



This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

Making Connections: A Case Study of Fifth Grade Learning
From Two Different Organizations of Curriculum Integration

presented by

Nicola J. Findley

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Education

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Wade T. May".

Major professor

Date 8/8/00

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.
MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
JUL 05 2002		
NOV 21 2005		

**MAKING CONNECTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF FIFTH-GRADE LEARNING
FROM TWO DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONS OF CURRICULUM
INTEGRATION**

Volume I

By

Nicola J. Findley

A DISSERTATION

**Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Teacher Education

2000

ABSTRACT

MAKING CONNECTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF FIFTH-GRADE LEARNING FROM TWO DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONS OF CURRICULUM INTEGRATION

By

Nicola J. Findley

This study was framed around the central question of “What kinds of learning are encouraged by different approaches to integrated curricula?” with an examination of student learning across two units of study in one classroom. The study focused on three questions about connections students might make: (1) What connections are students making across history and literature study at the same time? (2) What connections are students making within each subject across time? (3) What connections are students making with their own lives and the world? The related analysis of student learning focused on two questions: (1) What are students learning about the history and literature subject matter of the unit? (2) What are students learning about the study of history and literature?

This study is a qualitative, observational, case study of two units of integrated curriculum enacted in one, self-contained, fifth-grade classroom. Data sources included audiotaped interviews, informal interviews, observational notes, student work, and classroom and curriculum documents. Analysis included content analysis of transcripts, documents, and field notes, and constant comparative analysis and triangulation across sources and units.

For each unit, I describe the form and organization of the integrated curriculum, the way it was enacted in the classroom, and its impact on the kinds of connections that students made. I then draw conclusions about the influence of these different curricular organizations on student learning.

The differences between the two integrated units influenced the kind of student learning that was encouraged. Students showed related differences in the kinds of connections they made and their learning of the history and literature curriculum. The similarities across the two units, particularly in pedagogy and use of texts, contributed to a particular student understanding of history and literature study that changed little. The kinds of connections students themselves made were also significant.

These findings point to important implications for teachers. These include implications about the relationships between integrated curriculum organizations and the quality of connections that students make, between constructivist learning theory and curriculum integration, and between disciplinary ways of knowing and the teaching and learning of subjects within integrated curriculum. These implications lead to recommendations for teacher education, particularly around teachers developing important curricular questions and foci, around teachers learning to help students process and integrate their own learning, and around teachers' own subject-matter preparation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to a great many people for their various contributions to this work and to my studies more generally. Many of them will remain unacknowledged on these pages, but known and deeply appreciated nonetheless.

First, I wish to thank especially my dissertation director, Wanda May. Wanda has been an advisor, mentor, colleague, and friend. She has always found time to read my work, offer insightful feedback, and meet with me whenever I have asked. I have valued and enjoyed our discussions about curriculum, teaching, and learning, and have benefited enormously from the intellectual rigor with which she approaches these discussions. She has challenged me to think deeply and critically about a number of issues and to focus on enduring and important “big ideas” within the field. She has pushed my thinking while being a source of encouragement and support throughout. She has helped me to find my interests and my voice, and to believe in the importance of my work. This goes well beyond the role of advisor and I am deeply indebted to Wanda. I look forward to continuing our discussions and friendship.

I wish also to thank Cheryl Rosaen for many years of mentoring and collegiality in a number of roles. As my committee chair, Cheryl has guided me through the stages of my doctoral career with a sure and supportive hand. She has shown an interest and belief in my work. She has made a space and time for

valuable conversations around any number of issues. She has been a wonderful colleague in the teacher preparation program. I feel very fortunate to have been mentored by Cheryl in so many ways and for so many years.

I am grateful to David Pearson first of all for his readiness to join my dissertation committee after a few short conversations. I have very much enjoyed our conversations about integration and about literacy, and his unfailing good humor. I have benefited from his broad experiences, wide reading, and from the suggestions and references he has supplied.

Kathy Roth has for many years been someone I could go to for a stimulating conversation about integration. Her discussion of her own experiences with integration in elementary schools helped me to think more clearly about my study. I am grateful for her continuing interest, even from a physical distance this past year.

I am indebted to "Terri" and the students in her class, and to the principal and teachers of the school in which my study took place. I was welcomed into the community, and enjoyed working alongside professionals who were concerned with improving their practice and the lives and learning of their students. I was fortunate to be in Terri's classroom, and am extremely grateful for her willingness to open her door, her thinking, and her planning to me.

I have been surrounded by supportive colleagues during my time at Michigan State University. I cannot thank each one personally, but value the friendships and the professional relationships I have had. I am particularly

grateful to the faculty and graduate students in the Literacy Colloquium and in the Colloquium for Learning and Action in Social Studies. These gatherings have provided a wonderful venue for stimulating thought and conversation on a wide range of issues.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, I would like to thank my family. This includes my “adopted” American family from Colorado to Chicago and my own family in England, all of whom provide both the comforting backdrop to my life and also its major highlights when we can be together. But most importantly, I need to thank my husband, Steve, and my children, Lisa, Heather, and Emily. They have allowed me to do what I love to do. Steve has provided so many levels of support – emotionally, financially, and technologically! Lisa, Emily, and Heather have grown up while I have been pursuing graduate study, and they have done so beautifully. They have all listened to me, encouraged me, and supported me. They have kept me sane, and been my constant reminder of the important things in life. I could not have done this without them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	xi
List of Figures	xii
Chapter One: Introduction to the Study	1
A. Background Interests in Issues Raised in the Study	1
B. Purposes and Questions	2
C. Rationale for Study	3
Lack of shared definitions and understandings	3
Assumptions about integration and student learning	3
Lack of empirical evidence of student learning from integrated curricula	10
D. Use of Terms	19
Integration	19
Curriculum	20
Connections	22
Coherence	23
E. Organization of Dissertation	25
Chapter Two: Review of the Related Literature	26
A. Rationales for Integrating the Curriculum	26
Overview of rationales	27
Review of rationales found in current literature	30
Epistemological argument: All knowledge forms a unified whole	32
Limitations of disciplines argument: Real-world problems are Interdisciplinary	35
Ethical/social arguments: Integration addresses social purposes	37
Psychological arguments: Integration leads to better learning	40
Summary of rationales for integration	46
B. Models of Integrated Curricula	47
Distinctions based on the nature of the relationship between the disciplines and the organizing center	48
Distinctions based on the degree of integration	52
Distinctions based on focus of integration	58
Further considerations in examining models of integration	60
C. Literature about the Integration of Social Studies and Language Arts	62
Argument: Literature and history studies are similar subjects	66
Human themes and dilemmas as a common focus	70
Narrative as a common form	73
Argument: Literature and history studies complement each other	78

Chapter Three: Research Design and Methods.....	86
A. Research Choices	86
Framing questions	86
Choosing a research orientation.....	89
Selecting a site	91
Selecting participants	93
Time choices.....	95
Negotiating teacher and researcher roles	97
B. Data Collection and Analysis	102
Access and consent.....	102
Data sources and analysis – overview	103
Field notes	104
Audiotaping.....	105
Interviews.....	106
Artifacts	108
Card-sort activity	110
Data analysis and triangulation	114
 Chapter Four: Unit One: The Revolutionary War	 117
A. Description of Classroom and Program Context.....	117
Overview of classroom use of time.....	117
Parent handbook description of classroom	119
Terri’s beliefs: In her own words.....	121
Integration rationale	121
Subjects/disciplines.....	123
Description of the literacy program.....	129
Description of the social studies program.....	139
Social studies and Book Clubs: A summary of students’ perceptions.....	143
B. Integrated Unit One: The Revolutionary War.....	145
Terri’s planning for the Revolutionary War unit.....	145
Description of literacy	149
Read Aloud.....	149
Book Clubs.....	152
Description of social studies	159
C. Student Connections: The Revolutionary War Unit.....	168
What connections did students make across history and literature study?	169
What connections did students make within history study and within literature study across time?	177
What connections did students make with their own experiences and life outside the classroom?.....	181
Summary	186

Chapter Five: Unit Two: The Civil War and Freedom	188
A. Planning for the Unit on Civil War and Freedom	188
B. Enacted Curriculum: The Civil War and Freedom Unit	201
Introduction of unit	202
Description of literacy	206
Read Aloud.....	207
Book Clubs.....	211
Description of social studies	214
C. Student Connections: The Civil War and Freedom Unit	220
What connections did students make across history and literature study?.....	221
What connections did students make within history study and within literature study across time?	230
Literature study	230
History study	232
What connections did students make with their own experiences and life outside the classroom?	240
Summary	248
Chapter Six: Student Learning	249
A. Student Learning of and about History	249
Student learning of the history curriculum	249
What did students learn about the Revolutionary War era?	251
What did students learn about the Civil War era?.....	264
Student learning about history study	274
B. Student Learning of and about Literature Study	282
Student learning of the literature curriculum	283
Revolutionary War unit.....	288
Civil War and Freedom unit.....	306
What did students learn about literature study?	319
Summary	328
Chapter Seven: Conclusions and Recommendations.....	330
A. Summary of the Two Integrated Units	330
B. Summary of Student Learning	335
Integration and student learning of curriculum	335
Student learning about literature and history study	339
C. Conclusions and Implications	343
Forms of curricular integration	344
Relationship between integration and student learning	348

Inherent value of integrated curriculum?	348
Integration and constructivism.....	353
Integration and the disciplines	358
D. Recommendations	370
Terri's learning dispositions and the implications	371
Curricular organization and "big ideas"	372
Helping students make connections	374
Disciplinary knowledge	376
Appendices	383
A Interview Protocol: Initial Teacher Interview	384
B Interview Protocol: Initial Student Interviews.....	386
C Major Questions, Data Sources, and Analytical Strategies	387
D Final Student Interview with Card Sort.....	387
E Teacher's Plans	389
F Excerpts from Teacher's Classroom Handbook for Parents	393
G Reading Folder Assignments.....	395
H Teacher's Social Studies Plans for the Revolutionary War Unit.....	397
I Guiding Questions from the National Center for History in the Schools (1996)	400
J District Social Studies Curriculum.....	401
K Classroom Resources for the Revolutionary War Unit	406
L Record of Teacher Questions and Comments During Read Aloud Novel <u>Johnny Tremain</u>	407
M Final Book Club Project Sheet: Revolutionary War Unit.....	409
N Teacher's Social Studies Unit Plan for the Civil War Unit.....	410
Record of Teacher Questions and Comments During Read O Aloud Novel <u>Behind Rebel Lines</u>	413
P Dimensions of Student Learning in History	417
Q Dimensions of Student Learning for Revolutionary War Unit.....	418
R Dimensions of Student Learning for Civil War Unit.....	419
S IRA/NCTE Standards (1996).....	420
T Michigan Language Arts Standards (1996)	422
U Dimensions for Student Learning in Literature Study	424
V Book Club Research Sheets: Civil War and Freedom Unit	426
References	428

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Different integrated curriculum models based on the nature of the relationship between the disciplines and the organizing center.....	53
Table 2.2	Different integrated curriculum models based on the degree of integration.....	58
Table 2.3	Different forms of curriculum integration based on the focus or form of the integration.	60
Table 3.1	Relationships between concerns arising from integration literature, and the choice of research questions, research framework, and site.	87
Table 4.1	Teacher plans for integrating literature across the curriculum.	149
Table 7.1	Terri's planning for an integrated unit on the Revolutionary War.....	331
Table 7.2	Terri's planning for an integrated unit on the Civil War and Freedom.....	332
Table 7.3	Terri's curricular integration planning across the two units.	333

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1 Data collection timeline.....	96
Figure 3.2 Summary of data sources at different points in the study.....	104
Figure 5.1 Summary of Roland Case's (1991) examination of integration. ..	190
Figure 5.2 Homework assignments and class discussion emphasis for social studies in the Civil War unit.....	219
Figure 5.3 Civil War post-assessment for social studies.	220
Figure 5.4 Connections made by the Women's Rights group - Emma, Champ, Jeff, and Dee.	238
Figure 5.5 Connections made by the Immigrant Citizens' Rights group - Tom and James.....	238
Figure 5.6 Connections made by the Civil Rights group - Lynn, Max, D.J., and Michael.....	239
Figure 5.7 Connections made by the World War II and Holocaust group -Vanessa and Jim.....	239
Figure 5.8 Connections made by the Civil War group - Duke, Rex, and Cody.	239

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

A. Background Interests in Issues Raised in the Study

The study described here emerges from a combination of personal experiences and academic interests. My own schooling had a traditional academic focus and subject-centered curricular organization. My initial teacher preparation program emphasized thematic studies and alternative approaches to teaching and learning. My teaching experiences for ten years were with multiage groups of students from kindergarten through eighth grade and included a variety of approaches to curricular organization. Questions about the organization of subject matter have been woven through my personal experiences, and I have struggled to understand better some of the issues involved in teaching in integrated ways.

My teacher preparation program also introduced me to issues of the organization of knowledge and philosophical and pedagogical literature about curricular integration. I have continued to read widely around this issue and have framed research around related issues, such as teacher understanding of integration.

Both personal and research experiences have led me to focus the present study on student learning. Any rationale for "integration" must ultimately move beyond consideration of curriculum and teaching to include attention to student learning.

"I

gr

hi

ex

lea

qu

co

co

cla

qu

tau

sul

lea

ma

con

con

B. Purpose and Questions

This study addresses questions about student learning in a classroom with “integrated” curriculum.¹ The context for the study was a self-contained fifth-grade classroom, with data taken from the teaching and learning of two units of history (social studies) and literature study that the teacher intended to be examples of integrated curricula.

The research was framed around the central question of “What kinds of learning are encouraged by different approaches to integrated curricula?” This question recognizes a variety of models of integrated curricula and the need to consider student learning in light of particular approaches.

To address this central question, I looked at student learning and the connections that students made across two integrated units of study in the same classroom. My analysis of student learning in each unit focused on two questions: (1) What are students learning about the subject matter of the unit taught?; and (2) What are students learning about history and literacy as school subjects and/or disciplines? My study also focused on three questions about learning connections that students made: (1) What connections are students making across subjects at the same time (horizontal connections)?; (2) What connections are students making within subjects across time (vertical connections)?; and (3) What connections are students making with their own

l

a

i

to

in

lit

la

ap

nu

che

con

app

Lac

Imp

Wan

uset

it ch

are con

chity

lives and the real world? These questions reflect various claims advanced by advocates of integrated and interdisciplinary curriculum and are therefore important questions to study in a classroom setting. The purpose of this study is to contribute to our current understanding of the complex ways in which an integrated curriculum may influence student learning.

C. Rationale for Study

This research emerges from three major concerns raised by a review of the literature about integrated and interdisciplinary curriculum. One concern is the lack of shared definitions and understandings about various issues and approaches addressed in the literature on integration. A related concern is the number of assumptions made in much of the literature about the value and characteristics of integration, and the student learning that occurs. A third concern is the lack of empirical evidence of student learning from integrated approaches to curriculum and teaching.

Lack of Shared Definitions and Understandings

A recent review of the integration literature for the Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement (Gavelek, Raphael, Biondo, & Wang, 1999), notes that “the absence of shared definitions severely limits the usefulness of integrated instruction as a generative construct” (p. 4). It points to a

¹ In this section I shall use the terms “integrated”, “interdisciplinary” and “integration” as they are commonly used. I shall discuss definitions and uses of these terms in a later section, and clarify my own use of them for the remainder of the study.

t

c

i

in

a

(E

d

in

"h

(E

wo

dis

int

int

deg

prac

curr

ir pa

number of difficulties with the language of integration that are supported by other reviewers (Petrie, 1992) and by my own review of the literature.

For some writers the terms “interdisciplinary” and “integrated” are used to make a crucial distinction between curricula that preserve or abolish disciplinary boundaries (Beane, 1995, 1997), while for other writers the terms are interchangeable (Caine & Caine, 1991). Some writers use terms such as interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and transdisciplinary to distinguish further among either different forms or different degrees of curricular integration (Burns, 1995; Drake, 1993; Jacobs, 1989; Petrie, 1992), and these writers do not define these terms in identical ways. Other writers describe different forms of integrated curricula with terms such as “fusion,” “insertion,” “correlation,” “harmonization” (Case, 1997; Vars, 1991), or “connected,” “threaded,” etc. (Fogarty, 1991). There is no consensus on the terminology used, and the same words may be used in a variety of ways. The same words may be used to distinguish among different curricular models, to describe the degree of integration, or to distinguish different dimensions of integration, such as integration of content or skills in the curriculum.

This lack of a shared terminology to describe the various forms and degrees of integration reflects other theoretical difficulties with the concept and practice of integration. There is little attention to the origins of integrated curriculum (Petrie, 1992) and little shared understanding of how that history impacts proposals and discussions around integration taking place today. Many

v

e

o

g

lr

ig

on

lit

writers point out that much of the literature advocating integrated curriculum, especially that written primarily for teacher audiences, ignores the long history of integration and many of its original emphases, particularly emphasis on social goals (Beane, 1997; Martin-Kniep, Feige, & Soodak, 1995; Schubert, 1995). Integration also tends to be contrasted with disciplines and school subjects while ignoring the historical development of those subject-centered curricular organizations (Barth, 1972/1975; Miller, 1990; Pring, 1972/1975).

The CIERA Report (Gavelek et. al., 1999) concludes a review of integration literature with the following statement:

We were surprised that among the many articles about integrated approaches, with few exceptions, there was little attempt to address integration theoretically. There were references to important theoretical lenses, but a theory conceptualizing the whats, whys and hows of integration was seldom in evidence. Typically, proponents emphasized authenticity, motivational value, and efficiency which, while important, provide little rationale for thoughtful integration. What makes integration educative? And why?

Integration is multifaceted, referring to many distinct but related constructs. With no theoretical lens to guide research, policy, and practice, it is impossible to determine the relationship among these different facets of integration. Research questions to date may be too narrow, focused on whether or not integration is effective for organizing curricula. Instead of

T.

w

A

"in

19

pa

wa

in

pre

bot

asking *whether* to integrate, we need a principled, contextual conception of integration to guide us in addressing *what to integrate with what, why, when, how, and for whom*. (p. 17; original emphasis)

This study begins to address these more complex questions about integration within one classroom context.

Assumptions about Integration and Student Learning

As Pring (1972/1975) pointed out many years ago, integration is both an “in” word and a “pro” word. It is a word with high rhetorical appeal (Ackerman, 1989) and is frequently no more than a “buzzword” or slogan for promoting particular educational practices (Case, 1997). Pring wrote at a time when Britain was incorporating features of integration into education, both in classrooms and in the recommendations of government reports and the Schools Council. At the present time in the United States, there is again a great interest in integration both from teachers and many administrators. Pring’s cautions are still relevant:

Who would object to knowledge or personality or life being “integrated”?

Unity, integration, wholeness seem to have a fascination and value of their own. But what do they mean? “Integration” as such is an empty word.

There must be integration of something and one cannot really understand or appreciate what is meant by curriculum integration until one has clarified what it is that is being integrated. Yet to clarify this is by no means easy. It raises important questions in epistemology and ethics.

Failure to see these questions, let alone to attempt an answer to them,

r

a

t

u

th

"C

be

"n

th

tea

int

rep

unc

lear

itse

logi

learn

can

renders a lot of writing on curriculum integration superficial in its argument and confusing in its practical recommendations. (p. 273)

He goes on to say that "the word integration is bandied about as though its meaning were clear, and recommendations for curriculum integration are made as though its value were self-evident" (p. 275). I argue that little has changed -- that a great deal of the literature about integration is uncritical about the underlying theories of knowledge and rather unhelpful in its assumptions about the value and characteristics of integration.

Integration is contrasted with such terms as "fragmentation," "compartmentalization of knowledge," "irrelevance to life," "arbitrary subject boundaries," and so on. By contrast, integration is assumed to be "whole," "relevant," "authentic," and "meaningful." These linguistic binary pairs imply that integration, per se, is a valuable goal for curriculum development and teaching. As Pring (1972/1975) argues, an uncritical assumption of the value of integration does not address the argument that the disciplines are, in fact, valid representations of different ways of thinking, knowing, and inquiring. Such an uncritical stance also does not recognize the possibility that teaching and learning within disciplinary or subject-based organizations of knowledge can itself be relevant, authentic, meaningful, or coherent for learners. There is no logical connection between integrated curriculum and the kind of student learning that is claimed for it, and there is no logical reason why such learning cannot occur in other contexts. The literature advocating integration frequently

assumes an inherent value that is not logically valid. It also assumes certain characteristics of integration that may or may not be present in particular curricular enactments and which again are not logically inherent to integration.

As Pring (1972/1975) reminds us to search for the underlying theories of knowledge on which arguments for integration may be based, Barth (1972/1975) writes about the assumptions about children and learning, as well as knowledge, that lie behind arguments for “open education,” including integrated approaches. He notes assumptions about motivation, about conditions preferable for learning, about social learning, and about intellectual development. He points to inconsistencies and possible alternative arguments.

Barth (1972/1975) argues that central to open education is the question of agency, and the roles of teacher and child in selecting and ordering experiences and materials. He suggests that this has not been clearly worked out or expressed. An important consideration is raised here: that of the relationship between the teacher’s (or the written curriculum’s) ordering and selection of experiences, and the learning experienced by the child. He shows that teachers in open education (or integrated) classrooms, while assuming that children learn with a minimum of adult intervention, organize the environment to encourage particular learning.

My research also points to questions about the relationship between teacher (and curriculum) organization of content and experience, and the learning of individual students. Barth (1972/1975) argues that open education

te

di

th

in

ass

sep

or

an

exa

ad

Dr

bas

as p

con

con

This

in ge

stu d

tends to ignore the teacher's role. The literature on integration tends to assume a direct connection between an integrated curriculum and the student learning that occurs. There is an assumption that the adult organization of knowledge, if integrated, correlates directly with student learning. This is an interesting assumption, given that one of the arguments in favor of integration is that separate-subjects or discipline-based curricular organizations represent the adult, or "worked out" form of knowledge and are inappropriate for young learners.

This assumption that student learning will be more connected, coherent, and "integrated" in meaningful ways if the curriculum is integrated needs to be examined more closely through research in classroom contexts. Much of the advocacy literature explicitly or implicitly makes this assertion (Burns, 1995; Drake, 1993; Peters, Schubeck & Hopkins, 1995). Many writers have cited "brain-based teaching" research, particularly that by Caine & Caine (1991), to claim that as people learn through making connections, we should teach through making connections with integrated curricula. Whilst often implying that same connection, Caine and Caine themselves also caution:

Although we choose much of what students are to learn, the ideal process is to present the information in a way that allows brains to extract patterns, rather than attempt to impose them. (p. 89-90)

This is a subtle distinction, and it goes unnoticed by many proponents of integration who argue for integrating the curriculum in order to integrate student learning. However, it points to the larger question of who does the

integrating? This, it seems to me, is one of the crucial questions to ask about integration and it is one that this study addresses.

The literature on integration makes assumptions about learning and about the teacher's role in that learning, about the inherent value of integration and the characteristics of integration, and about the connection between integrated curriculum and student learning. These assumptions are rarely recognized or questioned. This study begins to address the complex connections among teaching, curriculum, and learning.

Lack of Empirical Evidence of Student Learning from Integrated Curricula

As I have shown, many writers and teachers assume an inherent value in the term "integration" which then may be transferred to a variety of practices with little critical examination. Related to this is the problem of a lack of empirical evidence about student learning from integration. If it is assumed that integration is valuable in itself and worthwhile for student learning, then evidence of that learning may not appear to be necessary. However, a closer reading of the literature does suggest that such evidence is in fact sorely needed for two reasons: first, because integration is not logically related to student learning or to coherent experiences, and the relationship must be shown to exist; second, because the variety of practices described as "integration" does not offer a consistent picture of resulting student learning.

As some writers point out, "integration" in itself is an ambiguous and poorly-defined term associated with different practices. For some, integration

itself appears to be the goal. However integration per se does not necessarily lead to coherence of experience or learning for students. Ladson-Billings (1995) argues that coherence should be the goal, and she notes that a matrix describing classroom practices may include integrated/nonintegrated and coherent/incoherent dimensions. That is, a curriculum may be coherent without being integrated, or may be incoherent whilst being integrated. It is therefore important to determine what kinds of integration lead to coherent experiences for learners.²

Many writers make a similar argument about the variety of practices that exist under the umbrella term “integration.” Coombs (1991) distinguishes between collections and integrated unities, arguing that curricular organizations that restructure curriculum are very different from those that create new conceptual unities. Coombs goes on to examine “themes” as a popular conception of curriculum integration. He argues:

Whether or not a theme can serve to integrate curricular content depends on the nature of the theme. Some themes may provide a principle of unity, but others, such as change and growth may provide only a principle of selection or organization. The difficulty with the notion of a theme is simply that it is too vague to allow us to make the kinds of discriminations we need to make between an integrated unity and a mere collection of

² I shall return to the concept of “coherence” in discussing my own emphases and definitions in a later section in this chapter.

C

n

P

to t

199

but

cur

mea

integ

invol

1996,

there

things that are selected and organized on the basis that they are all instances of the same very abstract concept. (p. 7-8)

Case (1991b) similarly argues that thematic integration does not guarantee meaningful learning. He offers hypothetical examples of themes that fail to provide any educational coherence to the curriculum and emphasizes:

Teaching around themes does not guarantee that the connections among the topics falling within a particular theme will be educationally significant. Integration of content is educationally significant only if the theme provides genuine coherence to the study – some themes may organize various subjects around a trivial or contrived common theme. (p. 7)

Many writers emphasize thematic integration as a form particularly prone to trivial connections and lack of meaningful content for students to learn (Court, 1991; Kellough, 1996; Shanahan, Robinson, & Schneider, 1995; Walmsley, 1994), but the point is well made that we cannot assume student learning takes place in curriculum integration, and in fact, some forms of integration work against meaningful student learning.

There is very little empirical data on student learning from curriculum integration. Teachers report positive attitudes, greater motivation and involvement by students (Ackerman, 1989; Burns, 1995; Jacobs, 1989; Kellough, 1996; Laney, Moseley, & Pak, 1996; Lounsbury, 1992; Tchudi & Lafer, 1996), but there are few studies of student reports, and few studies of student learning.

M

str

"fr

ch

con

stu

com

(199

atten

these

Ther

stude

learn

qualit

perspe

1994, A

critical

the liter

E

Group a

Mansfield (1997) describes the positive results of an integrated unit from the students' perspective, with students describing the unit as "interesting" and "fun." She raises questions about the easiness of the work or the particular topic choice contributing to student enjoyment. She concludes that student commitment resulted from increased learner autonomy, lack of fragmentation in studying the topic, and the variety of learning processes involved.

The measurement of "success" of integrated units in terms of student commitment and attention to assignments is not unusual. Embriano and Ryan (1995) also assess a high school Outreach Program in terms of increased student attention, promotion, and earned credits – implying a direct correlation between these and student learning, or implying that these results are the primary goals. There is little disagreement that integration is seen by many teachers and their students as providing more interesting, motivating, engaging, and active learning. However, there is little empirical evidence of that learning or of the quality of what is learned.

There is some discussion of student learning from integration from the perspective of particular subject areas (Alleman & Brophy, 1993; Alvermann, 1994; McGowan, Erickson, & Newfeld, 1997; Roth, 1994). These tend to be more critical of what students are learning in particular subject areas. I shall discuss the literature around social studies and literacy learning in the next chapter.

Barab and Landa (1997) report on work by the Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt that compared student learning in a traditional setting with

s

a

th

a

si

Br

Th

"ar

cur

inte

pou

exp

con

Eng

but

may

student learning of the same content in an integrated unit based on a “curricular anchor.” This is a “problem that the student acknowledges as worth solving and that validates the learning of a set of relevant skills and concepts” (p. 53) through a variety of learning approaches. For example, they describe a computerized simulation that asked students to participate in a research problem set in the Brazilian rain forest. They report:

Significantly, students learning the content to address the anchor problem scored higher on achievement questions and evidenced more transfer of knowledge than did students who studied the information without the anchor. More important, students learning in the context of an engaging anchor made connections among various disciplinary concepts (p. 54).

The authors also emphasize specific criteria for choosing interdisciplinary “anchors” that can lead to this sort of student learning.

This points to another complicating factor: the difficulty of integrating the curriculum well. There are fewer examples of teachers unsuccessfully attempting integration than there are stories of “successful” integration, but these reports point to important considerations. Kain (1996) describes a middle-school experience that failed to take into account past experiences and institutional constraints, arguing against mandating integration. Knight (1993) argues that most problems of integration are problems of implementation, not conception, but that these are serious problems nonetheless. Even proponents of integration may recognize that developing and teaching worthwhile integrated curricular

o

o

t

P

n

1

m

is

st

w

to

de

pos

experiences is not easy. Ackerman (1989) takes integration seriously, arguing that integration must meet rigorous intellectual criteria (validity within the disciplines, validity for the disciplines, validity beyond the disciplines, and contribution to broader outcomes), but it must also address practical criteria in terms of time and budget; administrative, parental, and peer support; and personal concerns. Some writers describe a continuum of evolving curriculum integration implicitly recognizing the difficulty of the work involved (Burns, 1995; Drake, 1993; Jacobs, 1989; Kovalik, 1986). It appears unadvisable to mandate integration and difficult to develop integrated approaches; therefore it is very important to have evidence that the effort is worthwhile in terms of student learning, and that it is possible for large numbers of teachers to do this well.

Those who do advocate integration often provide only anecdotal evidence to support their position. Many writers describe the reports of teachers who have developed integrated approaches, and these reports are overwhelmingly positive. Ackerman (1989) describes a Humanities program and concludes:

Although a formal study has not been conducted, Humanities teachers are unanimous in the view that the multidisciplinary approach augments the learning of their individual subjects. They also feel that the intensive yearlong effort to approach the story of civilization through "multiple lenses" helps students develop a sensibility to history that transcends specific subject matter knowledge and a correspondingly sophisticated

attitude toward knowledge in general. *Abundant anecdotal evidence*

exists to support these beliefs. (p. 34, my emphasis)

The language used to describe the effects of integration needs to be examined carefully. The use of teacher reports as the only evidence of the value of integration is common, but insufficient.

A further problem is that of confounding variables in reports of the benefits of integration. Burns (1995) describes a continuum of integration models and claims that "curriculum integration has positive effects on learning and teaching" (p. 4), but bases this claim on a few reports from teachers, all in teamed instructional groups in secondary schools. The teacher reports cite perceived or anticipated improvements in student attitude and motivation (although not specifically in student learning) without providing data or student reports. They also report benefits for teachers in terms of support, enthusiasm, and shared expertise. This serves to emphasize the difficulty of attributing results to integration itself when it is part of a team-teaching situation. Burns cites only teacher reports and only from secondary school teachers in team situations, so that her conclusion is far too broad for the evidence she presents:

In summary, many instructional teams that have designed and implemented integrated curriculum report positive outcomes for themselves and their students. It seems that theory is supported by practice. (p. 5)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

This example represents an approach to providing evidence of the benefits of integration that is far too common, but inadequate. For a further example, a text entitled Connecting the curriculum through interdisciplinary instruction (Lounsbury, 1992) is based on middle-school examples that include team teaching, and it never makes the distinction between interdisciplinary curriculum and teaming. Therefore any benefits described may be attributed to teaming rather than to integration. Evidence is needed that separates out the possible effects of teaming arrangements from integration itself, and I selected a self-contained classroom context with one teacher for my study for this reason.

Many of the articles in the above book also describe new instructional approaches introduced to the context in conjunction with integrated curriculum, such as real-world problem solving or simulation techniques. Again, these are not a necessary part of integration, nor are they particular to integration, and so any benefits described may be attributed to the approach rather than to the integration. Evidence is needed that separates out the possible effects of instructional practices from integration itself. It can be argued that teachers who integrate are more likely to be teachers who employ less traditional instructional strategies, classroom roles, participation structures, and so on (Tschudi & Lafer, 1996), and that it is these that influence student learning in particular ways, rather than the integration itself.

Laney, Mosely, and Pak (1996), in a description of an integrated art and economics unit, cite positive teacher and student reports, and also find student

achievement gains from pre-test to post-test in their understanding of both art and economic concepts. However, they are not able to show that these gains would not have been made in a non-integrated context. The authors are aware of the limitations of the study, and suggest the need for research to:

- (a) compare the effects of traditional, single-discipline units in art and other academic subjects versus the effects of an integrated unit, and (b) isolate the factors within integrated units that lead to various cognitive, social, and affective learning outcomes. (p. 77)

My research contributes to the latter emphasis on factors within integrated units that may lead to different kinds of learning. My study was based in one classroom with one teacher so that any differences in student learning are more easily attributed to the curricular organization rather than to the particular instructional strategies of the teacher.

Those who have done reviews of the integration literature find little empirical evidence to support the claims made by its proponents. Martin-Kniep, Feige, & Soodak (1995) present their argument for a more critical evaluation of the merits of various forms of curriculum integration in the context of the "dearth of recent literature on the merits and drawbacks of integration" (p. 227). Willis (1992), in a review of conversations with writers about integration, reports that

While Ebersole is confident that interdisciplinary instruction can be used to deliver essential learnings, he concedes that proof is lacking. "We need

research and evidence that interdisciplinary teaching does not neglect mastery of essential concepts of the disciplines,” he says. (p.7)

The authors of the CIERA Report (Gavelek et. al., 1999) review of integrated literature likewise conclude that there is relatively little reported research on integration and few data-driven studies to support the much larger literature advocating integration.

The vast majority of “studies” of any type of interdisciplinary approach consisted of anecdotal cases written for practitioners promoting an integrated curriculum... . Further, the majority of these texts were simply “how-to” proposals. (p. 10)

My own review of the literature leads to the same conclusion.

The literature on integration generally fails to distinguish between the effects of integration itself and effects of related conditions. It tends to ignore the difficulties and failures of integration. It is heavily anecdotal rather than empirical. It measures “success” in terms of student participation, enjoyment, or attendance rather than student learning. My study contributes to our empirical knowledge base on integration, providing a close examination of student learning within one classroom and teaching context.

D. Use of terms

Integration

The literature surrounding integration is complicated by a large terminology with few shared definitions and understandings. I have referred to

this terminology in a previous section, noting distinctions made between integrated and interdisciplinary curriculum, and among different forms and degrees of integration.

Whilst I find the distinction between integrated and interdisciplinary curriculum to be an important and helpful one, it is complicated by a lack of consensus about the definition and use of these terms. Furthermore, there is no verb that distinguishes between integrated and interdisciplinary curriculum, as both require “integrating” and there is little use of the noun “interdisciplinarity” to correspond to the noun “integration.” In other words, I find “interdisciplinary” to be a helpful adjective to describe curriculum or teaching that draws on more than one discipline. However, common usage of the word “integrated” and its counterpart verb “to integrate” and noun “integration” make it difficult to keep the distinction clear. In addition, my research took place in a particular classroom context with a teacher who described her own curriculum as being “integrated” across language arts and social studies. I find it helpful to use her own terminology as I describe her thinking and her classroom practice. I will return to the distinctions between integrated and interdisciplinary curriculum in a later chapter as I discuss my findings and their implications.

Curriculum

Curriculum is another word with many definitions and few shared understandings. It encompasses meanings as narrow as a written course outline and as broad as all the experiences children have (Jackson, 1992). Definitions may

include an emphasis on planned content for student learning, on the planned and directed experiences of learners, the actual experiences of learners in school or in and out of school, or the variety of planned and unplanned, hidden and missing experiences of children (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995).

There is little discussion of the meaning attached to the word "curriculum" within the various descriptions of integrated curriculum in the literature. When writers speak of "curriculum integration" they are usually defining curriculum in the more narrow sense of subject matter and written and planned curriculum. This is especially true of the many books for practitioners that emphasize 'how to' design and organize curriculum in integrated ways. Such language and the use of planning webs and charts, for example, suggests an emphasis on subject matter content, written curriculum, and teacher planning. Examples of this abound (Burns, 1995; Drake, 1993; Fogarty, 1991; Hughes, 1994; Jacobs, 1989; Kovalik, 1986; Lounsbury, 1992; Panaritis, 1995). James Beane (1997), who writes passionately about the need to meet the needs and interests of students, defines curriculum integration as:

A curriculum design that is concerned with enhancing the possibilities for personal and social integration through the *organization* of curriculum around significant problems and issues, collaboratively identified by educators and young people, without regard for subject-area boundaries.
(p. x-xi, my emphasis)

This definition of curriculum integration, whilst emphasizing student participation and social goals, nonetheless defines curriculum in relatively narrow terms of planned experiences, and also makes an interesting distinction between curriculum integration and the personal and social integration that is the goal. When writers speak of "integration" (rather than "curriculum integration,") they appear to be describing a combination of curriculum, teaching, and learning. "Integration" usually incorporates the total experience of the classroom, while "curriculum" refers to the subject organization of that experience.

As with my use of the word "integration", I shall use "curriculum" as it is commonly used - in its narrower sense of planned experiences - as I describe the classroom context and the teacher's plans. I will distinguish wherever possible between the teacher's stated and written curriculum plans for subject matter organization (curriculum), her enactment of these plans in daily teaching activities in the classroom (teaching), and the experience and learning of those plans by students.

Connections

I shall also refer to the "connections" that teacher and students make. The use of this term implies the joining of different pieces of the curriculum and the relating of different experiences. In many ways, this is the language of interdisciplinarity rather than integration. Integration, based on the root word "integrity" and wholeness, assumes an inherent unity; whereas

interdisciplinarity assumes the bringing together of different disciplines – making connections and joining together different pieces. It is, however, “connections” that the teacher expects children to make in this study, and the literature also talks about different kinds of connections within different forms of integrated curriculum. I shall therefore use this language to discuss the relationships that teacher and students identify.

This study focuses particularly on the kinds of connections that students and teacher make within history and literature study, across those subjects, and between school and everyday knowledge. It emphasizes the associations made by teacher or students across these different aspects of student learning, the ways in which they relate different facts and concepts. It notes the kinds of connections made and the frequency of such connections. It allows for interesting associations and connections to be noted. This is an important initial step in examining interdisciplinary teaching and learning, and provides a foundation for further exploration of the quality of these connections. Important questions may then be raised about the depth of these connections and about both student understanding and student misconceptions, both of which may be impacted by the kinds of “connections” they are encouraged to make.

Coherence

I have referred already to a distinction between integration and coherence (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Many writers argue that integrated curriculum is a way of providing coherence for learners. For many, coherence is provided by

curriculum connections. Ahlgren and Kesidou (1995) identify different kinds of coherence (vertical, cross-connection, context-based, and coherence of purpose) and show how Project 2061 provides coherence by connecting the curriculum in different ways. For others, coherence comes from a larger unity of purpose. Boyer (1995) suggests that a curriculum framework in which everything is related to life provides coherence, and Brady (1989) argues that culture as the central theme of the curriculum will provide coherence. Wiggins (1995) argues that coherence is a result of designing backwards from meaningful assessments or outcomes that provide an authentic focus for classroom experiences. Beane (1995) emphasizes coherence of student experiences in the present, coherence being both a methodological issue of curriculum planning and also a philosophical issue of whose curriculum it is.

The teacher in this study did not talk about student experiences or learning in terms of "coherence," nor did she speak of a coherent curriculum. However, I find the term useful as I think about student learning and how students experience the curriculum, and will return to it as I discuss my findings.

Generally, I shall use terms in the ways in which the teacher in my study used them, ways which correspond to common usage of the words "integration," "curriculum," and "connections." In later chapters, when I discuss my findings and their implications I shall return to the definitions and use of these terms and examine them again in light of my findings.

E. Organization of Dissertation

This first chapter has given an orientation to the major purposes and questions of my study. It has identified three major concerns about the literature on integration and how this study will contribute to that literature by a close study of student learning in a classroom context. I have described the terminology that will be used in the descriptive parts of the study, consistent with the teacher's usage of particular terms.

In the next chapter, I shall review the relevant literature on integration in terms of historical and current rationales, philosophical and epistemological perspectives on the nature and organization of knowledge, psychological perspectives on learning and integration, and different models of integrated curricula. I shall also review the literature more specific to literacy and social studies, the subject areas relevant to this particular study.

In Chapter 3, I shall discuss the context of my study and my design choices and methodology. In Chapters 4 and 5, I shall describe each of the two observed integrated units and my findings about the kinds of connections students made across literature and history study, within each of those subjects, and with their own lives. In Chapter 6, I shall describe student learning of and about history and literature from each of these units. In my final chapter, I shall summarize and discuss these findings and the implications I see for teachers and teacher educators.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

A. Rationales for Integrating the Curriculum

Much of the current literature advocating the integrating of the curriculum assumes that the benefits and reasons for doing so are self-evident, and provides a vignette or two as the sole rationale for integration (Fogarty, 1991; Meinbach, Rothlein, & Fredericks, 1995). Other proponents cite a variety of rationales for integration, many providing several reasons in quick succession without apparent emphasis on a particular argument (Drake, 1993; Jacobs, 1989; Seely, 1995). This casual attention to the rationale behind an approach to curriculum integration similarly implies that it is not something that needs much explanation. It also glosses over the deep differences in theoretical orientation that underlie different approaches to curriculum integration. Although many practitioners will claim more than one benefit from integration, their practice is often dominated by one major rationale that drives their focus and their classroom practices.

Those who have attended to the rationales behind integration distinguish several major positions underlying the current literature and also trace these same rationales historically. It is interesting to note that these rationales are identified in broadly similar ways and support my own research of the literature. I shall briefly outline these various rationales and then address each one separately in terms of the argument made for integration, its historical

antecedents and current adherents, and critiques of the argument. This will provide an important contextual background for examining the beliefs and practices of the teacher in my study.

Overview of Rationales

Integration may appear to many to be a “natural” way to organize curriculum. However, I find it helpful to turn to Pring (1972/1975) for his discussion of how the various rationales for integration all need to respond in some way to the disciplinary thesis that they oppose.¹ He argues that understanding, which is a major purpose of schooling, requires the development of conceptual schemes and their symbolic expression, and that the disciplinary thesis claims that the different curriculum subjects are there because:

Among other things they initiate the pupil into the different modes of understanding that are characterized by distinct organizing concepts, principles of verification, and logical *connexions*. Far from being merely conventional or arbitrary, they represent in their distinct disciplines of thought what it is to think, to know and to *enquire*. (p. 274, original spellings)

He does not defend this thesis, but insists that integrationists must address it, either by claiming that it is a false theory of knowledge or that it is incomplete.

¹ The basic division identified here is that between “integrated” curriculum and “disciplinary” approaches – based on Pring’s distinction. However, the disciplinary approach is commonly actualized in schools as a “separate subjects” approach. Some arguments for integration rest on critiques of the traditional separate subject approach as it has played out in many schools, rather

This may be done with epistemological arguments about the nature of knowledge, sociological arguments about its organization and representation in schools, psychological arguments about learning, or ethical arguments about the lives of children or the purposes of schooling. It is, in broad strokes, these different arguments that can be identified in the integration literature that takes seriously the need to provide a rationale for integrating the curriculum.

As Pring (1972/1975) suggests, a few current proponents of integration do argue that the disciplinary thesis is false (Brady, 1989; Burns, 1995; Wilson, 1998), and others argue that it is a limited theory of knowledge that ignores the interconnectedness of all knowledge (Fowler, 1994; Kovalik, 1986; Miller, 1990). Other writers argue that the disciplinary thesis is incomplete because it does not account for the interdisciplinary nature of most real-world and personal problems (Barab & Landa, 1997; Boyer, 1995; Cross, 1995; Drake, 1993; Merryfield, 1991; Peters, Schubeck, & Hopkins, 1995).

Others argue that the disciplinary thesis is incomplete because although the disciplinary thesis is a valid account of the structures of knowledge, this represents “worked out” forms of knowledge and does not reflect how students should learn (Tchudi & Lafer, 1996; Wiggins, 1995; Wolk, 1994). This argument is closely related to arguments about how people learn (Barab & Landa, 1997; Burns, 1995; Caine & Caine, 1991; Drake, 1993) and the claim that integrated

than on critiques of disciplines themselves. This distinction will be addressed more in a later section.

curriculum strengthens learning by reinforcement, application, multiple perspectives, and transfer (Boix-Mansila & Gardner, 1997; Kellough, 1996; Laney, Moseley, & Pak, 1996).

Related to the argument that the disciplines are the “worked out” forms of knowledge is the claim that they are arbitrary social constructs that have developed in particular ways and to the advantage of particular groups of people (Apple, 1995; Beane, 1995; Cross, 1995; Merryfield, 1991). This argument is related to Pring’s final rationale for integration, that it addresses ethical questions about the purposes of education for a child or a society. This position claims that integrated curriculum meets the needs of a democratic society more satisfactorily than a discipline or subject-based curriculum (Beane, 1997; Brady, 1989; Cross, 1995).

One rationale that Pring does not address is commonly found only in more recent advocacy of integrated curriculum. It is the argument that the present information explosion or “curriculum overload” demands more efficient use of time in the classroom and that integration can solve this problem by re-organizing content in more effective ways (Ahlgren & Kesidou, 1995; Drake, 1993; Hughes, 1994; Kniep & Martin-Kniep, 1995; Schmidt, Roehler, Caul, Buchman, Diamond, Solomon, & Cianciolo, 1985; Walmsley, 1994). In this argument, there is an emphasis on integration as an efficiency tool rather than an approach based on the nature of knowledge itself, or of real-world problems, or of learning, or of educational purposes. This rationale is perhaps most often

behind administrative calls for integration and ignores the complex nature of integration and the underlying issues that need to be addressed.

Reviews of Rationales Found in Current Literature

Pring (1972/1975) provides a helpful framework for thinking about the different rationales underlying calls for integration. He describes several possible rationales: (1) the "disciplinary thesis" is a false theory of knowledge; (2) it is incomplete because it does not address reality and real-world problems; (3) it is incomplete because it does not represent how students learn; (4) it is inadequate in addressing ethical issues about educational purposes and outcomes, particularly social goals.

Other recent reviews draw similar distinctions among the various rationales explicitly or implicitly underlying different approaches to integration. Willis (1992) finds rationales for integration based on arguments that the real world is integrated, the disciplines are contrived, learning is not isolated, disciplines are not the best vehicles for teaching children, and the curriculum is overcrowded. Beane (1997) identifies four dimensions of integration: experience, social integration, integration of knowledge, and integration as curriculum design. Case (1991a) identifies four objectives for content integration: the complexity of the world, rigid subject boundaries, the seamless web of knowledge, and efficiency. Gavelak, Raphael, Biondo, and Wang (1999) identify the rationales prominent in integration literature as related to the search for authenticity, meaningfulness, and efficiency. Knight (1993) identifies arguments

from epistemological, psychological, and pragmatic perspectives. All of these reviews of current integration literature are remarkably similar in the ways they characterize the various rationales behind integrated curriculum. They also point to the very different theoretical orientations that can underlie integration and suggest the very different practices that are likely to result.

Another important point made in several of these reviews of the current rationales for integration is that the emphasis has shifted over time, generally narrowing to subject-centered rather than community-centered integration and purposes (Schubert, 1995), and to an emphasis on individuals making sense of what is learned rather than on formal questions of knowledge (Martin-Kniep, Feige, & Soodak, 1995). Beane (1997) traces current interest in integration to curriculum developments in the 1980s, including early childhood work, whole-language approaches, middle-school multidisciplinary units, and social-problems approaches to science education. He also argues that constructivist learning theory and research on the brain have contributed to recent interest in integration. Beane emphasizes two important differences between current integration interest and integration approaches in the progressive era. The first is “the absence of any connection to the broader topic of curriculum design theory” (p. 35) and the second is:

the consistent failure in popular literature, journals, and conference programs to tie curriculum integration to broader social purposes.

Instead, the idea of “integration” is focused almost only on individual

learning and is more often associated with units on teddy bears, aviation, and the Middle Ages than with substantive issues and topics such as conflict, the environment, or the future. (p.35)

It is within this larger socio-historical context that my study takes place. The classroom teacher in this study was influenced by constructivist learning research and whole-language approaches and by the recent attention to curriculum integration as described here by Beane.

Having outlined the major rationales behind current calls for integration, I shall now examine each of these rationales more closely. For each, I shall present the arguments raised, look at historical and current examples, and raise critiques of the argument.

Epistemological Argument: All Knowledge Forms a Unified Whole

One major objection to a disciplinary organization of curriculum is that it represents a false theory of knowledge and that there is, in fact, a unity of all knowledge which should be represented by an integrated curriculum. Klein (1990) traces this theory back to Plato "who was the first to advocate philosophy as a unified science... and argued that a general idea or concept is timeless and immutable because it exists independently" (p.19). Klein traces the idea of unity through the work of the Renaissance Humanists "who demonstrated how unity can be defined not in terms of the divine but of human talent and consciousness" (p. 20), and the writers of the sixteenth through nineteenth centuries "including Francis Bacon, Descartes, the French Encyclopedists, Kant, Hegel, and Comte.

Each of them expressed concern about the fragmentation of knowledge, and each, in his own way, articulated a vision of the unity of knowledge" (p.21). This belief in the unity of knowledge is not commonly expressed by philosophers now but can be found in some scientific and popular writing (Wilson, 1998) and in proposals for integrating the curriculum by "dissolving the boundaries. These boundaries have been artificially imposed in an attempt to structure and order the world in a meaningful way; however, they have become accepted as reality" (Drake, 1993, p. 27).

Proponents of fully integrated approaches that do not recognize disciplinary or school-subject boundaries argue that their approaches are more comprehensive, conceptual frameworks that transcend the narrow scope of disciplinary world views (Klein, 1990). These approaches may be called transdisciplinary (Burns, 1995; Drake, 1993), transforming and holistic (Miller, 1990), and supradisciplinary curriculum (Brady, 1995).

This perspective runs counter to the long history of curriculum organization into subjects or disciplines that can be traced back to the division of the seven liberal arts into the trivium and quadrivium of ancient Greece. The curriculum has been divided in many different ways historically, but the argument for such organization is that the distinctions are not, in fact, arbitrary but represent important ways of knowing and learning, and themselves provide integrative principles. This argument has been expressed in different ways by those advocating an emphasis on the structures of the disciplines (Bruner,

1960/1977; Schwab, 1978), those describing distinctive realms of meaning (Phenix, 1964/1975) or cognitive domains (Hirst, 1971/1975), each with characteristic ideas, methods, and structures. More recently, the Holmes group (1990) described the disciplines as “clubs” we want our children to join, as “long-running conversations” that are dynamic, fluid, human creations addressing particular kinds of questions in particular kinds of ways.

Many writers find that the epistemological argument that integration is a better way of describing human knowledge is hard to defend (Coombs, 1991; Greene, 1995; Knight, 1993). Some point to the distinction between school subjects and disciplines as being important to consider here because arguments for integration may actually be in response to school subject organizations rather than disciplines (Beane, 1997; Klein, 1990; May, 1992). Beane (1997) makes this point well:

A discipline of knowledge and its representative school subject area are not the same thing, even though they may be concerned with similar bodies of knowledge. They serve quite different purposes, offer quite different experiences for those who encounter them, and have quite different notions about the fluidity of boundaries that presumably set one area of inquiry off from others. These differences are substantial enough that the identification of a school subject area as, for example, “history” amounts to an appropriation of the name attached to its corresponding discipline of knowledge. Subject areas are, in the end, a more severe case

of “hardening of the categories” than the disciplines they supposedly represent. (p. 39)

This argument points away from an epistemological belief in the unity of knowledge toward a belief in integration as a way to overcome the limitations of curriculum based on disciplinary or school subject distinctions.

Limitations of Disciplines Argument: Real-World Problems are Interdisciplinary

This argument for integration recognizes disciplinary distinctions but argues that their representation in school subjects is problematic and also that they omit important learning, “knowledge that ordinarily falls between the cracks of the disciplines” (Beane, 1995, p. 620).

The argument here is that knowledge is interconnected and that the curriculum goal is to develop students who will “understand the connections between apparently disparate bodies of knowledge and will better appreciate the inherent complexity of the world we live in” (Martin-Kniep, Feige, & Soodak, 1995, p. 227). This perspective argues that real-life problems are seldom approached from a single discipline or subject and that “the proper subject matter of education is reality” (Brady, 1989, p. 11). It is a perspective that encourages projects and problem-solving curricular approaches closely related to the world beyond the classroom walls.

Proponents of integration based on this rationale argue that as the real world is integrated, so should the curriculum be (Barab & Landa, 1997; Drake, 1993; Kovalik, 1986; Merryfield, 1991; Peters, Schubeck, & Hopkins, 1995). It can

be argued that this is not a necessary conclusion to draw, that schools should help children approach the complexity of life in more controlled and manageable ways, for example. But it is a common argument with a long history.

An emphasis on problem solving for its connections with real life and society was also part of progressive era calls for integration in the early years of the twentieth century. Kliebard (1987) helpfully distinguishes between four major camps in what he describes as “the struggle for the American curriculum” at that time. He describes social efficiency advocates, child developmentalists, and social meliorists as being in opposition to the prevailing view in the schools, that of the classical humanists. As Beane (1997) points out, several of these groups advocated curriculum integration in some form as a way to meet their educational goals.

For social efficiency advocates, the idea of integrating academic and vocational knowledge and applying it in real-life contexts was very attractive. For child-centered developmentalists, ideas such as personal integration, pupil-teacher planning, and project-centered learning were nearly enough to make an educational anthem. And for social reformers, social integration, collaborative planning, and the use of integrated knowledge to approach social problems offered a practical agenda for democratic education. (p. 22)

Beane points out that there were many different reasons behind calls for integration and problem-based approaches to curriculum. Some proponents

emphasized preparing students for the world they would join. Some emphasized child-centered projects and learning approaches. Some emphasized integration as being a means to social reform. This variety of rationales is still true today.

Ethical/Social Arguments: Integration Addresses Social Purposes

Most of the calls for problem-based curriculum today have an emphasis on the present – the connection with present lives of children and the “common sense” of mirroring life and providing a relevant and authentic context for learning. Historically, there was also an emphasis on present connections with children’s lives and the society of which they are a part. This is seen, for example, in progressive-era experiments in schooling such as William Kilpatrick’s Project Method (1927/1975) and Dewey’s Laboratory School curriculum focused on occupations. However, those earlier calls for integration around real-world situations were more likely to include a social concern about the future needs of society, and in particular about social reform, that is often missing today.

The argument that an integrated curriculum should attend to social problems introduces an ethical concern with social purposes and a call for curriculum that addresses the future lives and needs of children and society. This was true in the progressive era with the social reconstructionists such as George S. Counts who, as Kliebard (1987) describes “saw the curriculum as the vehicle by which social injustice would be redressed and evils of capitalism corrected” (p. 183). It was an important part of Dewey’s work and writing. Dewey always was aware of the importance of school as a social institution and its potential as a

miniature democratic community and the primary instrument of much-needed social reform (Dewey 1902/1964).

Many writers today similarly advocate integration as a way to address social concerns and purposes. Beane (1997) emphasizes the need to develop curriculum in negotiation with the learners in democratic classrooms and leading to a more just democratic society. For him, curriculum integration embodies important values: "the emphasis on democratic practices, the concern for wider access to knowledge, the recognition of everyday knowledge and popular culture, the critical analysis of social issues, and so on" (p. 99). Others similarly claim that the disciplines privilege particular forms of knowledge that discriminate against non-dominant groups in our society (Apple, 1995; Cross, 1995) and that curriculum integration is a way to overcome this inequity.

This concern with the sociological implications of disciplinary or integrated curricula, more commonly associated with progressive-era rationales for integration but present in the work of current writers like Beane (1997), is evident also in the distinctions between different curricular organizations described by Basil Bernstein (1975). Bernstein does not necessarily advocate integration as a way to address problems of inequity in schooling and society, but provides a sociological frame for looking at the classification of curricular contents. He argues that: "how a society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits and evaluates the educational knowledge it considers to be public, reflects both

the distribution of power and the principles of social control" (p. 202). He identifies "collection code" curricula as organizations of educational knowledge which involve strong boundaries between contents, which in turn implies particular relationships, representations of knowledge, and pedagogy. "Integration" refers to "the *subordination* of previously insulated subjects or course to some *relational* idea, which blurs the boundaries between the subjects" (p. 209, original emphasis). This organization also implies particular authority and status structures, relationships and pedagogy.

Bernstein (1975) describes differentiated (subject or discipline-based) curriculum as having strong boundaries not only between contents but also between what may or may not be taught, and between school and everyday knowledge. In contrast, the weak boundaries between contents in an integrated curriculum also imply more options about what may be taught and less distinction between everyday and school knowledge. Advocates of integration often identify the integration of school and everyday knowledge as an important aspect of integrated curriculum and argue for more student choice and negotiation in the school curriculum.

Bernstein (1975) claims that the "collection" of knowledge into subjects in a differentiated curriculum rests on beliefs about knowledge as a commodity, as private property, which is hierarchically organized and transmitted. This also implies the autonomy of the subject and authority of the teacher and text, leading to subject loyalty, specialization, selection, and socialization into particular

subjects, and hierarchical authority relations and status. In contrast, integrated curriculum reduces the authority of separate subjects and implies less hierarchical authority structures. He argues that this can lead to a common pedagogy, whereas differentiated curriculum allows a variety of pedagogy across subjects.

Attention to authority structures and pedagogy in classrooms is an important part of many arguments for integration, but Bernstein (1975) raises cautions about the way both organizations can play out in schools, noting problematic implications of integration as well as differentiated curricula. Bernstein's framing of the curriculum organizations and his consideration of implications will be helpful as I discuss the findings of my study in later chapters.

Psychological Arguments: Integration Leads to Better Learning

For many teachers, the major reason to consider integrating the curriculum is because of perceived benefits in terms of student learning. This argument has variations, but it is an argument about how children learn. For the most part, the emphasis is on individual learning and cognition, although proponents of problem- and inquiry-based approaches may also describe the learning benefits derived from the social interaction and discourse that may be associated with integration.

Historically, integrated curriculum grew in part out of the child study movement of G. Stanley Hall and the progressive era (although it can be traced

back to Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and the kindergarten movement begun by Froebel). This movement emphasized curriculum centered on the needs and interests of the individual child, based on the close observation of children and their development. It led to experiments in schooling, such as the Quincy school, with an emphasis on freedom, individualization, and curriculum driven by the natural predilections of children. It also led to an emphasis on the "concentration" of school subjects around a central theme, reflecting related Herbartian beliefs about the doctrine of cultural epochs, the belief that children have a natural affinity for learning materials drawn from historical eras reflecting their individual development.

These themes are present in integration literature of today. Many writers claim the value of integration in terms of its relevance to children and its interest and motivating factors (Embriano & Ryan, 1995; Jacobs, 1989; Lounsbury, 1992; Mansfield, 1997; McGowan, Erickson, & Neufeld, 1997). There is also an emphasis on student input and choice in learning that reflects progressive era themes (Barab & Landa, 1997; Beane, 1997; Wolk, 1994). There is a large body of literature for practitioners about thematic instruction, reflecting the emphasis on concentrating the curriculum around a central topic, although this is no longer linked to cultural epoch theory.

The child study movement of the progressive era placed emphasis on a scientific basis for curriculum development. Cognitive psychology has continued to play an important part in integration rationales, through Piaget's

work on the intellectual developmental stages of children to a current interest in how the brain functions to process information in learning. Many writers explicitly or implicitly argue along with Burns (1995) that “research on how people learn indicates that the brain searches for patterns and interconnections to construct meaning....so, if humans learn through connection making, it makes sense to teach through connections, not fragmentations, of knowledge (p. 3).

There are two major problems with this argument: first, current research is much more complex and difficult to apply to education than Burns allows here; second, there is a leap in logic between the fact that humans learn through connection-making and her conclusion that it therefore makes sense to teach through connections. This misses the point that it is the learners themselves who do, and need to do, the connection making. Although much of the current cognitive research has interesting and helpful things to suggest about how learners learn (Brandt, 1998; Caine & Caine, 1991, 1997; Greenfield, 1997; Jensen, 1998; Sylwester, 1995), it is often cautious about direct applications of research to classrooms (Bruer, 1998). Curriculum integration based on theories about the brain making connections may emphasize the curriculum design and teacher-made connections at the expense of learner construction of connections.

Learner construction of knowledge is at the heart of constructivist learning theory, which emphasizes an individual's construction of knowledge through a search for personal meaning, and which is often given as the reason for integration. As explained in Brooks & Brooks (1993),

Drawing on a synthesis of current work in cognitive psychology, philosophy, and anthropology, the theory defines knowledge as temporary, developmental, socially and culturally mediated, and thus, non-objective. Learning from this perspective is understood as a self-regulated process of resolving inner cognitive conflicts that often become apparent through concrete experience, collaborative discourse, and reflection. (p. vii)

From this perspective, learners bring naïve conceptions or prior knowledge that forms the basis for their understandings, and these can be challenged and developed so that they construct new understandings. Integrated curriculum is often viewed as a natural way to encourage students to follow important questions and purposes in ways most appropriate for them, and to develop new understandings from these experiences. The kind of integration particularly encouraged by constructivist learning theory is that of inquiry – the pursuit of meaningful questions. This implies a less teacher-directed curriculum design than that implied by curriculum designed to teach predetermined connections.

Social constructivist theory adds to the constructivist vision of teaching and learning an emphasis on the social context, discourse, and interaction in which individuals learn. Based on the work of Vygotsky (1986), it emphasizes the importance of language in social mediation and the importance of learning through “the interactions among learners and more knowledgeable members of the social and cultural communities within and beyond the classroom” (Raphael

& Hiebert, 1996, p. 12). This social constructivist emphasis on context and interaction again leads to integration that is more inquiry- and project-based, not just curriculum designed artificially around thematic or subject matter connections.

Integrated curriculum is advocated on the basis of both constructivist and social constructivist learning theory. This raises interesting questions about learner construction of understanding, particularly in a teacher-directed curriculum. This issue will be explored further in my study.

As I have shown, many writers argue that integrated curriculum is more interesting, relevant, and connected, and therefore better suited to student learning, than a disciplinary approach to curriculum. Other writers argue that integration leads to better student learning in the disciplines themselves (Boix-Mansila & Gardner, 1997; Davies, 1992; Kellough, 1996; Laney, Mosley & Pak, 1996; Perkins, 1989; Tchudi & Lafer, 1996). This shifts the emphasis somewhat, maintaining disciplines as important structures of knowledge, but arguing that they are in isolation inappropriate vehicles for student learning. Pring (1972/1975) states this position:

The disciplines therefore constitute in the most complete and developed form the logical structure of knowledge. They do not however reflect the pupil's level and mode of understanding, nor do they indicate the process whereby the pupil might attain these structures of knowledge. For, on this line of argument, the finished product, tidied up into the logical neatness

of distinct disciplines, does not contain within it the way in which it should be presented. (p. 275)

This position echoes Deweyan discussions about the nature of the relationship between child and curriculum.

Dewey (1902/1964) claimed that a false dichotomy had been set up between those advocating education based on the logic of the established disciplines and those advocating education based on the psychological needs and interests of the child. He argued:

Just as two points define a straight line, so the present standpoint of the child and the facts and truths of studies define instruction. It is continuous reconstruction, moving from the child's present experience out into that represented by the organized bodies of truth that we call studies. (p. 344)

Dewey recognized both the importance of the disciplines as a guide for learning and the dangers of teaching them as finished products without reference to the present experiences of the child. He discussed three major dangers: first, that children will learn the disciplines as empty symbols with no connection to a sense of their discovery; second, that the presentation of organized facts alone removes any motivation for learning; third, that important aspects of subject matter are lost in their modification for children. These dangers are ones being raised still by proponents of a curriculum integrated for more student-centered learning of disciplinary subject matter.

Summary of Rationales for Integration

John Dewey (1902/1964) is frequently identified with many different ideas from the progressive era that are related to integration. He is associated with ideas of project and problem-based curriculum reflecting the realities of life and the need for schooling to address social problems. He is associated with ideas about curriculum related to the present experiences of children, which are valued in themselves and also as an important beginning point for learning that moves towards disciplinary understandings. As Kliebard (1987) observes, "he is not so much a central figure in one or another of these groups as he is someone who synthesized and reinterpreted certain of their ideas, and, consequently, he became identified in a way with all of them" (p. 30). He may still be called on to support a particular rationale for integration, drawing on his philosophical, psychological, or social reform arguments.

A popular current rationale for integration that is not supported by reference to Dewey is the argument that the curriculum is overcrowded, and the pace of information growth now is so fast that integration should be used as an organizational tool for managing the curriculum in more efficient ways. This argument is not a response to the disciplinary thesis, but a response to time constraints and curriculum pressures. It does not argue for integration on the basis of the nature of knowledge or the realities of life, nor does it argue for integration on the basis of the needs of society or the needs of the learner.

The epistemological, sociological, psychological, ethical, and practical arguments for integration described here provide a variety of underlying orientations towards curriculum and education. The decision to integrate curriculum is much more complex than is realized by many teachers, and it is important to distinguish beliefs and expectations behind integration practices. In this study, the teacher's beliefs about integration will be described and findings will be related both to her rationale and to other claims about the benefits of integration.

B. Models of Integrated Curricula

As there are a variety of rationales behind curriculum integration, there are also many different curriculum models described. Some writers make distinctions among models based on the nature of the relationship between the disciplines and the organizing centers. These writers distinguish in particular between integrated and interdisciplinary approaches, or distinguish among multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and transdisciplinary models. Another way of distinguishing among different models is according to the degree of integration, often represented along a continuum of models. Yet another way to distinguish among models is to consider what it is that is being integrated – the form and mode of integration. I shall look at each of these in turn.

Distinctions Based on the Nature of the Relationship Between the Disciplines and the Organizing Center

James Beane (1997) makes a core distinction between “integration” and other “interdisciplinary” or “multidisciplinary” approaches to curriculum. He argues that the distinction is crucial, being based on different beliefs and leading to very different classroom practices. He identifies distinctions between these two approaches:

Like the separate-subject approach, the multidisciplinary one still begins and ends with the subject-based content and skills while curriculum integration begins and ends with the problem- and issue-centered organizing centers (Bellack & Kliebard, 1971). Along the way, these organizing centers also contextualize knowledge and give it significant purpose. Because the multidisciplinary approach begins with content and skills, knowledge is fixed in predetermined sequences, while integration recognizes external knowledge but sequences it by relevance to the problem at hand. (p. 11)

Beane draws out classroom implications of these distinctions by describing curriculum planning for each. Planning for integrated curriculum begins with a problem or issue and then develops concepts and activities to address this, not necessarily related to separate disciplines or subjects. Planning for multidisciplinary curriculum begins with an organizing center and addresses this specifically through the lenses of different disciplines or subjects.

Beane's (1997) distinction between integration and interdisciplinary approaches draws on the etymology of the two root words. "Interdisciplinary" refers to the contributions of two or more disciplines to a central focus. This maintains the particular characteristics of the distinct disciplines while drawing on them in pursuit of a common question. "Integration" derives from the same root word as "integral" and "integrity," implying working with the different pieces of an integral whole. This suggests a completeness, an entity that is different from a collection of parts.

This distinction focuses on the nature of the relationship of the disciplines to the organizing center. From this perspective, much of what is referred to as "integration" is in fact multidisciplinary (Kovalik, 1986; Meinbach, Rothlein, & Fredericks, 1995). Other models recognize the distinction Beane (1997) makes here, and describe their approaches as interdisciplinary rather than integrated (Barab & Landa, 1997; Embriano & Ryan, 1995; Lounsbury, 1992; Seely, 1995; Tchudi & Lafer, 1996). Other writers refer to integration and interdisciplinary curriculum interchangeably without making this distinction (Caine & Caine, 1991).

Klein (1990) refers to Pring's distinction, like Beane's, between "integrative" and "interdisciplinary" approaches to curriculum and Pring's argument that the "integrative" approaches raise epistemological questions to which "interdisciplinary" approaches remain indifferent. Klein adds that integration requires "restructuring" the disciplines, while interdisciplinary

approaches require “bridge building” between disciplines, assuming a grounding in the constituent disciplines and an applied orientation.

Klein then makes two core distinctions: (1) between “multidisciplinary” (or “pluridisciplinary”) and interdisciplinary approaches, and (2) between “interdisciplinary” and “transdisciplinary” approaches. She describes multidisciplinary as “essentially *additive*, not *integrative*” (p. 56), with disciplinary perspectives and processes being brought to bear on a common problem or question. Interdisciplinary approaches are integrative and “achieve a synthesis greater than any single disciplinary approach” (p. 58). She then describes “transdisciplinary” approaches as being more comprehensive conceptual frameworks in which disciplines become irrelevant or subordinate to the larger framework.

This description of transdisciplinary approaches is similar to Brady’s (1995) “supradisciplinary” curriculum. Brady (1995) describes a curriculum that makes explicit the coherence of reality through attention to “an integrated conceptual structure encompassing and organizing not merely all that lies within the boundaries of the disciplines, but all reality” (p.28). Such a curriculum helps students understand the myriad of relationships between the important elements of experience.

Klein’s three distinctions between multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and transdisciplinary approaches are reflected in Petrie’s (1992) work. He describes “multidisciplinary” as “simply the idea of a number of disciplines working

together on a problem, an educational program, or a research study, (p. 303)" implying group work rather than teamwork. Interdisciplinarity, in contrast "typically refers to those situations in which the integration of the work goes beyond the mere concatenation of disciplinary contributions. Some key elements of disciplinarians' use of their concepts and tools change. There is a level of integration" (p. 304). "Transdisciplinarity" is, according to Petrie, driven by the desirability of the integration of knowledge into some meaningful whole. In addressing issues of interdisciplinarity primarily at the college level, he claims that disciplinary activities tend to be primarily concerned with theoretical understanding, multidisciplinary and some interdisciplinary projects with practical results, and transdisciplinary activities toward questions of theoretical understanding.

Miller (1990), in his call for "holistic" curriculum, describes three approaches to education. In the "transmission" approach, the function of the curriculum is to transmit facts, skills, and values to students, and studies are integrated by "multidisciplinary" linking of the content of different subjects. In the "transaction" approach, education is viewed as a dialogue between student and curriculum, and integrated studies are facilitated through "interdisciplinary" problem-solving and inquiry-based approaches. In the transformation approach, the focus is on personal and social change, and integration is through "transdisciplinary" experiences that are explored for their personal, social, and educational meaning.

Susan Drake (1991, 1993) describes a similar continuum of curriculum designs that her team experienced when working on integrating the curriculum. She begins with a “multidisciplinary” approach that keeps each discipline intact and then moves to an “interdisciplinary” approach in which the focus is on commonalities and skills across disciplines. The final “dissolving of the boundaries,” the goal for the group, is in the “transdisciplinary” approach in which content and skills are embedded in a “real-world” theme and context that transcends disciplines, instead embedding them inside the theme.

Table 2.1 summarizes different understandings of integrated-curriculum approaches, based on the nature of the relationship between the disciplines and the organizing center.

Distinctions Based on the Degree of Integration

As used by Klein (1990) and Petrie (1992), for example, the terms multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and transdisciplinary reflect important beliefs about knowledge and the nature of relations between the disciplines and a common focus of study. For some writers, like Miller (1990) and Drake (1993), these same terms also represent different points on a continuum, reflecting different degrees of integration, with the implication that “transdisciplinary” is more desirable than “multidisciplinary.” Other writers also present alternative approaches to integration in terms of a continuum of options.

Table 2.1.

Different integrated curriculum models based on the nature of the relationship between the disciplines and the organizing center

	Disciplines applied to common focus	Disciplines integrated, achieving synthesis	Disciplines transcended
Beane (1997)	Multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary	Integrated	
Brady (1995)			Supradisciplinary
Drake (1993)	Multidisciplinary	Interdisciplinary	Transdisciplinary
Klein (1990)	Multidisciplinary, Pluridisciplinary	Interdisciplinary	Transdisciplinary
Miller (1990)	Multidisciplinary, (transmission)	Interdisciplinary, (transaction)	Transdisciplinary, (transformation)
Petrie (1992)	Multidisciplinary	Interdisciplinary	Transdisciplinary

Heidi Jacobs (1989), in her influential book on interdisciplinary curriculum, identifies a concern with the “polarity” issue which she describes as “the unfortunate tendency for school administrators and teachers to believe that the choice for content design boils down to an either/or proposition between

discipline field specialization and interdisciplinary integration” (p. 13). She describes instead a “continuum of design options” for integrating curricula, each with its advantages and disadvantages. This glosses over any epistemological differences or beliefs, instead recognizing curriculum design mostly as a matter of practical issues and choices.

Jacobs (1989) describes this continuum as ranging from discipline-based content design to “complete programs” of integration. She ignores any integration within discipline-based curriculum and also makes no distinction between disciplinary and separate-subject approaches. She then describes “parallel discipline designs” in which teachers sequence lessons to correspond to lessons in the same area in other disciplines. This is a re-sequencing of the existing curriculum to foster implicit connections. She next describes “complementary discipline units or courses,” elsewhere referring to these as “multidisciplinary” designs, where related disciplines are brought together to shed light on and complement one another. She then describes “interdisciplinary” approaches in which periodic courses of study bring together the full range of disciplines around a theme or issue. A more comprehensive approach yet is the “integrated day” model, in which “the emphasis is on an organic approach to classroom life that focuses the curriculum on the child’s questions and interests” (p. 17). Jacobs’ final design is the “complete program” where students live in the school environment and create the curriculum, as represented by A.S. Neil’s (1960) Summerhill School.

Jacobs' representation implies the limitations of disciplinary and parallel discipline approaches, and the radical nature of integrated-day and complete-program approaches. She therefore encourages a focus on the "interdisciplinary" model in conjunction with disciplinary teaching. As she later describes it, "the central aim of this interdisciplinary model is to bring together the discipline perspectives and focus them on the investigation of a target theme, issue, or problem" (p. 54). This is similar to Beane's (1997) use of "interdisciplinary" but more like the "multidisciplinary" approaches of Klein (1990), Miller (1990), and Petrie (1992).

Rebecca Burns (1995) also describes a continuum of stages through which integrated curriculum design might evolve. She describes the "parallel disciplines" approach as re-sequenced content drawn from the disciplines, much as Jacobs (1989) does. She describes "multidisciplinary" approaches as revised content from the disciplines around a theme. "Interdisciplinary" approaches focus on generic and metacognitive concepts and skills, similar to the skills focus of interdisciplinary approaches described by Miller (1990) and Drake (1993). For Burns, "integrated" approaches dissolve disciplinary boundaries and focus on real-life concerns, and "transdisciplinary" curriculum transcends subjects in a total curriculum focused on students' social and personal concerns. This is the goal.

Kovalik (1986) approaches the curriculum design continuum somewhat differently. In her description of Integrated Thematic Instruction, she does not

define degrees of integration with different terms, but suggests ways for teachers to build towards an integrated curriculum gradually. She gives examples of integrating around a theme in one subject area, such as science or social studies. She then describes how to add another subject area, such as language arts, to integrate further around the theme. Similarly she models adding more subject areas until the goal of “total integration” is reached, interweaving all subject areas into a year-long theme in which:

we know the curriculum is totally integrated and the degree of meaningfulness far surpasses the traditional lessons of reading the chapter and answering the questions. The entire day is now devoted to pursuing the topics and components of the theme. (p. 69)

In this approach, integration appears to be an end in itself, with little critical attention to alternatives or underlying rationales.

Another continuum of models is described by Robin Fogarty (1991). Fogarty identifies ten models for integrating curriculum. She recognizes that integration is possible within single disciplines, describing integration within the “fragmented” model of traditional schooling, in the “connected” model with related concepts and skills within subject areas, and in the “nested” model as multiple skills being targeted within particular content areas.

Fogarty’s (1991) next five models describe integration across several disciplines. “Sequenced” curriculum requires rearranging topics to coincide with those in other subjects, like Jacobs’ (1989) and Burns’ (1995) “parallel

disciplines." "Shared" curriculum has overlapping concepts between two related disciplines. "Webbed" curriculum represents a thematic approach to curriculum development in which each subject area contributes to a central theme.

"Threaded" curriculum focuses on integration around a metacurricular skill or process that is threaded through many subject areas. "Integrated" curriculum "blends the four major disciplines by setting curricular priorities in each and finding the overlapping skills, concepts, and attitudes in all four" (p. 76).

Fogarty's (1991) final two models concern integration within the learner - "immersed" integration describing the filtering of all content through a personal lens of interest and experience, and "networked" integration describing the network of connections a learner makes with related fields of expertise. It is interesting that she distinguishes so clearly between integration within disciplines, across disciplines, and particularly within the mind of the learner.

Table 2.2 summarizes different integrated curriculum models based on the degree of integration along a perceived continuum from least integrated to most integrated. For many of these authors (Burns, 1995; Drake, 1993; Kovalik, 1986), the implied goal is for complete integration across the curriculum. For others (Jacobs, 1989; Fogarty, 1991), the models represent choices for teachers to consider when planning their integrated curriculum.

Table 2.2.

Different integrated curriculum models based on the degree of integration.

	Least Integrated ←	-----	-----	-----	-----→	Most integrated
Burns (1995)		Parallel disciplines	Multi- disciplinary	Inter- disciplinary	Integrated	Trans- disciplinary
Drake (1993)			Multi- Disciplinary	Inter- disciplinary		Trans- disciplinary
Fogarty (1991)	Fragmented Connected & Nested	Sequenced & Shared	Webbed	Threaded	Integrated	Immersed & Networked
Jacobs (1989)	Discipline- based	Parallel disciplines	Multi- disciplinary	Inter- disciplinary	Integrated day	Complete program
Kovalik (1986)	Single subject model	Two content areas	Three content areas	Four or more curricular areas	Total integration	

Distinctions Based on Focus of Integration

Many writers distinguish among different models of integration by noting the focus or form of integration. Several different focuses have already been identified among the models described. For example, Miller (1990) and Drake (1993) both describe multidisciplinary approaches as being focused on content integration, interdisciplinary approaches as involving integration of skills and processes, and transdisciplinary approaches as focused on personal and social

integration in the real world. Burns (1995) also identifies content as the focus for integration in parallel and multidisciplinary approaches, generic and metacognitive skills as the integration focus of interdisciplinary approaches, and real-world and personal integration as the focus of integrated and transdisciplinary approaches. Fogarty (1991) refers to the integration of content in “connected,” “sequenced,” and “webbed” curricula, to the integration of skills and processes in “nested” and “threaded” curricula, and to personal integration in “immersed” and “networked” curricula. Martin-Kniep, Feige, & Soodak (1995) also identify a different focus for different forms of integration noting interdisciplinary connections across content, integration around skills, and integration between students’ experiences and internal lives and the school’s curriculum.

Roland Case (1991a) also points to these same forms of integration in a larger discussion of the various dimensions and characteristics of integrated curricula. He suggests that the elements to be united determine the “form” of integration and that these are most commonly integration of content, integration of skills and processes, integration of school and self, and holistic integration. The last form includes all school-related experiences and is most likely in religious schools or in the hidden curriculum of schooling.

Table 2.3 provides a summary of the different forms of curriculum integration based on the focus of the integration. This is commonly described in

terms of content, skills, real-world connections, or personal and social integration.

Table 2.3.

Different forms of curriculum integration based on the focus or form of the integration.

Burns (1995)	Content integration	Skills integration	Real world integration	Personal and social integration
Case (1991)	Content integration	Skills integration	Integration of school & self	Holistic integration
Drake (1993)	Content integration	Skills integration		Personal and social integration
Martin-Kniep, Feige, & Soodak (1995)	Content integration	Skills integration	Integration of school & self	
Miller (1990)	Content integration	Skills integration		Personal and social integration

Further Considerations in Examining Models of Integration

I have described different models of integration based on three major distinctions: (1) the nature of the relationship between the disciplines and the organizing center for integrating the curriculum; (2) the degree of integration along a continuum; and (3) the focus and form of the curriculum integration.

Roland Case (1991a) distinguishes between integration models in terms of their forms, but he also provides a helpful analysis of further considerations in

integration, identifying eight formal components of integration that may be considered when examining an approach or planning curriculum. His analysis is helpful in providing a more complex image of integration possibilities than many. His work was also of particular interest to the classroom teacher in my study, as she reconsidered her approach to integration. I shall therefore briefly outline his analysis here.

The broadest category of components is “domain,” the general field of human or natural endeavor in which the integration occurs. In this case, we are considering the domain of education, and the subdomain of curricular integration, rather than integration of classrooms or schools, for example. Within that domain, Case (1991a) identifies the four “forms” of curricular integration outlined above. He then distinguishes between the two “dimensions” of vertical integration over time and horizontal integration at any given time. These dimensions may be related to any of the forms of integration.

Case (1991a) also identifies major “objectives” of integration, linking them to the forms identified. He describes four interrelated objectives for content integration: dealing with the complexity of the world; overcoming rigid perceptions of subject boundaries; respecting the seamless web of knowledge; and promoting greater efficiency. He describes the dominant objective behind integration of skills and processes as being functional competence. He claims that proposals to integrate school and self are generally based on a desire to increase

students' perceptions of the relevance of school, and that the likely objectives behind holistic integration are to promote efficacy and equity.

He then goes on to describe "modes" of integrating the curriculum. These strategies include: "fusion" in which curricular elements previously taught separately are joined into a single entity; "insertion" in which one curricular element is added to a larger one; "correlation" when parallels are noted between separate subjects; and "harmonization" when disparate elements are made compatible with each other, often in holistic integration.

The "loci" of integration is considered - usually the classroom, the school or district, or the state. "Coherence" is an important consideration for Case (1991a), as he argues that finding common curricular features does not necessarily lead to increased coherence. In a similar argument, he claims that "degrees" of integration should be carefully considered because more integration is not necessarily the goal.

These eight components of integration provide a helpful framework for thinking about integration in its complexity. The framework is compatible with the distinctions among models made by other writers who have surveyed the integration literature.

C. Literature about the Integration of Social Studies and Language Arts

I have described different rationales for curriculum integration at a general level. These included rationales based on arguments about the unity of knowledge or the limitations of a separate subject or disciplinary approach in

terms of dealing with real-world problems or meeting learning or personal and social needs. I have similarly described various models of curriculum integration at a general level in terms of distinctions based on the extent of integration or the focus of that integration. I shall now turn to a more specific look at the literature related to the integration of social studies and language arts in elementary classrooms, specifically history and literature.

Arguments about integrating social studies and language arts tend to center on questions about student learning in those subject areas rather than other more generalized rationales, although there is some attention to integration as a more effective way of meeting curricular objectives (Schmidt, Roehler, Caul, Buchman, Diamond, Solomon, & Cianciolo, 1985). I am interested in looking at student learning as a rationale for integrating history and literature.

It is important to consider what different writers mean by integration within and across language arts and social studies. Both language arts and social studies are themselves interdisciplinary school subjects. Social studies is a subject that incorporates history and other social science disciplines. Language arts incorporates reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and literature study. Some writers only address integration within each of these school subjects. Some discuss the further integration of these school subjects with other curriculum subjects. This is notably true of language arts. Some writers appear to incorporate the integration of language arts across the curriculum into their definition of "integrated language arts." For Morrow, Wilkinson, and Smith (1994), for

example, “the integrated language arts perspective involves a group of concepts concerning how children learn and how this is specifically related to literacy learning” (p. 2). This perspective includes functional literacy, integration of literacy activities into the learning of content-area subjects, often through the use of themes, and the use of children’s literature as “the main source for reading from which children learn” (p. 2). Here the definition of integrated language arts goes beyond integration within literacy to include integration of literacy with other content areas.

Much of the general integration literature for teachers actually has a strong emphasis on language arts and/or the use of literature across the curriculum. It is interesting to note that the authors of these books, or the related titles in a series, are predominantly concerned with literacy, with integration apparently being just one aspect of that primary interest (Meinbach, Rothlein, & Fredericks, 1995; Seely, 1995). Other writers are more explicit about their interest in literacy instruction, and address integration within the language arts and across the curriculum from a literacy perspective (Pappas, Kiefer, Levstik, 1990; Raphael & Hiebert, 1996). The argument is often made that literacy instruction must be embedded in a context, that learners need to read and write about specific things and in specific ways, and that the integration of language arts skills with content from other curricular areas is a good way to contextualize language-arts learning (Kellough, 1996). There is a large body of professional literature addressing literacy in the content areas or language arts across the

curriculum. Social studies writers may refer to the use of literature or language arts in social studies but do not write books about integration in the same way.

Some writers have addressed content-area literacy more from the perspective of social studies learning. There is debate about the value of “language arts across the curriculum.” Hickey (1997) argues for the teaching of specific “critical reading skills,” including the recognition of cause and effect, distinguishing fact from opinion, and identifying propaganda techniques. This recognizes domain-specific-thinking and language skills for social studies. Lemlech (1982) argues that the advocacy of integrating basic skills into social studies promotes less teaching of social studies, claiming that:

reading skills do not transfer automatically from one subject field to another unless the technical vocabulary and special concepts and ideas of the subject are presented prior to reading. Most social studies concepts require more than an abstract definition. Discussion and activities related to students’ prior experiences are prerequisite to concept development. (p. 244)

Lemlech (1982) also argues that learning is counter productive when students “are subjected to the same teaching methods – all day, in all subject fields” (p. 245). She believes that an emphasis on reading in social studies does nothing to strengthen the social studies curriculum, but in fact only serves to promote more reading time. From this perspective, language integrated across the

curriculum threatens social studies learning. Alleman and Brophy (1993) raise similar concerns about applying language-arts skills to social studies curriculum.

There is no consensus on the value of integrating reading and writing (and speaking and listening) skills across the curriculum. In general, such integration appears to be valued more by those interested primarily in literacy learning than by those interested primarily in social studies learning. There is a distinction however between language arts and literature. The value of integrating literature across the curriculum, particularly with social studies, has advocates from both camps as well as many who raise concerns.

The integration of literature in social studies is generally discussed in terms of developing historical understandings, and I shall focus now on the dimensions of literature and history study, rather than on the larger school subjects of language arts and social studies. These are also the aspects of these subjects that are the focus in my study.

Argument: Literature and History Studies are Similar Subjects

Some of the arguments about the integration of history and literature study center on the perceived similarities or differences of the two subject areas, while others argue in terms of how adequately the two subject matters may or may not complement each other. I shall first address the issue of the similarities and differences between literature and history studies, beginning with a brief overview of ways in which history and literature study are defined.

Jenkins (1991) points out that we “tend to lose sight of the fact that there actually is this distinction between history – as that which has been written/recorded about the past – and the past itself, because the word history covers both things” (p. 6), and history study (historiography) is an inter-textual, linguistic construct based on the discourses of historians and their attempts to know the past. History, as a discipline, is a constructed, interpretive, and contested field based on attempts to better understand the past.

History study in schools contributes to social studies, which is broadly viewed as citizenship education. The National Council for the Social Studies outlines ten themes that form the framework for social studies standards and which cut across disciplines and draw from them to address the social studies goals of citizenship education. These themes are: culture; time, continuity and change; people, places, and environments; individual development and identity; individuals, groups, and institutions; power, authority, and governance; production, distribution, and consumption; science, technology, and society; global connections; and civic ideals and practices.

History study is expected to make a major contribution to these social studies themes. The National Center for History in the Schools, in an introduction to the National Standards for History (1996), outlines the reasons for including a strong history component in all grades:

The reasons are many, but none more important to a democratic society than this: *knowledge of history is the precondition of political intelligence.*

Without history, a society shares no common memory of where it has been, of what its core values are, or of what decisions of the past account for present circumstances. Without history, one cannot undertake any sensible inquiry into the political, social, or moral issues in society. And without historical knowledge and the inquiry it supports, one cannot move to the informed, discriminating citizenship essential to effective participation in the democratic processes of governance and the fulfillment for all our citizens of the nation's democratic ideals (p. 1, original emphasis).

History education here is viewed as an essential part of citizenship education in a democratic society, as well as an essential element of individual self-identity. The two major types of standards described for meeting these goals are historical thinking skills and historical understandings. Historical understandings "define what students should *know* about the history of families, their communities, states, nation, and world" (p. 2, original emphasis), and historical thinking emphasizes the following dimensions: chronological thinking, historical comprehension, historical analysis and interpretation, historical research capabilities, and historical issues-analysis and decision-making. These interdependent dimensions of historical understanding and thinking are reflected in the Michigan Framework for Social Studies Education (1996).

More specifically, the historical perspective draws on the following fields of historical thinking: time and chronology, comprehending the past, analyzing

and interpreting the past, and judging decisions from the past. Levstik and Barton (1997) describe history as the school subject that tells us who we are and who we may become. They draw on a review of literature to characterize history as: about significant themes and questions, interpretive, explained through narratives, and both controversial and involving multiple perspectives.

Literature study, like history study, is part of a larger school subject. The National Council for the Teachers of English and the International Reading Association (1996) have developed twelve interrelated standards that describe what students should know and be able to do in the English language arts. The first two standards relate particularly to literature study, recommending that students read a wide range of texts including fiction and non-fiction, classic and contemporary works, and works from a range of periods and genres. Students should read a variety of texts and literature for multiple purposes: to build an understanding of texts, of themselves, and of cultures; to acquire new information; to respond to the needs and demands of society and the workplace; for personal fulfillment; and for understanding the philosophical, ethical, and aesthetic dimensions of human experience.

Lee Galda (1998) describes four major reasons found by Hade (1993) for teachers using literature: teaching reading, developing literary knowledge, developing self-understanding, and developing social responsibility. She concludes, however, that these goals need to be balanced with the more important goal of powerful engagement with literature, "allowing readers the

chance to experience the dangerous power that reading can provide, to develop literate voices, to want to read and read more, to spontaneously share and refine their personal responses through self-reflection and social dialogue, and to see the world through the eyes of others” (p. 9). Walmsley (1998) also emphasizes the need to broaden goals of literature study beyond a tool for reading and writing development, and notes that “being a good reader from a literacy perspective and being a good reader from a school’s perspective aren’t the same things at all. Good literary readers read a lot, enter the texts they read, grapple with the underlying themes, and engage with the characters and stories”(p. 340). Just as history is a discipline that contributes to social studies education, while having specific goals related to historical understanding and thinking, so literature study contributes to language arts education while also having specific goals related to student engagement with text.

Human themes and dilemmas as a common focus.

One of the arguments for integrating history and literature study is that they share a common focus on central human themes and dilemmas (Barr & McGuire, 1997; Pappas, Kiefer, & Levstik, 1990) and a related emphasis on interpretation and perspective about that central focus. Another similarity often emphasized is the use of narrative form in both history and literature texts.

Judith Langer (1995) summarizes the goals of literature study:

Through literature, students learn to explore possibilities and consider options for themselves and humankind. They come to find themselves,

imagine others, value difference, and search for justice. They gain connectedness and seek vision. They become the literate thinkers we need to shape the decisions of tomorrow. (p. 1)

Compare those goals for literature study with Levstik and Barton's (1997) call for "a vibrant history curriculum that engages children in investigating significant themes and questions, with people, their values, and the choices they make as the central focus" (p. 3). It is these similarities, a common humanities focus, that elicits calls for integrating literature and history study as subjects that share common subject matter themes and purposes.

However, there are also distinct purposes and focuses for literature and history study. Most obviously, history study aims to address larger human themes by better understanding actual events and phenomena of the past, whereas literature study addresses human themes in a variety of ways. Boix-Mansilla and Gardner (1997) unpack the use of literary and historical texts to teach the Holocaust, arguing that "unlike history, which aims at portraying what the world was like in the past, literature aims at expressing aspects of human experience" (p. 384). They claim that the purposes, sources, and structures of literary and historical texts have different relevance and functions. For example, historians aim at reconstructing the past and draw on original documents for that purpose; whereas for novelists, past events are only an instrumental part of their work. Novelists are concerned with the internal coherence of their narrative, whereas historians are concerned with the correspondence between

their accounts and the data of the past, and use narrative only as a tool to express their analysis of the past. Boix-Mansilla and Gardner (1997) conclude by explaining the central distinction between the two kinds of knowing of literature and history study:

To demonstrate full-fledged *historical* understanding, students have to place the scene in a broader context and interpretive frame. Why did it happen? What did it mean to the people at the time? What would these people soon find out? Questions of this sort invite students to produce historical accounts that integrate facts and interpretations, accounts that are respectful of the characteristics of past times and are grounded in carefully marshaled evidence. To demonstrate full-fledge *literary* understanding, students have to grasp the essential aspects of human experience embodied in the scene and use figurative language to portray them in a novel, a short story, or a poem. What does this incident say about human experience? What does it symbolize? How can the story be told? Questions of this sort invite students to produce literary accounts that hold multiple layers of meaning and play with the expressive limits of language. (p. 386)

Boix-Mansilla and Gardner (1997) argue that history and literature represent distinct kinds of understanding and that each has important contributions to make. They argue that each has a different focus and also different use of the

common narrative form. They complicate the advocacy of the integration of literature and history study based on their shared use of narrative.

Narrative as a common form

Much has been written about narrative, including literary and historical narratives. Bruner (1990), in his argument for the return of psychology to a focus on the creation of meaning and human concerns, emphasizes the impact of culture and intentions on our acts and experiences. An important part of the cultural influence is the folk psychology of a society and the narratives created. He speaks of a “readiness or predisposition to organize experience into a narrative form, into plot structures and the rest “ (p. 45). Other writers have stressed that narrative, or storytelling, is a fundamental sense-making tool (Egan, 1997; McKay, 1997; Sipe, 1998) that contextualizes learning and makes it memorable (Barr & McGuire, 1997), and that helps children develop concepts like time and causation (Alleman & Rosaen, 1991; Downey & Levstik, 1991).

Bruner (1990) describes three characteristics of narrative. First, there is sequentiality – a narrative is composed of a sequence of events or mental happenings involving human actors or characters, and these have meaning by their place in the whole, the plot. Second, narrative can be “real” or “imaginary” without loss of its power as a story. Third, narrative specializes in forging links between the exceptional and the ordinary, achieving meaning by providing reasons for deviations from the ordinary. This gives a story verisimilitude.

Bruner (1990) also attends to the dramatic quality of narrative, borrowing from Kenneth Burke to describe narratives in terms of an Actor, an Action, a Goal, a Scene, and an Instrument, plus Trouble. In addition, narratives have what Bruner calls a “dual landscape” of events and actions in a putative “real world” that occur concurrently with mental events in the consciousness of the protagonists. Bruner explains the power of narrative as it deals...with the stuff of human action and human intentionality:

It mediates between the canonical world of culture and the more idiosyncratic world of beliefs, desires, and hopes. It renders the exceptional comprehensible and keeps the uncanny at bay - save as the uncanny is needed as a trope. It reiterates the norms of the society without being didactic. And... it provides a basis for rhetoric without confrontation. It can even teach, conserve, memory, or alter the past.

(p. 52)

Narrative is a universal structure for sense-making. Both history and literary texts draw on the same symbol systems of language and the same general form of narrative, although they may do so in different ways and for different purposes.

Many writers address the characteristics and uses of narrative in relation to literature study. Raphael and Hiebert (1996) draw on literary theory to describe the major elements of narrative as settings, theme, plot, and resolution, and point of view. They describe broad genres of literature with narrative

a

i

n

li

al

fic

to

act

esta

esta

structures for children, including folk literature, fiction (realistic, science fiction-fantasy, historical), biography (and autobiography), some picture books, and some informational storybooks. They contrast narrative texts with expository texts, which include genres that are used to convey information and which take forms such as argumentation, persuasion, or collections of facts. They claim that narrative texts are much easier for children to comprehend.

Rosenblatt (1978) distinguishes between efferent and aesthetic stances toward texts. An efferent stance is taken when we read for information, while an aesthetic stance allows us to read for the experience and emotion the text evokes in us. These two stances are often associated with expository and narrative text respectively, but Rosenblatt notes that either stance can be taken for any kind of literature and cautions against the common attention to efferent stances toward all literature in classrooms.

Bruner (1986, 1990) addresses the distinction between fictional and non-fiction narratives, noting that a “good story” succeeds in part by remaining open to interpretations and social negotiation, by dealing with human intention and action and consequences, and by particularizing experiences. The criteria that establish a good story, a narrative mode, are very different from the criteria that establish a good argument:

Each of the ways of knowing, moreover, has operating principles of its own and its own criteria of well-formedness. They differ radically in their procedures for verification. A good story and a well-formed argument are

This

liter.

diffe

embe

in int

struct

mean

r

t

i

si

(p

different natural kinds. Both can be used as means for convincing another. Yet what they convince *of* is fundamentally different: arguments convince one of their truth, stories of their lifelikeness. The one verifies by eventual appeal to procedures for establishing formal and empirical proof. The other establishes not truth but verisimilitude. (1986, p. 11)

This argument about the different purposes of narrative and argument reflects literary-theory distinctions between narrative and expository text, and also differences between narrative and other historical texts.

Levstik and Pappas (1992) describe some of the benefits of history embedded in narrative for eliciting interest among students and engaging them in interpretation and analysis. They discuss the characteristics of narrative structure that makes it particularly useful in looking at how children become meaning-makers in history:

To begin with, narrative involves the depiction of events that may be spatially and temporally remote from both teller and audience (Toolan, 1988). The reader understands these experiences both as events that have already happened, and as events that are logically and chronologically related. The discourse through which these events are related transforms them from chronology - a list of temporally related events, to history - an interpretation of events. In doing so, narrative shapes events, assigns significance to some events over others, and embeds them all in a culture. (p. 377)

Brophy (1999) also claims that “the narrative mode seems well suited both to history as subject matter and to children as learners” (p. 44), but argues that historical narrative and children’s fiction need to be used judiciously, so that the integrity of the history is not compromised. Gabella (1994) points out that “while historians typically present their interpretations through narrative, the sources upon which they build their interpretations exist in a variety of forms, including oral testimony, music, art, and (in the last 150 years) film” (p. 343). She argues that students need to work with these diverse forms of representations and different source materials. Levstik (1989) also raises cautions about the limitations of a narrative representation of history, while acknowledging that it can help children develop important aspects of historical understanding. She notes that without teacher intervention, children may read narrative as “the truth” and also notes that the narrative form changes historical data by forming a story that implies causal sequence and order, and by moralizing history in ways not supported by historical data.

Levstik and Barton (1997) summarize the research on literature and narrative in history education to show the complexity of the relationship between narrative, history, and historical understanding. The similarities between historical narratives and fictional stories ignore the important differences between the grand narratives of history and the narratives of individual agency of fiction. The particularizing, moralizing, and passion of historical fiction narratives has appeal for children, and the “human behavior”

schema children bring to these works is appropriate. It is less appropriate as a way of understanding the larger political and economic dimensions of historical issues. They suggest a variety of literature and text forms for classroom use because “history is more than a story well told” (p. 91).

Literature and history study share certain characteristics of both humanities content and narrative form. From these similarities, some argue for the “natural” integration of the two subjects. However, while they may share some common focus and forms of expression, there is more to each subject than this area of overlap and both the content and the narrative form also have distinct features within the two different subjects.

This brings me to the next argument for the integration of literature and history study – that the two subject areas complement each other in ways that increase student learning.

Argument: Literature and History Studies Complement Each Other

There are different arguments about how literature and history study complement each other for improving student learning and understanding. Some reflect those made more generally for integration, described in an earlier section of this chapter. These include arguments about motivation and interest of students, relevance to student lives, and making connections across the curriculum that help students make sense of what they are learning and that reinforce learning, from different subject areas.

Most arguments about the benefits of integrating history study and literature study in terms of student literacy learning focus on reinforcement and application of the language arts skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. There is also the assumption that more literature in the curriculum is a “good thing” and that integration is therefore beneficial in terms of introducing students to a larger and more varied selection of literature.

However, McKay (1997) cautions that literature can be abused in the service of other content-area subjects. Her argument is both that literature has an essential role to play in social studies education and that it must be used in social studies for literature’s sake. She refers to Rosenblatt’s (1978) distinction between efferent and aesthetic reading stances, and her argument is based on a consideration of the important aesthetic qualities of literature that, used in history study, “complement a subject area that cannot be mere facts, but includes human feelings and emotions” (p. 349). Similarly, it is these aesthetic qualities that must not be lost when literature is used to complement social studies. She also makes an exception to her position that the role of literature in social studies is first to evoke aesthetic response, to be used as literature. Informational books, while often having aesthetic qualities and values, are primarily written for efferent purposes and can helpfully be approached with that stance.

Shanahan (1997) also is cautious about the benefits of integration for literacy learning. He claims that integration can lead to reductions in the amount of language-arts instruction, and that incidental uses of reading within a larger

inquiry will not necessarily lead to progress in reading. His concern is that “reading is easy to include in all inquiries, though this can lead to practice without instruction. This shows students the value of reading, which is useful, but it does not necessarily help them to read better” (p. 17). Alvermann (1994) adds to this position with cautions about “literary correctness,” reading literature for its own sake and as literature, and with concerns about how trade books are used in classrooms, particularly how teachers learn to recognize potential bias in texts. These authors are wary about the possibility of literature being misused when it is integrated with history study.

Those who argue that the use of literature in history study leads to better student learning of history generally claim that literature complements the teaching of history by providing for aesthetic responses and by humanizing history. Pappas, Kiefer, and Levstik (1990), for example, claim that literature can help recapture the humanity of historical figures, can help children understand the interpretive nature of history, can provide context for the learning, and can bring history to life.

Most of the discussion about the use of literature in history study centers on narrative literature, although the use of informational literature is discussed by some. Many writers argue that narrative structures aid concept and theory development, and make history more memorable. Narrative structures may include biography and fiction, but most writers are primarily concerned with the use of historical fiction.

One area where this often is true is in the comparison of social studies textbooks and children's trade books, and textbooks are generally found wanting in terms of content (emphasis and coverage) and writing (form, text structure, style, and interest). McGowan, Erickson, and Neufeld (1997) review some of the literature addressing this trade book-textbook comparison. They write that proponents of trade books argue that fiction brings historical figures alive for children, that trade books provide more current information than textbooks and in a more engaging manner, and that fiction engages children's imaginations more readily than textbooks.

McGowan, Erickson, and Neufeld (1997) then review the arguments in terms of how well literature addresses the goals of student acquisition of knowledge, skills, and values for civic competence. Claims that students acquire more knowledge necessary for civic competence include the arguments that trade books provide a range of complex understandings, that literature-based reading allows students to link past to present, and that children make meaning in personal ways from literature accounts. The authors agree that these claims are supported to some degree by the evidence. However, although advocates argue that literature-based teaching builds a range of student skills necessary for civic competence, they do not find evidence to support this claim. They also argue that there is little evidence to support the claim that the use of literature in social studies promotes affective growth or the values needed for civic

competence. Their conclusions are very cautious about the benefits of using literature for teaching history:

The number of convincing arguments for social studies instruction based on literary sources far outweighs the amount of published research documenting the extent to which literature-based teaching promotes the knowledge, skills, and values that constitute civic competence. Evidence seems limited, inconclusive, and concentrated on how trade books enhance students' knowledge acquisition. Before embracing the literature-social studies connection without hesitation, educators need expanded research about the effects of this approach, particularly its impact on skill development and values formation (p. 336)

The authors also caution that "advocates use the terms literature, trade book, story, story book, and children's literature synonymously to identify any written account that is not a textbook, whether the work is poetry, fiction, biography, or nonfiction" (p. 87).

Levstik (1989, 1993) has written extensively about the use of literature with history study and is careful to distinguish among the different types of literature. She agrees that historical narratives, especially fiction, may inspire children and help them identify with historical figures and times; they may be easier for children to understand than expository text; and they may provide a safe context for the exploration of areas of human experience. Narrative's emphasis on human response to historical events may in fact be the beginning of

historical understanding and a precursor to critical analysis of history, as Egan (1997) suggests.

However, Levstik's (1989) research also shows young children being noncritical of the narrative, treating it as authoritative, and making moralistic judgments without weighing evidence. Levstik argues that narrative, and particularly historical fiction accounts, are inadequate for developing historical understanding and thinking. She suggests texts that provide for subjective responses be used in concert with critical analysis of historical data sources. She argues that well-written, historically-sound narratives can support informed and disciplined entry into events and into expository texts (Levstik, 1993, Levstik & Barton, 1997).

Levstik and Barton (1997) also outline criteria for selecting good narrative history: Does the book tell a good story? Is the story accurate and authentic in its historical detail, including the setting and the known events of history? Is the language authentic to the flavor of the times? Is the historical interpretation sound? Whose voices are missing? Does the book provide insight and understanding into current issues as well as those in the past? Attention to these questions can help teachers avoid historical narratives that distort or trivialize history in ways that have been discussed by other writers (Alleman & Brophy, 1993; Brophy, 1999).

Although most writers address the use of historical fiction with history study, biographies are a narrative form that draws some attention. Zarnowski

(1997) advocates the use of biographies because they resemble the fictional stories with which children are familiar, but without the confusing mix of fact and fantasy that historical fiction involves. This raises an important critique of historical fiction – the degree to which it may confuse children about what is historically accurate and what is fiction. Kazemek (1997) is less positive about biographies, cautioning that biographies may be prone to the same problems as historical fiction, such as distortions and generalities, lack of acknowledgement of a person's shortcomings, inaccurate representation of a person's historical role, lack of balance, and false impressions about historical movements and results.

Levstik and Barton (1997) remind readers about the increasing number of non-fiction, expository selections of literature beyond textbooks that are available to complement history study, and they urge the use of a variety of texts and genres. They also provide criteria for selecting non-fiction literature: What are the author's qualifications? How accurate and complete are the facts? Is the book up to date? Does the author distinguish between fact and supposition? How well is the book organized? What literary distinction does the book have? Again, attention to these criteria can mitigate against some of the problems identified with the misuse of literature in the teaching of history.

Integration of language arts and social studies incorporates numerous and complex issues and possibilities. Looking at history and literature study narrows the arena somewhat, but the research shows that it is still complex. Although many writers, especially from a literary perspective, assume and claim a number

of benefits for student learning, serious examination raises many questions and cautions. Literature, although only one part of literacy learning, includes narrative texts of historical fiction and biography as well as expository texts and other genres. The evidence from classrooms points to both advantages and disadvantages associated with the use of different kinds of literature with history study. I shall explore many of these complex relationships between subjects, texts, and student learning as I discuss the findings of my study. First, I shall describe the research design of the study.

1

f

s

in

co

ab

sh

mo

Fra

was

revie

desig

litera

show

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

This study was a qualitative, observational case study of two units of interdisciplinary curriculum enacted in one, self-contained fifth-grade classroom between January and May of 1998. It explored the opportunities for student learning and for different kinds of learner connections encouraged by different forms of curricular integration. The overarching question was, "What kinds of student learning and connections are encouraged by different forms of curricular integration?"

I shall first explain how my choice of research questions grew out of the concerns raised for me by the related literature on integration and how choices about my research design and setting grew primarily out of these questions. I shall then describe the setting and methods of data collection and analysis in more detail.

A. Research Choices

Framing Questions

My research was based in qualitative traditions, and the inquiry process was recursive rather than purely linear. However, the relations between my review of the literature and my central question, and between question and design can clearly be traced. An outline of the relationships between the literature, my framing questions, choices of setting, and research methods is shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1.

Relationships between concerns arising from integration literature, and the choice of research questions, research framework, and site.

Concerns about literature	Framing Questions	Research Framework & Design Study	Site Selection
Lack of empirical evidence of student learning	Focus on student learning: - What kinds of learning and connections are encouraged by different approaches to integration? - What are students learning about the literature/history curriculum content? - What are students learning about literature /history study?	Qualitative research to obtain a detailed, contextualized description of student learning	- One self-contained classroom - 5th grade students who can verbalize their understandings
Lack of shared understandings about integration issues and approaches	Question focuses on the variety of approaches and the possible differences in student learning	Comparative case study of 2 integrated units, to compare different forms	One setting for 2 units of study, to minimize possible confounding effects in comparison
Assumptions about values and characteristics of integration	Claims about student learning from integration and student connections across various dimensions used as framework for data collection and analysis	Data collected about learning and student connections in 2 different units and comparisons made across the units.	One classroom setting enables distinction between actual characteristics of curricular integration form and other characteristics of enactment by teacher classroom

7

t

b

b

d

w

d

ap

in

lea

qu

app

ass

In Chapter 1, I described three major concerns arising from my review of the integration literature: (1) the lack of empirical evidence of student learning from integrated curriculum; (2) the lack of shared understandings about issues and approaches addressed in the literature on integration; and (3) the many assumptions made about the value and characteristics of curriculum integration. My research questions addressed these concerns.

My major focus in this study was on student learning and understanding. There is a lack of empirical evidence to support the thesis that integrated teaching and curriculum necessarily impact student learning. There is a tension between constructivist learning theory and integration arguments purported to be based on this theory. There are questions to be answered about who it is that does the integrating – teacher and curriculum, or learners. This study therefore was designed as an observational case study that would yield close, rich descriptions of student learning in one classroom.

My review of literature about integration also showed a huge variety of approaches and classroom practices, and a lack of shared understanding of what integration means in practice. My central question asked, “What kinds of learning are encouraged by different approaches to integrated curricula?” This question recognized this variety of approaches and the probability that different approaches may lead to different outcomes in terms of student learning.

The study also addressed the problem I identified in the literature of assumptions that are made about the value and characteristics of integration.

Many benefits are commonly claimed for integration, and I used these claims as a framework for examining my empirical data. Advocates of integration claim improved student learning of content and of learning processes, and more positive attitudes toward learning. My analysis of student learning focused on these questions: "What are students learning about the subject matter of the unit taught?"; and "What are students learning about history and literacy study as subjects?" Advocates of integration also claim that integrated curriculum leads to improved connection-making by students across subjects and with their own lives and experiences in the world outside the classroom. My analysis again drew on these claims to examine what connections students were making across subjects, across time within each subject, and with their own lives and the real world. My research questions and analysis were framed in terms of the major claims and assumptions made by advocates of integration.

Choosing a Research Orientation

My research questions asked about student learning and the connections that students make across various dimensions of the curriculum and their lives. My questions asked for descriptions of the kinds of student learning rather than quantifiable amounts of learning. They asked for an understanding of the complex relationships between curricular organization and student learning. These kinds of questions are best answered through research that provides a "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) of the complexities of teaching and learning in context over a sustained period of time. Such a description aims at developing

o

i

a

a

g

th

p

re

a

m

ac

ch

so

co

an

Ea

a fr

me

“grounded theory” (Glaser & Strauss, 1975) from the detailed data of a particular context. My research design therefore was qualitative or naturalistic in terms of its goals, design, sampling, and methods. I aimed to understand relationships and meanings in a natural classroom setting in all its complexity.

My study began with broad questions that arose out of personal interests and experiences, and a close reading of integration literature. These questions guided my choice of a qualitative approach to research. The research itself led to the development of further questions as these emerged from the study in progress. This recursive, reflexive process is at the heart of qualitative inquiry, responding to the context, the participants, and the developing study. It allowed a responsiveness to the individual participants in the classroom setting and to my developing understandings.

A qualitative approach to research was the most promising framework for addressing my questions and interests. Bogdan and Biklen (1992) describe these characteristics of qualitative research: it has the natural setting as the direct source of data and the researcher is the key instrument; it is descriptive; it is concerned with process rather than simply with outcomes or products; data are analyzed inductively; and it is primarily concerned with participants’ meanings. Each of these characteristics was relevant to the kind of study I conducted. Such a framework then suggested particular choices about setting, time, and methodology.

1

s

a

c

c

in

co

cl

(F

stu

fo

int

nee

or i

two

in ir

Selecting a Site

My focus was on student learning from integrated curriculum. Such a focus requires in-depth encounters with students as they experience and reflect on the curriculum. Qualitative case-study research design and methodology are most suited to such questions (Stake, 1988). Therefore, I chose to focus my study in one classroom where I was able to gather rich, descriptive data from sixteen students over a period of five months by becoming involved in the classroom as a participant-observer through informal and semi-structured interviews, and by collecting artifacts of their school work. I was also able to work closely with the classroom teacher, to better understand her thinking about the curriculum and integration. The focused setting enabled a rich, multi-layered view of the complex interactions between curriculum, teaching, and learning in this classroom.

This classroom was the setting, the context for a focused case study (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983). The classroom provided the setting for a case study of the relations between integrated curriculum and student learning. The focus on one classroom helped to distinguish characteristics that are inherent in integration from those that are commonly associated with integration but not necessarily inherent in particular enactments of it, such as teacher characteristics or instructional practices. I was able to examine the differences in learning from two units taught by the same teacher, with the same children, with few changes in instructional practices.

org

one

also

ord

way

mon

a nu

teach

cont

poss

instr

the c

credi

differ

curric

with c

acade

chang

studen

within

My central question asked about the influences of different curricular organizations of integrated units on student learning. A qualitative case study in one classroom permits close attention to student learning. However, my question also made it desirable to observe different forms of curricular integration in order to examine how these different forms influenced student learning. One way to do this might have been to do a comparative case study across two or more classrooms. However, such a comparison would need to take into account a number of differences between the two contexts -- differences between teachers, instructional practices, student populations, classroom and school contexts, and so on. There are studies of integration that fail to separate out possible effects on student learning such as team teaching or particular instructional practices from the form of integrated curriculum being used, and the claims of such studies about the benefits of integration are consequently less credible. It was important to minimize the number of factors that might impact differences in student learning so that the influence of the particular forms of curricular integration on learning could more easily be traced.

The context of this study was one self-contained, fifth-grade classroom, with one classroom teacher working with the same group of students across the academic year. However, she designed and taught two different integrated units, changing the form of curricular organization in ways that did indeed influence student learning in interesting ways. These two cases of integration were studied within that one classroom, each of these curricular units was analyzed, and then

comparisons of student learning were made across the two units. This case study addressed the impact of curricular form on learning, while the focus on one classroom helped distinguish between curriculum effects on student learning and other possible effects.

Selecting Participants

My research questions called for a single, self-contained classroom with a teacher who “integrated” the curriculum and was interested in thinking more about ways to do this. I spoke with several teachers, based on recommendations from principals, teachers, and colleagues. Terri¹ was identified as a possible classroom teacher to work with because of her interest and enthusiasm, and her willingness to try changing her approach to curriculum integration in the middle of the year based on the conversations we would have about possible ways to do this. Terri’s classroom was selected after conversations and visits with many teachers who had been recommended to me on the basis of their interest in integration and their strong teaching qualities. Terri was recommended to me as a thoughtful, articulate teacher who was a good classroom teacher and someone who wanted to continue her own learning.

Terri’s classroom also was selected because it was fifth grade, a grade at which it was believed students would be able to verbalize and evidence their learning and understandings. It is also an elementary grade and a self-contained

¹ All names are pseudonyms

h
i
e
s
c
a
a
w
p

classroom and so I could focus on the influence of curricular organization on student learning without having to consider team-teaching effects. Also, Terri integrated language arts and social studies and used historical fiction literature to support her teaching of the fifth-grade U.S. History curriculum. This is quite common in terms of the subjects integrated at the elementary level and the uses of literature in integration. This setting was in many ways representative of integration practices at the elementary level.

My selection of Terri's classroom as a site for study was based primarily on her own interest in the study and also on my consideration of grade level, curriculum, and her integration plans. Although the focus of my study was student learning, the selection of student participants was dependent on the selection of the teacher and classroom. After gaining access to the school and classroom, I designed consent forms to be sent home to parents of each student in the class. I studied all the students for whom I received parental and student consent. I chose to gather interview, work sample, and observational data for all sixteen students across the five-month period in which I was involved in the classroom. This enabled me to identify commonalities and patterns of learning across the whole group as well as discrepant cases. From these data I was more able to contextualize the responses of individual students within the class as a whole, noting how they were representative of a larger group of students for any particular aspect of my study.

Time Choices

My research questions led to a qualitative approach to my study that could best capture the complex relations between teaching, learning, and curriculum in one classroom context and among several learners and their teacher. One of the major characteristics of observational studies is their sustained nature across time in one context.

My questions influenced my decisions about time, since I needed to observe the influences of two cases of integration in one classroom - with the same students, teacher, and classroom context. This meant limiting my study to one academic year when this classroom group would be together. In consultation with Terri, the classroom teacher, and taking into consideration practical issues such as human subjects approval and parental consent, we decided that I would observe a unit in January/February and a second unit in April/May. This allowed the students to become established in the classroom routines before I became involved in the classroom. I was able to come into the class after the winter break, a natural second "beginning" in the rhythm of schools and classrooms. I was able to analyze the first unit for several weeks before the second unit was implemented, and therefore be better able to contribute understandings from that unit to the planning of the second unit.² Then I conducted post-unit interviews with students and the teacher after the second unit and before the school year ended. This planned timetable was adjusted as

we progressed, in response to classroom needs and timeframes. A timeline of the major phases of data collection, as they actually occurred, is shown in Figure 3.1.

Jan. '98	Feb. '98	March '98	April '98	May '98	June '98
Access and consent	Unit I-----			Unit II-----	
Pre-Unit interviews -	"Revolutionary War"		Analysis of Unit I	"Civil War and Freedoms"	
Teacher/students	Participant observation		Planning with Terri for Unit II	Participant observation	
				Final student interviews and card sort activities	

Figure 3.1 Data collection timeline.

I chose to become a regular member of the classroom at specific times of day across both units, for several months. I was present during the morning literacy block that included the teacher's "Read Aloud" to the whole class and then the partner reading in Book Clubs. I also was a participant observer for every social studies class (except for occasional classes when the timetable had to be changed unexpectedly). I became an expected member of the classroom at these times. I also scheduled some student interviews at other times, such as journal time, particularly near the end of the school year when time was becoming critical. For the most part, I was a regular participant in the classroom on a daily basis for literacy and social studies classes. As time went on, the children and teacher anticipated my presence and showed no surprise or discomfort by my presence. I moved from being a stranger in the room to being a participant, in part, because of the consistency of my visits.

² For further understanding of this research design, see the next section

Negotiating Teacher and Researcher Roles

The research design explicitly recognized the negotiation of teacher and researcher roles at different points in the inquiry process, as well as the on-going negotiation of roles inherent in qualitative research. The study included three major phases: (1) participant observation and examination of the teaching of an integrated curricular unit, learning the students evidenced, and the kind of connections they made within and across subjects and with their own lives; (2) teacher and researcher planning together for a second unit with a different integrating theme and organization; and (3) participant observation of this second unit. These teacher and researcher roles were discussed and negotiated with the teacher for each phase.

Choices about this particular research design were based on the research questions and also on my beliefs about the participation of the classroom teacher in the design and process of this research. The research questions themselves necessitated close case-study analysis of classroom activities and student engagement in learning, as well as an opportunity to examine two different forms of integrated curriculum enacted in one classroom. The teacher planned and taught an integrated unit in February and March. The second phase then enabled me and the teacher to reflect together on the connections and learning that students had demonstrated during that unit, and to collaborate on the planning of a second curricular unit to be taught in May. The teacher then

taught that unit with me acting again as a participant observer. This design was consistent with the questions being addressed.

The design also took into consideration the needs and rights of the classroom teacher and was negotiated between researcher and teacher. This is consistent with an approach to research that recognizes the importance of involving participants in the research/inquiry process, and being involved with it as it unfolds. Such an approach emphasizes the need for research that is research for teaching as well as research on teaching (Noddings, 1986). Terri was interested in trying different approaches to integrating curriculum but did not have a great deal of experience or many models to consider. She was invited to become involved in the research in a number of ways.

Terri was interested in the potential for learning more about integration and her own classroom practice as the research progressed. She was particularly interested in thinking about different approaches to integration, different forms that curricular integration might take, and what these might look like in her classroom. Together, we planned this research design.

After the first unit had been taught, the teacher and I brought our observations and thoughts to a discussion about alternative forms of integrating literature and social studies. We brainstormed together, drawing particularly on the work of Roland Case (1991a) as it related to aspects of integration we were considering. Terri then chose to adapt her May unit in a couple of significant

ways and planned the unit from that discussion, and her own goals and prior experiences with the subject matter.

The research design allowed me to study two different instances of integration and allowed for teacher voice and participation in the research process. A personal letter after the end of the school year expressed the value of this experience for Terri:

The different models of integration that you brought forward were ones that I hadn't really considered before. They were challenges to my lens of teaching, the way in which I usually interpret a teaching task. With your thought and guidance, I expanded my horizons of how integration can be conceived and carried out. I hope to be able to continue some of that work in the coming years, even without the immediate push of your thoughtful questions. (personal communication, July 6, 1998)

For Terri, the research design enabled her to learn more about integration as the study progressed and to influence the study design in ways that were consistent with her instructional needs.

For me, the role most helpful throughout this study was that of participant-observer. This is consistent with qualitative research that seeks to understand the complexities of classroom practice by the researcher becoming part of a setting for an extended period of time. Also consistent with this research tradition, my role varied along the participant/observer continuum across time.

My relationship with Terri developed somewhat from being an “outsider” observing and asking questions about her classroom practices and students to being more of an “insider” who shared experiences with her and the class, and had insights that could be helpful to her from my observer role. Inside the classroom, I usually assumed a role that allowed me to interact with the students as participants in their classroom life and activities, rather than as another teacher. However, sometimes Terri asked me to take a teacher role temporarily, as when she had to take a student to the office, or a group needed specific help. This occurred more often later in the year, presumably as she became comfortable with me being there. I also shared some of the “work” of teaching – running copies, coming in on a Saturday to help her get materials together, brainstorming ideas for the second unit, and then going to the bookstore with her to hunt down resources. At these times, there was an increased sense of working together for the benefit of the students.

With the students, I began by being more of an observer than participant and gradually became more of a participant as children became comfortable with my presence and my involvement. I found it rather counter-productive to be seen in a teacher role by the students, and this was sometimes uncomfortable for me, given Terri’s increasing likelihood to see me as a colleague, sharing some perspectives on the class and some tasks. However, overall I was able to balance the roles of observer and participant-observer without damaging my credibility with teacher or students.

During whole-group, Read Aloud time, I was an observer. During direct teaching I was also an observer. When the children were working individually or in reading pairs or small groups, I circulated among them, sometimes listening to conversations and sometimes asking questions. Sometimes they would find me to make a comment or ask a question. Some questions were for clarification about classroom tasks, some were personal questions about where I was from or how old my children were, and some were related to their understanding of the subject matter.

When I took students out of the room, in their Book Club reading pairs for early interviews and mid-study conversations, and then individually at the end of the study, they understood that I was trying to learn more about what they did and thought. One student was reluctant to share with me, and refused to be audiotaped. Others were either enthusiastic about the opportunity to talk or neutral, but mostly helpful. The students knew whether or not their parents had returned consent forms, and I interviewed all those for whom I had consent. Therefore none of those students felt slighted by a lack of attention to them. I welcomed conversation informally with all students, as a participant in their classroom. All students in the study suggested pseudonyms I could use in referring to them for my study, and this I did.

B. Data Collection and Analysis

Access and Consent

I visited Terri's classroom in September 1997 to observe the class and to meet Terri and the children. Terri and I talked as I developed my research plans. I also obtained human subjects permission for my study during the Fall of 1997.

I met with Terri again in early January 1998 to interview her about her beliefs and purposes, focusing particularly on the integration of social studies and literacy. At that point, I obtained written consent from Terri for her participation (See Appendix A for interview protocol). Together we made more specific plans for my visits.

I then visited the school again. I spoke with the principal and outlined my research plans and obtained her verbal consent for my study. I had worked in this school in various capacities in the past, and the school had a culture that encouraged research links with the university through the Professional Development School projects and relationships developed over many years. Therefore, access to the school was not a problem.

I also visited the classroom in January and introduced the project to the students, obtaining initial verbal student assent. Throughout the project, I obtained verbal student assent from individual children whenever I audiotaped our conversations or conducted semi-structured interviews. I also sent letters and consent forms to parents of all the students in Terri's classroom (21 at that point in the school year) and began pre-unit interviews with the students as I

obtained parental and student consent (See Appendix B for Student interview protocol). I obtained parental consent from the parents of 16 students and collected data from each of those students.

During January 1998, Terri was finishing a social studies unit on Colonization with the students, with related historical fiction in Book Clubs and Read Aloud sessions. I used this time to take students out of the room in their reading pairs and do pre-interviews with them about their perceptions of these subject areas and their prior knowledge for the next social studies unit. One student, who asked to be called Michael in my study, commonly refused permission to be audiotaped, although he would join informal and semi-structured interview discussions. He soon learned that he really could turn off the tape recorder when he wanted to speak, and so he could be part of the conversations without being taped.

Data Sources and Analysis - Overview

My research involved two cases of integration in one classroom. Methods of data collection and analysis were consistent with a qualitative, comparative, case-study approach, as described earlier, and with my research questions. (Appendix C presents the major questions, data sources, and analytical strategies of my study.) I collected preliminary data about Terri's beliefs, purposes, and practices, in integrating the curriculum and in her teaching of literacy and social studies. I also collected preliminary data about the students' perceptions of literacy and social studies. For each case of integration, the unit on the

Revolutionary War and the unit on the Civil War and Freedom, I collected the same kinds of data from my participant-observer role and informal interviews. At the end of the year, I also conducted a card-sort activity during a final interview with individual students to gather summary data. These data collection phases and strategies are outlined in Figure 3.2.

<u>Preliminary</u> <u>Data Sources</u>	<u>Unit I</u> <u>Data Sources</u>	<u>Unit II</u> <u>Data Sources</u>	<u>Concluding</u> <u>Data Sources</u>
Semi-structured Interviews - Students Teacher Artifacts - Student work	Semi-structured interviews - students- ---- Informal interviews - students and teacher-- Artifacts- student work ----- - curriculum documents ----- Field notes and reflective memos -----		Semi-structured interviews - students Card Sort activity

Figure 3.2. Summary of data sources at different points in the study.

Having outlined the major phases of data collection, the kinds of data collected at each stage, and the relationships between my questions, my data sources, and my analytical strategies, I shall now describe my data collection and analysis in more detail.

Field Notes

As an observer and a participant observer in the classroom, I recorded field notes. These were primarily descriptive notes, recording the activities and conversations I observed. I noted the major activity segments of lessons, the directions given by the teacher, and the behaviors, body language, and responses of students. In teacher-directed lessons, I scripted much of the lesson as it happened, noting speakers and quoting directly wherever possible. I also recorded the passage of time at regular intervals. I also copied overhead, poster,

or chalkboard notations presented by Terri during her instruction. I also recorded references to textbook and other materials.

My field notes also included reflective memos recording ideas and thoughts about what I was observing. Here I commented on interesting occurrences or comments, my developing hunches and questions, and patterns I saw emerging. Some reflective memos were made as I took descriptive field notes. Others were made later as I reviewed my notes after leaving the classroom for the day, or after a longer interval. I also noted my own frame of mind and questions or concerns about methodology or ethical issues related to research in the classroom.

I analyzed my field notes in conjunction with audiotape transcripts of each lesson and interaction or when typing up my notes and doing further content analysis of them as a separate data source where they did not accompany audiotaped data.

Audiotaping

In addition to taking field notes, I used a small tape recorder to audiotape classroom lessons and activities so that I could have a detailed record of these interactions to analyze more closely. The students and teacher were aware of the tape recorder. I audiotaped discussions arising from the Read Aloud sessions in the morning, taping conversations but not the teacher reading from the novel. I simply noted pages and marked passages in my copy of the book. I taped the teacher-led portions of social studies lessons – often the entire lesson. I also taped

most teacher-led portions of Book Club sessions. In addition, I walked around with the tape recorder to capture informal conversations with students as they worked individually or in small groups. I recorded all semi-structured interviews with the teacher and students, and transcribed these verbatim in a format that allowed for reflective comments alongside the transcript.

The audiotape record allowed me to note intonation, concurrent conversations, pauses, and so forth not captured by my field notes. The transcripts permitted a close analysis of student and teacher language and conversation. The observational field notes and audiotapes provided complementary data as well as a check on the accuracy of my field notes.

Interviews

I conducted both semi-structured and informal interviews with both teacher and students at different times through the data-collection period. Semi-structured interviews were always audiotaped and transcribed. Informal interviews were sometimes audiotaped, sometimes recorded in field notes, and sometimes recorded afterwards with “jotted” notes.

Preliminary information was gathered primarily through document analysis and semi-structured interviews, which were designed to discover more about teacher and student perceptions, understandings, and practices. My initial interview with Terri asked questions about her beliefs about subjects and disciplines, about integration, about student learning and making connections. I

also asked about her purposes and classroom practices in literacy, social studies, and the integration of those two subjects.

In my initial interviews with students, I asked about Book Club and social studies, and allowed for comments and conversation about the curriculum and their school experiences. These initial interviews were conducted with pairs of children who were reading novels together. This had advantages in terms of students' comfort level this early in the study, and also in terms of building on each other's comments. It sometimes had the disadvantage of favoring the views of one student who was more inclined to speak. With the students particularly, these initial interviews were a helpful way of introducing me not only to their beliefs and understandings but also to their individual personalities.

Concluding information was gathered through a final interview with students and a card-sort activity. This final interview with each student was individual, audiotaped, and semi-structured. I asked questions designed to assess their learning of literacy and history across the year and to better understand their thinking. As with the preliminary interviews, the interview guide (and the card-sort activity) helped structure the conversations, but these were also responsive to the individual child and the flow of conversation.

After the first unit and in preparation for the second unit, I met with Terri to talk about our observations of the first unit and to plan for the second unit. This conversation was audiotaped and guided by some general questions we each brought to the interview. However, it was in many ways an informal

discussion that was co-constructed. It became more informal still as we began to work together to gather and analyze possible resources with the tape recorder off.

Other informal interviews occurred almost daily throughout the data-collection period as I spoke with teacher and students as they went about the daily classroom activities of teaching and learning. Sometimes these were taped if students consented and the tape recorder was handy. Sometimes they were recorded with notes taken at the time or reconstructed shortly afterwards. These informal interviews often captured comments and insights that occurred to people after the formal lesson period was over and therefore were an important source of data.

Artifacts

I collected two major kinds of artifacts – copies of student work and curriculum documents. At the beginning of my interactions with Terri, I collected classroom information such as student lists and groupings, weekly and yearly planning schedules, and the handbook Terri had designed for parents. I also collected school and district calendars, a map of the school, and district social studies objectives and curriculum guidelines for fifth grade. I made a map of the classroom and the major areas and materials available, and copied the posters and information that were on the walls. This helped me become familiar with routines and ways of working in this classroom, and also helped me consider major emphases identified by the teacher.

As Terri planned for the two units that I was observing, she gave me copies of her social studies plans and notes. Interestingly, she did not have similar plans for the literacy portion of these units. She also gave me copies of the supplemental readings she was using, and I noted the references for all books read and available to students in Book Clubs and teacher Read Alouds. I also copied the chapters of the social studies textbook that were the bases of the units I observed being taught.

I collected and copied student work from Book Club and social studies across the two units I observed. I did this at regular intervals across the units for all 16 students in my study. I also copied the entire social studies and Book Club folders for one student across the whole year. I selected the folders of a student who was rarely absent and who regularly completed assignments both in class and for homework and titled and dated these. This became a useful reference for me in identifying the papers of some other students. It also allowed me to recognize learning-task patterns and routines, as well as when something new occurred. I also copied the reading logs of each student, to help me identify the reading patterns and levels of the students, and consider how these might influence their literacy learning.

Content analysis of classroom documents was particularly helpful in letting me know the classroom, routines, and learning materials early in my study. Curriculum documents allowed me to access Terri's planning and to better understand the resources she and the students were using. Student work

samples helped me determine what students were making of the curriculum individually and sometimes gave me a starting point for conversations with them or questions to pursue.

Card-Sort Activity

My final interview with individual students utilized a card sort activity to prompt student responses of their own thinking about Book Club and social studies across the year. The card sort activity was designed to help me find out some specific things about student learning and also to encourage open-ended responses that could help me learn more about the connections students were making within and across subjects. The whole interview lasted between twenty and thirty minutes for most of the 16 students. (See Appendix D for final student interview protocol.)

I began by showing students seven index cards with historical events or periods written on them and reading these to them as I “dealt” them onto the table in random order. Some students chose to read the cards themselves and often commented on them as they did so. These comments were recorded on audiotape.

The seven original cards were: Native Americans, Colonization, Revolutionary War, Westward Expansion, Civil War, World War II, Vietnam War. These were the names given by the teacher to social studies units or Book Club group topics studied that year. Students had studied Native Americans, Colonization, the Revolutionary War, Westward Expansion, and the Civil War,

as separate units in social studies in that order, between September and May. They had briefly studied the Vietnam War through a unit led by student teachers that ran concurrently with their Revolutionary War unit and included writing workshop and computer reports. Different groups of students had read from non-fiction literature “baskets” during Book Club sessions. These included Civil War and World War II as topics. The cards were designed to help students recall the unit titles of periods studied in ways that would be familiar to them.

Students were first asked, “Why do you think I chose those?,” and then told, “They are all important times and events in the history of our nation. Can you put them in the order in which they happened?” A concern that arose from a review of literature and from my observations of the first unit was related to students’ ability to develop chronological, historical thinking across units. This activity helped me find out more about that. It gave me specific information about students’ chronological understanding and it also helped me find out which students were thoughtful about the rather simplistic designations of Native Americans and Westward Expansion, which did not necessarily refer to one particular historical event and therefore could not easily be sequenced.

I next added “subject” cards with all the classroom subjects, as named by Terri and the students across the year in daily schedules, work folders, and textbooks. These cards were: whole group (teacher Read Aloud), Book Club, social studies, writing workshop, science, math, and computers. I also had a card called “Me and my life.” Students were asked to use as many or as few as they

liked and to put these cards with the “history” cards in any way they wanted in order to show how they connected. They did this on chart paper, and together we recorded their thinking with markers. They explained why they sorted the cards in the ways they did. This gave me valuable information about their thinking about the different school subjects and where they thought they had learned about different topics. It was interesting to note where students correctly identified the subjects in which they had learned something, but particularly interesting to note where they had misconceptions or confusions, and where they clarified the kinds of “learning” or other activity they had done in different subjects for one topic.

I next removed the “subject” cards and added six more cards to the seven original “history” cards. These new cards were: Freedom, Conflict, Constitution, Women’s Rights, Immigrants, Civil Rights. These were chosen because they represented some of the major emphases of the curriculum, particularly the last Book Club groups, and reflected unit or group “titles.” Final Book Club groups had included Women’s Rights, Immigrants, and Civil Rights (as well as Civil War and World War II, which were already on cards included in this activity). The Constitution had been a major focus of the curriculum both for the Revolutionary War unit and as an introduction to the Civil War unit. Freedom had been Terri’s major focus for the integration of social studies and Book Clubs during the last unit. Conflict was selected because it was central to so many of

the units and Book Club issues represented, although it was not a word that students had necessarily been asked to be familiar with through the curriculum.

Students again were asked to organize as many of the cards as they wanted to, to show how they connected with each other. We recorded these connections on the chart paper, and they explained their choices. I then asked them to pick one card that connected with the most other cards and to show me why they picked it. This helped me find out some of the themes or stories that students used to make sense of the curriculum. Finally, if they had not already selected it, I asked them to show me how the “Me and My Life” card connected with any other cards. This helped me find out how students were thinking of the school curriculum in terms of its relevance to their own lives.

At the end of this interview, I removed all the previous cards and presented students with eight more cards with names on them. These cards were: Abraham Lincoln, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Harriet Tubman, Emma Edmunds, Stephen Austin, and Patience Whipple. I asked them to sort these into two piles – those people who had really lived, and those who had not. The cards were selected because they were names that had been part of social studies or Read Aloud for all students. This provided some valuable information about students’ reading of fiction and non-fiction, and their understanding of the differences between the two.

The card-sort activity gave me some specific information about individual student learning in social studies and Book Clubs across the year. It was also

very helpful in prompting students to talk about their learning and the connections they had made within and across subjects. It provided support or explanations for other observations and data gathered from student work, interviews, and audiotaped lessons.

As I gave the card sort activity to students, I realized that for some students, it was a record of previous thinking and learning, whereas for other students, it contributed to new thinking and learning. These students were generally very excited as they began to make new connections between different parts of the curriculum. Perhaps more noticeably than with other data sources and assessment tools, the card sort activity not only provided data but prompted new understandings for students. This suggested that an activity like the card-sort activity has potential as an instructional tool, as well as an assessment tool, helping students to process and synthesize information and make connections in personally-meaningful ways. I shall return to this in a later chapter.

Data Analysis and Triangulation

I have described multiple sources of data collected across the course of my study. I collected documentary information and interview records as preliminary data, and for information about the classroom I was entering and its members. I continued to collect data from documentary sources and audiotaped interviews and from observational field notes and informal interviews across each of the two units I studied. I collected summary data based on a card-sort activity and semi-structured interview with each of the 16 students.

Throughout data collection, I was also engaged in ongoing analysis of the data. I regularly transcribed tapes of lessons and interviews, and reflected on my observations and interactions in the classroom. My preliminary content analyses of these transcripts and of the student work I was collecting influenced further observations and interview questions as I began to sense emerging themes in the data.

I elected to collect data from all 16 of the students for whom I had obtained parental consent. I coded data from each of the semi-structured interviews, and I compared responses across different student accounts as well as across the two different units for each student and for the teacher. I was able to note representative cases as well as negative or discrepant ones. This was important in helping me to identify common themes. I could put individual student learning into the larger context of the whole group. Comparative analysis was important across student responses, across teacher and student responses, across pre-and post-unit responses in each case, and across the two units observed.

Triangulation is the process of collecting data and verifying assertions or trends in the data across several different data sources or accounts of the same event. I used artifacts, interviews, and field notes to provide evidential support for preliminary conclusions. For any one student or the teacher, I could check different data sources to corroborate a claim. For any one episode or example of learning, I could check the data from different students. For any individual

student, the data from other students contextualized what he/she had learned.

Often this would mean showing how one student was representative of the group as a whole, or it could mean showing one student as a special case.

In my study, I aimed to find out in what ways student learning or connections might have been influenced by different forms of curricular integration. This led to a design and forms of data collection that would enable a comparative analysis across two different integrated units. A classroom is a complex and unpredictable place, and a purely experimental study would have been impossible to conduct and inappropriate as a way of representing the rich complexities involved. However, I collected data from similar sources across both units. For example, I collected data from the same students, and I analyzed the data using similar coding and analytical frameworks. Precisely because these were two conceptually and instructionally different units, the student work, classroom lessons, and activities were different in each case. These differences in instructional and discourse strategies, for example, became part of the interesting data to compare. Comparative analysis of the two cases was possible with detailed examination of the data gathered from multiple sources across each unit.

I shall now examine each of the two observed integrated curriculum units, describing the planned curriculum, the enacted curriculum, and the kinds of connections students made within subjects, across subjects, and with their own lives.

CHAPTER FOUR

UNIT ONE: THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR

A. Description of Classroom and Program Context

At the time of this study, Terri had been teaching for two years, including working with several of these same students in fourth grade the previous year. She had done a fifth-year, student-teaching internship in the same school, working with an experienced mentor who modeled integration of social studies and literature. Terri was recognized by her principal, her colleagues, and university faculty with whom she had worked as an articulate and thoughtful professional despite her relatively novice status as a classroom teacher.

Terri had 21 students in her classroom in September, nine girls and twelve boys. Of these students, I obtained parental consent to gather data from 16 students, five girls and 11 boys. The students exhibited a range of abilities on standardized tests and according to teacher reports.

Overview of Classroom Use of Time

Terri's daily planning included a literacy block from 9:00 to 10:30 each morning. This consisted of a half-hour, teacher "Read Aloud" time in which children gathered in the reading corner on pillows on the floor, eating a snack, while Terri sat in the rocking chair and read aloud from a novel. They then had Book Clubs when they settled into a corner of the room or at their desks with a partner and took turns reading from a novel that they had chosen from a selection of novels made available to the class on a particular theme. Sometimes

students read together for a full hour, and sometimes they read for half an hour and then answered common questions from the overhead with reference to their particular novel. The teacher circulated around the room, listening to some students read, asking questions about their understanding of the novel, or monitoring behavior.

Following the literacy block, the students had recess time and then came back for an hour of science, social studies, writing workshop, or spelling. The rest of the day varied slightly according to the day of the week, but included daily math for an hour, occasional gym and music "specials," computer lab time, additional science or social studies, and mandated programs such as Drug Awareness Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.). The literacy program included journal writing for fifteen minutes daily, generally after lunch. There was also a writing workshop "mini-lesson" focusing on writing skills and strategies for one half-hour period a week, with a total of one-and-a-half hours of writing workshop during the week. Social studies was allocated a half hour once a week and another one hour later in the week.

Terri planned her teaching across the year in terms of the following subjects: literacy, writing, math, science, social studies, and computers. She blocked time within each of these subjects for units designed to last four to six weeks. She had a chart that indicated how each subject would progress across the year and what students would be studying in each subject at a particular

1

H

in

A

P

an

pr

jou

a p

time. (See Appendix E for Tables showing Terri's planned use of weekly time and planned units across the year.)

On this chart, Terri made explicit some connections she was hoping to emphasize between subjects: for example, an earth-science link with a social studies unit on geography, and a biography unit link in literacy with science and writing workshop. She also linked many of her literacy units with social studies, but without making this link explicit on her chart. It appears that this curricular connection was the most common and therefore in no need of comment or notation. She modified this plan as the year progressed, but these kinds of connections remained constant.

Parent Handbook Description of Classroom

The way Terri planned her year and her daily time with students reflects her beliefs about teaching and learning. These are further expressed in information made available to parents at the beginning of the school year. (See Appendix F for a description of the literacy program and the social studies program as described in the Classroom Handbook).

The handbook begins with a letter to parents introducing the handbook and the importance of parent-school communication. It then outlines the literacy program, dividing it into the following sections: Book Clubs, writing workshop, journal writing, spelling and handwriting, listening and speaking. This section is a page and a half in length. It is followed by brief descriptions (under a half-page

each) of the social studies, science, math, and computers curricula. There is then a paragraph on assessment through work folders and a portfolio.

Following these curriculum descriptions is almost a page and a half describing management, explaining the "Classroom Bucks" awards for individual students, the Class Family Award system for recognizing individuals' kind actions towards classmates, and the "gems" that the whole class may earn towards a reward they have chosen. Then there is a description of the system of contracts used to reinforce the posted classroom rules.

The final page of the handbook includes information about book orders each month, homework (described in terms of the transition to middle school that begins in fifth-grade), and a brief section on "Ways to help your child." This section stresses communication through Friday Folder sheets, classroom newsletters, and parents talking with their child and trying to "integrate school work into your family routines" by visiting the library or reading the newspaper together, for example.

The handbook is an interesting record of Terri's emphases at the beginning of the school year, at least for a parent audience. The space allocations imply a curricular emphasis on literacy and a significant emphasis on management routines and disciplinary consequences. It is evident that she has spent much time thinking about both her curriculum and her systems of management and communication with parents. She was very organized and structured her routines to help her meet goals for the class.

Terri's Beliefs: In her Own Words

My initial interview with Terri at her home in early January, reinforced my perception of her as a thoughtful, articulate, and well-organized teacher. It also helped elaborate further Terri's developing beliefs about integration, social studies, and literacy. (See Appendix A for the Interview protocol.)

Terri described major aspects of her literacy and social studies programs, and how she understood and practiced integration in the classroom. These are closely related to one another. Her understanding of literacy and social studies influenced her beliefs about integration, as did her understanding of other subject areas and their related disciplines.

Integration rationale

Terri described her rationale for integrating curriculum in terms that echo rationales historically and currently found in the literature. She admitted that she found integration interesting and creative for herself as a teacher. Beyond that, which she mentioned first but minimized as a reason for integrating, she based her beliefs about integration on two major rationales: the arbitrary nature of disciplinary boundaries and the potential for better student learning. Terri claimed:

I think that [integration] does help kids see that learning ideas are not isolated. I mean the whole paradigm of completely isolated disciplines is just sort of an outcome of how the academy has been set up. That people

hyper-specialize in one artificially-segmented area of learning without seeing connections across the board.

She recognized certain distinctions between disciplines, particularly in terms of content, but she also thought that many of the distinctions were arbitrary social constructs and that the ways we've learned to teach subjects is largely a matter of socialization. She believed that integrated curriculum can help blur the boundaries of the disciplines or make connections across the disciplines in ways that more accurately reflect her perception of the nature of knowledge.

Terri also believed that integrated curriculum can help children "make connections across the different areas to help them retain the ideas, to help make sense of them, and hopefully be able to understand how they apply to their life." The emphasis here is on student learning – retention, sense-making, and application. It is interesting that she hoped that students would themselves make connections with their own lives, although she didn't plan for these connections in the same way that she planned cross-curricular connections. She went on to say, "But if you begin to see how it plays out in different areas, then hopefully that will make more of a connection for them personally."

Terri saw connections across disciplines and school subjects, and believed that seeing such connections would be helpful for her students' learning. The language she used to describe her integration practice reflected this sense of linking different subject areas together so that boundaries are less definite, and children can see connections. She described how she learned from her mentor

who “would frequently have the Book Club books that we were reading *parallel* what we were doing in social studies. And sometimes there was also a *tie-in* with science... but generally, we usually have both the Book Club books and the historical fiction *mirroring* what we’re studying in social studies” (my emphasis). She also spoke of computer tasks that “*draw on* some aspect of either science or social studies, or [students] might type up a writing workshop project that they’ve done to print up” (my emphasis).

Subjects/Disciplines

Terri thought that connections among subjects were important and that distinctions between them were somewhat arbitrary. She also thought that differences in how we teach subjects have a lot to do with how we’ve been trained to think about them and to teach them, and with the influence of curriculum standards and national frameworks. We discussed possible differences in how students learn in different subject areas as I tried to probe her thinking about the subject-matter distinctions:

Terri: I should do a better job of having different approaches within each thing that we do, to address the different ways that kids learn. Because some kids do not learn – some people say Gardner’s a bunch of bunk, but I do definitely see that there are some kids who can learn very very well in one mode and not at all in another.

F: So we should be teaching in a multitude of different ways –

Terri: In a multitude of different –

F: Across the curriculum, rather than teaching math this way and social studies that way?

Terri: Right, right.

Terri believed that disciplines are distinct but connected. She appeared to think of the distinctions between subjects more in terms of their content than in terms of their forms of inquiry. She believed that the subject differences that do exist do not lead to different ways of learning and teaching. For Terri, differences in teaching approaches are important for meeting the particular learning styles of different students, not for reflecting different ways of knowing and learning inherent in particular disciplines or school subjects.

This understanding of the different subjects in turn influenced Terri's integration beliefs and practices. She found literacy the easiest subject to integrate, social studies relatively easy to integrate, science more difficult, and math very difficult to integrate. She spoke of math as being difficult to integrate in meaningful ways because, "I looked at district math objectives, and they're so concrete, and I really feel that it's important to address those so that they don't end up missing anything."

Terri also argued persuasively about the need for integration to be authentic saying, "You could be studying dinosaurs in science, but what natural way is there - what sensible and valuable way that you can integrate that with math? Ways to integrate math that actually make sense, outside of being cute?"

In contrast, she described writing as being the most “natural” way to integrate across other curriculum areas. She claimed that:

Probably the one way that I most thoroughly integrate across the curriculum is that we do writing in all the different areas – in math, science, and obviously in language arts, social studies as well. They write in logs, they write ideas, they do projects which involve writing.

Terri herself described this as “writing across the curriculum” and treated it somewhat differently from the kind of integration of curricular subjects that she generally meant when she talked about integration.

Curriculum integration for Terri always involved literacy. Sometimes this was writing and often it involved literature connections. She explained that this is because of the nature of literacy as a subject. She described literacy (her term, although she also used “language arts”) as:

More a set of processes that you’re trying to teach them. Like reading. I mean, you could teach reading from – they could read the backs of cereal boxes, I suppose, and it wouldn’t be the best way, but there are so many ways that you can teach it. Whereas teaching the concept of electricity in science – that’s a discrete idea you’re trying to teach. Whereas in reading, you’re trying to teach kids how to read and make sense of things. And they can read and make sense of so many things.

Terri referred to “process outcomes” in literacy, including “that [students] show enthusiasm about reading, that they can read fluently, that they can handle

unknown words.” She also said the district objectives for literacy were not as “specific” as for other subjects, although she admitted to not having examined them closely because in her view, “we’re all just working on process here, so however we choose to approach that is more acceptable.” Terri’s understanding of literacy as a “process” subject also meant she did not refer to school or district objectives, or make specific plans for the different units or novels taught.

Social studies was a different matter. Terri saw this as a “content” subject formulated in schools by specific, district-level, curricular objectives and guidelines, which included ideas for projects and related literature. She described the social studies curriculum at this grade level as being U.S. history, which she hoped to teach in relation to the five questions identified by the National Center for History in the Schools (1996): (1) What is/was the structure of government like and how is it related to the time period? (2) What was the economy like and how did it affect people’s lives? (3) What was the culture like? What sort of diversity was there at the time? (4) How did the environment affect how people lived and worked at the time? (5) What sort of links were there between the U.S. and other countries at the time? Terri saw her goal as helping students to internalize these questions so that these “would become a tool of helping people become historically literate.”

She thought the goals of history education were less specific than they were for math, for example, because social studies is the “study of society and social factors at different time periods. We could study anything. We could study

the French Revolution through these five questions, and it would still be social studies.” However, although she thought there was a wide range of what would be acceptable to teach in social studies, her teaching was actually guided by attention to the specific history content identified in the district guidelines, unlike her literacy teaching.

When asked what it meant for students to “do social studies,” Terri answered:

Well, I mean there are the obvious sort of baseline things, like doing the reading, listening, and I ask them to take notes either on discussions, or I sometimes lecture because I want them to begin to have that experience, to know what to do in that situation because they’re going to experience a lot of it from here on out where that’s the way things are. So I want them to develop that skill. So there are those sort of basic things - writing the reports, doing the projects. But beyond that, I guess my goal, I guess what I would hope for out of it is that they would internalize these five questions, these five lenses for looking at life.

It is interesting that when I asked Terri about any different approaches to teaching different subjects, she responded in terms of student learning styles and recognized that “I have been thinking recently that...my curriculum depends more on the sort of language-based intelligence than other ones,” which was consistent with her claim that she herself was “much more of a language person. I love science, and I really enjoy math, but I’m very verbal.”

Terri found it easiest to conceptualize the integration of literacy and social studies. In part, this seemed to be because of the way she saw them both as utilizing language skills. Also, she thought of these subjects as somewhat more flexible than math and science. She also thought of them as having some common characteristics and content. She explained:

I think it's in part because history, for me, history is the study of people and realities - things that happened. And so books are also the study of, books are about, fiction books are about people and about their realities. And there's so much really fine, children's, historical fiction that it's sort of natural in some ways, I guess. You read history books. History is *his* story. It's a story.

History and literature, for Terri, shared language and narrative characteristics, and a common subject matter of human reality and experiences. She saw the benefits of using historical fiction to extend the social studies curriculum because:

It does allow the kids to see that human side of history that's often lost in the way history is taught as a series of dates, or battles, or famous people, that you don't get a sense of what it actually means to, what it actually would have been like - the humanity of history as opposed to sort of "dates history."

It was harder for Terri to articulate the ways in which the integration of social studies and literature might strengthen the literacy component for students,

although she argued that it was helpful to have a grasp of the historical period that is the context for a particular historical fiction novel. She concluded, "I think that it might be a little more one-sided in that literacy gives more to social studies than vice versa. But I don't think that it's totally a one-way street."

Terri believed that curricular integration could help students learn better by showing them how subjects were connected and by reinforcing and complementing the learning from different subjects such as literacy Book Clubs and social studies. She believed that the disciplines on which school subjects are based are more related and connected than a separate-subject approach to instruction implies. She understood the differences in terms of content rather than distinct processes or ways of knowing and learning. She emphasized language as her dominant way of learning and as being important for student learning across the curriculum. All these beliefs about disciplines and subjects, and about learning and teaching, influenced the curriculum as it became enacted and experienced in her classroom.

Description of the Literacy Program

Terri's literacy program, as described in the parent handbook, consisted of Book Clubs, writing workshop, journal writing, and spelling. Her weekly schedule allocated almost four hours for Book Clubs, 90 minutes for writing workshop with another 30-minute writing "mini-lesson" period, one hour for journal writing (15 minutes four times a week), and 90 minutes for spelling. Her plans also included an opening 15 minutes daily when students were expected to

re

ha

30

of

stu

and

and

liter

sche

the l

and

get to

them

the ha

read independently and record the date and the title and author of the book they had read in a reading log. She also had a teacher Read Aloud every morning for 30 minutes.

Terri invited me to participate in the Read Aloud and Book Club portions of her literacy program, emphasizing the integration of literature with social studies. These two components were the most consistent parts of her schedule and together comprised a literature block from 9:00 to 10:30 three days a week, and from 9:00 to 10:00 twice a week. The centrality of this literature block to her literacy program and her total curriculum was evident in her planning and scheduling, and in the parent handbook where she wrote that "Book Clubs form the basis of my reading program."

Terri's goals for teacher Read Aloud sessions were centered on modeling and encouraging literary criticism. As she described this, "I try to do that so they get to think about books critically and the ideas in them, and challenge themselves about them" (1/11/98). Her goals for Book Clubs were described in the handbook:

Book Clubs allow children to explore different genres of literature and provide an authentic reading experience. As part of students' work in their Book Clubs, they write and share reflective responses in their reading logs. The process of reflecting and sharing their responses helps further their understanding and appreciation of the texts they are reading.

It is interesting that the emphasis here is on aesthetic and literary responses to texts, and that there is no mention of integration with content-area subjects such as science or social studies, although she planned this for many of the units.

Terri's Book Club plan was consistent with some of the recent research on literature-based programs and appears to draw particularly from the work of Raphael, McMahon, and colleagues (1992, 1994) and their description of Book Clubs in classrooms. They describe their Book Club framework for reading instruction in terms of four major intersecting components: reading, writing, instruction, and community share.

As Raphael and McMahon (1994) describe the Book Club program, reading instruction focuses on fluency, reading vocabulary, comprehension strategies, genres, and aesthetic and personal response to literature. Fluency is addressed by providing time for daily reading of stories. Vocabulary is increased by instruction in strategies and the use of scaffolding activities such as "think sheets." Reading comprehension strategies are embedded within the context of reading and writing about literature, and draw from state mandates and district guidelines. Genre study is addressed by the reading of different literature across the year and discussing the characteristics of each genre.

The writing component of Raphael and McMahon's (1994) Book Club program focuses students' attention on issues for discussion about texts. Students respond to literature reading in their reading logs, drawing on an array of ideas for writing, such as "character map," "me and the book," or "author's

crafts and special tricks.” Response prompts are designed to encourage students to synthesize ideas both within a text as well as across texts common to a particular theme, author, or genre. Again, the district curriculum guides are a source of ideas and activities in Book Club as they describe it.

The “community share” component of Book Club provides an opportunity for the teacher to meet with all the students either prior to book clubs, to help prepare for reading, or following book clubs, to share ideas and discuss issues. During community share, teachers model different ways of responding to texts and of participating in discussions about text.

Instruction in the Book Club model includes indirect support, for example, through clarifications or increasing students’ background knowledge, and direct support for enhancing the quality of students’ book club conversations. Instruction is embedded in the reading, writing, and community share components.

In Terri’s classroom, Book Club drew on aspects of this model, but was different in important ways. The reading component was focused on reading with a partner to develop fluency and a familiarity with different kinds of literature, although students read significantly more historical fiction than other genres because of the link to social studies units. Comprehension strategies were not an explicit focus of Terri’s planning, and she did not draw on state or district guidelines in the ways described by Raphael and McMahon (1994). Terri’s writing component included reading logs and a sheet of suggested responses,

but students did not in fact write about their novels unless asked to do so by Terri, and then only in the format she prescribed. Written responses to reading typically followed a format of answers to about three questions that Terri wrote on an overhead for the whole class. Sometimes students were asked to employ a particular strategy, such as a Venn diagram to compare characters. Mostly, they were asked to list an unfamiliar vocabulary word and its definition and then answer a couple of questions, often relating the novel to the historical period being studied in social studies (see Appendix G for the reading folder assignments of one student from September to January.) I shall discuss this further as I examine the kinds of connections students made. Community share was rarely a part of Terri's Book Club program, as I observed it or as students described it. There was little structured opportunity for students to talk across their books, or to talk with the other pair of students reading the same book. Similarly, explicit instruction was limited during Terri's Book Club program.

In January, prior to the beginning of the Revolutionary War unit, I took the opportunity to conduct audiotaped interviews with students. I took them out of the classroom during Book Club time, interviewing them with their reading partner. I asked them to tell me about Book Clubs. The responses tell a great deal about student understanding of Book Clubs in Terri's classroom up to that point in the year.

Students were asked to "tell me what [Book Club]'s all about?" Of the eight students who responded, six described it as a time to read books - an

emphasis on what they “do”. Four specifically described the books as being assigned by the teacher, or as books on one particular topic across the classroom. Three were explicitly negative about Book Clubs as their initial response. For example, Duke said the books had “too much words,” and James said Book Club was when “you read from books that don’t make sense” (1/26/98).

In response to the question, “What do you learn about in Book Clubs?,” seven of the nine students who responded spoke about historical topics, either specifically or generally (by using the term “history” to describe the content.) Three students specifically mentioned the link with social studies, and five recognized historical fiction as the genre read, either by name or by their description of the novels as “historical” but not necessarily true. Only one student, Tom, mentioned reading as the content of Book Clubs. Students overwhelmingly identified the content of Book Clubs in terms of the historical content of the novels they read, sometimes specifically tying it to their social studies unit topics. At this point in the year, they were reading their third consecutive historical fiction novel in connection with a social studies unit.

Students were more able to describe what they do in Book Clubs. Of the eleven students who responded to the question, eight spoke of reading, including reading to partners, and seven mentioned writing. Of those who spoke about writing, two identified “reading logs” specifically, and several talked about different kinds of things they might be asked to write about. Three talked about word definitions, two talked about identifying a problem and

l
c
c
F
th
c
P
or

"g
th

solution in the novel, one spoke of character, one of the time setting, one of “what you’ve been learning” and linked this with social studies, and four spoke generally of “what the book is about” or “what’s happening.” Max was sure that this work was done verbally with the teacher, but identified the same kinds of questions that students had to respond to. D.J. thought they could choose what to write, but six – without prompting – identified the writing tasks as teacher-assigned with no student choice. Three students spoke of the final projects they might be asked to do, such as plays or dioramas.

Students were asked how they knew if they were “doing well” or “doing a good job” in Book Clubs. Of the seven who responded to this, four talked in terms of behavior, including rewards in the form of “classroom bucks” for good behavior. One said there was no way to tell, one said you could tell from grades on Book Club journals, and one said you were doing well if you read a lot. It is difficult to tell whether by this Tom meant to imply reading frequently and perhaps from internal motivation, or reading a lot of pages, a common emphasis throughout Book Club sessions that I noted when listening to student conversations. The latter would appear to be more task-oriented. Certainly, the prevailing understanding of “doing well” in Book Clubs was behavior- and task-oriented.

Some students were asked how they knew if they or another student were “good” at Book Clubs or reading. Seven students responded to this. Four thought that reading “a lot” indicated being a good reader and two thought

reading itself or reading fast were indicators. Two relied on external cues such as the teacher saying so or test results. Dee thought being able to pronounce the words showed she was a good reader. Max and D.J. showed a different emphasis, answering that understanding the reading was important. The responses to the question about “being good at” reading were slightly less task-oriented than to the question about “doing well” in Book Clubs. Students seemed to respond to the question about doing well in Book Clubs more in terms of school behavioral and task expectations whereas they responded to “being good at” reading somewhat independently of school expectations.

When asked to talk about why the teacher had chosen these books, nine students who responded all linked the literature unit with their social studies unit. Seven students specified particular subject matter as the link across the two subjects; five specified social studies as the reason for reading these particular books in Book Clubs. Tom was interesting as he connected the subject matter and the school subjects, saying that they were studying slavery in social studies and slavery was part of his novel, but he denied that his novel was set “at the same time” as what they were studying in social studies. He seemed to make subject-matter connections but not chronological historical connections.

Students made other interesting comments and connections when they spoke about Book Clubs. Two specifically denied any links between their books and life outside the classroom, although nine could link Book Clubs with social studies within the classroom. Two students were able to identify the genre as

historical fiction, although one of these students could not identify which characters in her novel were “real” and which were not.

Of the six students who compared reading from their Book Club novels with reading from social studies texts, four preferred the social studies texts and only one preferred Book Club novels. Max liked both – for different reasons. He pointed to different kinds of books and said “they’re kind of like the same thing because they both teach you about what you’re learning and you read it – but different...But *those* [Book Club novels] are just books that people read. But *those* [social studies texts] are books that people know” (1/26/98). There appeared to be a connection between a task-oriented approach to reading Book Club novels, a belief that they read them to learn about the historical content, and a preference for texts that provide historical information more quickly and concisely. Student comments about social studies texts being “true” and “having more information” and novels being “too long” and “not real” support this assertion.

Three students talked about what Book Club unit might come next – but could not predict the likely topics. Becca and D.J. specifically talked about not being able to guess, and Becca said she wanted a choice. Lynn said the Book Club unit would “go with” the social studies topic.

There is evidence from these interviews that students had become very familiar with Book Club routines by January and with the social studies connections. They understood Book Clubs in terms of historical content and

c

w

y

1.

Af

ove

wri

ther

1/2

read

nove

2/2/

the pa

learning. There was also a strong understanding of Book Clubs in terms of what students “do” (read and write) and in terms of behavioral expectations. There was an undercurrent of discontent with Book Clubs, particularly over the lack of choice of genre and the assigned writing tasks.

According to the students, Book Clubs was a time when “you read for a whole hour, but sometimes if you only read for a half hour it’s either because you’ve got to go to music or because she’s going to like make you write” (Lynn, 1/28/98). The reading was with a partner:

We read to each other, we have to read the whole book. Me and this other kid read – page by page, he reads a page, I read a page, he reads a page – and we got to, after we’re done reading the book, we got to tell what happened and things like that” (Max, 1/29/98).

After reading together, sometimes there were writing assignments written on the overhead for all students to respond to: “Sometimes we have reading logs. She writes questions, and then we have to answer them, like what’s happening, is there a problem? Most of the time we just stop when it’s time to stop” (Emma, 1/22/98).

There was no mention of conversations about the books, either with a reading partner or as a whole class. There was an assumption by many that the novels were selected “because that’s what our social studies unit is” (Dee, 2/2/98) and that students were reading them “to learn about what happened in the past” (Dee, 2/2/98). These student understandings of the Book Club

1

h

s

c

y

H

th

te

co

of

gr

It th

envi

program both reflected the actual practices and routines of the classroom and also influenced the kind of learning that students were able to do.

Description of the Social Studies Program

Terri's social studies program was originally allocated one 40-minute period at the end of the school day on Tuesday and another 50-minute period between morning recess and lunch on Wednesday. This total of 90 minutes of social studies per week was in contrast to four hours for Book Clubs and a total of over nine hours of literacy time. Occasional changes were made during the year, sometimes with additional social studies time and sometimes less.

However, the planned time given to this subject matter was in stark contrast to the time given to literacy, and this had important consequences in terms of teacher enactment of an integrated curriculum as the year progressed. For comparison, math was allocated a total of four hours, science and health a total of two hours.

The parent handbook described the social studies curriculum for fifth grade as follows:

We will be progressing through some of the major eras of US history starting with our first citizens the Native Americans. Our overarching theme for the year will be to look at immigration and migration and how these processes have influenced American history" (handbook).

It then listed the "big" questions concerning government, economy, culture, environment, and links with other countries that students would use to reflect on

dit

err

as

eve

a g

the

not

imp

incl

also

inter

figur

heav

histo

abou

respo

point

geog

comp

different time periods. This description of the social studies curriculum emphasized a theme, immigration and migration, which did not in fact show up as a major theme during the year. Similarly, the handbook mentioned current events being linked with the historical themes under study, and Terri articulated a goal of helping children “think about history in ways that will, I hope, help them eventually look at current history, current events” (1/11/98). This goal was not met. The constraints of the schedule and the district curriculum significantly impacted Terri’s initial plans and enacted curriculum in this classroom.

Terri’s social studies goals, as expressed in an interview in January, included coverage of the content specified in the district curriculum guide and also the larger goal of developing “historical literacy” in her students. She was interested in teaching social history as well as the major dates, events, and figures usually taught in fifth grade. Her unit plans for social studies drew heavily on the district curriculum guidelines, addressing the core topics and historical figures, and using some of the suggested literature and resources.

My interviews with pairs of students in early January included questions about their understanding of social studies. As for Book Clubs, these student responses help shed light on the experienced curriculum of social studies by that point in the year. Students had completed units on “What is history/what is geography?,” “Native Americans before European Conquest,” and were completing a unit on “Colonization.”

Of the eight students who responded to the question, "What is social studies?," four answered by naming topics: three said "Native Americans" and Dee later said that "heritages" would be an interesting topic to study in social studies. Five said that social studies is history – two agreeing that it is "just history," and three saying it could be more than history, although not specifying what that might be. Vanessa spoke of economics, civics, diversity, and geography when she spoke about making a computer class assignment, but not when asked about social studies.

Nine students talked about what they learn about in social studies. Seven of these students cited specific topics: four talked about Colonization and six about slavery, the part of the Colonization unit they were studying at the time, and one said "Indians." Three gave details about slave ships from what they had just been learning. Two said they learn about "history" or how it was "back then." One referred to the discipline links the teacher uses – economy, government, culture and diversity, links with countries.

When asked what they do in social studies, eight students talked about reading from the textbook and other booklets provided by the teacher, and five students mentioned writing. Two said they "take notes," one said "write paragraphs," one said "answer questions from the board." Three students were explicit about this being teacher-directed writing. Jim spoke of looking back in the text to "figure out" the answers. Two students compared their work with that of historians, when asked to think about it, and both thought that historians

get their information from other sources, such as travel or museums or “looking stuff up that’s left behind” (Cody, 1/21/98). No students used the word “learn” to describe what they do in social studies. No students talked about inquiry activities. These student descriptions of the activity of social studies lessons reflect their experiences with social studies assignments across the year. (See Appendix for the social studies folder assignments of one student from September to January, which show the kinds of activities students were asked to do.)

“Doing well” in social studies was behavior- and task-oriented for the four students who talked about it in terms of grades, doing a lot, or doing what is assigned, or not misbehaving. “Being good at social studies” was a matter of getting the answers right. In addition, two students specified not liking social studies, although they were not asked that. Three students were asked why it might be important to learn social studies, and they all talked about needing to know things in later grade levels or college. No students talked about learning or about applying what they learned beyond the classroom.

When asked to predict the next unit in social studies, no student could accurately do so, although Dee and Vanessa thought they might study the Civil War (in fact, they were to study the Revolutionary War). This is understandable at fifth grade. What is more significant is that no student could suggest a rationale for the sequence of learning in social studies. Jeff said the teacher would decide, Cody said they would use textbooks, and Lynn said they would link it

with Book Clubs. No student suggested that the social studies curriculum reflected an historical chronology.

Students talked about social studies first in terms of content and particular topics. They were able to name “what it was about” in this way. When they talked about processes, they referred to reading and writing. There was generally an understanding that their task was to find out things by reading and getting predetermined “right answers.”

The students’ description of social studies was consistent with my early observations and with the written work in social studies folders for the period of September to January. Terri spent time finding resources from books other than the social studies text. She compiled excerpts from other books, much of it at easier reading levels, into “booklets” for student reference. The most common use of social studies class time then involved reading and answering questions from these booklets, either independently or with partners. There was also some whole class work and some assigned homework, which I shall describe in a later section of this chapter.

Social Studies and Book Clubs: A Summary of Students’ Perceptions

In January, when I interviewed students about the Book Club and social studies program in their classroom, students responded to an open-ended question about Book Clubs in terms of what they did and how that worked in the classroom – partners reading selected books on an assigned topic. They tended to describe social studies in terms of historical topics.

When asked what they learn about (content) in each, students tended to answer in terms of historical content for both social studies and Book Clubs.

When asked what they did (processes) in each, they tended to answer in terms of language arts processes (reading and writing) for both Book Clubs and social studies.

When asked about “doing well,” students had similar responses for both social studies and Book Clubs, answering in terms of behavior and completing assigned tasks. The goal seemed to be task-completion in both cases and a matter of finding the answers that the teacher wanted. In neither case were students making connections with life beyond the classroom.

When asked about “being good at” reading, students were more able to talk in general terms that did not necessarily imply external expectations or rewards. They were not able to do this for social studies. Social studies is a school subject, not something they do outside of school, whereas some students were able to talk about reading outside of Book Clubs and school. These students talked about reading with a broader perspective that was not limited to reading as a school activity.

Students were not able to predict the next unit in social studies or Book Clubs, or even to suggest how Terri would make that decision. However, many were able to predict links between social studies and Book Clubs, and showed an awareness of that link in the curriculum and a “unit” approach to these subjects, and to other subjects across the curriculum.

v

7

t

sc

ou

th

att

wi

Na

had

B. Integrated Unit One: The Revolutionary War

Terri's Planning for the Revolutionary War Unit

The Revolutionary War unit was originally planned as a five-week unit, integrating history and literature study, to be taught between January 5 and February 6. In social studies, the unit would build on the three previous units taught between September and December: (1) What is history? What is geography?; (2) Native Americans before the European Conquest; and (3) Colonization of the United States. In Book Clubs, the unit would follow a realistic fiction unit with animal stories and then two historical fiction units that linked literature with the Native Americans unit and the Colonization unit.

Although the sequence of units did not change, the Revolutionary War unit did not begin until February 2nd. It continued until Spring Break (April 3). The unit was therefore begun about a month later in the year and lasted almost twice as long as originally planned.

Terri's planning for the Revolutionary War unit included a unit plan for social studies. (See Appendix H for Terri's social studies unit plan.) This plan outlined the unit in terms of four major emphases: causes of the war, timeline of the war, culture and diversity issues, and outcomes of the war. She included attention to geography, government, economics, culture and diversity, and links with other countries, as suggested by the five guiding questions identified by the National Center for History in the Schools (1996). These are questions that she had identified as guiding her social studies teaching and which all students had

S

re

th

on

gro

hist

in the front of their social studies folder (see Appendix I). Her plans were closely related to the district social studies curriculum guide and outcomes described for grade five. (See Appendix J for District curriculum, outcomes, and core units.)

Terri also paid particular attention in this unit to two important aspects of historical understanding -- cause and effect, and chronology. This is how she explained to students this new emphasis:

I think this is probably your first time studying history in this way.

Previously, when we've studied history like in fourth grade, and I bet in third and second and first grade, when you've studied history, it's been more the study of time periods. Like we've just got done studying about the colonies. And last year we studied about different parts of Michigan. Now, we're starting to study history in the way that older kids and grown-ups do, where we think about things in sort of a timeline. And we think about things in terms of what happened and who was involved in it, and why those things happened. (2/10/98)

She then talked more about cause and effect, gave an example, and also reminded students of a timeline of their own lives that they had created earlier in the year.

Terri's planning for literacy during this Revolutionary War unit centered on selecting appropriate literature for the teacher Read-Aloud and Book Club groups. She utilized the district's social studies guidelines as she considered historical-fiction literature to complement student learning about the

Revolutionary War period, but did not refer to the district literacy guidelines or objectives.

Terri first considered the historical content of a novel and then aimed for a variety of reading levels before presenting the children with several novels to peruse. After the children had ranked their preferred novels from the ones she had selected, Terri paired readers and put them in Book Club groups of about four students per novel. The novels used for Book Clubs were the following: The fighting ground by Avi (1984); My brother Sam is dead by Collier and Collier (1974); Moon of two dark horses by Keehn (1997); Sarah Bishop by O'Dell (1980); and Time enough for drums by Rinaldi (1986). The novel that Terri selected for daily Read Aloud sessions was Esther Forbes' Johnny Tremain (1943).¹

Terri's planning for the Revolutionary War unit reflected her understanding of integration and her usual implementation of those beliefs. Terri's overall plans for the year included points of planned integration between literature and social studies, as well as between literature and science. Table 4.1 shows planned curricular connections across the year, with the planned integration in boldface.

This plan represents a common way of thinking about curriculum integration, one in which two or more subjects are aligned to support and complement each other. This has been described as "parallel teaching" (Burns, 1995; Jacobs, 1989), as "sequenced" curriculum (Fogarty, 1991), and as

“correlation” (Case, 1991a). In such models of integration, the units of study in different subjects are rearranged and aligned horizontally in order to emphasize particular connections and common subject matter themes.

For Terri, this is only partially accurate as a description of her planning.

Although she did indeed arrange her schedule in order to have her literature and social studies content correspond, she actually planned many of these literature units directly out of the social studies subject matter. The literature units were not planned separately and then rearranged for integration with historical units. This is a subtle distinction but shows how the social studies curriculum guided the choices Terri made for Book Clubs and the literature curriculum.

Although Terri claimed to want children to read a variety of genres and literature for multiple purposes, her planning limited the use of literature somewhat in the service of integration with social studies. Across the school year, she had an animal story unit, a poetry unit, and four units that were integrated with social studies: three historical fiction units and one historical non-fiction unit.

¹ For full references, see Appendix K

Table 4.1.

Teacher plans for integrating literature across the curriculum.

	Social Studies	Book Clubs	Read Aloud	Other
September	What is History? <i>What is Geography?</i>	Animal Stories	Animal Stories	<i>Earth Science</i>
October	Early Native Americans	Historical Fiction - Native Americans	"Morning Girl"	
November/December	Colonization	Historical Fiction - Colonization period	"Slave Dancer"	
January	Revolutionary War	Historical Fiction - Revolutionary War period	"Johnny Tremain"	
February	Civil War	Fantasy		Space Science
March	Westward Expansion	Biographies - inventors		Forces, simple machines
April/May	World War II	Historical Fiction	"Number the Stars"	

Description of Literacy

Terri's literature block consisted of about a one half-hour Read Aloud session from the historical fiction novel, Johnny Tremain followed by Book Club for about an hour each day. The routines mirrored those that the students were accustomed to from previous units, described earlier in this chapter.

Read Aloud

Terri introduced the students to the new Read Aloud novel, Johnny Tremain (Forbes, 1943) the day after they had made their new Book Club choices and more than a week after she had begun the social studies unit on the Revolutionary War. She read from this novel almost every morning from

February 11 until April 3, missing only for special events such as field trips or state-mandated testing. Children sat on pillows around Terri's rocking chair in the reading area. They ate a snack as she read to them. She opened most Read Aloud sessions with a question designed to direct students' attention to the novel. The majority of the time was devoted to her reading aloud from the book.

Occasionally, Terri would stop and ask a question or answer a child's question. Sometimes she would stop to correct behavior. In these half-hour sessions, there were usually between one and four short breaks in reading for Terri to ask questions. After the reading, she usually ended with a comment or question to conclude the Read Aloud session, and then moved students toward Book Clubs.

The general pattern of discourse was that of teacher-student-teacher. Occasionally, two or more students would give their answers to a question, but generally Terri initiated a question, a student answered, and she commented or asked another question. One session focused more on a discussion of the text than her reading. That was when Terri had decided to spend time on the passage in the novel where James Otis argues for fighting the war (pages 178-179). This was a very difficult passage for the students, and Terri did most of the talking as she tried to guide the students to an understanding of the broader issues addressed here.

Terri's questions served a variety of purposes. (See Appendix L for a record of teacher questions and comments during the Read Aloud sessions for

Johnny Tremain). The majority of her questions helped her check for student comprehension and helped students recall and recap the plot. Many questions invited predictions based on the text or illustrations. Many asked students to make inferences from the text. Sometimes she asked about the characters and sometimes she drew attention to vocabulary. Occasionally, she gave something specific for students to listen for. One time she drew attention to a metaphor and another time to the author's creative use of language. These were literary questions and modeled reading and comprehension strategies, and thoughtful reading of a difficult text.

Terri also asked questions about setting, particularly in relation to the Revolutionary War time period and the specific events of that time as they were being studied in social studies. She specifically asked the students to notice certain events of that period, to refer to the Revolutionary War timeline they had made for the classroom, to consider the reasons for the war put forward in the novel, and to determine which of the characters were Patriots and which were Tories. With these questions, Terri was drawing attention to the connections between the novel and what students were learning in social studies.

Read Aloud sessions allowed Terri to model reading and comprehension strategies, to expose the students to a more difficult text with its complex plot and characters and with much vocabulary and language that was new to the children. She also used these sessions to make explicit connections to their social studies learning, particularly the timeline and events of the Revolutionary War

period. Through the text they were also given images and details of daily life during the Revolutionary War period.

Book Clubs

Terri introduced new Book Club novels to the students on February 11. She showed them the books, read excerpts from the back of the books, and put them around the room for students to browse through. The students ranked their choices from one to five, and Terri later arranged reading partners and groups, mostly on the basis of their interests and reading abilities. Because of standardized testing, students did not receive their group assignments or books until February 17. By this time, they had had three social studies lessons on the Revolutionary War period and two Read Aloud sessions from Johnny Tremain. On the first day, Terri announced the Book Club reading partners and groups, and as she did so, students were given a copy of the novel and could find a place to go and read together for the remainder of the time.

Book Club sessions followed the routines and format established earlier in the year, as described earlier in this chapter. Book Club was one-hour long, three times a week, and a half-hour long, twice a week. During this time, there were three days when Terri's student teachers used the Book Club time to do an oral history mini-unit. There were also occasional interruptions in the schedule for assemblies and field trips.

Students wrote in reading logs three times during this period, between February 17 and April 2. They also worked on a final project. There was one

whole-group discussion across the different novels. The remainder of Book Club time, the vast majority of the time, was spent in partner reading of the novels. While students read together, Terri circulated around the room monitoring reading and behavior, listening to some students read, or talking with pairs of students about their novel.

I spent much of the Book Club reading time talking with students, individually or in pairs, about their reading. I also spent time “shadowing” Terri in order to have a better perspective on her use of this time. For example, on February 26, Terri was approached by Lynn, who showed her how she and Jim had found Trenton on their social studies map after seeing it in their novel, and how they had found dates in their novel that helped them place it on the social studies timeline on the wall. Terri responded by looking with them at the map and timeline. Then Terri listened to a student read and asked him, “When was the book set?,” and they looked together at the timeline to answer this before Terri heard his other two group members read. At this point, the group was interrupted by behavior problems in a different group, and Terri gave one student a “contract” for behavior. She then moved on to listen to a different reading pair for a couple of minutes before answering Champ’s question about where the characters lived. To do this, she helped the students look back through the book and then said, “So they lived near Pennington and Trenton, so I bet you could find where Pennington and Trenton are.” Then Terri moved on to Dee and Vanessa asking, “How are you guys liking the book?” and then, “What’s

happening now?" They answered briefly, and Terri moved on to the group who had previously caused disruptions and asked about that.

Terri moved around the group, listening to students read, monitoring behavior, and asking and answering questions. Her questions and responses to students modeled literary processes, as she asked about the action of the novel or a student's personal response, or helped students look back in the book for details. Her questions were also related to the Revolutionary War content of the novels, emphasizing setting in terms of the timeline and maps students had worked on in social studies.

On the second day of Book Clubs, Terri gathered the students together as a whole group after their reading time. She introduced a discussion about the novels and the Revolutionary War:

Most of us are far enough along in our books now to the point where we've begun hearing about the Revolution, and we're hearing about the war, and I'm wondering what you guys are thinking about how the war is affecting the lives of your main characters? Think about that. As you've been reading, you've been hearing about the war and the Revolution and the fighting. So what have you been hearing about how it's been affecting the lives of people in your story? First of all, tell us what your book is and who your main character is. (2/18/98)

Cody responded that in The Fighting Ground, Jonathan "always wanted to do it, to go fight, and now he gets to." Terri then asked others who were reading that

same novel for their comments on why this was so. She then moved on to ask another student about her novel and main character. She drew contributions from readers of four of the five novels during this discussion and took opportunities to summarize important points and to generalize across novels:

So, we see in one family, all the men have been fighting for the Revolution, and another wants to go. In this family, we see something different – right? One part is Tory, and the other part is Patriot, and that leads to some problems for the family. (2/18/98)

At the end of the discussion, Terri summed up for the students the major point she hoped they would keep in mind as they continued reading:

So – another situation where there are people on both sides of the fence. So we need to keep thinking about that Patriot/Tory issue because that's an important one for us to think about – how people acted towards one another and what the consequences were of standing up for your ideas and your beliefs. (2/18/98)

During this whole group discussion, Terri was having the kind of inter-textual discussion recommended by Raphael and McMahon (1994) and described as “community share”.

In the second week of these Book Clubs, Terri commented to me at the beginning of the session that she would ask students to write something that day. She noted that she thought some of them were not yet far enough into their novels to think about war issues, and so she might ask them about character or

setting. The questions she actually put on the overhead for all students to respond to, independently, in their reading logs were these:

- 1) Write down a new word and its definition.
- 2) Write about what you've learned about what life was like before and during the Revolution: what did people do, wear, eat, etc. (3 sentences)
- 3) Make an educated guess about where on our timeline your story is. Explain why you think your guess is good and list your page # you're on (3 sentences). (2/23/98)

After writing these questions on the overhead, Terri used their Read Aloud novel to give examples of how to think about the social studies timeline in relation to the plot of a novel. These questions were about setting and were closely related to social studies learning about life during the Revolutionary War period and about the major events of that time.

On March 2, Terri again put questions on the overhead for students to answer in their reading logs. The questions were:

- 1) Write down a new word and its definition.
- 2) Write down 5 details in your book that let you know it takes place long ago. At least 1 should be a clue it takes place at the time of the Revolution.
- 3) Write down 5 things you know about your main character (these details should not be things you can see).

Again, these questions asked students to identify and define a new vocabulary word, using the dictionary. Then she asked a question about setting, particularly encouraging students to consider the novel's description of life at the time of the Revolutionary War. This was both a literary question and one that specifically linked the novels to students' social studies learning. On this day she also asked a literary question about character.

The third reading log entry came on March 16. Terri talked through the questions with the class as she wrote on the overhead:

1) Compare your book to Johnny Tremain. Write 2 paragraphs about things that are similar or different.

- How the war affects the main character.
- What the lives of the main characters are like.
- What we learn about the Revolutionary War Era in the 2 books.
- What happens to Tories in the books.

2) Predict what will happen next in Book Club book.

She elaborated on the kind of answers she wanted, asking for depth and details, and added that for the second question, "If you can draw on your knowledge of the Revolutionary War, that would be excellent. Draw on what you know about the Revolutionary War to tell what you think's going to happen." Again, there were both literacy and social studies emphases here. Terri asked students to compare across literary texts, to find details in the novels, and to make predictions. She also asked students to link their novels with social studies

learning and specifically asked them to draw on their knowledge of the Revolutionary War period.

Most students had finished reading their Book Club novels by March 27th. Those who had not done so were asked to finish reading them over the weekend. On Monday, March 30, Terri introduced their final projects for Book Clubs. These projects were to be "character mobiles." (See Appendix M for project description). Terri introduced these projects by making a sample with the students, based on the Read Aloud novel Johnny Tremain. She told students that they had one week to complete these.

Once again, the final Book Club projects integrated literary and historical kinds of questions. The focus of the projects was explicitly the central character in each novel and how this character changed over time. Attention to the dynamic nature of literary characters is an important literary response. Students were to compare the character at the beginning and end of the novel, although this was actually phrased as "before the war" and "after the war," which narrowed the focus slightly. Sub-questions asked students to consider what the central character was like in terms of likes, activities, and family, for example, and also what that character thought about the war. Again, these questions had both literary and historical emphases.

The Book Club historical-fiction unit with Revolutionary War-era novels lasted for about seven weeks. For the first six weeks, most of the time was spent in independent partner reading of the novels selected. Terri spent her time

moving around the room checking in with pairs of readers, answering questions, and attending to behavior. She held one whole-group discussion. She gave three opportunities for students to respond to specific questions in their reading logs. And she assigned a final project for the last week of the unit.

The questions Terri asked students individually, as a whole group, or through questions on the overhead were both literary and historical in nature. The main literary emphasis was on character and setting, but these were both also related to the Revolutionary War era. Terri's questions focused on the setting of the novel in terms of the specific time and place described. Except for occasional vocabulary definitions or clarifications about the novels, her questions actually addressed literary elements within a framework of the historical content of the novels. This was consistent with her belief that historical fiction could help students understand the lives of real people:

The people who did the work and the living and the dying and that whole larger background to the historical figures and major events of history.

And that's what I hope that they get a sense of through the reading of historical fiction especially. (1/11/98)

Description of Social Studies

Social studies was scheduled for a half-hour at the end of the day on Tuesdays, and for one hour before lunch on Wednesdays. In both cases, students arrived at class from recess and had social studies until either the end of the school day or their lunch break. For this unit, lessons were consistently held on

Wednesdays but sometimes took the place of science on Mondays, allowing for a longer lesson. The Revolutionary War unit took just over seven weeks.

Terri introduced the Revolutionary War unit to students on February 2 in the following way:

Today we are going to start our new social studies unit. We're working on our project for our old social studies unit, so that's a sign that it's a time to start a new topic. And the next thing that we're going to be studying about in social studies is the American Revolution. And I was wondering, before we get started with some of the other stuff, if anybody can help us think about what that means. What's a revolution? (2/2/98)

Dee responded that a revolution "meant to, like, change what they were doing," and Terri extended that through more question and answers to raise ideas about war and changing laws. She then asked, "Does anybody know anything - any parts about the Revolutionary war? About the American Revolution? Does anybody know any people who were involved? Or places that were involved?" (2/2/98). She was a little surprised to find that no student could tell her anything, and so she began by telling them the dates of the American Revolution and asking them to figure out its duration. She then told them to begin reading with partners from the reading packets she had made up for them, thinking about the introductory questions:

How did the economy play a role in starting the revolutionary war? How did the structure of government play a role in starting the revolutionary

war? And how did links with other countries, including England, play a role in starting the revolutionary war? (Social studies reading packet)

Students read in pairs for about fifteen minutes, but struggled to make sense of the material or answer the questions. In a subsequent lesson, Terri “backed up” to explain the concept of cause and effect, and its importance in studying history.

In this first lesson, Terri introduced the unit to students, discovered that they knew very little about this historical period, and introduced the idea of cause and effect, a major focus of her planning for the unit. She also introduced the reading packets that would be the major source of information about the Revolutionary War for students, and she established some routines for social studies lessons across the unit.

Social studies lessons took various forms during the Revolutionary War unit. Terri opened with an introductory lesson that had a teacher-led, whole-class, question-answer format followed by independent student reading to answer teacher-developed questions from the reading packet. Both of these formats, teacher-led discussion and reading to answer questions, were quite common during this unit, as they were across her social studies for the year.

Sometimes questions were taken from the social studies text, sometimes from the reading packet Terri had developed for this unit, and sometimes written on the overhead that day to guide the lesson. Terri left reading excerpts and questions for the students to answer with a substitute when she was unable

to be there. For example, on February 3 students were asked to read from the reading packet and answer questions written on the board:

Write 3 sentences for each question:

“What were the Patriots fighting for?” Am. Revolution, pp. 14-19

“A Taxing King” pp. 50-55

1. How did decisions get made in the colonies?
2. Who made the decisions?
3. How were they made?

On March 11 and 18, students were asked to read and answer questions from the social studies text with the substitute teacher. Terri also assigned reading and questions for homework on occasion. Sometimes she then reviewed those homework questions in a whole-class, question-answer format during class, as on March 16 and 25, or reviewed the questions assigned during class with the substitute, as on March 24. After the first two classes of this unit, Terri only assigned independent reading and answering of questions for homework. She preferred to use a whole-class, read-aloud, question-answer format to better help students understand the content.

Terri sometimes guided whole-class reading and discussion with questions written on the overhead. For example, on February 23, Terri wrote on the overhead: “What do you hear about what sort of government they wanted? How did they describe how it should be? What was important to them?”

Students then took turns reading paragraphs from the reading packet, and Terri asked questions requiring short answers to guide the class through the reading. A similar format was used on March 2 to guide student understanding of the Declaration of Independence, except that in that case, Terri read the document herself, pausing to ask questions and clarify language. This format of the teacher reading aloud and asking questions of the group was repeated at other times, and sometimes students voted for this format rather than students reading passages aloud.

In social studies lessons involving whole-class, teacher-led sessions, the majority of time was given to teacher talk. Sometimes Terri read aloud and asked questions. Sometimes students read aloud and Terri asked questions; sometimes Terri led a question-answer session to guide students to an understanding of the larger questions being considered. In each case, Terri set the agenda, asked most of the questions, decided where reading should begin and end, and did most of the talking. Students did not address each other or build on the comments of other students.

Transcripts of these lessons show that Terri spoke approximately four times as much as all the students combined. Students rarely answered beyond one word or a phrase. The longest recorded student contribution during a social studies lesson, other than reading aloud, consisted of Lynn responding to a question about the rights of all people to be treated equally. She said:

So that like the king, he would only, like he might only like his family and treat them well, and then all these other people that work for him and stuff, and they're working hard for him, and he'll just say they're (*inaudible*) or something, and like won't care about them, so the government should be nice to everyone and treat them equally. So if you like this person you should like the other one. (3/16/98)

More commonly, the question-answer part of a lesson would involve short answers and teacher guidance in a recitation format:

Terri: So what are the people who wrote and signed the Declaration of Independence saying is important to them? What's important? This is the stuff our country is based on.

Student: All men are created equal.

Terri: That all men are created equal. And do they mean that each one of us are the same?

Students: No.

Terri: No. What do they mean by "all men are created equal?" Champ, what do they mean by that?

Champ: Not that like we're the same, but we should be treated equally.

Terri: We should be treated equally, right? And what else specifically?

Champ: That we all have the same rights.

Terri: That we all have the same rights. And what were the rights that were so important? There were three basic rights. Three basic rights they

named.

Student: The right to live. The right to be free. And the right to, to – the right to be able to try to find (*inaudible*)

Terri: Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Okay. So those are important things to them. Okay. Who can read the next section? Who can read that section for us?

Some lessons involved activities or projects that students worked on either individually or in small groups, and the discourse and participation patterns were different for these lessons. On March 18, Terri introduced a timeline project. Each student pulled a strip of paper out of a basket. The paper gave them a reading reference and a topic for which they were to create a timeline sheet. They were to write the date of the historical event, draw a picture of it, and write a caption describing the event. Students worked independently on their reading and timeline sheet, asking for help when they needed it. There was much engaged independent reading, writing, and drawing. There was some student-student interaction about the project topics. The following day, the students each came up to read their timeline sheets and place them in chronological order along the classroom wall, with Terri providing commentary and summarizing the events.

On February 25, Terri introduced a map activity that was different from the common, social studies lesson format. Students were to use the maps in their reading booklet and text to label on a blank map ten places important in the

Revolutionary War. They were also challenged to locate places where their Book Club or the Read Aloud novel took place. This activity involved different kinds of discourse and participation. Like the timeline sheets, the maps were individual, and each student worked independently, but there was student conversation as they worked, and there was a product to complete rather than the more common question-answer session.

A different lesson pattern involved a group activity to write a Bill of Rights for students. Terri introduced this after reading the Declaration of Independence to the students, saying:

This ties in not only with our next part of the social studies unit when we're going to study the Constitution and the Bill of Rights but it also ties in with something that the teachers are working on right now. All the teachers in the building are working on developing a new system to help kids make good choices at [this] school and to help those who make mistakes to learn from their mistakes. And I thought it might be interesting if I could get us to think about what rights do you think are important for kids when they come to school? So just take, put your heads down, and think. I'd like to get at least five that we think are really important. (3/2/98)

Then there followed a discussion of her example of eating candy in school, but Terri was clear that this would be inappropriate, despite the views of several students to the contrary. After this, the discourse took on the familiar question-

answer pattern. The students spoke more often than usual, but still with short answers and in response to the teacher rather than each other. Although there were no specific questions to answer or reading to be done, and although this lesson was an attempt to link historical concepts with students' lives, the lesson in fact looked very similar to other lessons in terms of teacher-directed participation and discourse.

The final assessment for this unit was an individual evaluation for students to complete independently but using any of the resources at their desks including, their social studies text, reading packet, notes, and their Book Club novels. There were five questions:

- 1) What were the major causes of the Revolutionary War? Why did the Patriots decide to fight the war?
- 2) How did the war affect the lives of everyday people? (For this answer you may want to use your book club book - think about how the lives of people in your book club book were affected by the war.)
- 3) Tell about either one famous person from the Revolutionary War or tell about one important event that happened during the Revolutionary war. Tell about the person or the event and say why the person or the event was important.
- 4) Complete the Venn diagram below, using it to compare what Tories and Patriots believed in and did. You should have at least three items in each area.

- 5) Extra Credit. Tell how the main ideas in the Constitution relate to the reasons why the Revolutionary War was started. (4/1/98)

This assessment reviewed Terri's major goals for student learning from the Revolutionary War unit, including an emphasis on cause and effect, and on the lives of both famous and ordinary people living at the time.

The Revolutionary War unit, as enacted and experienced in the classroom, was similar to previous units in this classroom that integrated social studies and literature around a historical period. Terri's planning for the unit, her routines and expectations, the materials and tasks, and the discourse and participation patterns examined in this unit were consistent with student reports of earlier units, and with student work and assignments from those units.

C. Student Connections: The Revolutionary War Unit

Integration is commonly advocated on the basis of claims that integrated curriculum helps students make connections of various kinds, and that these connections are important, valid, and lead to improved student learning. I have argued in an earlier chapter that this is not necessarily or logically true. My study addresses this issue by examining the three major kinds of connections proponents of integrated curriculum argue students may be expected to make: across subjects at the same time (horizontal connections); within each subject across time (vertical connections); and with their own lives and the world outside the classroom.

As I have previously discussed, the teaching and learning patterns for the Revolutionary War unit were similar to those for earlier integrated units. In January, students had described Book Clubs in terms of reading and writing processes and historical content. The majority of the students recognized the link between social studies content and literature selections for Book Club and Read Aloud. Students also had described social studies in terms of history or specific historical topics and periods, and the processes of reading, writing, and listening. During the Revolutionary War unit, similar student understandings about history and literature study were evident.

What Connections did Students Make Across History and Literature Study?

Student understandings about history and literature study in this unit reflect Terri's understandings about integration in terms of an emphasis on the connections across subjects. I refer to these as "horizontal" connections, defining the horizontal dimension as integration "at any given time" where students are encouraged to see coherence among different areas of study (Case, 1991a). In this integrated unit, the horizontal connections were predominantly across history and literature study.

Terri's plans showed an emphasis on these horizontal connections. She selected literature on the basis of its historical content and its anticipated contribution to student understanding of the lives and times of that period. She planned assignments for reading journals and final Book Club projects that also emphasized these connections. For example, there were three reading journal

assignments in this unit and one final project, with a total of ten written questions for students to address. Out of these ten, six were specifically based on the historical context of the novels, two were vocabulary questions, one was prediction, and one was about character. In social studies, students had written assignments to complete on ten occasions, including a final assessment. There was a map to complete, a timeline event to illustrate and describe, and a total of twenty-four written questions to answer. Of these twenty-four questions, one question on the final assessment asked students to think about their Book Club characters to consider how the war affected the lives of everyday people. No other questions referred to literature.

Terri's planning showed a disproportionate emphasis on connecting Book Club novels to history study. This focus was evident when Terri planned an early reading journal assignment for students and commented that she didn't think students were far enough in their novels to discuss the war issues, so she would ask them to write about character or setting. This comment and the fact that she actually did ask them to write about setting, but in terms of the historical era, illustrate her primary concern with connecting Book Clubs to social studies content.

Terri also planned one Read Aloud session devoted to re-reading a particular passage in which one character delivers a speech about the necessity of fighting the war. This discussion might have been planned because of how hard the passage was for students to understand as literature, or because of its

importance in relation to the historical content. She planned an early, whole-class discussion during Book Clubs focusing on how each novel's main character was affected by the war. This discussion encouraged both horizontal connections within literature (across the different novels), and with social studies content.

As she led lessons, Terri also took opportunities to make explicit connections across social studies and literature. Again, this looked different in social studies and in literature lessons. As she reviewed a homework assignment in social studies, Terri referred to their literature books as she said about the war, "As we know, it wasn't any fun..., which you're learning about in your Book Club books. It wasn't any fun. So they fought for five hard years, and they finally won the right to establish their own government" (3/16/98). This was a casual reference to Book Club connections, as were her only other such comments during social studies lessons. She once said, during a discussion of the second amendment, "If you read My Brother Sam is Dead, the British came through and took all the guns," and another time she referred to that same novel as having an example of the right to a fair trial. These comments showed that she herself was making a particular connection between literature and social studies, but they were unplanned comments that did not ask the students to make any connections themselves or respond in any way.

In literature lessons, she made many more such connections, in addition to planning for more student thinking about the connections in their written assignments. I have described earlier how Terri paused in her reading of Johnny

Tremain, to talk with students about the historical setting of the novel, where it could be placed on the Revolutionary War timeline, and the historical events and figures that were woven into the plot. Students were able to identify such events as the Boston Tea Party and the Stamp Act, to recognize historical figures like Paul Revere, and to infer Patriot and Tory sensibilities.

Terri sometimes made horizontal connections within literature study in this unit. She drew on their common reading of Johnny Tremain as an example when she asked students to complete assignments for their Book Club novels and particularly when she modeled the final assignment. She also had one assignment asking students to compare their Book Club novel with the Read Aloud novel.

The horizontal connections that students made mirrored those emphasized by Terri. They also focused on the connections between the historical content of their Book Club novels and the history study of their social studies unit. Vanessa seemed to assume this connection when she said her novel was boring and “really stupid – it doesn’t even tell about the Revolution. It just tells about her running away” (3/11/98). Dee added that the events in the book could have happened even if there had been no war, apparently assuming that the plot itself was somehow not valid to her without the Revolutionary War context.

Students sometimes went to the timeline and moved the arrow indicating when their Book Club novel was taking place. Some students were able to talk

about the historical connections when invited to, although they rarely initiated such connections beyond moving the timeline arrow or finding a place on the map.

In a post-unit interview, Lynn argued that Johnny Tremain was not a real person but that “all that stuff he did really did happen. The Boston Tea Party happened. The minutemen defeat the British. The First Continental Congress. The next that’s going to happen in the timeline is the Second Continental Congress” (4/2/98). Vanessa defined Patriots during Read Aloud sessions, drawing on social studies class information, and Cody made connections between the Boston Massacre and Johnny Tremain.

Not all students made the kinds of connections across subjects that Terri planned and hoped for. During conversations with students near the end of the unit, I asked many of them how their book might end and specifically how the war would end. Although they had studied the end of the war in social studies, many did not carry this information over to predictions for their Book Club novels. Cody could not tell who would win the war. James and Tom had this exchange with me about this:

F: Do you want to know how the war ends, or do you already know how the war ends?

James: We know how the war ends. It’s in the book.

Tom: No we don’t.

F: Do you know how the war ends? You've been studying the Revolutionary War.

James: America wins! (3/11/98)

Apparently James had not been making the literature/history-study connection until explicitly asked to do so, and Tom was not sure about the ending of the war at all. It is also likely that the different text genres typically encountered by these students in social studies and Book Clubs led them to keep the subjects and categories separate rather than make these kind of horizontal connections. A similar conversation with Max and Rex showed Max unable to say who would win the war, but Rex was able to point to the timeline as evidence of the outcome.

Max may not have been making connections because of a lack of history learning that he could transfer to the reading of his novel. Another exchange during Book Clubs showed him struggling to understand the novel and the history:

Max: They said they're not going to quit until the Redcoats are beaten.

Whoever the Redcoats are.

F: Who are the Redcoats?

Max: They're like the Indians I think. Aren't they?

Rex: No! They're the British.

Max: Oh yeah. (3/16/98)

Max appeared to confuse "Redcoats" with "Redskins," which was probably a linguistic confusion but one that may have been compounded by a view of both as "the enemy."

Max was not alone in this difficulty of making connections because of incomplete historical understanding. Early on in Book Clubs, Jeff and Michael were unable to estimate the time context of their book (within several centuries). They appeared to make no connections between the events and places in the book and their history study, but on other occasions they also struggled with dates and the concept of time. It seems likely that they, like Max, could not make connections well *across* subjects when their understanding *within* a subject was incomplete.

Some students made horizontal connections across literature and history study that were actually faulty. For example, Champ's novel included the Hessians, and he was unable to say who they were fighting for, whether his main character was a Patriot or Tory, or who would win the war. He became confused in part because his novel included a group of people, the Hessians, that he had not learned about in Book Club and in part because his novel complicated the issue of which side of the war was "good" or "bad." Although Terri recognized the complexity of the different novels and the potential for this to contribute to student understanding, she was not able to spend the time needed to help these students unpack the complexities.

There were many times when students were confused about an assignment that asked them to consider particular time periods, such as before or after the war, when their novel did not explicitly address that time. Also, the time frames of each novel, of the Read Aloud novel, and of the history studied in social studies were all slightly different, so that events were encountered by students at different times across all three texts.

Students made very few connections with literature during social studies class, which was consistent with Terri's emphasis in planning and teaching. Duke made a faulty connection writing about Sam Adams because he "was the one who made that dumb speech" in Johnny Tremain, when actually the speech was by James Otis. Emma was unable to say anything about Tories on her final assessment until she was asked to think about her Book Club. She then remembered that John Reid was a Tory and that he had been treated badly, and she generalized to claim that Tories were treated badly.

Horizontal connections across literature and history study were the kind of connection Terri primarily planned for in this integrated unit. They were also the kind of connection she most commonly made in assignments and in teaching. Terri most notably asked students to complement their history study by considering what their Book Club novels contributed to their understanding of the era and events, and different perspectives. Written assignments in Book Club show that students were able to explore the historical setting of their novels and find details establishing the Revolutionary War era context. However, students

initiated few cross-curricular connections themselves, beyond placing literature events on their history timeline. Many students tended to read the novels without reference to the history, although some students may not have been able to make connections because of a lack of understanding in social studies.

What Connections did Students Make Within History Study
and Within Literature Study across Time?

As students spoke with me in pre-unit interviews in January, it became clear that many of them thought about their Book Clubs and their social studies in terms of bounded units. Students were consistently unable to predict what they might study next in either subject, or how it would be selected by the teacher, although they often predicted that the Book Clubs would be linked to the social studies unit topic. They also showed an understanding of “units” in many subject areas, telling me about units they were studying in math or in gym, for example.

This emphasis on units of study in each subject area and on the connections between literature and history study raised questions for me about students’ ability to make vertical connections. Vertical connections are the connections within a particular subject area across time (Case, 1991a). While “integration” of curriculum usually refers to horizontal connections across subjects, cautions about integrated curricula often refer to a loss of vertical coherence and consequent damage to the “integrity” of a discipline. Each kind of

connection implies a different kind of coherence of curriculum and integration of student learning.

In the Revolutionary War unit, Terri's planning emphasized horizontal connections, but she had a larger framework for the year in both social studies and literature that included attention to vertical connections. Her social studies plan outlined units of study beginning with an introduction to history and geography and then moving from early Native American history through Colonization, Revolution, Westward Expansion, the Civil War and World War II. This was a chronological treatment of United States history.

Terri's Book Club units began with Animal Stories and were to move through three units of Historical Fiction linked to social studies units, and then a Fantasy unit, a Biography unit, and a final Historical Fiction unit. This plan included a variety of genres across time as the basis for her literature study.

Terri's planning for the Revolutionary War unit did not include assignments that asked students to consider connections with other history or literature study from earlier in the year. Students sometimes made inter-textual horizontal connections across the Book Club and Read Aloud literature of this unit but did not make vertical references to books read as part of earlier units.

Students made some vertical connections *within* the social studies unit, particularly by using the Revolutionary War era timeline to locate major events, but the emphasis was on locating the events on the timeline rather than linking events chronologically or causally. On the day when they put up their pieces of

the timeline in chronological order, students were also asked to take notes on three major events. They commonly used their own event first, and then chose two other events, apparently rather randomly. They were not asked to have them in chronological order and did not do so. Apparently this was not a particular goal for Terri in this lesson. Later, she did have the goal of students recognizing the connection between the war and the Constitution, but Champ explicitly did not understand what they had to do with each other, and other students did not make the causal connection without help.

Students were not asked to refer back to earlier historical periods or units studied and rarely did so on their own. In a post-unit interview, Jeff could name no other social studies units studied this year. When I asked him what he had studied before this unit, he first named the Revolutionary War and then amended that with Michael's help, and said he meant "colonists and Indians" (3/24/98). Earlier, he had also been unable to make a connection between the colonists in the Revolutionary War he was studying and the Colonization unit they had just completed, even though I explicitly asked him about this.

In the first social studies lesson of the unit, Lynn asked, "What's the economy? What's government?," although she had been writing about these for other units across the year.

The Revolutionary War unit was taught in many ways like earlier integrated units of history and literature study. Therefore, I was not surprised that students made few connections between this unit and earlier units, as they

had not been able to do so in January, particularly as Terri's emphasis was on the horizontal connections. Her understanding of the larger curricular framework and its vertical connections within both history and literature study were not visible to the children.

However, when I asked students in post-unit interviews about what they might study next in social studies, their responses were more mixed than they had been in January. James and Tom imagined perhaps the Bill of Rights or the world wars but could not give a reason. Champ still thought that Terri "just chooses," but Cody thought that "she, like, goes up in a timeline" (4/2/98). A similar conversation occurred with Lynn and Jim:

F: What do you think you'll be studying next in social studies?

Jim: Um

Lynn: I don't know

Jim: She just picks the subject without letting us know.

F: How does she pick?

Lynn: I don't know.

Jim: I guess - timeline.

F: What do you mean by "timeline"?

Lynn: I guess what comes after the Revolutionary War. Maybe the next couple of years (4/2/98).

These exchanges suggest a slight change in student understanding about the curriculum. It appears that the work with the Revolutionary War timeline had

helped some of the students begin to see history study more chronologically and understand the vertical connections or continuity within that curriculum across the year.

What Connections did Students Make With Their Own Experiences and Life Outside the Classroom?

Another common claim of integrated-curriculum proponents is that it is more meaningful to students and helps them to make connections between their learning and their own lives and experiences and the “real world” outside the classroom. Again, this is a claim that is not necessarily true and needs further examination.

Terri’s plans made no explicit mention of connecting the classroom curriculum with children’s experiences or the world outside the classroom. However, she did hope that students would learn historical habits of mind that would enable them to make some of those connections. She had also hoped to be able to discuss current events in the light of their history learning. However, time constraints worked against this, and it never became part of the curriculum.

Terri planned a couple of class activities specifically aimed at making connections between the history curriculum and present-day life. She told students they were going to work on a “Bill of Rights for Students” that would link with work the teachers were doing in the school. On another occasion, for homework, students were asked to choose the amendment to the Constitution that they thought was most important and say what life would be like without it.

These were both explicit examples of Terri planning for connections between student learning of history and applying it to present day life. Student responses and understanding were mixed, however.

There also were occasions when Terri made these kinds of present-day links with the history curriculum as she taught. As the students discussed the amendments, Terri explained the fourth amendment by saying, "That's why police have to have search warrants," saying they had probably heard of people "taking the fifth" on television crime shows (3/24/98). She also explained about states accepting the laws of other states, with an example of her driver's license being good in Indiana, and reminded them about her jury duty experience to help them think about a right to a fair trial. She introduced their study of the Declaration of Independence by asking a question and then asking, "What's important to them [the Framers]? This is the stuff our country is based on" (2/23/98).

Students responded to the planned assignments with mixed success in linking history with present life. Champ was able to speak about the importance of free speech with reference to Martin Luther King Jr., and Jim thought freedom of religion was important because without it, we "might have to be another religion" (3/25/98). However, some students struggled with making the present-day connections because they took the amendments too literally or were confused by the language or the details. Cody thought that without the right to a fair trial "people could get away with crimes," and Champ thought that we

could still have British soldiers in our homes without the Bill of Rights. James was able to say, "Why would the British want to come over here and live with us? It could be American soldiers" (3/25/98). These examples show how complex it was for students to move from their limited understanding of history to more abstract ideas and to present-day implications.

Students also made faulty connections because of limited knowledge. Champ predicted that in his Book Club novel, the Americans would win the war "because they usually do. They have all these weapons, and they can control the earth 'cause of their planes and everything." He drew on his understandings of the world and made connections and generalizations that were faulty because he also had a limited understanding of the concept of time. A similar exchange with James and Tom about their novel shows them bringing their own understandings of the present to their reading:

F: And then he's captured by the Hessians who are supposed to be the enemy, and they don't seem bad. That's very confusing!

James: Well a lot of countries don't treat prisoners bad.

Tom: Yeah, they do.

James: America doesn't. They just put 'em in jail.

Tom: Unlike the Nazis.

Emma also tried to make connections but was confused. She asked, "Do we have Patriots now?" but was confused because she was not sure what a Patriot really was.

Students did show their own attempts at making connections between their learning in this unit and their understandings of present-day life. In a discussion of the issue of "no taxation without representation," Jim asked Terri how much the taxes were, and whether they were more than they are today, in an apparent attempt to understand why the colonists were so upset. Several days later, Lynn asked, "How come we still have taxes if they said they didn't want them?" (2/19/98). Like Jim, she missed the link between taxation and representation, but she also was trying to make a present-day connection. Champ helped Max to understand who won the war by asking, "Is the king still telling us what to do?" (4/1/98). Max then understood.

Both Terri and the students made some attempts to connect history study with their understanding of present-day life. (Neither Terri nor the students made explicit connections between the literature study and present- or everyday life.) The connections students made were influenced by their understanding or misunderstanding of both the present day and of history.

Terri appears to have made some assumptions about student understandings that were not accurate. For example, she wanted to help students link the outcome of the war with the writing of the Constitution, and led them through a question-answer session. However, students were not coming up with the Constitution as the answer and were instead guessing that what the colonists would write up after their victory was perhaps a peace treaty, or the Bill of Rights, or Congress. She had to tell them that it was in fact the Constitution. Terri

said, "I'm sure everyone's heard of the Constitution." Then she asked for a show of hands, and many students did not raise their hands, indicating they had not heard of it.

In this case, it seems Terri was hoping to help them make connections between the war and something important in present-day life that she expected them to know about, but which they did not all know about. She was working on the assumption of a shared background knowledge that did not exist. This exemplifies one of the difficulties of teaching, which is the huge difference between teacher and student prior knowledge that is brought to a topic.

Integrated curriculum often is claimed as a way to help students make connections not only with the world beyond the classroom, in this case, mostly seen in connections made between history and present-day life, but also with their own lives. Terri did not make explicit plans for such connections, but students showed several attempts to personalize their learning in this way. Sometimes students made personal connections to try to make sense of something. Early in the unit, Terri asked why the colonists thought taxes were unfair, and a student began to respond with, "Well I just think it's unfair because--," and Terri reminded him to consider "not why do *you* think, but what do *they* think?" (2/10/98). Another time, a student worked out that "they celebrated the two hundredth birthday in 1987 and I was already born in April, so that was eleven years ago, so now it's two hundred and eleven" (3/24/98).

Sometimes students could make personal connections when asked. In Book Club this was not a common part of their responses, but when I had conversations with students, I asked about their personal responses and if they had ever been in similar situations, or felt the same way a character in their novel felt. Lynn and Jim liked their book because of their interest in horses and in muskets, respectively. Becca described a hospitalization that was scary, like an event in her book. Champ said he wouldn't want to be in a war "because I don't want to get killed or anything" (3/16/98). On the other hand, James was very explicit at one point: "I don't want to study the dumb Revolution. It's not going to help me get a job. I'm going to be a photographer" (2/25/98).

Students appeared to make connections with their own lives and present-day life to try to better understand something they were learning about. They were not asked to do this often and were asked to make rather narrow and specific connections. Some of the connections they themselves made were not explored or used.

Summary

There is evidence that Terri's beliefs about integration and about history and literature greatly affected the curricular plans she made for an integrated unit about the Revolutionary War and influenced the kinds of connections that students made. These plans also were changed somewhat by the realities and constraints of the classroom context, particularly time constraints, and became an enacted curriculum that reflected both Terri's original plans and these constraints

that consequently also influenced student learning. In addition, students brought their own interests, experiences, and understandings to the study of history and literature, and these in turn affected the kinds of connections they made across subjects, within subjects, and with life outside the classroom.

CHAPTER FIVE

UNIT TWO: THE CIVIL WAR AND FREEDOM

A. Planning for the Unit on Civil War and Freedom

Terri's original planning for the year included a five-week social studies unit on the American Civil War. This unit was originally not planned as an integrated unit with literature. The literature for this time was to be fantasy, linked with a space science unit. However, Terri's plans changed as the year progressed, particularly because the history and literature of previous units had taken longer than expected.

Terri completed her integrated Revolutionary War unit with students on April 3, the last day before Spring Break. After the break, she began a three-week social studies unit on Westward Expansion, and a Read Aloud novel of historical fiction set during the period they were studying. She also began a literature unit on poetry. During this three-week period, I was out of the classroom and continued to transcribe notes and interviews from the first observed unit and to do preliminary analysis of the data.

I have written about the negotiated teacher and researcher roles of this study in Chapter Three. Terri and I had had informal conversations about some of my observations, as well as her own observations, during the teaching of the Revolutionary War unit, and we continued to do so. We also met for a lengthy planning session at Terri's home on Saturday, March 28 toward the end of the first unit. We spent time talking about the first unit and planning for the next

observed unit. Terri then continued to plan the unit while I continued to work on data transcription and analysis. We then met again at the school on Tuesday, April 28 for Terri to tell me how her planning for the unit had progressed and to further prepare for the second observed unit. This unit became the Civil War and Freedom unit.

We both came to our meeting on March 28 with some thoughts about the first observed unit, which was in its final stages in the classroom, and some ideas about the next integrated unit for May. I also brought some notes to share with Terri about alternative ways to think about integration, as Terri had continued to express an interest in thinking more broadly about this.

I had drawn together some ideas from various authors about different organizing schemes and centers for integrated units. For example, I outlined Jacobs' (1989) continuum of integration models from discipline-based integration, through parallel, complementary, interdisciplinary, and integrated, to a completely integrated program, with her emphasis on how much is integrated. I also outlined Fogarty's (1991) ten models for integration, particularly the five models for integrating across subject areas - sequenced, shared, webbed, threaded, and integrated - and her emphasis on what is to be integrated and in what ways. I outlined Case's (1991a) examination of integration. It was this work that drew Terri's interest particularly and began a conversation that led to a different form of integration for the second unit. I

therefore include in Fig 5.1 the summary of Case's work that Terri and I talked from during this meeting.

- Integration of - Content
 - Skills and processes
 - School and self
 - Holistic
- Dimensions - Vertical (within subject across time)
 - Horizontal (at same time across subjects)
- Modes - Fusion (joining together e.g. Humanities)
 - Insertion (adding elements of one to another)
 - Correlation (drawing connections and noting parallels)
 - Harmonization (common form of inquiry across different elements)
- Organizers:
 - Theme (idea shared by number of elements e.g. places, events, eras, concepts, generalizations, phenomena, entities)
 - Issues (questions whose answer is value judgment)
 - Inquiry (question whose answer is description - how things were/ could be)
 - Problem (question whose answer is a course of action)
 - Project (creation of a "product")

Fig 5.1. Summary of Roland Case's (1991a) examination of integration.

I also brought to our meeting some notes about the criteria for "good" integration discussed by different authors (Ackerman, 1989; Barab and Landa, 1997; Perkins, 1989; and Shanahan et. al, 1995) and the cautions raised about integration by other authors (Alleman & Brophy, 1993; Boix-Mansilla & Gardner, 1997; and Roth, 1994). Terri showed little interest in these notes at this meeting, focusing more on the various ways of integrating the curriculum suggested in the summary of Case's (1991a) work.

I also brought my own thoughts about the planning for the second integrated unit, drawn from observations of the first unit and my reading and

thinking about integration. These were in the form of notes for myself for our conversation. I thought we might talk about alternate uses of time, for example: having time on the integrated topic that was not specifically “social studies” or “Book Club”; having time for learners to synthesize some of their learning across subject areas and with their own lives or previous learning; or using shorter pieces of literature and allowing for more discussion across them. I also thought we might talk about the issue of student choice, perhaps allowing a group discussion about what to study, or allowing different groups to study different aspects of a topic. I also thought we might talk about ways to integrate the subject areas around a common question, problem, goal or assignment that students were working towards from the beginning. As we talked about Case’s (1991a) forms and dimensions of integration, I also referred to notes I had made with examples of what these might look like for a Civil War unit, which was our stated starting point.

Our conversation explored a variety of issues. We began by looking at the dimensions of integration Case (1991a) describes as vertical and horizontal. Terri had been excited about the students’ use of the Revolutionary War timeline and disappointed that she could not find a good U.S. History timeline to put up in the classroom. She noted:

That has been really powerful for them to help understand the flow of events and it would be nice to have that sort of excerpt from the timeline

and then have the big thing for the whole year up about all the different things in American history. (3/28/98)

Terri's concern with student understanding of the timeline of history led to a conversation about the vertical dimension of integration and having something that "pulled everything back" from across the year in terms of chronological history study. This became part of the planning for the second integrated unit.

We moved from looking at the vertical and horizontal dimensions of integration to some of the other aspects outlined by Case (1991a). Terri remained interested in integration of content rather than integration of skills, or of school and self, or holistic integration. We looked together at the different organizers described. I gave examples of different organizers, such as staying with a theme of era but using non-fiction. Or having a theme based on a concept like "citizenship" or "conflict" or "freedom" that crosses eras and might include literature that was not directly related to the Civil War. Instead, "You could look at a concept and talk about it from the angle of the literature and from the angle of the social studies" (3/28/98).

As Terri read the notes about different organizers, she picked up on the "issues" approach and said:

Well, this is an interesting thing, this issues approach. Since we're, you know, never going to get to the modern era that could be a really interesting thing, you know - whether or not that's the focus of Book Club to have like "do all Americans have equal right?" Or just to have some

component of that within the social [studies] – like to have a current events section about equal rights. Either way that could be interesting.

(3/28/98)

This idea grew into the Civil War and Freedom unit that Terri taught in May. She became excited about the possibilities for linking such an issue of the struggle for rights with the Civil War, recognizing that the Civil War was partly about states' rights but also about freedom, and that this issue could "also help make it more real." She then thought about the possibilities for Book Clubs, thinking aloud: "Like, if we can find modern historical fiction, modern realistic fiction, or biography. Things of real people, things they can relate to more about people fighting for freedom or working for rights" (3/28/98).

It is noticeable that Terri's thinking about this focus on an issue included historical topics for Book Clubs from the beginning, with the explicit goal of addressing some of the social studies curriculum that would otherwise not be reached. Her thinking about the issue of freedom as an integrating center was in terms of historical struggles for freedom.

We talked more about integration of content, and Terri reiterated her belief that such integration is helpful for students:

Because I just think it's really useful for the kids to have some kind of, like the content integration, I mean especially after seeing how much they've struggled with understanding just the plain history of the Revolutionary

War – to make those realities more understandable to them through fiction or something like that. (3/28/98)

And so we planned for integration of content around an issue or theme having to do with the continuing struggle for freedom and rights. We spoke about this as an approach in which there would be separate areas of teaching and learning for each of the subjects of Book Clubs and social studies, such as the Civil War history, as well as an overlapping area having to do with the theme of freedom.

Next, Terri looked at the idea of students having some more choice about what they studied. This is how she began to think about this:

Well this idea here of different groups studying different things. I mean that could be interesting. We could have, you know, one Book Club focusing on..., fighting for Women's rights. One Book Club focusing on fighting for the rights of African Americans. One Book club focusing on fighting for the rights of Native Americans. And within that..., maybe they'll read some historical fiction. Maybe they'll read some non-fiction as well, depending on what we find. But then they would each make a presentation to the whole class addressing the large issue. Okay, so "how does, how do these people fight for freedom, and how is that related to the ideas of the Civil War?," you know, if that second question will bear being asked. I don't know. (3/28/98)

She then went on to expand on this interest in Book Club groups reading about different freedom struggles. And she began to think more about students reading

"a range of genres" within a group, including fiction and non-fiction. She wanted to finalize her plans so that she could begin compiling literature resources for Book Club groups.

As Terri thought about this issue, she also thought about the opportunities it presented for emphasizing the timeline of American history:

I think though freedom is a pretty strong - I mean, it's an issue that's been played out again and again in American history, and so -- . And in some ways you know that would be a nice end-of-the-year thing too, to get that vertical thing - to look at how freedom has been fought for in all these different time periods. You know, to tie back and say, "What were the pilgrims fighting for?," and "What were the Patriots fighting for?"

(3/28/98)

I agreed that in some ways this theme would link with the Constitution and Bill of Rights that students had just been working with, and that it could connect back from there to their history study across the year, as well as forward from there in new Book Club readings. Terri agreed that that was her idea here.

We talked a little more about the need to have Book Club selections that weren't too long, given the end of the school-year deadline. Terri still hoped to use a mix of genres - including historical fiction, non-fiction, and biography. We went to the bookstore together and spent several hours selecting books. In the end, we selected non-fiction literature, including biography. This met the criteria

both of shortening the reading selections and also working with the non-fiction genre of literature for a change.

Terri seemed quite excited about the possibilities she had outlined here and the opportunity to try a new approach in the classroom. She said:

I'm definitely up for something different. And I think it would be good for the kids too to have something different. So that Book Clubs aren't always so static, so that the format of things isn't always so the same. (3/28/98)

I also was excited by the possibilities beginning to emerge for this second unit. From the alternatives outlined, Terri had chosen to continue to focus on content integration but with an emphasis on a theme (or issue) rather than a common historical era. This was a significant change from anything she had done before. She had also chosen to work with non-fiction literature rather than historical fiction, and to have students select different historical struggles for freedom to study in their Book Clubs. This attention to student choice of topic was new for Book Clubs. Terri also seemed to be planning a unit that might link history and literature study around a common question.

Terri and I spoke at length again on April 28, a few days before she would begin teaching the second integrated unit that I would observe. Her planning for this unit had developed since our first planning session, and I was primarily concerned with understanding her goals and thinking as well as helping her prepare reading baskets for Book Clubs.

There was a student teacher there with Terri that afternoon, and so Terri recapped what we were discussing. She described both her usual form of integration that I had observed for the Revolutionary War unit and how she understood this new form for the Civil War and Freedom unit:

And so the way I've been standardly [integrating across curricular areas] would be in Book Clubs to read in the genre of historical fiction to read something about the time period that we're reading about in social studies.... But we came up with this idea of integrating both across content areas, both across social studies and literacy, but then also integrating across a big idea.

So that what we're going to be doing, we have these book clubs that we're just talking about.... And all of these will have to do with the big theme of freedom. So we'll be thinking about freedom in this realm of Book Clubs. How does the idea of freedom tie into different time periods in history? And then in social studies, we'll be talking about the Civil War, and we'll touch on how freedom was an issue in the Civil War. (4/28/98)

Here, Terri confirmed that the "overlap" between social studies and literacy would be "Freedom," and she then explained that that issue might "have different applications and definitions, and different interpretations depending on what they're reading and what the timeframe was." She also confirmed that Book Clubs would be entirely non-fiction literature. She described the groups as Civil War, Civil Rights, Women's Rights, the Holocaust and World War II, and

Immigrant citizens' rights. She had also considered Child Labor rights but had not been able to find enough books.

We had an interesting discussion about the Read Aloud novel, which Terri was still thinking about. She said, "I want to get at the historical fiction aspect. Because we're going to be reading a novel" (4/28/98). I questioned this, because Terri had said she would be focusing on non-fiction, but she explained it in terms of history study: "To get at that social studies stuff. You know, like what life was like for the people during the war." (4/28/98) So her plan was for students to read non-fiction literature during Book Clubs and historical fiction in support of the historical study of the Civil War during Read Aloud. She noted later in the conversation that, "We're also integrating across genres I suppose too. That's another fashion of integration in what we're doing, both fiction and non-fiction [literature], you know, tying them together this way" (4/28/98). In the end, she selected a Read Aloud novel that was a narrative based on a true story, Behind Rebel Lines by Seymour Reit (1988).

Although Terri mentioned genres and integrating across genres in literature study, her emphasis was still on history study. When she spoke about trying to complete this unit before the end of the school year, we had a brief but notable exchange:

Terri: Yes, we'll see. In four weeks. "All social studies, all the time."

F: Yeah – except for the non-fiction bit.

Terri: Which is still social studies, you know. In another form. Because they're learning about social studies content that ..., like you say, we just aren't getting to this year. (4/28/98)

My notes and transcription from this planning session show that I was the one raising issues of genre and literacy, and that Terri frequently returned to the theme of Freedom in light of historical eras and issues.

However, Terri also talked about Book Club goals for this unit, stressing reading strategies for non-fiction, such as not necessarily reading from beginning to end or learning how to use an index. She also talked about the focus of discussions within Book Club groups being on the topic, rather than on one particular book, because they would be selecting from a basket full of books on a topic: "It'll be information-sharing within the rest of the group. You know, 'What have I learned?,' 'What have we learned this week?' So it'll be like a mini-presentation sort of thing" (4/28/98). She continued to think aloud about the sorts of things students might also write about for Book Club:

Obviously, talking about how freedom is an issue...what people were fighting for. We could also get them to think about "how does this struggle relate to other struggles for freedom that we've read about?" And then interesting facts.... And then they'll have to come up with sort of basic era overviews. "Who are you reading about? When are you reading about it? Where?" (4/28/98)

When I again mentioned genre she thought perhaps that could best be discussed during Read Aloud times when she could also model keeping notes about interesting facts and so on, even though that would be a fictionalized biography.

I raised a question about whether or not the students would know what it was they were working towards because “it just seemed like maybe informational reading needed some purpose for reading. You’d mentioned a final project that was going to be like presentations” (4/28/98). Terri had forgotten that idea, but picked up on it and thought perhaps she would make some kind of activity sheet to guide Book Club reading. This did become part of her unit planning.

Terri spent a great deal of time thinking and talking about her plans for doing Book Clubs in new ways for this unit. As with the first integrated unit, however, Terri’s written plans were more detailed for social studies than for Book Clubs or Read Aloud. (See Appendix N for Terri’s social studies plans for the Civil War unit). She planned to open the unit with a discussion about Freedom, talking particularly about the distinction between Freedom to do and have certain things, and the Freedom from certain things, and linking this with earlier history study. She then planned to help students learn about the social and economic bases of the North and the South, including slavery. She then planned to spend time on the Civil War itself, teaching about the “Outbreak of the War,” and then the “Battles and Important Figures,” ending with a look at

how “Resources” affected the war, and finally how different groups of people experienced the war. She made a note to connect this with Book Club issues.

Terri’s planning for the second integrated unit evolved as she talked and thought about it. As she spoke about it with me just days before beginning the unit, there was an emphasis on students studying the Civil War in social studies and reading for information from non-fiction selections in literature. The integration was to occur with an overlapping area of emphasis on the theme of Freedom as it related to both the Civil War and the struggle of other individuals and groups for freedom. This model of integration could be represented by a Venn diagram. The theme of Freedom emphasized conceptual understanding of the theme and applications of it across many eras and contexts. There was also an emphasis on the vertical integration across historical eras as well as horizontal integration across Book Clubs and social studies during the unit.

B. Enacted Curriculum: The Civil War and Freedom Unit

The Civil War and Freedom unit was planned to be different from Terri’s earlier integrated units in significant ways in terms of the connections that students were encouraged to make and the amount and kind of integration of content across literature and history study. Book Clubs were going to be especially different in terms of students’ experiences. Terri took time at the beginning of the unit to explain to students the unit focus, and particularly to describe Book Clubs.

Introduction of Unit

On the day that Terri introduced the new Book Club choices to students, she showed them how to look through a whole basket of books about one of the choices: Civil War, Civil Rights, Women's Rights, Immigrant Citizens' Rights, Holocaust and World War II. They were to rank their choices and would be given partners and Book Club groups two days later. She explained how Book Clubs would be different for this unit:

What you're going to do, you're going to work with a partner to do reading from some of these books, and I'm going to start you off with one of the books, and then after that you'll be able to choose any of the books in the basket. And as a partner, you guys are going to work to get some information. And as a group, you guys are going to work to do some kind of presentation. (5/4/98)

She then briefly described the kinds of books that were in each basket. For example, the Civil War basket was described:

There are some books that have a lot of pictures in them as well as words. There are a couple of really big history books here. And then there are a variety of smaller books that are biographies of people like Harriet Tubman and Frederick Douglass and Abraham Lincoln, and then a book about one of the divisions of the union army that was free black slaves against the south. And of course, all of them talk about the Underground Railroad, the Emancipation Proclamation - lots of different books that all

relate to the people, places, and events that happened during the Civil War. (5/4/98)

For the other baskets, with time periods or issues not being addressed in social studies, Terri took a few minutes to describe some of the major issues or figures involved as she showed them the books. For example, as she showed them books in the Women's Rights basket, she said:

There are a couple of biographies - Susan B. Anthony. And some other things that have stories about women who fought for women's rights and changed how things happened in the world. And the story of the Women's Rights convention where women got together, not long after the Revolutionary War, and said that women and men should be created equal because, remember, that in the Declaration of Independence, it said, "All men are created equal"? Well they wanted to say, "Men and women are created equal" because they felt like women were equal. And some information about women's voting rights. And some biographies.

(5/4/98)

For the Immigrant Citizens' Rights basket Terri also described the issue briefly as she showed the books:

This is a book that talks about the experience of Japanese Americans during the Second World War. I don't know how many of you know this, but the picture on the back - this is a Japanese-American family - and they, many Japanese who were American citizens --maybe they were born

in Japan or maybe their parents or grandparents were – during World War II, one of the countries that the United States fought against was Japan, and the U.S. government decided that Japanese-Americans should be kept in concentration camps in our country. So they were all herded into – see how they're standing behind barbed wire - they had to leave their homes and their jobs and their businesses. That's a story about that.
(5/4/98)

She then showed a few more books from that basket.

Terri also took this opportunity to ask for student knowledge about two of the issues, the Holocaust and Civil Rights. When she asked, "Who knows what the Holocaust is?," Vanessa knew it involved Hitler and Germany, Steve that it involved the Nazis, and Lynn that it was about the concentration camps. Terri then told them:

Six million Jewish people were killed by the Nazis during World War II just because they were Jewish. Not because they had done anything wrong, but just because they were Jewish. So this book basket is about that time period. (5/4/98)

She went on to show them many of the different books in the basket, with brief descriptions of the stories behind them.

Similarly, she introduced the Civil Rights basket by asking, "Who can tell me what we mean by Civil Rights? What was that about? People fought for Civil Rights or worked for Civil Rights?" (5/4/98). James immediately mentioned

Martin Luther King, and so Terri showed several biographies about him and also about Malcolm X and Rosa Parks.

By the time she had students in Book Club groups, Terri had also developed a sheet for each reading pair to use to record information about their topic as they read. She told them:

This is sort of being ready to do your Book Club projects at the end when you do your presentation. And at the end, what you're going to do, as a group, is you're going to make a little mini-timeline. And do a few brief historical portraits, where you'll draw a picture of an important person from the era you're reading about. Just do a little..., two or three sentences about who they were, what they did. And you're also going to do a Venn diagram, you know, circles like this, comparing the issues of freedom in your era that you're reading about and other freedom issues that we've read about during the year. And then last, you have the choice of doing some creative things - either a skit or diorama about your time period.

(5/6/98)

Terri then read the instructions on the sheet, which told students to keep a lookout for information as they read and make notes on the sheet. The categories for note-taking were: important events, important people, freedoms that people had, freedoms that people did not have, ways these freedoms are the same as others studied this school year, and interesting facts. Students were advised to

use notebooks and page numbers as they took notes, so they could return to the references easily.

Terri began each group with a book she felt would be a helpful one to start with. Students could then select from any of the books in the basket. The baskets were rather different in terms of how many books students could choose from, but there were enough books in each basket that students could not read through all of them in this time period. The Immigrant Citizens' Rights basket contained just eight books, and the Women's Rights basket had several copies of just four titles. The Holocaust basket had several copies of many of the eight titles. The Civil Rights basket had sixteen titles, and the Civil War basket had seventeen different books.

As she introduced the Book Club baskets to the students, Terri also explicitly introduced the topic of Freedom and also gave brief summaries of the issues and the time periods associated with them. This therefore became an introductory lesson to the issue of Freedom and the connections across the Book Club groups as well as to each particular issue.

Description of Literacy

Terri's literature study for the Civil War unit centered on Book Clubs and Read Aloud, as usual. The Read Aloud part of the unit was experienced by students as similar to earlier units, with daily reading from a novel linked to their social studies era. The Book Clubs were experienced as new in format and focus.

Read Aloud.

The Read Aloud book that Terri finally selected for literature study in conjunction with the Civil War and Freedom unit was Behind Rebel Lines (Reit, 1988). This is a true story, written as a narrative, taken from memoirs and U.S. army records, and the work of historians, as explained in an introduction which a substitute read to students on the first day it was read.

Terri was absent on the day that she had expected to introduce this novel to students. However, they had read a picture book for two days prior to that, at the end of which Terri made connections with the new novel, saying:

So that was our first book, and that was based on a true story. Obviously, parts of it the author had to imagine, like the conversation that Pink and Say had together. It was based on a true story, and we'll be reading another true-story kind of thing, starting tomorrow, about a young woman who was 21, Emma Edmunds, who dressed as a man so that she could fight for the union in the Civil War. And it's really interesting. And this is a true story, too. She really did all these things. (5/6/98)

Terri therefore explicitly introduced genre as an important consideration during the Read Aloud sessions, as she had planned on doing.

Read Aloud was broadly similar to how it had been all year. Students sat on the floor eating a snack while Terri sat in the rocking chair and read from the novel, occasionally pausing to ask questions or respond to student comments or

questions. Read Aloud generally lasted from 9:00 to 9:30, followed by Book Clubs.

Terri commonly opened the session by asking a question to help students re-orient themselves to the novel, usually a question that asked them to recap the plot in some way. There was often some discussion around this, and then Terri would continue with the reading. Sometimes she would stop in the middle of the reading to clarify something for a student or to make a point. She rarely stopped for discussion more than once in the middle of the reading. Generally, she had a discussion at the beginning, then read, and then had some discussion at the end of the reading.

Terri's questions served a variety of purposes, as they had during her reading of Johnny Tremain in the Revolutionary War unit (see Appendix O for a record of teacher questions and comments during Read Aloud sessions for Behind Rebel Lines.) Her opening question each day usually helped recap the plot and check for comprehension. The plot involves a girl, Emma, who disguised herself to fight as a Union soldier in the Civil War and then became a spy and disguised herself many more times in order to penetrate the Confederate army. She therefore changes her name often during the story, becomes "he" as well as "she" as the story is told, and appears to be on different sides in the war. This was sometimes confusing for students, and Terri checked their comprehension and clarified things for them each day.

Other questions asked students to remember details of the plot, to make predictions or inferences, and to consider character. For this novel, Terri showed an emphasis on genre. She began the novel by reiterating that this was a true story and later had a discussion focused on, "How is this book different or the same as the books you're reading?" She talked about its classification as "fictionalized biography" and how that was different from the biographies they were reading in Book Clubs. She also asked students to consider, "Why do you think, if we're reading all those informational books, that I chose to read this book to you?" She agreed with students that it had to do with the Civil War subject matter and how it also incorporated other freedom issues. But she stressed that the main reason was that this fictionalized, narrative account was "adventure. Exciting. Fictionalized gives a sense of what day-to-day life was like" (5/13/98).

Terri's questions also asked students to make connections between this book and the freedom issues they were reading in Book Clubs. Students talked about the fact that Emma was a woman and not supposed to fight in the war, that she was a Canadian and therefore an immigrant, and that the issue of slavery was important.

Questions also asked students to generalize from this story to broader issues in the Civil War. For example, Terri asked, "What do we know so far about what some women did in the Civil War?," and she then referred them to the new bulletin board in the classroom that included pictures and stories of

women spies during the war. Once she re-read a quotation from the novel and asked what it suggested about why Emma was fighting. She linked this to a recap of the Revolutionary War and an emphasis on the hard-won union of the states as a reason the north had for fighting the Civil War. Another time she asked, "What did we learn about what fighting a war was like?" This helped students connect the novel with the Civil War but also showed her concern for using books to flesh out the realities of living in that time.

This novel was not a long one, and Terri was able to read it in ten sessions. She also was able to hold longer discussions at the beginning and end of the reading sessions. She frequently took answers from several students when she asked a question. For example, when she asked about freedom issues in her first lesson, four students contributed. When she asked for predictions in the next session, four students again had suggestions. Later, she asked students about the kind of song that the slaves were singing, and students contributed their own knowledge and experiences with encouragement from Terri. Jim had a religious background that allowed him to talk about the angel, Gabriel, and Tom spoke of a different spiritual he knew. Another time when Terri asked, "How is this book different or the same as books you're reading?," nine students contributed ideas with little additional prompting from Terri.

There was one Read Aloud session that was a different format. On May 14, Terri opened by saying they would do something different today and work together on freedom issues, recording their thinking on the easel. This was to

model something each Book Club group was going to do with reference to their books. Terri asked what some of the freedom issues were in this book, and students suggested: slaves couldn't go where they wanted; women didn't get to go to war; immigrants didn't have the freedom to fight right away, and slaves had no freedom of speech. Terri then asked how those freedoms related to other freedoms that students had heard about, and she connected their ideas visually as they spoke about Native Americans and the Pilgrims in England.

The Read Aloud with Behind Rebel Lines provided a venue for Terri to model literary thinking about genre and story elements. It was also an opportunity for Terri to help students make connections between this novel and both their Book Club and social studies texts and topics.

Book Clubs

As I have described, Book Clubs for the Civil War and Freedom unit involved baskets of non-fiction books, including biographies on different eras and particular struggles for freedom: Civil War, Civil Rights, Women's Rights, Immigrant Citizens' Rights, and the Holocaust and World War II. Students ranked their choice of topic and were paired with a reading partner in a Book Club group. With their partner, students were to read a teacher-selected book and then others of their choice from their basket, and keep notes on specific pieces of information on "Research Sheets." With their whole Book Club group, students would be working towards a final group project including a timeline, mini-biographies, and a creative presentation about the issue they had studied.

Terri introduced the new Book Clubs on May 4 with overviews of the issues, the books in each basket, the new format, and the final assignment expectations for this unit. Two days later, she shared with them her expectations for note-taking during their reading. She then gave them their Book Club groups, reading partners, and first required book.

Book Clubs looked quite similar to lessons across the year, with students around the room reading with a partner and Terri circulating among them. However, there were no reading journal assignments during this unit. Students were expected to take notes as they read or at the end of each day's lesson. They were also expected to select books as they needed or chose to after the first book.

Students began their reading on Wednesday, May 6. That Friday, Terri pulled them together as a whole group before they began Book Clubs. She reminded them of how to use the research sheets to record notes and how to choose a second book from their basket when they were finished with the first one she had given them. She took that opportunity to explain:

The books that I gave most of you, for the most part, were shorter books.

And were sort of like this book [Behind Rebel Lines]. Often read sort of like a novel – sort of, it sounded like a story as opposed to a history book.

It sort of had a fictionally feel to it. There are other books in your basket that'll be like this. And there'll also be some books that are more non-fiction-like. More information books. (5/8/98)

She showed them how they might choose their next book and how they might decide how to read it. She asked students for ideas they had about what strategies they could use to read from these books. Students mentioned the index and the table of contents, and she modeled using the table of contents and then talked about reading the introduction. This was the only whole-class discussion in Book Clubs in this unit that was unrelated to doing an assignment.

On May 14, after a Read Aloud session to model what they were going to do, Terri asked Book Club groups to get together to discuss the freedom issues they were learning about and to compare those with other freedoms they had learned about. This was the first time I had seen students gather with a whole Book Club group to discuss what they had been reading. This session – and students continued to work on it later in the day – looked very different from the usual Book Club lessons. Students worked in groups of four or five with large chart paper and markers, discussing the information from their books, how it related to other freedom issues they had learned about, and how they would present this on the sheet.

Students had been introduced to the final Book Club project at the beginning of the unit. They were given more details by a substitute teacher on May 26 but were confused about the timeline they were to create. Terri clarified the project when she returned, and students then worked on these during two more sessions, and then presented them on June 2. Each student worked on a bibliographic sheet of a famous person connected with their era and freedom

issue, drawing a picture and writing a few sentences. Each student also worked on a timeline sheet, contributing a picture and a caption about one important event they had learned about. In addition, there were plays presented by some members of each Book Club group and dioramas from two groups of reading partners.

For this unit, Book Club reading began on May 6 and ended on May 22, with a final week devoted to preparing projects that were presented on the last day. This gave students three weeks of reading and note-taking in addition to the final week of project work. The emphasis was on reading non-fiction literature and reading for information.

Description of Social Studies

Terri planned to teach the Civil War unit in nine social studies sessions, with overlap around the issue of freedom during literacy lessons in Book Club and Read Aloud. Time became even more constrained as the school year drew to a close. There were a total of eight social studies lessons.

Terri introduced the unit with a discussion of the concept of "Freedom" as planned on May 4. She began by asking students to consider two kinds of freedoms, freedom to and freedom from. Students did not understand that immediately, but picked up on one student's idea that this was like the beginning of a sentence, "Freedom to - " that they could complete. Jim thought of Freedom to say what you wanted, freedom of speech. This became compared with Cody's idea of Freedom from slavery. Max recognized Freedom to do

different things as being like "rights," and many students then contributed other freedoms. At least eleven different students became involved in this discussion, with a fairly rapid exchange of ideas. Terri then moved to her second major question for the day, which she explained as she wrote on the board:

List times in our country's history when freedom was important. It could be because people had it. People didn't have it. It could be because people lost it, people lost their freedom. Or because people fought for it. (5/4/98)

She asked students to write individually, and then they would see how many examples they had altogether.

When they were asked to share their ideas, Terri recorded them and elaborated on what students said. Nine students contributed a total of 17 ideas. This was a different kind of social-studies content from what students were used to, reminiscent perhaps of the discussion of student rights that they had had during the Revolutionary War unit. Student engagement was high, and there was considerable student contribution to the lesson.

The second lesson opened with Terri's reference to a homework assignment that students were supposed to have completed and to questions on the overhead about economic differences between the North and South. She also said that taking notes would be helpful to them "when you're taking our post-evaluation." She then talked about what "economics" meant and about the different economies of the North and South before the Civil War. The questions on the overhead were: "What were the main economic differences between the

North and the South?," and "How did these differences affect what the North and South wanted and what they felt?" During this lesson, students spoke for less than a fourth of the total time, with several students not contributing at all, and most students saying one or two answers to questions and answering with a word or a phrase. Terri wrote notes on the board to help answer the questions she had posed. But it was apparent that this material was difficult for students to grasp, and there was less engagement than in the first lesson.

There was a similar format and discourse pattern in the next lesson on May 13, with a question on the overhead, homework pages to be turned in, and a teacher-directed discussion. The question guiding the lesson was, "What events led up to the Civil War?" Terri began by reading an excerpt from the text, which became the focus of the class time. Later in the lesson, Terri introduced the additional question, "What were the freedom issues involved in the starting of the Civil War?" This was harder for students to grasp, dealing with the idea of the South wanting their own government. In this lesson, students again contributed less than one-fourth of the discussion, all in short answers, and with fewer students contributing anything than in previous lessons.

This pattern was repeated for the lesson on May 19. The first question for discussion that day was, "What were the major battles of the Civil War?," and students were asked to refer back to earlier readings and discussions. The second question was, "What was the Emancipation Proclamation?," and students followed along as Terri read an excerpt from the textbook and then referred to

the text to answer her more specific questions about this. A third question that day was, "Why did President Lincoln wait so long to write the Emancipation Proclamation?" A final question asked, "How did technology play a role in the Civil War?" Terri referred students to the picture in the textbook as she read from the text. Again, student contributions took the form of short answers to Terri's specific questions. Fewer students contributed to the discussion in this lesson.

Terri's last social studies lesson addressed the question, "How did the North's and South's different resources affect the outcome of the Civil War?" Terri referred students to their unit notes to help answer this question, and she wrote on the overhead the population of the North and South as information to consider. Students were to take their own notes on the conversation, and at the end, Terri told them they should have four "reasons that resources affected the war," and then she recapped those.

The only social studies lesson in this unit that had a different format was one that was left for a substitute teacher to lead. In this, pairs of students were given cards to read with interesting details about the Civil War. They were to summarize the information and report to the class. These ranged from cards about specific battles or people to cards about medicines and uniforms. Some of the reading was very difficult for students, and there was a range of responses.

Students' social studies folders included a number of assignments and notes from this unit on the Civil War. Students wrote notes during lessons, either

writing their own answers to the questions posed, or more often recording the notes Terri put on the board or the major points brought out in the class discussion. Students wrote down the brainstormed ideas about freedom from the opening lesson. They took notes about economic differences between the North and the South, about the events and freedom issues that led to the Civil War, about the battles of the war and the Emancipation Proclamation, and about technology and resources.

Students also had homework assignments that asked them to read from the text and answer questions. On May 5, students answered questions about where Abraham Lincoln and Jefferson Davis were from, about the South in the 1800s, about the Underground Railroad, and about sectionalism. On May 11, the questions were: "What was slavery like for the Africans who were captured and brought to the U.S.?", "In what ways did African slaves and their friends resist slavery?," and "What is an abolitionist and what did they believe in?" On May 13, the questions were about the first shots of the war, the Emancipation Proclamation, major battles, and how Black Americans helped the North win the war. Students also wrote paragraphs about each of the following persons: Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson Davis, Harriet Tubman, Frederick Douglass, and Harriet Beecher Stowe.

The homework assignments required students to read the social studies chapter about the Civil War and to answer most of the textbook questions. This was then to provide background information and preparation for class

discussions of the issues and questions Terri wanted to emphasize. This pattern can be seen in Fig 5.2.

5/4	Class - introduction to concept of Freedom
5/5	Homework - chapter 11, background to war, questions (p 238)
5/6	Class - discussion of economics based on homework reading
5/11	Homework - questions about slavery
5/13	Class - Causes of the Civil War, with some discussion of slavery
5/13	Homework - reading and questions about battles and Emancipation Proclamation (p 247)
5/18	Class - review of major battles based on homework reading
5/19	Class - review Emancipation Proclamation based on homework reading, and the role of technology in the war
5/26	Class - (substitute) - cards about Civil War
5/27	Class - role of different resources in the war
Date unknown	Class - Post Assessment
Date unknown	Homework - biographical paragraphs

Fig 5.2. Homework assignments and class discussion emphasis for social studies in the Civil War unit.

There was a post-assessment assignment for the social studies portion of the Civil War unit. There were eight questions for students to write a few lines about. The questions were clearly related to the lessons and homework assignments of the unit. Fig 5.3 shows this Civil War post-assessment.

1. What were some of the events that led up to the Civil War? What caused the war to start? Tell about at least two.
2. How were the North and South different? List three ways that they were different from each other in terms of their resources, their economy, and their society.
3. How did differences in economy and resources for the North and South affect how the war turned out? Explain how at least two differences played a role in the North winning and the South losing.
4. Tell what an abolitionist is and give an example of a persona who was an abolitionist.
5. How did slaves resist and fight back against their conditions in the South? Describe at least two ways that slaves resisted and fought back.

6. How did women and children play a role in the Civil War? Give at least two examples for both women and children.
7. Tell about one important battle during the Civil War and tell where and when it happened and who won it.

Extra Credit: How were some of the issues in the Civil War related to issues in previous times that we've studied this year? How were the freedom issues for the Civil War the same as freedom issues at other times?

Fig 5.3. Civil War post-assessment for social studies.

In addition to the study of the Civil War in social studies class, Terri had planned an overview of U.S. history for computer class. She asked students to make a HypersStudio stack with five informational cards. They were to choose four events or people and one freedom issue that they thought were important in U.S. history. Terri did not invite me to join these classes, but I collected copies of the students' planning for these cards. They become relevant as I look at the kinds of connections that students made.

C. Student Connections: The Civil War and Freedom Unit

My study examines three major kinds of connections that students may be expected to make through their experience of integrated units of study: across subjects at the same time; within each subject across time; and with their own lives and the world outside the classroom. I focus on history and literature study learning and connections.

This second observed integrated unit, the Civil War and Freedom, was planned and taught in ways that were different from earlier patterns. Terri planned social studies around the topic of the Civil War history with an emphasis on issues of Freedom. Her Read Aloud literature was a fictionalized

biography about the Civil War. She then planned Book Club groups to emphasize non-fiction literature and reading for information, with an emphasis on issues of freedom in different eras and around different topics. Her planning therefore included separate history and literature study emphases on the Civil War and on non-fiction as a genre. It also included an overlapping area where students would be encouraged to think about issues of freedom in both their history and literature study. The topic of freedom was additionally a tool for helping students to look across the social studies curriculum and make connections with earlier units as well as with Book Club topics. Freedom then was planned as both a horizontal connecting theme across history and literature study, and also as a vertical connecting theme through the year's history study.

What Connections did Students Make Across History and Literature Study?

This unit was planned to include attention to issues of freedom in both history and literature study. This focus was to provide for connections across the two subject areas, a horizontal dimension of integration. This integration across subjects at the same time was what Terri originally understood as curriculum integration and most like what she had planned for in other units, such as the Revolutionary War unit. In this unit there was also some horizontal integration within the literature curriculum around the theme of freedom, both across different Book Club groups and with the Read Aloud novel.

Terri introduced this horizontal integration to students in both Book Club and social studies. In Book Clubs, she told them what the different topics would

be and asked them, "What do you think the theme is? They have a theme that relates all of the books." One student thought the theme was "Rights," and Terri responded, "It does have to do with rights, and in particular with types of freedom. We're going to be thinking in social studies and in Book Clubs about freedom, issues of freedom" (5/4/98). This theme of freedom in different Book Clubs and in the history study of the Civil War and the related Read Aloud novel provided the horizontal integration across subjects for this unit.

Terri's attention to the integrating theme of Freedom was most apparent in Book Clubs where she selected issues for each group because of their relevance to the topic of Freedom. She also prepared research sheets for students to complete as they read which included questions specifically asking students to identify freedom issues and relate these to other learning. The ongoing emphasis of the Book Clubs was the struggle for freedom and rights of particular groups of people. The final project was to include a timeline of the era or issue studied by the group, bibliographic information about important figures, and a creative presentation, all of which were expected to emphasize the theme of the struggle for particular freedoms. This project also had the potential of creating an opportunity for student thinking across the different topics studied by various groups *within* Book Clubs, although this was largely unmet.

In addition to this ongoing emphasis on the freedom theme in Book Clubs, Terri planned a lesson when students would specifically relate the freedoms they were reading about with other freedom issues they had learned about in social

studies across the year. This was an effort to integrate horizontally across Book Clubs and social studies, but it also asked students to integrate vertically across the theme in the social studies curriculum.

In her teaching of Book Clubs, Terri took advantage of just two other opportunities to make connections across history and literature study with the whole class. When she introduced the Women's Rights basket of books, she referred to the Declaration of Independence and how that had not included women. When she modeled for students how to take research notes on the sheets for Book Clubs, Terri used an extended example of the Westward movement history that they had recently studied. She talked about how the events and freedoms of that era related to other freedom issues they had learned about in social studies. The main emphasis was actually on relating historical topics from social studies with each other, not on the literature-history connections, but it was done as part of Book Clubs.

Terri's planning for history study emphasized study of the Civil War, with an introductory lesson about freedom and a note in her written unit plan to relate the unit to their Book Clubs. (See Appendix N for social studies unit plan). The final assessment for the Civil War unit did not include direct mention of the theme of freedom or connections with Book Clubs. The questions that students answered for homework were taken from the textbook and did not address the theme of freedom directly. The questions Terri put on the overhead to guide each social studies lesson rarely directly addressed this freedom theme. Of a total of

nine questions from four observed lessons that had guiding questions, only one question asked about freedom, and that was, "What were the freedom issues involved in the starting of the Civil War?"

In her teaching of social studies for this unit, Terri made a few connections with the literature study of Book Clubs and the Read Aloud novel. When Terri was leading a discussion in social studies about the economies of the North and South, she drew on examples from Johnny Tremain, the Read Aloud from the Revolutionary War unit, and from the Fighting Ground, one of the Book Club novels from that unit. She used these to talk about the shops in the North and the difference in farming between the North and the South. As she was talking about the issue of slavery in the Civil War, she said, "I know some people were reading about abolitionists today. Who can tell me what an abolitionist is?," helping Rex to make a connection with his Book Club reading and to answer, "A person who doesn't like slavery" (5/6/98).

It was with the Read Aloud lessons that Terri made perhaps the most explicit connections between literature and history study. The Read Aloud novel was about the Civil War, and so there were opportunities to help students make those kinds of connections. Terri often asked questions to help students generalize beyond the particulars of the novel to larger conclusions about the Civil War. For example, she asked, "What do we know so far about what some women did in the Civil War?" and students were able to talk about the many women who disguised themselves to fight (5/11/98). She also asked, "What did

we learn about what fighting a war was like?" and Jim understood that "it was hard for them. The soldiers from each side kept going down " (5/14/98). In these examples, Terri used the book to help students better understand the realities of living during the Civil War era for different people.

In addition to these generalizing questions, Terri asked more specific questions that related the literature novel to their history study. One day she asked, "Does anyone know who Jefferson Davis is?" and Vanessa was able to recognize him as "the opposite President" from her social studies reading (5/11/98). Terri also used a short passage from the novel to emphasize an important point in the history study. She reread a passage and then led this brief exchange:

Terri: So why is she fighting the war?

Jim: She wanted the Union to win.

Terri: She wanted the Union to win. What did she say about the Union?

She wanted the Union to what?

Dee: To survive.

Terri: To survive. Now - remember that was a large part of the reason why the war started, about the Union.... (5/15/98)

On the same day, she asked, "What can it be about the fact that all the states came together in one union that was so important to them?," and James was able to answer, "Because they all fought together to be a country. They fought England so they could be a whole country" (5/15/98). Another time, Terri drew

students' attention to one of the characters with typhoid fever and used this to talk about the fact that so many people died of disease, sanitation conditions, and lack of medications in the Civil War. In these instances, Terri used the novel to re-emphasize an important historical point she wanted students to learn.

Terri also made connections between the Read Aloud novel and the Book Club novels around the integrating theme of freedom. She sometimes stopped to ask, "And what did we learn about the freedom issues here? What were some of the freedom issues? What kinds of freedom were involved in the story we were just reading about?" (5/6/98). She also used the Read Aloud novel as a model for how to complete the Book Club assignment, asking students to relate their particular freedom issue to other freedom issues they had learned about in social studies that year. In these cases, Terri was integrating both across the Book Club and Read Aloud parts of her literature curriculum, and with her social studies curriculum through the theme of freedom.

Terri also made some horizontal connections across the literature parts of her curriculum, asking students to consider the non-fiction books they were reading in Book Clubs and the fictionalized biography she was reading in Read Aloud. She asked them how they were different, and why they thought she was reading the fictionalized biography aloud to them (5/12/98). These were connections across two different aspects within her literature program.

Terri planned this Civil War and Freedom unit for specific horizontal connections around the theme of freedom. She also taught the unit with some

further references to these connections within literature study and across literature and history. Book Clubs directly addressed the theme of freedom and drew from history study. Read Aloud connected both with the Civil War topic and issues of freedom, as well as with literacy discussion of texts. Social studies drew little from literature study. Students themselves also were making connections. These reflected the connections Terri emphasized.

Lynn was making connections with history learning as Terri introduced the unit in Book Clubs. She said, "There's a lot of freedoms. Like freedom of speech. In the Civil War people owned slaves" (5/4/98). Champ also thought about social studies, or perhaps earlier literature, to say, "Freedom's like when you don't have to work for anybody. Like they had slaves, and they had to work in the fields and in the house and all that. But they wanted to be free so they could make their own decisions and not have to do what their owners said and everything" (5/4/98).

Jim referred to pilgrims coming for freedom of religion when discussing his Book Club topic, the Holocaust (5/11/98). Jeff understood similarities between the Revolutionary War fight against unfair treatment by the British government and the later Women's Rights struggle for equality (5/11/98). Rex and Cody, in discussing the Civil War in their Book Club group, recognized the fight for freedom to be like the Revolutionary War and Indian fights for freedom (5/12/98). Another way that students brought their social studies learning to Book Clubs was by using their social studies texts for reference. Lynn referred to

the Constitution to look up the Amendment relevant to her topic of Civil Rights, as did Dee for Women's Rights.

Students were more likely to bring their history learning to discussions of freedom issues in Book Clubs than they were to bring their Book Club reading to social studies class. The only exceptions were Rex and Cody, who were studying the Civil War in both social studies and Book Clubs. Rex drew on his Book Club reading to talk about the Emancipation Proclamation in social studies, where it was just being introduced. He and Cody also contributed their Book Club learning to the Civil War discussion about why Lincoln did not issue the Emancipation Proclamation earlier. Cody first noticed the connection with his reading and said, "He was afraid the slaves would do something. I'm not sure. I read it in Book Club. Rex read it." Rex then clarified:

He was going to write the Emancipation - it's in the Emancipation book - he was going to write it to stop slavery. And they were losing battles, they had more losses, so - I don't know what his name was, but he said if he wrote the Emancipation Proclamation, the people might think that he wrote that as a last resort. (5/19/98)

Other students, whose Book Club topics were different from their history study, did not contribute their reading from literature to their study of the Civil War. Dee did draw on the Read Aloud novel once to notice a connection between the medical terms on a card one student was reading and the silver nitrate used as a disguise by the central character in Behind Rebel Lines. This was the only

example of this kind of connection. It was noticeable also that Rex and Cody both assumed that Terri was reading this particular book aloud to the class because it was about the Civil War. Other students, whose Book Club groups were not focused on the Civil War, thought she was reading it because of its reference to other freedom issues like women's rights or immigrant rights. They made connections that reflected their own Book Club topic.

Occasionally, students made faulty connections across history and literature study. Some children had difficulty with sequencing Book Club topics accurately in a historical context. Students were used to studying the same era in both literature and history study and they were now studying issues that spanned decades and were not the same as their social studies period. This was confusing to some. D.J. was confused about the dates of the Civil War and Civil Rights. Lynn was in the Civil Rights group but was reading a book about Harriet Tubman from that basket and also learning about the Underground Railroad during the Civil War in social studies, and was confused about whether Harriet Tubman was fighting for Black freedom from slavery or for civil rights. Although students were encouraged to see similarities across eras and fights for freedom, Lynn did not explore the ways in which Blacks continued their struggle for freedom from slavery to freedom to the same rights as Whites.

Students generally made the same kinds of horizontal connections across history and literature study that Terri had planned for and emphasized. They drew on their history learning to make connections with their Book Club topics

around the theme of freedom but rarely drew on their literature in history study. They made some connections between their Read Aloud book and both the Civil War history and their Book Club issues and literature. They made some faulty connections across subjects, mostly around concepts of time and chronology. But they were generally able to talk about issues of freedom and rights in ways that demonstrated understanding and connections.

What Connections did Students Make Within History Study and Within Literature Study Across Time?

Terri's year long planning originally had included attention to the chronology of U.S. history in social studies class and to the development of student understanding about a variety of literary genres through Book Clubs. This framework was not visible to students, and there was evidence to suggest that students were more aware of horizontal than vertical curricular connections.

This Civil War and Freedom unit had been planned in part because of concerns about student ability to make these vertical connections within each subject area over time, particularly within the history curriculum. Terri planned the integrating theme of Freedom as a way both to integrate literature and social studies around a common conceptual theme, and also as a way to integrate different aspects of history learning across the year.

Literature Study

Terri's emphasis on the development of language-arts processes in literacy perhaps contributed to there being little explicit attention to vertical connections

within the literature-study curriculum, although she did plan for discussion of fiction and non-fiction genres. There were opportunities in such plans for connections to be made across the historical fiction novels of earlier Book Clubs, the animal stories they had read at the beginning of the year, the poetry unit they had just completed, and the non-fiction they were to read in this unit. Terri did talk about fiction and non-fiction texts in the Read Aloud time for this unit, making connections with their current Book Club books. But she did not refer back to other Read Aloud or Book Club novels in literary terms. The only references to earlier literature were actually made during one social studies class when Terri drew on two books from the Revolutionary War unit to help students think about the different economies of the North and the South. Vanessa also once referred back to an earlier Read Aloud novel as an example of people coming to America "for religion" (5/4/98). These were history connections, not literary connections.

Terri had no written plans for literature study beyond her description of Book Clubs in the parent handbook for the beginning of the year. Nor did she ask students to make inter-textual connections with books or works read earlier in the year. Any vertical curriculum connections Terri might have been making in literature study were not visible. Students themselves did not volunteer any vertical connections in literature study.

History Study

In contrast to this, Terri's plans and her teaching for the Civil War and Freedom unit reflected her emphasis on using this unit in part to help students understand the connections within the history curriculum across the school year. In social studies, she planned to talk about issues of freedom in the Civil War era and relate these to other issues of freedom in eras previously studied. This was particularly clear in Terri's introductory lesson for this social studies unit, when she began by asking students for different examples of freedom (5/4/98).

Some students spoke in general terms about freedom, and many of their responses reflected the discussion of student rights held during study of the Revolutionary War and Constitution. Max also suggested that freedom was like "rights". For example, Champ said "free to make mistakes" and Cody thought "freedom from getting hurt," and "freedom from hard pressure." Vanessa said "freedom to dress the way you want," and Max said "freedom to have the same stuff and rights as everyone else has... like to be equal." James thought about "freedom to get what you need, like help, to go to the doctor." He then added, "like the people in the Indian war." Other students apparently were also drawing on their history learning to think about freedom. Jim mentioned free speech, and Lynn added, "Like if you're someone who wants to stand up against something that you think is wrong, you could have freedom of speech." Cody thought "freedom to not work for someone for free. To not be a slave." James generalized this to "freedom to a job or something. To do what you want. You're

not forced to do one job. You can pick." Cody suggested "freedom to have your family, because like when you were a slave, sometimes they would ship your family away."

Terri then asked them to brainstorm together "how the issue of freedom was important in some of the social studies things we've done this year."

Students more specifically drew on history learning then. Duke spoke of slaves and also of when "the Indians lost (freedom)" because their land was taken. Rex spoke of "when Britain made laws forcing people to live in their houses" and "when people could get out of jails to come to America." Cody mentioned "during Vietnam when they made people get drafted," which may have drawn from a guest speaker visit in social studies earlier in the year. Duke spoke of poor people searching for freedom "like good jobs and stuff." Lynn raised the thought that "when people had freedom they had too much control sometimes, like Whites." Jeff remembered that "didn't some Whites not have freedom, like they had to work for others?" and Terri gave the example of sharecroppers. In this discussion, many students drew on past learning of history to find examples of when freedom was an important issue, as Terri had planned.

During her teaching of social studies, Terri also took opportunities to draw student attention to connections with earlier history learning and to ask them to do the same. For example, many times during the discussion of the causes of the Civil War, Terri asked students to think back to the Revolutionary War as a fight for a new government uniting the states (5/13/98). She talked

about the “big freedom they were fighting for” in terms of the South wanting their own government, and she built on Dee’s comment, that “I just wanted to say that one reason they left England was for the freedom to vote.” Similarly, during a discussion of the different resources of the North and South, Terri drew on student learning about the west saying:

Remember how we talked during Westward Expansion how the government sent out soldiers to fight the Indians? Same thing was still happening. There were White settlers there and there were Native Americans and there were U.S. Army people out there. What did the west have that would have been particularly helpful for a war? (5/27/98)

Lynn then spoke about trains, Duke about land and farms, and Dee (with prompting from Terri) spoke about ranches.

Students themselves sometimes drew on their own earlier learning of history. In a discussion Terri led about the population resources of the North and South, particularly the impact of the slave population, students drew on their knowledge of slavery from this and other units. Tom spoke of them being weak “because they didn’t eat very much and they got beaten and they work a whole bunch.” Jeff, however, thought slaves were strong “because they had to lift heavy things.” D.J. thought slaves would not make good soldiers because “they have to work a lot, and they work all day long.” Vanessa added that they “had to like wash the floors and still take care of the crops, and they couldn’t fight.”

These comments may have drawn on the novels read in Read Aloud or Book

Club or from students' own prior knowledge from outside school, but it seems likely that many reflect learning from other social studies units.

Terri's planning and teaching of literature also addressed the vertical connections of the history curriculum. The Read Aloud novel was selected largely because it would complement the Civil War unit, and the emphasis was therefore on horizontal connections across history and literature study. Twice, however, Terri used the Read Aloud novel as a common text for modeling a Book Club task and explicitly made connections with earlier social studies work.

The final Read Aloud session was used to model the Book Club project students would be doing in their groups. Terri had left plans for the substitute to draw on examples from their previous history unit about Westward Expansion (5/26/98). Earlier in the unit, Terri opened a lesson by announcing that they were going to do something different, working together at the easel to think about "in this book, what were some of the freedom issues?" (5/14/98). One student immediately spoke about slaves, a major focus of the novel and the Civil War setting. Then students spoke about freedom issues that mirrored their Book Club topics, women's rights and immigrants' rights and freedom of speech. Terri wrote these as students spoke and then asked, "How do these relate to other freedoms we've heard about?" Vanessa and James spoke about coming to America for freedom of religion. Jim spoke about Native Americans who "didn't have freedom to stay where they wanted because the Whites kicked them off their land." As they talked, Terri wrote down student ideas connecting the

condition of slaves during the Civil War period with Native Americans and Pilgrims.

Meanwhile, students were making their own connections -- or not. My field notes indicate that during an extended passage from the Read Aloud by the substitute on one day, there was mention of such places as Richmond, Yorktown, and the Potomac. I noted that there was no visible recognition of any of these names by any of the students, although they had been important during earlier history studies (5/7/98). Later in the unit, Lynn asked, "Did the Revolutionary War come before or after the Civil War?" (5/15/98). Tom was able to contribute his understanding that "the Civil War was in the 1800s and the Revolutionary was in the 1700s, and that was the beginning of the U.S.A." Generally, the Read Aloud sessions encouraged students to make horizontal connections with both Book Club and social studies but rarely encouraged them to make vertical social studies connections.

Book Club assignments, however, explicitly asked students to make these vertical history connections. The research sheets students were to use asked them to relate the freedom issues of their Book Club to other freedom issues they had learned about. When Terri introduced these research sheets for Book Clubs, she modeled how students might take notes on important people and events of the era, and on the freedom issues involved. She drew on an extended example from their learning about Westward Expansion in the previous social studies unit,

using Chief Blackhawk, the Trail of Tears, and freedom of religion as examples, and then relating those freedom issues back to the Revolutionary War issues.

Students themselves were able to make connections when asked. For example, Jeff understood that women's rights was argued in part on the basis of a comparison with the Revolutionary War fight for fair treatment (5/11/98), and Jim was able to talk about the Pilgrims coming to America for religious freedom. They rarely raised these connections, however, unless asked to do so.

One major part of this Book Club unit was the group assignment introduced in Read Aloud and briefly described above. Students were asked to get together with their whole Book Club group and discuss the freedom issues involved. Then they were to get a piece of chart paper and write their Book Club title and the freedoms they had found. Finally, they were to "think about other freedom issues that we've studied, and write down ones that relate to those from your Book Club units. Draw arrows to show connections" (5/14/98).

The conversations around this task were often animated. The resulting charts show some significant understanding of freedom issues for different groups of people across different eras. Figures 5.4 - 5.8¹ show the connections that students made.

<u>Women's Rights</u>	<u>Other Freedoms</u>
1. They couldn't vote 2. They couldn't go to college 3. The had to give there land to there husband 4. They didn't have the right to speak out 5. They didn't have the right to fight in the war 6. Some women's fathers signed a contract saying that she had to marry men they didn't like 7. Women wanted to go work but they couldn't 8. They need permission from there husbands to get a job	• Slaves didn't have the right to vote • Slaves couldn't learn how to read or write • Slaves couldn't own land • Native Americans didn't have the right to live where they wanted too • Slaves didn't have the right to speak out • Native Americans didn't have the right to speak out • Slaves couldn't fight in the war inless a white told them to • Slaves were not allowed to get married to who they wanted to • Slaves couldn't do what they wanted to do and they always had to work everyday • The slaves couldn't leave anywhere without there masters permission

Fig 5.4. Connections made by the Women's Rights group – Emma, Champ, Jeff, and Dee.

<u>Freedoms</u>	<u>Examples</u>
1. The immigrants didn't have the freedom to make their own choices 2. The immigrants had freedom to go to America 3. The Japanes had the freedom to fight with Americans 4. The immigrants didn't have the freedom To choose their own jods 5. Too get freedom japanese tried to prove They were American Citizins	• The slaves didn't have the right to chose who they marid and had kids with • The pilgrims had the right to come to America • Freed slaves were alloud to fight with the americas • The blacks didn't have the freedom to pick their own jobs • The Cambodian people had to prove they were American Citizens

Fig 5.5. Connections made by the Immigrant Citizens' Rights group – Tom and James.

¹ These figures are shown with the students' original spelling, punctuation, and grammar.

<u>Book Club Freedom (Civil Rights Era)</u>	<u>Related Freedoms</u>
1. Blacks couldn't do the same things as whites could 2. Blacks had to ride in the back of the bus 3. Whites could do whatever they wanted 4. Blacks spoke out against slavery and bad things 5. Blacks couldn't go to school with whites 6. Blacks did sit ins because they couldn't do the same things as whites	• Men could go to war and a woman couldn't • Whites could take other peoples land Whites could capture Blacks to be slaves • During the Vietnam war they spoke out Also in the revolutionary war • People did sit in during the Veitnam War They also did big marches

Fig 5.6. Connections made by the Civil Rights group - Lynn, Max, D.J., and Michael.

1. Jews didn't have freedom of speech. 2. Jews didn't have freedom of dress. 3. Jews didn't have freedom of food. 4. Jews didn't have freedom of marriage. 5. Some jews didn't have freedom of life. 6. Jewish people had to shave their heads when they went to concentration camps. 7. Jews had to wear golden colored stars to let people know they were Jewish. 8. A lot of jews died about 850,000 jews died.	• Slaves didn't have freedom of speech. • Slaves and girls didn't have freedom of dress. • Slaves hardley got any food. • Slaves didn't have freedom of marriage. • Slaves didn't have freedom of life. If slaves got married they did it privately. • Army people had to shave their heads. • Indians died because of who they were in the Indian Removal Act • A lot of black people and colored people died during the Civil rights era.
---	--

Fig 5.7. Connections made by the World War II and Holocaust group - Vanessa and Jim.

<u>Civil War</u>	<u>Other Freedoms</u>
Slaves had an hour of freetime In the north slaves weren't slaves The slaves in the south did not have freedom of speech In the south slaves couldn't just leave Slaves could not say what they wanted in the south	->The freedom to go where you wan't ->The freedom to be free. ->The indians didn't hav a say in if they wan'ted to move or not ->Native Americans had to stay in the reavation ->The slaves could say what they wanted in the north

Fig 5.8. Connections made by the Civil War group - Duke, Rex, and Cody.

The Women's Rights group focused on a comparison between women's rights and slavery, with occasional note of Native American freedom issues. The Holocaust group also focused on similarities between Jewish and slave limits on freedom, although they brought in a few different issues. The Immigrant citizens' rights group compared groups within their topic as well as making comparisons with slaves, pilgrims, and African Americans during Civil Rights. The Civil Rights group made connections to other eras and then made further connections from that new issue. The Civil War group, already studying slavery in both social studies and Book Clubs, made more general statements about freedom and compared with Native American freedom issues studied earlier. The most common relationship noted was that between slavery and a Book Club freedom issue, but there were a variety of other issues raised and eras drawn upon by students. During this work, students were engaged and excited about the connections they were making across their learning of history.

What Connections did Students Make With Their Own Experiences and Life Outside the Classroom?

A common claim for integrated curriculum is that it is more meaningful to students personally and that it helps them to make connections between the real world and their school learning. It is important to note the kinds of connections that students were actually making between this unit and their own lives and the world around them. I begin by looking at the connections that this unit

encouraged students to make between the curriculum and the world beyond the classroom.

Terri's plans did not explicitly include attention to connections with the "real world" or the present. Her Read Aloud and Book Club teaching rarely made such connections. In one Read Aloud lesson, Terri drew attention to the number of people who died during the Civil War as a result of sickness and the lack of treatment for their injuries. Jeff made a connection with the AIDS virus today, and Terri picked up on that, noting that AIDS was not common then, but:

You're right, that would be a real big risk with mixing blood.... We're really lucky now. For many - for as long as mankind has existed up until about - when was penicillin first invented? Early 1940s? Until then - really in your parents' lifetime or your grandparents lifetime. Before that, when people would get sick, things even like strep throat used to sometimes kill people because it would get out of control, that it would kill you - the infection would get so bad. Because we didn't have these new drugs to combat the diseases. So we're lucky now we have such medication. And we're lucky especially in this country. Because grown-ups and kids in other countries that aren't as wealthy as ours or don't have as [good] medical systems can still die from things like that because there aren't doctors that they can go to, or they don't have money to buy the medicine. (5/15/98)

This is the only example of a connection with the present that Terri attends to from Read Aloud or Book Clubs, and it was initiated by Jeff. Even here, Terri deflected the discussion away from the controversial issue of AIDS treatment, and especially away from possible discussion of cost inequities in this country, and toward both the past and distant “others.” Jeff’s attempt to make present and personal connections was actually discouraged by Terri although she appeared to pick up on his comment.

Students were more likely to voice connections with the present or with the world around them than Terri was, especially in literature lessons. They did not do this in Read Aloud lessons, but made some connections between their Book Clubs and the world around them. For example, Lynn wanted to tell Terri about a news show she had seen with an interview with someone from Anne Frank’s family, and she also wanted to tell about a connection with the Civil War. She said, “Well you said something about the Underground Railroad – if you go to Eaton Rapids there’s a house –”(5/4/98). At that point, Terri cut her off because it was time to move on.

For the most part, students voiced these kind of present-day, real-life connections with the Book Clubs when they were in small groups, rather than aloud to the whole class. Jim talked about Jewish religious beliefs in connection with his reading about the Holocaust. Lynn noted that Malcolm X lived in Michigan and that “his mom died in the hospital in Kalamazoo” (5/8/98). Tom and James frequently took opportunities to make connections beyond the

classroom as they read about the rights of immigrant citizens. One of their books was titled, Who Belongs Here? An American Story, and I asked about them about the question of who belongs here, and had the following discussion:

James: Anyone who wants to be here.

F: Hmm. What if we run out of space?

James: We move to, to, to -

Tom: I don't think everybody will move here.

F: I know. That's right. Some people want to stay right where they are, don't they? They like their countries.

Tom: Yeah.

James: I don't want to go to Cambodia.

F: You don't want to emigrate?

James: 'Cause they probably still might not have peace.

F: They don't -

James: I wouldn't mind going to Canada. (5/8/98)

Another time they had a discussion about whether or not Pol Pot was as bad as Hitler was. They also talked about Yugoslavia and recent politics there, with James saying, "Now they're not a country, now they're a state" (5/19/98), and Tom comparing that to the break up of the USSR, which he thought happened in the eighties. Another time, they had a discussion about Ancient Greece and Rome because Greece was mentioned in a reading. James also talked about how "Iceland is green and Greenland is ice" (5/26/98) after the readings mentioned

Ireland. These were two students who were not the most successful in the class, particularly in their written work. But their conversations showed a range of interest, knowledge, and an ability -- indeed a need -- to make connections between their personal knowledge and what they were learning in their Book Club groups.

Terri did not plan to make particular present-day or real-world connections in her social studies lessons, and yet she did so as she used present-day examples to help students understand concepts and events from the Civil War history. She talked about free trade and NAFTA, and the "Buy American" campaign to keep American dollars in the United States when she was describing trade issues in the Civil War era.

When she was explaining the impact of different ways of life on the start of the war, she said:

So it wouldn't surprise you guys to know that because their lives were so different, they wanted different things, right? Does that make sense? That if your way of life depends on several things then you want to protect those things. So if this table here made their living from - fishing, you depended on fishing. And this table here made their living from planting crops along the lake. You guys would want to protect your fish, right?....

(5/6/98)

She then gave an example of how the different interests would impact ways of thinking and acting. She used another example later in the lesson, pretending

that some of the students were factory owners and workers in the North, and others were people in England to explain some of the trade issues in the Civil War. For each of these examples, Terri used a narrative style and the present tense to describe a hypothetical situation that could shed light on the historical issues.

Terri also used student knowledge of the present to help them think about the past. They identified from their reading that Lincoln's election was a cause of the Civil War, but she pushed them about why that was: "President Lincoln was elected. Why - gosh you know when Bill Clinton was re-elected that time, did a whole bunch of states say they were going to leave the country?" (5/13/98) Similarly, she tried to help students think more about the significance of the attack on Fort Sumter by asking, "So why did they have to capture a fort in what's now their own, their very own country? Doesn't that seem kind of weird? I mean, you don't see the army around here going to any fort around here and trying to recapture it. It's in our country" (5/13/98). She also got their attention when she was talking about the resources of the Western ranches and said, "I know I'm getting hungry for lunch. Let's see - I could eat cotton or tobacco, or chew on some sugarcane, or I could have a nice, juicy steak. Which do you think would sound better?" (5/27/98).

Terri made connections between the Civil War and the present to help students better understand what they were learning. She also slipped between

the past and present tense, between expository and narrative styles of speaking, as she used these kinds of examples, or as she told “the story” of the Civil War. Students were far less likely to make these kinds of connections between the Civil War and the present, although Tom noted that “if there wasn’t any [Emancipation Proclamation] there’d probably still be slaves, and the United States would be different” (5/19/98) in response to Terri’s question about why it was such an important part of our nation’s history.

Students did not volunteer connections between the Civil War learning in social studies and the present, unless asked to do so. However, they did make some personal connections. When Terri asked about why some people are concerned about buying American goods instead of, for example, goods from China, Cody responded, “They don’t, they don’t do really good jobs on them. When I was younger I had this toy with two left arms,” which missed the economic point Terri was trying to stress, but was an attempt to make sense of things based on his own experiences and possibly on his own developing economic understanding. Jeff was confused about the trade and tax issues leading up to the Civil War and raised an example of, “Say my mom bought this shirt” (5/6/98), and Terri told him that’s a different kind of tax. Here his own experiences, which he tried to bring to bear on the issue, were not helpful, particularly without help from Terri to discover the sense he was making and trying to make, and how that might connect with the discussion at hand.

In Book Club conversations, students also made some connections with their own lives, experiences, and interests. James wanted to read all the baskets because they all looked interesting. Vanessa volunteered, "I have a book called The Upstairs Room, and it's about Anne Frank and her hiding in the house, and they had a room, and I could bring that in" (5/4/98). She followed this interest throughout this Book Club unit.

James made a couple of comments about the rights of children in both social studies and Book Clubs when they were asked about freedom issues. He described freedom as "to be on your own kind of thing. Make your own decisions. Do whatever you want. But me - I can't be free 'cause I'm a kid. What do I know?" (5/4/98). He also connected with the immigrant issues when he said, "My mom went to, well she was born in America, but she lived in Germany for a while" (5/8/98). And he tried to find an experience to help him understand Pol Pot's regime, saying "that would be like me killing Tom for saying that he wants hot lunch, and I want him to have cold lunch" (5/8/98).

Jim brought his religious upbringing and experiences to his understanding of the Holocaust issues and also to the Read Aloud novel when it included a song that the slaves sung about the angel Gabriel (5/12/98). Max was indignant at the thought of teachers who teased Malcolm X when he was in school and he said, "I would slap my teacher so bad" (5/19/98).

Terri did not plan particular assignments or activities that would emphasize connections between student learning in this Civil War and Freedom

unit and their own experiences or the world around them. However, she helped them understand difficult historical issues by moving to narrative and using the present tense, and telling hypothetical stories that drew the students into the story. The students themselves made many personal connections, especially with their Book Club literature. They attempted to better understand what they were reading by drawing on their own experiences.

Summary

There is evidence that Terri's new thinking about integration, and her subsequent planning and teaching of the Civil War and Freedom unit, influenced the kinds of connections students made. Students made interesting connections across Book Clubs and Read Aloud literature around issues of genre. They made connections across Read Aloud and social studies around the Civil War era. They also made connections both across social studies and Book Club and within the social studies curriculum for the year around the central theme of freedom.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 02092 5263

THESIS
5
2000

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.
MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
JUL 05 2002 0216 02		

**MAKING CONNECTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF FIFTH-GRADE LEARNING
FROM TWO DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONS OF CURRICULUM
INTEGRATION**

Volume II

By

Nicola J. Findley

A DISSERTATION

**Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Teacher Education

2000

CHAPTER SIX

STUDENT LEARNING

In previous chapters, I showed how Terri's beliefs and purposes influenced her curriculum plans, how the different curriculum plans became enacted in her classroom, and how these curricular organizations influenced the kinds of connections that students made within literature and history study, across those subjects, and with the "real world." I shall now compare student learning from the two different integrated units.

A. Student Learning of and about History

My study was framed around the central question of "What kinds of learning are encouraged by different approaches to integrated curricula?" To address this central question, I looked at student learning and the connections that students made across two integrated units of study in the same classroom. My analysis of student learning in each unit focused on two questions: (1) What are students learning about the subject matter of the unit taught? and (2) What are students learning about history and literacy as school subjects and/or disciplines?

Student Learning of the History Curriculum

Historical study is expected to make a major contribution to the social studies goals of citizenship education. The National Center for History in the Schools (1996) describes two major types of standards for meeting these goals: historical understandings and historical thinking skills. Historical

understandings define “what students should *know* about the history of families, their communities, states, nation, and world” (p.2, original emphasis). These are:

Drawn from the record of human aspirations, strivings, accomplishments, and failures in at least five spheres of human activity: the social, political, scientific/technological, economic, and cultural (philosophical/religious/aesthetic). They also provide students the historical perspectives required to analyze contemporary issues and problems confronting citizens today. (p. 42)

Historical thinking emphasizes the following dimensions: chronological thinking, historical comprehension, historical analysis and interpretation, historical research capabilities, and historical issues-analysis and decision-making.

These dimensions of historical understanding and thinking are reflected in the Michigan Framework for Social Studies Education (1996). This document describes the objectives of the historical perspective: “Students use knowledge of the past to construct meaningful understanding of our diverse cultural heritage and to inform their civic judgments” (p. 3). The standards for the historical perspective are these: time and chronology; comprehending the past; analyzing and interpreting the past; and judging decisions from the past.

In her planning, Terri drew explicitly on the five spheres of human activity, phrased as questions to address in a study of any historical period, from the National Center for History in the Schools (1996). She also drew on the

district curriculum guide for fifth grade, which outlines goals for students in terms of knowledge, skills, democratic values, and civic participation.

Knowledge outcomes explicitly relate U.S. history to the five spheres outlined above. Skills outcomes include working with a variety of information resources, placing events chronologically, using various representations (maps, globes, charts, graphs), demonstrating problem-solving techniques, and taking informed positions on issues.

Terri's plans for both integrated units were consistent with many of the goals for historical understanding and thinking outlined in the National Center for History in the Schools document. They also were consistent with many of the related standards in the Michigan Council for Social Studies Framework and the knowledge and skill outcomes described in the district curriculum guidelines. Appendix P shows these various dimensions of student learning in history, as described for fifth-grade students or later elementary students.

What did students learn about the Revolutionary War era ?

I have described national, state, and district objectives for historical learning. Appendix Q delineates the specific national and district objectives for a unit focused on the Revolutionary War era at fifth grade. The district curriculum guide for the core units entitled "Birth of a Nation" and "The U.S. Constitution" lists core topics, events, and historical figures to be taught for this era. The guide also lists outcomes in terms of student knowledge, skills, and dispositions, and suggests possible assessments and resources. (See Appendix J for guides). Terri's

plans emphasized cause and effect and chronology as well as the major events of the Revolutionary War, and consideration of economics, government, culture, geography, and links with other countries. Her stated goals included attention to the daily lives and experiences of ordinary people at the period under study. These various learning frameworks for history are helpful as I examine student learning of the Revolutionary War era.

The final assessment task in social studies for the Revolutionary War unit addressed many of these historical understanding goals, and examining student responses is helpful in indicating student learning at the end of the unit, although it was an open-book test. Much of the learning -- and the confusion -- evidenced here was supported by student comments during class time. There were five questions.

Students were first asked, "What were the major causes of the Revolutionary War? Why did the Patriots decide to fight the war?" Twelve students wrote about Patriots wanting to vote or wanting their own laws or government rather than the British laws or government (usually referred to in terms of the king rather than the country). Eight students wrote about how much the Patriots hated the taxes or thought they were unfair. Only one student explicitly linked the issues of taxes and voting, although many mentioned both. Nine students wrote in more general terms about the Patriots wanting freedom. Four students wrote about the harsh living conditions that existed because the

king was punishing the Patriots for the Boston Tea Party, because colonists had little food, or because they had to have soldiers live with them.

Knowing about the causes of the American Revolution was a key goal for Terri and in the district, state, and national curriculum frameworks. Terri had reviewed readings about the causes of the war early in the unit for students, emphasizing the French and Indian War, taxation without representation, and the government of the colonies. In the final test, no student mentioned the French and Indian War, but taxes, representation, and government were cited often. Social studies lesson transcripts revealed that many students recognized taxes and representation as key causes of the war. For example, by the middle of February, as Terri reviewed at the beginning of a lesson what students had been learning about, Rex spoke of taxes and fair government, Jim remembered “no taxation without representation,” and James mentioned the right to vote. In mid-March, in a similar review, Lynn said the colonists were fighting to be free so “the king couldn’t be their ruler any more” and for a right to vote for their leaders.

The second question of the final assessment asked, “How did the war affect the lives of everyday people?” and suggested that students draw on their Book Club novel to answer this. Five students explicitly drew on their Book Club novel, and one wrote about the Read Aloud novel. Others wrote about effects that were major parts of their novels but not talked about in social studies, such as the students who wrote about people going into hiding, or about women

not being treated equally, or children not having school. Two students wrote about having to pay taxes, and five wrote about soldiers taking things and ordinary people not having as much as they did before the war. These points appear to have been learned in social studies.

Three students wrote about people being scared, and one mentioned that some were excited, which are very general points. Three talked about people being either drafted or arrested for not fighting, and this appears also to have been influenced by a mini-unit taught by student teachers during this time that included an interview with a “revolutionary” from the Vietnam War era. A large number of students (15 references) wrote about the tragedy of war in terms of people being killed, hurt, or captured and of families and friendships being broken.

The question and its reference to Book Club novels encouraged this student emphasis on the hardships of war, but it is noticeably different from the focus of the majority of the social studies curriculum and reading. A review of social-studies lesson transcripts revealed that the only mention of the hardships of war by Terri was very early on, when she spoke to the students about the colonists’ decision to fight:

Why did the colonists decide that they wanted to start their own government, and why did they decide it was worth fighting for? ‘Cause you’ll find out when we’re reading in our Book Club books, it was a very, very tough war to fight. (2/10/98)

Even here, she referred to Book Club novels rather than historical sources or social studies texts, and she offered none of the details that students referred to in their answers to this question.

Terri's goals included students understanding the lives of ordinary people and she appears to have met this goal. Such a goal also addresses the National History standards of historical comprehension: drawing upon literary sources, and historical analysis, and considering perspectives.

The third question asked students to "Tell about either one famous person from the Revolutionary War or tell about one important event that happened during the Revolutionary War. Tell about the person or the event and say why the person or the event was important." One student wrote about Paul Revere, two about Sam Adams (although Duke had evidently copied directly out of a text), and five wrote about John Hancock as the signer of the Declaration of Independence. These were all important characters in the Read Aloud novel as well as historical figures researched in social studies by some of the students. Four students wrote about the signing of the Declaration of Independence as the most important event, while two wrote about the Boston Tea Party, and two more about the punishment of colonists as important triggers for the war. One student wrote about the First Continental Congress.

Each student who answered this question (14/16) was able to give good reasons for his/her choice. Notes taken as students completed this assessment show students referring to various texts and the classroom timeline of the era to

answer this question. There had been an opportunity in one social studies lesson for students to read from a basket of Revolutionary War (non-fiction) books, and most students returned to these to answer the question or to their notes from that lesson.

The historical figures and events selected by students were ones emphasized by Terri and were commonly found in the list of core topics in the district unit guide. This question also addressed state and national standards concerning the importance of individuals and events in history.

The fourth assessment question asked students to compare the beliefs of Tories and Patriots. Students were generally able to identify Tories and Patriots in terms of loyalty to the British king (14/16). Notes from the assessment period show that not all these students were able to do this unaided. At one point, Terri asked the class, "Can anyone tell Duke what a Patriot is?" At another point, Max asked, "Did the Patriots or the Tories win the war?" Emma and Max wrote nothing without help. Other students appeared to have learned this material well enough to answer independently.

Although the majority of the students grasped the major difference between Tories and Patriots in terms of loyalty to the king, there was some confusion about the reasons for this loyalty. Two students made faulty claims about Tories and Patriots having or wanting different religious beliefs. Two generalized from the British king or people to the colonists, one claiming that the Tories were royal, and one that the Patriots wanted to be king. Others were

confused about where the Tories and Patriots lived, variously claiming that the Patriots were Americans, the Tories “lived in a different state like Britten,” and the Tories are British, and Patriots “are people that live in america. They are american.” Others generalized with judgments about these groups, claiming that the Tories were bad, and the Patriots “are the good people,” or that the Tories “wanted to kill all the Yankees,” or, “toris are nicer than patriots.” Other comments brought in issues such as the different responses to taxes, relative strengths of their armies and different expectations for the outcome of the war, and different uniforms.

There were a variety of similarities noted between Patriots and Tories, about their lives before, during, and after the war. Students noted that both groups had families and homes, had the same king, were punished by the king, had to house and feed the British soldiers, and included people who “wanted their own way without fighting.” Eight students noted that both groups fought in the war, wanted to win, had soldiers and guns and spies, and that in both groups, family members were killed. Other students noted that both groups “can be mean and nice,” and that both were Americans and became free. These noted similarities appear to draw on both social studies lessons and Book Club experiences.

This question addressed Terri’s goals for student learning about the various participants, the district emphasis on comparing the British and American causes, and national standards of historical analysis – comparing

values and considering perspectives. Students generally evidenced understanding of the basic difference between Patriots and Tories but were less sure of the details. Some students were beginning to demonstrate a grasp of multiple perspectives on events. The ability to think about the similarities between two adversary groups is a complex understanding, and was possibly encouraged by the historical-fiction reading of this unit.

The final question on this assessment was optional, for extra credit, asking students to "Tell how the main ideas in the Constitution relate to the reasons why the Revolutionary War was started." Eleven students out of 16 attempted this question. Nine students focused on the idea that both the Revolutionary War and the Constitution were about securing rights and freedoms, although there was some confusion here about women or slaves being treated equally or getting the vote. Two students wrote that both the Revolutionary War and the Constitution aimed at securing a better government, while three students talked about the Constitution stating that King George III "couldn't do what he wanted." The connections made between the Constitution and the Revolutionary War were generally a matter of students noting similarities between the two or similar reasons for both occurring. Champ attempted to link them by cause and effect, but got confused and wrote that the war perhaps began because people didn't like the rules in the Constitution. Notes indicate that his confusion was more basic, as he asked, "What's the Constitution?" and then "I have no idea what the Constitution has to do with the Revolutionary War" (4/1/98).

No student wrote about the Constitution as an outcome of the Revolutionary War. This had been one of Terri's stated goals, reflecting also the national standard for historical understanding about the impact of the American Revolution on politics, economy, and society. This goal was apparently not met. However, in a conversation with Lynn and Jim about Book Clubs the following day, I asked if they thought it had been worth fighting the Revolutionary War:

Lynn: At least we won. If we didn't won we probably wouldn't -

Jim: No we have the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence.

Lynn: Yeah, without the Revolutionary War we probably wouldn't have the Declaration of Independence.

F: And what else might be - ?

Jim: The future would be changed. We probably wouldn't be here talking about it.

F: No, probably wouldn't. And why -

Lynn: We wouldn't be talking about the Revolutionary War!

Jim: Freedom of speech might be taken away.

F: Freedom of speech might be taken away.

Jim: The Constitution.

Lynn: All the things in the Declaration of Independence probably wouldn't exist.

F: So it's hard to think that even -

Lynn: And we might not even be able to pick our own president. We'd just be ruled by the king. And his family. (4/2/98)

Here it seems that Lynn and Jim had a good grasp of important consequences and outcomes of the war, as Terri had intended. Perhaps the test question the day before had helped them think about it, or perhaps the interview situation and wording of questions helped prompt them to think about it in new ways. The number of times they interrupted during this exchange shows their excitement with the ideas, and suggests these thoughts were new. A similar conversation with Champ and Cody showed Champ understanding that "if we didn't fight in the war then the king would still be bossing us around and stuff," but Cody over-generalized that "we'd be living in Boston!" So student understanding of the political outcomes of the war was mixed, at best.

The final unit assessment is a helpful summary of student learning, particularly about the causes of the American Revolution, life at that time, major figures and events, the two major colonist groups and beliefs, and the Constitution as an outcome of the war. At the end of the school year, about two months after the Revolutionary War unit ended, students were interviewed individually with a card-sort activity. One of the cards was labeled "Revolutionary War" and another "Constitution." Students were asked to sort the cards in different ways, including a chronological sequencing of many different historical eras they had learned about that year. Student comments as

they sorted cards provided some further insight into more long-term student learning.

There were a variety of comments made about the Revolutionary War as students sorted cards. Champ said it was fought “because they didn’t have some freedoms that they thought they should have.” D.J. said he didn’t know when it was or who was fighting, and Duke, Emma, and Max said they couldn’t remember what it was about. Jeff confused the Revolutionary War and the Civil War throughout his interview, and Michael said he “got all the wars confused.” Jim said it happened in the 1700s and involved George Washington and John Hancock but couldn’t identify the armies involved. Rex said it was “the first war” and was “to free America from England.” Vanessa described the Revolutionary War as “the British and Americans, and it happened because the Americans wanted more land. I mean, ‘cause like the British sort of owned them and they wanted to be their own country, wanted to be independent” (Vanessa, 6/2/98).

There were also interesting comments made about the Constitution. Champ thought that it had something to do with the ship, the U.S. Constitution. Dee noted that it was “made because of the Revolutionary War” while Duke asked, “Wasn’t the Constitution in the Revolutionary War?” Rex echoed that. Lynn connected it with the Revolution but had forgotten what it was.

When students were asked to show how any of the cards connected with each other, there were some interesting patterns. Of 16 students interviewed, five

then connected the Revolutionary War with the Constitution. Three connected it with other wars, one with "Conflict," and two connected it with "Freedom." The "Constitution" card was also twice connected with "Freedom" and once with "Conflict." It was also connected with the Civil War, Native Americans, Colonization, and Women's Rights. No student made any connections between the Revolutionary War or the Constitution and the card, "Me and my life" until asked to do so. Then three students made that connection with the Revolutionary War and three with the Constitution. For example, Rex talked about the importance of Freedom of speech guaranteed by the Constitution, and James said "the Revolutionary War was an important part of my life, because if it wasn't for that I might have not been born in a good country like this" (5/26/98).

These responses are generally not encouraging, although students implied more understanding of big ideas as they made connections between these topics and other cards. Student confusion also raises interesting questions about short-term learning and long-term retention, and how curricular organization may affect the latter. For example, some students were more able than others to revisit past units or to keep details of different eras and wars separate. Some focused noticeably on the most recent unit, and some over-generalized from that unit to past units.

I have reviewed student responses to the final social studies assessment at the end of the Revolutionary War unit, and given other examples from social studies lessons and a final interview. I have shown how student learning met

and did not meet various goals stated by Terri, the district, the state, and the National Standards. I shall summarize these here.

Terri's plans included student learning about the causes of the war, the chronology of major events, the major participants, and the outcomes of the war, particularly the Constitution. Students showed a very basic understanding of these topics. She wanted to help students understand the lives of ordinary people and met this goal. She also wanted to help students understand cause and effect and chronology. These were more difficult for students. They were able to state causes of the war, but less likely to see the Constitution as an outcome of the war. They were able to locate events and dates on the classroom timeline but less likely to use it to think about cause and effect or to situate it into a larger chronology of the era. The timeline remained for them predominantly a collection of individual events, each individually reported. This is consistent with its use in the classroom by Terri and the students. Terri did not use it to look for patterns or causality, but to locate events in time.

In addition to these goals, Terri used the district curriculum guides to help her plan the unit. Although she mentioned, or students read about, many of the core topics listed, student learning about each of these events and figures was uneven. Students were mostly able to identify causes of the war, arguments for independence, and contrasting beliefs. In social studies lessons, there was attention to states' rights but this was not taken up again. In class, students were able to talk about how a particular amendment affected their own life, as I

described in an earlier chapter, but later showed little connection between social studies learning, the Constitution, and their own lives.

State standards for history include attention to key events and lives, and to chronology, comprehending the past, historical perspective, and judging decisions. Students showed some learning about key events and lives. They showed only a very basic understanding of chronology, of historical perspective, and of the short and long-term consequences of past decisions.

National Standards state goals in terms of the causes of the Revolution, its impact on politics, economy and society, and the institutions created. Student learning of these has been examined. In this unit, students showed some chronological thinking and some comprehension of both fiction and non-fiction sources, and some historical analysis. They had little opportunity for historical research or issues-analysis.

What did students learn about the Civil War era?

I shall again frame my examination of students' historical learning during the Civil War and Freedom unit in reference to the national, state, and district objectives outlined earlier in this chapter and summarized in Appendix P. Specific objectives for the Civil War era are also included in Appendix R.

Terri's Civil War and Freedom unit emphasized many of the same historical understandings and core topics found in national and district curriculum guidelines. Her unit plan was based on six major aspects of the Civil War Era. These were: social and economic bases of the North and South; slavery

and the abolitionists; the causes and outbreak of the war; the major battles and important historical figures of the period; the role of resources and technology in the outcome of the war; and social experiences of the war. These reflected national goals for student understanding about the causes, course, and character of the Civil War, and the social experience of it. Terri's plans also reflected district emphasis on North and South lifestyles, slavery and abolitionists, and particular events and figures. Terri's plans included student reading about the Underground Railroad and major events such as Gettysburg and the Emancipation Proclamation. They also included reading about many of the major historical figures noted in district guidelines. (See Appendix N for Terri's social studies unit plan).

The post-unit assessment that Terri gave students to complete explicitly addressed many of the learning goals I have outlined. As with the Revolutionary War unit, students drew on notes to answer the questions, so their answers indicate their ability to access relevant information and work with it to show understanding of major issues and events rather than recall from memory.

The first question asked students to tell some of the events that led to the Civil War. Ten students (out of 15) wrote about the election of Lincoln, and seven wrote about the South wanting a different president or government and "splitting" from the North. One student wrote about Lincoln wanting to keep the Union together. Most students linked this instead to the differing beliefs about slavery. One student wrote about the different economic bases of the North and

South, linking those to the issue of slavery. Five students wrote about the first shots at Fort Sumter as a cause of the war. One wrote about the Emancipation Proclamation. One student wrote about people shooting at ships.

The next question asked students to list three ways in which the North and South were different in terms of resources, economy, and society. Students were generally able to list at least two differences. The fact that there was slavery in the South and not in the North was noted by 12 students. 14 students wrote about the factories in the North, several linking this fact with the manufacture of guns, while two students mentioned mines, and four mentioned shops. 11 students wrote about the agriculture and plantations of the South, growing cotton, sugar, and tobacco. Four students wrote about trade differences with the British, two wrote of the cattle ranches in the West that the North could draw on, and one student wrote about the population difference. Slavery was a major issue for these students, but they also recognized the different resources and economic bases. There was also some incomplete learning revealed here. For example, Emma wrote that the South “have slaves so they don’t have to do any work,” which is only a partial understanding of life in the South.

The next question asked students to explain how these differences in economy and resources played a role in the outcome of the war. Several students repeated what they had said for the previous question. But most of them were able to focus more closely on the fact that the North was more able to produce

guns (11 students), and that the North had more people to draw on (seven students).

The next question asked students to say what an abolitionist is and to give an example. All 15 students understood an abolitionist to be someone who was “against slavery,” although Champ was not clear about the distinction between disliking slavery and disliking slaves. 11 students included the idea that abolitionists actively worked to abolish slavery, and they mentioned having meetings or publishing newspaper articles, giving slaves fake papers, or working on the Underground Railroad, or being “some one that hides slaves in their house. Had holes in their flores and helped slaves get away” (Duke). Michael specified that an abolitionist was a White person helping slaves and he gave Lincoln as an example, as did two other students. Four students mentioned Frederick Douglass, three Harriet Tubman, two William Lloyd Garrison, and one student listed Sojourner Truth and Susan B. Anthony. Three students gave no examples, and Max wrote about Rosa Parks in connection with the Underground Railroad.

The next question asked students to say how slaves resisted and fought back against their conditions in the South. The most popular answer here was that slaves ran away (seven students), and again the Underground Railroad was cited many times, and that they joined the Union army (three students). Another popular response was that slaves sometimes killed their owners (six students) or fought back (one student). Four students also talked about slaves refusing to

work, or working more slowly, or having “accidents” while working. Two students wrote about slaves giving speeches. Three students did not answer the question as asked. Jeff and Champ both wrote about slaves trying to do their best so they would not be beaten, and Duke said they “had to work in the fields any way anless it was a nice owner.”

The next question asked about the roles of women and children in the Civil War. Some students wrote quite generally but others drew on specific examples. Rex wrote that:

Women sometimes were spys, like crashamn. Women were abolitionists like Susan B. Anthony. Some children were slaves and became abolitionists, like Sojour truth. Black children were born as slaves to farm and some may be able to work in ther owers house, like Harriet Tudman.
(original spelling)

Seven students wrote that women disguised themselves in order to fight in the war, and three more spoke about women protesting their right to fight, while one wrote about women being spies in the war, and one about women dying. These answers imply that many students thought about roles in the Civil War in terms of actually being involved in the fighting. This was also true with answers about children’s roles. Six students wrote about children fighting, speaking out to fight, or lying about their age in order to fight, and four spoke about children dying.

Another set of responses showed students thinking about how women and children played supporting roles in the war. Four students said women

nursed the injured, and five students wrote about women and children helping soldiers by sewing clothes, growing and cooking food for them, giving up their rooms for them, or hiding them. Students also wrote about children speaking out in support of the North or South and about women who were abolitionists.

Another set of responses, a much smaller sample, showed students thinking about the lives of women and children at the time. A few students wrote about women being slaves, children being born into slavery, and women fighting to save their children. Only Michael said he had “no idea” about children’s role in the war.

Another question asked students to tell about one important battle in the war, where and when it was, and who won it. The battles of Bull Run, Shiloh, and Fort Sumter were each chosen by four students. The battles of Antietam and Gettysburg were each chosen by one student. In addition, Michael appeared to misread the question and listed any battles he could: “gettysburg, bull run, and antitam was some major wars in the civil war, That’s all I can think of.” Most students found references to the battles and recorded information about time and place and victory. However, some students were not able to infer from the text whether the North or South had won a particular battle. There were differing opinions about the outcome at Fort Sumter, and Max simply stated that, “We won.” Dee thought that the Union army had won the battle of Bull Run, misunderstanding why it was so important.

The final question on this post-unit assessment was for extra credit and asked: "How were some of the issues in the Civil War related to issues in previous times that we've studied this year? How were the freedom issues for the Civil War the same as freedom issues at other times?" Ten students (out of 15) chose not to answer this question at all. Both James and Cody wrote about how Native Americans were treated badly by settlers like slaves were treated badly at the time of the Civil War. They also both wrote about how the Revolutionary War and the Civil War were both fought in part because of concerns about the kind of government wanted. Rex drew parallels between the lack of freedom of speech for slaves and Martin Luther King Jr.'s demonstrations. Jeff wrote that women couldn't fight in the Civil War, implying a link with women's rights. And Champ said, "slaves still had the same rights but one they were aboll to fight in the war. The was a thing that siad that slave could not fight in the war." It is not at all clear to me what this referred to, and Terri wrote no comments on these papers.

This post-unit assessment suggests student learning about the Civil War in many of the areas identified by Terri and by curriculum guidelines as being important. Most students appear to have grasped the major differences between the North and South in terms of resources and slavery, and how these contributed to the outbreak of war and to the outcome of the war. Most students understood what an abolitionist was, could name one, and had some ideas about the lives of slaves, although a broader understanding of slavery as an economic

and social phenomenon was harder for them to develop. Their responses to the question about women and children's roles in the war appear to reflect attention to specific examples and may reflect their Read Aloud novel as well as their social studies learning. These answers quite closely match outcomes expressed in Terri's plans, in the district curriculum guide, and in national standards for the Civil War era.

Another source of evidence of student learning could be the transcripts from lessons. For the most part, however, social studies lessons asked students to answer factual questions based on readings from the textbook and the teacher-led discussions of these. Students who answered the questions, therefore, were not necessarily showing learning so much as an ability to find the answer. Some students answered questions only about a very limited set of questions. For example, for several sessions, Champ almost always answered questions about the Civil War in terms of the South allowing slavery, and the North not allowing it. Although he appeared to be contributing to different lessons and discussions, he actually showed little growth or learning during these. Occasionally, evidence of a student's confusion would become evident. For example, Lynn asked during a Read Aloud session, "Did the Revolutionary War come before or after the Civil War?" (5/15/98). Tom was able to clarify that the Civil War was in the 1800s and the Revolutionary War was in the 1700s.

My final interview with students at the beginning of June included a card-sort activity with a number of components. Students were asked to sequence

some cards, with the names of historical eras as they had been referred to in social studies, chronologically. Later, they were asked to sort them in different ways to show how they connected with each other, or with school subjects, or with their own lives. The focus of this activity was on the connections that students were making, but in the process they talked about some of the cards, giving reasons for what they were doing or talking about what they knew. Their comments can be useful in checking retention of the learning their post-unit assessments suggest they had made.

D.J. described the Civil War: "It was about the North and the South. The South wanted slaves, and in the North they didn't like slaves." He also explained that the Civil War was in the 1800s and was a really big war. Emma also recognized that the Civil War was "the North and South, fighting about slavery and that kind of thing," and that Abraham Lincoln was president and the South didn't like him. Jim also described the Civil War in terms of the North and South, the Union and Confederates, in the 1800s, around issues of slavery and freedom, and he described it as "one of America's bloodiest wars." Max also identified the Union and Confederacy but focused on the fact that "a lot of people died and stuff. Some people died of sickness. There was a lot of sickness. More people died of sickness than of gunfire." Rex explained the Civil War: "Part of it was about freeing slaves. And the right to be free." James commented that without the Civil War, we might still have slavery. Vanessa, as she often was, was the most verbal, and described the Civil War in the following way:

The Civil War is when they elected Abraham Lincoln. And the South - and he said that nobody was allowed to have slaves, and so North Carolina and a couple of other states, but North Carolina was the first, they moved out into their own states and became the CFA, the Confederate States of America. And then they got back later - I think in 18-, oh, I don't know. But it lasted about four years. And at first, the South thought it was only going to last a couple of, like maybe a couple of months, and some of the wars, some of the battles in the Civil War were Bull Run. Gettysburg was the last one. And then President Lincoln gave the Gettysburg address, and after the Anti, Antietam, Abraham Lincoln gave the, I think, Emancipation Proclamation. And it set slaves free in the South and let, you know, all the slaves free and come back to the North and stuff. And the South didn't like that very much. (Vanessa, 6/2/98)

Allowing students to speak about the Civil War in any way they chose led to some interesting emphases. It also revealed a few confusions. By this time, Jeff confused the Revolutionary War and the Civil War throughout the card sort activity. Michael said, "I got all the wars confused." Some students made faulty connections between the Civil War and the Civil Rights movement, noticing similarities in terms of the freedom issues involved but over-generalizing to assume that they were at about the same time, chronologically. But for the most part, the Civil War was remembered well, as the last unit studied, with the most

spontaneous and correct comments made about it, and with students knowing about the major causes and outcomes and some of the major figures and events.

Student Learning about History Study

Terri's beliefs about history are important to consider when examining what students learned or believed about history as a subject or discipline. In our original interview, Terri defined social studies as "the study of society and social factors at different time periods," and history as "the study of people and realities" (1/11/98). She thought about teaching social studies in terms of the content outlined in the district guidelines with an additional emphasis on the lives of ordinary people. She described the activities of social studies in terms of reading, listening, writing notes, doing projects, and internalizing a "historically literate" outlook on historical and current events. This translated to a social studies program that emphasized reading, listening, answering questions, and also emphasized reading historical-fiction novels in Book Clubs and Read Aloud sessions in part for the added dimension of students understanding ordinary lives and experiences of the time.

The district guidelines for fifth grade do not define history or social studies, but stress knowledge objectives, historical content, and also skills, values, and civic action. A program suggested by these guidelines would include working with information from a variety of sources, using multiple representations and resources, formulating opinions, problem solving, and active democratic and civic participation.

For the Revolutionary War unit, Terri worked with fiction and non-fiction sources, but no primary sources, for example. In the Civil War and Freedom unit, she drew on a broader range of literature sources, but this is still a limited use of resources in comparison with the broad range of documents and sources that are available. She used a timeline and maps, but not the range of skills and classroom activities suggested by these curriculum guidelines, and not as a consistent and embedded part of her social studies teaching. Such a program would entail a greater allocation of resources, particularly of time, to the social studies curriculum than Terri allocated as well as a perspective on history study that included attention to the disciplinary modes of inquiry.

The description of the historical perspective in the Michigan Social Studies Framework (1996) assumes the goal is that “students use knowledge of the past to construct meaningful understanding of our diverse cultural heritage and to inform their civic judgments” (p. 3). This requires the integration of historical knowledge and thinking skills, including historical reasoning, interpretations, and historical inquiries. It also implies connections with the present and with future citizenship. Terri’s social studies classroom emphasized knowledge of the past but with little focus on the thinking skills or inquiry practices suggested here. Students also had few opportunities to connect their history study with their present lives or an understanding of their future roles as citizens. This was true for both integrated units observed.

The National Center for History in the Schools (1996) claims that “knowledge of history is the precondition of political intelligence” (p. 41). The standards offered represent historical understandings and historical thinking skills, similar to the knowledge and skills goals outlined in state and district documents. As in those guides, these two strands are mutually dependent and interrelated. Again, many of the historical thinking skills and their related ways of knowing and investigating history were not apparent in Terri’s classroom.

In the Revolutionary War unit, the patterns of teaching and learning were very similar to those of previous units integrating literature with the study of a historic period. Student understanding of what history is and what it meant to “do” history did not change as a result of this unit. History was equated simply with the past. It involved important figures and events. It was learned by reading and answering questions. There were “right answers.”

The student understanding of history as being about the past was exemplified by a short exchange after a student teacher asked the question, “Do you know anyone who is a part of history?” to which D.J. responded, “George Washington,” interpreting “know anyone” as “know of anyone.” They redirected him, and Tom then said, “My dad. He was in the war.” Michael commented that he had a grandfather in World War II and another in the Marines. Jim picked up on this and said, “He may not actually be a part of history, but my grandfather was a marine.”

From this snippet of conversation, it is apparent that these students still thought of history first as important figures and then as significant events, not as the lives and experiences of ordinary people. This was despite their long acquaintance with historical fiction in conjunction with social studies topics.

During the Civil War and Freedom unit, Terri still emphasized major content knowledge for the historical era studied, along with helping students better appreciate daily life at the time. She also drew on a fictionalized narrative account of the lives of ordinary people in the Civil War for her Read Aloud. She also used Book Clubs as a time to help students find out more about some other historical periods that they were not going to be able to study together as a class in social studies. These Book Club groups drew on non-fiction, secondary sources for informational reading of the history of those times and issues.

Much of Terri's teaching of the Civil War and Freedom unit also utilized reading, writing, and answering questions. This way of learning history was consistent with Terri's stated preference for language-arts approaches to teaching and learning and her belief that disciplinary distinctions had more to do with content than ways of knowing. There was nothing inherent in history or social studies, according to this view, that would lead to particular ways of teaching or learning history.

As with earlier units, this teaching of history focused on historical knowledge and understanding and gave less attention to historical thinking skills and inquiry processes. The use of secondary-source reading material for

finding historical information, without an emphasis on historical thinking and inquiry skills, led to a belief frequently expressed by students that the textbook and non-fiction books were “true.” They did not question the information or the perspective of the books as they used them to find information about history.

One major difference in the planning and teaching of this unit on the Civil War and Freedom was Terri’s emphasis on drawing connections between the current unit and past units, particularly through the issue of Freedom. In the first social studies lesson of the unit, Terri asked “Who can give me one example of a time in our country’s history when freedom was important?” Student answers included: the Montgomery bus boycott (Lynn); “when Britain made laws forcing people to live in their houses” (Rex); “during Vietnam when they made people get drafted” (Cody); “the Indians lost it” (Duke); when African Americans fought with words for freedom” (Rex); “freedom to the land” (Jim); and coming to America for religion (Vanessa). These examples show students thinking across the past for examples “from our history.” Most of the examples are taken from social studies units of this year, but not all. For example, students had not learned about the bus boycotts in social studies, and had learned about the Vietnam era draft from a guest speaker. This indicates that students equated history with “the past” and not just with social studies class.

This equating of history study with learning about the past was evident throughout the unit as students worked in their Book Club groups on different historical periods and struggles for freedom. The fact that they were learning

about the past, and reading from non-fiction accounts, led them to think of this as “history.” This is noticeable in the final interview and card-sort activity after this unit, at the end of the school year, when some students claimed to have studied a historical topic in social studies when in fact they had studied it during Book Clubs.

In the final interview, I gave students index cards that included unit titles from previous social studies units and some of the Book Club group topics from the Civil War and Freedom unit. The cards were: Native Americans, Colonization, Revolutionary War, Westward Expansion, Civil War, World War II, and Vietnam War. When I asked, “Why do you think I chose those?,” six students answered that these were all things they had learned about or studied in school, four students thought they were all “social studies” topics, two students identified them as “history,” and three students thought they were all wars. There was a mix here of thinking first about the subject matter (history or wars), or thinking first about them as school subjects.

I then added cards with different school subjects and classroom activities on them. These were: Read Aloud, Social Studies, Book Clubs, Writing Workshop, Computers, Science, Math, and a card called “Me and My Life.” I asked students to use as many or as few cards as they wanted. I put the “history” cards on one side as I introduced the subject cards, and then brought back the “history” cards and said, “Can you put these cards on the paper with the subject cards to show how they connect? You can use markers to draw lines, or make

stacks. Tell me about your choices.” All students removed the Math and Science cards as being irrelevant to these topics, and all but four students removed the Me and My Life card as being similarly irrelevant. Other connections between topics and school subjects were interesting.

No student completely agreed with Terri’s description of which topic was studied in which subject area. Many students over-generalized to claim that “all of them go in social studies and Book Club because we learned about the one thing in both Book Clubs and social studies” (Jim), or “we did all of them in [Read Aloud], ‘cause we always read a book on what we’re studying” (Vanessa). There was a common understanding of the earlier pattern of integration across literature and history study, in which a historical era was studied in Book Club and Read Aloud at the same time as it was studied in social studies. Six students identified all the cards as social studies topics, although World War II had been studied only in Book Clubs and only by one group of students, and the Vietnam War had been discussed as part of a special mini-unit led by student teachers mostly during writing workshop time. They seemed to be working on a generalization about historical eras and wars being “history” and therefore learned about in social studies.

Some students were careful to distinguish between the kinds of learning and activity done in different school subjects for a common topic. Tom was quite clear about this, although other students such as Michael, Cody, and D.J. were also careful about describing just what they did in each subject. Tom began by

identifying all the cards as “history” and then he said they were all learned about in social studies. But he amended this to say, “sometimes we do Book Club, we do Book Club and [Read Aloud]. So, like sometimes, like right now we’re doing that kind of stuff on computers.” I asked him to show me how to record that on chart paper by moving the cards and making connecting lines with a marker. I said, “Shall we say that you learn about it in social studies? Do you also learn about it somewhere else?” and his answer was, “Well we learn about it in social studies.” He went on to add that some people read about World War II in Book Clubs, and that in computer class they wrote about what they had learned. As I recorded his connections on paper he continued to make these distinctions between learning about a topic in social studies, reading about it in Book Club and Read Aloud, and writing about it in computers or writing workshop. For Tom, history learning happened in social studies class and was linked to a particular kind of activity and particular kind of text.

During this unit, a few students were able to understand history as impacting the present, although this was not common or initiated by students. Terri asked why students thought the Emancipation Proclamation was so important and Tom replied, “Because it’s really important thing, if there wasn’t any there’d probably still be slaves and the United States would be different” (5/19/98).

Again, the final card sort activity asked students about connections between their learning of historical eras and issues, including abstract “concept”

cards added to the original “history” cards, and their own lives. Very few students made connections until explicitly asked about them, and then four students (D.J., Emma, Jim, and Michael) claimed specifically that none of the cards had anything to do with their life. Some students were able to find connections between many cards and their life when asked to do so. The cards most often connected with students’ own lives were Conflict (seven students), and Freedom (five students).

After the second integrated unit, the Civil War and Freedom, the students showed an understanding of history as being about the past, with some links to the present that were not immediately identified or considered important. History study was understood in terms of reading for information and getting knowledge, generally from social studies texts but sometimes from other non-fiction texts such as those read in Book Clubs.

B. Student Learning of and about Literature Study

I have described the kinds of learning that students demonstrated in history from the two different integrated curriculum units in this classroom. I shall now examine student learning of the literature curriculum in each integrated unit, within a framework of objectives as stated by Terri herself and by state and national standards. I shall end this section with an examination of student understanding about literature study itself.

Student Learning of the Literature Curriculum

The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) together with the International Reading Association (IRA) has published standards for the English Language Arts (1996) with the shared purpose of ensuring that:

All students are knowledgeable and proficient users of language so that they may succeed in school, participate in our democracy as informed citizens, find challenging and rewarding work, appreciate and contribute to our culture, and pursue their own goals and interests as independent learners throughout their lives. (p. vii)

The standards were developed within a framework that placed the learner at the core within three other primary dimensions: the content dimension “addresses what students should know and be able to do with the English language arts”; the purpose dimension “addresses the question of why we use language”; the development dimension “focuses on how learners develop competencies in the language arts” (p. 13). The standards primarily foreground the content dimension, whilst recognizing that “students will best develop their knowledge, skills, and competencies through meaningful experiences and instruction that recognize purpose, form, and content as inextricably interrelated” (p.14).

In addition to the content dimension, there is a focus on four purposes of language use. These are: obtaining and communicating information with an emphasis on non-fiction texts; learning and reflection with an emphasis on student discussion and self-generated texts; problem-solving and application

with an emphasis on using language in everyday life; and literary response and expression described in the following way:

Literary response and expression are aesthetic acts involving complex interactions of emotion and intellect. The acts of responding to, interpreting, and creating literary texts enable us to participate in other lives and worlds beyond our own and to reflect on who we are. In order to interpret and create, students need to understand what makes a text literary. We use the word *literary* broadly here, to mean the imaginative treatment of a subject using language and text structure that is inventive and often multilayered.” (p. 17, original emphasis)

This perspective anticipates extensive literary experiences with text so students can learn that virtually any type of text can contain powerful literary expression.

The development dimension of the standards describes how students acquire knowledge and develop competency, and also how they should be able to use it. This perspective is that language learning is active, purposeful, and developmental. Students are expected to learn to use language clearly, strategically, critically, and creatively. An important aspect of this is drawn out further in the discussion of the context dimension of language arts in which there is emphasis on the social purposes and context of language learning and use.

Content standards are based on a view of the essential knowledge base for the English language arts. These include: knowing about and working with a broad range of texts (written, spoken, and visual); developing a repertoire of

processes or strategies for creating, interpreting, and analyzing texts; and knowing about the underlying systems and structures of language.

Working with a range of texts particularly involves a variety of genres of literature but also includes informational and academic texts, student-produced texts, technological resources, mass media, socially-significant oral and written texts, and everyday texts. Students need to study some texts in detail but also to understand and enjoy diverse works independently. They also need opportunities to compare the ways in which ideas and information are presented in different media. Additionally, they “need to know about the literary traditions that contextualize literary texts and about properties of the genres they represent” (p. 15). An example of this is that students “should realize...that reading a literary text involves some different processes and different background knowledge than reading an informational text” (p. 15).

In addition to knowledge about texts, students are expected to learn strategies and processes for comprehending and producing texts. Such strategies include: the use of background knowledge to construct meaning; effective strategies for fluently identifying words; study strategies to enhance learning and recall, and systematic processes for approaching writing.

Another critical part of the content of the curriculum is the study of the systems and structures of language and of language conventions such as grammar, punctuation, and spelling. This includes knowing how conventions

vary from one context to another and how to create texts for a range of audiences and purposes.

The IRA/NCTE standards focus primarily on the content dimension (what students should know and be able to do). Twelve standards are described, with the understanding that this is a suggestive list rather than exhaustive, and that there are complex relationships among all the standards. (See Appendix S for the IRA/NCTE Standards). The standards most directly related to the literature and literacy opportunities of Terri's Revolutionary War unit are those concerning the reading and interpretation of texts. Standards referring to the creation of text were addressed in her writing workshop lessons. Computer classes offered opportunities for students to work with different resources and research strategies. English as a second language was not an issue in Terri's classroom.

The Michigan Curriculum Framework for the English Language Arts (1996) addresses similar themes and goals. It also emphasizes process and content:

How people communicate as well as *what* they communicate. *Process* includes skills and strategies used in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and viewing. *Content* includes the ideas, themes, issues, problems, and conflicts found in classical and contemporary literature and other texts, such as technical manuals, periodicals, speeches, and videos. (p. 2, original emphasis)

The goal for language arts learners is "personal, social, occupational, and civic

literacy.” (See Appendix T for Michigan Language Arts Standards.) Again, the standards most directly related to the literature and literacy opportunities of Terri’s Revolutionary War unit are those concerning the reading and interpretation of texts. These are found in the standards that emphasize meaning and communication, literature, skills and processes, genre and craft of language, depth of understanding, and ideas in action.

Terri’s planning for literacy is consistent with several of the goals for content knowledge outlined in both the NCTE and State of Michigan Standards.

Terri’s stated literacy goals are based on her Book Clubs, which aim to:

Allow children to explore different genres of literature and provide an authentic reading experience. As part of students’ work in their Book Clubs, they write and share reflective responses in their reading logs. The process of reflecting and sharing their responses helps further their understanding and appreciation of the texts they are reading. (Parent Handbook)

In our early interview, Terri described language arts as “a set of processes” involving learning how to read and make sense of things, including such skills as reading fluently and figuring out unknown words (1/11/98). These are processes included in the state and national standards. She also described the opportunities for literary learning in the Read Aloud sessions, such as critical consideration of the author’s craft.

Appendix U shows the various dimensions of student learning outlined in relevant national and state standards, and as stated by Terri. These standards are the ones that emphasize reading and literature objectives because these were the standards addressed in Book Clubs and Read Aloud lessons as the literacy part of Terri's integrated Revolutionary War unit.

I shall use these student learning objectives as a framework for examining student learning in this integrated Revolutionary War unit, considering what students learned about reading and literature from this unit. Then I will examine what they understood about literature study itself.

Revolutionary War unit

Assessing student learning in reading and literature study from this integrated Revolutionary War unit is complicated by the lack of recorded teacher objectives or formal assessment strategies. Terri assessed student learning of the history of the Revolutionary War era with an open-book test. There was no final assessment of student learning from the Read Aloud novel. The final Book Club project was a mobile, either made independently or with a reading partner, to show the changes in the novel's central character before and after the war. In addition, there were just three other reading-log assignments across the seven-week unit.

The final project can be examined both for what it suggests about Terri's literacy goals and for what it tells us about student learning. Students were asked to consider their central character both before and after the war in terms of such

things as, what did he/she think about the war, and what was he/she like?

Students were to consider how his character's life was changed by the war. These questions appear to address Terri's objective for students to make sense of what they read. They also may address state objectives for comprehending texts and reading for multiple purposes, and for reading literature to understand human experiences. Similarly, national standards emphasize reading for multiple purposes and from many genres to build understanding of human experiences, and to reflect on the values of other cultures and times. These final project questions also appear to address Terri's historical learning objectives.

Student responses to this task show that, at least within reading pairs, students were able to comprehend major plot lines from their novels. They all gave examples of a character's life before and after the war, and many gave specific details of things their character did or enjoyed. Some of these details were general details about the kinds of things that people living in that period did, such as churning butter and working on a farm. Other details were more character-specific, such as feeling excited about going to war, or liking animals, or "getting lippy with his dad" because of disagreements about the war (Jeff, 4/29/98).

Five students (three projects) wrote in the first person, as the central character, which had not been discussed as an option. This may suggest a closer identification with the novel's character or it may have been a literary device used by students to present this project.

Several students understood the major changes in a character's life after the war in terms of family members or friends who had died, or houses and farms being ruined. Several also understood changes in the character in terms of feelings and beliefs. For example, Tom and James wrote about Jonathan in The Fighting Ground, writing in the first person: "I am sure glad I am home, with my Dad. fighting is more work than farming. I am never going to do that again. I thought I could be a hero being in the war" (Tom & James, original spelling, 4/2/98). About the same character, Cody and Champ wrote, "He wished he had never been involved in the war because he got captured and planned not to get captured. Johnathan knew now why his dad did not want him to go in the war" (Cody & Champ, original spelling, 4/3/98).

Jeff and Michael, and Max and Rex wrote about Sam from My Brother Sam is Dead, although Tim is the central character. This suggests that the concept of central character was not well understood by them. When I asked them about this as they began their project, Max was frustrated with my question. We had this exchange:

F: Why did you choose Sam as the central character?

Max: *Because* it said "My brother *Sam*" on the cover.

F: Why not Tim?

Max: He's *one* of the main characters, but we didn't choose [to write about] him. (4/1/98)

This final project suggested that Terri's learning objectives for students were both for literary and historical understanding. Students mostly showed a grasp of the major plot and character developments in their novel. They were able to identify how the war changed lives and people. It seems likely that, especially for those students who wrote in the first person, there was increased understanding of war as a complex human experience.

Apart from this final project, there were three written assignments for students to complete in their reading logs. The first was on February 23 and asked students to do three things: (1) write down a new word and its definition; (2) write about what you've learned about what life was like before and during the Revolution -- what did people do, wear, eat, etc.; and (3) make an educated guess about where on our timeline your story is, and explain why you think that your guess is good and list the page you're on.

The first question perhaps addressed Terri's goal of students figuring out unknown words. It also related to the state objective for students to determine the meaning of unfamiliar words, specifically by using a dictionary. However, this was a common reading journal question, and students never used other sources or strategies to determine the meaning, as suggested by state and national standards.

Students chose a variety of words to look up: muslin, palomino, tyranny, provoke, ambush, bayonet, siege, juxtapose, seer, encampment, corporal, and zealous. These words were selected after they had finished reading for the day,

rather than arising out of their reading. They were not necessarily important to the plot or theme of the text, or to understanding a particular passage, or to the historical period. Students did not have to refer to the context in which they were used. When I asked individual students later to tell me what their chosen word meant, not one could tell me. Student learning from this exercise did not include incorporating new words into their vocabulary, although they did practice looking words up in the dictionary.

In addition, some students misspelled their selected word, and so any learning they might have done would have been faulty. D.J. wrote, "Frickle - changing not constant, likely to change without reason," and Duke defined "corperull," which has a phonetic spelling indicating that the word may have already been familiar to him although he did not know the correct spelling for it.

The last two questions about the time period and ways of life represented in the novels appear to be strongly linked to the historical era under study. While these therefore may be seen as more linked to history study than literature study, they also asked students to make sense of the text and to appreciate the novel, as Terri planned. They also imply the reading of these novels for information.

Similar questions were assigned for reading journal responses on March 2. Students again looked up a new word and its definition. My conclusions about student learning from this are the same as before. They were then asked to write down five details from their book that lets them know it takes place long ago, with at least one being a clue that it took place at the time of the Revolution. This

question again appeared to focus student attention on the historical context of the novel and perhaps on historical learning objectives. The question asked for attention to historical setting but did not use that literary terminology. Again, it did ask students to make sense of the text in some way and to find supporting details from the text. However, they did not have to quote the text or give a page number. The question again asked students to read for information.

Student responses ranged from specific dates taken from the novel to looking at the clothes depicted on the cover of the book. Those who included details about the Revolutionary War era wrote about a variety of clues: they wore Redcoats; it was Spring 1776, or it takes place in 1775-1781, or "it tells the date" (James); "there is patroits and torys in my book" (Dee); "it takes place during the battle of breed hill" (Jim); "it talked about the america revolution" (Max); "they (killed) the British lobster backs" (Rex); and "men who hated King George III went and burned down houses" (Vanessa). Several students gave no specific details that suggested a Revolutionary War-era context. Students mostly showed an ability to draw on the text for information, some more able to find specific details than others who answered rather generically.

The last question that day asked students to write down five things they knew about their main character that could not be "seen." This again asked for attention to details in the text, but this time thinking about a central character and moving beyond physical characteristics. This emphasizes character as an important story element and could also have drawn student attention, as state

objectives suggest, to the ways characters reflect both positive and negative characteristics. Many students were unable to explore character values or beliefs that cannot be “seen,” and instead described other attributes, such as being an orphan or a Christian. Some were able to mention that a character was “nice and polite” (Emma) or “wanted to go to war like his brother” (James). Jim’s response appeared to get closer to what Terri may have hoped for when he answered, “She has a changing attitude, she gets angry about wrong things. She sometimes defies people. She tries to get out of things. She knows how to keep a secret without telling. She almost always keeps her word.” Internal motivations and character qualities were difficult for students. Unfortunately, there was no conversation about this to help students better understand and learn from their own novels or those of other students.

The final reading journal assignment for this unit on March 16 asked the students to compare their novel with the Read Aloud novel, Johnny Tremain. They were asked to write two paragraphs and to think about this in terms of: how the war affects the main character, what the lives of the main characters are like, what we learn about the Revolutionary War era in the two books, and what happens to Tories in the books. Once again, the gist of these questions is considering the historical context and details of the novels. There is also an opportunity for inter-textual comparisons and for examining issues and themes across texts, as suggested in the state standards.

Of the suggested topics to address to help compare the novels, it was noticeable that only one student wrote about how the novels compare in terms of what we, as readers, learn about the Revolutionary War era. James wrote, "In jonny Tremain I leanred that if you were cought taking teac you could be throwen over. I leaned that if you were cought you would not allways be killed." Here it appears that he lost the comparison aspect of the question as he wrote about what he learned about the history.

Five students chose to write about what happened to the Tories in each book, as suggested. Six students addressed the question of how the war affects the main character in each novel. Eight students wrote explicitly about what the lives of the main characters were like, writing about whether or not they worked, where they lived, and their families.

Some students made comparisons that were not specifically asked for, particularly comparisons between the two central characters. For example, Champ wrote that "Johnny was 15 and John was 13," and D.J. noted that "Coshmoo is different from Johnny Tremain bec Coshomoo is an indian and Johnny tremain is a settler." Max wrote about Johnny Tremain having an injured hand, unlike the character in his novel. Three students compared the dates and time period of the novels, at least at that point in each book.

Several students took the opportunity to summarize the plot so far, or parts of it. For example, Jeff wrote about Johnny Tremain, "Johnny wanted to be a silversmith but now he can't because his hand got buriend And nobody would

give him a Job." Duke wrote, "He gets capshurd By 3 germans. He was involved in the Boston tea party. Jonathan cout Dove trying to steal tea."

The details students gave of their own Book Club novel again demonstrated an understanding of the major plot and character developments. They also showed an interest in the central characters of the novels and particular incidents that happened to them.

The last part of the assignment that day asked students to "predict what will happen next in your Book Club book." Prediction is an important strategy for constructing meaning. Students were able to do this well. For example, those reading Time Enough for Drums predicted that "Dan and his friends will be going in the war" (Emma), "John Reid will come back to fight for Jemima" (Jim), and that "the British people will leave and Jimima has a big mess to clean up" (Lynn). Those reading Sarah Bishop predicted that "they will not catch Sarah" (Dee), and that "Sarah Bishop will get captured. I thik she will escape and run away" (Vanessa). Those reading The Fighting Ground all agreed with Duke who predicted that "ther going to find him and kill all the hessians" (Duke). Those reading My Brother Sam is Dead all predicted that Sam would die in the war but made no predictions about the central character, Tim.

These predictions show some knowledge of the different novels to this point. They show an ability to use that knowledge to think about the possible plot line. They also may show a familiarity with certain characteristics of novels based on their experiences. For example, most students appeared to assume that

the central character would survive. (Those reading My Brother Sam is Dead did not address the central character). The responses also may show expectations based on the integration of their Book Club reading with their social studies work on the Revolutionary War era. For example, many students made predictions about upcoming fighting and the war, and a positive outcome for Americans or their characters.

One of the difficulties of having five different novels being read by pairs of students independently of the teacher is that there may be less opportunity for the teacher to monitor and foster comprehension as needed. For the most part, students were able to answer reading journal assignments and complete their final projects in a way that suggested they had grasped the major plot, character, and themes of their Book Club novels. However, there were misunderstandings along the way, revealed in conversations I had with students.

On the second day of Book Clubs in this unit, I spoke with Jeff and Michael about My brother Sam is Dead. They had a new student joining them, and I asked them to tell him about the story so far. Jeff's summary that "It's about Sam, and he's going to get dead by these people" missed the point that the book was not really going to be about Sam, but about his brother, Tim. I read the beginning of the book: "It was April...My brother Sam was standing there." I asked them who was telling the story, and we had to spend time establishing that it was told by Tim, not Sam. The following day, I had a similar conversation with Rex and Max about the same novel. They understood that Tim was telling

the story, but had missed important details in the first few pages about where Sam had gone, and why. We went back to the text together to recreate the argument Sam and his father had had about who fired the first shot, and to try to find out if both of them felt the same about the British.

D.J. and his reading partner had a similar difficulty deciding which character was telling the story in their book Moon of Two Dark Horses. I also had an early conversation with Dee and Vanessa about Sarah Bishop, in which we had to go back over details in the text to decide which characters were Tories and which were Patriots, which was critical to understanding the novel. There were important details in the first few pages of these novels that students on their own were not necessarily noticing.

Part of the reason for this was an apparent emphasis on reading as much and as quickly as possible, especially with the longer novels. Rex and Max expressed this when I suggested they go back and re-read a passage. When I asked Dee about her novel, she told me what page they were on. Lynn didn't want to talk with me because "we have two hundred and thirty-eight pages to read." A few days later I noted that Lynn did not listen as Jim took his turn reading a page, but was eager to finish the page when Terri told them it was time to stop, and that Champ was comparing book length with another student. This emphasis on the number of pages to be read seems to have been important to many of the students.

Pairing readers involved attention to reading level, expressed interest in the different books, and how well students could be expected to work together. The pairs changed for each unit. There were therefore many variables for Terri to take into account. I discovered that at least six students were given a novel that was not their first choice. In addition, Vanessa reported having read three books by the same author, Scott O'Dell, for Book Clubs. And Tom and James had read their book previously but not told Terri that. Vanessa and Dee were adamant about disliking their book and its central character, while Champ and Cody liked their novel, as did Rex and Max. Lynn and Tom grew to like their books. Terri's goals of having students appreciate and enjoy these texts was met for only some of the students. In addition, many of the students commented that they had read enough historical fiction and would like more choice about the kinds of book they read.

Some students were quite familiar with literary terms like character, plot, and setting. Lynn quickly named the major and minor characters in her book when asked. Vanessa and Dee were able to speak about their character and what they liked and disliked about her. Champ and Cody drew a distinction between liking a character and finding him interesting to read about. Max and Rex, however, make some generalizations not based on the representation of characters in the novel but on whether they were Tory or Patriot. They brought other, relevant, background knowledge to bear on their interpretation but were less alert to nuances of character in the novel. Jeff was interesting in that he had

needed help discovering who was telling the story in his novel at the beginning of the unit. He became quite clear by the end when he told me: "It's about a boy named Timmy and he's having a hard time 'cause his brother is going to get executed" and "It's Timmy's point of view." But his final character mobile focused on Sam.

Most students seemed able to talk about plot. However, when I asked Cody and Champ about the plot of their novel, we had this exchange:

F: How about the plot? Is it a good plot?

Cody: Uh-huh.

F: What do I mean by plot?

Cody: Like, particular place, I guess.

F: The plot is the story line - right?

Champ: It was in 1978. It was in 1778. April third.

F: Okay, that would be setting. That would be when it was set.

Champ: Yeah. (3/11/98)

Vanessa and Dee argued that the plot of their novel was not good because it was "not much about the war" and "not much problem." Most conversations about plot revolved around detailed retellings of the last passage read. Students understood plot to be about the action or events in the book but were not all able to separate the big ideas and major events from the myriad details as they read.

There was some evidence of student understanding of larger themes.

When Terri asked about the character Sam saying, "There are people out there

dying for you," Rex explained that, "They're not just dying for *her*. They're dying for everybody. So people can be free." When I asked Jeff to use one word to describe what his book was about, he said, "Violence," and Michael said, "War." Jim also summarized his book as being about "War," while Lynn tried to tell the plot instead of finding a theme. Champ also tried to summarize the plot when asked this question, but Cody said his book was "about somebody wanting to go to the war and finding out it's not as exciting as he thought it would be."

Student understanding of genre might be expected from this unit integrating historical fiction with the study of the Revolutionary War era. Terri wanted students to explore a variety of genres across the year, and state and national standards refer to student learning about different genres. In conversations I had with students, they generally agreed that the incidents in their novels "could have happened" and that the books portrayed life as it was like at that time.

By mid-unit, Cody and Champ were not making a connection with the Revolutionary War in terms of what the outcome of the war might be, although they had already studied that in social studies. On the other hand, Max drew on his understanding of that era to assume that all the Tories in the book were "mean." Jeff and Michael were reading My Brother Sam is Dead, which has an epilogue about how much of the novel is true and which characters were "made up" (Jeff, 3/24/98). Dee was able to identify her novel as historical fiction, and

Vanessa said it “talks about history and a little bit about the war.” Jim was able to identify that Johnny Tremain was a fictional character, but Lynn added that some events in the novel “really did happen.” Cody also said Johnny Tremain was fictional, but Champ wasn’t sure and thought the novel was based on a true story. In final interviews in June, Champ then thought that he was “just in a book,” and Michael was not able to say whether or not Johnny Tremain was a fictional character. Emma thought he had really lived.

Terri never spelled out her goals for Book Clubs and Read Aloud in the same way that she did for social studies, but hoped to help students make sense of text, enjoy reading, become more fluent and strategic readers and develop literary criticism skills. There was no formal assessment of reading or literature study.

Most students were able to make sense of text in terms of basic plot and character development, although not all students were comfortable with these literary terms. They continued to develop an understanding of character, setting, and theme, although rarely referring to these terms. They were able to use supporting details from their novels. They were able to use a dictionary but appeared to use few other strategies for comprehending new words. They were able to make comparisons across two texts. They could predict and summarize.

It is very interesting to note the similarities between these examples of student learning found in Book Club journals and conversations, and the explicit modeling and questioning that Terri did in Read Aloud sessions with the novel

Johnny Tremain. In Appendix L, I summarized the questions and comments that Terri used to guide student comprehension and learning during Read Aloud.

In the Read Aloud, Terri helped students make sense of the novel by recapping the plot and by asking recall and comprehension questions about the plot. This was her most common form of question. She also asked prediction questions most sessions and a number of questions that required students to make inferences from the text in order to predict or make sense of the story. She asked several questions about the setting, always about time, and always in reference to the Revolutionary War era context. She sometimes asked about a character and occasionally asked about a detail in the text. All of these reading and comprehension strategies were similar to those students showed success with when they did Book Club work.

Terri also paused several times to help students figure out vocabulary that might be new to them. Interestingly, she modeled ways of figuring these out from prior knowledge, context, and other examples. Neither she nor students referred to a dictionary definition, as they were expected to do for Book Club vocabulary.

Twice, Terri stopped to have children explore metaphors that the author had used, which was not part of Book Club. Three times she gave them something specific to listen for as she read. In Book Club, she neither suggested a specific purpose for their reading nor asked them to set their own purposes for reading. According to my earlier interviews with students, many of them

thought one of the major reasons for reading was to find out more about the historical era.

There was one other interesting exchange when James asked, “Was Johnny Tremain really in the war?” and Terri briefly answered, “I believe he’s a made-up character.” This was the only reference made to the historical fiction. As I have shown, students were not entirely clear about the genre, its characteristics, or the fictional nature of the main characters.

The opportunity to study genre, particularly historical fiction, was not taken up in this unit. As all teachers must do, Terri made particular choices about her emphases for literacy and literature study, and student learning reflected these. Another look at the relevant state and national standards indicates other choices Terri made and might have made regarding student learning goals.

The national standards emphasize four purposes of language use: obtaining and communicating information, learning and reflection, problem-solving and application, and literary response and expression. In the Revolutionary War unit, students used non-fiction texts in social studies to obtain information but they also used Book Club novels for that purpose. They were encouraged to respond to literary texts to explore other lives and worlds, but rarely were asked to respond personally or aesthetically to texts as literature.

The national standards focus on content goals that emphasize knowing about and working with a range of texts, developing a repertoire of strategies for interpreting and analyzing texts, and knowing about the systems and structures

of language. These are then detailed in the standards. Terri emphasized the reading of nonfiction texts (in social studies) and fiction texts (in Book Clubs) for this unit. She made connections across these but did not address the different genres or text structures and their different purposes, and their contributions to the topic of the Revolutionary War. She used Book Clubs to help students explore a variety of aspects of human experience and issues but did not explore aesthetic aspects of literature or personal responses and connections. Probably due to time constraints, she did not ask students to make connections across the various Book Club novels and the perspectives and purposes represented by these. Her Book Club format was an effort to build literacy communities within the classroom but did not extend beyond the reading partners.

The Michigan Language Arts Framework (1996) suggests an emphasis on meaning and communication, and Terri did emphasize student comprehension of texts, although there was less emphasis on multiple strategies than in the standards. Related to this, the framework suggests student monitoring of progress and strategies, and student goal-setting; Terri's Book Club format allowed for some student choice and self-regulated pacing of their reading, but she did not choose to extend this to goal-setting or self-monitoring of learning.

The framework also emphasizes the reading of literature for multiple purposes, and Terri also emphasized reading literature for understanding of our common heritage and humanity, and also for seeking information. There was less emphasis on reading literature for other purposes, such as enjoyment and

recognition of literary quality and merit. Similarly, the framework addresses the genre and craft of language, and Terri emphasized story elements such as plot, character, and setting but did not emphasize genre or particular text features.

The framework emphasizes depth of understanding and ideas in action, and Terri also emphasized the exploration of substantive issues, such as war, through the reading of historical fiction. In a conversation I had with Terri, she spoke of students making connections from the books and themes to their own lives, and she appears to have plans for helping them make connections across texts, as her one, whole-class discussion from Book Clubs suggests. However, she did not explicitly make these connections.

Civil War and Freedom unit

I shall again refer to the student learning objectives outlined in state and national documents as a framework for examining student learning of the literature curriculum in the integrated unit of the Civil War and Freedom. (See Appendix U for details of the relevant standards).

Terri's Civil War and Freedom unit plans were not written, but in our planning sessions she emphasized using the Read Aloud novel to help students better understand life during the Civil War and Book Clubs to help students learn more about a different historical period and the struggles for freedom. Additionally, she began to emphasize the Read Aloud period as an opportunity to model and discuss finding and recording information, and to talk about

genres. She spoke of Book Clubs as a time to use non-fiction literature. For this unit there was to be an emphasis on non-fiction as a genre.

The enactment of this unit reinforced these emphases. Read Aloud included discussion of genre, daily life at the time, and freedom issues. Book Clubs were each focused on a different era and freedom issue. Students were to make notes as they read, reading for particular kinds of information and toward a final presentation.

As with the Revolutionary War unit, there were no recorded teacher objectives or formal assessment strategies in literature study for this unit. The final project was a group presentation of information about the freedom issue studied during Book Clubs. It was to include important events, mini-biographies of important historical figures, and a creative presentation. It drew on notes that students had been taking on research sheets across the unit as they read Book Club books.

These research sheets and the literature formats for this unit addressed particular literature-study learning objectives. Terri's stated goals included making sense of text, working with non-fiction, and exploring freedom issues. State benchmarks similarly include reading and comprehending a variety of material for different purposes, including gathering information, increasing conceptual understanding, and understanding our common heritage and humanity. State benchmarks also include attention to genre and text elements, including non-fiction and biography, and include student ability to make

connections across texts and with their own lives about important issues.

National standards also emphasize students reading a range of texts for different purposes and student attention to the form and structure of text. This unit provided opportunities for these learning goals to be met.

I shall examine student learning in two broad literacy areas: (1) reading for information and (2) learning about genres and text structures. Another learning goal in this unit was student ability to make connections across texts and with their own lives. I have examined this in an earlier chapter.

A major goal of this unit concerned reading for information, which includes making sense of text and gathering information from different texts. The research sheets asked students to note important events and important people of the era. They also asked students to think about freedom issues in the era in terms of the kinds of freedoms people had and did not have, how people fought for freedom, and how these freedom issues relate to other ones studied during the year. Students also were to note interesting facts they learned about the era while reading. (See Appendix V for Book Club Research Sheet). These research sheets provided some data about student learning in terms of reading for information and comprehension. Additional data were drawn from conversations with students during Book Clubs and from the final interviews conducted at the end of the unit and the school year.

Max, Michael, and D.J. read about Civil Rights. They recorded biographical information about Rosa Parks and wrote about her arrest as the

important event of the era. They wrote about her to show what freedoms Black Americans did and did not have. They wrote about the way freedom was fought for in more general terms, but drawing on their reading about the bus boycott:

They boycotted to not ride the bus and they didn't get much money

Because the black people wouldn't ride any more. They formed meetings to talk about black issues. And Martin Luther Kind said and warned them that there would be no violence in the issue. (Max, Michael, D.J.)

They wrote that, "The slavery issue could compare" but did not say how the two could compare. They also commented on Rosa Parks' arrest as an interesting fact.

Max, Michael, and D.J. focused heavily on Rosa Parks in their research notes.

They drew on the first book that Terri had given them to read. According to my notes of conversations with them, they also drew on prior knowledge. Max

claimed to know about Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King Jr. already. Their

presentation included Michael's report on Rosa Parks, both her arrest as the

"important event" and a short biography of her as his "important person." Max

wrote about Malcolm X and about when his house was burned down. D.J. wrote

about Martin Luther King Jr. being shot.

From these notes and projects, it appears that D.J., Max, and Michael have read and understood some of the Book Club materials and gathered information to answer specific questions. Notes from class show that they had difficulty at first separating the Civil Rights period from the Civil War, and had to be led through thinking about the different historical periods. In the final interview, at

the end of this unit, D.J. still claimed that “Civil rights happened in the civil war.” He was able to say that Civil Rights had to do with Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King, but insisted that they were during the Civil War.

Max was also confused in the final interview and said, “I forgot about Civil Rights. Civil War? What is Civil Rights again? Civil Rights? Rights about what? You’ve got Women’s rights. What’s Civil Rights?” (5/28/98) Michael also in our final interview could not remember what Civil Rights referred to. It appears that these students were able to get certain types of information from the Book Club research and books but not put it into a larger framework. They understood some connections with Freedom issues but did not form a conceptual understanding of Civil Rights or of the Civil Rights movement. They could recall the stories about particular people but not speak about the larger movement.

Lynn also worked on the Civil Rights movement with her reading partner. They chose to read a book about Black heroes that had biographies in alphabetical order, and they chose to read it all the way through. Lynn was able to talk about a number of different people involved in civil rights across several decades and to make general statements about the struggle for freedom and for particular rights. She was able to gather information and organize it for herself conceptually.

Emma and Dee worked together on Women’s Rights. Unlike the Civil Rights groups, they had little prior knowledge about the people in their first book, and Dee said, “I’ve never heard of anybody in this book” (5/7/98). Dee

narrated the stories of the women she was reading about, such as Ernestine Rose and Victoria Woodhull. She was able to find specific information in these non-fiction books when asked, but she preferred to tell the stories of the women. She was also able to conceptualize the issues and put the information together into a larger idea. For example, when asked if women were fighting for the same rights in different eras since the Civil War, she answered, "Different things. Sometimes they were fighting to get into the workforce, and sometimes they were fighting to get into the army, and sometimes they were fighting for the right to vote" (5/22/98). But she found it difficult to conceptualize or recall the time frames about Women's Rights, particularly as the books she read spanned a number of periods and different struggles. In the final interview she also claimed that "Women's Rights was for voting, and it happened during the Civil War" (5/26/98).

Dee and Emma had used at least two books to fill in their research sheets and wrote about seven different women at different times, and about four different events in the struggle for Women's rights. They were able to gather information, and Dee showed an ability to understand the big ideas and to recall some of the stories. Time was a more difficult concept. Emma volunteered very little information apart from Dee.

Champ and Jeff also worked on Women's Rights. They drew on two different books and recorded information about several different women and events. They also were able to connect the main ideas they had read with issues

of freedom. Neither student elaborated much on the information or on Women's Rights as an issue in the final interview.

Vanessa and Becca read about World War II and the Holocaust. Becca was absent for most of this time, and Vanessa guided the reading choices and focus. Vanessa recorded notes from two books, both of them about Anne Frank, whose story she had said she was quite familiar with on the day Terri introduced Book Clubs. Vanessa took notes from narrative biographies of Anne Frank, noting Anne's family members and friends under "Important people from my era" and noting events in Anne's life under "Important events during my era." For example, she wrote "Hannah's mother died and the new baby during birth" although she also noted more general events like, "Another truck load of 16 year olds were taken away to do forced labor."

Vanessa was able to write about freedoms in more general terms, drawing on the books she read about Anne Frank. For example, "People went to the street to complain when the Nazis were out" and "People didn't have freedom of speech." Vanessa wrote about Anne Frank for her final presentation and also wrote a play about her life for her group to present. There were three books in this basket that were not focused on the life of Anne Frank, and five books that were. Vanessa had shown an interest in Anne Frank prior to the unit and continued to follow that interest. She re-told events in narrative form and was fascinated by the characters in Anne's story, but she was also able to move from this example to talk about larger issues and ideas. In the play that Vanessa wrote

for the final presentation, she re-told the story of Anne Frank and included the major events that happened to the family because of the Holocaust. She also included characterization and humor around the sibling rivalry of Anne and Margot, and showed an understanding of play structure.

Jim also worked on the Holocaust with his partner. He took notes on events and people in a more general way than Vanessa had done. For example, he noted major events leading to the Holocaust as "Jews accused of Christ killing. Jews banished from Germany. Hitler vice chief counsler. Jews robbed." He gave page numbers from one book for these. He wrote about some of these for his final project and also wrote about David Rubinowicz, whose recovered diary was one of the books he had been reading. The selection of books, with an emphasis on the stories of the people affected by the Holocaust rather than the leaders at the time, appeared to influence Jim's choice for a biographical sketch. However, unlike Vanessa, his list of "Important people from the era" also included Hitler and the Jews. Vanessa's focused entirely on important characters in her book's story.

Tom and James, along with two other students, read about the rights of immigrant citizens in this country, particularly about the Japanese internment and its aftermath for Japanese citizens, and about a Cambodian child escaping Pol Pot's regime and immigrating to the United States. Early in their reading, I asked what "immigrant" meant. Tom said he didn't know. James answered, "It's someone who moves to America, like someone who like moves to like America

from China or Cambodia, like he did. He moved from Cambodia to America" (5/8/98). Later, Tom appeared to have learned this and told me about immigrants who came through Ellis Island.

Both Tom and James talked about the big ideas of freedom and rights. Tom said that the Cambodian people, like the Japanese citizens, "had to prove that they were Americans" (5/14/98). James described how in World War II, "They attacked us and we kept all the Japanese people 'cause they thought that they could help the, the Japanese were going to try to help Japan and stuff. So they put them in camps" (5/8/98). He explained that these were Japanese citizens who had immigrated before the war.

James and Tom also had to have help recognizing the different time periods they were reading about, but they remembered and were able to sequence these after we discussed them. James wrote about both Pol Pot and about Japanese internment camps, showing a grasp of the big ideas and his ability to read for information. He wrote, "Pol Pot killed over 2 million people. He said he would make the people of Cambodia stronger. I don't agree that he would make them stronger by killing all of them." He also wrote:

Manzanar was built in 1942. Manzanar was built for the Japanese, to put Japanese in Manzanar because after Japan bombed the usa we thought the Japanese living here would try to help Japan so we put them in Relocation centers.

James also wrote a play for the final presentation about Pol Pot's regime.

Although the play did not address issues of immigration it showed a good understanding of what he had read and a high interest level.

Rex and Cody, along with Duke and his reading partner, read about the Civil War era for Book Clubs as well as for social studies. Cody and Rex recorded information about events and figures from the era, and also made generalizations about freedom issues. It appears that they used the research sheet questions as a guide to their reading. Cody said they decided what to read based on "things that had, like important events and important people" (5/12/98), and he later told me they were "looking for freedoms that they didn't have" (5/19/98). They chose to read for particular pieces of information, and Rex used the glossary to define Emancipation. These students did not find reading easy, and Cody said he did not like reading. They used these non-fiction books to find information they were asked to find, but little beyond that. They were able to gather information as needed by using text features such as index, glossary, captions, and sub-titles.

One of the major learning goals of this unit was reading for information. Students were able to find information in their books for the categories on their research sheets and to complete final projects about an important person and an important event. They were also able to generalize from their books and information to larger issues of freedom and to make connections with other examples of freedom. These are important student learning goals expressed by

Terri and outlined in national and state documents. Some students showed greater conceptual understanding than others, which is another goal of reading for information. Time was a difficult concept for most of the students, particularly those students whose books included information across many decades. Although the resource sheets referred to each issue as an "era," many of the issues actually spanned many years.

It is interesting that those for whom reading was more difficult or less enjoyable (students like Dee, Jim, Champ, Jeff, Rex and Cody) were more likely to read these texts for specific information, making most use of the non-fiction text features and elements such as table of contents, index, and picture captions. Other students, like Vanessa and Lynn, enjoyed the narrative biographies they were reading, and chose to read these books from cover to cover and to focus on the story elements whenever possible.

A second important learning goal in this unit was learning about genre and text forms and structures. Max, D.J., and Michael recognized that they were reading non-fiction, whereas they usually read fiction in Book Club. D.J. preferred this "cause it's true" (5/7/98) and because he only had to read the whole book if he wanted to. Jeff also liked non-fiction because "it's a true story. Nobody's lying in it." Lynn liked reading fiction because "you can use a lot of your imagination if you use fiction" but liked non-fiction because "you really do figure out what people were like back then and what was real for people"

(5/12/98). Lynn always chose to read the non-fiction books from cover to cover, however.

Jim identified these books as non-fiction, but he chose to use the table of contents to select just one chapter to read from a book that contained five different children's journals of the Holocaust. Cody and Rex described selecting pieces to read from different books by looking at the cover and the index, and choosing important parts, such as the Emancipation Proclamation. Cody explained, "We read a little, and then if we don't think the book is telling much about it, then we just put it back and get another one" (5/12/98). They both said they preferred reading non-fiction books because they "tell the truth" (5/12/98).

Dee, on the other hand, preferred fiction or biographies, saying, "I like stories about it. I don't like this kind of stuff [non-fiction]" (5/12/98). Although she was able to refer to the text for information when asked to, she often quoted rather randomly from the captions under pictures and chose what to read by "flipping through all the pages" and "just picking bits out." When she wanted to find information for herself, she was able to do so, for example at one point she decided to use the social studies text to check which Amendment gave women the vote. She preferred to read and re-tell the stories of the figures in the Women's Rights movement rather than find specific information like dates.

Vanessa also chose to read narrative biographies and non-fiction, to re-tell the stories of the people she was reading about, and to read a book from beginning to end. She enjoyed the book Memories of Anne Frank (1997), and

explained that it was written by Anne's friend, Hannah, "And she's trying to remember what happened. And the person that she met that told her is taking notes and then wrote a book about it" (5/15/98). She could identify this as non-fiction, a true story.

James and Tom were aware of the differences between fiction and non-fiction reading, although many of their books were in narrative form. One book, Who belongs here? An American story, told the story of a Cambodian refugee and then included interesting facts at the bottom of each page in a different type font. Both boys liked that, and were able to use both the narrative text to understand the larger issues of freedom and immigration and the informational text to find interesting facts. James said, "I liked how it told his point of view and then the author's point of view" (5/8/98).

Students all showed an understanding by the end of this unit of the difference between fiction and non-fiction. Terri had used Read Aloud time and transitions between the Read Aloud and Book Clubs, to talk about these genre differences, and also how to read non-fiction to gather information or to read about particular interests. Many students said they preferred non-fiction because it was "true," which matched their purpose for reading, which was to gather information about particular events, people, and issues. This unit met the goals Terri had expressed, which reflect state and national objectives for student understanding of these genres and their ability to access them and recognize particular text features and elements associated with them.

What did Students Learn about Literature Study?

Terri's own beliefs about literacy and literature study influenced her curriculum, and her students' understanding of what literature study is. In our January interview, Terri had described literacy as a set of processes that could be taught using a variety of possible literary resources. She chose to base her literacy program on Book Clubs and teacher Read Aloud sessions.

National Standards are based on a definition of language arts that emphasizes content objectives within a framework of multiple literacy purposes, learners' development and use of language, and the social contexts of literacy. These content standards refer both to the processes that Terri emphasized, what students should be able to do with language, and also to content knowledge, what students should know about language and literature. The state framework also defines the English language arts as encompassing both process and content in terms of how people communicate and what people communicate.

The integrated Revolutionary War unit was organized in ways very similar to previous units integrating literature with the study of an historical period. Therefore, student understanding of reading and literature study did not change as a result of this unit.

From the January interviews with students, it was clear that students understood their Book Club time to be about reading books linked to their history study and sometimes answering questions. The writing was viewed as a teacher-directed assignment, not a personal response or a tool for thinking or

learning. There was a strong task orientation to the reading and writing with an emphasis on reading a lot of pages and reading to learn information about the historical context. There was a general desire for more choice in reading novels and a belief that the novels were too long, and too often were historical fiction and not other genres.

These beliefs about Book Clubs were still apparent in the Revolutionary War unit, as shown by student comments. When they were first given their reading partners and books, there was some grumbling by the several students who did not get their first choice of book or who were not partnered with a friend. There was also an assumption that the books were about the Revolutionary War. Jeff predicted "It's going to be about his life and how hard it is," and Michael said, "Maybe he got shot in the war."

Lynn had hoped to read a different book, basing her choice on the fact that it had easier words and fewer chapters than other books. She made comments throughout the unit about the length of their book and needing to get through the reading without stopping to talk about it. Dee and Vanessa also had a conversation about the length of their book the second day and expressed their dislike of the book in subsequent conversations. Dee also brought a task-oriented approach to her final project, working through the questions and then saying, "Fine, I'm done," when she learned that they were *suggested* questions only.

In conversations I had with students, there was an emphasis on what they needed to do rather than on understanding or enjoying the book. No student

asked me a question to help better understand the book, beyond occasional vocabulary definitions, and I have no record of a student asking Terri comprehension-oriented questions. Although their written work suggests that they did make sense of these novels enough to talk about plot, character, and war-related issues, this did not seem to be their major purpose for reading. Emma asked me to help her figure out where her novel was set “because she’ll probably want us to write it in our reading logs” (2/23/98), not because that was of interest to her or would help her better understand the story.

During Book Clubs, students focused on reading the book and answering teacher questions. They rarely raised their own questions or offered personal responses to the novel unless asked to do so in side conversations with me. Similarly, in Read Aloud sessions, students listened and responded to teacher questions. They rarely raised their own questions or offered comments or opinions.

On the day that Terri introduced the Read Aloud novel, Vanessa volunteered a comment about a detail she noticed in the book. At the end of that session, Terri asked if there were any questions or comments, and one student asked a question about the characters. On the second day, Jeff asked a comprehension question at the end of the reading. After that, there were very few student-initiated comments and questions to Terri or the whole group. At one point, two students commented on the illustration on the cover, but there was no further conversation. Later in the unit, James asked about whether or not

Johnny Tremain was really in the war, and Terri answered briefly and moved on to reading the next passage. There was more discussion when a substitute teacher was present, perhaps because the substitute did not feel the same time pressures that Terri did.

It seems that Terri was more amenable to taking time for student questions and comments during Read Aloud earlier in the unit. This may have been because she wanted to make sure that students understood the novel early on, or it may have been because the length of the novel became a concern later on. On April 1, just days before Spring Break, Terri opened the Read Aloud session with the comment, "We have a lot to read by Friday, because I'd hate for us not to be finished when our unit's over." This constraint may well have influenced the kinds of discourse patterns evident during Read Aloud.

Students' understanding of reading and literature study in the Revolutionary War unit remained consistent with their earlier understandings. Book Club and Read Aloud literature lessons were a time to read or listen and sometimes answer questions. The purposes were the teacher's purposes, and were related to finding information in the book and in relation to social studies. Although students could tell me their personal responses to the books, they appeared not to believe that personal response or enjoyment was a major purpose for reading books at school. Student understanding of literature study focused on literary processes rather than literary knowledge of texts or language.

The “content” of literature reading and study was understood in terms of the historical content of the novels being read.

Terri had always used fiction for her Book Clubs as she did for the Revolutionary War unit, but at one point in the January interview, she wondered aloud:

I know that [two other teachers] have done like non-fiction reading for Book Clubs that tied in with something they were doing in science or in social studies. And I guess I haven’t explored that as much. Partly because – I don’t know, I just haven’t. I mean, that would be a good thing to think about exploring – and maybe when I do the space stuff, I could do a mix of fantasy and a mix of – I mean, there’s no reason why, I guess, I’ve never stopped to consider that. Why do I always presume that it’s got to be fiction? (1/11/98)

By the time we met in March to think together about possible ways to integrate social studies and literacy for the second unit, Terri picked up on this thought and developed a unit with non-fiction literature in Book Clubs and a focus on reading non-fiction texts.

In this unit, students were explicitly reading for information about historical periods and freedom issues. They were taking notes, and Terri was helping them think about text features of non-fiction books. Students understood the purpose of Book Clubs to be reading for information about a particular era and/or issue. Some students chose to read only for the information needed to

complete their research sheets, and some chose to read books from beginning to end. This may reflect a personal preference or a difference in understanding about the reading of non-fiction texts. In the post-unit interview card-sort activity, many students claimed that what was read in Book Clubs was always connected with the social studies unit. Several assumed a Book Club connection with the Civil War unit, even when they had, in fact, had a different Book Club topic. For example, D.J. claimed to have learned about the Civil War in Book Club, although his topic was actually Civil Rights.

Students also understood a connection between the Read Aloud book and their Civil War history study. When Terri asked why they thought she had chosen to read that particular book to them, a fictionalized biography from the Civil War, their first thoughts were in terms of its content. D.J. said, "So we'll learn more," which implies literature for content learning. Rex said, "Because it's about the Civil War," and James said, "Because it shows like what they would do to get in war." Cody thought, "Because it shows what it was like in the Civil War," which implies a continuing understanding of literature as support for history study. Lynn and Vanessa made connections between the Read Aloud book and the issue of freedom, with Vanessa saying:

It's more interesting and it tells about almost everything we have [in Book Club groups] except the Holocaust. Some people might say it doesn't say about Women's Rights, but it does because she's dressing up because women aren't allowed in the war. (5/13/98)

Some students picked up on the idea of the fictionalized biography being “more interesting,” having more details, or being easier to understand than the informational and reference books.

D.J. made an interesting comment during this discussion. He said: “That book tells about what she’s like doing, and the Civil War books told about a long time ago. Well, that book’s long ago too, but it’s a story.” Throughout my observations, I had noted that students frequently told about their Book Club novels in the present tense, but used the past tense to describe their learning of history. Here it seems that D.J.’s first instinct was to think of the fictionalized biography as happening in the present in contrast to the history told in the informational books. This present-tense thinking about the novel was encouraged by the way the teacher and students talked about what happened, is happening, and might happen in the story. The language we use to talk about a book as we read it suggests that the events are unfolding in the present.

This may be related to the narrative focus some of the students brought to their Book Club literature. Some students focused on reading and re-telling the stories of individuals, and selected biographies and narrative non-fiction whenever possible. In their re-telling, many of these students also spoke in the present tense about what the main figure (or character) was doing at the point they had reached in their reading. They were able to re-tell the story in the past tense after they had read the whole account. It then became “history” in a sense. Sometimes, students would mix tenses as they spoke about a historical person or

event they were still reading about. For example, Dee was beginning an excerpt about Susan B. Anthony and said, "She's a little girl right now. And she liked apples. And she knew how to build a fire now – she just learned. And she has two sisters – one I can't pronounce her name and the other one's Hannah" (5/8/98). Later in the same conversation, Dee was able to talk about when Susan B. Anthony had lived, recognizing that her story was historical, although she was unable to put dates with it.

Max seemed to believe that there was one "truth" or story to be learned about each historical person or event and that reading more than one version would not be helpful. When I asked him what he was reading about Rosa Parks' arrest, he insisted that, "You know all about it," and when I suggested there were different ways of telling a story, he continued to insist that, "You know Rosa Parks." He refused to read about her in a different book (5/6/98). Similarly, Champ was upset at the idea of reading about the same event (the first time women could vote) in more than one book. But Jeff said, "Yes, but it was different. This is going to tell us more" (5/8/98).

Some students spoke differently about the learning and activities they did in Book Club and in social studies. For example, Max was clear about learning something in social studies and reading about it in Book Clubs. For Max, reading and learning (or studying) were two distinct activities. As social studies includes a great deal of reading in this classroom, the distinction may be based on the types of reading and text encountered in each subject. But some students

thought of both the reading of literature in Book Club and Read Aloud, and the textbook reading in social studies as “learning.” For example, Lynn said in the card sort activity, “Well [Read Aloud] we learned about Civil War and Revolutionary War ‘cause we read books on it” (5/29/98). For Lynn, reading books – textbooks and literature – is equated with learning. James claimed that “Book Clubs and social studies are almost the same thing. ‘Cause what we do for social studies we read about in Book Club.” He made a distinction between “doing” (and later “studying”) in social studies and “reading” in Book Club, but understood them both to be concerned with learning more about the same content.

Students understood the purpose of reading literature in this unit to be gathering information. Some students focused more on reference and informational books to answer specific questions and find facts. Others preferred narrative non-fiction and focused on the lives of people. Some students understood that there could be different sources of information about an event, but others did not want to explore beyond what they had already learned. Students understood connections between their history study of the Civil War and the Read Aloud novel, and between the topic of freedom and their Book Club selections, which influenced their understanding of the purposes of reading literature.

Summary

Student learning was influenced by the different curricular organizations of each integrated unit. The Revolutionary War unit emphasized horizontal connections across social studies and the literature study of Book Clubs and Read Aloud. This influenced student learning about the history of the Revolutionary War, especially in terms of developing an understanding of life at the time. The lack of any vertical integration also influenced student learning about history in isolated units and with few connections to their own lives.

The Civil War and Freedom unit was organized to help students make similar horizontal connections across social studies and the Read Aloud, influencing student understanding about life at the time in similar ways. It was also organized to pay attention to integration of social studies and literature across the larger theme of Freedom, and students showed a developing understanding of this theme. This also influenced their understanding of history across different chronological eras and curricular units. This unit was also organized to pay explicit attention to genre features and to reading for information in literature study, and student learning reflected this.

Both the Revolutionary War unit and the Civil War and Freedom unit emphasized using literature to read for information about historical periods and issues, either explicitly or as students understood assignments and teacher emphases. The subject matter of the literature was consistently historical and this was reflected in student understanding of what it means to read and study

literature. Also, in both units, history was learned through reading and answering questions. Some students understood non-fiction texts to be “history” and fiction to be “reading,” and some students understood both to be “history” because the content was historical and they were reading for information from both kinds of text.

In the next chapter, I shall summarize the organization and planning of each integrated unit, the kinds of connections students made in each unit, and the learning encouraged by each curricular organization. Then I shall discuss some of the major implications of these findings and my recommendations for teacher education and practice and for further research.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In previous chapters, I showed how Terri's beliefs and purposes influenced her curriculum plans, how the different curriculum plans became enacted in her classroom, and how these curricular organizations influenced the kinds of connections that students made within literature and history study. I analyzed student learning of the history and literature curriculum of each unit and student learning about what it means to study history and literature. I shall summarize these findings, and then discuss some of the major implications of this study.

A. Summary of the Two Integrated Units

Terri planned for the Revolutionary War unit in ways that were consistent with a "parallel" model of integration (Burns, 1995; Jacobs, 1989), "sequenced" curriculum (Fogarty, 1991), or "correlation" (Case, 1991a). She first planned the social studies unit content and then planned her literature study to complement that history study. This reflected her beliefs about integration and about the subjects of literacy and social studies. This integrated curriculum model is outlined in Table 7.1. The curriculum emphasis is on horizontal integration across history and literature study.

The enacted curriculum for the Revolutionary War unit reflected Terri's beliefs and planning. Learning experiences and activities, assignments, and classroom discourse were consistent with Terri's emphasis on history content

and literacy processes. The enacted curriculum was also impacted by perceived curricular and time constraints.

Table 7.1

Terri's planning for an integrated unit on the Revolutionary War

History Study – Social Studies lessons	Literature Study – Book Clubs & Read Aloud
Revolutionary War Era – Causes Chronology Government & Outcomes	Historical Fiction – Revolutionary War era -Life during Revolutionary War era -Language arts processes e.g fluency, comprehension of text -Character, plot, setting

Terri's planning for the second observed integrated unit, the Civil War and Freedom unit, reflected many of these same beliefs about integration and about history and literature study. It also reflected her new thinking about some of the possibilities of integrated curriculum and particularly an emphasis on the vertical connections within the curriculum and on non-fiction literary texts.

This second unit was organized around an integrating theme of Freedom that was found at the intersection of history and literature study. It provided for horizontal connections across literature and history around the concept of Freedom as it was encountered in the history study of the Civil War and in the Book Club literature about different eras and issues. It also provided for vertical connections within the history curriculum, as Terri encouraged students to think

about how Freedom had been an important issue in other historical eras and events they had learned about. This curriculum model is outlined in Table 7.2.

Table 7.2.

Terri's planning for an integrated unit on the Civil War and Freedom.

History Study / Social Studies Lessons	Literature Study / Book Clubs	Literature Study / Read Aloud
<u>Civil War era -</u> -Social & economic bases of north & south -Slavery & abolitionists -Cause & outbreak of war -Battles & important figures -Resources & technology -Social experiences of war <u>Freedom Issues -</u> -slavery -states' rights -other Freedom issues across history (and curriculum)	<u>Freedom Issues -</u> 5 Book Club groups all focused on Freedom topic -Women's rights -Immigrant citizens' rights -Civil Rights -Holocaust -Civil War <u>Genre Study (non-fiction) -</u> -characteristics of genre -reading for information	<u>Civil War era -</u> Fictionalized biography of Emma Edmunds from her experiences during Civil War -understanding experiences of war and life at the time <u>Genre Studies -</u> -example of fictionalized biography to compare with non-fiction Book Club and Social studies texts

Terri was interested in the elements of curricular integration outlined by Roland Case (1991a) and by his description of alternative unit organizers (1991b), and she drew on these for her planning of the Civil War and Freedom unit. It is helpful to look at the elements of curricular integration that Case describes and

examine the changes that Terri made in her planning. A summary of Terri's planning for the two units is shown in Table 7.3. Changes between units are identified by *italic font*.

Table 7.3

Terri's Curricular Integration Planning across the two Units.

Case's Descriptors	Revolutionary War Unit	Civil War and Freedom Unit
Domains (curricular, school/ social)	Curricular integration	Curricular integration
Forms (content, skills & processes, school & self, holistic)	Integration of content	Integration of content
Dimensions (vertical, horizontal)	Horizontal - literature and history study	Horizontal - literature and history study <i>Vertical - within history study</i>
Objectives(e.g. complexity of world, rigidity of subjects, web of knowledge, efficiency; functional competence; relevance of school; equity)	Overcoming rigid perceptions of subject boundaries & promoting efficiency (complementing history study learning)	Overcoming rigid perceptions of subject boundaries & promoting efficiency
Modes(fusion, insertion, correlation, harmonization)	"Correlation" of history and literature study	"Correlation" of history and literature study
Loci of Integration (state, district/school, classroom)	Classroom	Classroom

Table 7.3 (Continued)

Coherence (common feature, organizing principle)	<i>Around Revolutionary War era</i>	<i>Around Freedom issue</i>
Degree/ Extent of Integration (how much integration?)	<i>Integration of historical content across both subjects</i>	<i>Separate literature and history study emphases as well as overlap</i>
Unit Organizers (theme, issue, inquiry, problem, project)	Theme - <i>historical era</i>	Theme - <i>concept of Freedom</i>

Table 7.3 shows how Terri's planning for the Revolutionary War unit and the Civil War and Freedom unit were in many ways similar. She was explicitly working on curricular integration, within her classroom curriculum, and she maintained a focus on integration of content through the correlation of history and literature study. Her objectives were primarily focused on what Case (1991a) describes as overcoming rigid perceptions of subject boundaries and on promoting greater curricular efficiency. In the Revolutionary War unit, Terri focused on complementing history study through literature, and in the Civil War and Freedom unit she added an emphasis on helping students make connections across different historical eras in ways that reinforced and extended their history study.

The differences that Terri emphasized between the two units were enough to influence the kinds of connections and learning that students evidenced. Terri's Civil War and Freedom unit added the vertical integration element within

history study. This also changed the organizing theme and the emphasis for curriculum coherence to the concept of Freedom, rather than an historical era. And it changed the degree of integration, so that there were now separate areas of history study (Civil War) and literature study (non-fiction genre and different Freedom issues), as well as the integrated area of study around the Freedom concept. Given the many very different elements and possible ways of organizing curriculum integration, these changes that Terri made were relatively minor. However, they led to some significant changes in the kinds of connections that students made and learning that students evidenced, as I described in earlier chapters.

B. Summary of Student Learning

This study compared student learning across two different integrated units in one classroom, asking “What kinds of learning are encouraged by different approaches to curriculum integration?” In earlier chapters, I showed how different curriculum organizations encouraged different kinds of curricular connections and impacted student learning. I shall briefly summarize the findings here.

Integration and Student Learning of Curriculum

The different curricular organizations of the two units impacted student learning of both the history and literature curriculum. Issues around text genres were particularly important. The Revolutionary War unit emphasized horizontal connections across historical fiction literature in Book Clubs and Read Aloud and

the social studies curriculum. There were few explicit connections made *within* either the history or literature curriculum or with students' personal experiences.

The Revolutionary War unit emphasized using literature to support student understanding of history, and students did make horizontal connections and showed a developing understanding of the everyday lives of people at that time. This is consistent with claims that historical fiction provides children with a safe context for exploring human experience, humanizing details that are often absent from history texts, and helping children empathize and think about issues of emotion, morality, and judgment (Levstik, 1989).

The integration of historical fiction with history also caused some confusion for students around historical understanding. Good historical fiction weaves fictional characters, dialogue, and events together with historical events and figures seamlessly for the purpose of providing a credible story. Boix-Mansilla and Gardner (1997) point out that history and literature share certain characteristics but have distinct purposes and sources. Without explicit discussion of the genres and their purposes, some students were confused about what was "real" and not. In addition, the history study in this unit rarely coincided exactly with the events occurring in any of the Book Club novels. Details of events were sometimes confused, and developing an understanding of chronology and causality was problematic for many students.

Historical fiction emphasizes particular themes, issues, and perspectives. Levstik (1989) cautions that children, drawn into the story and characters, may

not question the interpretation or perspective of a novel. In this unit, children rarely moved beyond the perspective of their novel in talking about the Revolutionary War. Opportunities for discussion about different perspectives were present in the choice of Book Club novels, but time constraints limited the discussion across books that could have helped students develop more awareness of perspective. Such discussion would have enriched students' learning in both history and literature study.

By the time of the Revolutionary War unit, students had read several historical fiction novels, and many expressed a dislike for this genre and a desire for more choice about the kinds of books they could read for Book Club. They also were frustrated by the length of the novels, and this also led to a task-oriented approach by many students, where reading quickly and for the kinds of information Terri could be expected to ask became the goals. Terri's goal for student appreciation of reading was not always met.

It appears that student learning of history through literature texts may have been at the expense of other literary goals, such as appreciation and enjoyment of texts, for many students. The focus on history connections also may have been made at the expense of personal connections or intertextual connections across different Book Club groups or with other books across the year. Certain reading and comprehension strategies may have been underdeveloped as students focused on reading quickly.

The Civil War and Freedom unit was integrated in a different way. Horizontal connections across literature and history study continued to encourage student learning about experiences of life and war at that time through a Read Aloud novel. However, again few personal or present-day connections were explicitly encouraged.

The central connection was around the theme of Freedom, which provided a way to connect Book Clubs and social studies as well as to connect the history curriculum vertically across eras and the units studied over an academic year. Students talked about this broad theme of Freedom and related concepts across eras. They also were more able to sequence historical events and eras after this unit. They were beginning to talk about different people and their struggles for different freedoms. They saw similarities and some differences between these struggles. This is an important aspect of historical understanding as students began to understand cause and effect in terms of people's values, beliefs, and goals, and their consequent behaviors and actions.

In this second unit, time constraints were less apparent than in the Revolutionary War unit because of the kind of literature selected. The Read Aloud novel was much shorter, and therefore Terri was able to spend more time discussing points, modeling reading and comprehension strategies, and talking about genres with the class. Students were more able to discuss fiction and non-fiction genres and features after this unit.

The Book Club books for this unit were non-fiction, and students were free to make choices about which books to read and how to read and use them, with no pressure to reach the end of these books. This allowed Terri to devote occasional Book Club lessons to group discussions of the larger theme of Freedom and allowed students to take notes on their reading without the pressure of using all their time to “finish” the books. Students showed greater variety in how they approached the reading.

In both units, however, students understood the major purpose of the Book Club reading and the social studies reading to be gathering information. This leads me to a discussion of student learning about literature and history study from the two units.

Student Learning about Literature and History Study

The different curricular organizations of these integrated units and the ways they were enacted in the classroom also influenced student learning about the disciplines and study of history and literature. Additionally, certain aspects of the enacted curriculum that remained constant across the two units also influenced student understanding of history.

The Revolutionary War unit emphasized a bounded unit with horizontal connections. Students spoke of history as being about the past only. In the Civil War and Freedom unit, students began to make connections back through history, although rarely with the present. After this unit, however, I encouraged students to talk about connections with their own lives, and some were able to

do so. This suggests that the connections they were encouraged to make across historical eras may have encouraged them to consider connections with the present and also that explicit attention to such connections could be helpful to students.

In the Revolutionary War unit, students understood history to be about the major figures and events that they learned about in social studies, not about the ordinary people and lives they read about in novels. Although they understood the content of both subjects to be history and the past, they distinguished between history learning from non-fiction texts and Book Club reading from fictional novels. This understanding of history texts as non-fiction and literature texts as fiction again was clear when students read non-fiction texts for Book Club groups in the second integrated unit on the Civil War and Freedom. Many students could not say whether they had learned about something in social studies or in Book Clubs because they understood both the content and the non-fiction texts to indicate history study, not literature study.

Terri's beliefs and pedagogy contributed to confusion about what history is and what it means to study history. Common to both units was her emphasis on reading and writing for information in history study. Students understood non-fiction to be "true" and showed no sense of the human construction or interpretation of history. They also understood history study to be a matter of reading and answering questions, and finding pre-determined "right answers" rather than framing questions and gathering and interpreting artifacts or data.

Both units, and both fiction and non-fiction literary texts, were also understood by students to emphasize literature study as being for the purpose of gathering information. The Civil War and Freedom unit explicitly asked students to keep a research log about important events, figures, and ideas from their Book Club baskets around the issue of freedom that they were reading about. Terri modeled how to read for information using non-fiction texts. The emphasis was on this particular genre and purpose for reading, although students themselves did not set the purpose or select the questions they would answer. Had they been encouraged to so, this would have been an even more authentic use of informational text, which is usually read (outside of school) in response to a reader's genuine personal interests and questions.

Some students made a distinction between the reading they do at home and the reading they do for Book Clubs in terms of choice and purpose. They told me that at home they were reading adventure books, realistic fiction novels, and books based on popular culture such as movies, television, sports, or movie stars. They read these for the stories or for information, but they followed their own interests and purposes for reading. This is more consistent with reading purposes such as literary response and learning or reflection. Students in this study did not understand their Book Club literature study to be particularly connected to aesthetic reading purposes or their own enjoyment or interests. They made a distinction between Book Club reading (or literature study) in school and "reading" in more general terms. They did not connect school

reading in Book Clubs with their own lives and experiences. Connections they did make were generally to the historical era or the theme being emphasized.

This connection, however, is consistent with another common purpose for literature study, which is the development of understanding about significant human experiences and dilemmas. Ironically, students in this classroom did become involved in discussion of the important human theme of Freedom through the non-fiction literature they read, but they were less likely to become engaged in such themes through their reading of the historical fiction novels of the first unit. It is interesting to speculate about how much of this was due to Terri's emphasis on the Freedom theme and her organization of classroom activities to encourage consideration and discussion of the theme. Students were most engaged when they were asked to discuss the theme with other students and make new connections across eras. Without such a theme as a focus for the Revolutionary War novels, students focused on the fictional story and on the historical content and context. Perhaps they might have become equally interested in a compelling theme during their reading of the historical novels in this first unit had they been given the same kind of focus, questions, activities, and discussion opportunities.

The opportunity for discussion around literature is relevant here and is linked to issues of purpose and choice in reading. Students in this study, particularly in the Revolutionary War unit, had little opportunity to discuss books with anyone other than their reading partner. This was contrary to the

Book Club model as described by Raphael and McMahon (1994). It also led students to understand reading comprehension as an individual activity. Again, there was little opportunity to construct meaning through interaction with others and with other perspectives or interpretations.

In both these integrated units, literature study was understood to be for the purpose of gathering information. In addition, students understood these purposes to be set by the teacher. Reading in school was different from reading at home in terms of purposes and choice, and the literature was not expected to connect with student experiences. Construction of meaning was mostly an individual task and a matter of "finding the meaning" that existed in the text. There was little understanding of literary texts as constructed, or of readers bringing their own experiences and meaning to literary interpretation of texts.

Student learning of the history and literature curriculum of each unit was influenced by the organization of the integrated units. Student learning about what history and literature are and what it means to "do" these subjects was somewhat influenced by the curricular organization, but also by Terri's beliefs about the subjects themselves, about integration, and by her pedagogy.

C. Conclusions and Implications

In Chapter 1, I outlined three major concerns I had from reading the literature related to integration, and which influenced the design of my study. First, there is little empirical data on student learning from integration. Second, there is a lack of shared definitions and understandings about integration. Third,

there are many assumptions made about the relationship between integrated curriculum and student learning, and the inherent value of integration. I shall now outline how conclusions from my study address these concerns.

First, my study provides solid empirical data on student learning from two different integrated curriculum units in one fifth-grade classroom. It describes the kinds of connections that students made within history and literature study, across the school subjects of Book Clubs, Read Aloud, and social studies, and with their own lives and the “real world.” It shows how these connections were influenced by the organization of the curriculum in each integrated unit and by the teacher’s beliefs and practices. I have rich empirical classroom data that documented the teacher’s beliefs and planning, classroom activities and instruction, and student connections and learning.

Forms of Curricular Integration

My study also addresses my concern about the lack of shared understandings about curriculum integration. It recognizes the complexity of integrated curriculum and the variety of forms that this can take. It describes two different integrated units that emphasize particular kinds of connections and curricular integration.

My study shows that the particular organization of integrated curriculum does influence the kinds of connections that students are encouraged to make and the kind of learning that they may demonstrate. For example, students tended to make horizontal connections across Book Club and social studies

lessons around the Revolutionary War era in the first unit, and to make vertical connections across different historical eras within the history curriculum in the second unit, as Terri had planned and taught.

The findings from my study point to important considerations for teachers and those planning integrated curriculum. I have discussed a variety of possible forms and models of integration, and shown how relatively minor changes in focus or an organizational center for a unit can significantly influence student learning. The study also raises important questions about planning for integration, particularly around issues of time and student choice.

Integrated curriculum sometimes is perceived as an answer to problems of “curriculum overload” and the information explosion. It is argued that integration is an efficient organization of curriculum that helps limit redundancy and reinforce learning across subjects. My study points to more complex influences of perceived time constraints in the classroom. For example, Terri’s concerns about the social studies curriculum to be “covered” in fifth grade led to an emphasis on planning literature around her social studies curriculum. This, I have argued, was at the expense of some literary goals and teaching. Ironically, the use of historical fiction novels to support students’ historical understanding of the Revolutionary war led to additional concerns about time. The novels were long and required a great deal of class time devoted to students just reading the books. This limited other uses of instructional time.

Another important finding in my study is that student choice was a very relevant factor in learning. Integration itself did not necessarily lead to greater motivation or personal relevance for students, particularly as Terri did not encourage students to make many personal connections with the curriculum. Students spoke about their lack of choice of Book Club genres. Some responded favorably to reading non-fiction texts, texts they could read in ways that made most sense to them and which they could reject if they wanted to. Integrated learning requires students to make personal connections with the curriculum, and some choice in their learning appears important. These connections or personal relevance are not guaranteed by curriculum integration itself.

Terri emphasized curriculum integration with a focus on integration of content around subject matter and district curriculum objectives, particularly in her Revolutionary War unit. This is a common form of integration. Students responded in many positive ways to the curricular connections she encouraged. However, students also showed a need to make personal connections with the curriculum. Different forms of curricular integration focus specifically on these kinds of personal and real-world connections. For example, Barab and Landa (1997) emphasize problems or questions to guide integrated study. Beane (1997) argues that the organizing center of integrated units should be the concerns of young people and social issues. These forms of integration around student interests or social issues are quite different in purpose and enactment from the kind of cross-subject curricular integration that Terri planned and taught.

Teachers need to be helped to consider the many different forms and purposes of curriculum integration, whether around content, skills, or real-world and personal issues. Teachers also need to be helped to think about the beliefs and assumptions they bring to their curriculum planning and classroom practices, as these influence the enacted curriculum and opportunities for student learning. In this study, Terri broadened her understanding of what is possible with integration and changed her practice in ways that positively influenced student learning. It appears that, at least for teachers who are interested in considering changes in their practice, awareness of alternatives and support for thinking about these can lead to small but significant changes in teaching and learning.

Teachers also need to be helped to consider the trade-offs embedded in alternative models of integration. There are possible unintended consequences and faulty or incomplete connections that students may make. My study showed some of these trade-offs in the forms of curricular integration. For example, Terri's emphasis on horizontal connections across subjects in the Revolutionary War unit contributed to some lack of continuity in student learning within history. Students were influenced by the curricular organization and emphases, and by Terri's explicit instruction and connections. However, student learning and construction of connections within and across the curriculum were personal and idiosyncratic. The relationship between integrated curriculum and student learning is much more complex than many proponents of integration suggest.

Relationship Between Integration and Student Learning

This leads me to a consideration of how my study contributes to a much-needed discussion of the assumptions about curriculum integration. Two common assumptions are that there is an inherent value in curriculum integration and that there is a particular relationship between integrated curriculum and how students best learn.

Inherent value of integrated curriculum?

My study shows that some of the benefits claimed for integrated curriculum do not necessarily happen automatically. For example, students did not necessarily find their learning in either unit to be particularly relevant, interesting, or connected to their own lives, as some advocates of integrated curriculum would expect. Similarly, not all students made the kinds of connections across subjects that Terri hoped they would. Sometimes, students made connections that were based on overgeneralizations or incomplete understandings. Sometimes, students made connections, but these connections did not necessarily lead to depth of understanding of history, literature, or their own lives.

I would argue that integrated curriculum may support student learning of subject matter, but this is not a necessary outcome of integrated curriculum any more than of other curricular organizations. Other writers have also argued that curriculum integration can actually negatively impact student learning of subject matter. Alleman and Brophy (1993) raise concerns about how efforts to integrate

curriculum may trivialize and distort social studies content. Roth (1994) raises important questions about how one discipline may be misrepresented or diminished in the service of integration with another discipline.

In this study, Terri was aware of the dangers of integrating curriculum for the sake of integration. She planned her integration with particular learning objectives in mind, generally linked to her social studies curriculum. Student learning about the Revolutionary War era did appear to have been strengthened by the integration of historical fiction literature with the social studies in terms of student understanding of life at that period. Terri integrated the curriculum for particular student learning goals, and this had important consequences for student learning.

Terri understood curriculum integration to be a means towards a more important end – worthwhile student learning. In our initial interview, she talked about the dangers of topic-centered curricula in which integration was an end in itself and did not attend to important learning goals. This raises again the issue of the *quality* of connections. In chapter one, I described how this study focused on the kinds of connections that students and the teacher were making and the frequency of those connections. Helping students to make associations or connections across subjects, within subjects, or with personal experiences may contribute to meaningful learning and understanding. However, connections may be superficial or trivial, or may even contribute to confusion and misconceptions. Attention needs to be paid not just to the kinds of connections

students are being encouraged to make but also to the quality of those connections. Integrated curriculum should attend to worthwhile student learning goals and depth of understanding.

Wiggins and McTighe (1998) describe understanding as a complex family of interrelated abilities that go well beyond the knowledge and skills of a traditional curriculum. They argue that there are six facets to understanding: explanation, interpretation, application, perspective, empathy, and self-knowledge. Students who can show evidence of working with ideas in these ways “understand” important ideas and essential questions. They can *explain* by providing thorough, supported, and justifiable accounts of phenomena, facts, and data. They can *interpret* by telling meaningful stories, offering apt translations, or providing personal dimensions and analogies. They can *apply* by effectively using and adapting what they learn in diverse contexts. They have *perspective* when they see and hear points of view through critical lenses and can see the big picture. They can *empathize* when they can find value in what others may find odd or implausible. They have *self-knowledge* when they can perceive the personal style, prejudices, and habits of mind that shape and impede their own understanding.

The authors recognize that students also need to learn particular knowledge and skills and to develop particular attitudes and habits of mind. Understanding is the goal for complex, abstract, and counterintuitive ideas that can only be grasped by student involvement in authentic learning experiences

and performance tasks. Such “enduring understandings” represent “big ideas” that have enduring value beyond the classroom; they reside at the heart of a discipline; they require “uncoverage” because they represent particularly difficult concepts or counterintuitive ideas; and they offer potential for engaging students in questions and issues that provoke and interest them.

Interdisciplinary curriculum can contribute to such understanding of “big ideas” if the connections students are encouraged to make are deep, authentic, and meaningful. Such connections are “authentic” in terms of deep disciplinary knowledge, personal, and social meaning and value.

As Terri and I met to discuss plans for the second integrated unit, she was intrigued by the theme of Freedom. She talked about this theme in terms of how different Americans have had to struggle for freedom and rights, but she then described the integrated unit in terms of the one-word descriptor “Freedom.” However, she also mentioned that it might have been interesting to work across the whole year with a question as a focus for study, such as, “How have different Americans fought for their freedoms?” Such a question would have come closer to the kind of “essential question” that Wiggins and McTigue (1998) describe. They argue that curriculum should be built around essential questions that reveal the complexities of a subject and allow for multi-layered understanding and work through student inquiries. It is important to consider the kinds of student learning that integration is expected to foster, the quality of connections made, and their contribution to important understanding.

Another claim sometimes made is that integration adds an important dimension to student learning that would otherwise be missing. Many writers have described criteria for “successful” or “good” integration that include attention to going beyond the possibilities of the separate-subject organization of curriculum. For example, Ackerman (1989) describes necessary intellectual criteria of integration in terms of validity within the disciplines, for the disciplines, and beyond the disciplines, and a contribution to broader outcomes. Coombs (1991) emphasizes the need for conceptual unity rather than simply an organizing principle or collection of activities and ideas around a theme. Ladson-Billings (1995) argues for curricular coherence, which may or may not include subject integration. Perkins (1989) describes good integration as a “lens worth looking through” that applies broadly and pervasively, discloses fundamental patterns, reveals similarities and contrasts, and fascinates learners. These writers stress that integration should contribute something extra to the curriculum and to student learning.

The findings of my study show the complexity of the relationship between student learning and integrated curriculum. My study supports the argument that integration can contribute to student learning in ways that could not happen in separate-subject approaches. Terri’s Civil War and Freedom unit included integration around a broader conceptual theme of freedom, which added a new dimension to student learning that went beyond the contributions of either Book Club or social studies. Particularly in that second unit, curricular integration

added an important dimension of learning for students that would not have been encouraged by a separate-subjects approach.

Integration and constructivism

Much of the literature about integration assumes benefits in terms of student learning of the curriculum and/or broader, more complex, and significant learning through connections across subjects or with real-world issues. These claims rest in part on assumptions about the relationship between the curriculum and student learning. My study raises important questions about what individual students bring to the learning experience and how they make sense of the curricular integration and planned connections.

Current integration literature often draws on recent cognitive research with an implicit or explicit assumption that curricular connections will lead to student learning connections. Whilst my study showed that curricular organization does indeed influence learning opportunities for students, it also showed that the link between the two is complex and difficult to achieve.

Constructivist and cognitive learning theory suggest that making connections, especially with prior knowledge and personal relevance, is critical for learning. This is consistent with the findings of this study, which showed that students tried to make sense of their learning by making their own connections, more often with personal experience than across the curriculum. Although Terri did not offer many opportunities for students to connect their learning with their lives, students tried to do this.

Some writers have moved beyond assumptions about curricular integration leading to student learning to make the important point that integrated and coherent learning happens within the learner. Davis (1997) describes integration as an active and personal process of meaning-making, a pursuit rather than an end product, and impossible to predetermine and organize. Beane (1995) argues that coherent learning depends on a conversation between young people and the planned curriculum, with the individual learner making sense of what the school offers, and the school offering something that can be made sense of. Lounsbury (1992) claims that we should not only be making connections for our students but also teaching them to see and make their own connections. Wiggins (1995) distinguishes between the coherence of a planned curriculum and the coherence of the realized curriculum from the learner's perspective. My study supports this argument, showing that curricular organization can help students make particular kinds of connections but that ultimately integration is the work of the learner.

This implies that teachers need to uncover the connections students are, in fact, making and find ways to encourage students to make helpful connections, rather than simply imposing their own curricular connections. Integrated learning is the goal, not integrated curriculum itself. The organization of the curriculum and explicit attention to certain horizontal and vertical curriculum connections can support integrated learning. However, the larger questions for

teachers need to be, “Whose connections are most helpful and most valid?” and “How can students’ integrated learning best be encouraged?”

In my study, I used a card-sort activity to help uncover student connections of various kinds. I asked students to sort “history” cards chronologically to explore their ability to make vertical connections within the history curriculum and to sequence across historical eras. I asked students to sort cards according to what school subject they had learned about them in, which told me more about their understandings of history and literature as subjects. I asked students to sort and connect “history” cards and “concept” cards such as Conflict and Freedom, to show how they related to one another.

During this activity, I was struck by the many ways this “assessment” strategy was helpful both to me and to the students. It was helpful in telling me a great deal about student learning of particular historical eras and also about their thinking about history. It was also helpful in showing me the very different ways that students made sense of their learning and made connections across the curriculum and personally.

Vanessa told long narratives and used themes about injustice and the struggle for freedom to explain most of the historical periods she had learned about. She also used personal experiences to help understand and explain historical events, for example, explaining the Civil War in terms of sibling rivalry. Jim worked only to make school-subject connections, claiming that there were no connections between these topics and his own life. He organized cards

in a linear, sequential way that was very different from Vanessa's personal connections or the many students who created webs of connections among the cards. James was one student who developed a complex web of connections among the historical periods and events, and he became very enthusiastic as he began to make the connections.

For several students, this activity was an instructional tool as well as an assessment. It enabled them to make open-ended connections, which contributed to their learning as well as revealing it. It demonstrates the importance of finding ways to help students to process their learning and make connections between their own individual experiences and prior knowledge and their new learning. It would have been interesting to conduct this card-sort activity at various intervals across the school year to see how students' understanding changed and developed, and also to encourage them to construct those kinds of connections themselves more independently. Such personal construction of knowledge should be encouraged throughout learning experiences and assessments.

It is important for teachers to constantly check and encourage student understanding through complex and varied tasks in ways that add layers of meaning and multiple connections and perspectives. Wiggins and McTigue (1998) point to the importance of establishing performance tasks towards which students will be working. They encourage teachers to consider five key questions in planning instruction: What enabling knowledge and skills will students need to perform effectively and achieve desired results? What activities will equip

students with the needed knowledge and skills? What will need to be taught and coached and how should it best be taught? What materials and resources are best suited to accomplish these goals? And, is the overall design coherent and effective? Such questions can provide a helpful framework for integrated study focused on complex interdisciplinary questions and ideas. These questions and the “big ideas” they represent must “be explored, questioned, played with, and used in realistic contexts” (p. 113).

The six facets of understanding that Wiggins and McTigue (1998) describe -- explanation, interpretation, application, perspective, empathy, and self-knowledge - can be used throughout a unit to help students explore a question or idea. They suggest a variety of activities, such as the “one-minute paper” in which students summarize major learnings and raise unanswered questions, simulations and applications, use of analogy and metaphor, visual representations, question boxes, and so on. Other writers also stress the importance of allowing students enough time and opportunity to process new learning and to make connections with other learning or with their own experiences (Caine & Caine, 1991; Jensen, 1998). It is difficult for teachers to make time for such processing of learning, given the perceived constraints of schooling with curriculum standards and testing, but the distinction Wiggins and McTigue (1998) make between “coverage” of the curriculum and “uncoverage” of important ideas and complex learning is pertinent here. Curriculum coverage

cannot ensure learning. Time taken to help students “uncover” and unpack big ideas is critical.

Integration and the Disciplines

I have argued that teachers need to be helped to think about the various forms of integrated curriculum and the kinds of connections and learning encouraged by each. I have also argued that teachers need to think more carefully about how to help students make their own connections and process their own personally integrated learning. Therefore, I have discussed implications of my study in terms of curriculum organization and in terms of individual student learning.

Teachers also need to be encouraged to think beyond what is possible with integration to what is important, and about their larger social and educational purposes. Current approaches to integration emphasize cross-subject approaches that omit social purposes present in the work of reformers like Dewey (1902/1964) and Kilpatrick (1927/1975) in the early decades of the twentieth century. Integrated curricula that focus on problem-solving, social issues, or community projects have different purposes and ask teacher and students to make explicit connections with the outside world and student experiences in ways missing from Terri’s curricular models.

Bernstein (1975) raises important questions about the relationship between curricular organization and the social distribution of power. His description of integrated curricula points to various ways in which such curricula disturb

existing authority structures including the authority of the separate subjects, of teacher-student relations, and of school knowledge relative to everyday knowledge. He also suggests that integrated curriculum is likely to encourage a common pedagogy across subjects. This study supports that supposition. Terri based her teaching of both history and literature on reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills. She used written texts as a primary source of information, using secondary texts and literary texts for history study as well as for literature study.

Terri understood any disciplinary differences between school subjects to be a matter of subject-matter content, which could overlap and be integrated across curricular subjects, rather than as a matter of different ways of knowing. This led to her emphasis on reading and writing processes across both literature and history study. Students did not understand history study to be about asking questions or interpreting multiple sources, for example, but of answering questions from secondary sources. They understood literature study in similar ways. In such a learning environment, students who do well with the literary processes tend to succeed across curricular subjects, and this raises issues of equity in the classroom. It also raises questions about the disciplinary thesis described in Chapter 2 and the claim of many integration proponents that integration represents a more accurate or more complete theory of knowledge than the disciplines or a separate-subjects curriculum (Pring, 1972).

Some proponents of integration claim that the disciplinary thesis – that the disciplines represent distinct ways of knowing and learning about the world – is a false theory, or that it is incomplete. I have described how integration, if it meets certain important criteria, can contribute to student learning of subject matter and also provide opportunities for student learning that goes beyond the separate subjects in some way. Terri's freedom theme accomplished this for many students. Integration in this way added an extra dimension to student learning that would have been missing from a traditional, separate-subject approach to the curriculum. This appears to support curriculum integration.

I would argue, however, that Terri's integrated units also lost an important dimension of student learning that is present in more disciplinary-based approaches to the curriculum. Here I explicitly make a distinction between separate-subjects and discipline-based curricula. Traditional school-subject approaches tend to focus on the different subject matter of each school subject. Disciplinary approaches recognize distinct ways of exploring and knowing about the world.

In Chapter 2, I outlined common reasons given in the literature about integration for integrating history (or social studies) and literature studies (or literacy). There were two broad arguments for this integration: first, the argument that literature and history are similar subjects, sharing a common focus on human themes and dilemmas, and a common use of narrative and language; or second, that literature and history study complement each other by helping

students make connections that reinforce learning in each subject and add important dimensions to that learning. I have examined the second argument in the last section, exploring the complex relationship between curricular integration and student learning of the history and literature curriculum, and of larger curricular themes. I shall now turn again to the first argument, which claims that history and literature are similar subjects.

In Chapter 2, I described history study as part of the larger school subject of social studies, and literature study as part of the larger school subject of language arts. History study aims at developing students' historical understandings and thinking skills in order to contribute to their citizenship education. Literature study contributes to multiple individual and social goals. There is overlap between the purposes and subject matter of history and literature study.

I argued, however, that there are also distinct purposes, foci, and forms of inquiry for literature and history study (Boix-Mansilla & Gardner, 1997). Integration of the two must respect the distinct characteristics and purposes of literature study (McKay, 1997; Shanahan, 1997) and history study (Brophy & Alleman, 1991; Levstik and Barton, 1997). As Stodolsky (1988) argues, the subject matters. The particular subjects, and the disciplines from which they draw, influence the kinds of things students are expected to learn and the ways in which students can be expected to learn them. I argue that teachers need to consider these differences explicitly and provide learning opportunities that

respect the differences between the subjects/ disciplines as well as the similarities across them.

Terri's integrated units emphasized particular aspects of the history and literature curricula as outlined by national, state, and district guidelines, and not others. The International Reading Association/ National Council of Teachers of English Standards for the English Language Arts (1996) framework outlines objectives for student learning from and about a variety of texts and a range of literary genres for multiple purposes. The Michigan Language Arts Framework (1996) also describes learning objectives in terms of multiple purposes, such as: meaning and communication, skills and processes, genre and craft of language, depth of understanding, ideas in action, and critical standards. Terri's planning for Book Clubs and Read Aloud attended specifically to reading for meaning, developing comprehension strategies, developing reading fluency, and learning about human experiences. She also wanted students to become familiar with a variety of genres.

The NCTE/IRA standards (1996) also describe four purposes for literacy education: gathering information, primarily with non-fiction texts; learning and reflection with self-generated texts; problem-solving and application with everyday-life texts; and literary response and expression with literary texts. Terri's literature study curriculum emphasized the first purpose, gathering information, both from fiction and non-fiction texts. Although this was quite appropriate for the second unit, the Civil War and Freedom unit, it was less

appropriate for the Revolutionary War unit and encouraged students to think of reading and literature study as supporting history, and as a series of tasks to be completed for the teacher.

Many writers have discussed various conceptions of literacy and literature instruction in terms of purpose and text. Wells (1990) argues that different texts have different purposes and require different modes of engagement. Texts may be linked to action, for transmission of information, or may offer an author's interpretation of a particular aspect of experience, and students need to have the disposition and ability to engage appropriately with these different kinds of text. Probst (1990) also describes the conception of literacy as extracting information from text as inadequate. He argues that literature should be a source of experience, not just information, and that students should become involved in ongoing dialogues about the central questions of a culture and in humanizing engagements with literary texts.

This apparent contradiction in the use of particular kinds of texts for particular purposes and in particular ways underscores the range of literary texts and purposes that exists. Rosenblatt (1978) outlined two major stances towards text, aesthetic and efferent reading, but is careful to note that these exist on a continuum, and that any text may have both efferent and aesthetic characteristics and may be read from either stance. However, efferent reading is primarily concerned with acquiring information to be retained and used after reading, and aesthetic reading is primarily concerned with experiences, thoughts, and feelings

during the reading. Rosenblatt (1991) also cautions against the use of literature across the curriculum if teachers are not clear about their purposes. She is particularly concerned about literature that falls near the middle of the continuum, literature such as historical fiction, and worries that children who know they are usually quizzed on factual aspects of a book will adopt an efferent stance to all texts. This concern is justified by the findings of my study.

Langer (1995) similarly describes two basic orientations of text, the literary and the discursive, which lead to subjective or objective reading experiences. The goal of the discursive orientation is to make points; such texts are developed with a steady end point or reference and are used by readers to gather information. The goal of the literary orientation is to create an imaginary world, which opens toward a "horizon of possibilities" for the reader. Like Rosenblatt (1991) Langer argues that literature should not be imported into other subjects just to supplement content learning; it should be used *as* the curriculum rather than *in* the curriculum. In Terri's second unit, she began to focus on characteristics of the genre and features of the literature texts. This kind of explicit attention to the literature could have been helpful in the first unit and might have contributed to student learning both of the historical fiction genre and of aesthetic, or literary, experiences of reading.

The issue of purpose and use of texts is critical in thinking about history study as well as literature study, and in thinking about the integration of the two. One of the arguments in favor of integrating history and literature study (or

social studies and literacy) is that they both utilize narrative forms and language processes for learning and communicating understanding. In Chapter 2, I discussed distinctions between narrative and expository texts, and also between historical and literary uses of narrative. Many writers are cautious about the use of narrative texts across social studies because it may distort both literary and history purposes. My study supports the validity of this concern.

Sebasta (1989) recommends the use of tradebooks in teaching social studies, arguing that they can bridge the gap between efferent and aesthetic reading in the content areas. However, he argues that learning experiences should move beyond reading, talking, and answering questions, and that such texts should encourage other activity, student synthesis, and application of learning. Calkins (1994), writing about theme studies, also notes that reading and writing are not the only way of learning about the world. She argues that students should take on the inquiry stances of different disciplines and include reading and writing as authentic activities, with fiction always read first from an aesthetic stance, as literature. History study should also attend to other texts and kinds of historical investigations (Levstik, 1989, 1993).

Shanahan (1997) is also cautious about the integration of literature with other subject areas. He extends his thinking about the integration of reading and writing to examine curricular integration of literacy with other subjects, arguing that they have areas of overlap but also distinct aspects that must be taught separately. He warns that integration of literacy across the curriculum can

emphasize practice in reading rather than instruction. The pressure to read lengthy novels in Terri's first unit contributed to what might be considered an emphasis on quantity of reading rather than quality of engagement with literary texts. Shanahan also is concerned about the effect of such integration on other subjects and argues that subjects like social studies and science cannot be taught through novels alone, although novels may make important contributions to the study. He argues:

Integrated instruction works best when it makes children conscious of the connections being made, and when it focuses their attention on the cultural differences that exist across disciplines and how to translate across these boundaries. Integrated instruction works best when within the context of meaning, students are still given opportunities for enough instruction, guidance, and practice, to allow them to become accomplished. (p. 18)

Terri's second unit on the Civil War and Freedom is closer to this image of integration than her Revolutionary War unit. In the second unit, there was an area of overlap where students made interesting connections across subjects, but there was also attention to each subject area of literature and history study separately.

The National Center for History in Schools (1996), on whose recommendations Terri based some of her planning, describes both historical understanding and historical thinking goals. Terri asked students to think about

historical eras in terms of the five spheres of activity outlined for historical understandings: social, political, scientific/ technological, economic, and cultural. She also introduced students to the historical skill of chronological thinking. However, her curriculum and pedagogy paid little attention to the other historical thinking skills outlined: comprehension of a variety of sources, historical analysis and interpretation, historical research, historical issues-analysis and decision-making.

Similarly, Terri's history instruction focused on content goals described in the historical perspective of the Michigan Framework for Social Studies Education (1996), such as time and chronology, and comprehending the past. She did not focus on analyzing and interpreting the past, or on judging decisions from the past, nor did she specifically address strands concerned with social studies inquiry, public discourse and decision-making, and citizen involvement.

The school district curriculum described learning objectives in terms of knowledge, skills, democratic values, and civic participation. Terri explicitly addressed the knowledge objectives in her planning and teaching. She attended to the skill of chronological placing of events and to certain communication skills. She addressed democratic values through work on the Constitution. She spent little time helping students learn to use a variety of resources or to interpret multiple representations of data.

Students in Terri's class showed an understanding of history as being about the past, as being concerned with major events and important figures, and

as having little connection with their own lives, although this was somewhat changed during the Civil War and Freedom unit. "Doing history study" was understood to be a matter of reading and writing for information. Non-fiction texts were particularly associated with history study and perceived as "true." However, historical fiction was also understood to contribute to the learning of history. These understandings of history study were consistent with Terri's planning and teaching emphasis.

Terri emphasized historical understandings but not historical thinking and inquiry skills. In so doing, she utilized written texts that provided information. Social studies texts (non-fiction and mostly textbooks) were used as a major source of historical information. They were treated as authoritative. Historical fiction texts for the Revolutionary War unit were mostly understood by the children to be "made up," but were also used to supplement historical understanding of the era.

Arguments that history and literature study are easily integrated because they share a common subject matter and common language and narrative forms ignore important differences between the two disciplines. My study showed that students benefit from attention to particular subject matter within each discipline, such as genre forms in literature study and concepts such as freedom in history study, as well as attention to the connections across subjects.

My study also points to important considerations about the purposes and uses of texts in history and literature, particularly narrative texts. Although

narrative texts contributed to student development of important historical understandings, students could also have benefited from specific attention to literary and aesthetic purposes of literature texts, and from attention to other kinds of historical texts and sources of historical information, such as primary source documents. More attention needs to be paid to the use of texts in literature and history study, and to consideration of the similarities and differences between literary and historical readings of texts. For example, narrative text can have different purposes and characteristics, as I described in Chapter 2. It would also be helpful to examine more thoroughly related issues such as interpretation, prediction, and perspective in historical and literary uses of texts.

This study showed that integrated curriculum can encourage certain kinds of student connections across the curriculum and the learning of subject matter. With attention to students' own connections and ways of making sense, integration shows potential for curricular and real-world connections and learning. However, the study also raised questions about how integrated curriculum influenced student understanding about what history and literature study entail. I argue that each discipline or school subject has important contributions to make to student learning and that a more explicitly interdisciplinary, rather than integrated, approach could better help students apply the different lenses and procedures of each subject to a focus theme or topic.

D. Recommendations

The findings of my study have led me to draw conclusions about the integration of history and literature study, and to describe some of the major implications of my study. I have paid particular attention to three important aspects of curricular integration. First, I have emphasized the influence of curricular organization on student learning and the need to help teachers think more deeply about this. Second, I have described the complex relationship between curriculum and learning, and the need to help students make connections of their own. Third, I have argued the benefits of explicitly interdisciplinary approaches to curriculum that emphasize distinct ways of learning and knowing about the world as well as recognizing the connections that exist across subjects. I have written about the implications of these points for teachers.

This leads to particular recommendations for teacher educators, which I shall now discuss. I shall situate these recommendations within the context of my study and with reference to Terri, the teacher in my study who made such interesting changes in her curriculum in the space of a few months. I shall think about the characteristics of this teacher and situation, and then the implications for teacher education more broadly.

Terri's Learning Dispositions and Implications

My study encourages me to believe that teachers who are interested in integration can indeed be helped to think more deeply about it and to consider multiple organizations and purposes. Terri was a novice teacher with no formal preparation for integrated teaching, yet she was able to entertain alternative forms of integration and to consider these based on her learning objectives for students. She made changes in her curriculum planning and her instruction that influenced student learning. Her positive disposition toward integrating the curriculum and with the explicit goal of improved student learning was important.

Terri invited me into her classroom to study her curriculum and her students' learning. This is a brave thing for a novice teacher to do and shows how much she wanted to learn more about integration and to think about student learning. It also showed a confidence in her own teaching that helped her entertain alternative ways of approaching units. Some teachers may be afraid to try anything that appears too different from what is "tried and true" for them. Terri had actually struggled with classroom management the previous year, with many of the same students in a class that was recognized as being particularly difficult. She was happy to have these students again and to have already established many routines and expectations. This may originally have added to her confidence, but it could also have become a stumbling block to change.

Considering that she was a novice teacher with a "difficult" class, Terri made significant changes in her practice.

It is important that this kind of learning opportunity be offered to teachers who are interested, but not mandated for teachers who are not, as a personal investment in integrated curriculum is an important element of its success. For practicing teachers, this means providing appropriate learning opportunities, feedback, and support to those who are interested. This is unlikely to take the form of a one-shot workshop or in-service training session. The work I did with Terri was in part successful because I became part of her classroom, listened carefully to her concerns and questions, helped support the changes she made, and provided resources on an individual basis. Such intensive work could be provided with a long-term series of workshops that incorporate follow-up visits and in-classroom support. University in-service courses can also provide a venue for collaboration with other teachers as well as support in creating units and plans for particular classrooms and contexts. Sustained, contextualized support for teachers with an expressed interest in integration seems most likely to lead to successful teacher learning about the ways in which an integrated curriculum can help encourage student learning. Following are the kinds of foci that such support and teacher learning could entail.

Curricular Organization and "Big Ideas"

I have suggested that teachers can be helped to think about their purposes for individual learners and their larger educational goals, and to think more

deeply about the many different forms that curriculum integration can take. These are closely related. Teachers considering integrated curriculum need help thinking about worthwhile content, student learning goals, activities, and assessments. They need help finding a “big idea” around which to build a unit. National and state standards may help teachers look at larger goals within school subjects, but these may be too broad to be very helpful. District standards vary in their quality and specificity, and some may be little more than a list of content topics to be covered or behavioral objectives that are far from the “big ideas,” generalizations, and principles recommended. Additionally, integration can contribute in important ways to student understanding of the curriculum and to learning that goes beyond separate subjects to broader themes and issues. These “big ideas” that cut across disciplines should be the focus of curriculum courses and continued professional development for integration. Teachers may choose to focus on social and real-world issues, questions, or projects. However, they need to be encouraged to consider integration that contributes to worthwhile student learning and to learning beyond the separate subjects.

Wiggins and McTigue (1998) discuss “big ideas” and essential questions, as well as more specific unit questions and entry-level questions to “hook” student interest. Roland Case (1991a) also outlines different forms and organizations of integrated curriculum and I have found his work helpful in suggesting practical alternatives to “themes.” Terri was particularly interested in his suggestions. He outlines different types of unit organizers: theme – an idea or

feature shared by many separate elements, such as the Civil War; issue – a question whose answer is a value judgment, such as “Should further technological innovation be encouraged?;” inquiry –a question whose answer is a description, such as, “What will my life be like thirty years from now?;” problem –a question whose answer is a course of action, such as, “What can we do to promote world literacy?;” and project –which involves creation of a product or performance, such as a play or diorama. These alternative organizers reflect a range of integration practices that exist and are described by other writers, and they can be examined by teachers more closely or used as a basis for planning. The questions suggest the kind of inquiry to be undertaken, the kind of performance task that will result, and the kind of broad learning goals emphasized.

Helping Students Make Connections

I have also argued that teachers need to consider the trade-offs that appear to be embedded in various organizations of integrated curriculum and the kinds of connections students might be expected and able to make. Close examination of student learning is essential. Also, my study strongly suggests the need for instruction that would more explicitly help students make meaningful connections rather than incomplete or faulty ones. An important aspect of this is explicit attention to text purposes, uses, and features. There is a move towards more explicit teaching in literacy, and the recent genre literature from Australia is an important example, urging instruction in important genres

of reading and writing, with an emphasis on issues of equity and access in literacy education for all students (Cope & Kalantzis, 1993).

I have argued that teachers need to be helped to think more carefully about the complex relationship between planned curriculum and student learning. My study showed that students can and do bring a variety of important experiences, beliefs, and understandings to their learning, and that they can and do try to make connections to help make personal sense of the curriculum. This learner integration, usually with their own lives and with the "real world," should be encouraged and developed. Teachers need to find ways to uncover what students are bringing to the learning and the kinds of connections they are making. They also need to find ways to help students process their learning and make new and interesting connections for themselves, both across different dimensions of the curriculum and with their own lives.

More research could help contribute to our understanding of how students make valuable connections. Teachers can be helped to find more ways to encourage such connections. Many teachers already use concept mapping, webbing, and other graphic organizers. More open-ended approaches are likely to contribute to even greater webs of personal connections for students. In an earlier section, I referred to ideas offered by Wiggins and McTigue (1998) for helping students process complex learning. Another model exists in the seminar discussions described by the Paideia Group, conversations which encourage students to work with ideas, form connections, and explore issues in depth

(Adler, 1984). An important part of this is encouraging teachers to allow time for students to play with ideas, revisit concepts and content, and process their learning, and giving them strategies for assessing students' developing understanding.

Disciplinary Knowledge

I have also argued that the disciplines contribute in important ways to student learning, providing distinct lenses on the world. This suggests that teachers need to understand the "big ideas" within disciplines as well as big ideas that cross disciplines and subjects. This implies the kind of teacher preparation that includes grounding in the different disciplines that contribute to the elementary school curriculum. This must go beyond superficial acquaintance with pieces of content from various disciplines. Teachers should understand the kinds of questions, forms of inquiry, and ways of knowing that are represented by different disciplines. They need to be able to think about curriculum and curriculum integration in terms of the various contributions and forms of understandings offered by different disciplines.

This disciplinary understanding may not be an outcome of undergraduate study in the various departments or colleges around the university, although closer collaboration with those departments could encourage this. It is likely that such a consideration of disciplinary knowledge is necessary during pre-service teacher preparation as students begin to think about the particular subjects in

terms of how they are taught in elementary-school classrooms. I shall address this further in a later section.

Teachers and student teachers are increasingly interested in “learning styles” and “multiple intelligences” (Gardner, 1983). They are interested in providing interesting and varied learning experiences for their elementary students. This should not be an “add on” consideration that teachers and student teachers try to balance along with other aspects of their planning for children. An elementary classroom curriculum that takes seriously the big ideas within each discipline will also provide students with varied and interesting learning experiences that draw on different ways of learning and representing that learning. Different disciplinary ways of knowing provide a variety of ways of learning about the world.

As prospective teachers take courses that help prepare them to teach particular subject matters to elementary students, they could be asked to consider more explicitly questions about the nature of each subject matter, the kinds of questions it addresses, and ways of exploring the world that it draws on. They would then be thinking more deeply about the content of a discipline and its related school subject. They would also be thinking about the kinds of questions a discipline addresses and the forms of exploration, verification, and communication that it involves. This would lead to a more authentic consideration of the kinds of experiences, resources, and texts that teachers plan to introduce to children. For example, history study should draw on multiple

sources of information, including authentic artifacts, primary source documents, and texts as well as the more traditional use of secondary texts. This would lead to different kinds of exploration and different kinds of evidence of learning and performance tasks and assessments than other subjects.

This consideration of the big ideas of each discipline would help prepare pre-service teachers to think more critically about curriculum integration and interdisciplinary approaches that draw from the particular disciplines to address important questions and issues that go beyond any one discipline. A further important step for worthwhile curriculum integration would be for prospective teachers to be involved in conversations that cut across the different courses and subject matters. The kind of open-ended opportunities for thinking across subjects that I recommend for elementary students can also be a helpful way of encouraging pre-service teachers to think across disciplines. This could be accomplished through more collaboration between course instructors teaching different "methods" courses across a year. It could also be accomplished through small group seminars that ask student teachers to think about their learning in courses and field experiences, and to make their own connections and associations across these various experiences. Key questions could encourage student teachers to consider the big ideas in different school subjects and to examine the ways children learn, and evidence their learning, in these subjects.

I have suggested that Terri's teaching, particularly of the Revolutionary War unit, would have been more powerful in terms of student learning if she

had considered the particular contributions of history and literature to the content she had selected as a focus for her integrated curriculum. Terri was a graduate of the university teacher preparation program in which I work. There is an emphasis on subject-matter preparation that reflects in part the program's involvement in the Holmes Group and that group's emphasis on teacher preparation in the "long-running conversations" represented by various disciplines (Holmes Group, 1990, p.14). There is also an emphasis on field-based experiences, reflective practice, and the national professional teaching standards. Terri was a successful and thoughtful graduate of this program. However, the difficulty she encountered as a novice teacher trying to implement a meaningful integrated curriculum in her classroom not only points to the complexity of such work but also raises questions about how her teacher preparation program might have better helped her think about this.

Our teacher preparation program introduces prospective teachers early on to issues of learning. Attention to the subject matters of that learning can provide an important introduction to the idea that different ways of learning are related to *what* is being learned. This course could also help introduce important strands of the program that prospective teachers will re-visit in later courses and field experiences. My study shows the importance of vertical integration of curriculum topics across time with young learners. This is also an important consideration in a teacher preparation program.

Teaching and learning of four school subjects – math, literacy, science, and social studies – is then the focus of intensive study during the senior year, which is connected to field-experiences. These courses are organized so that math and literacy together constitute one course, and science and social studies another. There are opportunities here for instructors to organize cross-disciplinary connections, and some instructors do indeed take advantage of this. This may be done through occasional collaborative class sessions that explicitly address key questions about what is similar and different about the teaching and learning of these subjects and the disciplinary fields from which they draw. Or, it could be pursued through collaborative course planning that frames course experiences and syllabi in terms of the same, broad, key questions and issues around the different subjects.

Similarly, the field experiences linked to these courses offer opportunities for prospective teachers to think more deeply about the teaching and learning of different subject matters. They can look carefully at the content and teaching of particular school subjects and compare these. They can examine different resources, materials, and texts for different school subjects and consider how authentic these are for each subject and how they help children explore the particular aspect of the world addressed by science or literature, for example. They could follow a few children closely, examining how these children learn in different subjects, through different kinds of experiences, and with different kinds of texts and resources. These focused explorations in classrooms can guide

prospective teachers to a deeper understanding of the big ideas within disciplines and school subjects that give them a powerful way to think about planning for student learning within subjects and perhaps across subjects.

The teacher preparation program in which Terri participated culminated in a one-year internship in an elementary classroom, with master's level classes taken across the year. This plan encourages prospective teachers to move back and forth from university classes to their classroom experiences and provides opportunities for connections between coursework and field experiences. Two courses are taken each semester, one focused on reflection and inquiry and one on professional issues. The teaching and learning of specific subject matters could provide a basis for the exploration of some of these topics. Again, there is room here for explicit attention to how the subject matter itself can influence teacher planning, strategies, assessment, and student learning.

The internship year also includes small, school-based seminars. These are focused in large part on classroom issues that arise in particular contexts, as well as supporting interns through course experiences and emerging professional issues. However, there is room here to support prospective teachers as they consider curriculum planning in particular subjects and perhaps across subjects. This internship year is important for encouraging thinking about the larger curriculum, across subjects and across time. Some interns will be placed in classrooms that "integrate" the curriculum in various ways. A solid foundation in the key questions and methods of the different subjects during the senior year

could provide a basis for thinking more carefully and critically about curriculum integration when interns experience and plan for it during their internship year.

Given the curricular, time, and institutional constraints of a teacher preparation program, it is unlikely that interdisciplinary curriculum will itself be a key component. However, more explicit attention to disciplinary issues throughout a program will prepare pre-service teachers to think in constructive ways about possible interdisciplinary experiences for their students as they move into an internship year and their own classrooms. Attention to the big ideas within disciplines might help prospective teachers think about big ideas across disciplines. More explicit attention to thinking across school subjects through seminars or a common framework of course questions and experiences could help preservice teachers make associations and connections of their own across the larger curriculum of their own program and also in elementary classrooms.

My study has demonstrated the influence of curricular connections and coherence on student learning. It points to the need to take seriously the kinds of connections students can be encouraged to make so as to integrate their own learning. And it points to the need for disciplinary as well as interdisciplinary learning and inquiry. These three important implications are true for pre-service and experienced teachers as well as for elementary students and classrooms.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Interview Protocol: Initial Teacher Interview

JANUARY 11, 1998

Thank you for taking this time...

You've agreed to help me learn more about integrated curriculum so perhaps we can get a bit clearer about what that means to you and in your classroom. There are many different understandings of integration and I'd like to be clearer about yours.

Integration in this classroom

1. In what ways would you say your present classroom curriculum is integrated?

Probes: (for subject matters? Learning, teaching, curriculum integration?)

- What is it that is being integrated (content? Processes?)
- How is it being integrated? (around what?)
- How completely is it integrated? (separate aspects? Sometimes not integrated? Taught as separate subjects or as 'topic' or 'theme'?....)

2. Can you tell me how you decided which subject matter areas to integrate and why?

Probes: subjects? disciplines?

Subjects / Disciplines

3. Let's think about some of these individually for a minute.

a) You integrate (social studies)__. What about this makes it easier or better to integrate than other subject matters do you think?

- How would you describe what (social studies)_____ is?
- What does it mean for a student to "do" (social studies)_____?
- What does it mean for a student to "know" something or to have learned (social studies)_____?

b) You also integrate parts of your language arts program.

What makes these areas appropriate for integration?

- Are there any parts of your language arts/literacy program that you don't integrate?
- How would you describe your Book Club program in terms of what students are doing and learning?
- How would you describe your Writing Workshop program in terms of what students are doing and learning?

- What does it mean for a student to know or learn something in (language arts) _____?

c) You may integrate technology. How do you think about doing that and why does it make sense to you?

Probe for understanding of the subject matter/ discipline

4. Are there any subject areas you never integrate?

Why do you think that is?

Probe: what about that subject matter makes it difficult or inappropriate to integrate?

- What does it mean to "do" or "know" or "learn" that subject? What "is" that subject?(body of knowledge, way of knowing, set of processes....)

Integration Rationale

5. I'd like to know more about why you choose to teach in this integrated way - what are your reasons for teaching like this?

Probe: Integration as tool or goal?

- Does it do something that traditional subject teaching cannot do, or do it better?

- Integration as benefiting who? (kids, teacher,)

- Integration because of view of learning, teaching, reality, children, etc..

1. In an ideal teaching world, how much do you think would like to integrate your curriculum?

Probe: why?

7. Are there any disadvantages or difficulties that you see to integrated curriculum/ teaching?

Student Learning

8. What kind of connections do you hope to see children making as you work on an integrated unit?

Probe: Connections across subject-matter? with real world? to own lives? process and learning connections?

9. Have you seen any powerful learning or connections that students have made as you teach in this way?

- How do you know when they're making these kinds of connections?

Other?

10. Is there anything else I should understand about how you think about or enact integration?

APPENDIX B

Interview Protocol: Initial Student Interviews January 1998

Pseudonyms: _____

Introduction

I came in a few days ago to talk to you - remember? Thank you for giving your families my letters. I'd like to ask you some questions about what you're learning. You can choose whether to say "Yes" or "No" anytime, and you can change your mind anytime you don't want to answer a question or go on with the interview. I'd like to use this tape recorder to make sure I get your words just right but you can ask me not to, or ask me to turn it off anytime you like.

1 School Subjects

i) Book Club

I had a look at your classroom (daily) schedule. I'd like it if you could tell me more what you do and what you learn at these different times of day.

For example, now the class is doing "Book Club" - what's that all about?

Probes:

- What do you do? (processes)
- What do you learn about? (content)
- How do you know when you're doing well in Book Club/if you're good at it?
- Why do you think Ms. _ chose these books for you to read now?

ii) Social Studies

I see you also have Social Studies. Tell me about what that is.

Probes:

- What do you do? (processes)
- What do you learn about? (content)
- How do you know when you're doing well in Social Studies / if you're good at it?

2 "Birth of the Nation" - prior knowledge

i) What do you think you'll be learning about next in Social Studies?

(How do they know or why do they think that?)

ii) Can you tell me a bit about what it was like to live at that time (Revolutionary War)?

iii) What do you think you might learn more about?

iv) How will you learn that?

APPENDIX C

Major Questions, Data Sources, and Analytical Strategies

Major Questions	Data Sources	Analytical Strategies
Preliminary Information: Teacher understandings and plans What are teacher understandings? - of each discipline (history/social studies and literacy) - of integration - of purposes/goals in teaching unit - of "meaningful learning" and "important connections"	- Teacher lesson & unit plans - Curriculum artifacts and documents - Semi-structured interview (audiotaped) - Informal interviews - Teacher assessments and comments on student work - Maps, diagrams, schedules - classroom documents	- Content analysis of curriculum documents, interview transcripts, field notes - Comparative analysis across teacher and student responses - Triangulation across data sources
Preliminary Information: Student Perceptions What understandings do students have? - of each subject (history/social studies and literacy/book clubs)	- Semi-structured interviews (audiotaped) - artifacts e.g. early work in social studies and book club	- Content analysis of interview transcripts - content analysis of student work samples
For each case: Student Learning What are students learning about the disciplines/school subjects incorporated? (History/social studies, literacy) - e.g. content, processes, verification, evidence, uses What are students learning about the subject matter content of the unit? - content (facts, info) - processes, procedures, inquiry - concepts & ideas What are students learning about learning? - where does it happen? how? When? for what?	- Artifacts e.g. student work samples, tests & assessments, concept maps - Semi-structured interviews with all students (audiotape) - Participant observation during social studies and literacy classes - Field notes & reflective memos - Informal interviews with students - Teacher notes and/or written & oral reports of student learning	- Content analysis of student artifacts, interview transcripts, field notes - Comparative analysis of before/after responses for each unit - Analytical descriptions: look for accumulation of positive evidence and for negative & discrepant cases - Triangulation across different student accounts - Triangulation across data sources - Stimulated recall using card sort activity
For each case: Student Connections What connections are students making across subjects at same time? (horizontal integration) - content, processes, other? What connections are they making within subjects at different times? (vertical integration) - last year, other units, What connections are they making personally? - own lives, 'real world' What do the connections add (if anything) to their understandings? - of subject matter? of issue or	- Participant observation & field notes during literacy and social studies - Informal interviews with students - Semi-structured interviews after each unit (audiotape) - Student card sort activity (audiotaped) as part of final interview - Teacher reports of student connections	- Content analysis of written artifacts, interview transcripts, field notes - Comparative analysis of before/after responses for each unit - Analytical descriptions: look for accumulation of positive evidence and for negative & discrepant cases - Triangulation across different student accounts - Triangulation across data sources

problem? Of disciplines/ subjects? Of themselves or others?		
<i>Major Question Across 2 cases</i> What kinds of learning and connections are encouraged/ discouraged by these different approaches to integrated units?		- Comparative analysis across units - Relationships to theoretical models and literature

APPENDIX D

Final Student Interview with Card Sort May 26-June 3rd, 1998

I. History Cards

Cards = Native Americans (NA), Colonization (Col.), Revolutionary War (RW), Westward Expansion (WE), Civil War (CW), World War II (WWII), Vietnam War (VW)

a) Why do you think I chose these?

(Note: Social Studies curriculum included NA, Col., RW, WE, CW in that order. During teaching of RW- speaker about VW. Some researched WWII in Book Clubs)

b) They are all important times and events in the history of our nation. Can you put them in the order in which they happened?

(Note: do students think about Native Americans as crossing eras? Do they recognize Westward Expansion as having different phases - before and after Civil War? Do they sequence them according to order in which they learned them? Do they mention WWI?)

II. Subject Cards added - chart paper

Cards = Whole Group (WG), Social Studies (SS), Book Clubs (BC), Writing Workshop (WW), Computers (C), Science (Sc), Math (M), Me and My Life (Me)

a) *(Use as many of these as you like. If you don't want to use one just put it on the side.)* Can you put these (history) cards on the paper with these (subject cards) to show how they connect? You can use markers, or make stacks. Tell me about your choices.

III. "Concept" Cards added to History cards

Cards = Freedom (F), Conflict (Conf.), Constitution (Const.), Women's Rights (WR), Immigrants (I), Civil Rights (CR)

(Note - take away subject cards. Keep Me and My Life Card out)

a) Can you put these cards down too, and draw lines to show they connect with any of the other cards? Draw as many lines as you like.

b) Is there any one card you can see that seems to connect up with every other card in some way - put it in the middle and show me how they others connect.

(Note - if not chosen, ask them to try with Me and My Life card too)

IV. Names Cards

Cards = Abraham Lincoln (AL), Patience Whipple (PW), Stephen Austin (SA), Johnny Tremain (JT), Benjamin Franklin (BF), Thomas Jefferson (TJ), Harriet Tubman (HT), Emma Edmunds (EE)

a) Can you sort these cards out for me and tell me your choices?

APPENDIX E

Teacher's Plans

Teacher's Weekly Plans

	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
8:45-9:00	Opening to 9:00	Opening to 9:00	Opening to 9:00	Opening to 9:00	Opening to 9:00
9:00-9:30	Whole Group	Whole Group	Whole Group	Whole Group	Whole Group
9:30-10:30	Book Clubs	Book Clubs	Book Clubs	Book Clubs	Book Clubs
		Music (9:55-10:25)		Library (10-10:20)	
10:30 -10:50	Recess	Recess	Recess	Recess	Recess
10:55-11:45	Science	Science	Social studies	Writing Workshop	Spelling/Journals
11:45-12:15	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
12:15-12:30	Journals	Journals	Journals	Journals	Math (12:15-1:00)
12:30-1:30	Math (until 1:40)	Math	Math (until 1:40)	Computers	Buddies (1:00-1:30)
1:30-2:00	Gym (1:40-2:20)	Writing	Gym (1:40-2:20)	Health	Homework/ Friday Folders
		Minilesson/skills			
2:00-2:20	Gym	Recess	Gym	Recess	Recess
2:25-3:05	Spelling	Social Studies	Recess (2:20-2:50) Writing Workshop	Writing Workshop	School Store

Teacher's Plans for Year

Time Frame	Social Studies	Literacy	Science	Math	Writing	Computers
5 Weeks Aug. 25- Sept. 26	What is history/ Geography	Realistic Fiction-- Animal Stories	Earth Science (link with SS)	Review of skills	Newspaper article	Internet - - Volcano and earthquake sites
5 Weeks Sept. 29- Oct. 31	Native Americans before European Conquest	Historical Fiction ??? Native American fict. - Morning Girl	Hydros- phere <u>Trip to water plant?</u>	Probability	Persuasive writing (link with math)	Publishing newspaper articles, graphs and article on probability
5 Weeks Nov. 4- Dec. 19 (to break)	Colonization of United States	Slave Dancer	Light	Decimals	Pocohontas Revisited (link with S.S. and lit.)	Continuation of above, (link with writing workshop)
5 Weeks Jan. 5- Feb. 6	Birth of US- - Revolutionary war, Constitution	My Brother Sam is Dead, Johnny Tremain, Sarah?	Life Science - - life cycles and classification	Geometry/ Measurement	Similies and person- ification	Pocohontas Revisited (link with S.S. and w.w.)
5 Weeks Feb. 9 - Mar. 6	Civil War	Fantasy (link with science)	Space Science <u>Planetarium</u>	Fractions	Color Poems	
4 Weeks Mar. 9 - Apr. 3	Westward Expansion	Biography- - inventors & US figures (link with sc. & w.w.)	Forces and simple machines	Problem Solving/ Reasoning	Invention brouchures (links with lit. and science)	Famous People Stacks
6 Weeks Apr. 13 - May 22	World War II	Number the stars, Stepping on the cracks	Physical science Chemistry <u>MSU chem.</u> <u>Demo</u>		Biographies / Auto biographies	US History Time Line stack

APPENDIX F

Excerpts from Teacher's Classroom Handbook for Parents

Literacy

Literacy studies are a pivotal part of our curriculum. My literacy curriculum includes the following areas: Book Clubs, Writing Workshop, journal writing, spelling, handwriting, and listening and speaking.

Book Clubs

Book Clubs form the basis of my reading program. Students are given choices among several titles that share a common focus. Our first set of Book Clubs this year is works of realistic fiction that involve children and their pets. I assign students to Book Clubs groups of 4-6 children and students meet daily to read with a partner. Book Clubs allow children to explore different genres of literature and provide an authentic reading experience. As part of students' work in their Book Clubs, they write and share reflective responses in their reading logs. The process of reflecting and sharing their responses helps further their understanding and appreciation of the texts they are reading.

Writing Workshop

Several times a week we will have Writing Workshop periods. This time is set aside to develop specific pieces of writing and to work on the mechanics of writing. Topics will range from poetry to report writing, and will at times bridge with our studies in other areas. For example, during our Book Clubs on biographies students will write their biographies or autobiographies. By integrating the learning of writing mechanics with writing projects, students form a better understanding of how to use language. During Writing Workshop, students will go through the writing process, drafting and revising pieces so that they reflect conventions of grammar and spelling.

Journal Writing

Students will have journal writing time several times a week where they will be able to choose to write about topics of interest to them. This free writing period is a great way for kids to "get into" writing and express themselves. When writing in their journals, I will not require students to have "perfect" writing. The main emphasis will be on cultivating their written expression.

Spelling and Handwriting

We will have spelling twice each week: once on Monday when we will

have a pretest and once again on Friday when we will have a post-test. Students who score 16 or more correct on their pretests will be eligible to select a set of ten words that they would like to learn. I require that the words be ones that are challenging to students (for example, no names of friends or family members) and that the list be reviewed and signed by you and returned before the Friday test.

Students will continue to work on their cursive handwriting this year. They will be required to use cursive writing during their spelling tests as well as for final drafts of some writing assignments. We will continue to have handwriting practice homework each week. I've enclosed a copy of handwriting samples for you to keep on file.

Listening and Speaking

Listening and speaking are often not thought to be part of a language arts curriculum. However, they are vital to our success in life! The practice of listening and speaking will be integrated across the curriculum and I will periodically assess how students are doing in these areas. Prime opportunities for listening and speaking arise as students present their work to one another - the presenter gets to practice good speaking techniques and her/his audience illustrates their active listening through thoughtful comments.

Social Studies

Our social studies curriculum this year is United States' History. We will be progressing through some of the major eras of US history starting with our first citizens the Native Americans. Our overarching theme for the year will be to look at immigration and migration and how these processes have influenced American history. As we look at different time periods students will reflect on the following "big" questions:

1. What is/was the structure of government like and how is it related to the time period?
2. What was the economy like and how did it affect people's lives?
3. What was the culture like? What sort of diversity was there at the time?
4. How did the environment affect how people lived and worked at the time?
5. What sort of links were there between the US and other countries at the time?

We will also be spending several times each month thinking about current events in our nation and how we see evidence of these themes in our current time.

APPENDIX G

Reading Folder Assignments January - June (Taken from Lynn's folder)

Date	Lynn's Responses
	Animal Stories Unit: <u>A dog named Kitty</u>
9/3	1. My main character's name is Ricky. He is afraid of dogs. 2. He loves foot ball. 3. He faces the fear of dogs. Because a long time ago a dog bit him. And he had to get stitches.
9/10	1. <u>callus</u> A hardened and thickened place on the skin. People get calluses on their hands and feet. 2. He tried to pet the dog and he did and now it's his best friend and he feeds him and takes him to the vet. 3. so people don't treat dogs bad and like them.
9/12	1. <u>brocade</u> A heavy cloth with patterns woven into it. The queen wore a robe of gold brocade/ 2. (Venn diagram comparing herself with the character Ricky)
9/?	1. I did not like it. Because the pup died when he could have lived longer. And how the pup was beat up. And how he starved and they didn't feed him.
9/17	<u>Shiloh</u> . I just started. 1. We have new names Marty and Shiloh. 2. People do find dogs on the side of the road and people do drive in cars like in the book. 3. I like it so far. Because it's got a lot of detail. And it's already talking about the main characters.
	Historical Fiction - Native Americans Unit: <u>Zia</u>
11/5	1. <u>Zia</u> 2. Captain Nadiva made a really detailed boat in a bottle. Zia found a boat and wants to rescue her aunt. Zia loves clam soup. Zia likes finding treasures on the beach. She lives without her parents, only her brother and the mission. 3. Zia lives in California, and her tribe is hidden by trees on a mountain range. I think it happened 1921. They live at Santa Barbara.
11/17	1. <u>Zia. A new word</u> 2. The new word I learned is tumaiyowit. It is there god that wanted people to die so they would have room on earth. 2. <u>The native Americans economy</u>

In this book indians live close to the water so they it a lot of fish and the girls were shalls. Zia weres a blue shall and a indian necales. They do not were eny type of shoes. They eat roots and maby grasshoppers.
 3.I like that Zia is helping her people by snickinag them out and setting them free, And how Zia never gives up on finding her ant Karana. She is determind to bing her back.

11/19

Zia

1.Why does Karan alsways sleep by her dog? (Runto-Aru)

11/?

(Venn diagram comparing Zia and Karana)

Historical Fiction - Colonization Unit Amos Fortune

1/9

1.(At-muh-shi) it is the name of a trib.

2.Amos had two sale to a nother wrold and he didn't know enything about it, And in pationts wipple she had too sale to a nother world that she new nothing about.

4.when did the blacks sale over to America.

APPENDIX H

Teacher's Social Studies Plans for the Revolutionary War Unit

The Revolutionary War and the Constitution Fifth Grade

1. Causes. (1 week)

- Talk about how we study history: study of what causes events, the people involved in the events and the events themselves, and what happens because of the events and people.
- Talk specifically about the importance of cause and effect in history.
 - Economy: taxes from England. Question: Why were the colonists taxed?
 - Government: colonies were ultimately ruled by the King of England, the smaller units of democratic governance that they developed were over ruled by the decisions of the king.
 - Links: Question: What did the colonies gain from their ties with England?
 - Trade relations with England: Questions: What and how did the colonies trade with England? What restrictions were placed on what and how they could trade?
 - The French and Indian War
 - Committees of Correspondence

2. Time Line of the Revolutionary War (1 week) with extensive homework project.

- Geography:
 - Battles and events: Assign one student to each event and have her/him read about it and then make a time line sheet. When a student finished his/her sheet, read readings 7 a,b,c in the packet. When the timeline is done, have kids talk through it.
 - 1754-1763, French and Indian War, p.142 social studies text
 - 1765, Stamp Act, tax on printed material, p.143 social studies text, "Taxes"
 - 1767, Townshend Acts, tea tax, p.143 social studies text
 - 1770, Boston Massacre, p.144 social studies text
 - 1773, Boston Tea Party, P.145 social studies text
 - 1773-1774, British blockade of Boston harbor, p.145 social studies text, "Punishment for the Colonists"

- 1774, 1st Continental Congress, p.146 social studies text
- 1775, battles of Lexington and Concord, all of p.147, social studies text and readings 2 and 3 in the packet
- 1775, 2nd Continental Congress – Washington named commander in chief, p.148 social studies text
- 1775, Britain declares war on America
- 1775, Battles of Breed's Bunker hills, reading 4 in packet
- 1776, Declaration of Independence, p.149 social studies text and reading 5 in packet
- 1776, British capture New York City, pp.152-153 social studies text and reading 5 in packet
- 1776, Americans defeat British in South Carolina, pp.157-158 social studies text, "War in the South"
- 1776-7, Washington crosses the Delaware River and captures Trenton and Princeton, NJ, p.153 social studies text, "Christmas Surprise"
- 1777, Americans defeat British at Saratoga, p.153 social studies text
- 1777-1778, winter at Valley Forge, p.156 social studies text and reading 6 in the packet
- 1778, Forts in the Ohio Valley captured by Americans, p.156 social studies text, "War in the West"
- 1781, French and American fleets defeat British navy at Yorktown. The end of the war. p.158 social studies text, "Surrender at Yorktown," and reading 8 in packet.
- 1781, Articles of Confederation adopted at Continental Congress meeting.
- 1787, Constitution adopted.
- 1788, Constitution ratified and becomes law
- 1789, Washington elected 1st President of the USA
- 1791, Bill of Rights written by James Madison
- Fighting on different fronts – West, naval front, and South (in social studies book)
- Government:
 - Continental Congresses
 - Declaration of Independence
- Links:
 - Alliance with the French
 - Side taking of the Native Americans

3. Culture and Diversity (1 week) Question: Who fought in the war?

- Participants in the war: pp.158-161 in social studies text.

- Issue of loyalists and patriots
- Dress, language
- Phillis Wheatley's poetry

4. Outcomes of the War (1 week)

- Articles of Confederation
- Constitution written and adopted

Final project: Students make a time line or labeled map that shows the locations of important events and battles during the period.

APPENDIX I

**Guiding Questions from the National Center for History in the Schools (1996)
(as included as reference sheet in each student's social studies folder)**

- 1. What is/was the structure of government like and how is it related to the time period?**
- 2. What was the economy like and how did it affect people's lives?**
- 3. What was the culture like? What sort of diversity was there at the time?**
- 4. How did the environment affect how people lived and worked at the time?**
- 5. What sort of links were there between the US and other countries at the time?**

APPENDIX J

District Social Studies Curriculum

Grade Five - United States Studies Curriculum Guidelines

Purpose:

The purpose of the fifth-grade social studies curriculum is to introduce students to the development of the United States from the arrival of the earliest Native Americans and explorers through the present. Examples of both cooperation and conflict in the development of the United States as a democratic nation are highlighted. The diverse cultural origins of the American people are stressed. Students are exposed to the historical perspectives of the United States regions.

Knowledge:

Students develop an understanding of our nation's history through the study of the major events of our past along a basic timeline. They are acquainted with various individuals and groups who have made significant contributions to the political, technological, economic, and cultural life of the United States. The students will investigate the global connection of the United States. Using the five themes of geography, the students will discover how geography helped to shape the development of the country. The students will be introduced to how the federal government works, with a focus on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Skills:

Communication and geographic skills are practiced through the study of the history of the United States. Students will use media and technology as tools to access and process information. Students improve their skills at interpreting tables, charts, and graphs by working with different kinds of data concerning the United States. Students begin to make reasoned decisions regarding public issues.

Democratic Values:

Students recognize the right to express various points of view. Emphasis is placed on constitutional rights and their extension to all people over time. By

acknowledging the importance of cultural diversity in the development of our country, students will explore free expression, religious freedom, fair procedure, and equal protection of the law. Through the study of American government, students expand their appreciation for the role of law in a democracy and its implication for responsible citizenship.

Civic Participation:

Students will participate in the drafting and upholding of school rules and the peaceful resolution of disputes. Activities should take place within the classroom that provide cooperative learning and role-playing situations that enable students to work with others to formulate and carry out responsible plans. Students will explore the rights and responsibilities of active civic participation.

Curriculum Outcomes

Upon completion of fifth-grade social studies, students should:

Knowledge:

1. Apply knowledge of the five fundamental themes of geography (place, location, human-environment relationships, movement, and region) and their influence on United States history.
2. Explain how history is relevant to the decisions citizens must make.
3. Identify the basic structure and function of the federal government.
4. Investigate cultural traditions and diversity as related to American history.
5. Explore the basic functions of economics, such as the role of producer and consumer in American history.
6. Investigate connections that link the United States to other parts of the world.
7. Describe the purpose of rules and laws as related to the Constitution and Bill of Rights.
8. Summarize chronologically people, places, and events that have contributed to the history of the United States.

Skills:

2. Locate, organize, interpret, analyze, and summarize social studies information using print, media, graphic, oral, and technological resources.
3. Place events in United States history in chronological order.
4. Determine and express informed positions about issues that affect the United States.
5. Identify and use different types of maps, globes, charts, and graphs as they pertain to American history.
6. Demonstrate problem-solving techniques as related to social studies.

Democratic Values:

1. Select responsible behavior for various social groups and situations as related to rules and laws.
2. Respect their own personal worth and the dignity of all human beings.
3. Describe and compare cultural similarities and differences among people.

Civic Participation:

1. Participate responsibly in developing and upholding school rules and solving disputes peacefully.
2. Work individually or with others to decide on and pursue appropriate course of action.
3. Keep informed of current events that affect the United States and our global society.
4. Participate in cooperative efforts to promote responsible citizenship in their classrooms, schools, local communities, state, and nation.

Core Unit: Birth of the Nation and The U.S. Constitution

Unit Title <i>Plus suggested time allotment</i>	Core Topics <i>Major topics included in this unit</i>	Unit Outcomes <i>What do you want students to know, do, be like?</i>	Suggested Assessments <i>How will you know if outcomes have been achieved?</i>	Possible Resources <i>What possible instructional resources could be used?</i>
Birth of the Nation (2-1/2 weeks)	French & Indian War Stamp Act Boston Massacre Boston Tea Party Declaration of Independence Major Battles of Revolutionary War Patriot Loyalist Minutemen George Washington Paul Revere Thomas Jefferson Lafayette Charles Cornwallis Abigail Adams Molly Pitcher Sybil Ludington	-Identify the causes (people, places, & events) that led to the birth of the United States. -Present arguments for independence as stated in the Declaration of Independence. -Explain how women helped win the American Revolution. -Compare and contrast the strengths and weaknesses of the British and American causes. -Design ad flow chart showing the events that led to the Declaration of Independence. -Write a letter to King George or Sam Adams, stating your views as a Patriot or Loyalist, respectively. -List three significant contributions made by women during the American Revolution.		Textbook Historical maps, globes <u>Cobblestone</u> magazine <u>My Brother Sam is Dead</u>; <u>Johnny Tremain</u>; <u>Sarah Bishop</u>; <u>Samuel's Choice</u>; <u>Phoebe the Spy</u>; "Paul Revere's Ride" by Longfellow Jean Fritz books: <u>Can't You Make Them Behave?</u>; <u>Sign Here, John Hancock</u>; <u>Why Don't You Get a Horse, Sam Adams?</u>; <u>What Happened on the 29th of May?</u>; <u>What's the Big Idea, Ben Franklin?</u> <u>The U.S. Constitution</u>

The U.S. Constitution	Articles of Confederation Republic Democracy Northwest Territory Northwest Ordinance Compromise Preamble Legislative Executive Judicial Congress Senate House of Representatives President Supreme Court Checks & Balances Amendments Bill of Rights Federalists Republicans District of Columbia Washington, D.C. John Adams Alexander Hamilton James Madison	-Describe the problems faced by our young country after the Revolutionary War and before the Constitution was adopted. -Contrast the viewpoints of states/ rights versus the federal government's need to pass laws. -Describe the region of the Northwest Territory and the importance of the Northwest Ordinance. -List the three branches of the national government and the main duties of each. -Describe the problems faced by the presidents during this time. -Explain why the people thought the Bill of Rights was necessary. -Pick one of the 10 Amendments and tell how it affects you today. -Choose a founding person and give his/her opinion on the issues of the day.	-Name the strengths and weaknesses of the Articles of Confederation. -Write a dialogue that might have taken place between two people during the Revolutionary War. -Summarize the events that led to the writing of the Constitution. -Write the Constitution using "We the people of fifth grade..." -Collect news articles dealing with their own personal rights. -Have students find and display the names of the departments in the Cabinet today.	Textbook <u>Cobblestone</u> magazine -Bill of Rights -Constitution -Two-Party System -U.S. Constitution -Supreme Court -Presidential Election (1-800-821-0115) <u>Shh! We're Writing the Constitution</u> by Jean Fritz; <u>If You Were There When They Signed the Constitution</u> by Elizabeth Levy
------------------------------	---	--	--	---

APPENDIX K

Classroom Resources for the Revolutionary War Unit

Whole Class Teacher Read Aloud Book

Forbes, E. (1943). Johnny Tremain. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Book Club Books

Avi (1984). The fighting ground. New York: Harper Collins.

Collier, J. & Collier, C. (1974). My brother Sam is dead. New York: MacMillan Publishing

Keehn, S. (1997). Moon of two dark horses. New York: Turtleback Books.

O'Dell, S. (1980). Sarah Bishop. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin

Rinaldi, A. (1986). Time enough for drums. New York: Dell-Laurel Leaf.

APPENDIX L

Record of Teacher Questions and Comments During Read Aloud Novel Johnny Tremain

Date	Teacher Questions / Comments	Literacy	Social studies
2/11	-Look at the cover - do you think Johnny's going to be a Patriot or Tory? (who can remember what they are?) -Is that an example of creative language and why? -What does the word "stout" mean?	Prediction Language Vocabulary	Patriot/Tory
2/17	-Last week we started reading. What does Johnny do?	Re-cap plot	
2/18	-Who can fill in [new student] on the story? -What else do we know about Johnny? What was Mr. Lapham getting on his case about? -What do you think "affluence" is? (worked them through from context) -What did Mr.Lapham call John Hancock and Sam Adams?	Re-cap plot Character Comprehension Vocabulary Details	Patriot/Tory
2/20	-Think today about our timeline and where we fit into that. Let's be listening and thinking for when in the American Revolution this might be happening -Has anyone heard of Paul Revere before? (explains) -Do you think it's going to work out?	Reason for listening Setting (Time) Prediction	Revolutionary War Timeline Paul Revere
2/23	-Becca's been gone so who can fill her in? (prompts) -What's the setting? When and where? -What do you think is going to happen?	Re-cap plot Setting Prediction	Revolutionary War timeline
2/24	-Do you think the Observer is a Tory or a Patriot paper? - Any predictions?	Inference Prediction	Tory/Patriot
2/25	-Do you think he remembered who Johnny was? -Does anyone know what the gallows are? (explains)	Inference Vocabulary	
2/26	-Who do you think's in the picture? -What do you think is going to happen? - So what do we know for sure about where Johnny Tremain happened on our timeline?	Inference Prediction Setting (time)	Revolutionary War Timeline

3/2	-What do you think happens? What's the penalty for stealing a cup? -Do you think he stole it? -What do you think Johnny's going to do to get out of this? We've got quite a bit more book - what might happen? -Where are we on the timeline? It said "Year of our Lord One Thousand Seven Hundred Seventy Three"	Prediction, inferences Inference Prediction, plot Setting (time)	Revolutionary War Timeline
3/9	-What have we learned about Rab? -What do you think this picture is about? (Boston Tea Party) -What's "treason"? (explained). Keep listening for other things that might be treason	Character Inference Vocabulary, reasons to listen	Revolutionary War events
3/10	-So what do you think? Think the doctor could have helped if he'd let him?	Inference, comprehension	
3/11	(sub)		
3/16	-What do you think about Cilla and Isannah living with the Lytes? Is it a surprise? How do you think it's going to work out?	Personal response Prediction	
3/18	(sub)		
3/24	Reviewed book so far -And what else? What about the historical things that were happening? (talk about the timeline) -That's a pretty big speech that Otis gave - important. "That a man can stand up" - not because of taxes, not to get the British soldiers out of Boston, but so a man can stand up. Think about it before tomorrow - as a reason for the war. We'll re-read the passage tomorrow	Recap plot Plot Inference, comprehension	Revolutionary War events Reasons for war
3/25	-Please be listening with that question in mind - "why did he feel it was important to fight the war?" (re-read passage by Otis) So what do you think he was saying that they should fight the war for? (teacher-led discussion for majority of session, very difficult for children) -"The Scarlet Deluge" what's a deluge? (after some discussion) Is it going to be like a red rain or a red flood? Would that make sense? What do you think it's going to be? If it's a metaphor what can the metaphor be standing for?	Reasons for listening-comprehension, inference Metaphor	Reasons for war
3/30	-Why do you think?	Comprehension	
4/1	James asks: was Johnny Tremain really in the war? T answers: I believe he's a made-up character. Then continues on -who remembers what that signal meant? -when he's talking about liberty what kind of rights are they talking about? -why do you think Johnny felt sick?	Genre (teaching opportunity not taken) Recall Comprehension Inference	Rights
4/3	-What happened when I was gone?	Recap plot	

APPENDIX M

Final Book Club Project Sheet: Revolutionary War Unit

Book Club Projects: Before and After Character Mobile

1. Working alone or with your book club partner, write down all the information you need that will go “inside” the character’s head for the before time period. Ask yourself questions like:
 - What did the main character think about the war before the beginning of the book?
 - What was the character like at the beginning of the book?
 - What sorts of things did he/she do?
 - What sorts of things did he/she like?
 - What was the character’s family like?
2. Now go through the same process, this time thinking about what the character was like at the end of the book, after she/he had experienced the war. Ask yourself the same questions, thinking especially about how your character changed because he/she experienced the war.
 - What did the main character think about the war before the end of the book?
 - What was the character like at the end of the book?
 - What sorts of things did he/she do?
 - What sorts of things did he/she like?
 - What was the character’s family like?
 - How was his/her life changed by the war?
3. Edit your writing on your own and then with an adult.
4. Create your final copy.
 - Draw the outline of your character’s head. Cut out three copies of this outline.
 - At the top of one of the outlines, write the name of your character and the words “Before the War”. Copy down the ideas, thoughts, etc. that you came up with in step one on this outline. Be sure to use your best handwriting!
 - At the top of a second outline, write the name of your character and the words “After the War”. Copy down the ideas, thoughts, etc. that you came up with in step two on this outline. Be sure to use your best handwriting!
 - In the third outline, draw a portrait of your character.
 - Using tag board, create the mobile by making a cylinder and the pasting your three character outlines on to the cylinder.

APPENDIX N

Teacher's Social Studies Unit Plan for the Civil War Unit

Civil War Unit: Fifth Grade

Nine Sessions

- I. Talk about issues of Freedom.
 - A. Day One - What is freedom?
 - 1. Freedom to...Talk about this type of freedom, give examples
 - 2. Freedom from...Talk about this type of freedom, give examples.
 - 3. Write about examples of these types of freedom that we've learned about this year in social studies.
 - 4. Sharing examples of the two types of freedom that they wrote about on day one.
- ** Pre homework Life as a Slave p. 137 and pp. 230-238 and questions on p. 238.
- II. Talk about the social and economic bases of the North and South and how they were different. Pre homework Life as a Slave and pp. 230-238 and questions on p. 238. One week.
 - A. Day Two - Economic bases of the North and South (1 day)
 - 1. Development of factions based on these economic differences.
 - 2. How factions played into political realm.Questions: What were the main economic differences between the North and South? How did these differences lead to the North and South taking different sides on things?
 - B. Day Three - Slavery/ Abolitionists: (1 day)
 - 1. Life as a slave
 - 2. Slave resistance
 - a. underground railroad, Nat Turner's revolt, Harriet Tubman, Frederick Douglas
 - 3. AbolitionistsQuestions: What was slavery like for the Africans who were captured and brought to the United States? In what ways did African slaves and their friends resist slavery? What is an abolitionist and what did they believe in?

III. The Civil War

A. Day Four – Outbreak of the war, pp. 239-240 (1 day)

- 1. Lincoln Elected**
- 2. Secession and the Confederate States of America**
- 3. For Sumter**

Question: What were the events that led up to the start of the Civil War?

B. Day Five, Six, and Seven – Battles and Important Figures (3 days)

- 1. Battles, pp. 242-243 and 246-247.**
 - a. Assign kids to read about the different battles/events and create a time line.**
- 2. Emancipation Proclamation, p. 243-244**
- 3. Technology of the War: Battle of the Monitor and Merrimac, p. 241-242.**

Questions: What were several major battles of the Civil War? Who won those battles? What was the Emancipation Proclamation? Why did Lincoln wait so long to write the Emancipation Proclamation?

C. Day Eight – How Resources Affected the Course of the War (1 Day)

- 1. Manufacturing vs. Agricultural**
- 2. Mines /Raw materials in North and West**
- 3. Population of North and South – South 9 million total of which 4 million were slaves. North had a population of 22 million. South's army was 900,000 and the North's army was 2 million (including 186,000 blacks).**
- 4. Railroads in Northeast facilitated transportation**

Question: How did the North's and South's different resources affect the outcome of the Civil War?

D. Day Nine—Social Experience of the War (1 day)

- 1. Whole group book**
- 2. Additional readings on examples of women, African slaves (p.246), and children in the war.**

Questions: What responsibilities did women have at home during the war? What responsibilities did women have on the battlefield during the war? Why did soldiers choose to fight for the North? Why did soldiers choose to fight for the South? What role did African American soldiers play in the war? Why did some African Americans fight for the South?

IV. Connections: See how their book club books relate to the issues that happened in the civil war, especially the experiences of women and children.

Time line of Civil War Events

- Missouri Compromise, 1820, (reading from Encarta attached)
- Kansas-Nebraska Act, 1854, (reading from Encarta attached)
- Dred Scott Case, 1857, (reading from Encarta attached)
- Harpers Ferry, 1859, (p.233-4, but need more info.)
- Lincoln Elected President, 1860, (p.238)
- Secession of Southern States, 1861, (p. 239)
- Fort Sumter, 1861 (p. 239)
- First Battle of Bull Run, July 1861 (p. 242-3)
- Battles at Sea, 1862 (p.241)
- Bull Run II, August 29 and 30, 1862
- Antietam, September 17, 1862 (reading from Encarta attached)
- Emancipation Proclamation, New Years' Day, 1863 (p. 243-246)
- Chancellorsville, May 1863, (p. 243)
- Vicksburg, July 1863, (p. 246)
- Gettysburg, July 1863, (p.246)
- Gettysburg Address, November 1863, (p. 246)
- Lee Surrenders, April 1865, (p.246)
- (17)

In addition to the dates: Time line cards on the following people.

- Abraham Lincoln, (p. 230 and Encarta reading attached)
- Jefferson Davis, (p. 231-232)
- Frederick Douglass, (p.234)
- Harriet Tubman, (p. 235)
- Harriet Beecher Stow, (p. 236-7 and Encarta reading attached)
- Nat Turner (reading attached)

The following pages of Terri's unit plan had Additional Resources for Bull Run, Missouri Compromise, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Abraham Lincoln, Emancipation Proclamation, Surrender at Appomattox, Kansas-Nebraska Act. Dred Scott Case, Harpers Ferry, Nat Turner, and Antietam.

APPENDIX O

Record of Teacher Questions and Comments During Read Aloud Novel Behind Rebel Lines

Date	Teacher Questions / Comments	Literacy	Book Club	Social studies
5/8	-What was happening? (recapped) -What else was going on? -And did (sub) point out that this was a true story? -might involve some women's rights issues -did you guys talk with sub about some of the freedom issues? Any other freedom, rights going on here? – keep listening for them (st – immigrant citizens – T. explains “immigrant”)	Recap plot Genre	Freedom issues	
5/11	-we heard a little bit about what Emma had been up to – what do we know so far about what some women did in the Civil War? (refers to CW bulletin board including pictures and stories of women spies) -recaps plot – what do you think the risks of that could be? (disguise as slave) - students – get whipped, get found out & shot, disguise might come off -does anyone know who Jefferson Davis is, from our reading?	Recap plot Predictions		Generaliz e to women in CW Historica l figure
5/12	-recaps – what does he need? -why do you think the slaves chose to sing that song? What do you guys think about what (student) said, that they're singing about what they want? ... but why do you think this type of song? You could call it a genre. The types of songs...why do you think this type – this genre – would have been so popular with slaves?	Recap plot Genre?		Link with slavery issues in SS

5/13	-How is this book different or the same as books you're reading? -(James asks "what kind of book is it supposed to be?") T - see what they classify it as? Like historical fiction or a "fictionalized biography" 'cause usually in biographies you don't hear dialogue. -What's different about what you can learn for the 2 kinds of books? -(Vanessa - that tells a story and the other gives more information) T - so what could we learn from story? -why do you think, if we're reading all those informational books, that I chose to read this book to you? Think about it - I'll ask later -why are they called Quaker guns? -what do you guys think about the answer to my question? Why am I reading this kind of book instead of informational? Yes - because about CW, Yes - adventure, exciting. Fictionalized gives a sense of what day to day life was like. And it touches on different issues.	Genre Genre Genre - story Listen for Comprehension/Inference Fiction - adventure	Compare across RA & BC	Students link with CW T - everyday life
5/14	Different today - work at the easel -in this book what were some of the freedom issues? (students mention slaves, women, immigrants, freedom of speech) -how do these relate to other freedoms we've heard about? Wrote on easel (Civil War and other Freedoms) - compared Behind Rebel Lines with others.		Freedom issues - model task	
5/14	-what did we learn about what fighting a war was like? -Vanessa confused about what side Emma was on. T - can anyone help (they don't have slaves on the Union side) Recapped plot "Yes she went over to get lots of information. Not that she didn't like slaves, it's that she didn't like slavery"	Comprehension/plot recap		Generalize to CW - what fighting war was like

5/15	-What was the Union trying to do at that point? ..Military goal? (read about it yesterday) ..Trying to capture a place. -Vanessa "if there's a peddler already there - maybe checking as a spy". T - because already knew about 1 peddler who was a spy? Good caution. -"When she was feeling sort of sad about all the other men who had died - she said "it was brutal and cruel, the war, and yet she knew that the Union had to survive. For her that was all that mattered." So why is she fighting the war? -Remember that was a large part of the reason why the war started, about the Union. The south wanted to break away from the Union and the north wanted to keep it together. Why do you think that people in the north felt so strongly that the union shouldn't break up? Why was that so important to them? What can it be about the fact that all the states came together in one union that was so important to them? (James - they fought to be a country) - T "do you agree?" Recaps history. -Lynn "did the RW come before or after the CW? T - "when was the Revolutionary War? What dates?" and then "so did the CW then happen even a hundred years after the Revolutionary War?" - no, less than. Recaps again about history. -There was one other thing in here that we passed that Richard had said about the sickness that the soldier had that she came across. What was the name of that sickness? -And what did she say about was was happening with typhoid fever? This question is really important. -More men and boys in war died from things like typhoid fever and bad sanitation - gave examples -Lucky now because have new drugs and especially lucky in this country -take more questions	Details of plot Supports student connection Details of novel		Link with larger SS Reasons for CW Reasons for war Recaps history of RW and links to CW Sickness in CW Conditions in Civil war and in past
------	--	---	--	--

5/19	-It's been a few days - what was happening the last we read? -And how did Emma feel about finding the soldier and helping him?	Recap plot Character		
5/22	-what happened yesterday? (had had sub) -Any predictions about what trouble is coming? Responds to ideas about getting killed or injured or discovered. Gets ideas from 6 students.	Recap plot Predictions		

APPENDIX P

Dimensions of Student Learning in History

	Historical Understandings	Historical Thinking
National Center for History in Schools (Grades 5-12)	5 spheres of human activity: -social -political -scientific/ technological -economic -cultural	-Chronological thinking -Historical comprehension of variety of sources -Historical analysis and interpretation -Historical research -Historical issues-analysis and decision-making
Michigan Council for Social Studies (Later Elementary)	Historical Perspective: -Sequence of key events -lives and characters of individuals -decisive and divisive events from history	-Time and Chronology: sequence key events within early U.S. history; examine relationships & explain cause and effect, and sequence within an Era -Comprehending the Past: identify people, setting, and sequencing of events in narratives about American history -Analyzing and Interpreting the Past: compare interpretations written by others, using conflicting accounts, and create own narrative of events -Judging Decisions from the past: evaluate short and long-term consequences of decisions
School District Curriculum Guide (Fifth Grade)	<i>Knowledge:</i> -Major events of our past along basic timeline -Individuals & groups who have made significant contributions to political, technological, economic, & cultural life of U.S. -Global connection of the U.S. -How geography helped shape development of U.S. -How federal government works, with focus on Constitution and Bill of Rights	<i>Skills:</i> -Communication skills, using media and technology to access and process information, use variety of resources -Interpretation of tables, charts, graphs -Make reasoned decisions about public issues & demonstrate problem-solving -place events chronologically <i>Democratic values:</i> -Recognize right to express points of view, constitutional rights & their extension over time, importance of cultural diversity in development of country, role of law in democracy & implications for responsible citizenship <i>Civic participation:</i> -Participate in drafting & upholding school rules & resolving disputes

APPENDIX Q

Dimensions of Student Learning for Revolutionary War Unit

	Historical Understandings	Historical Thinking
National Center for History in Schools	Era 3: Revolution and the New Nation (1754-1820s) -Causes of Revolution, interests involved, reasons for American victory -Impact of Revolution on politics, economy, society -Institutions and practices of government created and revised, U.S. Constitution & Bill of Rights	-marshal evidence -consider multiple perspectives -establish temporal order -analyze multiple causation -interrogate historical data -compare and contrast ideas, values, behaviors, institutions -analyze cause-and-effect relationships -utilize quantitative data -draw on historical maps -formulate a position on an issue -examine influence of ideas -assess importance of individuals -explain historical continuity & change
MCSS	Revolution and the New Nation (1754-1815)	(Not specific to fifth grade)
School District Curriculum Guide	<i>Core Topics - Birth of a Nation:</i> French & Indian War, Stamp Act, Boston Massacre, Boston Tea Party, Declaration of Independence, Major Battles of Revolutionary War, Patriot, Loyalist, Minutemen, George Washington, Paul Revere, Thomas Jefferson, Lafayette, Charles Cornwallis, Abigail Adams, Molly Pitcher, Sybil Ludington <i>Core Topics -U.S. Constitution:</i> Articles of Confederation, Republic Democracy, Northwest Territory, Northwest Ordinance, Compromise, Preamble, Legislative, Executive, Judicial, Congress, Senate, House of Representatives, President, Supreme Court, Checks & Balances, Amendments, Bill of Rights, Federalists, Republicans, District of Columbia, Washington D.C., John Adams, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison	<i>Examples of Unit Outcomes:</i> -Identify causes (people, places, events) that led to birth of U.S. -Present arguments for independence as stated in Declaration of Independence -Explain how women helped win Revolution -Compare and contrast British and American causes -Contrast viewpoints of states rights versus federal government's need to pass laws -Explain how amendments affect you today -Explain opinion of founding person on issues of day

APPENDIX R

Dimensions of Student Learning for Civil War Unit

	Historical Understandings	Historical Thinking
National Center for History in Schools	Era 5: Civil War (and Reconstruction) (1850-1877) -Causes of the Civil War: understand differences in North and South and how politics & ideology led to war -Course and character of Civil War and its effects on American people: a) how resources affected course of war, including technology; turning points of war; Emancipation Proclamation – reasons, provisions, significance; Gettysburg Address – purpose, meaning, significance; Indian nations during and after war b) social experience of war on battlefield and homefront, including soldiers & women -(How various reconstruction plans succeeded or failed)	-draw on quantitative data -analyze multiple causation -analyze cause-and-effect relationships -examine the influence of ideas -compare competing historical narratives -utilize visual & mathematical data -assess importance of the individual in history -identify the author of historical document and assess its credibility -reconstruct patterns of historical succession and duration -evidence historical perspectives -consider multiple perspectives -compare and contrast differing sets of ideas -examine historical perspectives
MCSS	Civil War (and Reconstruction) Era (1850-1877)	(Benchmarks not specific to fifth grade)
School District Curriculum Guide	<i>Core Topics – Civil War (and Reconstruction)</i> -North & South lifestyles -Slavery -Abolitionists -Underground Railroad -Confederacy -Emancipation Proclamation -Secession -Union -Gettysburg -Harriet Tubman -Frederick Douglass -Abraham Lincoln -Jefferson Davis	<i>Examples of Unit Outcomes:</i> -List Confederate, Union, & Border states; define each term -List causes of Civil War -Explain functions of the Underground Railroad -Explain why the South seceded from the Union -Identify the following people: Harriet Tubman, Nat Turner, Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, Ulysses S. Grant, Clara Barton -List advantages and disadvantages of Union and Confederacy during the Civil War -(Describe Reconstruction and the changes that resulted from it)

APPENDIX S

IRA/NCTE Standards (1996)

1. Students read a wide range of print and nonprint texts to build an understanding of texts, of themselves, and of the cultures of the United States and the world; to acquire new information; to respond to the needs and demands of society and the workplace; and for personal fulfillment. Among these texts are fiction and nonfiction, classic and contemporary works.
2. Students read a wide range of literature from many periods in many genres to build an understanding of the many dimensions (e.g., philosophical, ethical, aesthetic) of human experience.
3. Students apply a wide range of strategies to comprehend, interpret, evaluate, and appreciate texts. They draw on their prior experience, their interactions with other readers and writers, their knowledge of word meaning and of other texts, their word identification strategies, and their understanding of textual features (e.g., sound-letter correspondence, sentence structure, context, graphics).
4. Students adjust their use of spoken, written, and visual language (e.g., conventions, style, vocabulary) to communicate with different audiences for a variety of purposes.
5. Students employ a wide range of strategies as they write and use different writing process elements appropriately to communicate with different audiences for a variety of purposes.
6. Students apply knowledge of language structure, language conventions, (e.g., spelling and punctuation), media techniques, figurative language, and genre to create, critique, and discuss print and nonprint texts.
7. Students conduct research on issues and interests by generating ideas and questions, and by posing problems. They gather, evaluate, and synthesize data from a variety of sources (e.g., print and nonprint texts, artifacts, people) to communicate their discoveries in ways that suit their purpose and audience.

8. **Students use a variety of technological and informational resources (e.g. libraries, databases, computer networks, video) to gather and synthesize information and to create and communicate knowledge.**
9. **Students develop an understanding of and respect for diversity in language use, patterns, and dialects across cultures, ethnic groups, geographic regions, and social roles.**
10. **Students whose first language is not English make use of their first language to develop competency in the English language arts and to develop understanding of content across the curriculum.**
11. **Students participate as knowledgeable, reflective, creative, and critical members of a variety of literacy communities.**
12. **Students use spoken, written, and visual language to accomplish their own purposes (e.g., for learning, enjoyment, persuasion, and the exchange of information).**

APPENDIX T

Michigan Language Arts Standards (1996)

Meaning and Communication

1. All students will read and comprehend general and technical material.
2. All students will demonstrate the ability to write clear and grammatically correct sentences, paragraphs, and compositions.
3. All students will focus on meaning and communication as they listen, speak, view, read, and write in personal, social, occupational, and civic contexts.

Language

4. All students will use the English language effectively.

Literature

5. All students will read and analyze a wide variety of classic and contemporary literature and other texts to seek information, ideas, enjoyment, and understanding of their individuality, our common heritage and common humanity, and the rich diversity in our society.

Voice

6. All students will learn to communicate information accurately and effectively and demonstrate their expressive abilities by creating oral, written, and visual texts that enlighten and engage an audience.

Skills and Processes

7. All students will demonstrate, analyze, and reflect upon the skills and processes used to communicate through listening, speaking, viewing, reading, and writing.

Genre and Craft of Language

8. All students will explore and use the characteristics of different types of texts, aesthetic elements, and mechanics - including text structure, figurative and descriptive language, spelling, punctuation, and grammar - to construct and convey meaning.

Depth of Understanding

9. All students will demonstrate understanding of the complexity of enduring issues and recurring problems by making connections and generating themes within and across texts.

Ideas in Action

10. All students will apply knowledge, ideas, and issues drawn from texts to their lives and the lives of others.

Inquiry and Research

11. All students will define and investigate important issues and problems using a variety of resources, including technology, to explore and create texts.

Critical Standards

12. All students will develop and apply personal, shared, and academic criteria for the enjoyment, appreciation, and evaluation of their own and others' oral, written, and visual texts.

APPENDIX U

Dimensions for Student Learning in Literature Study

IRA/NCTE Standards	(1) Students read a wide range of print and nonprint texts for a variety of purposes and within a variety of contexts, and discover connections among them (2) Students read a wide range of literature from many periods in many genres to build understanding of the many dimensions of human experience (philosophical, ethical, aesthetic) -learn about literary texts – metaphor, imagery, theme, etc. -genres – poetry, short stories, novels, plays, essays, biographies.. -learn about relevance of literature to own lives -learn terms, concepts, qualities of literary genres and analysis -reflect on values and beliefs of other cultures, times, places -explore moral and ethical complexities of human life, -explore multiple perspectives (3) Students apply a wide range of strategies to comprehend, interpret, evaluate, and appreciate texts e.g. interactions with others, knowledge of word meaning and other texts, word identification strategies, understanding of textual features -generalize demands and conventions of different genres -understand how purpose affects approach to reading -know how to vary reading strategies according to text, purpose,... (6) Students apply knowledge of language structure, language conventions, media techniques, figurative language, and genre to critique and discuss texts -attention to form and structure of text (9) Students develop understanding of and respect for diversity in language use, patterns& dialects across cultures, ethnic groups, geographic regions, social roles -recognize and honor cultural differences (11) Students participate as knowledgeable, reflective, creative, and critical members of a variety of literacy communities (12) Students use language to accomplish their own purposes
Michigan Language Arts Framework (and benchmarks for later elementary grades)	Meaning and Communication (1) All students will read and comprehend general and technical material -use reading for multiple purposes (enjoyment, gathering information, learning new procedures, increasing conceptual understanding) -read with developing fluency a variety of texts -employ multiple strategies to construct meaning -employ multiple strategies to recognize words as they construct meaning -respond to texts and compare their responses to those of their peers (3) All students will focus on meaning and communication -integrate listening, speaking, viewing, reading, and writing skills for multiple purposes and in varied contexts -employ multiple strategies to construct meaning (summarize, predict, generate questions, map, examine picture cues, use phonic analysis, analyze word and sentence structure, discuss with peers, use context and text structure) -determine meaning of unfamiliar words and concepts by using variety of resources (prior knowledge, context, glossaries, electronic sources) Literature

	(5) All students will read and analyze a wide variety of classic and contemporary literature and other texts to seek information, ideas, enjoyment, and understanding of their individuality, our common heritage and common humanity, and the rich diversity in our society -select, read, and respond thoughtfully to classic and contemporary texts recognized for quality and literary merit -describe and discuss the shared human experiences depicted in literature and other texts from around the world -demonstrate awareness that characters and communities in literature and other texts reflect life in that they are portrayed in both positive and negative ways -describe how various culture and our common heritage are represented in literature and other texts -describe how characters in literature and other texts form opinions about one another in ways that can be fair and unfair Skills and Processes (7) All students will demonstrate, analyze, and reflect upon the skills and processes used to communicate through listening, speaking, viewing, reading, and writing -use combination of strategies when encountering unfamiliar texts -monitor their progress while using variety of strategies to overcome difficulties -apply new learning by forming questions and setting learning goals that will aid in self-regulation and reflection on their developing literacy Genre and Craft of Language (8) All students will explore and use the characteristics of different types of texts, aesthetic elements and mechanics - including text structure, figurative and descriptive language, spelling, punctuation, and grammar - to construct and convey meaning -identify elements of various narrative genre and story elements (theme, plot, conflict, characterization) -identify aspect of the craft of the writer to formulate and express ideas artistically (perspective, dialogue, characterization, metaphor, simile, points of view) Depth of Understanding (9) All students will demonstrate understanding of the complexity of enduring issues and recurring problems by making connections and generating themes within and across texts -explore and reflect on universal themes and substantive issues from texts -draw parallels and contrasts among key ideas, concepts, and varied perspectives found in multiple texts -use conclusions based on their understanding of differing views presented in text to support a position Ideas in Action (10) All students will apply knowledge, ideas, and issues drawn from texts to their lives and the lives of others -identify how their own experiences influence their understanding of key ideas in literature and other texts -use texts to research how individuals have had an impact on people in their community or nation Critical Standards (12) All students will develop and apply personal, shared, and academic criteria for the enjoyment, appreciation, and evaluation of their own and others' texts -make choices in reading based on aesthetic qualities, and supply a rationale
--	---

APPENDIX V

Book Club Research Sheets: Civil War and Freedom Unit

Names: _____

Book Club Research Sheet

Book Club Focus: _____

Instructions:

As you read in your book club books, keep a look out for the information you need! When you find something, make a note about it using this worksheet.

Important Events During My Era

Important Event That Happened	Date & Brief Description of What Happened	Book I Read About It In and Page #

Important People from My Era

Important Person from the Era	Brief Description of the Person	Book I Read About Him/Her In and Page #

Freedom Issues in the Era We're Reading About

People had the following freedoms in this era: (What sorts of freedoms did people have during this era?)

People didn't have some freedoms, here are some they didn't have:

To get the freedom they wanted, people did these things to try to win their freedom:

These freedom issues are like some of the others we've studied about this year. Here are some ways they are the same. (How do these freedom issues relate to ones that we studied during the rest of the school year?)

Interesting Facts We Learned About the Era

Here are some interesting things we learned about while we were reading:

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, D. (1989). Intellectual and practical criteria for successful curriculum integration. In H.H. Jacobs (Ed.), Interdisciplinary curriculum: Design and implementation (pp. 25-37). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Adler, M. (1984). The Paideia Program: An educational syllabus. New York: Macmillan.
- Ahlgren, A. & Kesidou, S. (1995). Attempting curriculum coherence in Project 2061. In J.A. Beane (Ed.), Toward a coherent curriculum, 1995 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp.44-54). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Alleman, J. & Brophy, J. (1993). Is curriculum integration a boon or a threat to social studies? Social Education, 57 (6), 287-291.
- Alleman, J. & Rosaen, C. (1991). The cognitive, social-emotional, and moral development characteristics of students: Basis for elementary and middle school social studies. In J. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning. (A project of the National Council for the social studies) (pp. 121-133). New York: Macmillan.
- Alvermann, D. (1994). Trade books and textbooks: Making connections across content areas. In L.M. Morrow, J.K. Smith, & L.C. Wilkinson (Eds.), Integrated language arts: Controversy to consensus (pp.51-69). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn Bacon.
- Apple, M. (1995). Facing Reality. In J.A. Beane (Ed.), Toward a coherent Curriculum, 1995 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp. 130-138). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Avi, (1984). The fighting ground. New York: Harper Collins.
- Barab, S. & Landa, A. (1997). Designing interdisciplinary anchors. Educational Leadership, 54 (6), 52- 55.

- Barr, I. & McGuire, M. (1997). Social Studies and effective stories. In M.E. Haas & Margaret A. Laughlin (Eds.), Meeting the standards: Social studies readings for K-6 educators (pp.292-294). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Barth, R. (1972/1975). Open education: Assumptions about children, learning and knowledge. In M. Golby, J. Greenwald, & R. West (Eds.), Curriculum Design (pp. 58-81). London: Croon Helm.
- Beane, J. (1995). Toward a coherent curriculum: 1995 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Beane, J. (1997). Curriculum integration: Designing the core of democratic Education. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bernstein, B. (1975). Class, codes, and control: Vol.3. Towards a theory of educational transmissions (2nd ed.) London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bogdan, R. & Biklin, S. (1992). Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theory and methods (2nd ed.) Needham, Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boix-Mansilla, V. & Gardner, H. (1997). Of kinds of disciplines and kinds of understanding. In Phi Delta Kappan, January.
- Boyer, E. (1995). The educated person. In J.A. Beane (Ed.), Toward a coherent curriculum, 1995 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp. 16-25). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Brady, M. (1989). What's worth teaching? Selecting, organizing, and integrating Knowledge. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Brady, M. (1995). A supradisciplinary curriculum. In J.A. Beane (Ed.), Toward a coherent curriculum , 1995 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp.26-33). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Brandt, R. (1998). Powerful learning. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Brooks, J. & Brooks, M. (1993). In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Brophy, J. (1999). The development of knowledge and empathy. In Social Education, 63, 39-45.
- Brophy, J. & Alleman, J. (1991). A caveat: Curriculum integration isn't always a good idea. In Educational Leadership, 49 (2) 6.
- Bruer, J. (1998). Brain science, brain fiction. Educational Leadership, 56 (3), 14-18.
- Bruner, J. (1960/1977). The process of education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1986). Actual minds, possible worlds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1990). Acts of meaning. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burns, R. (1995). Dissolving the boundaries: Planning for curriculum integration in middle and secondary schools. Appalachia Educational Laboratory.
- Caine, R. & Caine, G. (1991). Making connections: Teaching and the human Brain. Innovative Learning Publications: Addison-Wesley.
- Caine, R. & Caine, G. (1997). Education on the edge of possibility. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Calkins, L. (1994). The art of teaching writing. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Case, R. (1991a). The anatomy of curricular integration. Canadian Journal of Education 16:2, 215-224.
- Case, R. (1991b). Integrating around themes: An overemphasized tool? Forum on Curricular Integration (FOCI): Occasional paper #7. Vancouver: Tri-University Integration Project, Simon Fraser University.
- Case, R. (1997). Integrating the curriculum: Getting beyond the slogan. In R. Case & P. Clark (Eds.), The Canadian anthology of social studies: Issues and strategies for teachers (pp.330-338). Barnaby, BC: Simon Fraser University.

- Collier, J. & Collier, C. (1974). My brother Sam is dead. New York: MacMillan Publishing.
- Coombs, J. (1991). Thinking seriously about curriculum integration. Forum on Curricular Integration (FOCI): Occasional paper #4. Vancouver: Tri-University Integration Project, Simon Fraser University.
- Cope, B. & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.) (1993). The powers of literacy: A genre approach to teaching writing. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Court, D. (1991). Curricular integration and teachers' personal practical knowledge. Forum on Curricular Integration (FOCI): Occasional paper #5. Vancouver: Tri-University Integration Project, Simon Fraser University.
- Cross, B. (1995). The case for culturally coherent curriculum. In J.A. Beane (Ed.), Toward a coherent curriculum, 1995 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp.71-86). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Davis, O. (1997). The personal nature of curricular integration. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 12, 95-97.
- Dewey, J. (1902/1964). In R.D. Archambault (Ed.) John Dewey on Education: Selected writings. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Downey, M. & Levstik, L. (1991). Teaching and learning history. In J. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning. (A project of the National Council for the social studies) (pp.400-410). New York: Macmillan.
- Drake, S. (1991). How our team dissolved the boundaries. Educational Leadership, October, 20-22.
- Drake, S. (1993). Planning integrated curriculum: The call to adventure. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Egan, K. (1997). Story forms and romantic perspectives: Alternative frameworks for planning in social studies. In R. Case & P. Clark (Eds.), The Canadian anthology of social studies: Issues and strategies for teachers. (pp. 309-318). Barnaby, BC: Simon Fraser University.

- Embriano, A. & Ryan, M. (1995, March). Using interdisciplinary block programming for underachieving pupils. NASSP Bulletin: The curriculum: Challenge and change, 38-45.
- Fogarty, R. (1991). The Mindful School: How to integrate the curricula. Arlington Heights, IL: IRI/Skylight Training and Publishing, Inc.
- Forbes, E. (1943). Johnny Tremain. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Fowler, C. (1994). Strong arts, strong schools. Educational Leadership, November.
- Gabella, M. (1994). Beyond the looking glass: Bringing students into the conversation of historical inquiry. Theory and Research in Social Education, Number 3 (pp. 340-363). National Council for the Social Studies.
- Galda, L. (1998). Mirrors and windows: Reading as transformation. In T. Raphael & K. Au (Eds.) Literature-based instruction: Reshaping the curriculum (pp. 1-12). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.
- Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind. New York: Basic Books.
- Gavelek, J., Raphael T., Biondo, S., Wang, D. (1999) Integrated literacy instruction: A review of the literature. CIERA Report #2-0001. Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement.
- Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In The interpretation of cultures. New York: Basic Books.
- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1975). The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine.
- Gold, A. (1997). Memories of Anne Frank. New York: Scholastic.
- Greene, M. (1995). Notes on the search for coherence. In J.A. Beane (Ed.), Toward a coherent curriculum , 1995 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp.139-145). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Greenfield, S. (1997). The human brain: A guided tour. New York: Basic Books.

- Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. (1983). Ethnography: Principles in practice. New York: Routledge.
- Hickey, G. (1997). Reading and Social Studies: The critical connection. In M.E. Haas & Margaret A. Laughlin (Eds.), Meeting the standards: Social studies readings for K-6 educators (pp.330-332). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Hirst, P.H. (1971/1975). The logic of the curriculum. In M. Golby, J. Greenwald, & R. West (Eds.), Curriculum Design (pp. 181-193). London: Croon Helm.
- Holmes Group Report. (1990). Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools.
- Hughes, M. (1994). Curriculum integration in the primary grades: A framework for excellence. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Jacobs, H.H. (1989). Interdisciplinary curriculum: Design and implementation. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Jackson, P. (1992). Conceptions of curriculum and curriculum specialists. In P. Jackson (Ed.), Handbook of research on curriculum (3-40). New York: Macmillan.
- Jenkins, K. (1991). Rethinking History. London: Routledge.
- Jensen, E. (1998). Teaching with the brain in mind. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Kain, D. (1996). Recipes or dialogue? A middle school team conceptualizes "curricular integration." Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, Vol. 11, 163-187.
- Kazemek, F. (1997). Human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability: Bibliographies of Martin Luther King, Jr., in the classroom. In M.E. Haas & Margaret A. Laughlin (Eds.), Meeting the standards: Social studies readings for K-6 educators (pp. 342-346). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Keehn, S. (1997). Moon of two dark horses. Madison, WI: Turtleback Books.

- Kellough, R. et al. (1996). Integrating Language Arts and Social Studies for intermediate and middle school students. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.
- Kilpatrick, W. (1927/1975). A project curriculum. In M. Golby, J. Greenwald, & R. West (Eds.), Curriculum Design (pp. 269-271). London: Croon Helm.
- Kliebard, H. (1987). The Struggle for the American Curriculum 1893-1958. New York: Routledge.
- Klein, J. (1990). Interdisciplinarity: History, theory, and practice. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Kniep, W. & Martin-Kniep, G. (1995). Designing schools and curriculums for the 21st Century. In J.A. Beane (Ed.), Toward a coherent curriculum, 1995 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp.87-100). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Knight, M. (1993). Who belongs here? An American story. Gardiner, ME: Tilbury House.
- Knight, P. (1993). Primary geography, primary history. London: David Fulton Publisher.
- Kovalik, S. (1986). Teachers make the difference. Village of Oak Creek, AZ: Susan Kovalik and Associates.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). A coherent curriculum in an incoherent society? Pedagogical perspectives on curriculum reform. In J.A. Beane (Ed.), Toward a coherent curriculum, 1995 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (pp.158-169). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Laney, J., Moseley, P. & Pak, L. (1996). Children's ideas about selected art and economic concepts before and after an integrated unit of instruction. Children's Social and Economics Education, Vol 1, No. 1, 61-78.
- Langer, J. (1995). Envisioning literature: Literary understanding and literature Instruction. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lemlech, J. (1982) Integration of basic skills: the great deception in elementary social studies. The Social Studies, Nov/Dec.

- Levstik, L. (1989). Historical narrative and the young reader. Theory into Practice, XXVIII, Number 2, pp.114-119.
- Levstik, L. (1993). Building a sense of history in a first-grade classroom. Advances in Research on Teaching, Vol.4, 1-31
- Levstik, L. & Barton, K. (1997). Doing history: Investigating with children in elementary and middle schools. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Levstik, L. & Pappas, C. (1992, Fall). New directions for studying historical understanding. Theory and Research in Social Education, XX, Number 4, pp369-385.
- Lounsbury, J. (Ed.) (1992). Connecting the curriculum through interdisciplinary instruction. Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.
- Mansfield, B. (1997). Students' Perceptions of an integrated unit. In M.E. Haas & Margaret A. Laughlin (Eds.), Meeting the standards: Social studies readings for K-6 educators (pp.300-304). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Martin-Kniep, G., Feige, D., & Soodak, L. (1995). Curriculum integration: an expanded view of an abused idea. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, Vol. 10, No. 3, 227-249
- May, W. (1992). What are the subjects of STS - Really? Theory Into Practice, Vol. XXXI, No. 1, Winter.
- McGowan, T., Erickson, L., & Neufeld, J. (1997). With reason and rhetoric: Building the case for the literature-social studies connection. In M.E. Haas & Margaret A. Laughlin (Eds.), Meeting the standards: Social studies readings for K-6 educators (pp.342-346). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- McKay, R. (1997). Promoting the aesthetic experience: Responding to literature in social studies. In R. Case & P. Clark (Eds.), The Canadian anthology of social studies: Issues and strategies for teachers. (pp. 349-360). Barnaby, BC: Simon Fraser University.

- Meinbach, A., Rothlein, L., & Fredericks, A. (1995). The complete guide to thematic units: Creating the integrated curriculum. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.
- Merryfield, M. (1991). Science-Technology-Society and global perspectives. Theory Into Practice, Vol. XXX, No. 4, Autumn.
- Michigan Department of Education (1996). Michigan Framework for Social Studies Education.
- Miller, J. (1990). Holistic learning: A teacher's guide to integrated studies. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Morrow, L., Wilkinson, L., & Smith, J. (1994). Introduction to the issues. In Morrow, L., Smith, J. & Wilkinson, L. (Eds). Integrated language arts: Controversy to consensus. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Neil, A. (1960). Summerhill. New York: Hart Publishing.
- National Center for History in the Schools. (1996). National Standards for History. Los Angeles, CA: National Center for History in the Schools.
- National Council of Teachers of English & International Reading Association. (1996). Standards for the English Language Arts.
- Noddings, N. (1986). Fidelity in teaching, teacher education and research on teaching. Harvard Educational Review, 56 (4).
- O'Dell, S. (1980). Sarah Bishop. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Panaritis, P. (1995). Beyond brainstorming: Planning an interdisciplinary program. Phi Delta Kappan, April, 623-628.
- Pappas, C., Kiefer, B., & Levstik, L. (1990). An integrated language perspective in the elementary school. New York: Longman.
- Perkins, D.N. (1989). Selecting fertile themes for integrated learning. In H.H. Jacobs (Ed.), Interdisciplinary curriculum: Design and implementation (pp.67-76). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Peters, T., Schubeck, K., & Hopkins, K. (1995). A thematic approach: Theory and practice at the Aleknagik School. Phi Delta Kappan, April 1995, 633-636.

- Petrie, H. (1992). Interdisciplinary education: Are we faced with insurmountable opportunities? In G. Grant (Ed). (1992). Review of research in education, Volume 18, 299-333. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.
- Phenix. P. (1964/1975). Realms of meaning. In M. Golby, J. Greenwald, & R. West (Eds.), Curriculum Design (pp. 165-173). London: Croon Helm.
- Pinar, W., Reynolds, W., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. (1995). Understanding curriculum. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Pring. R. (1972/1975). Curriculum integration. In M. Golby, J. Greenwald, & R. West (Eds.), Curriculum Design (pp. 272-278). London: Croon Helm.
- Probst, R. (1990). Literature and Literacy. In G. Hawisher & A. Soter (Eds.) Literacy and its teaching. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Raphael, T. & Hiebert, E. (1996). Creating an integrated approach to literacy Instruction. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.
- Raphael, T. & McMahon, S. (1994). Book Club: An alternative framework for reading instruction. The Reading Teacher, Vol. 48 (2), (pp. 102-116).
- Raphael, T., McMahon, S., Goatley, V., Bentley, J., Boyd, F., Pardo, L., & Woodman, D. (1992). Research directions: Literature and discussion in the reading program. Language Arts, Vol 69, Jan. (pp. 54-61).
- Reit, S. (1988). Behind Rebel Lines. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace & Co.
- Rinaldi, A. (1986). Time enough for drums. New York: Dell-Laurel Leaf.
- Rosenblatt, L. (1978). The reader, the text, and the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Rosenblatt, L. (1991). Literature - S.O.S.! Language Arts, 68 (6), (pp. 444-448).
- Roth, K. (1994). Second thoughts about interdisciplinary studies. American Educator, Spring, 44-48.
- Schmidt, W., Roehler, L., Caul, J., Buchman, M., Diamond, B. Solomon, D, & Cianciolo, P. (1985). The uses of curriculum integration in Language Arts instruction: A study of six classrooms. Journal of Curriculum Studies, Vol. 17, No. 3, 305-320.

- Schubert, W.H. (1995). Toward lives worth living and sharing: Historical perspective on curriculum coherence. In J.A. Beane (Ed.), Toward a coherent curriculum, 1995 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp.146-157). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Schwab, J. (1978). Science, curriculum, and liberal education: Selected Essays. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sebasta, S. (1989). Literature across the curriculum. In Steigig, J. & Leaton, S. (Eds.) Using literature in the elementary classroom. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Seely, A. (1995). Integrated thematic units. Westminster, CA: Teacher Created Materials.
- Shanahan, T., Robinson, B., Schneider, M. (1995). Avoiding some of the pitfalls of thematic units. The Reading Teacher, Vol. 48, No. 8, 718-719.
- Shanahan, T. (1997). Reading-writing relationships, thematic units, inquiry learning...In pursuit of effective integrated literacy instruction. The Reading Teacher, Vol. 51, No. 1, 12-19.
- Stake, R. (1988). Case study methods in educational research: Seeking sweet water. In R. Yaeger (Ed.) Complementary methods for research in education. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.
- Stodolsky, S. (1988). The subject matters: classroom activity in math and social Studies. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sylwester, R. (1995). A celebration of neurons: An educator's guide to the human Brain. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Tchudi, S. & Lafer, S. (1996). The interdisciplinary teacher's handbook: Integrated teaching across the curriculum. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Vars, G. (1991). Integrated curriculum in historical perspective. Educational Leadership, October, 14-15.

- Vygotsky, L. (1986). Thought and language. (A. Kozulin, Trans.) Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Walmsley, S. (1994). Children exploring their world: Theme teaching in elementary school. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Walmsley, S. (1998). Literature as a core component of the elementary literacy program. In T. Raphael & K. Au (Eds.) Literature-based instruction: Reshaping the curriculum. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.
- Wells, (1990). Creating the conditions to encourage literate thinking. Educational Leadership, March, (13-16).
- Wiggins, G. (1995). Curricular coherence and assessment: Making sure that the effect matches the intent. In J.A. Beane (Ed.), Toward a coherent curriculum, 1995 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp.101-119). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Wiggins, G. & McTighe, J. (1998). Understanding by design. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Willis, S. (1992). Interdisciplinary learning: Movement to link the disciplines gains momentum. ASCD Curriculum Update. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, November.
- Wilson, E. (1998). Consilience: the unity of knowledge. New York: Vintage Books.
- Wolk, S. (1994). Project-based learning: Pursuits with a purpose. Educational Leadership, November, 42-45.
- Zarnowski, M. (1997). Learning about contemporary women: sharing biographies with children. In M.E. Haas & Margaret A. Laughlin (Eds.), Meeting the standards: Social studies readings for K-6 educators (pp.339-341). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 02092 5271