participants that they would have to figure out what works for them once they started teaching.

Overall, participants seemed to understand that they would need to adapt to their own teaching situations, and Professor Stern would agree. During an interview, he said, “I don’t believe we inoculate people at the end of teacher education. What I always say at the end of teacher education, you’re a certified beginner. It then takes three to five years to learn your craft.” Whether participants implement Stern’s social studies methods was beyond the scope of this study. But, the fact that many participants remained dubious of student-centered approaches to teaching social studies demonstrated the difficulty of implementing more democratic, participatory versions of citizenship education, especially when the educational environment in which participants have spent their entire lives learning seemed inherently undemocratic.

There was at least some evidence that participants learned democratic pedagogy, and that was in their embrace of classroom community. For example, in their “Multicultural Social Studies” assignments, in which students responded to a series of excerpts about diversity by leading education experts, they found statements about balancing unity and diversity, by Maxine Green (1993b) and James Banks (1993b), to be particularly resonant. Seema wrote, “Greene’s use of the word ‘community’ helps to acknowledge this idea of diversity within this notion of a greater community.” Lisa noted
Greene’s (1993b) discussion of the challenges balancing community with individuality, which is a tension with which all educators grapple. Referencing Banks (1993b), Kyle highlighted the importance of “bridging people in a meaningful way,” and Dave discussed building a nation of “caring and active citizens.” In an interview, Kate explained that she was “starting to learn that the way [Stern’s] doing his lessons is to make it connect to everyone and to make people connect to each other so everyone gets engaged. Because you can’t really leave kids out or let them leave themselves out.” Similarly, Matt discussed “trying to create an environment where students can feel comfortable.”

Several students related inclusion to this notion of community—an important bridge between democratic citizenship education and inclusive education. Seema said that community “goes back to the whole concept of inclusive classrooms.” This connection was significant because it demonstrated that participants were able to draw theoretical parallels between the concept of community, which was emphasized in their methods class, and inclusive education. This point also spoke directly to the central research question of this study, that of preparing students for inclusive social studies. Although participants often remained trapped in the deep groves of normative schooling, with its emphasis on teacher-delivered official knowledge, this concept of community, which is essential for inclusive education, did resonate with them. Unfortunately, there were many other obstacles to preparing participants for inclusive schooling, such as the persistence of ableism and a traditional special education paradigm.
Disability, Identity, and Stigma—“...just being that difficult student that no one wanted.”

Kyle had changed a lot during his four years at Franklin. A senior undergraduate, he was the only participant in the study who identified himself as a student with disabilities on my initial survey. Before coming to Franklin, Kyle had been diagnosed with “alphabet soup: It’s OCD, ADD, ADHD, ODD (obsessive destructive disorder)—that’s what my sister called it, at least.” Kyle had been expelled from three middle schools and had attended two segregated BOCES (Board of Cooperative Education Services) schools, but he eventually graduated from a typical suburban high school. At college, Kyle became a student leader, as a campus assistant in one of the dormitories, as director for his college’s chapter of Relay for Life, a cancer awareness and fundraising organization, and as a finalist for Homecoming King. He explained that his desire to obtain dual certification in special education and social studies stemmed from his own experiences with disabilities: “Eventually I want to do special education because I want to give back to the people that have similar issues that I used to have.” Although Kyle identified himself as a person with disabilities, and recognized how this identity shaped his life, he also mentioned that he had not “felt the need to associate with” his disabilities at Franklin. In fact, he and other student participants often attempted to distance themselves from the disability label, demonstrating the stigma that disability carried.

Every participant in the study had some personal connection to disability, either from their own educational histories or their relationships with people with disabilities. Three of the students revealed that their personal relationships with family members who have disabilities shaped their perspectives on disability and, in some cases, their desire to
pursue certification in special education. For example, when I asked Lisa, who was seeking dual certification in social studies and special education, about her experiences with disability, she said,

I have family members [with disabilities]. One, my cousin, is not classified as autistic, but she probably has some things on the spectrum. We grew up together; she’s two years older than me. We’re both only children so she’s like my sister. A few of my other cousins, younger cousins on the other side [of my family], have speech delays and they’re beginning services for that, so it definitely touches my life a lot.

Similarly, Michelle said that disability was a “personal thing…. I have a little cousin who has autism and I’ve noticed that he interacts very well with people who are much more mature than he is.” With Michelle, there was a note of surprise at her cousin’s ability to socialize with others, as if those classified with disabilities are typically incapable of such interactions. Dave, a senior undergraduate, also revealed his latent prejudices about disability when discussing his brother, who was in special education classes as a student. He said,

My brother is…not mentally challenged in any way, but he was in resource room his whole life, special education classes…. He doesn’t have intellectual disabilities, but I mean, he has ADD. But he’s lazy. He doesn’t like school and this kid who doesn’t want to do work, in the education system, he’s special ed. Meanwhile, he’s got a job and half of his friends don’t.

By attributing his brother’s placement in special education classes to “laziness,” Dave disclosed his hesitance to admit that his brother had a disability, and his statement about his brother’s gainful employment implied that somebody with a disability would be less likely to find work. Despite their family relationships with those who have disabilities,
Michelle and Dave, along with most of the participants, seemed to view disability through a lens of deficiency.

Regardless of recent legal progress in the attainment of civil rights for persons with disabilities, and academic shifts toward social and cultural interpretations of disability, the concept of disability carried a stigma among participants. In his seminal work on the subject, Goffman (1963) defines stigma as “an attribute that is deeply discrediting” because of social definitions of what is normal and ordinary (p. 3). Often, stigmatized individuals will manage information about themselves to “pass” for what they and society deem normal (Goffman, 1963, p. 42). Of the nine student participants in the study, only one identified himself as disabled; yet three additional participants eventually revealed that they, too, had been labeled as students with disabilities in primary and secondary school. Labeling, a byproduct of traditional special education, contributes to stigmatization (Shapiro, 1999). Participants’ unwillingness to identify themselves as disabled did not make disability any less a part of their personal, social, and cultural identities. It did, however, expose their attitudes about disability as a stigma, as well as their normative conceptions of ability and schooling. Moreover, this tendency demonstrated how disability differed from other forms of identity, such as race or gender, in that it was a source of shame, rather than pride, for these students.

Participants distanced themselves from the disability label in part because they believed they had overcome it and no longer required the services afforded to them in primary and secondary school. For example, although Kate still struggled with reading comprehension in college, she decided in high school that she no longer wanted to be
associated with special education. She explained, “I was in resource rooms with kids who had severe learning disabilities and my work was almost honors-level.” So her parents hired a private tutor and after that, she said, “I didn’t really have an IEP plan anymore; I didn’t come to [Franklin] with an IEP. I was out of all resource classrooms.” When I asked Kate why she did not identify herself as a person with a disability on the survey, she admitted, “I still see it sometimes. I don’t think you can completely get rid of it. I think I just found out how to work with it and how to use my skills the best I can.” Kate and her parents made a decision to disassociate her from the disability, and, with the help of private tutors, worked to shed an identity that they found discrediting (Goffman, 1963).

John, a second-year graduate student who also did not identify himself as disabled, was classified with a disability in school and had access to resource room, academic services, and IEP accommodations, such as extra time on exams. When I asked why he did not identify himself as a person with a disability on the questionnaire, he explained,

I was the only person in my family that had [a disability]…. And I had things such as like time-and-a-half on tests, none of which I actually ever used; and I was able to take the tests in the Resource Room, but…I never actually used that. But most of the special ed kids where I went to high school were not different than anyone else, really. You’d see them; you wouldn’t be able to pick them apart…. I’m not really sure what my disability is and I wasn’t certain that my parents knew until the other day when I found out in [my Special Education class at Franklin] that they obviously would have to have been informed. I think it stems from a writing problem when I was in elementary school, and I think they just moved it with me while I moved up to middle school. But it was all corrected.
John had ambivalent feelings about his experiences with disability. On the one hand, he mentioned that students with disabilities “were not different [from] anyone else,” but he also tried to distance himself from his own disability, stating, “I never actually used” the accommodations and “it was all corrected.” These examples demonstrated that John, like other students, struggled with his own social identity and the stigma of disability. According to John, it was possible for someone to have a disability and be ordinary, but he was hesitant to be associated with disability. In our second interview, he elaborated.

John: I didn’t use [my accommodations] because I was kind of embarrassed of it, but looking back on it I kind of wish I used more of it.

Dennis: You said you were kind of embarrassed. Do you think there was this kind of stigma attached to special education [and] disability?

John: Definitely. Definitely. Because people see you socially as normal, per se. You have normal classes, you hang out with normal people outside of school, you’re around these students socializing and then they see you in these [resource] rooms and they kind of get a negative perception: “Why were you there? You don’t seem like you should be.” Because they think it’s like a zoo, but it’s really not. It definitely has a negative perception and hopefully with time that will go away.

John’s sense of what was “normal” was shaped by social perceptions of disability as abnormal, which was, and continues to be, reinforced by traditional models of special education that label, classify, and segregate students according to ability.

Alicia, a graduate student seeking dual certification, discussed how the stigma of disability affected her own identity as a student with Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD). In elementary school, she “was in academic intervention for math, because I can’t do complicated math to save my life,” but she wondered if she would send her own child to the resource room for academic support. She said,

[If] I was my parent and I saw this situation that my child could be going to because they had a problem with taking their tests and things like that, I
wouldn’t want to send them in that [resource] room either, because what is my child going to pick up from sitting around with children who are at reading levels that are significantly lower than theirs? So, like, I think for me, being a young child there was that, definitely that stigma. My parents never had a problem with it because they knew that I was gifted, and I’m not saying that to like toot my own horn. Like my IQ’s like 151, I think, or 152…like I have an exceptional 99th-percentile ability. And my life is, it’s always been like super-duper struggle.

Alicia’s experiences were somewhat similar to Kate’s and John’s. She acknowledged her disability diagnosis, but quickly attempted to distance herself from it to demonstrate that she was “normal,” or that she was smarter than the average student classified with a disability. Moreover, she signaled that disability was something that parents did not desire in their children, and that her parents “never had a problem” with her disability because her intelligence offset it. Even though most people were familiar with disability through relationships or personal experiences, it was not something with which they wished to identify. Disability manifested as a source of shame rather than pride.

The segregated structure of special education seemed to contribute to the stigmatization of participants with disabilities. Like John and Kate, Alicia mentioned that she had worked to overcome her disability, as people who feel stigmatized often do (Goffman, 1963). I asked her why she chose to disassociate herself from disability, and she responded,

Because I think that when I come to school and I work really hard, and like I’ve learned all these things about how to you know, bypass the problems…Not really bypass, I guess, build bridges in between the deficiencies that I have, and what I need to do to fix it and accomplish my goals, I think at those moments I’m free of the problems that I have. And then I’m like kind of, you know, I get to take time off from being frustrated. And, I mean, it’s something that I’ll never escape, but it’s like [a] part-time disability.
Her perception of disability as something to be overcome, as a problem or a deficiency, has a long tradition in public schooling. Contrary to a Disability Studies model of inclusive education, the medical model reinforces the special education paradigm, whereby students must change to fit into predefined modes of learning. Although laws such as ADA and IDEA outlawed discrimination against persons with disabilities, the persistence of negative perceptions of disability—reinforced by discourses of deficiency coupled with segregationist special education approaches to schooling—continue to stigmatize individuals and feed stereotypes. Additionally, recent movements in standards-based education reform, which places a premium on testing, exacerbate the disadvantages that students with disabilities face within normative constructs of schooling. Kate, John, and Alicia discussed their personal experiences with disability—which were part of their social identities even though they did not affirm it on the survey—as abnormal: something that they needed to overcome, to compensate for, in order to become part of the dominant group. Stigmas, stereotypes, and other “identity contingencies—the things you have to deal with in a situation because you have a given social identity”—carry with them negative educational consequences, as well (Steele, 2010, p. 3).

During the focus group, even as participants with disabilities became apologists for equal treatment of students with disabilities, they continued to qualify their disabilities with normative ways of thinking about ability. For example, after a discussion in which some respondents voiced concerns about the impact students with disabilities would have on the pace of instruction in general education classrooms, Kyle and Kate spoke up.
Kyle: I feel like we have a lot of generic statements of special ed students with special needs, students who are Regents students, or honors students, that are AP-level. I’m a student who had special needs at my school, yet I was at AP-level.

Kate: I’m AP-level and I had an IEP.

Kyle: Like, these stereotypes, they bug me. I understand that there’s no proper way to do it. I’m not saying definitely, but possibly if they went to a higher-level class, that they might not have been able to handle it because they’re so accustomed to the old one.

Kate: That’s true. I mean, I agree with Kyle because I’m the same thing, like I got straight A’s my entire life, but I had a severe learning disability when I was in high school and middle school.

Kyle and Kate were able to mitigate their disabilities in order to negotiate the “codes of power” that dominate schooling, which, in this current age of high-stakes testing, they defined as participating in Advanced Placement courses and achieving good grades (Delpit, 1995). Ableist educational environments, which run counter to inclusion, often require students to accommodate to existing, normative modes of schooling.

**Ableism in Education**—“I have a good heart…but I don’t know how I will be towards mentally challenged [students].”

Dave learned most of what he knows about disability from school. Growing up in a diverse, working-class suburban town, he got along with everyone. As an undergraduate senior at Franklin, Dave also worked full-time and had to borrow a lot of money in student loans to pay for his education. In addition, because of the limited job prospects for new teachers, he planned to take the New York City Firefighter Exam, just to keep his employment options open. But Dave really wanted to teach, and spoke of his desire to work in a diverse, low-income area because, he said, “I can relate to [the students].” Despite this ostensibly inclusive outlook on teaching, his views on disability were mixed. His brother was in special education classes, and Dave himself was tracked
into remedial reading as child. His experiences with disability as a student shaped his ideas about those with disabilities. Although “everyone accepted them and talked to them,” Dave admitted his own discomfort with having “someone in a wheelchair or mentally challenged” integrated into mainstream educational settings, for fear they would “slow down a classroom.” When I pressed him to clarify his use of the term “mentally challenged,” he gave an example:

> Just from my experience in class, there was a kid that was mentally challenged…. Maybe he had Down Syndrome. I’m not 100 percent sure…but he wasn’t up to the educational level that we were all in. So I feel like that child, even though he was harmless…at times it did slow the classroom down. Is it fair to the teacher? I mean is it fair to him?

While he did not define or defend his use of the term “mentally challenged,” Dave revealed the extent to which segregationist special education models of teaching students with disabilities shaped his thinking about teaching and learning. Dave’s thinking also demonstrated how disability remained separate from his belief in the importance of classroom diversity. Left unchecked, these ableist assumptions can reinforce prejudices against those with disabilities, function as barriers to equity and equality, and “lead to low levels of educational attainment” (Hehir, 2002, p. 1).

Ableism is not individual prejudice or bigotry against persons with disabilities, but is a social “devaluation of disability” that is deeply “rooted in the discrimination and oppression that many disabled people experience in society” (Hehir, 2002, p. 3). According to Hehir (2002, 2007), evidence shows that ableist assumptions, if left unquestioned, contribute to educational inequities for students with disabilities. Some of the previously discussed data, including a desire to “overcome” disabilities, or...
“problems,” and to associate with “normal” students, were evidence of the impact that ableism had on the participants (Hehir, 2007). Several of the participants indicated that they had mitigated their disabilities and, even among those who were not classified as disabled, there was a sense that schooling should aim to cure disability. For example, when Dave discussed mainstreaming students with disabilities into general education classrooms, he said, “They’re going to feel normal, as they should feel, and it’s going to improve whatever the problem may be. It’s good for them.” In addition to revealing his assumptions about disability and inclusion, Dave noted that mainstreaming could potentially fix students’ disabilities, their “problems,” to help them become normal.

Dave’s attitudes about disability also demonstrated the shortcomings of situating disability within a diversity paradigm. Although he wanted to work in a school with a diverse student body, his calculus of diversity did not include those with disabilities because, unlike race or class, disability signified something that needed correction. Other participants expressed these sentiments, as well. Kyle, who acknowledged his own identity as a person with disabilities, reflected, “Inclusion is extremely beneficial for the students with disabilities because it gives them a sense of…[hesitates]…not normalness, because no one’s normal, but a typical life.” As a person with disabilities, Kyle recognized that difference was normal, but his statement revealed how the default discursive mode regarding inclusion presupposes the nondisabled students as “typical.” Similarly, Michelle said, “Having special ed kids included in classes with kids who are on the normal, regular track would benefit them in a way, you know?” By using terms like “normal” and “regular,” Michelle acknowledged that segregated schooling for
students with disabilities was undesirable, but that those included in this setting were still considered “special ed kids” who should adapt to the normal surroundings, which may not be accommodating to all learners.

When participants discussed their observation fieldwork, many commented that a successful inclusion class was one in which they could not identify students with disabilities. This assimilationist view of inclusive education, a disability studies corollary to the colorblind perspective, made it difficult to realize the full potential of pluralistic educational settings (Banks, 2001; Schofield, 2004). For example, Dave, who was skeptical about inclusive education, was excited to share his observation experiences with me. He discussed how all students were fully included in the class, saying, “You didn’t even know who had a disability. I didn’t know. I still don’t know to this day…. They were just treated like everyone’s a regular student.” John brought up a similar point during our second interview, recalling, “You can’t tell who’s who. You really can’t. Is everyone special ed? I don’t think so.” And Kate said of her social studies observations, “I couldn’t tell [who had a disability] at all. I think I got a sense of maybe one or two and only because like we learned in special ed…that they deviate far away from the standard or typical answer.”

Kate’s comment revealed of the difference between the inclusive understanding of disability that they learned in Professor Stern’s class—that students with disabilities are part of the diverse nature of the classroom community—and what they learned in their special education courses, which often focused on pathologized understandings of students with disabilities deviating from typically achieving students. Nonetheless, as
Cochran-Smith (2004) argues, preservice and new teachers must “move beyond color blindness” and learn to “work effectively in local contexts with learners who are like them and not like them” (p. 62).

Participants’ responses highlighted the challenges of balancing unity and diversity—tensions that manifest in any democratic endeavor—and how community can be misinterpreted as assimilation. Moreover, their comments revealed how disability differed from other forms of diversity. With discussions of race and gender, there were no expectations, at least not explicitly, that all groups should conform to masculine, white, Eurocentric ways of being and knowing. When discussing disability, however, participants perpetuated “the fiction that human variation is a problem that needs solving” (Bejoian & Reid, 2005, p. 221), and remarked repeatedly that inclusion should help students conform to normal academic standards, which may be impossible for some students with disabilities.

If the diversity approach for addressing inclusive education was insufficient, so too was the medical model, which participants witnessed in their required special education courses. There, students learned to identify and classify specific disabilities, which, according to participants, offered little practical information about teaching in inclusive environments. According to Seema, “You go over the disabilities and laws in [special education] class.” To be fair, as Professor Hollingsworth explained, these introductory classes were not meant to be methods classes. But, a focus on labeling students contributed to the stigma that accompanied disability (Shapiro, 2000). According to Kyle, “If you have that label put on your students, as a student with special needs, you
will judge them differently.” He continued, discussing his own personal experiences with disability, “You could say that you won’t judge me, but to me that’s the biggest boldfaced lie you could tell.”

Moreover, unlike the methods class fieldwork, the required classroom observations for special education often took place in segregated environments for students with severe disabilities. Matt reflected on his observation experience:

I got to see basically students that don’t communicate, that need talking devices, and I also got to see students that are high functioning with some severe disabilities…. They’re kind of trying to prepare them to basically be able to pick up some sort of job when they get out of that school…. They were basically teaching them how to clean hotel rooms…. They kind of taught them how to make a bed and things like that.

Similarly, several students discussed visiting a United Cerebral Palsy school, which, according to Kate, “is really just based on mobility. I mean, I don’t think that they would put kids functioning at that level in an inclusion class.” The observations that participants experienced as part of their special education requirement sent certain messages about the nature of disability: that persons with disabilities received education in segregated facilities and were capable only of completing menial tasks, such as housekeeping. This harkened back to “functional” citizenship education of the mid-20th century (see Urban & Wagoner, 2009), and revealed the persistence of medical models of disability. These conceptions of disability and conflicting messages that participants received in their teacher education program reinforced their prior ableist beliefs and served as barriers to inclusive educational models.

Although nearly all participants recognized the persistence of ableism, acknowledging the discrimination that students with disabilities have faced, they could
not fully escape its influence. For example, Matt understood that students with disabilities continued to face ridicule from their peers, and gave an example from a class he observed, in which a student with Asperger’s Syndrome was mocked.

I mean [students with disabilities] obviously have to deal with things. They obviously can’t do the same things that everybody else gets to do just because of their capabilities, and obviously they get made fun of a lot. I mean you can obviously see someone that has some sort of disability that is acting a different way, and I guess as adults you wouldn’t really, you wouldn’t make fun of the person. You would understand, but I feel like younger kids don’t really understand….

Perhaps an adult would not act that way because they have an understanding of difference. But Matt assumed, as many do, that students with disabilities could not do the same things as typical students, an assumption that he saw as “obvious,” self-evident. In our current age of standardized, high-stakes testing, one cannot fault Matt for thinking this way, because students with learning disabilities are at an academic disadvantage in this type of environment. Later in the same interview, Matt indicated that the purpose of inclusive education was to see “if [students with disabilities] can perform at the same level academically as students without disabilities.” Rather than defining inclusion as an approach that maximizes “opportunities for students with disabilities to participate in schooling and the community” (Hehir, 2007, p. 9), he conceptualized inclusive education purely in academic terms.

Ableism is not unique to American education, and in other parts of the world it is even more prevalent. Seema, a graduate student who was born in India but raised in New York, discussed her recent experiences teaching for a nongovernmental organization in India. She explained,
We had one student that used to come; they used to want to attend but didn’t have legs…. Parents didn’t encourage the student to be educated anyways because, you know, the concept of being handicapped or having any disability, whether it be physical or a mental disability, in this specific culture, you’re sort of, you know, isolated from the rest of the kids growing up.

Because ableism is a product of society and culture, and because disability has been devalued in most societies throughout history, it is not the unique province of American schools to discriminate against students with disabilities. Seema’s story indicates the ways in which culture shapes disability. Ableism not only has been institutionalized in most societies and cultures, but in attempt to de-institutionalize it in the United States, through antidiscrimination laws and inclusive educational reforms, it has become more difficult to detect (McDermott & Varenne, 1995). The latent and manifest forms of ableism, which permeate the discursive communities surrounding formal education in the United States and co-opt the rhetoric of inclusion, continue to hinder efforts to promote inclusive education. Yet despite the persistence of ableism, preservice teachers generally had positive views of inclusive education, even if they doubted its efficacy in light of high-stakes academic environments.

**The Equity and Efficacy of Inclusion**—“Why shouldn’t a student that just has a minor learning disability be in a class with his or her peers?”

Lisa strongly supported inclusive education and equal rights for students with disabilities. Like several participants in the study, her interest in inclusive education was personal: she had cousins with disabilities, and her mother worked with preschoolers with autism. As a graduate student double-majoring in special education and social studies, Lisa was well versed in the history and language of special education. Having taken
several special education courses, her interviews were laced with the relevant terms and acronyms: Person-first language, Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), Universal Design for Learning (UDL), Individualized Education Plans (IEPs), and alternate assessment standards. Lisa made clear her opposition to segregated schooling for students with disabilities, attempting to counter prevailing attitudes of ableism. She said, “I think that if we address the issues of [students with] special needs early on and we find ways to get rid of special education then, yes, it’s inclusive.” Lisa expressed her desire for inclusive classrooms, but recognized the persistence of the traditional special education model. This represented a viewpoint that was similar to other participants’ in its support for inclusion, but there was an important difference, as well. Lisa acknowledged the continuing presence of this special education model and its impact on perceptions and practices of inclusion, while other participants remained unaware of its persistence. What is more, despite their purported support for inclusive education in terms of equity, many students questioned the academic efficacy of inclusion as a model of schooling.

Preservice educators generally have positive attitudes about inclusive education (Berry, 2010; Gately & Hammer, 2005; Pugach, 2005), but research on prospective and practicing social studies teachers shows mixed opinions (Mendez, 2003; Passe & Beattie, 1994; Passe & Lucas, 2011; Stufft, Bauman, & Ohlsen, 2009; van Hover & Yeager, 2003). Based on the results of the survey I distributed to student participants, attitudes toward inclusion were favorable, which reflected previous findings on the topic (Mendez, 2003). Participants also believed that inclusive schooling would benefit all students, not just those classified with disabilities. These results could be attributed to the fact that
many of the participants were seeking dual certification, and that almost half of the participants were classified as having a disability at some point in their lives.

Some participants were ambivalent towards inclusion, however. For example, both Dave and Seema were neutral in their responses to the statement, “In general, I support the notion of inclusion.” Seema explained she was “on the fence” about inclusive education.

An inclusive classroom does not work for every child. I think there’s a degree to what type of a need the child has that can be met in an inclusive classroom, but not every child is meant for an inclusive classroom, I think.

This sentiment was consistent with Mendez’s (2003) findings, which revealed “prospective teachers also perceive type and severity of the disability as factors…in their willingness to include students with disabilities in their general classrooms” (p. 110, italics added). Others echoed this sentiment, as well.

Regardless of the severity of disability, though, many participants had reservations about inclusion, particularly about its potential impact on the pacing and rigor of instruction. This line of thinking was indicative of broader trends in high-stakes testing, in which the deliberative, unhurried path of democratic learning is sacrificed for the sake of the fast-paced content coverage (Vinson, Ross, & Wilson, 2011). Moreover, it was consistent with participants’ apprehension that activity-based, student-centered instruction would impede social studies teaching and learning. Dave questioned, “How does a teacher slow it down for one student when the rest of the class is going at this pace? You know, is that fair? I don’t believe it’s fair.” Matt agreed, saying, for inclusive classrooms “it might have to be…[hesitates]…not dumbed down, but maybe you have to
spend more time on a specific topic.” Michelle wondered whether general education classes “might actually be, like, a little too fast for them or something,” and that students without disabilities “would feel the class is slowed down or something a little bit.”

There is no question that inclusive social studies requires a different approach to planning and teaching lessons, and it may result in a slower, more deliberative path of democratic citizenship education. But whether this constitutes a “dumbed-down” curriculum raises different issues about the nature of schooling and the persistence of ableism. Throughout the study, there was an assumption of a normal, ideal pace of instruction, a fixed body of content—a metanarrative or canon of historical knowledge—and skills that teachers must deliver within a given timeframe for class to be successful. Moreover, there was little consideration of democratic citizenship education as a conjoint, communicative experience. This problem has been exacerbated in New York State, where all secondary students must pass two standardized social studies Regents Exams—one in Global History and Geography and one in United States History and Government—and by recent developments in standards-based educational reform under No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top. As Professor Stern demonstrated, however, there are ways of negotiating through this standardized curriculum of “official knowledge and skills” to allow students “past the gatekeepers of socioeconomic access” while still teaching democratic citizenship education (Beane & Apple, 1995, p. 17; Delpit, 1995).

Although participants were reluctant to tout the academic efficacy of inclusive social studies classrooms, most admitted that inclusion promoted a more socially democratic school environment, which was consistent with their attitudes toward creating
a community of learners in the classroom. In articulating his support for inclusion, Matt stressed the importance of having “students with disabilities socialize with students without disabilities.” Kate discussed how segregation harms students’ confidence and undermines social capital. She said, “You can’t expect a child to feel happy and successful when they’re segregated from every other kid. You’re in adolescence; this is the time that you want to feel accepted.” According to Lisa, inclusive classrooms more closely mirror the social experiences that students have working with diverse groups of people. Inclusion, she explained, “teaches students to work together as teams with everyone who’s different from them…working together as a team to accomplish their goals.” Alicia agreed, adding that these classrooms “create a great working environment where the students can motivate each other.” Participants seemed to recognize the social significance of schooling. In this way, inclusive schooling was not preparation for social life, but rather, “produces, within itself, typical conditions of social life” (Dewey, 1909, p. 14).

Perhaps participants’ support for educational equity helps explain why methods of differentiated instruction resonated with them during their time at Franklin. Early in the semester, some participants did not understand what it meant to differentiate instruction, and initially did not realize that they were learning such methods. For example, Dave, Kate, and Michelle asked for clarification when I asked what they had learned in methods class about differentiating instruction. Once I defined the term, however, they pointed to examples of the gallery walk activity, the liberty tree assignment, and the incorporation of visual and written texts. Many students mentioned these methods on their final exams
and included them in their unit plans. For example, Alicia discussed using art and music in her lessons as an attempt to incorporate “Universal Design for Learning in order to help accommodate the specific needs of the students.”

Nearly every student mentioned cooperative learning as a way to differentiate instruction and recognized the potential of such instructional arrangements for inclusive environments (Tomlinson, 1999). For example, on the final exam, Matt wrote about arranging “students with different ability levels in the same group” to promote student learning, while John wrote that cooperative learning can “get all students motivated in the activity.” Students also discussed how cooperative learning groups allowed for reciprocal teaching and peer tutoring. Many participants referenced differentiating written texts, an instructional method that Stern taught about in lessons on the Anne Hutchinson trial and Irish immigration. In their unit plan rationale, Lisa and Matt wrote, “By editing documents that may be confusing for some students…we are allowing students of all reading levels to access the documents.” Reflecting on what she learned in Professor Stern’s class, Kate said he “connects to everyone’s skills…through art, poetry, music, dance, songs, and handouts and graphic organizers.” Overall, participants seemed to learn about the fundamentals of differentiating instruction during their time at Franklin.

Classroom observations also afforded some participants opportunities to learn about differentiated instruction in inclusive and collaborative settings. For example, Dave discussed a stations lesson: an instructional approach that employs flexible grouping to “allow different students to work on different tasks” (Tomlinson, 1999, p. 62). Others, however, misinterpreted the co-teaching and lesson modification for differentiated
instruction. Kyle highlighted the relationship between the general education teacher and special education teacher as a form of differentiation, explaining, “The one general education teacher…just did the overview and the special education teacher related it to them as well as broke it down.” This mode of thinking—that special educational “experts…not the classroom teacher, must accommodate differences”—was indicative of a normative special education paradigm, and represented a major barrier to inclusive education (Broderick et al., 2005, p. 196). Moreover, many of the observed methods participants discussed would be better classified as modified instruction, assuming there is a typical, standard curriculum that teachers must simplify, which “people often consider…an unfair burden on the classroom teacher (Broderick et al., 2005, p. 196).

Several of the participants, including Seema and Matt, viewed the inclusion model as “overwhelming” and as proceeding at a “slower pace” than the “regular” classroom. Kyle commented, “It becomes increasingly difficult to become creative with multiple versions of the same lesson each day.” Michelle mentioned that the teacher she observed “needed to do things a little shorter in her inclusion class,” while John discussed “spending a little more time on certain things and [making] some of the readings a little easier.” Although they were open to methods of differentiated instruction, participants’ confusion about what constituted differentiated and modified instruction further demonstrated the challenges of teaching and learning inclusive social studies when the concept of inclusion is situated in a special education paradigm.

Perhaps one of the greatest obstacles to learning inclusive social studies was the belief among participants that teaching methods for students with disabilities were
reserved for special education methods courses. Inclusive education is more than a physical space where students with and without disabilities are educated; it is a democratic approach to educating all children equally (Baglieri et al., 2011). But on the questionnaire and during interviews, many of the participants defined inclusive education in terms of physical placement and environment. This conception of inclusive education influenced their learning in the teacher education program. The dualistic nature of special education instruction—its segregation both in secondary schools and in teacher education programs—led participants to think that learning to teach in inclusive environments happened in a separate department, not in the social studies program. Ironically, while the teacher education program aimed to promote inclusion by requiring a course in special education, it actually reinforced the normative notion that education for students with disabilities takes place in a separate environment.

Because participants’ conceptions of inclusion as a placement applied to teacher education, they were unaware of the ways in which their preservice social studies programs attempted to prepare them for inclusive education. Many participants did not associate Stern’s activity-based and differentiated instruction with inclusive education, and they were “shocked” when Stern asked about inclusion on the final exam. Some admitted they “had no idea” what to write in their essay. Matt sounded a bit annoyed, saying, “We didn’t even go over any of it in the class,” and Michelle commented, “I don’t think we covered much inclusion in methods class, just the one day.” Many students saw inclusive education as part of the special education department. According to Kate, inclusion is “[Professor Gregory’s] department. That’s why we take [Gregory]
because...[Stern] never really talks about inclusion.” And Dave said, “[Stern] doesn’t really teach you how to teach inclusion. I guess that’s something you learn in special education.” Perhaps Professor Stern could have been more explicit in class when he was incorporating methods about inclusive education—although the course syllabus made ample reference to inclusion—or perhaps students assumed that these methods were solely the province of the special education department. Either way, the normative constructs of contemporary schooling, which shaped the lived and learned experiences of participants, seemed incongruous with the aims of inclusive social studies.

**Summary**

Inclusive social studies envisions a socially democratic educational setting that fosters the development of a community of learners, attempts to balance the unity and diversity of democratic citizenship, and adopts a curriculum that is flexible, participatory, and accessible to learners of all abilities. The purpose of this study was to investigate how a preservice social studies program prepared students for inclusive social studies through an examination of participants’ prior knowledge and the teaching and learning that took place in the program. Data revealed that Professor Stern modeled a democratic and inclusive approach to social studies education. His methods course taught prospective teachers about knowing and doing democratic citizenship education, fostering a classroom community of diverse learners, and creating a flexible curriculum for all students. In addition, despite the shortcomings of his diversity education approach to teaching about disability, this conceptualization of disability was more inclusive than the
medical model to which student participants had been exposed for their entire lives, and which the special education program espoused.

Unfortunately, though, there was little congruence between what students learned in Stern’s class and what they observed in their fieldwork and other coursework. This theoretical inconsistency among and between coursework and fieldwork is a longstanding problem in teacher education, evidence of the “two-worlds pitfall” that Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1985) documented nearly three decades ago. Overcoming this pitfall—which sent mixed messages to participants and caused them to question the efficacy of Stern’s methods—“requires acknowledging that worlds of thought and action are legitimately different” (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985, p. 64). Such acknowledgement means that teacher education programs must afford students the opportunity to reflect critically and socially on the discursive contexts that shape these two worlds.

The normative approaches to schooling that participants experienced in their special education coursework and observational fieldwork reinforced their lifelong apprenticeship of observation and filtered much of Stern’s pedagogy for inclusive social studies. Participants’ initial perceptions, which included traditional, academic understandings of citizenship education and ableist, placement-based conceptions of inclusive education, persisted through much of the study. Moreover, the dominance of a normative special education paradigm, which segregated instruction for students with disabilities, prevented participants from learning many elements of inclusive social studies that were presented in their methods class. This prior knowledge and socialization
found solace in program coursework and fieldwork that stressed teacher-centered pedagogy, official knowledge, segregationist schooling, and a traditional special education framework.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

During my semester at Franklin University, I conducted a total of 18 interviews and one focus group with student participants, and I closed each discussion with a variation of the same question: “How prepared are you to teach inclusive social studies?” In part, I designed this question to keep each stage of the data collection focused on the main research question, but I was also curious about their perceived progress over the course of the semester. At the end of the focus group, our last interview, participants’ responses were mixed, reflecting a need for more experience with special education, collaborative teaching, and differentiated instruction. But, as Professor Stern said, the goal of teacher education is not to “inoculate” students to the risks of real-world teaching, but to certify them as beginners entering an increasingly complicated field. The preservice social studies program at Franklin University provided students with an opportunity to learn inclusive and democratic pedagogy, particularly in Professor Stern’s methods class.

These methods, however, often faced resistance from normative teaching practices that reinforced participants’ apprenticeship of observation. While there was theoretical and pedagogical incongruence throughout the program—students received differing and conflicting messages from their methods class, special education class, and fieldwork—perhaps the greatest obstacle to inclusive social studies was the lack of space in which to engage this dissensus in a discursive and critically reflective fashion. The areas in which there was some consistency, or at least perceived consensus across the disparate components of the program, allowed for the potential development of classroom
communities of learners and flexible, differentiated curricula, which are essential components of inclusive social studies.

This chapter begins by discussing salient issues, which emerged from data analysis, that represent obstacles to and opportunities for preparing students to teach social studies in inclusive settings. In addition, I highlight gaps in the existing literature on social studies, inclusive education, and teacher education, and discuss the ways in which my study contributes to these fields of inquiry. Then, I explain the implications of these findings in the areas of inclusive education, teacher education, and democratic citizenship education. Next, I discuss the limitations of my study and explore other potential projects that might build upon the current study. Finally, I reflect on the current state of inclusive social studies in light of these findings and consider how educators might move toward more inclusive and democratic schooling.

Obstacles to Inclusive Social Studies

Apprenticeships of Observation

Preservice teachers’ apprenticeship of observation, their 16 years of socialization as students in formal educational settings, as an obstacle to learning in teacher education programs has been well documented, and the purpose of this study was not to revisit this well-trodden terrain (Grossman, 1991; Kennedy, 1999; Labaree, 2000; Lortie, 1975; Zeichner & Gore, 1989). However, it is worth discussing the ways in which student participants’ observation fieldwork reinforced their socialization and prior understandings as prospective teachers. These complementary and self-confirming apprenticeships of
observation demonstrated the intransigence of normative models of teaching and learning, especially in relation to the essentially contested concepts of democratic citizenship education and inclusive education, and proved that university teacher education can be “washed out” by intra-program experiences, such as fieldwork and coursework, before an educator enters the workforce (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981).

Much of what participants knew and understood about democratic citizenship education was influenced by their experiences with social studies as high school students. Oftentimes, students recalled versions of social studies education that Parker (1996a, 2003) would classify as traditional citizenship education, organized around facts and skills related to United States history and government. These experiences reflected the narrow, academic version of citizenship education that most participants learned from attending high school in New York State, where mandated standardized exams continue to shape the social studies curriculum (Grant, 2001). The resulting official knowledge effectively marginalized Stern’s counter-narrative: an alternative curricular approach to social studies that introduced diversity, community, and participation as essential elements of democratic citizenship education. Additionally, the type of instruction participants learned as students was predominantly teacher- and textbook-centered, leaving little room for the type of democratic, student-centered experiences necessary for more advanced, participatory forms of citizenship education.

The social studies classes that students observed in local high schools revealed a disconnect between the methods that Professor Stern taught and the practices that took place in secondary classrooms. It should come as no surprise that little had changed
between these “two worlds” during the few years separating participants’ high school
social studies experiences from their teacher education observations. After all, the
“grammar of schooling” emphasizing teacher-centered instruction and objective
knowledge has remained relatively static for a century, and recent emphasis on
standardized high-stakes testing has only exacerbated the trend in social studies (Cuban,
1993; Tyack & Tobin, 1994; Vinson, Ross, & Wilson, 2011). Participants reported
observing lecture-driven social studies classes, in which teachers prized historical breadth
over conceptual depth, usually to prepare their students for the end-of-year Regents
exams. Couched in traditional conceptions of citizenship education, these pedagogical
approaches to social studies education were usually coupled with narrow, ableist notions
of inclusive education.

Participants’ observations, both for their methods and special education courses,
served to reify normative misconceptions of inclusive education and perpetuate
institutional ableism. As primary- and secondary-school students, many participants
experienced or witnessed the stigmatizing impact of a disability label. This stigma
resulted in explicit or implicit ableism among the participants, which manifested as
negative attitudes about disability and as disassociation from self-identifying or being
labeled as disabled. These ableist tendencies also resulted in narrow, placement-based
conceptions of inclusion and conflicted feelings about the equity and efficacy of inclusive
education. When they discussed their experiences as student observers, participants
tended to associate inclusive education with classes that were taught collaboratively—a
common strategy for implementing inclusion that involves a general and special educator
co-planning and co-teaching lessons (Magiera & Zigmond, 2005). While the conflation of inclusion with co-teaching has its limits—namely, an emphasis on inclusion as the placement of certain students in a co-taught classroom rather than as a school-wide model to educate all students (Baglieri et al., 2011)—it did allow students to observe collaborative efforts to create an inclusive learning environment in secondary schools. On the other hand, student observations for their required special education courses often took place in segregated facilities for students with severe disabilities. These observations confirmed many stereotypes participants held about disability, and reinforced a segregationist special education paradigm.

**The Traditional Special Education Paradigm**

Although the terms are commonly and mistakenly used as synonyms, inclusion and special education are very different concepts. Situated in the medical model of disability, special education stresses the identification and classification of students with disabilities to be placed in an appropriate, least restrictive environment. Rather than restructuring the educational process, schools often expect students with disabilities to adapt, with certain accommodations, to existing, normative structures of schooling with the goal of overcoming their disabilities (Hehir, 2007; Sapon-Shevin, 2007). Schools often adopt this model uncritically, unaware of the resulting stigmatization of disability as a deficit and the misconception of inclusion as a placement.

This special education paradigm influences teacher education programs, as well. Like most preservice programs, the one at Franklin University required a single special
education course to fulfill the state certification requirement, and there was little evidence of collaboration between the special education and social studies departments (Pugach, 2005; Pugach, Blanton, & Correa, 2011; Rice, 2006b). Moreover, although Stern did critique the content and objectives of the requisite special education course, none of the participants proposed transformative alternatives to this model of teacher education, other than simply requiring additional special education courses.

The persistence of the traditional special education paradigm and its teacher education corollary—the dualistic, segregated, single-course model of preparing teachers to teach students with disabilities—prevented many participants from detecting elements of inclusive social studies in their social studies methods class. Students often received conflicting messages about disability and inclusion from their methods course, special education course, and classroom observations. This lack of congruity between and among various components of the teacher education program was a problem, but worse was the fact that these inconsistencies were not critically engaged between and among the students and instructors in the program.

Professor Stern argued that teaching special education laws and syndromes, the focus of students’ single required special education course, did little to support “differentiated instruction and a classroom community with diverse student populations.” However, Professors Hollingsworth and Gregory did provide students with an introduction to information, such as IEP accommodations, that all teachers are legally required to learn before entering the field. Stern did not, and perhaps could not, address these requirements in his methods classes. Moreover, Stern’s diversity education
approach to teaching about inclusion and disability had its limitations, which the next section will discuss. As this study demonstrates, preservice teacher education can be impeded by incongruous, and even competing, pedagogical theories, such as those advanced by Professors Stern, Hollingsworth, and Gregory. Greater collaboration between the departments, as well as space for critical reflection on current practices, might have helped avoid the pitfalls of this segregated approach to preparing teachers for inclusive education.

The normative special education paradigm and medical model of disability have deep roots in American education. This was evidenced by participants’ experiences with and beliefs about disability, and by the fact that they did not question or critique these experiences and beliefs. Nearly half of the participants were reluctant to admit that they had been classified as disabled, and were quick to mention that they had overcome, or at least mitigated, their disabilities. Others expressed concern about the presence of students with disabilities in mainstream educational settings, despite their ostensible support for inclusive education and diverse classroom communities. In this way, participants’ beliefs in educational equity for students with disabilities did not correlate with their views on the efficacy of inclusion as a model for excellence in schooling. There was a fear that inclusion would “slow down” instruction, which might be true.

Democratic education, in line philosophically with inclusive schooling, is inherently a deliberate process. But with current educational policies and practices placing a premium on standardized test results, students with disabilities were seen as a liability, a belief that has been stitched seamlessly into the fabric of education in an age
of high-stakes testing. Even those who prized diversity as an essential element of classroom communities questioned the efficacy of including those with disabilities in mainstream academic settings, demonstrating the limitations of the diversity model approach to preparing students for inclusive education.

**The Limits of Diversity Education**

There is an inherent risk in teaching disability in the context of diversity or multicultural education, in fostering “an atmosphere where preservice students pick and choose which of these many ‘diversities’…to learn about” (Pugach, 2005, p. 570; Pugach & Seidl, 1998). Stern attempted to avoid this risk by highlighting links between poverty, race, and disability; by teaching lessons on flexible, differentiated instruction; and by embedding “discussion of disability within the larger framework of diversity” (Pugach, 2005, p. 570). But, efforts to weave disability into that broader pedagogy of diversity education often went unnoticed because of the persistence of a traditional special education framework, participants’ narrow conceptions of diversity, and the unique challenges that disability poses compared to other forms of diversity.

Students did not view disability the same way as other forms of diversity, such as race, ethnicity, or gender, and perhaps that is because there are very real differences. No doubt, disability classification is often linked to other racial and cultural factors, resulting in the overrepresentation of certain groups, such as students of color and English language learners, in special education settings (Ferri & Connor, 2005; Reid & Knight, 2006). Disability, however, permeates all diversity categories; it weaves through and
between other diversity markers, as any individual might become disabled at some point in his or her life. During the course of the study, only one student, John, discussed disability in the context of difference and diversity. In addition, participants believed that the goal of inclusion was to assist students with disabilities in achieving normalcy and overcoming disability. Some students, such as Dave, were excited about teaching social studies in a racially and economically diverse environment, but were skeptical about including students with disabilities in their classrooms. Moreover, three participants avoided identifying themselves with disability, as it represented a shameful stigmatizing marker, whereas nobody had any qualms about self-identifying with their race, gender, religion, or social class. This demonstrated the unique challenges that teaching about disability and inclusion pose within a framework of democratic citizenship education. These challenges would be better met through a lens of DSE instead of diversity and multiculturalism, which is how social studies literature typically addresses the subject, if it is addressed at all (Heilman, 2009).

Recent standards-based legislation has instantiated practices, such as high-stakes testing and annual yearly progress, which not only put students with disabilities at a disadvantage, but also contribute to the negative, ableist attitudes teachers harbor about disability. Bejoian and Reid (2005) explain,

Universal proficiency is a goal [of NCLB], and marginalization of students labeled as disabled will undoubtedly result since these students neither fit nor support normative expectations. Thus, teachers could not be blamed for spending their time on those students who are most likely to pass and meet the established standards (p. 228).
As a result of attending high school and college in the age of NCLB, many participants feared that students with disabilities would slow down instruction and hurt the academic progress of the class, rather than contribute to the overall diversity of a classroom community engaged in deliberative, democratic citizenship education. Further, with the introduction of new evaluation systems in New York State that yoke teacher ratings and student test scores, participants might be unhappy about teaching students with disabilities whose chances of success in traditional academic environments are lower (Engage NY, 2012). Unfortunately, participants remained largely unaware of these biases and prejudices, these obstacles to inclusive social studies education, because of the need for critical reflective space within the program.

**The Need for Reflective Space**

Space for critical self- and social-reflection was lacking throughout the program. During the last class session of the semester, Professor Stern taught a lesson on methods for teaching economics. He presented students with statistics on the employment status of the civilian population by race, sex, and age, and asked them to hypothesize reasons for economic disparity among certain groups in the United States. After students gave their hypotheses, Stern began a discussion about teacher bias and lesson planning.

**Professor Stern**: Teachers’ points of view cause them to pose questions and organize lessons in certain ways.

**James**: Shouldn’t we allow students to form their own opinions?

**Professor Stern**: You always bring your opinion, even if you don’t mean to. Everyone has a point of view.

**Kate**: You can’t *not* give an opinion.

**Dave**: Now I realize [teachers] were giving their opinion the whole time.
Stern was trying to make a point that teachers and, more broadly, schools carry with them an inherent bias: a hidden curriculum that reflects dominant discourses and influences the socialization of students. As students, participants developed apprenticeships of observation, which I have already discussed, and teacher education programs have an obligation to help students interrogate and complicate what they have learned and what they are currently learning. In other words, teacher candidates need space to reflect.

Dewey (1933) defines reflection as the “active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends” (p. 9). Stern engaged his students in this kind of reflection when discussing his mini-lessons and students’ fieldwork experiences. Going a step further, though, critical reflection involves “carefully considering a problem…in light of multiple perspectives,” including the “broader historical, socio-political, and moral context of schooling” (Jay & Johnson, 2002, p. 79).

It seemed counterproductive that so little space was offered in the teacher education program for students to unpack their own biases, beliefs, and prior knowledge, which their fieldwork and coursework reinforced. Provided with many “windows…to encounter the world and all its complexity,” but few mirrors to “reflect upon themselves” (Oyler, 2011a, p. 144), students were unable to reflect critically, individually or socially, to implicate their apprenticeships of observation within the broader contexts of schooling (Dinkelman, 1999; Grossman, 1991; Korthagen & Kessels, 1999; Oyler, 2006; Segall & Gaudelli, 2007).
Because current trends in standardized, high-stakes testing threaten to undermine the democratic aims of schooling, critical reflection is necessary to promote deliberative process of democratic citizenship education. Twenty-five years ago, Giroux (1988) wrote, “In the current political climate, there is little talk about schools and democracy” (p. 1). The same can be said about today’s educational climate, and unless teacher educators equip prospective teachers to reflect critically on the democratic potential and undemocratic trends in contemporary schooling, an inclusive social studies classroom is unlikely to be realized. According to Segall and Gaudelli (2007), collective, critical reflection in social studies teacher education programs is an “overt effort to counter-socialize teacher candidates” to critique normative modes of schooling and critically examine “the theories that underlie its practices” (pp. 89-90). To be sure, when it comes to an essentially contested notion like democracy, critical reflection carries no guarantee that students will think in ways that challenge narrow conceptions of democratic citizenship. As Dinkelman (1999) found, although teacher educators can teach preservice students to become critically reflective, they cannot influence the “quality and content of such reflection,” especially when trying to teach more advanced notions of democratic citizenship that embrace visions of conjoint, associated living (p. 329).

Ironically, the current study provided participants with several opportunities to reflect critically and socially on the intersections between inclusive education and democratic citizenship education, which is one reason why these findings have rich potential for social studies researchers and teacher educators. When prompted, participants recognized the overlap of inclusive schooling and democratic citizenship
education, despite institutional and academic barriers separating the two fields. And they did grapple with complex meanings and theories surrounding democratic citizenship education and inclusion. Nonetheless, reflection alone is insufficient to broaden students’ perspectives around essentially contested concepts, as most of their beliefs about democratic citizenship and inclusion remained unchanged (Dinkelman, 1999). But the study did provide opportunities for students to speak openly and honestly about disability, which is too often consigned to diversity or medical educational models. It also allowed participants the opportunity to explore facets of democratic citizenship and inclusive education that they initially overlooked, such as fostering a classroom community of learners and creating flexible, differentiated curricula.

**Opportunities for Inclusive Social Studies**

**A Community of Learners**

The practice of fostering a classroom community of learners is essential for both democratic citizenship education and inclusive education, and it is a concept that students learned throughout the program. For example, Professor Stern’s methods course stressed that creating a “sense of community” in the classroom was paramount, and it hinged on elements of respect, cooperative learning, inclusion, and caring (Matusov, 2001; Noddings, 1992). Stern recognized that classroom communities are neither self-evident nor self-executing, especially given the ethos of individualism that standardized testing promotes. Rather, these democratic educational environments must be nurtured (Zindler, 2009). In addition, despite the shortcomings of their special education courses’ “disability
of the week” approach, Professors Gregory and Hollingsworth taught, in the words of one participant, “that students with disabilities aren’t [special education] students; they’re our students.” Further, some of the classrooms that participants observed during fieldwork, especially those that were taught collaboratively, helped students understand the potential for fostering caring classroom communities for all students.

Data from this study revealed that students supported inclusive education on grounds of equity, even if they were suspicious of its impact on the academic progress of students, and this helps to explain why the concept of classroom community resonated with them. Students recognized the importance of purposefully integrating students with and without disabilities for purposes of socialization and, despite the ever-present subtext of the normative special education paradigm, participants deplored segregationist models of schools as unfair and unjust. Others highlighted the significance of having all students work together, in groups or as a whole class, to solve problems and accomplish their goals. In this way, participants’ positive attitudes about the equity of inclusive education helped them to recognize the broader democratic purposes of schooling, in spite of their otherwise narrow conceptions of democratic citizenship education.

Even if they did not always associate this concept with democratic citizenship or inclusive education, participants discussed methods that they could incorporate into their own classrooms to create classroom communities, such as cooperative learning, class discussions, student self-regulation, respect and care. Student-centered and cooperative learning, hallmarks of a classroom learning community, were evident in many of the lessons that participants submitted as part of their summative unit plans (Matusov, 2001;
Rogoff, Matusov, & White, 1996). Although phrases like “cooperative learning” and “working in pairs or groups” were not uncommon, there was little evidence of planning for authentic discussion, dialogue, and deliberation among the students. This may stem from participants’ belief that activity- and project-based approaches to teaching social studies were impractical in secondary classrooms, despite Stern’s modeling these types of lessons in methods class. Nonetheless, students seemed responsive to methods of differentiated instruction, particularly for students with disabilities, even as they questioned the practicality of activity-based instruction, perhaps a testament to their confusion over the semantics of pedagogy or their lack of classroom teaching experience.

**Flexible Curriculum and Differentiated Instruction**

Creating a flexible curriculum requires many of the same approaches that help to foster a classroom community of learners, such as cooperative learning and peer teaching, but it also demands innovative teaching strategies and classroom structures, including multilevel teaching, differentiated instruction, attention to multiple intelligences, and UDL (Sapon-Shevin, 2007). During our formal and informal interviews, Stern made explicit reference to differentiated instruction on many occasions, and UDL was evident in nearly every methods class I observed (see Table 5). According to Minarik and Hicks (2011), “differentiation of instruction builds on the notion of a more democratic classroom, allowing teachers to effectively respond to the varying needs of diverse student populations” (p. 49). Student participants recognized and were receptive to
examples of differentiated instruction in their methods class and fieldwork settings, and incorporated it into their own lesson plans and unit rationales.

According to Tomlinson (1999), curricular flexibility is the hallmark of differentiated instruction. In the context of this study, such flexibility would be impossible to measure, since it requires observation of participants in practice. Nonetheless, participants’ discussions of differentiated instruction in interviews and their inclusion of it in their methods coursework indicated the potential for its translation into practice. Participants incorporated art and music into their lessons to tap into students’ multiple intelligences and interests, differentiated texts to facilitate literacy for students of all ability levels, and encouraged cooperative learning to allow for peer and reciprocal teaching and learning. Students sometimes misinterpreted differentiation for modification (see Broderick et al., 2005), but their willingness to integrate differentiated approaches into their lessons demonstrated the potential for inclusive social studies, despite the persistence of the traditional special education framework and the teacher-dominated pedagogy they experienced before and during their time in the program.

Although existing social studies literature addresses and tests accommodations for students with disabilities in social studies classrooms, it fails to consider how teachers themselves learn to design flexible curricula for all students. What is more, the scant body of research on the intersection between social studies and inclusive education makes no mention of teacher education for inclusive social studies. To be sure, this study highlights the many obstacles that hindered preparation for inclusive social studies within a teacher education program, such as theoretical incongruence that pitted participants’
apprenticeships of observation against Stern’s inclusive and democratic pedagogy. What is more, this study demonstrated the limits of the medical model and normative special education paradigm, which participants’ special education courses reinforced, as well as the diversity model for teaching about disability and countering ableism. Nonetheless, emerging from this teacher education program’s competing philosophical frameworks and methods were important lessons for fostering communities of learners and creating flexible, differentiated curricula, which are essential for inclusive social studies and are possible within the current educational climate of standardized, high-stakes testing.

Implications

Implications for Inclusive Education

The current aims of public schooling, which place students with disabilities at a measurable academic disadvantage, make inclusive education increasingly difficult to realize (Bejoian & Reid, 2005). Although legislative accomplishments like IDEA provide a legal mandate for the inclusion of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment, the current emphasis on standards-based, high-stakes testing undermines inclusion and reinforces the traditional special education paradigm. Baglieri et al. (2011) explain,

A student who fails to meet predetermined academic criteria set by national, state, and local standards will come to the attention of assorted school personnel, including teachers, administrators, and psychologists. Student performance deemed outside of the defined parameters of “normal” becomes understood and acted on within the “discourse of difference” that circulates among school personnel…. In turn, to be below average is synonymous with being abnormal, and societies have
historically responded to various “abnormalities” by containment, forcing populations with disabilities into colonies, clinics, institutions, hospitals, asylums, special schools, and other segregated spaces.

In the context of public schooling, this segregated space is the special education class or, increasingly, the inclusion class. Given participants’ placement-based definitions of inclusion and their apprehension about the negative impact students with disabilities might have on the pace of instruction, it is clear that the standardized testing bears on teachers’ attitudes toward inclusive education.

Additionally, the normative constructs of contemporary schooling become more difficult to dismantle at the secondary level than at the primary level, where inclusive education is more compatible with the community ethos. Perhaps so much of the empirical research on inclusive education takes place in elementary schools because these environments lend themselves to community narratives, in which “peers freely and voluntarily engaged in relations” with students with disabilities (Naraian, 2008, p. 536). At the high-school level, the community-oriented narrative changes into an “institutional narrative” that leaves students disconnected, isolated, and disempowered (Naraian, 2008, p. 540). In other words, the normative high school narrative, which has served to socialize participants both before and during their time in Franklin’s preservice secondary social studies program, may explain why it is so challenging to foster meaningful socially inclusive environments in secondary schools and in teacher education programs. To be sure, this study demonstrates the challenges in overcoming the many obstacles to inclusive social studies in secondary school settings, but elementary social studies is
beyond the scope of this study, and I cannot make empirical comparisons between the two settings.

Throughout the study, it became clear that both the medical and diversity models for teaching about disability and inclusion were insufficient as standalone approaches. An interpretation based solely on diversity ignores the unique qualities of disability, and a medical model pathologizes disability as an abnormality to be cured. According to Slee (2001), traditional special educators cloak the medical model “through linguistic dexterity.” He explains, “While they use a contemporary lexicon of inclusion, the cosmetic amendments to practices and procedures reflect assumptions about pathological defect and normality based upon a disposition of calibration and exclusion” (p. 167). This was common in the special education classes that were required of preservice teachers at Franklin, as well as in participants’ own conceptions about inclusion. The “disability-a-week” approach of Franklin’s introductory special education course did not allow students to critique the “underlying messages with which labels are inscribed…[or] the nuanced ways in which those labels function to create regimes of fitness among students in schools” (Mutua & Smith, 2006, p. 125).

Moreover, the medical model and traditional special education paradigm rest upon objective, scientific assumptions of knowledge and knowing, which are reinforced by standards-based reforms and testing. These trends exacerbate the ableist tendencies of schooling by assuming a “one-size-fits all cure mentality” that stresses the transmission of official knowledge (Bejoian & Reid, 2005, p. 225). As a result, a “medicalized discourse…[has] become the only driving engine that both propels and limits special
education” (Danforth, 2006b, p. 84). Certainly, this medical model is borne out by special education research that prizes scientism and objectivity as ways to “sort out what interventions are effective” for students with disabilities (Gallagher, 2006, p. 100; see also Shavelson & Towne, 2002).

But if the medical model is an insufficient approach for preparing teachers for inclusive education, so is the diversity model, albeit for different reasons. Although Professor Stern tried to teach about disability as part of his integration of pluralism into his methods courses, students conceptualized disability differently than they did race, gender, or religion, which were the identities to which their narrow understandings of disability were limited (Marri, 2005). Many scholars caution against making irresponsible linkages between diversity and disability (Artiles, 2003; Pugach, 2005; Pugach & Seidl, 1998). Although I have lamented the absence of disability from democratic citizenship discourses, the subjects of disability and inclusion do appear in literature on diversity and multiculturalism (see Adams, Bell, & Griffin, 2007; Banks & Banks, 2004). In fact, Hehir (2002) argues that schools should “include disability as part of [their] overall diversity efforts” (p. 22). But Artiles (2003) warns that a diversity paradigm “essentializes culture and…that traditional treatments of difference ultimately reaffirm difference” (p. 192-193). Pugach and Seidl (1998) agree, writing,

The unexamined pairing of disability with diversity in special education reform is extremely problematic…. While on the surface diversity and disability approaches share a common goal—that of access—several features of the relationship between the two demonstrate that they are neither equal nor parallel nor reciprocal (p. 320).
The authors go on to explain that disabilities, unlike other sociocultural identities, “are individually situated and limit access to the full range of human functioning,” and require “a scaffold for full access” (p. 321). In practical terms, teachers and teacher educators must engage in “dialogue and carefully structured activities that address diversity and its relationship to disability” (Pugach & Seidl, 1998, p. 330). This approach would bring education at all levels closer to a DSE model of teaching all students.

So how does one reconcile the movement for inclusive education with special education, diversity education, and normative, neoliberal modes of schooling? Educators cannot altogether abandon labels, accommodations, and IEPs for students with disabilities, as stigmatizing as they might be, for to do so would undo four decades of legislative accomplishments protecting civil rights for the disabled. Nor can we deny students the academic content and skills required to succeed in the current standards-based educational environment, as difficult as it might be for students with disabilities to pass state and local assessments.

The social and academic goals of inclusion need not be an either/or prospect. But there is another way to approach inclusive education, one that allows teachers to see disability differently. Absent from discussions about inclusive education among Franklin University’s instructors and students was a DSE approach, or, at the very least, a recognition “that our categories of ‘normal’ and ‘abnormal’ or ‘typical’ and ‘atypical’ or disabled or nondisabled are created, rather than natural” (Oyler, 2006, p. 141). According to Broderick, Reid, and Valle (2006), DSE can inform the teachers’ practices “in a number of ways, most notably in (a) the ways that they ‘frame’ or understand their
students, and (b) the choices of epistemological and pedagogical models that they draw
upon in their instructional decision making” (p. 144). This perspective could allow for
similar changes in teacher education programs, as well.

**Implications for Teacher Education**

The current study demonstrated the intractability of preservice teachers’ prior
knowledge and beliefs about inclusion and democratic citizenship education, especially
when these were reinforced by fieldwork and coursework. The fact that Professor Stern’s
methods and pedagogy of inclusive social studies had little effect on students’ learning
highlights the need for greater theoretical congruity between program goals and practices,
with particular attention to fieldwork placements. In addition, the program’s segregation
of general education and special education courses belied any attempts to teach inclusive
theories and practices, as participants continued to distinguish between education for
general education and special education students. In other words, teacher education
programs must work to ensure theoretical alignment and articulation across coursework
and between coursework and fieldwork. According to Darling-Hammond (2006),
successful teacher education programs demonstrate
tight coherence and integration…between course work and clinical work
in schools that challenges traditional program organizations, staffing, and
modes of operation. The extremely strong coherence extraordinary
programs have achieved creates an almost seamless experience of learning
to teach (p. 7).

Social studies teacher education programs should seek out field placements in which
teachers’ pedagogical theory and practice are congruent with the programs’, especially
when the program advocates a democratic and inclusive framework that challenges
normative modes of education. This theoretical and pedagogical consistency will avoid sending mixed messages to students and can challenge the apprenticeship of observation with which students enter teacher education programs. Otherwise, methods class instruction will become “washed out” even before prospective teachers leave their preservice programs. Additionally, this “tight coherence and integration” must also manifest “between coursework.” This means that “faculty plan together and syllabi are shared across university divisions as well as within departments” (Darling-Hammond, 2006a, p. 7).

General education and special education departments cannot continue to operate as silos if teacher education programs are serious about preparing students for inclusive education. If teacher education programs maintain separate special education department, which seems most likely for the foreseeable future, then departments will need to align and articulate their goals and practices for greater consistency. In the absence of this theoretical cohesion, however, programs must allow room for teacher candidates to reflect on these inconsistencies in a discursive and recursive fashion.

The lack of reflective space within the program prevented students from critically identifying, addressing, and discussing the theoretical and pedagogical inconsistencies within and outside of the program. Critical reflective space would allow students to navigate the “plural universes” of teacher education, “wherein multiple and sometimes even contradictory reforms proceed simultaneously” (Cochran-Smith, 2005, p. 4). However, this space and the democratic educational practices it could potentially engender are in short supply because of broader economizing trends in traditional teacher
education programs that make democratic and inclusive education more difficult to realize. As teacher education becomes increasingly market- and evidenced-based, “the sine qua non of good teacher-preparation policies and practices is that they ensure teachers can ensure pupils’ achievement” on standardized exams (Cochran-Smith, 2005, p. 9). What is more, competition from alternative teacher education programs, such as Teach for America, have placed pressure on traditional teacher education programs, such as Franklin University’s, to become more streamlined and cost-efficient. Unfortunately, this “open-market approach to entry into teaching” has resulted in “reduced teacher confidence and efficacy” (Darling-Hammond, Chung, & Frelow, 2002, p. 297).

Teacher education institutions, furthermore, are increasingly being “evaluated based on graduates’ performance on licensing tests,” data that policymakers and accreditation institutions interpret as proof of teacher readiness and effectiveness (Darling-Hammond, 2006b, p. 120). This trend was evident in the amount of class time—part of at least three methods class sessions—that Professor Stern devoted to preparing preservice social studies educators for the New York State Teacher Certification Exams. Because time and space for critical reflection are not measurable data, perhaps schools of education are simply excising this practice, which has implications for democratic schooling within and beyond teacher education programs.

**Implications for Democratic Citizenship Education**

During a mid-semester methods class session on social studies assessments, Professor Stern made clear his opposition to high–stakes testing and the current state of
education in the United States. As a result of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and, more recently, Race to the Top (RTTT), he explained, we are in the midst of an “assessment boom.” He continued,

Social studies suffers from NCLB’s emphasis on math and science. New York State cancelled the fifth and eighth grade social studies exams. I’m against heavy emphasis on standardized testing, but the Regents exams help define what students should know. They’re useful guidelines.

While the Regents exams may be flawed, they keep in place the requirement to teach social studies. But, as Stern pointed out, the current trends in standardized, high-stakes testing, which began in 1983 when the publication of A Nation at Risk sounded the alarm about the failures of American education, have refocused national attention on schooling for economic gains rather than for democratic citizenship (Vinson, Ross, & Wilson, 2011). Thus, the educational environment that socialized these nine preservice students, both before and during their time at Franklin University, essentially ran counter to the type of democratic citizenship education required for inclusive social studies.

Over the past decade, democratic citizenship education has steadily been supplanted by math, science, technology, and language arts education. According to an NCSS (2007) position paper, “By requiring states to measure student achievement in language arts and mathematics and tying school performance reports and financial incentives to testing results, NCLB resulted in the diversion of both funding and class-time away from social studies.” Under NCLB, these financial incentives are based in large part on standardized test scores. While social studies educators and scholars are divided over whether to push for standardized tests in social studies (Burroughs, Groce, & Webeck, 2005)—for example, Professor Stern lamented high-stakes testing but
accepted them because they forced New York schools to teach social studies—they have been “united by…their belief that an education in social studies is essential to civic competence and the maintenance and enhancement of a free and democratic society” (NCSS, 2007). The recent implementation of RTTT has only exacerbated the threat to citizenship education. Onosko (2011) argues, “The sizeable reductions in class time for social studies…are very likely to get worse under Race to the Top,” which is “silent on social studies reform and the need for a robust civic-education curriculum” (p. 9). What is more, this high-stakes, test-based educational climate not only narrows the social studies curriculum, but also affects the “teaching styles and activities” that social studies educators adopt (Mathison, Ross, & Vinson, 2006).

Enacted and learned democratic citizenship education reflect trends toward academic, content-oriented, teacher-centered and demonstrable (i.e., testable) social studies that an emphasis on standardized testing has engendered. It is not simply that preservice teachers’ ideas about democratic citizenship are still developing (Adler, 2008), but that their entire social studies education has been dominated by history content and political definitions of democracy. Moreover, their fieldwork served to reinforce the academic, teacher-centered approaches that they themselves had experienced as students. Traditionalist conceptions of democratic citizenship education are dominant among in-service and preservice social studies teachers (Carr, 2008; Patterson, Doppen, & Misco, 2012; Ross & Yeager, 1999). While the academic and democratic purposes of education need not be a zero-sum game, academic aims alone are “insufficient to further the goals of teaching democracy” (Kahne and Westheimer, 2006, p. 313).
There seems to be an inherent incongruity between “an American culture that embraces democratic ends for its schools but resists the democratic means necessary to achieve them” (Oakes, Quartz, Ryan, & Lipton, 2000, p. 568). In spite of Stern’s efforts to move toward advanced models of democratic citizenship education, which stressed the importance of student participation, community, and diversity, traditional citizenship education continued to dominate participants’ beliefs about and fieldwork (observations) in social studies education. As a result, participants questioned the efficacy of more democratic approaches to teaching secondary social studies, against the reality of federal legislation and standardized testing that continue to narrow the social studies curriculum. Within this context, which emphasizes objective content coverage over democratic deliberation, teachers, as curricular-instructional gatekeepers, must work “to carve out space” for the type of democratic citizenship education that inclusive social studies demands (Oyler, 2011a, p. 153).

**Limitations**

Qualitative inquiry, and case study research in particular, brings with it limitations on generalizability and issues of interpretive relativity. Epistemologically, qualitative research is an interpretive paradigm, in which “the knower and the known interact with and shape one another” (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, p. 26). The nature of such inquiry opens it to charges of subjectivity and relativism, which the qualitative researcher acknowledges and balances with carefully wrought and triangulated research methods. Because I conducted my case study at only one university, these findings may not be wholly transferable to other cases. Case studies are contextually driven. According to
Stake (1995), however, although case studies have limited generalizability because of their size and scope, “people can learn much that is general from single cases…because they are familiar with other cases.” What is more, from case studies people can form naturalistic generalizations: “conclusions arrived at through personal engagement in life’s affairs or by vicarious experience” (p. 85). Providing thick descriptions and excerpts from data sets helps readers form naturalistic generalizations from case studies.

My background as a student and a teacher undoubtedly influenced my assumptions about social studies and inclusion, but my graduate study helped me understand that research is not purely a subjective or objective endeavor. Qualitative research, “a systematic approach to understanding qualities…of a phenomenon within a particular context,” must include internal checks for validity, reliability, and credibility, and it must stand up to the external scrutiny of data collection, analyses, and conclusions (Brantlinger, Jiminez, Klingner, Pugach, & Richardson, 2005, p. 196). I also recognize that my position as an educator, researcher, and person not classified as disabled has implications for the “crisis of representation” that affects both the researcher and the subjects of the research (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998).

Finally, because this study examined teaching and learning inclusive social studies in the context of a preservice social studies education program, the impact that such preparation has on teacher practice is beyond its scope. Moreover, the examination of only one semester may not fully represent a student’s entire course of study throughout the program. According to Adler (2008), absent from the body of research on social studies teacher education are large-scale, longitudinal studies that link education to
practice and student learning. There is an ongoing debate over the efficacy of teacher education, which can become “washed out” after the transition from student to full-time teacher takes place (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). The present study does not address these issues of translation of teacher education into practice, but it does provide insight into an understudied aspect of social studies teacher education.

**Future Research**

Because of their limited generalizability, case studies require further research to explore the complexities of education. The current study could provide a springboard for a number of other projects related to inclusive social studies. According to Yin (1994), a well-developed theory could serve as a template for future research. My hope is that this framework of inclusive social studies, which combines theories of democratic citizenship education, inclusive education, and DSE, could be used to guide future research on teacher education and classroom practices. In particular, this study has the potential to spur cross-case analyses and longitudinal investigations on inclusive social studies, as well as research on fully integrated inclusive teacher education programs.

Despite the limited generalizability of a single case study, research of this nature is not “unconnected to other scholarship; each is part of a growing body of empirical research, and each builds on previous work while also inspiring further investigation” (Barton, 2006, p. 2). For example, additional case studies on inclusive social studies in teacher education programs would allow for cross-case analyses, which could provide greater insight into teacher education for inclusive social studies. Of course, each case is unique and contextually driven, and Yin (1981) warns, “Accurate but thin generalizations
across cases are likely to be the only result” (p. 62). Nonetheless, comparative cross-case analyses of teacher education program would assist in building a theory of inclusive social studies at the preservice level (Yin, 1981).

Teacher education in all fields, not just social studies, would benefit from longitudinal studies that “connect teacher characteristics, teacher education, teacher learning, and teacher practice” (Zeichner, 2005, p. 742). It is important to understand how teacher education translates into teacher practice, an area that is beyond the scope of the current study. It is often assumed that preservice education falls victim to the occupational socialization of teaching, and research has certainly demonstrated this trend (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981). Moreover, many first-year teachers are skeptical of the “practical relevance of the preservice programs they…graduated from,” just as students at Franklin University were skeptical of Professor Stern’s student-centered, activity-based approached to teaching social studies. But, as Brouwer and Korthagen (2005) have demonstrated,

Teacher education can make a difference in regard to the kind of teaching competence that graduates develop. Our study also shows that a longitudinal research design can generate a more positive view of the possible contribution of teacher education programs to teacher development than cross-sectional studies allow…. The analyses of our data pointed toward particular program features influencing the relationship between practice and theory. These program features did not exert their influence in a direct or mechanical way, but in a complex interplay with each other (p. 213).

Therefore, future research needs to explore the complex ways in which teacher education and teacher practice interact with one another, especially in the context of an education system that seems to contradict the theoretical underpinnings of inclusive social studies.
Another area that requires further exploration is the impact of fully inclusive teacher education programs, in which preparation for inclusion is not relegated to a single class, but is integrated throughout the program. Oyler (2011b) has written about such a program at Teachers College, Columbia University, which adopts a DSE approach to teacher education and makes “no distinction between special education faculty and general education faculty” (p. 214). When situated within a special education framework, teacher education programs can be obstacles to inclusive education. Therefore, there need to be more qualitative studies of fully-integrated elementary and secondary inclusion education programs, what few may exist, to gather empirical evidence about the impact these programs have on students’ learning for inclusive education.

**Conclusion: Whither Inclusive Social Studies?**

Ten years ago I graduated from Teachers College, Columbia University, with a degree and certification to teach social studies, but with very little understanding of the concepts of inclusion and democratic citizenship education. When I was assigned an “inclusive” section of social studies my first year of teaching, I felt the same way most of the participants in the current study felt at the end of the semester: unprepared. Much has changed in the field of education over the past decade, and many of these changes have made it even more difficult to enact the framework of inclusive social studies that guided this study. As schools continue to move toward standards-based educational reforms that demand a greater emphasis on testing objective knowledge, the space for democratic education becomes narrower. As this study demonstrates, the high-stakes nature of schooling leads to apprehension among preservice teachers about embracing inclusive
education and advanced models of citizenship education, which slow down the pace of curriculum and instruction to allow for student deliberation, dialogue, and discovery. No doubt, the deep channels of schooling make it more difficult to navigate against the strong normative current, but there is room to realize an inclusive and democratic version of social studies education.

Given the time and space to reflect critically upon their apprenticeships of observation and to trouble the existing special education paradigm, prospective teachers can build upon notions of classroom community and flexible curriculum, which are essential for both inclusive education and democratic citizenship education and which seemed to resonate with this study’s participants. In addition, a DSE approach to teaching and learning about inclusion and disability can help chisel away the medical model of disability, which serves to perpetuate ableism and stigma, and complicate the diversity model, which oversimplifies the unique qualities of disability vis-à-vis other socio-cultural identities. Finally, greater collaboration between general and special education departments at schools of education could potentially result in theoretical and pedagogical consistency within teacher education programs, and might trickle down to primary and secondary schools to subvert the segregationist special education paradigm that continues to dominate schooling for students with disabilities. Inclusive social studies is not necessarily a lost cause, although it is certainly a challenging one. But, for the sake of democracy and inclusion in education, it is a worthwhile endeavor.
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APPENDIX A – QUESTIONNAIRE
Questionnaire

NAME (Please print): ______________________ / ______________________

                           Last Name                      First Name

EMAIL ADDRESS: ____________________________________________

** Please indicate whether you would be willing to participate in a series of interviews related to this study: (please circle)   YES    NO

I am conducting a study examining a social studies teacher education program. Specifically, I am researching what preservice social studies students learn about democratic citizenship education during a semester of coursework and fieldwork.

Please answer all the questions, as your responses will help me to understand your beliefs about social studies, inclusion, and students with disabilities.

The information collected here will not be used in any way that would reflect on you personally. What you say will be held in confidence, and I will not use your real name in any reporting of data.

ALL INFORMATION ON THIS SURVEY WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.
PART I: BELIEFS ABOUT THE TEACHING AND LEARNING OF SOCIAL STUDIES

For the statements below, indicate your agreement or disagreement by circling the number that best expresses what you think about the statement. Your replies to these statements can range from strongly disagree (SD or 1) to strongly agree (SA or 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A lot of my ideas about teaching and learning come from my own experience as a student.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teachers should use the same standards in evaluating the work of all students in the class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Since there is no &quot;best way&quot; to teach, every teacher has to figure out what works for him- or herself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It is impractical for teachers to tailor instruction to the unique interests and abilities of different students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Students learn best if they have to figure things out for themselves instead of being told or shown.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>When working with students from low-income families, teachers should rely primarily on teacher-directed focused, whole-group instruction.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Required social studies courses should have separate classes for low-achieving and high-achieving students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Social studies teachers must prepare all students for participation in a pluralistic democratic society.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The main job of the social studies teacher is to transmit the values of the mainstream American culture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The main job of the social studies teacher is to teach subject matter.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The main job of the social studies teacher is to encourage students to think and question the world around them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II: BELIEFS ABOUT SOCIAL STUDIES AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

In this section there are a few ranking questions and short answer questions. Please respond to the short answer questions as thoroughly as possible. All questions refer to teaching social studies at the middle or high school levels.

12. Why do you want to teach social studies?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

13A. Reasons to Teach Social Studies. There are many reasons why social studies may be an important subject for middle and high school students. Please rank the TOP 3 reasons why social studies is important for students. Please rank them so that 1 is the most important reason to teach social studies.

___ To help students practice critical and higher-order thinking skills by examining historical content and investigating primary sources.

___ To help students become active, informed citizens who participate in democratic society.

___ To help students recognize and discuss multiple perspectives held by diverse groups of people.

___ Another reason (please specify): __________________________

13B. Why did you rank your reasons for teaching social studies this way?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

14. Teacher Education in Social Studies. What do you hope to learn about teaching social studies from your social studies methods class(es)?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________
15A. Democratic Citizenship Education. According to the National Council for Social Studies (NCSS), one of social studies education’s principal objectives is to help students develop the “knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to assume the ‘office of citizen’ in our democratic republic.”

How would you define “Democratic Citizenship”?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

15B. How would you define “Democratic Citizenship Education”?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

15C. Which definition of Citizenship Education most closely matches your own? (Circle one)

- Citizenship education should emphasize the transmission of values, knowledge, and skills about United States history and government.

- Citizenship education, while addressing knowledge and skills related to history and government, should promote student participation, practice, and action.

- Citizenship education should promote student agency and democratic values, while embracing difference and diversity as essential components of American democracy.

16. How would you define “Inclusive Education”? 

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________
PART III: BELIEFS ABOUT INCLUSION AND STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

For the statements below, indicate your agreement or disagreement by circling the number that best expresses what you think about the statement. Your replies to these statements can range from strongly disagree (SD or 1) to strongly agree (SA or 5).

1   2   3   4   5

< ---------------0----------------0----------------0----------------0----------------0-------- >

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. In general, I support the notion of inclusion, in which students with disabilities are integrated into general education classrooms.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Inclusion will benefit the academic progress/achievement of students with disabilities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Historically, students with disabilities have faced discrimination and oppression.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Inclusion is fundamental to my beliefs about democratic citizenship.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Inclusion will have a negative effect on the social life of students with disabilities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Inclusion will require a significant amount of additional work for me as a teacher.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The inclusion of students with disabilities will compromise the content and pacing of instruction for average/high-achieving students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Having students with disabilities in my social studies classroom can be beneficial for students without disabilities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Inclusion will require significant changes in general classroom procedures.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I am comfortable collaborating and co-teaching with special education teachers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Teaching social studies to students with disabilities is not as important as teaching social studies to students without disabilities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I believe that social studies should be part of the curriculum of students with disabilities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART IV: DEMOGRAPHIC AND EDUCATION INFORMATION

29. Date of Birth ___________________________

30. Gender
   a. Male
   b. Female

31. How would you describe yourself? *(circle all that apply)*
   a. African American
   b. Asian
   c. White
   d. Latino/a
   e. Native American
   f. Other *(please specify): ___________________________

32. Would you describe yourself as a person with a disability?
   a. Yes
   b. No

33. Educational Status
   a. Undergraduate student
   b. Graduate student
   c. Other *(please specify): ___________________________

34. If you are planning to teach, what type/level of certification will you receive?
   a. Secondary social studies ___________________________
   b. Other *(please specify): ___________________________

35. Do you plan to seek dual certification in social studies and special education?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Maybe

36. Are you taking any of the following courses during the current semester? *(circle all that apply)*
   a. SPED 201 - The Exceptional Child
   b. SPED 264 - Inclusion in Today's Schools
   c. SPED 102 - Inclusion: Meeting Special Needs in PreK-12 Programs
   d. I took one of these courses in a previous semester
   e. I have not taken any of these courses
APPENDIX B – OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Course:</th>
<th>Topic:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time/Duration:</td>
<td>Instructor:</td>
<td># of Students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation #:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classroom Diagram

Observation Notes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Descriptive Field Notes</th>
<th>Reflective Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Stage Interview Questions

1. I'd like to start out by learning a little about what brings you to teaching. When did you first start thinking you might want to teach? Why are you interested in teaching social studies? What do you remember learning about social studies as a student?

2. What is the purpose of social studies education? Consider #13A on the questionnaire – Why did you rank the reasons for teaching social studies in this way?

3. Consider #15 on the questionnaire – Can you elaborate on your definition of “democratic citizenship”? How about “democratic citizenship education”?

4. What has been your experience with diverse (student) populations? When you were a student, did your social studies classes address issues of diversity and multiculturalism?

5. (I noticed that you plan on seeking certification in Special Education as well as social studies. Why?)

6. What have been your experiences with persons who have disabilities (yourself, friends, family, etc.)? Where would you say your ideas about disability come from? Generally speaking, where do people get their ideas/attitudes about disability?

7. When you were in high school, what did it mean to be a student with a disability? How were students with disabilities educated?

8. In general, you (do not) support inclusive education (#17). Can you elaborate a bit on your definition of “Inclusive Education” (#16)? Is it different from “special education”?

9. What impact might the classroom presence of students with disabilities have on students with/without disabilities?

10. Do you see a relationship between Inclusive Education and Democratic Citizenship?

11. Are you confident in your ability to teach social studies in inclusive classrooms? Explain.

12. What are your expectations for this teacher education program to prepare you for inclusive social studies? How do you think your social studies methods class specifically might prepare you for teaching social studies in inclusive classrooms?
Second Stage Interview Questions

1. What courses are you taking this semester?
2. What have you learned from your methods class about teaching social studies?
3. Describe Professor Stern’s approach to helping you prepare for teaching social studies.
4. What have you learned in your methods class about teaching social studies in inclusive settings (i.e., with students who have disabilities integrated into mainstream settings)? Please be specific.
5. Have your methods course readings and assignments helped prepare you for inclusion?
6. In your methods class, what have you learned about the following issues as they relate to social studies?
   a. Democratic citizenship.
   b. Diversity, difference, and/or multiculturalism.
   c. Creating a community of learners.
   d. Encouraging participation, involvement, and learning for all students, regardless of ability.
   e. Teaching literacy (reading and writing) to all students.
   f. Adapting lessons through differentiated instruction (developing teaching materials so that all students within a classroom can learn effectively, regardless of ability).
7. Discuss your special education class. Describe a typical class session. What have you learned?
8. Discuss your instructor’s approach to teaching about disability and inclusion.
9. What assignments have you completed in your special education course? What have you learned from these readings/assignments?
10. Discuss one class session, topic, or assignment that really stands out.
11. Have you observed an inclusion or special education class? Describe what you observed.
12. Have you observed an inclusive social studies class? Describe what you observed.
13. Have you observed a co-taught social studies class? Describe what you observed.
14. What have you learned about inclusion from your field observation requirements?
   a. Were students with disabilities fully included in the class?
   b. Did teachers provide accommodations for students with disabilities and/or differentiate instruction?
   c. Was the class co-taught? If so, what were the teachers’ roles?
15. How prepared are you to teach social studies in inclusive settings?
Third Stage Interview Questions

Focus Group

1. Based on what you’ve learned this semester, what’s your understanding of social studies education? How does it relate to democratic citizenship education?

2. Based on what you’ve learned this semester, what is your understanding of inclusive education?

3. Has this semester’s coursework and fieldwork changed your attitude towards inclusion?

4. What have you learned this semester about teaching social studies in inclusive settings?
   a. What do you think you should’ve learned that you didn’t?

5. How did your social studies methods course prepare you for inclusion? How did your special education course prepare you for inclusion?

6. What specific practices/ideas you learned during the semester would you adopt in your own classroom?

7. Would you be comfortable collaborating and/or co-teaching with a special educator in a social studies classroom?

8. Are you confident in your ability to teach social studies in inclusive classrooms?
APPENDIX D – INTERVIEWS WITH COURSE INSTRUCTORS

Interview Questions for Social Studies Methods Course Instructor

1. How did you become interested in teaching social studies? What are the main purposes of social studies education? What’s the connection between social studies and citizenship education?

2. How do you define democratic citizenship education?

3. Why did you become interested in teacher education? How long have you been a teacher educator? What are your goals as a social studies teacher educator?

4. Discuss your experiences teaching this specific methods course (goals, outcomes, students, etc.).

5. Describe an effective social studies teacher.

6. What are your thoughts about inclusive (social studies) education? How do you define it?

7. Is there a connection between democratic citizenship and inclusive education?

8. How should a teacher education program in social studies prepare teachers for inclusion? How does Franklin’s program go about doing this? What’s the relationship between your department and the special education department?

9. During the course, how much time did you spend addressing inclusive education? (Specific topics, approaches, teaching techniques, etc.)

10. What do you hope your students learned about inclusive education from this methods class?
Interview Questions for Special Education Course Instructors

1. How did you become interested in special education?

2. How do you define disability?

3. What have been your experiences with persons who have disabilities (yourself, friends, family, etc.)? Where would you say your ideas about disability come from?

4. How do you define inclusive education? What makes a class inclusive? Is there a difference between special education and inclusive education?

5. Do you see a relationship between inclusive education and democratic citizenship?

6. How did you become interested in teacher education? (How long have you been a teacher educator?)

7. What are your goals as a special education teacher educator?

8. Describe an effective secondary school teacher in our current era of inclusive education. What skills and dispositions should such a teacher possess to include all students, regardless of their ability level?

9. Discuss your experiences teaching SPED ___.
   a. What are your goals for SPED ___?
   b. What topics do you address in SPED ___? Why?
   c. What types of coursework/projects do you assign? Why?
   d. How do you approach the fieldwork/observation component of this course? What do you hope students learn from these observations?
   e. How does your course prepare secondary school teachers for inclusive education?
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APPENDIX F – INFORMED CONSENT AND PARTICIPANT’S RIGHTS FORMS

TEACHERS COLLEGE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

INFORMED CONSENT (Preservice Teachers)

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH: You are invited to participate in a research study on what preservice social studies teachers learn about democratic citizenship education during a semester in a social studies teacher education program. This research study involves an introductory questionnaire, observations of social studies methods classes, participation in interviews and a focus group, and submission of written coursework. First, you will be asked to complete a brief questionnaire at the beginning of the semester. Second, I may ask you to participate in a series of interviews, once during the first month of the semester, once during the middle of the semester, and once during the last month of the semester. One of the interviews will be a focus group with all interview participants. The interviews will be tape-recorded for transcription purposes only and tapes will be destroyed within one year of the study. Finally, I may ask you to submit your written coursework for review. The research will be conducted by Dennis Urban, a doctoral student in the Program in Social Studies at Teachers College, Columbia University. William Gaudelli is serving as faculty sponsor for this study.

Your decision to participate or not to participate in the study will not affect your grade in the course. Your responses to questionnaires or interview questions will not be shared with the course instructor(s), nor will the principal investigator’s analysis of preservice teachers’ written coursework be shared with the instructor(s). Finally, participation is voluntary and you may remove yourself from the study at any point. If you will not be participating in the study and will not be completing the questionnaires, you will be provided with an alternate task during class time, after consultation with the course instructors, such as a reflective writing or reading task that will not serve as a data source for this research study.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: Minimal risks to participants include psychological discomfort caused by participants’ reflecting upon their learning about democratic citizenship in a social studies teacher education program. These risks are not substantially greater than those ordinarily encountered during a social studies methods class. The social risks are also minimal, as the data will not be reviewed by anyone other than the principal investigator, and pseudonyms will be used throughout the study.

There is an inherent risk in using focus groups, since individuals will know each other and will be sharing personal opinions or information. Therefore, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. The special precautions taken to ensure confidentiality, including the use of pseudonyms on focus group transcripts and in the final reports, protect the identity of subjects in the publication of the research data.

There are no direct benefits to participants in this study. A possible benefit may be that this study provides a space for students to intentionally reflect on their beliefs about democratic citizenship education and their learning in a social studies teacher education program, and how this might affect their practice as social studies teachers.

PAYMENTS: Students who complete the questionnaires will not be remunerated for their participation. Students who elect to participate in interviews and the focus group, and who submit their written coursework for analysis, will receive a $50 Visa Gift Card. There will be
no partial remuneration for students who participate in only some of the activities related to the study. Only students who complete the entire study and participate in all phases of the study will receive payment.

DATA STORAGE TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIALITY: Your name will be kept confidential and a pseudonym will be used in all written or oral communication associated with this study. The first page of the questionnaire, identifying students by name, will be removed from the responses, stored separately, and used only as a means of contacting students to participate in interviews and submit written coursework. All data will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the principal investigator's office and on password-protected files on the principal investigator's computer. Unless a participant objects, interviews will be taped and stored in the same locked file cabinet. The tapes will not be reproduced, and all tapes will be destroyed after one year.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: It is estimated that the total time for your participation in these activities (completion of questionnaire and interviews) will be approximately 3 hours over the course of a semester.

HOW WILL RESULTS BE USED: The results of the study will be used to complete my dissertation, in partial fulfillment of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Teachers College, Columbia University. The results of the study will also contribute to the field of research in social studies teacher education through publication(s) and/or conference presentation(s).
INFORMED CONSENT (Course Instructors)

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH: You are invited to participate in a research study on what preservice social studies teachers learn about democratic citizenship education and inclusive education during a semester in a social studies teacher education program. This research study involves class observations, completion of questionnaires, participation in interviews, and submission of written coursework. If you choose to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in one or two interviews during the course of the semester. The interviews will be tape-recorded for transcription purposes only and the tapes will be destroyed within one year of the completion of the study. I will also ask you to submit artifacts from the course for review, such as course syllabi, texts, and assignment prompts. The research will be conducted by Dennis Urban, a doctoral student in the Program in Social Studies at Teachers College, Columbia University. William Gaudelli is serving as faculty sponsor for this study.

Students will be informed that their decision to participate or not participate in the study will not affect their grade in the course. Students’ responses to questionnaires or interview questions will not be shared with the course instructor(s), nor will the principal investigator’s analysis of preservice teachers’ written coursework be shared with the instructor(s). Finally, students will be assured that their participation is voluntary and that they may remove themselves from the study at any point. If students will not be participating in the study and will not be completing the questionnaires, after consultation with the course instructors, these students will be provided with an alternate task, such as a reflective writing or reading task that will not serve as a data source for this research study.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: Minimal risks to participants include psychological discomfort caused by participants’ reflecting upon their thinking and teaching about democratic citizenship and inclusive education in a social studies teacher education program. These risks are not substantially greater than those ordinarily encountered during a class session. The social risks are also minimal, as the data will not be reviewed by anyone other than the principal investigator, and pseudonyms will be used throughout the study.

There are no direct benefits to participants in this study. A possible benefit may be that this study provides a space for instructors to intentionally reflect on their beliefs about democratic citizenship education and inclusion, and their teaching in a social studies teacher education program. The study may also provide benefits to researchers and teachers in the areas of social studies and inclusive education.

The instructor’s responses to interview questions will be viewed only by the principal investigator. The instructor will be assured that their participation is voluntary and that they may remove themselves from the study at any point.

PAYMENTS: While you will not be receiving remuneration for participating in this study, I will share my findings with you at the completion of the study.

DATA STORAGE TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIALITY: Your name will be kept confidential and a pseudonym will be used in all written or oral communication associated with this study. All data will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the principal investigator’s office and on
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password-protected files on the principal investigator's computer. Unless a participant objects, interview will be taped and stored in the same locked file cabinet. The tapes will not be reproduced, and all tapes will be destroyed after one year.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: It is estimated that the total time for your participation in these interview(s) will be 1 hour.

HOW WILL RESULTS BE USED: The results of the study will be used to complete my dissertation, in partial fulfillment of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Teachers College, Columbia University. The results of the study will also contribute to the field of research in social studies teacher education through publication(s) and/or conference presentation(s).
TEACHERS COLLEGE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

PARTICIPANT'S RIGHTS

Principal Investigator: Dennis Urban

Research Title: Learning for Inclusion in a preservice teacher education program in social studies

I have read and discussed the Research Description with the researcher. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the purposes and procedures regarding this study.

- My participation in research is voluntary. I may refuse to participate or withdraw from participation at any time without jeopardy to future medical care, employment, student status or other entitlements.
- The researcher may withdraw me from the research at his/her professional discretion.
- If, during the course of the study, significant new information that has been developed becomes available which may relate to my willingness to continue to participate, the investigator will provide this information to me.
- Any information derived from the research project that personally identifies me will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without my separate consent, except as specifically required by law.
- If at any time I have any questions regarding the research or my participation, I can contact the investigator, who will answer my questions. The investigator's phone number is (212) 678-6944.
- If at any time I have comments, or concerns regarding the conduct of the research or questions about my rights as a research subject, I should contact the Teachers College, Columbia University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The phone number for the IRB is (212) 678-4165. Or, I can write to the IRB at Teachers College, Columbia University, 525 W. 120th Street, New York, NY, 10027, Box 151.
- I should receive a copy of the Research Description and this Participant's Rights document.
- If video and/or audio taping is part of this research, I ( ) consent to be audio/video taped. I ( ) do NOT consent to being video/audio taped. The written, video and/or audio taped materials will be viewed only by the principal investigator and members of the research team.
- Written, video and/or audio taped materials ( ) may be viewed in an educational setting outside the research ( ) may NOT be viewed in an educational setting outside the research.
- My signature means that I agree to participate in this study.

Participant's signature: __________________________ Date: __/__/__

Name: __________________________