

2013

Susan Bauer's 2003 Theory of Well-Educated Mind: Could the Classical Approach to Teaching History Work in Southern California History K12 Classrooms?

Tomasz B. Stanek

California State University, San Bernardino

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.claremont.edu/lux>

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Educational Methods Commons](#), [European History Commons](#), [Liberal Studies Commons](#), [Other History Commons](#), [Secondary Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stanek, Tomasz B. (2013) "Susan Bauer's 2003 Theory of Well-Educated Mind: Could the Classical Approach to Teaching History Work in Southern California History K12 Classrooms?," *LUX: A Journal of Transdisciplinary Writing and Research from Claremont Graduate University*: Vol. 3: Iss. 1, Article 17.

Available at: <http://scholarship.claremont.edu/lux/vol3/iss1/17>

Susan Bauer's 2003 Theory of Well-Educated Mind: Could the Classical Approach to Teaching History Work in Southern California History K12 Classrooms?

Tomasz B. Stanek
California State University, San Bernardino

Abstract

The main purpose of this research evolved from the publication of S. W. Bauer Well-educated mind, a study of the significance of new methods of teaching history course. Bauer (2003) argues that the grammarian approach of simple recognition and memorization removes students from reading primary sources. This theory suggests a new methodology for the instructors and students through the three-stage process of grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric preparation with aid of primary sources or "great books list". This paper supports Bauer's thesis and provides evidence through extensive interviews that indeed this concept of pedagogy is present in Southern California schools.

The statistical data from the Department of Education tend to piece together all social sciences, including history, into summary reports or longitudinal studies. In general, however, more graduating high school students earned their greater share of credits in the social studies and history (Townsend, 2010). In the span of this decade, the data and statistical analyses were derived only from the measurable trends embedded in the state-level standards and their measurements (Townsend, 2010). The Department of Education electronic publications on all education reforms show that "the social studies and history are only valued as test-worthy in 11 states" (Townsend, 2010, p 1101). In comparison, all of the states test for English, math, and science (USDE, 2005).

Most of the analysis of this (NAEP 2002) report expressed concern that many students possessed a below basic knowledge of American history and history in general. History courses are a critical part of our nation's school curriculum. "it is through history that we understand our past and contemplate our future" (Ravitch, 2002, p. 2). Ravitch (2002) estimated that all "published questions that stumped so many students involved the most fundamental concepts of our democracy, our growth as a nation, and our role in the world" (p. 2). Ravitch insists in her call by invoking President Bush's No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, and criticizing those who said the administration was not spending enough on education, it must be pointed out that education spending has risen from \$23 billion in 1996 to \$50 billion in the 2002 budget. (p. 2)

Furthermore, Ravitch's assessment showed that "use of primary sources was related to higher student achievement among eighth-grade students, and twelfth-graders who read biographies performed better than students who did not" (p. 2).

Statement of Problem

The purpose of this exploratory study is to discover how courses in World History and, the United States History are taught in Southern California secondary schools. At this stage of the research the study of the history course instruction will be generally defined as an exploratory and investigative inquiry involving the interviews of the history faculty, analysis of their course offerings and syllabi content, and the overall teachers' course content preparation and knowledge. The study involves the research instrument and interviews of teachers in high schools located within Southern California school districts. The aim of this exploratory research is to determine the extent to which traditional grammarian instruction in history could be remedied by the introduction of the *paideia* and the "great books" concept approach as defined by Susan W. Bauer (2003). Further, the assessment will focus on the instructional quality, the use of the primary sources and literature, as well as on the application of the *trivium* of grammarian, dialectic, and the rhetoric concepts in teaching history, as well as, the Bloom's (1960) taxonomy model.

Definition of Terms and Constructs

1. Continued education and individuation in learning: *paideia*.
2. *Trivium*: grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric methods in instruction.
3. Social and cultural reproduction: positive or negative depending on the quality of instructors and methods used in history pedagogy.
4. Bauer's (2003) concept of "well-educated mind." The terms included in Bauer's concept include: classical education methodology, self-education, learning through literature, *paideia*, and *trivia*. Bauer (2003) postulates that anyone may become "well-educated" through reading, critical understanding, and eloquence of speech. A critical piece in her theory involves the usage of the classic literary pieces known as the "great books" concept that moves learners from grammarian *trivia* to logic and eloquence in mastery of the subject, which is a similar approach to Adler's (1982) learning mastery.
5. *Primary sources*, as used in this study, refers to the use of documents, artifacts, photographs, and other items that are used by historians to develop historical understanding of the past. Bauer (2003) defined a primary source as "firsthand evidence of historical events or periods."

Literature Review

Because this study focuses on and incorporates the history of the Western Civilization, World History, and the United States History courses and the theoretical pedagogical assumptions built by Bauer (2007), as well as the practical implications for K12 and the community colleges in the field of history, it is necessary to examine the essential and critical pieces of the literature, which contribute to this study. In order to effectively do this, and in keeping with the theoretical considerations which this study proposes, the literature review is divided into its three components of approach. Each section contributes to an overall scenario of the dramatic changes through which the history curriculum is taught and developed in the higher education institutions in the United States. The first component deals with the Eurocentric

curriculum. Second, the approach focuses on Bauer's (2003) theoretical framework for teaching the Western Civilization, World, or the United States history course through her constructed prism of the "well-educated mind." The third component of the literature review helps to understand the postmodern philosophy and its pressures on the Classical canon of the Western Civilization and World History courses. The purpose of this study is to trace the Bourdieu's (1990) social reproduction theory through teachers of the K-12 environment and how it shapes our learning of history across the institutions, Giroux's (1990) essence of the *public intellectuals* in instructors at all levels, and to inquire whether Bauer's (2003) and Adler's (1982) concept of the "great books" could indeed help teachers to equip students to become well-educated, as defined by Bauer (2003).

Global and Eurocentric Perspectives on Teaching History

Curriculum and the pedagogy is the foundation of an educational system. A structured body of course requirements is connected to the underlying philosophies of particular cultural values and assumptions (James, 2007). This is particularly true for the traditional American curriculum where all cultural values and assumptions are based on the European or Eurocentric perspectives, traditions, and focus. The term "Eurocentric" means "centered or focused on Europe or European peoples, especially in relations to historical or cultural influence" (*The American Heritage Dictionary*, 2000). Several main characteristics illustrate this traditional curricular approach in our modern American educational system: first, it definitely focuses on Western Europe in principle and derives its depth from early Greek and Roman traditions; second, it pinpoints dates, names, and events, and third, it shapes and builds our common culture within the confines and constructs of the Western Civilization discourse (Bok, 2006; Lefkowitz, 2008; Hanson 2001; Watts, 2006).

There is a peer-reviewed debate surrounding the course of Western Civilization and what it should provide in both settings: secondary and collegiate (Slekar, 2006; Swartz, 2008; Bok 2006; Yilmaz, 2008; DeOlivera, 2006; Orrill & Shapiro, 2005). A Western Civilization course is typically divided into a two-semester sequence. The division in most textbooks and courses is placed around the date of the fall of Constantinople in 1453 C.E. (Swartz, 2008; Bok 2006; Yilmaz, 2008; DeOlivera, 2006; Orrill & Shapiro, 2005). Although a typical course focuses on just one of the world's civilizations, it is the civilization that is near and dear to many Americans and is the source for many of our values, institutions, and beliefs. Those that support this course (Swartz, 2008; Bok 2006; Illinois, 1998), argue that it is imperative for students to understand the foundations of this particular worldview. World historians or the proponents of "Big History" view the Western Civilization course as a mere description of only one of many civilizations, and find the call for just a Western civilization course narrow and arrogant (Stokes-Brown, 2007; Davis, 2004; Jenkins, 1991). Stokes-Brown (2007), Davis (2004), and Jenkins (1991) purport that the term itself, the "civilization," demeans other regions as just a history tale but imports the syllogism of Western history and the civilization as if others were not civilized or came second (Bishop, 2005; Hallet, Green, Davidson, & Slavitt, 2002). Consequently, in the nineteenth century the common understanding and usage was that Europeans had civilization and others had culture or were savages. Illinois (1998) discusses further the defeat behind the concept of a holistic approach to world history in our modern education, and attempts to avoid making random value judgments pertaining to different civilizations (Illinois, 1998). Ironically, an easy solution of a grammatical description "Western History" could indeed dismiss the

unproductive discussions surrounding the hegemonic and imperialistic syllogisms of the noun “civilization” in Western Civilization course. Nonetheless, this is not an argument for an abrupt abandonment of our national and Western Civilization curriculum nor is it a call suggesting that the study of Western Civilization precludes the acknowledgement of other cultures.

The purpose of this work is not to defend or to attack the content of our current Western Civilization courses but to reexamine its achievements and the socio-cultural traditions to construct a well-defined instructional and pedagogical example of “well-educated mind” as coined by Bauer (2003). This theoretical framework composed and thought of by Bauer (2003) illustrates a desired theoretical content and the preferred instructional knowledge familiarity in the Western Civilization course both by the students and their instructors as basis for of her thesis: a “well-educated mind.”

Although other forms of curricula were developed in the recent decades to address the multiculturalism in the field of history, (e.g., World History, African, Chicano, and Oriental specializations), the Eurocentric curriculum remains as the dominant form in the United States (Bok, 2006; D’Souza, 1991; Weinberg, 2008). Of the many reasons that exist to address this state of being, the most commonly held is that the dominant and hegemonic (Anglo-American) culture uses its power to select what it deems best suited for Americans and those to be Americanized. Simply, Americanization pertains to this process of learning common background of knowledge, values, history, social interactions, and language. Hirsche’s (1999) response to a system of common knowledge or a part of Americanization has more than one basis. He states on page 94, “This system of common knowledge and root attitudes needs to be imparted in school not just to achieve a citizenry competent to rule itself, but also to achieve a community, social peace, and, not least, economic justice.” Hirsche (1999, p. 31) points exactly to the limited opportunities in the United States, particularly opportunities of freedom and earning power to those individuals who have not mastered the subtle use of English in speech and cultural constructs. Perhaps the education as we see it in our curriculum and its potential benefits could free society from long standing paradigms of Western societies that created divisions based on wealth and education. On the other hand, however, the dominant and ruling classes could afford formal schooling and were engaged in subjects having to do with intellectual and higher level thinking skills, such as critical thinking, philosophy, science, and the arts. This type of education, in conjunction with moral education, added to the assumption that the privileged class would rule wisely and justly, and understanding of the plight of the workers and the masses. The moral education given to the masses exhorted them to obey, respect authority, work harder, be thrifty, and suffer with little to no complaining (Nelson et al., 2000). Bourdieu (2004) provided a similar argument with his *Gramscian* perspective that schools reproduce: “cultural capital” for those occupying positions of advantage. From Apple’s (2000) perspective, attention should be given to material conditions, class conflict, and the social structures that support them; namely, the educational theory that fails to do so is thereby weakened. In *Teachers as Intellectuals*, Giroux (1988) calls for a critical pedagogy that views teachers as “cultural workers” who are “transformative intellectuals” occupying special social and political roles. Through these prisms teachers become scholars and practitioners, and their role is not simply to teach a body of knowledge but to help students understand how curricular knowledge may serve them in life to liberate themselves. By connecting the terms: “cultural workers,” and “cultural social reproduction,” Susan W. Bauer’s approach to “well-educated mind” may find its purpose through wide promotion of the intellectual knowledge found in teachers through *paideia*. Bauer (2003) in a similar manner to Zoja’s (1997), “attempts to discover an important

historical precedent for the concept of individuation in the idea of *paideia*, which today, mistakenly, is often understood to have been simply the form of education practiced in ancient Greece” (Bauer, 2002, p. 167). *Paideia*, however, is not limited to the education of students but it was conceived as a continued process of life-long learning, especially for the instructors, in a form of a personal pedagogical potential.

Although the purpose of this work is not a critical one in postmodern terms, the theoretical backing of Bourdieu’s (1990) and Giroux’s (1988) theories could help to understand some basic consequences of Bauer’s (2003) pedagogical formulations. Simply, a well-educated instructor may culturally and socially construct a well-educated student. Another important implication of Bauer’s (2003) usage of the *trivium* of grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric is revealed through Giroux’s *Border Pedagogy* concept that “stresses the necessity of providing students with the opportunity to engage critically the strengths and limitations of the cultural and social codes that define their own histories and narratives” (Giroux, 1988, p. 64). As a result, usage of *trivium* develops a sense of healthy skepticism towards all discourse authorities by questioning the events and their results throughout history.

One of the most essential tools championed by Bauer (2003) is the program of “great books” of the Western World. It was first addressed and articulated by Hutchins and Adler (1982), and stressed the understanding of knowledge that has been passed down through ages in form of the greatest literary works. Following this line of reasoning, one suggestion for educational reform that began in 1982 as a direct effect of Adler’s publication of *The Paideia Proposal* calls for a series of proposals and recommendations, which include (a) that schooling should be a one-track system, and (b) that it be general, non-specialized, and non-vocational (Adler, 1982; Schervish, 2003; Miller, 2007; Weltman, 2002). For Adler, all students should encounter the great ideas of philosophy, mathematics, history, geography, and social studies, and the best ways of teaching them is through the *Socratic* method of questions and answers. In response to the charge of being elitist, Adler claimed that his approach to learning was designed for all students, not just those who were college bound.

Eurocentric curriculum in the United States and in Europe constitutes the most prominent form of educational curriculum. Its origin can be traced back to the Platonic Academy, Aristotelian Lyceum, or Alexandrian Museum of 4th century B.C.E through the Enlightenment onto the 20th century. It was during this wide era when the concept of humanism became popular and foremost evident in Western epistemology. Humanism is a doctrine primarily concerned with human beings and their values, capacities, reason, and achievements (Kliebard, 1989). Two concepts associated with humanism are cultural and literary; first, based on rational experimentation, and second, with pursuits of the humanities in literature, philosophy, and history. Thus one who holds mastery in such arts holds a key to ancient traditions and the elements of cultural heritage of Western Civilization. This theory can be traced back to what humanists consider rational philosophy, deeply rooted in the Western traditions of Greece and Rome as a result of Hellenization, or globalization in the third century B.C.E. (Robinson, 1996).

According to Kagan, Steven, Ozment, and Turner (1995), the aim of education changed from the mastery of practical skills to broad intellectual training, critical thinking, and new image of a well-rounded, educated person. A modern-day humanist sustains cultural and academic Western traditions and knowledge within the curriculum and believes that the curriculum should teach the power of reasoning. This belief is in line with both classical and contemporary humanists’ reasoning that rejects the notion that the school’s role is to prepare students for the

work force but instead supports working towards the development of general intellectual skills for the student's well-being (James, 2007).

Paideia, Rhetoric and Modern Education

There is a multitude of difficulties in terms of politics and education destroying most attempts to create a modern equivalent of the old classical humanist curriculum.

Because the core of the classical curriculum was drawn from the humanities and the goal was rhetoric, several things could simultaneously be achieved or aimed at: the transmission of a culture, the development of practical reason, and the development of what we would now call 'literacy.' (Miller, 2007, p. 190)

Thus the art of the rhetorician was to reinforce each element of the curriculum into one integrated program of study. In rhetoric, the curriculum was organized around the art of communication, and by simultaneously developing both linguistic and analytical skill (e.g. structure of the argument and its clarity in expression), rhetoric as a program was distinctively more valuable than our concept of simple grammarian "literacy or basic skills." Consequently, some writers (Bloom, 1987; D'Souza, 1991; Kimball, 2008; Burke, 1969; Bauer, 2003; Toulmin, 2003; Bok, 2006; Miller, 2007; Vatz, 2009) call into question the very concept of literacy as a distinct skill that can be conceived and developed independently of the subject matter of the curriculum while retaining humanities as a core. Morris (2007) argues that the divisions and specializations among Classical, English, Western and world literature dilute the purpose of humanities, while it is retained through mass media, such as; television, film, and the Internet in a form of the wider cultural experience. Many scholars (Sayers, 1948; Adler, 1983; Bauer, 2003; Wilson, 2003; Miller, 2007) believe that the movement to return "classical education" to American schools, while rejecting elitist traditions, could be accomplished through a well-designed programs based on the humanities core of literature concept of "great books." Recognizing this tendency (Sayers et al, 1948), and since the curriculum could be centered on "great books," rhetoric could again play a central role by diminishing current objective of grammarian parsimony in teaching.

"Well-Educated Mind": Working Theory by S. W. Bauer

The goal here is to apply the knowledge of the "Great Books" list to an understanding of the ways in which the history has changed over time within the paradigm and the discourse of Western Civilization as seen and studied from the American perspective. All of the titles are arranged chronologically by date of composition but do not include all of the "great books" titles of history. Bauer (2003) insists that the list provided is relatively well fitted for an average reader and not for the professional historian, so it compiles stories to shape the past without more complicated analysis of the philosophical works but it retains some essays of political thought by Machiavelli, Locke, and Hume.

Bauer's (2003) pedagogical approach emphasizes the comprehension and teaching of Western Civilization history by instructors, which can be as effective as their familiarity with the topics best content representations. Consequently, the list of Bauer's (2003) "great books" provides a logical guide to a comprehensive familiarity in the field without which the effective instruction might be in peril. Further, her theoretical teaching guide introduces three stages of

understanding the material based on the ancient Greek concept of trivium: grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric.

In the first grammarian stage, Bauer's (2003) recommendation centers on the basic recognition of the title, cover, and the table of contents in order to assess the work in its initial stage: topic, structure of argument, main thesis or topics. Following Bauer's questions should be addressed at this level:

1) Did the writer state his or her purpose for writing? 2) What were the major events of history? 3) Who was the story about? 4) What changes did this hero or heroine face? 5) Who or what causes this challenge? 6) What happened to the historical hero or heroine? 7) Did the characters go forward, or backward, and why? 8) When did the story take place? 9) Where did the story take place? (Bauer, 2003, p. 167)

The dialectic stage assumes that students grasped the content of the history and it transforms students into the evaluators who argue over the accuracy of texts using outside evidence to build such arguments. At this logical stage of inquiry instructors or students should be able to formulate the following questions provided by Bauer (p. 168-169):

1) What are the major assertions of the historian? 2) What questions is the historian asking? 3) What sources does the historian use to answer them? 4) Does the evidence support the connection between questions and answers? 5) Can you identify the genre of the history?, and 6) Does the historian list his or her qualifications?

One of the most important aspects of this stage listed by Bauer (2003) contain the incredibly important concepts, such as; the authors' misdirection, a false analogy, an incorrect sampling, a hasty generalizations, failures to define terms, a backward reasoning, a wrong causation (e.g., post hoc, ergo propter hoc fallacy), an identification of a single cause-effect relationship or parsimony, and a failure to notice the differences or similarities of events.

Once the methods, implications, and conclusions are fully understood, the third stage of *trivium* begins. In this rhetoric stage the following Bauer's (p. 169) questions should be asked,

1) What is the purpose of history? 2) Does this story have a forward motion? 3) Why do things go wrong? 4) What does it mean to be human? 5) What place does free will have? 6) What relationship does this history have to social problems? 7) What is the end of history? 8) How is the history the same as, or different than, the stories of other historians? and 9) Is there another possible explanation? (Bauer, 2003)

Traditionally, the rhetoric stage is the ultimate achievement in a particular student's life, for it transforms this individual from a mere reader, who mechanically recognizes the terminology and content, into an orator and a debater who fully comprehends, argues for, and foresees the implications of the knowledge learned.

Postmodern Perspective on Modern Education

Educational theory and practice have always been strongly wedded to the language and assumptions of modernism (Aranowitz & Giroux, 1990). Educators as diverse as Dewey (1966), Tyler (1950), Gintis (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, 2003), Goodlad (1984), and Carnoy (1983), have shared a faith in those modernist ideals that stress the capacity of individuals to think critically, to exercise social responsibility, and to remake the world in the interest of the Enlightenment dream of reason and freedom. Within the discourse of modernism, knowledge draws its limits almost exclusively from a European model of culture and civilization. Civilization in this script is an extension of what Lyotard (1984) calls the "grand narrative" of the Enlightenment. In

addition, modernism has been largely drawn from cultural scripts written by white males whose work is often privileged as a model of high culture and born within the elite (Aranowitz & Giroux, 1990). Postmodern criticism does not challenge dominant Western cultural model with its definition of universally valid knowledge; it also offers the promise of deterritorializing modernity through redrawing its political, social, and cultural boundaries that affirm racial, gender, and ethnic differences (Giroux, 1990). As Laclau (1988) stated, "Postmodernism cannot be a simple rejection of modernity; rather, it involves a different modulation of its themes and categories."

Postmodernism's refusal of grand narratives, its rejection of universal reason as a foundation for human affairs, its de-centering of the humanist subject, its radical problematizing of representation, and its celebration of plurality and the politics of racial, gender, and ethnic difference have sparked a major debate. For example, Bloom (1987) argued that postmodernism represents "the last, predictable stage in the suppression of reason and the denial of the possibility of truth." In a similar argument, Bell (1976) claimed that postmodernism extends the adversarial and hedonistic tendencies of modernism to destructive extremes often expressed in film, arts, music, and fiction as "a reflection of the present wave of destructive political reaction seeping the Western world" (Gott, 1986, p. 68).

Liberals such as Habermas (1983) and Rorty (1985) take opposing positions on the relevance of postmodernism in education in terms of a threat to a democratic public life and the capitalist society. Radical critics such as Eagleton (1985), Anderson (1984), and Christian (1987) see postmodernism as either a threat to or a flight from the real world of politics and struggle. Foster (1983), Huyssen (1986), Hall (1987), and a number of feminist critics such as De Lauretis (1987), Morris (1988), and Frasier and Nicholson (1990), approach the discourse of postmodernism in education cautiously by interrogating critically its claims and absences. On the other hand, Baudrillard (1988) and Lyotard (1984) utilize postmodern discourses as a theoretical weapon to articulate either the nihilism of capitalist society and its alleged collapse of meaning into the tyranny of modernistic narratives often included in the concept of *paideia*.

It is possible to make a strong case that reading classic texts is necessary even today, because they still continue to relate to our modern lives, they depict daily issues parted only by time, and connect to the ideals, epochs, and history long gone. This is not an argument for full acceptance of the privileged Western texts to our curriculum, nor it is a call for their total rebuttal. The responsibility of intellectuals for the current state of affairs must be acknowledged before the tensions worsen between tradition and modernity or postmodernity (Aranowitz & Giroux, 1990). These so called "tensions" were identified by Bauman (2000) as modernity's struggle with ambiguity, later resulting in the Holocaust, invoking the postmodern ethics in a concept of "liquid" modernity.

In a general sense, Hirsch (1976) and Bloom (1987) represent different versions of the same ideology, one that is deeply committed to cleansing democracy of its critical and emancipatory possibilities. They both have a common concern, however, for rewriting the past from the perspective of the privileged and the powerful. In their view, history becomes a vehicle for endorsing a form of textual and cultural authority that legitimates an unproblematic relationship between knowledge and truth. Both Hirsch (1976) and Bloom (1987) define the study of history, along with the authority it sanctions, as not so much a battle or struggle but as a mere artifact or a warehouse of goods posited either as a canon of knowledge or a canon of information that has simply to be transmitted as a mean for promoting social order and control. Thus in this light, the argument for *paideia* and the "great books" concepts is truly a pedagogical

one that has little to do with dialogue and struggle over the meanings and practices of a historical tradition. Hirsch's defense of a unified version of Western tradition ideologically marks his definition of cultural literacy as more than a simplistic call for a common language and canon of shared information.

The failing of Hirsch's view of culture is more evident in his analysis of public schools and in his misunderstanding of the issues of struggle. Theorists such as Bourdieu (1990), Bernstein (2009), Freire (2000), and Apple (2004) have investigated the relationship between power and culture, arguing that the culture transmitted by the school is related to the various cultures that make up the wider society or dominant groups while marginalizing and silencing the sub-cultures.

It would be too easy to dismiss this vision of education as simply an effort to reestablish a new order but the virtue of Bloom's and Hirsch's philosophy, despite its reactionary content, stands to remind us of what has been lost in the drive for rationalization, for the supremacy of science over philosophy, history over eternal essences (Giroux, 1990). H. Giroux (1990) believes that this historical legacy of technicization has been to turn the universities into training institutions, which create few spaces for intellectuals. What must be accepted in Bloom's discourse is that anti-intellectualism in American education is rampant, influencing even those whose intentions are actually opposed to closing the doors to genuine learning (Bloom, 1987; Bauer, 2003; Adler, 1983; Aronowitz & Giroux, 1990).

Methods

The research instruments were adopted and modified from the (2005) Drinnon study at East Tennessee State University concerning the perceived value of primary source documents in teaching history.

An item pool of statements concerning primary source documents was developed using the literature. A survey instrument containing fifty items with a Likert scale response and thirteen open-ended questions was developed from the item pool of statements.

In addition to the survey instruments the researcher proceeded to interview six instructors, assuming a non-intrusive role by attending meetings in the place of choice of the interviewee, usually a Starbucks cafe. The interviews served as an additional source of data on how the history courses were taught, with particular attention being paid to usage of primary sources or Bauer's (2003) "great books." Since all educators involved in this study teach history at the level identified within the study the researcher proceeded to ask sixteen semi-structured questions mentioned earlier to gather broader understanding and scope of teachers' subject preparation. The data from the interviews were used to identify potential weaknesses or strengths within instructors' teaching methodologies, examples of documents presented, stories told, and extra-curricular activities attended.

Before the research proposal was submitted for approval from the Institutional Review Board of California State University San Bernardino, a pilot test of the survey instrument was conducted with sixty student respondents. These data were used to assess the workability of the survey instrument, as well as to confirm or reject prior assumptions. Simple descriptive statistics and calculations were performed using the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 16.0 and 17.0*. No hypotheses were tested since this was primarily a qualitative exploration and observation and the findings were only analyzed to deliver visual non-narrated results.

Participant Description

There were two populations of participants: tenured history and social science teachers in the K-12 environment all teaching United States or world history courses in Southern California, and a group of six interviewed volunteers K-12 history teachers who served the purpose of triangulating this study and legitimizing the results obtained from the survey instrument. The participants contacted were mostly tenured-history teachers of grades 11th and 12th among the multiple institutions within Southern California school districts. Overall all, 246 invitations were sent out to eligible history teachers in Southern California's Inland Empire. In addition, several reminders were sent out after the initial invitations produced scarce results. The email addresses were collected from the published districts' websites. Thirty teachers responded and completed the survey, and ten teachers agreed to the interviews out of which four cancelled their commitment. The overall response ratio to the survey instrument was 12%, and about 2.4% volunteered to be interviewed. There was no clear difference in the response rate dependent on the method of distribution of research materials. Thirty teachers from twenty-two different schools returned completed surveys. Although the researcher in this study did not claim that the survey was rigorously representative of the population sampled, it did provide a useful profile of the United States history teachers in Southern California, which was used to ground the interpretation of all the data collected in this study. All respondents answered the call to participate in the study voluntarily, thus the sample had some limitations.

The following Table 1 provides some descriptive characteristics of the interviewed pool of participants.

The data for this study was collected from the electronic surveys returned from teachers who taught history in public schools in Southern California school districts of Inland Empire.

Table 1
Interview Participants

Identifier	Age	Teaching experience	Type of school	Selected characteristics
Ron	45+	20+	Suburban	Dept. head and visionary
Magda	45+	15+	Suburban monocultural	Passionate and pet loving
Patricia	20+	5+	Suburban multicultural	Visionary and insightful
Osa	40+	20+	Suburban multicultural	Dept. head and history reader
Eliza	30+	10+	Suburban monocultural	Dept. head and curious
Shena	20+	3+	Suburban multicultural	Dedicated and novice

Results

The demographic data, as well as the questions concerning the seniority, the overall teaching experience in the field of history, education and teaching credentials, the overall usage of primary sources in classroom instruction, the professional academic organizations' membership, the professional development, and the evidence of any parallel non-history teaching assignments were all included in the first page of the survey instrument. The second through fifth page of the survey instrument contained the instructions for completion of the survey pertaining the usage, familiarity, and importance of the primary sources in history instruction, all formatted to be answered based on the methodology of a Likert scale. Here, all respondents' answers were limited to: strongly agree, agree, unsure, disagree, and strongly disagree evaluative outcomes. The seventh and the last page of the survey instrument asked for the open-ended narrative responses such as: "Why should students be required to study history?" "What type of instructional practices define a quality history class?" "What is your personal opinion on using primary sources in your instruction?" "Are students in your class exposed to academic articles?" "Are you familiar with a 'great books' concept?" "Should history teach logic, reasoning, and verbal eloquence?" "If you could meet a person from the past: who would it be, what would you asked of that person, why, and what is your rationale?" "And since this is impossible, how could you currently go about to find your answers?"

The demographic data in Table 2 revealed that the largest percentage of the participants were males with a total number of 15 respondents, or 53.6%. The majority of all participants were in the age group from 31 years of age to 50 years of age; a combined 62.9% of all

respondents. The average total years of teaching for the particular district in Southern California was 12.6 years; with an average history teaching experience of 15.8 years; and average total years of teaching history in the district average of 13.7 years.

Table 2
Respondent Characteristics

Respondent characteristics	Number of individuals	% of sample
Gender		
Male	15	53.6
Female	13	46.4
Age		
21-30	2	6.9
31-40	9	31.0
41-50	9	31.0
51-60	6	20.7
61 and older	3	10.3
Credential		
Single subject	22	78.6
Multiple	3	10.7
No credential	3	10.7
Members of professional organizations		
Yes, I am		
No, I am not	9	32.1
	19	67.9
Teachers' GPA when schooled		
2.6-3.0	2	7.1
3.1-3.5	12	42.9
3.6-4.0	14	50.0
Teaching assignments		
History only	12	47.8
Economics/Bus	11	52.2
Teaching in years		
Less than 5	7	25.0
More than 5	21	75.0
Education		
BA	7	25.9

Respondent characteristics	Number of individuals	% of sample
MA plus	20	70.3
Doctoral	1	3.7
Primary sources usage		
Yes, I use	26	92.9
No, I don't use	2	7.1
Major or degree concentration		
History		
Philosophy	20	71.4
Pol/Science	1	3.6
Other, nonrelated	3	10.7
	4	14.3

The largest number of the respondents (44.4%) had a master's degree with additional graduate work or certificates; 25.9% had graduated with a master's degree without additional certificates, while 25.9% had graduated with a bachelor's degree, of whom 70% had additional certificates. Only one participant marked a doctoral degree as the highest educational accomplishment. A clear majority (78.6%) of respondents possessed a single subject credential in social science or history, 10.7% marked the possession of the multiple subject credential, while 10.7% respondents indicated no teaching credential; 92.9% of all teachers reported using primary sources in their classes between one to five days each month; 32.2% are active members of the academic and professional organizations; 92.9% graduated with a combined grade point average between 3.1 and 4.0; and a majority (71.4%) reported 'history' as their major and graduate specialization. While 52.2% of respondents reported teaching history as their only and exclusive teaching assignments, 47.8% of teachers reported non-related instruction in economics and business as their other parallel duty assignments. None of the participants marked PE or athletics as their other parallel instructional assignments at their districts.

What picture of the history teachers in San Bernardino County, California does this descriptive information provide? A profile of the "typical" teacher emerges from a quick analysis of the statistical survey data. The San Bernardino County History teacher is a male, 31-50 years old, with about 16 years of teaching experience, and 12 years in the current district. He has a bachelor's and master's degree in an area directly related to his teaching assignment, graduated with high and above 3.0 (GPA) grade point average. In addition, he teaches few other non-history related classes in mostly business, or economics fields. It must be remembered that although the data point to a male-dominated field the participants in the survey were willing volunteers. In terms of the exposure to the study of history, these sampled teachers differ from the norm. The relationship between the training in the discipline of history (bachelor's and master's degrees in the field) and teachers' approaches to curriculum and pedagogy in the K-12 environment provided this study with a unique opportunity to look inside those who are dedicated and willing to go out of their way and spend time contributing to the betterment of

history pedagogy. Of about 246 surveys sent out only 12% of possible respondents participated, and only six agreed to a formal interview.

While the K-12 teaching field is primarily female dominated, the gender distribution of the participants in this study reflects a long-standing trend that secondary social studies departments are predominantly male (Ochoa, 1981).

The survey data raise also some important epistemological questions based on the characteristics of the respondents. Does the relative homogeneity of the history teachers matter in how they approach the study of history and its instruction? Do their life experiences influence their instruction? And if so, what are or what could these implications be?

Walter Parker (2010) in *Social studies today: Research and practice* introduced several lenses that challenge these questions as well as today's history curriculum and pedagogy. In terms of the purpose of teaching history, Parker (2010) points to the political struggles over curriculum and its pedagogy, which he specified as: the transmission of knowledge or the transformation of society. Through this prism, our respondents may dominate certain angle of this political struggle purely based on their demographic characteristic. Analyzing Parker's (2010) perspective lens, most educators sampled in this study, were affected by the pluralistic and multicultural society. Many of the in-service teachers sampled believed that they are "color" blind or that diversity does not matter and that they taught their students assigned to their respective classes. This set of beliefs of "color blindness" could possibly deliver great harm in the classrooms that teach true and effective citizenship, and where students may or may not side with teachers' perspectives (Giroux, 1990). Parker's (2010) third perspective deals primarily with the content of the curriculum and how students understand history through film, maps, geography, and primary sources. Understanding how students interpret history through film and its selection is something all educators should consider. Often, the hegemonic and dominant discourses and contents reappear within a certain demographic group of history teachers who tend to predominantly focus on these themes. For instance, Holocaust education is under threat because it appears in so many places in the curriculum (English, Social Sciences, U.S. History, World History) and across so many school grades, that students simply "turn off" their interest and curiosity with a "here we go again" attitude (Parker, 2010). Most interviewed history teachers agreed that introducing the theme of Holocaust and genocide should not be exclusively dominated by World War II events but inclusively shared with other events such as: Columbian Exchange genocide and Holocaust, the native American Indian eradications in North American, immigrant plight, civil rights history in the United States, etc.

The globalization lens (Bauer, 2003; Parker, 2010) focuses the reader on both practical pedagogies for globalizing curriculum and the controversial nature of the topic. It alerts history teachers to the issues of multicultural literature in the classroom. The discussion of globalization and world history problematizes how teachers select and present multicultural information to avoid stereotyping and still tackle a global curriculum. Dunn's essay in Parker's (2010) points out that: study should be particularly informative to world history teachers, especially those who may have been in the field for a considerable number of years as have the surveyed respondents in this study. The changes in the academic approach to studying world history are defined as Arena A, the investigation of the planet as a whole, and Arena B, social studies in general and world history in particular as expressions of national value and purpose. These arenas have political constituents that are stakeholders in the public school curriculum and severely restrict, through the adoption of standards and tests, a teacher's freedom to stay academically fresh and to appropriately prepare students for further history education beyond high school. (Parker, p. 71)

The researcher's personal response to this problem was to consider how this information would impact teachers' approaches to their secondary social studies methods focused on teaching world history. And most importantly, what global experiences and knowledge do the sampled teachers have to transfer on to the students in the United States or world history classes?

The themes that emerged in this first part of this study confirmed that nearly all (96.4%) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed on the importance of the usage of primary sources in their history classrooms. The study also supports Parker's (2010) findings where most teachers who taught world history did it without including United States history inclusion or vice versa. One of the interviewed respondents, Magda, repeatedly underlined that the standards' requirements do not allow her to diverge and "dig deeper" into the meaning of world history and how it is intertwined with our domestic historical discourse. The clear majority of the survey respondents (96.4%) agreed on the importance of students' interpretation of primary sources in their history education. 78.6% agreed that primary sources were easily obtainable for their classes. In almost a rebellious stand, 50% did not agree with the California curriculum framework, standards, and benchmarks, which drive their lecture contents. The "power" standards along with the designed pacing guides in all history classes did not allow for any primary source usage simply out of time restraints and limitations. The mad dash through the curriculum, power standards, and major themes were often labeled and referred by the teachers during the interviews. The over-compartmentization of knowledge was a major issue, with which most teachers struggled, not from ignorance, but simply from time constraint. Although the issue of reading original texts is often difficult and challenging for students the primary sources persist: 46.4% of teachers agreed that they preferred the primary sources to the selected textbooks, with 25% teachers remaining unsure, and 7.1% disagreeing. Over 80% of participants agreed that they were comfortable in using primary sources in teaching history, while only 57.1% attended a high quality social study workshop.

The data in the Table 3 summarizes the major findings and teachers' responses to the survey instrument. Although the data provided descriptive statistical representations of participants the results were not as meaningful as the interviews that followed. Overwhelmingly, the data revealed a well-rounded group of professionals of whom a clear majority supported usage of primary sources in history instruction, knew the limitation of course textbooks, students' abilities, and other constraints. What this data did not provide, and which was explored through interviews, was the in-depth take and revelation of the systemic limitations and failures found in the way history courses are managed. Although very informative and predictable, the survey data in this study were considered complementary to the more "telling" interview findings.

Table 3
Descriptive Summary of Primary Source Usage in Southern California Secondary Schools

Problem or statement (<i>n</i> = 30)	Support (%)
Primary sources are important to history teaching	96.4
Students enjoy using primary sources	46.6
I (teacher) am comfortable with using of primary sources	92.6
My (teacher's) preparation emphasized the use of primary sources	75.0
It is not difficult to integrate primary sources in history lessons	85.7
I find time to find primary sources for my lessons	75.0
Primary sources analysis is not difficult for my students	64.3
My school's collection of primary sources or delivery technology is inadequate	55.0
I (teacher) often study primary sources for my own classes	65.3
Part of my job is to teach critical thinking skills to students	100.0
I am comfortable in selecting primary sources for use in my classes	92.9
I have analyzed primary sources for historical interpretation	100.0
My textbook does not provide a sufficient number of primary sources	77.0
I have attended a history/social science conference this year	40.7
My students score higher if I use primary sources	66.0

Emerging Themes From Interviews

The main object of this research study focused primarily on the instructors and teachers of the K12 institutions in the Inland Empire of Southern California in order to address the following themes:

1. To assess the instructors' topic knowledge and academic interests as well as their familiarity of primary sources and related literature other than the textbook in teaching history.

2. To discover whether the concept of *paideia* and life-long learning exists among the instructors teaching history courses.
3. To establish the instructors' desired pedagogical outcomes of student learning: Are they purely grammarian, or also dialectic and rhetoric.
4. To discover whether there are social reproductive consequences of instruction using theoretical approaches of Bourdieu (1990), Giroux (1988), and Willis (1977).
5. To discover the applicability of Bauer's (2003) concept of "well-educated mind" among history instructors and their teaching methodologies.
6. To address the acceptance or resistance of Adler's (1982) original idea of *Paideia proposal* and the "great books" concept into a main stream of the K-12 history instruction.

Research Theme 1

The teachers' topical knowledge was evident during the interviews. Ron, a twenty plus year veteran in Southern California, did not hide his immense knowledge and practice of primary sources and major literature works.

I think my first year teaching in the United States was the world history course instruction. It got up to the industrial revolution subject, and by the way, I was teaching English second language as well, it was the Jack London's story, I had my class read this. It was a shortened version of the book. The class quickly got the oppressiveness of the harsh conditions of the period, which the students quickly got. It was not because they'd read the short paragraph or two in the textbook, but this story settled in their minds. It is interesting that the reading program, as I understand is taught at your university (Cal State, San Bernardino) tries to rectify this barrier between true learning through primary sources and writing and dry recitations from the text. History classes and the theory of knowledge that I push are all about the teaching, the depth of it, the critical aspect of learning but not the simple recognition. Often teaching is not through showing the right answer in the paragraphs of the textbook but by leading the students to come up with their own answer and understanding based on the knowledge they just acquired. Students are smart or witty and limit themselves to look or skim for keywords in their assignments rather than to fully understand the theme or a problem. (Ron, personal communication, October 28, 2011)

Another respondent and teaching veteran, Magda, expressed her frustration with the pressure to cover the curriculum and the difficulty of introducing the primary sources to her student population,

Primary sources for world history are a bit difficult to read. For instance, Magna Carta, I try to read it but I don't think it is effective. I use little articles that are easy to digest and read that deal with the nature of general world history. So to sum it all up, I don't use primary sources. (Magda, personal communication, November 3, 2011)

Magda's department follows a strict pacing guide that limits her to specific areas only with little or no time left for "deeper" readings. The context of her teaching has shaped her style and led her to focus on just a few key notes in her world history classroom, apart from the daily

outlines: Mongols and Huns, stories of animal migrations and early humans, and pets that matched her own interest and a personal study niche. Although Magda possesses an average content knowledge in her field she could not point to any recent primary source analysis in her class.

The following four respondents, Patricia (personal communication, November 5, 2011), Osa (personal communication, November 7, 2011), Eliza (personal communication, November 9, 2011), and Shena (personal communication, November 15, 2011), all shared with Ron a wealth of content knowledge. Patricia's response was swift and exact "Yes, I do use them [primary sources] a lot. In fact, I cannot imagine teaching history without the involvement of the documents" (personal communication, November 5, 2011). Osa's response magnified her stance on this issue:

This [primary sources] is a huge importance. Students need to get used to reading of very difficult passages to avoid the trivia. They need to prove that each document is a trustworthy document. I make my kids analyze the primary documents to see if they are biased, self-serving, objective. . . . In this way, they develop a sense of knowing through examining the documents. They don't just simply believe but think. (personal communication, November 7, 2011).

In Eliza's own words,

The primary sources are excellent. My AP classes use them from the get-go. Since we're teaching towards the test and the testing is expensive and about \$80 per test, we use many primary texts for DBQs (Document Based Questions). We constantly ask students to analyze the texts. Why? What was the reason? What was the result? . . . I don't use too many primary sources in my general classes but I do introduce graphs, maps, pictures, and cartoons. It is often frustrating to read difficult passages with students who barely pass English. When I attended college all our textbooks were the primary source documents, which gave me an excellent foundation in history understanding that, in turn, I tend to pass on to my students. I am essentially socially reproducing a younger generation of me! In addition, the students today are the iPad generation. To illustrate this as my dilemma, I was talking about a phonograph, which students had a difficult time picturing. Imagine some of them haven't see the a-track, cassette players, or even CD players, let alone a phonograph! (personal communication, November 9, 2011).

Finally, Shena, perhaps the youngest veteran in the teaching field responded:

I like it [primary sources] and I always try to use it few times during the unit. Often I have to break the source down, highlight the material, and re-tell the content through my own analysis. Otherwise, students automatically fall into this 'I can't do it' mode (personal communication, November 15, 2011).

Although most of the teachers expressed the challenges of teaching through primary sources, all but Magda were very familiar with their content, willingness, and selections. Unlike many participants in this study, only Magda did not believe that primary sources were essential

or necessary in her classroom instruction. In fact, the interviews and further conversations with each teacher revealed a well-researched or excellent content knowledge in the field of history.

Research Theme 2

The essence of the research question considered whether consciousness of the concept of *paideia* and life-long learning (Bauer's 2003 theoretical framework) existed among the instructors teaching World History and United States History sequence courses in Southern California. All but one teacher was able to provide a definite and well-substantiated answer. Ron stated,

I do consider myself a life-long learner. Currently, I am reading five books all at one time. Currently I am rereading "Iliad" by Feagles, also started a "Book of Mormon," "History of Papacy," which I find very fascinating and full of contradictions, biography of Heinrich Schliemann, which shows that he was a liar in his own diary! So, yes, I enrich myself. (personal communication, October 28, 2011).

Magda's response to this question included: "Yeah, I get bored super fast. I am always thinking of new projects. I guess that's it" (personal communication, November 3, 2011), which did not provide any specific information as to the activities or a reading list.

Patricia's response referred to a long reading list that included the most common history texts: "Common Sense" by Paine, works by Marx, Locke, and Wollstonecraft (personal communication, November 5, 2011). Patricia mentioned her recent Masters degree in history as well as online training through University of Chicago and Stanford University. Osa's area of enrichment revealed during the interview included Jarred Diamond's works in the area of geography and world history that she recently re-read and studied, as well as Stokes-Brown book, titled *Big History* that drives her world history classes, and the world economic history essays by Ferguson such as: *The Ascent of Money*, and others (personal communication, November 7, 2011).

Similarly to Osa's response, Eliza expressed,

I think so. I think that I am [a life-long learner]. I am a history geek always looking for new ideas. As a teacher, I must hone my craft, and I attend conferences often. Perhaps, PhD may be in my future but it is too soon to tell. There are different ways of becoming a life-long learner. (personal communication, November 9, 2011).

Shena, a twenty-some-years old and a newly minted graduate of a master's program plans her future to include a history PhD degree, while, in the meantime, she "enjoys the politics, travel, conferences, and a good book" (personal communication, November 15, 2011). The titles mentioned by Shena were familiar to Bauer's list of "great books" and included: Machiavelli's *The Prince*, Moore's *Utopia*, Locke's *The True End of Civil Government*, and Hume's *The History of England*.

The conversations revealed a well-read group of teachers, who do read, attend conferences, and pursue their history passions, including considering advanced doctorate degrees in near future.

Research Theme 3

The interview inquiry posed a question to the respondents to establish their pedagogical and content abilities: are the teachers exercising a purely grammarian, dialectic, and rhetoric teaching approach in their classes as proposed by Bauer?

All interviewed teachers rejected the ‘trivia’ approach to teaching history through a series of lists that include: dates, persons, numbers, battle details, etc.

Ron, a veteran and a department chair, was perhaps the most vocal about the issue:

I do expect the students to know the sequence and the timeline of events. We are looking for linkage, historical argument, and causality. First we tell a story and then we put it to the historical argument test. I expect them to be able to formulate a “What if?” argument based on the story told. Causal links are important in my opinion. What caused the event and what were the end results? Could they have been any different provided with other known aspects of history, behavior, or findings? I think this comes back to the same point: “What if?” test. In case of the Pearl Harbor date and event I bring in a story, a primary source, criticism that portrays the history in light of contradicting and speculative information. For instance, I show the students the bits and pieces of information that purport the prior knowledge of the US Government and of the events that will shortly occur. The conspiracy theory surrounding the event builds a deeper understanding of history, the cause and effect aspect of knowing, and ability to not only recognize and remember the event but to get involved into a meaningful conversation. Something else that I do for critical thinking analysis. I steal the ideas and materials from the Sonoma State University critical thinking foundation. I teach those concepts from the beginning. (personal communication, October 28, 2011)

Ron continued to answer this question with his analogy to Sophist philosophy that perhaps is not as easy to replicate in a K-12 environment:

Here is where I find the problem with the question. I am struggling with the thought and the only thing that comes to mind is the Sophists’ philosophy. I am looking for clear discussion and expression but nothing beyond this from my students. I just want a clear communication. Speech writing or persuasiveness sits rather on the sidelines in my short classes. (personal communication, October 28, 2011)

Although Ron was fully aware of the issue at hand, he realized that the limitations among students and work expectations from the district exist that prevent rhetoric: final act of learning history in Bauer’s terms.

Magda’s response followed Ron’s philosophy but was a bit simplistic (perhaps more aware of students’ limitations):

I don’t do dates. I do time periods, chronology, or reference to the story or general event, e.g. Christopher Columbus. I tell stories but we don’t read books, not the primary sources but their adaptations, secondary sources. I turn the paragraphs into some quick write up exercises for students and they do pretty well. My basic goal in social science

class instruction is supported by the material, such as the discovery videos, which I use in format of: play, pause, and explain the background information. For instance, the Mongols, the Huns, and the invasions are all fascinating for kids to watch. (personal communication, November 3, 2011)

Magda's response rejected the understanding of *trivium* by Bauer and ignored the interviewer's inquiry through solidifying herself in passive and grammarian method.

As it turned out, Magda was the only teacher who taught through purely grammarian methods of showing, telling, and delegating. Patricia's response was very reminiscent of Ron's approach:

I don't make my students memorize dates at all. You must have a context, a time frame, and you don't have to absolutely know that Reconstruction ended in 1877, although we talk about the dates and review them . . . but I emphasize the greater context of the theme. We look at the articles from 1892 Harper's Magazine and look at cartoons, articles, and comments that land the students in the general theme. So what is going on in 1892? How have things changed and how are they presented in 1892 as opposed to earlier dates? But I am, in my pedagogy, perhaps different than most. All AP history teachers do this and follow the standards (including dates and primary documents), however others don't at all. (personal communication, November 5, 2011)

Osa's reply to this question was very much the same:

From my experience and books (mostly AP) the scope of study begins with Paleolithic *Big History*. . . that is the publication of *Big History* C.S. Browne text that pretty much designed my course: Big Bang, the global look at ancient Chinese civilizations, Japan. So, we do specialize but very broadly. We don't go by dates nor do we remember them besides the obvious, e.g. 1453. We often look at the big picture by theme, by dynasties in case of the Chinese history that bring dates and chronology but not trivia. Students know their bearings in time chronology through surrounding stories, primary sources, and dynasties but not exact dates. (personal communication, November 7, 2011)

Eliza followed with this comment:

I actually have my kids to learn key concepts. For instance, today we were talking about the 'Lost Generation of Writers,' which introduced my new chapter. I don't teach dates and trivia but instead I tell history as a personal story. We do role-playing, which becomes more personal and gives them some critical thinking skills. Now, the process is not immediate and varies from AP history course to general history classes. Some students are very motivated knowing where they're heading. But then again, some students are lost" (personal communication, November 9, 2011)

Although the teachers' comments represented a uniform approach and philosophy towards "un-trivializing" the history pedagogy, Shena's comments brought up an important limitation:

I try to bring in a story to learning. Today, I showed my class different perspectives on the Treaty of Versailles, but this involved so much work on my behalf. In fact, this type of exercise is appropriate for grades 11 and 12, but my 10th grade classes cannot even understand certain terminology, such as: “social,” “political,” “perspective,” etc. So, I do have to go really slow. (personal communication, November 15, 2011)

Five out of six interviewed teachers identified the *trivium* approach to effective history learning as described by Bauer. All of the participants rejected the grammarian approach but two out of six respondents continued to teach in the grammarian fashion, simply because of their students’ limitations. Overall, five out of six participants were adequately prepared to teach and to grasp the differences in the teaching philosophy that required them to distinguish between the grammarian, dialectic, and rhetoric approaches.

Research Theme 4

The inquiry in this area asked the respondents whether they were aware of the socially reproductive consequences of instruction as presented earlier in the theoretical frameworks of Bourdieu (1990), Giroux (1988), and Willis (1977). Importantly, the aim of this inquiry was to see if the teachers recognized their role in socially reproducing their knowledge in students.

Eliza, a history department chair, responded that, “I am essentially socially reproducing a younger generation of me!” (personal communication, November 9, 2011). She understood the importance of not only using the right materials but also the enthusiasm and spirit of instruction.

Ron added that he molds his students into inquiry-based researchers by avoiding erroneous causality effects experienced by him during his lifetime of experience:

by taking the ideas from Sonoma State I do introduce a bias but I make students realize that some events are reported from different sides of the argument, point of view, cultural background, and time. The primary sources are both from the accuser and the accused so students can position themselves in a role-playing scenario that puts them perfectly into a historical argument. There are some allegories and examples that I use to show the bias in reporting, understanding, and culture. Those kinds of things I hope bring about a deeper understanding. Things may not occur to a male that are self-evident for a woman, and so on. (personal communication, October 28, 2011)

Ron’s lectures are not basic nor grammarian. He teaches his classes to introduce a piece of himself that as theory may or may not be included in the standards.

In contrast to Ron and Eliza, Magda seems to follow the pacing guide in her classes and inputs her passion that is not necessarily academically driven: “What engages my students is my introduction of stories that present the history of canines (dogs). I am a dog lover, and it seems that this aspect of my presentations generates the most conversations” (personal communication, November 3, 2011). Shena, a young starting history teacher did not provide any indicators in the interview to suggest her awareness of social reproduction in her history classes. Shena has mostly focused on adjusting to the tasks and the career of teaching history.

Patricia relied heavily on her history background aided by the conference attendance and the newest research out of Stanford and Chicago University:

I think the pedagogy oftentimes depends on my resources, and I do have resources for all different areas, the reason why DBQ from Chicago and the Stanford projects are important for me is because all the hard work has been already done by collecting, digesting, and preparing of instructional material that I learned. All I have to do is to apply the material to my class and relate this knowledge to the students, I believe that I socially reproduce my skills into this new generation. (personal communication, November 5, 2011)

Osa, the department chair, applied her historical curiosity and life-long learning into exactly the same curiosity driven lectures that fascinate her AP history students:

This is my new course syllabi and the course contents with such details of amazing stories: waru-waru agriculture, Tong Dynasty, paper printing and scripts. What is interesting, the standards and this curriculum make me look up stuff and read upon it constantly. The way I feel, they pay me for my hobby and professional development. Not only the standards are addressed, but I grow and my students grow with me! (personal communication, November 7, 2011)

The majority of all interviewed teachers revealed their enthusiasm, knowledge, and the awareness that the social reproduction takes place in their classroom in terms of knowledge and method, whether it is or not prescribed on the pacing guide standards. The reference to the social reproduction here does not consider the social class position, which is the most dominant interpretation by Bourdieu (1990), Giroux (1988), and Willis (1977), but the contagion of knowledge passed from one generation to another. Overall, only two out of six interviewed teachers failed to notice the importance of social reproduction.

Research Theme 5

The nature of the fifth research question in this study relied on the recognition and the applicability of Bauer's concept of "well-educated mind" among history instructors and their teaching methodologies. Since the theory depends heavily on the extensive reading list of the "great books" concept that teachers must be familiar with (included in the following research question six) all but one participant found the approach interesting, fresh, surprising, and applicable to their line of work. Most of the teachers revealed their interest in the work listed [see Appendix A] and its positive impact on their understanding of history and how they project this knowledge onto students. Although the concept seemed foreign at first, a quick glance at the reading list dissipated any doubt as to teachers' knowledge of the Adler's (1984) or Bauer's (2003) literature list. Most teachers (85% of the interviewed respondents) agreed to Bauer's concepts of applicability and benefit in their teaching careers. However, just as many expressed their concerns over the difficulties of the texts, time constraints, and students' abilities to cope with this approach through reading.

Research Theme 6

This research question attempted to address the acceptance or the resistance of Adler's (1982) original idea of the *Paideia proposal* and the "great books" concept into the main stream

of K-12 history instruction. Most of the respondents could not identify the “great books” concept, but after few enlightening moments, and time with the list [see Appendix A] most of the teachers were familiar with the literature list. Ron, a twenty plus year veteran and department chair, acknowledged the list but positioned it from his students’ perspective:

I heard of it but I never got into it. I have a comment. I see a problematic approach. I can tell you right now: students wouldn’t understand the Herodotus. I read ‘The Prince’ by Machiavelli, we read ‘Poetics’ now but the students are struggling. As you have discovered yourself, some of the difficulty lies in the complex sentence structures in Locke, Hume, and Plato. The students get just lost in the sentences. The concept is marvelous but the problem is the sheer volume of the material. For instance, we read the Cave Allegory but not the whole Republic. Since most of it is not on our power standards we don’t bother. There is simply not enough time. (personal communication, October 28, 2011)

Magda was quick to point to her limitation in this question:

You know what? I’ve never heard of it. After reviewing your list, I can recognize just a few but I don’t imagine using it in class. ‘The Prince’ comes to mind by Machiavelli, with which we work a bit through more simplified discussions. I have seen some of the titles, but not read them. (personal communication, November 3, 2011)

Patricia was surprised at first but quickly regained her ground:

Not really, not that I can recall. Oh, upon looking at this list I can recognize that most of those show in our standards. I am familiar with just about all of them. Locke’s, and *The Reasonableness of Christianity*, Rousseau’s *The Social Contract*, Paine’s *Common Sense*, Marx, *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*, and *The Souls of Black Folk*, I didn’t read with my class but used it, *The Democracy in America* by de Tocqueville is part of my standard. Some I honestly haven’t heard . . . *The Longest Day* by Ryan? No, I am not familiar, and not sure if I’d enjoy it since I am not a military historian. (personal communication, November 5, 2011)

Osa’s, a history department chair, reaction was almost identical with a denial at first and a quick repeal afterwards:

No. But after reviewing this list I can state that I am very familiar with the texts. Now, I am a history major, most history teachers are not history majors so I can see how this list may not be familiar. More and more districts desire its social science teachers to teach: psychology, history, political science, history, philosophy, economics, geography, etc. . . . but you can see how some may find this list unfamiliar. (personal communication, November 7, 2011)

All of the following respondents had an exactly the same reaction to the question. In Eliza’s words,

No . . . I see, is this the literature list? It rings a bell. Oh yeah, we do read *Prince, Social Contract*, “Common Sense,” . . . oh yes, most of the texts on the list are covered either in our US history, AP history, or world history curriculum. Most of them are familiar to me. (personal communication, November 9, 2011)

Shena’s response was,

No, but after reviewing the list I am very familiar with many of the literature titles. In fact, I am familiar with a lot of these on the handout. We go over some of these titles but not all of them. (personal communication, November 15, 2011)

Although Adler’s work and concepts seemed unfamiliar to most of the respondents, the content and the aim of his methodology is present not only in California’s curriculum standards but teachers’ choices of reading (see Table 4).

Table 4

Result of Adler’s “Great Books” Concept Familiarity Among Teachers From Survey Instrument

Are you familiar with Adler’s concept?	% of respondents ^a
Yes, I am	30
No, I am not	65

^a $n = 30$ but only 23 responded to this question.

In stark contrast to the survey findings the interviews revealed different results. When asked, a clear majority of the interviewed participants expressed their unfamiliarity with the concept of “great books” at first. However, upon seeing the list (see Appendix A) all but one recognized almost all of the literature pieces listed. Consequently, the data obtained from the survey instrument were accurate yet incomplete due to this limitation.

In this chapter the data revealed the importance of literature and primary sources not only in teachers’ but also students’ history education. While the survey data revealed that there is much expressed commitment to primary sources, the interviews suggested that these commitments were difficult to carry out in current classroom settings across Inland Empire. Both the survey and the interview data provided that there is a great deal of evidence for life-long learning, extensive reading, and holistic background to history instructors. Furthermore, most interviews revealed the passion and encouragement for deep seeded love of history, literature, and history profession as a whole.

Discussion of Findings and Themes

The issue of bias in this qualitative research demands a special attention and discussion as in any qualitative research project. While researcher bias and subjectivity are commonly

understood as inevitable and important by most qualitative researchers, the general tendency among the K-12 community today seems to suggest that most remain uncomfortable with the idea of a highly subjective research. A systematic and reflective analysis of pedagogical content knowledge through a carefully designed primary sources survey and the follow-up interviews among the teachers in Southern California suggest that issues raised by Bauer (2003) and Adler (1984) require more critical thinking and reflection than initially assumed by the researcher. The initial assumption of the researcher and a research supposition in this study was that (a) teachers are not well-read and prepared to teach history and (b) Bauer's (2003) and Adler's (1984) theoretical frameworks could provide a remedy to the ailing history programs in the K-12 environment. The data obtained from the participants in this study suggested quite opposite results: (a) surveyed and interviewed teachers were in fact well-read and prepared to teach K-12 history and beyond, and (b) the suggested "great books" concept of Bauer (2003) and Adler (1984) is heavily represented in California history standards. Thus Bauer's idea of "well-educated mind" is technically followed.

The teacher voices in this paper, and the unique framework in which they are expressed, conveyed their increased understanding of biases, their role in reproducing the next generation of scholars, and above all their self-discovery in the process of life-long learning that includes Bauer's literature lists. As a result, several themes developed as a direct consequence of the follow-up interviews. Although the questions asked through the interviews were pre-designed (see Appendix B) most teachers shared the additional information about themselves, their students, administrators, and the nature of their job and duties either on or off the record.

One such theme is the importance of teacher identity through pedagogical content knowledge. Levstik and Barton (2008), for example, clearly demonstrated the impact of certain key intellectual influences, commitments, and curiosities, both on their own character as scholars and on the direction and development of their research. They reveal connections between what they were thinking at a particular time and why, what, and how they were conducting their studies. (p. 31)

Interestingly, their discussion of their research suggests how their studies might have been different, had they been carried out today. The timing and the selection of the interviews in this study echoed Levstik and Barton's conclusions. This is different from, though equally important to, the contemporary practice of researchers "positioning" themselves. This process is clearly seen through the series of interviews in this study. All teachers positioned themselves to answer the inquiry questions based on their life experiences and knowledge they possessed at the time. This same process appeared to mold their classroom interactions, themes, and discussions apart from the required pacing guide standards.

In a related theme, curiosity for growth through reading the conceptual literature included in Bauer (2003) and Adler (1984), generated the intellectual growth and the reflective self-criticism seen in the interviews. Just like Levstik and Barton (2008) who reconstructed their own course of development as researchers, showing how the unsuitability of prevailing learning theories and dominant methodologies, these teachers resorted to seeking out new appropriate approaches through the social context-oriented theories using photographic images, videos, and biases. The teachers in this study demonstrated the causes and effects of decisions that distinctly affected their work and their students. This self-critical, thoughtful orientation is evident throughout the interviews and was supported by beyond-average level of content knowledge, as in Ron's historical and contextual unfolding of investigations in his classrooms (personal communication, October 28, 2011). What Ron created, through his own perfection of knowledge

and through his own intellectual curiosity, provided a starting point for social reproduction of perhaps the same curiosity in his students.

Levstik and Barton (2008) also “presented the benefits and difficulties of several significant elements of their work, including collaboration, international and cross-cultural research, and interdisciplinary study” (p. 73). They argue that the potential payoffs outweigh the complications and time invested in the research. As both the survey research and the interviews show, this cross-cultural curiosity can lead to a productive and influential pedagogy. Levstik and Barton’s insights were extremely important and relevant to all the findings and interpretation of data in this research.

Levstik and Barton’s (2008) second set of background theoretical themes dealt with children’s historical knowledge and understanding, and the principal concern of the interviewed teachers in this study. They argued that even very young children: “1) can and do ‘know’ history; 2) create contextualized and situated historical understandings; 3) are capable of historical sense-making and reasoning; and 4) are able to produce knowledge as historical (and archaeological) researchers” (p. 78). The teachers interviewed in this study did diverge some information about their students, which only in a small part (can and do “know” history) agreed with Levstik and Barton (2008) research. The largest obstacle to become more effective and challenging history teachers in the Inland Empire schools was students’ difficulty to comprehend complex historical arguments, paradoxes, or even comprehensive reading of the primary sources. Ron, Patricia, Shena, and Osa all agreed that most students entering their classes possess bleak or below basic knowledge of historical events. What was more surprising was the statement by Shena who stated that most 11th and 12th graders in her classes read with 9th or 10th grade level skills. Lacking vocabulary and the possession of the basic elementary knowledge of reading and logic among most students prevented Shena from deeper exploration of the historical themes with what appeared to be a significant number of students. Levstik and Barton maintained that history teaching and learning are contingent processes, ones in which student identity makes a difference to how they are being taught. History education, therefore, is not an absolute, predictable, one-size-fits-all system of rights and wrongs, as depicted on the popular measures of high stakes testing. All teachers disagreed with the high stakes testing and even with the basic multiple-choice measurements, which may not be appropriate for history education. Ron, Shena, Osa, and Eliza repeatedly underlined the fact that all teaching is catered to the tests, leaving little or no room for the narratives and stories searched for by Bauer. Such findings, as reasonable as they may sound to most readers, still contest the dominant order of history and social studies education.

A third set of findings and themes addresses history teaching itself. Levstik and Barton make several points that are often discounted by educational “leaders” but that are nonetheless crucial to contemporary history and social studies education. Levstik and Barton promote history teaching based on the notions (shared by Bauer) that:

1) there are a multitude of good history educators and educators; 2) learning and understanding history is an active and dynamic process; 3) the field of history is inherently multidisciplinary and multifaceted; and 4) high-stakes standardized test scores do not necessarily represent what students know and understand about history. (p. 80)

These theoretical assumptions and Levstik and Barton’s (2008) and Bauer’s (2003) findings were reinforced in this study, which overwhelmingly found these suggestions valid. The fourth suggestion from Levstik and Barton and Bauer resonated passionately in this study. Ron, a twenty plus some years veteran, insinuated broadly, that the standardized testing in the field of

history sets the stage for the unfortunate nature of the course (a perspective shared by most of the teachers interviewed):

I am sure you came across and tripped over the standardized testing in the field of history. If you're looking for major problems and how to fix them, you can surely look at testing to the standards list that must be addressed. It really comes down to trivia. Tests are mostly written with low-level questions so I ask myself, "Did I teach the right trivia?" I am not following the California standard curriculum for my pre-IB history classes, as most others do in my profession. My students score very well on the state standards. I have a group of students who understand history at a deeper level of causality, cause and effect, and more on the meta-cognitive level that perhaps many don't. Sadly, the majority of all students have to rush through two to six chapters, and then memorize simple and meaningless facts! For instance, "The Schliffen Plan" comes on the test every year, so if I touch on that topic hoping that the students will be able to recall the term from their short-lived memory on the test. So this is this trivia I am talking about. Nothing deep since we have no time to cover but a triviality of memorized events that are totally disconnected from any logic. Now, I have the honor students in my classes, with whom I "unpack" the standards and look for the buzzword "power standard" that will most likely appear on the test. Without much discussion most history teachers teach towards the test, and those "power standards!" Now, I am not teaching the standard curriculum. There are some old-timers in our district who simply don't care and set their lessons to address only the items that will address the release questions from the California test. Those "power standards" help position the students before the test to see if they can score higher than previously and move from let's say "below basic" to "basic" level and by that improve school's overall standing within the district. In fact most are concerned with moving the students from far below basic to basic understanding since this is the area in which school scores the highest. The losers are the children who are average "proficient," and could move to the higher bracket "advanced." This area is not so meaningful for the schools as the below basic-to-basic movement and little or no time is spent addressing good students. If I move one student from "far bellow basic" to "basic" I get more of a bump in my API than one good student from the "proficient" to the "advanced." So now you can see where the priorities are and how they can be manipulated. We had thirty 5% of students of World History in "far below basic" level last year and only 18% this year by dedicating three history teachers to teach towards the test, building a simulated or similar test to the administered standard, and using it periodically throughout the year. The power standards were addressed! (personal communication, October 28, 2011)

Ron's comments resonated throughout this study as extremely insightful insinuating the process of trivializing the history curriculum to the point of simple memorization in order to pass the standards' test. Moreover, teaching methodology became mechanized and catered only towards the outcome (test). Thus teaching towards the test predominates in history classrooms! This becomes extremely problematic and exclusive of Bauer's concept of *trivium* pedagogy. As a result, history education is trivialized and marginalized through focusing on one and only one objective: teaching towards the test in order to pass the test! To the unexamined content and processes involved in the K-12 schooling in California, an average observer could point to (a) the

quality of teachers as the main culprit in the state of affairs of history education, and (b) the general lack of use of the great books reading list. Both of these variables were not found to be determining factors in this study. It is not the methodology of instruction, the instructor's lack of involvement, or their pedagogical content knowledge but, as Ron and the research instrument suggest, lack of time for proper instruction, broad curriculum, trivia, and the marginalization of the humanities in the K-12 environment. These outside factors that are out of teachers' control: the reduced hours for the humanities' curriculum, pacing guides that sprint through the over-trivialized curriculum, and teaching towards the test detract from history pedagogy in Southern California secondary schools. Thus the initial assumption of this study that placed teachers and their pedagogical content knowledge under scrutiny, and which was not explicitly investigated, resulted in the greater findings that mostly point out to the design of history curriculum and courses and their nature of testing among other factors—a conclusion requiring a further research.

Limitations of Study Design and Procedures

Another set of problems that the researcher encountered stemmed from the small sample of teachers achieved in this study: a survey instrument responded to by 30 participants, and interviews by six teachers. A verification (and extension) of the results with a larger sample of teachers could be helpful for several reasons. A larger sample could be more representative, since all participants in this study were volunteers and the majority held a department head position. Secondly, the sampled population represented the “willing and able” pool of history teachers and missed those perhaps who were “less willing and more unable.” Since the research questions relied heavily on the subjects who could perhaps surface and solidify this exact assumption, the results of this study became heavily skewed towards the group of the willing, the best, and brightest among the K-12 teachers in the Inland Empire of Southern California.

In addition to a small sample and participation, which was due in part to the methodological limitation, most of the data collected through the survey instruments were self-reported. This type of data gathering rarely can be independently verified thus the interviews, questionnaires, and comments had to be considered at face value. What may be included in this limitation are the potential sources of bias such as (a) selective memory of the participants, (b) telescoping of erroneous recall of events and issues, (c) attribution of positive outcomes to one's own experience but negative ones to others', and (d) misrepresentations through exaggeration or embellishment.

A possible limitation of the researcher was perhaps the most important in this study design. Access to participants and organizations in Inland Empire was very limited. In fact, any attempt to collect data on school premises was promptly denied by all school districts through either written or electronic formats. As a result of this major limitation, all data were collected through publicly available means of contacting individual teachers through their email accounts at their respective districts. This “access” limitation explains the marginally small sample in the survey instrument. In addition, lack of prior research studies on this topic made it difficult to understand issues at hand. The exploratory design of this study became a new research typology, where initial assumptions were quickly dismissed in lieu of entirely new and emerging research problems, themes, and findings.

Findings and Future Implications

Although this study serves as a testimony to the hard work of history teachers and their uphill struggle to deliver quality of education, it is difficult to ignore the systemic limitations. This exploratory research attested to the existence and practice of *trivium* and *paideia* concepts among Southern California's teachers. What limits the desired educational outcomes in history pedagogy in the Inland Empire schools is the overall mutual exclusivity of the curriculum and instructional time. Most teachers interviewed in this study pointed out to the overall lack of instructional time to cover the material. In fact, all the testimonies of interviewed teachers stressed the systematic decreases of instructional hours in the past semesters. What emerged from the observations in this study was the dichotomous relation of the limitations and educational goals. The dichotomy of this mutual exclusivity could be described as: the overall curriculum standards and the "well-educated" teachers on one side, and the testing methodology as well as lack of the instructional time on the opposite side. With these findings, among Southern California schools, it is almost impossible to set any meaningful goals and corrections that may remedy the decaying state of history education. How can a young adult actively and effectively learn history of the United States when: (a) the tests are trivialized and of grammarian nature, (b) he or she is taught towards the tests or power standards, (c) there is not enough time to cover the material in a meaningful manner, (d) the release questions from the previous high stakes tests are driving curriculum for most teachers, (e) increasing API scores, and not learning, is the only objective for the districts, and finally (f) both history and humanities are marginalized in lieu of English and math.

The qualitative interview data suggest an overall crisis in the humanities and social science curriculum in all measured K-12 institutions (see above Table 5). The dichotomy of equally opposed factors, (limitations and outcomes are mutually exclusive), create a divergent paradox that limits the established history curriculum and pedagogy. Although this study points to the consistency of history standards and curriculum as agreed by Bauer, the reduced instructional time and overbearing trivialization deems the system to failure.

Table 5
Dichotomy of Limitations and History Education

Existing condition	Limitation	Desired outcomes
Instructional time	Reduced	Increased
High stakes tests	Grammarians and trivial	Not appropriate for discipline
Curriculum	Test driven	Holistic and literature driven
Methodology of pedagogy	Teaching towards the test	Critical thinking, reading
Politicized priorities	API scoring and game	Eliminate history API
Marginalization of humanities	Needed in lieu of math and English	Increased role to equal importance

This failure can only be remedied by the increased instructional time and equal consideration of humanities to the importance of math and English. Thus, overwhelmingly, this research' recommendations call for the increased instructional time and non-high stakes testing methods in history instruction among Inland Empire schools. After all, the aims of history education through California history curriculum in K-12 system and the way this subject is taught, trivialized, and limited as shown in this research, cannot be rectified. Perhaps, the only suggestive way out of this systemic failure is the realignment of the curriculum instruction in which: English, math, sciences, and humanities are equally important thus given an equally adequate instructional time.

Based on the above findings and their implications, this study further suggests the inquiry and investigation into the wide-spread phenomena of "teaching towards the test," into depoliticizing of curriculum and API scores, and the instructional time limitations for history and humanities, which became standard among the Inland Empire district schools.

References

- Adler, M. J. (1982). *Paideia proposal: An educational manifesto*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Allardyce, G. (1982). The rise and fall of the Western Civilization course. *The American Historical Review*, 87(3), 695-725.
- Anderson, P. (1984). Modernity and revolution. *New Left Review*, 144, 96-113.
- Aristotle. (2000). *Aristotle: Art of Rhetoric*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Appadurai, A. (2008). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Apple, M. W. (2000). Can critical pedagogies interrupt rightists policies? *Educational Theory*, 50(2), 220-254.
- Apple, M. (2004). Creating difference: Neo-liberalism, neo- conservatism and the politics of education. *Education policy*, 18(1), 12-44.
- Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. A. (1990). *Postmodern education: Politics, culture, & social criticism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ayers, E. L. (2009). Where the humanities live. *Daedalus Journal of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences*, 9(1), 24-34.
- Bandura, A. (1971). *Social learning theory*. New York, NY: General Learning.
- Baudillard, J. (1988). *Selected writings*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bauer, S. W. (2003). *Well-educated mind: A guide to the classical education you never had*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Bauman, Z. (2000) *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bell, D. (1976). *The cultural contradictions of capitalism*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bloom, B. S. (1971) Mastery learning. In J. H. Block (Ed.), *Mastery learning: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Bloom, A. (1987). *The closing of the American mind*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Brown, S. D. (2007). History circles: The doing of teaching history. *The History Teacher*, 42(2), 56-72.
- Bok, D. C. (2006). *Our underachieving colleges: A candid look at how much students learn and why they should be learning more*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York, NY: Greenwood).
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). Reproduction in education, society and culture. *Theory, Culture, & Society*, 2(2), 1-90.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (2003). Schooling in capitalist America twenty-five years later. *Sociological Forum*, 18(2), 343-348.
- Burke, K. (1969). *A rhetoric of motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cherryholmes, C. H. (1988). *Power and criticism: Post- structural investigations in education*. New York, NY: Teachers' College Press.
- Craver, S. M., & Ozmon, H. A. (2008). *Philosophical foundations of education* (8th ed.). Alexandria, VA: Prentice Hall.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and education* (2nd ed.) New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Dewey, J. (1997). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Touchstone.
- Driscoll, M. P. (2007). *Psychology of learning for instruction* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Allyn & Bacon.
- D'Souza, D. (1991). *Liberal education: The policy of race and sex on the campuses*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Eagleton, T. (1985). The subject of literature. *The Cultural Critique*, 2, 95-104.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A. (2006). *The Giroux reader*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Gott, R. (1986). The crisis of contemporary culture. *The Guardian*, 1(10), 5-9.
- Graser, M. (2009). World history in a nation-state: The transnational disposition in historical writing in the United States. *The Journal of American History*, 103(3), 268-275.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *The philosophical discourse of modernity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Heidegger, M. (2008). *Basic writings*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Hirsch, F. (1976). *Social limits to growth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press.
- Hutchins, R. (1936). *The higher learning in America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hutchins, R. (1937). Grammar, rhetoric, and Mr. Dewey. *The Social Frontier*, 3(23), 137-139.
- Jaeger, W. (1936) *Paideia: The ideals of Greek culture, Volume I*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Jaeger, W. (1945) *Paideia: The ideals of Greek culture, Volume III*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Jenkins, K. (2007). *Re-thinking history*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Joyce, B., Weil, M., & Calhoun, E. (2004). *Models of teaching*. (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Kaplan, E. A. (1988). *Postmodernism and its discontents*. London, England: Verso Books.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University Of Chicago Press.
- Laclau, E. (1988). Politics and the limits of modernity. In A. Ross ed., *Universal abandon?* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Levstik, S., & Barton, K. C. (2008). *Researching history education: Theory, method, and context*. NY: Routledge.
- Liotard, J. (1984). *The postmodern condition*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Maslow, A. (1962). *Toward a psychology of being*. New York, NY: Van Nostrand.
- Miller, A. (2007). Rhetoric, paideia and the old idea of a liberal education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 41(2), 183-202.
- McLaren, P., and Ramin Farahmandpur (2005). *Teaching against global capitalism and the new imperialism: A critical pedagogy*. New York, NY: Littlefield.
- Moody, J. (2004). *Faculty diversity: Problems and solutions*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.
- Morris, M. (1988). *The pirate's fiancée: Feminism, reading, postmodernism*. London, England: Verso Press.
- Noblit, G. W., Flores, S. Y., & E. G. Murillo. (2004). *Postcritical ethnography: Reinscribing critique*. Cresskill, NY: Hampton Press.

- Parker, W. C. (2010). *Social studies today: Research and practice*. New York, NY: Rutledge.
- Parsons, A. W. (1949). A family of philosophers at Athens and Alexandria. *Hesperia Supplements*, 8, 268-462.
- Ravitch, D. (2002). Should we be alarmed by the results of the U.S. History test? YES. *History News Network*, 5(1), 11-15.
- Rorty, R. (1985). Habermas and Lyotard on postmodernity. In R. Bernstein (Ed.), *Habermas and modernity* (pp. 121-130). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Sayers, D. L. (1948). *The lost tools of learning*. London, England: Methuen.
- Schervish, P. G. (2003). The inheritance of wealth and the commonwealth: The ideal of paideia in an age of affluence. *Willy Periodicals*, 42(12), 5-25.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundation of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Slekar, T. (2005). Case history of a methods course: Teaching and learning history in “rubber room.” *The Social Studies*, 1(1), 237-241.
- Weinberg, S. L. (2008) Monitoring faculty diversity: The need for a more granular approach. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(4), 366-387.
- Weltman, B. (2002). Individuation versus socialism in American education: Rereading Morimer Adler and the paideia proposal. *Educational Theory*, 52(1), 61-83.
- White, H. L. (1983). World History: Theories, teaching models, textbooks, community college practices. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Illinois State University, Normal.
- Willis, P. (1977) Notes towards a theory of cultural forms and social reproduction. *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Wilson, S. (2003). *The case for classical Christian education*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.
- Yilmaz, K. (2008). A vision of history teaching and learning: Thought on history education in secondary schools. *The High School Journal*, 12, 37-46.
- Zinn, Howard. (2003). *A people's history of the United States: Teaching edition Abridged*. Boston, MA: New Press.

Zoja, L. (1997). Individuation and paideia. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 42(1), 481-505.