University of Alabama at Birmingham

UAB Digital Commons

All ETDs from UAB

UAB Theses & Dissertations

2021

The Marriage of Public Issues and Civic Action: A Case on Integrating Public Issues into the C3 Framework

Rebecca Macon Bidwell
University Of Alabama At Birmingham

THE MARRIAGE OF PUBLIC ISSUES AND CIVIC ACTION: A CASE STUDY ON
INTEGRATING PUBLIC ISSUES INTO THE C3 FRAMEWORK

by

REBECCA MACON BIDWELL

JEREMIAH CLABOUGH, COMMITTEE CHAIR
LOIS M. CHRISTENSEN
ANDREW KEITT
JENNA LACHENAYE
SUSAN SPEZZINI

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the graduate faculty of The University of Alabama at Birmingham,
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA

2021

THE MARRIAGE OF PUBLIC ISSUES AND CIVIC ACTION: A CASE STUDY ON
INTEGRATING PUBLIC ISSUES INTO THE C3 FRAMEWORK

REBECCA MACON BIDWELL

EDUCATIONAL STUDIES OF DIVERSE POPULATIONS (ESDP)

ABSTRACT

This qualitative case study examined a teacher's perceptions of implementing a research intervention that included the discussion of public issues and analyzed student artifacts from the intervention for ideas related to taking civic action. The research intervention was created using indicators from the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework published by the National Council of the Social Studies (NCSS, 2013). The researcher used purposeful sampling to choose who would implement the research intervention. The case study took place in an 11th grade U.S. history class during the 2020-2021 school year. The methods of data collection included teacher interviews and analysis of student artifacts generated by the research intervention. Analysis of the data generated several themes related to discussing public issues and taking civic action. Findings suggested that teaching strategies using the discussion of public issues fosters civic empathy in students akin to that identified by Endacott and Brooks (2013). However, some students had difficulty developing civic empathy because they failed to develop a civic identity through the intervention. Another finding also suggested that students benefit when using civic action examples that are culturally relevant to their own communities. It was also suggested that discussing public issues develops civic thinking skills, and that those skills are essential for civic literacy.

Keywords: public issues, civic action, civic empathy, civic thinking, civic literacy

DEDICATION

For my parents, Barbara and Jim Macon. They helped me believe that I could do anything. For my brother and sisters, without whom I would have never completed the project. Finally, for my family. Your love and support are what made this possible. I love you.

<div align="right">RMB.</div>

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The publication of the College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework by the National Council of the Social Studies (NCSS) has changed social studies instruction. The C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013) was published out of concern that the Common Core State Standards, published by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers (NGA, CCSSO), was de-emphasizing the importance of teaching social studies literacy, thinking, and argumentation skills (NGA, CCSSO, 2010; NCSS, 2013). The purpose of the C3 Framework is to provide guidance for states, schools, and institutions in creating meaningful instruction for students in the K-12 social studies classroom (NCSS, 2013). Using research collected by experts in their fields, the C3 Framework laid the foundation for dramatic change in the way that the social studies is taught (NCSS, 2013). Moving from teacher-centered instruction to student-centered instruction, the framework lays out an outline to implement inquiries into the different disciplines of the social studies: civics, economics, geography, and history. The dramatic shift was influenced by scholarly research that indicated a growing need for students to be prepared for active participation in American democracy (NCSS, 2013).

Statement of the Problem

The current political discord carried out in social media and news media has renewed discussion of the importance of teaching students the skills of rational decision making and discussion of public issues (Engle, 1960; Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Oliver & Shaver, 1966). The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) assessed eighth grade students on social studies knowledge and skills. Called the "Nation's Report Card," it measured the proficiency of students using standards from U.S. history, geography, and civics. The most recently released report indicated that only 23% of students demonstrated mastery at or above proficient level in civics. The civics scores for eighth graders increased from the first administration of the assessments in 1998. However, there was no increase in scores from the 2010 administration of the assessment (NCES, 2015). Such results indicated that students were not acquiring the knowledge and skills necessary to be proficient in civics.

The C3 Framework called for student-centered inquiry-based learning through research and investigation, culminating in students taking civic action. Additionally, a major goal of the C3 Framework encourages students to use evidence to reach conclusions that help them become more active participants in society (NCSS, 2013). To achieve this goal, NCSS (2013) created the Inquiry Arc. The Inquiry Arc is comprised of four dimensions containing indicators that encourage students to develop questions, evaluate sources, use evidence, reach conclusions, and take civic action. Despite the encouragement for students to evaluate sources and use evidence in the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework, there were no guidelines for students to debate enduring and frequently controversial public issues in society. According to NCSS (2016a), social studies

instruction was best when it was value-based, meaningful, and active. When students debate public issues, they explore the social and political values that often undergird a democratic society. Students scrutinize the values at the core of the public issue by analyzing primary sources related to the discussion. This helps students practice the skills needed to become reasoned and democratic citizens (Clabough & Turner, 2015). Oliver and Shaver (1966) said that social studies instruction must prepare students to deal with controversial public issues by discussing conflicting social values. The authors suggested that not only do students need to be challenged with social and political controversies that examine ultimate human dignity, but they also need to struggle with decisions in which there is no easy choice. Therefore, there is a need in the research for studying the effects of discussing controversial public issues utilizing the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework on teaching public issues.

Purpose of the Study

Social studies instruction has been evolving over the last few decades. The study of perennial public issues is not new to the world of social studies instruction. Oliver and Shaver (1966) extolled the benefits of using discussions of public issues to prepare students to become active participants in society. Engle (1960), as well as Barr and colleagues (1977) argued that the most important goal of social studies instruction is to prepare students for participation in a democratic society. For active participation in a society, social studies students should be able to make rational decisions based on the evidence presented from multiple sides of the public issue. However, in the contentious

political climate of today, it has become vital that students learn how to deliberate important perennial issues rationally with other members of the community.

Oliver and Shaver (1966) supported the idea that learning about and discussing social and political issues improved the ability to think critically. For example, they explained that "by describing the ethical basis of our own governmental system, the student is introduced to the general subject of political philosophy . . . the more sophisticated our own citizens become, the more intelligent will be their ideological choices" (Oliver & Shaver, 1966, p. 85). Providing students with the foundational knowledge of the principles of democratic constitutionalism and opportunities to discuss controversial public issues prepares them for participation in a model of democratic constitutionalism like the one practiced by the United States.

Another purpose of the research study is to empower students by discussing public issues and taking civic action. Levinson (2012) made a strong argument for a growing civic empowerment gap. She argued that students' opportunities to analyze public policies varied by culture group. Levinson (2012) provided data indicating that individuals who make more than $75,000 a year were six times more active than individuals who make less than $15,000 a year. She provided evidence that students of color were less likely than their white counterparts to influence civic and political debate and decision making. Helping students learn the skills of making rational decisions, discussing perennial public issues, and taking civic action are all methods of closing the civic empowerment gap.

Although the publication of the C3 Framework and its Inquiry Arc has provided guidelines for how to implement inquiry in the social studies classroom and help students

take civic action, it says little about how to integrate discussions of public issues into the secondary social studies curriculum. Therefore, the proposed research study seeks information on how to integrate the study of public issues with taking civic action. For instance, best practices as described by NCSS (2016a) included using disciplinary knowledge, skills, and diverse perspectives to engage students in discussions of public issues and ways to improve society. The social studies classroom was described as "the ideal staging ground for taking informed action because of its unique role in preparing students for civic life" (NCSS, 2013, p. 62). In other words, students taking informed action could be seen as the natural extension of civic learning in the social studies classroom.

Significance of Extending the Literature on Public Issues

Despite the promising outlook of Oliver and Shaver's (1966) public issues model, the model failed to produce any significant change in social studies instruction. Stern (2011) conducted a review of the public issues model of teaching social studies, the teaching materials, and the authors' contributions to the project (Oliver & Shaver, 1966). She listed several reasons why the public issues model failed. Lack of support from teachers and administrators was a major cause of the demise of the model. Teachers feared a lack of support from administrators over the controversy that often arises when public issues are discussed. Administrators fear the backlash from parents and the community over discussions of public issues. Other factors contributing to its failure were lack of grant funding and high readability rates of the materials (Stern, 2011).

Despite the different ways that the model did not work, discussions of public issue are an important component of civics education (Gould et al., 2011).

The number of civics classes in which students learn the skills of civic participation is declining (iCivics, 2018). Journell (2010) referenced the large body of research examining the effects of high stakes testing on social studies instruction. Results of declining civics class enrollment were reflected in the 2014 civics assessment data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). According to NCES, students' proficiency in civics standards on standardized tests shows no gains from 2010 administration of the test to the 2014 administration of the test. Furthermore, only 23% of eighth graders demonstrated proficiency on the 2014 test (NCES, 2015). Indicators such as these support the need for more effective ways to teach social studies, particularly the knowledge and skills required for active participation in a democracy.

A reluctance to use discussions of often controversial, perennial public issues was noted in several studies. For instance, Byford and colleagues (2009) noted that teachers feared backlash from parents and their colleagues. The authors noted that teachers also feared more frequent classroom disturbances resulting from discussions of public issues. Journell (2013) discovered that despite deep pedagogical knowledge, pre-service social studies teachers lacked knowledge of contemporary public issues to effectively discuss these in the classroom. Other scholars have found that despite evidence of the benefits of discussing public issues, teachers rarely use these discussions during instruction (Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Journell, 2016; LeCompte & Blevins, 2015; Oliver & Shaver, 1966; Philpott et al., 2011). The proposed research study hopes to extend the literature on using discussions of public issues in the social studies classroom by designing a method for

integrating the best practices of discussing public issues with the best practices for taking civic action using the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework. Such a method prepares students for participation in American democracy.

Research Methodology

The researcher chose the instrumental case study research design for the proposed research study. Two research paradigms influenced the design of the proposed research study. The first to influence the research design was the social constructivist paradigm. This research paradigm allows for socially-constructed multiple realities for learners and the teacher (Creswell, 2015). Learning within this research paradigm is created jointly among the teacher, learner, and possibly other learners. Researchers using the social constructivist paradigm value a balance of views for the research. The second is the transformative research paradigm. Its ontology rejects cultural pluralism and focuses on the role of power in relationships (Creswell, 2015). The epistemology of the transformative research paradigm is similar to that of the constructivist research paradigm which encourages learning through cooperation and interaction. For this research paradigm, trust and power play a special role in learning. The transformative research paradigm values respect for cultural norms, as well as advocacy for oppressed groups. There is also value in challenging the status quo. The rationale for using these paradigms comes from the researcher's desire to design a research study in which the participants' cultures and values are honored and respected, while at the same time providing the tools to challenge the status quo of established institutions by providing learners with the skills to become active and productive members of American democracy.

The design of the research study is a qualitative instrumental case study. The case study is based on the proposition that when students discuss public issues as outlined by Oliver and Shaver (1966), as well as by other notable scholars, students are more naturally inclined to take civic action. Another fundamental proposition of the case study is that teachers need an easier way to integrate the discussion of public issues with the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013). For instance, Yin (2009) gave the following characteristics in his definition of a case study. "A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (p. 18). For the proposed research study, the contemporary phenomenon is the use of public issues within the real-life context of using the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework. The boundaries are blurred by the need for students to learn how to become active and participatory members of American society by taking civic action.

Research Questions

The researcher must create a series of case study questions that help her obtain the information needed to understand the participating teacher's experiences implementing the learning intervention (Yin, 2018, 2018). The propositions of this qualitative case study are based on the following research questions:

1. What ideas about taking civic action manifest in student artifacts from the research intervention when discussing public issues as part of a C3 Framework based lesson?

2. How do the classroom teacher's perceptions about implementing the designed research intervention change over the course of the study?

Public Issues and Taking Civic Action

Public issues have been defined in a number of ways. Oliver and Shaver (1966) described public issues as the problems that arise out of conflicts over social values in a community. This definition is based on the authors' assumptions that a number of subgroups in a society will have different ideas about how to solve public problems. Oliver and Shaver (1966) distinguished three problems that need to be clarified before starting any discussion of a public issue. The first problem is definitional. Are people with differing perspectives defining the public issue in the same way? Once all participants agree to a definition of the public issues, discussion of how to solve the problem can continue.

The second problem in the discussion of public issues is valuation. Valuation refers to the different ways that groups value the same public issue. Different subgroups value public issues in different ways. These differences in valuation often produce conflict over a public issue.

The third problem is evidence. Controversy arises during discussions of public issues when different subgroups make varying claims about the same public issue. Members of a democratic society must have the knowledge and skill to distinguish between claims based on evidence and those that are not. Likewise, members of a democratic society must possess the skill to differentiate among the claims and counterclaims by examining the evidence supporting the claims (NCSS, 2013; Oliver & Shaver, 1966).

Diana Hess (2009) wrote about the importance of the controversial aspects of discussing public issues. She has become a well-known expert on integrating the

discussion of controversial issues into the social studies classroom. She defined controversial issues as any issue that sparks significant disagreement. By introducing controversial issues into the social studies curriculum, students learn how to rationally discuss and deliberate public issues productively (Hess, 2009). Hess (2009) combined the ideas of several different authors. For instance, Hess's (2009) controversial issues model is predicated on Oliver and Shaver's (1966) public issues model. Her assertion that students must have the skills and abilities to make rational decisions reflects the works of Shirley Engle (1960). Hess's (2009) controversial model also reflects influences from scholars such as Barr and colleagues (1977) and Engle and Ochoa (1988) which encourage preparing students for the rigors of political participation. A basic premise of these texts is that students learn best when provided opportunities to engage in authentic decision-making practices revolving around some perennial public or social issue.

Hess and McAvoy (2015) argued that students are shaped—for good or bad—by their social experiences in school. The authors defined a controversial issue as the political process that asks basic questions about how individuals live together on a daily basis. They further explain that polarization harms society because it undermines trust in society. Individuals in a democratic society must have trust that other individuals will make good decisions regarding democracy. The losers in discussions of public issues must be able to trust that the winners will continue to represent the interests of the losers as well as themselves. Political polarization undermines that trust. The result is that fewer people participate in the discussion of public issues. Discussing controversial issues allows students to research the different perspectives of an issue, develop their own conclusions about the issue, and craft a reasonable response to the issue.

McAvoy (2016) argued that students growing up in the United States are growing up in a more bitter, partisan world. She stated that teachers needed to remember that students live in a more "fractured context—politically polarized and deeply divided along lines of race and social class" (p. 31). Exacerbating the issue is that for many students, this is the only climate of discussion that they have ever known.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Proposed Study

The proposed research design is a bounded qualitative research study limited to the study of one participating teacher's experiences implementing a framework for integrating public issues with the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013). As a result, the researcher must be careful not to generalize the findings in the research study to other classrooms across the country. Although other Southeastern states have similar demographics, populations, and cultures, students are uniquely influenced by their own location. Therefore, the data collected in the research study cannot be applied to similar situations, even in the same state, much less throughout the region. Another limitation is that the researcher was relegated to a specific geographic area due to the relationship between the researcher, the school district, and the university which approves the research.

Delimitations

The researcher iterated a couple of delimitations. For instance, the researcher chose to limit the research study to one case study, as opposed to a multiple case study approach. The primary justification of that decision is based on time limitations for the

research study. Also, the timing of the study is limited by the school's class schedule. The

school participating in the research study uses a modified block schedule. As a result, the

intervention takes place in a limited time frame at a faster pace than a traditional seven

period class schedule.

Theoretical Framework

The philosophical framework was influenced by Amy Gutmann's (1987) and

Paulo Freire's (1974) philosophies of the power of education for creating active citizens

in a democratic society. Gutmann's (1987) theory of democratic education aligns with the

best practices in civic education. She reviews the different theories influencing education

and outlines an argument for why the theory of democratic education is the best for

establishing educational policy. She argued that the inevitable arguments of educational

policy are a feature of the theory of democratic education, but also these arguments allow

opportunities for learning through the disagreements over the education policy. Most

notably, Gutmann (1987) acknowledged that "the primary aim of a democratic theory of

education is not to offer solutions to all the problems plaguing our educational

institutions, but to consider ways of resolving those problems that are compatible with a

commitment to democratic values" (Gutmann, 1987, p. 11). Gutmann's (1987)

democratic education theory is a natural extension of the ideals of a democratic society.

Paulo Freire (1970) argued that education should include teaching students how to

think for themselves. When students realize that they are part of an oppressive system

that exploits the knowledge and skills of its citizens, they work to transform the system

into a more equitable one in which the wealthy and their oppressive institutions are

overthrown and replaced with democratic institutions. This process does not occur easily.

Freire (1970) reasoned that communication was the key to meaning. He maintained that

> only through communication can human life hold meaning. The teacher's
> thinking is authenticated only by the authenticity of the students' thinking. The
> teacher cannot think for her students, nor can she impose her thought on them.
> Authentic thinking, thinking that is concerned about reality, does not take place in
> ivory tower isolation, but only in communication (Freire, 1970, p. 77).

Similarly, Freire argued that for critical awareness to occur, "it must grow out of a critical educational effort based on favorable historical conditions" and "achieving this step would thus require an active, dialogical educational program concerned with social and political responsibility and prepared to avoid the dangers of massification" (Freire, 1974, p. 15). The discussion of public issues supports Freire's idea that developing critical consciousness in students helps ensure that democracy continues to thrive. Such ideas complement basic ideas behind civic education.

The pedagogical framework for the study was informed by the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013), the public issues model (Oliver & Shaver, 1966), and the controversial issues model (Hess, 2009; Hess & McAvoy, 2015). Levinson's (2012) research confirming the civic education gap also influenced the pedagogical framework for the research study. Here, the common idea among these authors is the belief that discussing controversial public issues helps close the civic empowerment gap (Levinson, 2012), and it encourages students to take a more active role in democracy (Appiah, 2005; Banks, 2016; Fields, 2017; Hess, 2009; Hess & McAvoy, 2015; NCSS, 2013; Oliver & Shaver, 1966; Ross, 2014; Sklarwitz et al., 2015; Stanley, 2005; Stern & Riley, 2010).

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the following chapter, the researcher describes best practices and research on using public issues in the social studies classroom. A thorough review of the research revealed a wide range of articles and studies about public issues and social studies teachers' use of public issues in classroom instruction. Additionally, this review of the research also revealed that social studies teachers do not regularly implement discussions of public issues in their classrooms. Therefore, a need exists for developing a method for teachers to more easily implement discussions of public issues in the social studies classroom.

Best Practices and Research on Discussing Public Issues

Oliver and Shaver (1966) defined public issues as social and political controversies connected to issues, events, and public policies. They believed that students need to be put into situations in which they struggle with the choices during discussions of public issues. These types of discussions often spark intense disagreement. Students are encouraged to find a common solution to upholding ultimate human dignity. This is the definitive goal for creating informed and active citizens for a democratic society. Members of a community need to come together despite disagreements to compromise on a solution to a problem. For example, both President Obama and President Trump have

been heavily criticized for their policies of separating children from their parents who were attempting to cross the U.S. border illegally. The issue is the detention of immigrant children attempting to enter the U.S. illegally. The events were mass migrations of immigrants seeking asylum in the United States. The public policy associated with the issue is illegal immigration. The deeper issue is whether the basic rights of life, liberty, and happiness are denied to children held in detention centers. Oliver and Newmann (1992) defined public issues as "problems and value dilemmas persisting throughout history and across cultures" (p. 100). This definition clarified that discussing public issues is not relegated to one particular social studies discipline. Students often grapple with questions of humanity, liberty, and the common good in the social studies classroom. When given opportunities to observe, participate, and practice, students learn the skills needed to become active participants in a democracy.

Discussing public issues in the social studies classroom benefits students in many ways. Oliver and Shaver (1966) reported that learning about and discussing social and political issues improved students' ability to think critically. The authors argued further that providing students with the foundational knowledge of the principles of democratic constitutionalism and opportunities to discuss controversial public issues prepared them for participation in a constitutional democracy like the one practiced by the United States.

Another important benefit of civic education is building students' civic identity. Engle and Ochoa (1988) discussed ways for helping students learn the skills to make informed decisions in a democratic society. When discussing the basic tenets of democracy, access to information is vital. In developing their own identities, students must have opportunities to use their intellectual skills to make meaning out of the

information around them. They must also be able to classify, sort, validate, and justify information particularly as it relates to public issues and social problems. Developing these skills helps students reflect on their own civic identities as they investigate and make decisions regarding public issues and social problems (Clabough, 2017).

Avery and colleagues (2013) presented information from their international study on the effectiveness of the Deliberating in a Democracy project. The results of their study indicated several benefits for students deliberating public issues as part of the curriculum. Students reported having greater insight into public issues and felt more confident about public issues when discussing them with their peers. They could also more fluently express their opinions as a result of participating in discussions of public issues. Avery and colleagues (2013) also argued that their findings were "educationally and civically significant" (p. 111) because it showed that students could learn to recognize the differing rationales of differing views on public issues. Such a skill showed a more nuanced understanding of the issue, and also that students could understand reasonable people can disagree without vilifying the other.

Theory, Practice, and Research on Teaching Public Issues

The researcher discusses the theory, practice, and research on teaching public issues in the following section. The discussion was divided into three sections: public issues, civics instruction, and public issues. The purpose of this section is to summarize the theory, practice, and research impacting the research study.

Public Issues

Oliver and Shaver (1966) laid the foundation for the use of public issues discussions and deliberations in the social studies classroom. In their model, students discuss the 'should' type of ethical questions. Ethical questions evolved into other legal, factual, and definitional questions where students compare competing solutions for the ethical dilemma. The mixture of ethics, law, government, and politics within discussions around perennial public issues is referred to as jurisprudential teaching. Their stated goal of attacking both the broad, abstract nature of the substance of the social studies that renders the social studies learner a passive participant, and the fractural nature of the social studies curriculum that provide the foundation for the text. The authors took the position that using public issues in the social studies requires a common set of well-established standards, a common set of ethical and political conduct, and a common set of vocabulary. Based on the American creed developed by Gunnar Myrdal (1944), such concepts included property rights, free speech, and separation of powers. Social studies teachers, according to the authors, should make a commitment to the selection of controversial and political issues when selecting content for instruction in the social studies.

Oliver and Newmann (1992) published an article about teaching public issues in the secondary social studies classroom. The authors argued that the public issues model could be used to discuss a wide range of issues related to the many different social studies disciplines. An example they provided was how using the public issues model could be used in civics to grow students' interests in the dynamic political system of the U.S. by analyzing case histories relevant to the issues. The power of analogy was another tool

Oliver and Newmann (1992) suggested that could help teachers successfully facilitate discussions of public issues. By using analogies of variants for the same public issue, teachers challenge students to justify the distinctions in their beliefs related to the public issue. Analogies also allowed students to make connections across time and place. An interesting part of the article was the authors' assertion that students could learn to work toward mutual understanding and compromise as opposed to taking defensive positions to uphold their position. The authors argued that discussions centered on public issues could be as exciting for participants as attending a competitive sports event. However, to achieve such a feat, teachers need to establish class procedures that become second nature for participants. Additionally, for discussions to be authentic and effective, "the letting go to express one's most significant and authentic feelings and ideas and the skilled personal and group reflection that give direction to these moments of letting go" (Oliver & Newmann, 1992, p. 103) must be carefully fostered through an atmosphere of trust in the classroom. The authors argued that discussing public issues "is to use the power of both critical and caring relationships to educate individuals and the group" (Oliver & Newmann, 1992, p. 103). As a result, there must be a sense of camaraderie, support, and sensitivity established by the teacher and the group.

Bohan and Feinberg (2008) conducted a retrospective analysis of the work of Donald Oliver, Fred Newmann, and James Shaver on the Harvard Social Studies Project. These authors, according to Bohan and Feinberg (2008), focused extensively on inquiry-based lessons, decision-making, and case study analyses. Bohan and Feinberg (2008) also argued that Donald Oliver, Fred Newmann, and James Shaver "made notable contributions to social studies education" (Bohan & Feinberg, 2008, p. 54). These authors

also explored the contributions of each scholar to the Harvard Social Studies Project, and the impact following its publication and distribution. The ensuing pamphlets encouraged students to examine multiple perspectives of an issue, examine historical sources, and evaluate factual claims and values related to the public or social issue. Bohan and Feinberg (2008) reviewed the framework and methodology of the Harvard Social Studies Project noting its reliance on historical methodology, and the inherent use of primary and secondary sources to examine different perspectives on an issue, learn new information, and establish the relevance to the public or social issue. After relating the contributions of each scholar to the Harvard Social Studies Project, Bohan and Feinberg (2008) reviewed the materials and procedures of the project. They concluded that the "aim of the Harvard Social Studies Project was to encourage students to understand differing perspectives, evaluate sources, make judgements, and clarify values which are all ideas that represent the apex of human thinking" (Bohan & Feinberg, 2008, p. 62). Such comments illustrate the authors' belief that the innovative approaches used in the Harvard Social Studies Project should guide contemporary efforts to promote student discourse on public issues.

Levy (2018) conducted a study on the effects of student participation in a Model UN club and how this supports the development of students' political efficacy. Developing students' political efficacy is important because of its role in predicting political participation. Students with a high level of political efficacy tend to participate politically. Participation in the Model UN club helped students "research, discuss, debate, and propose solutions to complex political problems, such as poverty, discrimination, and nuclear proliferation" (Levy, 2018, p. 415). One of the conclusions reached by the author was that authentic political participation supports the development of political efficacy,

but few students have been engaged in such activities. Another factor instrumental in the development of political efficacy is the opportunity to discuss political issues with their peers. Discussing public issues as part of the social studies curriculum helps develop political efficacy, which in turn is a strong predictor of political participation.

Singleton and Giese (1996) revisited the public issues model that came out of the Harvard Social Studies Project. Based on the authors' interpretation of the public issues model, they concluded that citizens of the U.S. must have three important characteristics:

1. Citizens should be familiar with the values of the civic culture of the U.S. (e.g., the values of the U.S. Constitution, Bill of Rights, Declaration of Independence, and pivotal court cases).

2. Citizens should also have skills clarifying and resolving different types of issues (i.e. social, political, and economic) by weighing evidence, analyzing legal and ethical arguments, examining the different perspectives, and synthesizing the information in order to make the best possible decision.

3. Citizens must be passionate and committed to working with other citizens to make the best possible decisions for democracy (Singleton & Giese, 1996).

Singleton and Giese (1996) also offered two criteria for selecting issues used for discussion: the importance of the issue to the community and the personal significance of the issue for teachers and students. They also reviewed the three basic areas of possible disagreement related to public and social issues. For instance, the public issues model advocated that issues could spark disagreement in three ways: over the definition of the issue, over the facts or events of the issue, and over the ethics of the issue and what should or should not be done. Following their discussion of the public issues model, the authors offered six steps for discussing issues using the public issues model. The first step included being sensitive to what other people are saying to ensure that people are discussing the same issue. The next step was clearly stating the issue, followed by setting

an agenda to address all aspects of the issue. The next two steps were making clear

transitions before moving away from the current discussion and avoiding potential

roadblocks in the discussion. The last step was reflecting on the discussion. The authors

suggested that students and teachers know that a discussion has been productive when the

positions and discussions were more complex than when the discussion started. This type

of discussion reflects authentic civics practices for students as they enter democratic

society.

　　　　Walter Parker (1996) wrote about assessing students' learning using an issue-

centered curriculum. He outlined six steps in curriculum planning for the inclusion of

issues in the social studies curriculum. The six steps were content selection, use of

multiple objectives, focus on the core curriculum, assessment, curriculum differentiation,

and opportunities to learn. He outlined the six steps to emphasize the important link

between curriculum planning and assessment. The teacher's decision to include selected

issues was what drove the assessment of the project. Parker (1996) argued that when

assessments are linked to curriculum goals that are clarified, specified, and qualified,

boundaries become blurred between assessment and curriculum goals. Assessment is the

extension of in-depth curriculum planning. For assessing student learning as part of an

issues-centered curriculum, Parker (1996) advocated issue-oriented assessment using

measures that fit valued curriculum goals and performance assessment. Performance

assessment requires students to "perform some type of task that is related meaningfully to

a valued curriculum goal" (Parker, 1996, p. 283). During the issues-centered discussion,

students complete performance tasks. The author also provided example rubrics tied to

course targets and anticipated learnings for illustrating ways to measure student learning

in an issues-centered curriculum. Distinguishing between exemplary, mediocre, or insufficient performance is simply adding gradations of quality levels to the rubric. Doing so ensures meeting the goals of curriculum planning for issues-centered education.

Stern (2011) analyzed the public issues model developed by Donald Oliver, James Shaver, and Fred Newmann as a part of the Harvard Social Studies Project. The purpose of the Harvard Social Studies Project was to improve social studies instruction and help students learn how to analyze and discuss enduring public issues in order to prepare them for participation in a democratic society. Stern (2011) reviewed the background and the research base as well as the materials used for implementation of the public issues model. The author also provided a critical analysis of the effectiveness of the model by suggesting that Oliver and Shaver's public issues model had failed. She offered several reasons for the failure of the public issues model. According to Stern (2011), the main reason why the public issues discussion model failed was resistance on the part of teachers, administrators, districts, school boards, and parents. Many people in the community resisted having their children discuss such controversial issues or question the conduct of the U.S. in such a manner. Administrators, districts, and school boards did not want to face parent backlash for teachers discussing such issues at school. A major criticism of the public issues discussion model was the authors' assumption that students had mastered basic foundational concepts in economics, geography, history, and civics. Additionally, the materials provided in the Harvard Social Studies Project (which developed out of the jurisprudential model) had a high reading level. This discourages weaker readers who would benefit from participating in discussions of public issues. Another factor contributing to the author's conclusion that the public issues model was a

failed model was the loss of federal funds to support the project. Without money to fund the project, the materials developed from the project could not be field tested and distributed for widespread use in the social studies classroom. Despite these criticisms, Stern (2011) concluded that the failure of the public issues model was to the "detriment of our students' education" (p. 58). Additionally, she provided examples of the public issues model in present-day social studies practice. Two such examples were the inclusion of teaching strategies similar to the public issues model and to Socratic discussions. Based on her analysis of the public issues model, Stern (2011) suggested that a revision of the jurisprudential model, while maintaining the pedagogy of the original model, could be a method for improving social studies instruction for students.

Henning and Kruger (2012) returned to the Oliver, Shaver, and Newmann public issues model and its role for promoting civic discussion. After reviewing the history, research base, and major precepts of the public issues model, the authors considered ways that the model continues to be used today as well as implications for future use. The public issues model, according to the authors, holds great promise for social studies teachers wishing to prepare students for in-depth discussions by using conflicting values provoked by the study of social and public issues.

Hartwick and Levy (2012) provided an example of how to bring public issues to life in the social studies classroom. The focus of the article was to deliberate on the best ways to limit big spending on election campaigns. States have begun challenging the personhood rights given to corporations. Students debate the issue of whether there should be a constitutional amendment to the U.S. Constitution limiting the extent of personhood rights for corporations. The authors suggested using a structured academic

controversy to allow students to investigate the different perspectives of the issue. A structured academic controversy puts students in small groups to work through the evidence supporting both sides of the issue. Equal number of students are assigned pro and con positions of the issue. Although the authors introduced this as a political election issue, other basic values such as free speech, free elections, and representative democracy appeared in student discussions. Using practices like the structured academic controversy as described by the authors gives students the opportunity to practice the skills necessary to be thoughtful members of society.

Civics Instruction

  O'Brien and Mitchell (2019) described ways to tap into students' perceptions of civic engagement. The purpose was to highlight how teachers could use individuals outside of the standard historical narrative to analyze their reasons for taking civic action. The authors argued that "placing students in the position of other historical "outliers" as they confronted decisions akin to those of [Civil Rights Movement leader] Rustin might enable students to better historically situate such figures and their actions" (O'Brien & Mitchell, 2019, p. 7). Additionally, when students investigate and deliberate about the ethical dilemmas facing civic actors of the past, students come to grips with democratic principles in discussions of controversial public issues. Student investigations of the ethical dilemmas of historical civic actors allow students to become civically engaged in today's democratic society.

  Gould and colleagues (2011) outlined the best practices for civic education in his edited report. Discussing controversial public issues comprises part of his edited report.

He argued that discussing controversial public issues was an important component of civic learning and helps build the skills and dispositions needed for taking civic action. The third proven practice advocates for quality civic engagement activities that bridge the knowledge and skills learned in civics for solving social problems. The results indicated that students "have higher commitments to civic participation and make significant gains in academic achievement than nonparticipating students" (Gould et al., 2011, p. 29).

Levinson (2012) wrote about the effects of civics instructional practices between student populations of color and white student populations. She discussed her experiences teaching in the Atlanta area in a school with a population that was predominantly African American. It was her experiences teaching in Atlanta and New York that inspired her interest in civic education. She documented evidence of a growing civic empowerment gap where minority students have fewer opportunities to engage in civic action as compared to their white counterparts. In her research, Levinson (2012) discovered what she identified as a growing civic empowerment gap among the races. As a result, she made several arguments for improving the quality of civic education. An important argument she advocated was that many students of color or other ethnicities feel alienated and dispossessed by the traditional and "moderately triumphalist" (Levinson, 2012, p. 55) narrative that has been taught in most social studies textbooks. She urged that civic education reform help "students construct and engage with a multiplicity of historically accurate and empowering civic counternarratives" (Levinson, 2012, p. 55). An additional factor was the socioeconomic level. To close the gap, Levinson (2012) suggested that students take part in a variety of activities, including the discussion of public issues and deliberations of public policy. More specifically, guided experiential civic education was

the key to improving civic education. Another way to close the civic empowerment gap was giving students opportunities "to engage in policy-oriented, collective action about potentially contentious issues" (Levinson, 2012, p. 57). The author acknowledged the immense effort and risk required for guided experiential civic education. For high quality civic education, teachers would need to invest considerable amounts of time in preparing their lessons. Additionally, community support is essential because parents and community leaders must be comfortable with students revealing and challenging painful realities that may exist in their local communities, state, and nation (Levinson, 2012).

Journell (2013) reported the findings of a three-year study on the civic knowledge and dispositions of pre-service middle and secondary social studies teachers and their readiness for teaching in the social studies classroom. Discussions of public and social issues were emphasized in the author's examination of best practices for developing the political content knowledge of pre-service social studies teachers. Additionally, Journell (2013) noted that despite pre-service teachers showing deep pedagogical knowledge, a lack of content knowledge contributes to new social studies teachers' dependence on the rote memorization of events, people, and dates. This finding was important because effective social studies teachers use their pedagogical skills to engage students in civic discussions of public and social issues. Findings such as these support the need for creating a model to help social studies teachers integrate the discussion of public issues into their daily teaching practices.

Controversial Public Issues

  In a study measuring social studies teachers' perceptions about the importance of teaching controversial issues and whether teachers value teaching controversial issues, Byford, and colleagues (2009) reviewed the advantages of using controversial issues in the social studies classroom. The authors cited research from an NCSS position statement on academic freedom which outlined four essential skills and attitudes developed by the study of controversial issues (NCSS, 2016b). The first two skills were directly related to the study of public and social issues. For instance, the first skill developed would have been the ability "to study relevant social problems of the past or present and make informed decisions or conclusions" (Byford et al., 2009, p. 165). The second skill developed by studying controversial issues was the ability to reason critically by analyzing significant issues and ideas. Byford and colleagues (2009) concluded that social studies teachers supported engaging students in controversial discussions but were reluctant to actually do so. The authors suggested that teaching with controversial issues was important. However, in order for teachers to effectively implement controversial issues, the following problems must be resolved: class disruptions, conflict among students, and negative repercussions for the teacher.

  The role of deliberating controversial public issues was the focus of Avery and colleagues (2013). These authors defined civic deliberation as the "serious and thoughtful consideration of conflicting views on controversial public issues for the purpose of decision making" (Avery et al., 2013, p. 105). They also argued that when students rationally deliberate controversial public issues they are participating in the foundations of deliberative democracy. This echoes several scholars who have advocated that the

discussion of public issues and democratic values support decision making skills needed for a vital democracy (Byford et al., 2009; Engle, 1960; Engle & Ochoa, 1988; NCSS, 2013; NCSS, 2016a; Oliver & Newmann, 1992; Oliver & Shaver, 1966). The authors discovered that students consistently informed the researchers that the deliberations of controversial public issues helped them recognize multiple perspectives. They argued that this is significant because the recognition of the rationales of opposing arguments is essential in a democracy. This skill is essential because it allows for open dialogue among opposing views. The authors also found that open dialogue among citizens with differing views helped avoid demonizing of the opposing perspective of the controversial public issue.

Hess (2009) has become the foremost contemporary expert on using controversial issues in the social studies classroom. Drawing upon Oliver and Shaver's work (1966) on the importance of discussing public issues as part of the social studies curriculum, Hess (2009) added the element of controversy. She defined controversial political issues as "questions of public policy that spark significant disagreement" (Hess, 2009, p. 37). The questions sparked by the controversial political issue had legitimate multiple interpretations and solutions, with each side having strong and reasoned support. The results of the study found that students who engaged in discussions of controversial political issues had higher levels of tolerance, greater knowledge acquisition, better awareness of how social change takes place, and increased likelihood to engage in civic acts than students who were not.

Hess and McAvoy (2015) added to the literature on using controversial political issues in the social studies classroom. The authors conducted a study to measure the

political attitudes of high school students. They were concerned about the effects of increasing political polarization in U.S. politics in the face of mounting resegregation by race and class in public schools. The authors noted that in an ideal democracy, people are viewed and treated as political equals who all have an opportunity to express their viewpoints through political elections. However, the reality is that democracies make policy decisions that can negatively impact the equality of persons in that society.

Journell (2016) built upon Hess's (2009) definition by clarifying the term political. His use of the term 'political' reflected themes introduced by Hess and McAvoy (2015): the idea that people democratically engage in politics every day when they ask questions about how people should live and work together. To answer those questions, people must grapple with the political issues that arise from such discussions. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, public issues are those issues that arise from the political discussions of how people live together in a democratic society.

Intervention for Teaching Public Issues

Pairing discussions of public issues with the best practices of taking civic action is an effective way to support social studies teachers using discussions of public issues in the classroom. Civic action has been described as the application of democratic skills and knowledge by students to effectively engage with issues and public policies in their local, state, and national communities (Saavedra, 2012). Gould and colleagues (2011) described civic action as a variety of different activities. Activities such as joining groups that facilitate political participation, identifying public issues, showing concern for the rights and welfare of others, and organizing people to support an issue or cause are all examples

of civic action (Barr et al., 1977; Croddy & Levine, 2014; Gould et al., 2011; Levinson, 2012; NCSS, 2013; NCSS, 2016a; Parker, 2015).

C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013)

The authors of the C3 Framework emphasized the role of discussion, which was defined as discussing issues and making choices and judgements based on information and evidence. Such practices provide opportunities for students to see how participation is done, to participate, and to take informed action (NCSS, 2013). Furthermore, best practices as described by NCSS (2013) included using disciplinary knowledge, skills, and perspectives to engage community members in discussions of public issues and ways to improve society. The civic indicators listed in Dimension 2 of the Inquiry Arc in the C3 Framework enumerate the significance of civic action with statements such as "Explain how a democracy relies on people's responsible participation, and draw implications for how individuals should participate," and "Explain specific roles played by citizens (such as voters, jurors, taxpayers, members of the armed forces, petitioners, protesters, and office-holders)" (NCSS, 2013, p. 32). Additionally, the social studies classroom was described as "the ideal staging ground for taking informed action because of its unique role in preparing students for civic life" (NCSS, 2013, p. 62). In other words, students taking informed action could be seen as the natural extension of civic learning in the social studies classroom. Therefore, the intervention aligns to best practices for civic education by having students take informed action as described in the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013).

The study is designed for use in the second part of American history, usually taken by students during their junior year covering the Second Industrial Revolution (1877 to 1929) to contemporary topics. The study draws upon an inquiry-based learning model in which students drive the learning based on essential questions that frame the inquiry (NCSS, 2013). According to Vygotsky, students learn about public issues in both social and cognitive ways. Three fundamental concepts composed Vygotsky's theory of learning: importance of culture, role of language, and zone of proximal growth (Lefrançois, 1991). The zone of proximal development is the concept that every child has a zone in which they are currently developing. Essentially, it refers to factors and individuals in their communities that help to impact and shape their thinking. According to Vygotsky (1986), culture and language are interdependent. Children learn language through imitation and by watching those around them. Similar to how the child's community influences the development of language, it also influences the developmental levels within a child's zone of proximal development. The inquiry-based model of learning is based in part on constructivism developed out of Vygotsky's ideas about the zone of proximal development (Doolittle, 1997). As students engage in inquiry-based lessons, they expand their zone of proximal development as they work with others to find a common solution (Doolittle, 1997).

Influences on Research Intervention

The study was influenced by the civic indicators found in Dimension 2 and the taking informed action indicators in Dimension 4 within the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013). In Dimension 2, students are encouraged to think like an

active participant in a democracy. In Dimension 4, students apply the skills learned in the first three dimensions to present their conclusions in a public format and take informed action. By doing so, Dimension 4 fulfills the third component of the C3 Framework which is preparing students for civic life (NCSS, 2013).

The C3 Framework is composed of three levels or stages: civic literacy, civic thinking skills, and civic argumentation. Students advance through the dimensions of the C3 Framework incrementally, starting with small and relatively easy tasks and then moving into progressively more demanding tasks. As mentioned previously, the civic indicators used in Dimension 2 of the C3 Framework outline the knowledge students need to be effective citizens and then progresses through the skills needed to take informed action. Students apply the skills outlined in the indicators for taking informed action in Dimension 4 of Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013).

The civics indicators in the Inquiry Arc reflect the best practices for developing civic literacy (NCSS, 2013). Teitelbaum (2011) argued that civic literacy was more than simple knowledge and skills about the theories of government and its political structures. Critical civic literacy

> involves interrogating the basic assumptions we have about social science
> knowledge and democratic citizenship, including critical inquiry of differing
> accounts of historical events and current affairs . . . focusing in active ways on
> concerns and problems that are meaningful to students; and linking ideas,
> policies, and practices to larger issues of social justice (Teitelbaum, 2011, p. 13).

Civic Literacy

In the first phase of the intervention, students develop their civic literacy skills by building background knowledge on the democratic principles undergirding the American constitutionalism system. Clabough (2018a) identified three important components of the C3 Framework: civic literacy, civic thinking skills, and civic argumentation. For example, to build civic literacy, students analyze the federal and state laws limiting women's right to vote, the supporting and opposing views on women's suffrage, the efforts by suffragettes to change the system, and their own civic identity as it relates to women's suffrage. The goal of this stage in the learning process is to help students look at how people challenge laws at the local, state, national, and even international levels to raise awareness of public issues (NCSS, 2013). Building students' civic literacy skills helps them develop more in-depth knowledge about the content, in this case women's suffrage.

Clabough (2018a) also described a framework of civic literacy that reflects the "best intentions of the C3 Framework" (NCSS, 2013, p.9). The components included

1. analyzing local, state, and federal laws,

2. voicing the diverse beliefs of people in their communities,

3. recognizing and expressing how others have advocated for change in society, and

4. articulating individual identities in relation to contemporary public, social, and policy issues (Clabough, 2018a).

Designing activities that require students to use components of civic literacy better prepares them for active participation in a democracy.

Civic Thinking

In the second phase of the intervention, civic thinking, students analyze the primary sources and are introduced to the public issues and perspectives related to the content. According to Wineburg (2001), students apply historical thinking skills, which is the craft of the historian. Components of historical thinking are corroboration, sourcing, and contextualization of the past. Students learn and practice these skills through analysis of primary sources (Vansledright, 2011; Wineburg & Monte-Sano, 2013; Wineburg, 2001). However, where civic thinking differs is applying democratic principles to the issue. Another layer of analysis in civic thinking has students question whether the laws and policies of the public issue match these democratic principles. For the intervention, students apply civic thinking to the discussion of public issues by investigating the political theories and perspectives of the public issues. For instance, they examine perspectives regarding child labor during the Gilded Age. The students examine the political structure within the context of the time period. Civic thinking encourages students to analyze public policies that allowed child labor to flourish. In their investigation of child labor during the Gilded Age, students discover that many parents opposed ending child labor, revealing differing perspectives about the issue. This activity demonstrates the two layers of analysis posited by Clabough (2018a) that distinguish civic thinking skills from historical thinking skills. Students engage in these two layers of analysis when they examine the relationship among political structures, their role in society, and the political participation of people in a democracy while also reflecting on whether the actions within the time period (child labor) match the democratic principles set forth in the U.S. Constitution.

Civic Argumentation

The third stage of the intervention is civic argumentation. Students use the

knowledge from the civic literacy stage and the civic thinking from the civic thinking

phase to engage in civic action. By using the indicators from taking informed action, the

teacher designs a set of writing prompts in which students must take civic action using

the writing process. Clabough and colleagues (2016) argued that writing is thoughts made

permanent, and it is an essential skill in K-12 education. Furthermore, they articulated the

different ways writing serves the writer, including but not limited to criticizing or

praising the work of others, interpreting something that was said by another person, and

solving problems (Clabough et al., 2016). Writing can also be a tool of action by devising

writing prompts that encourage students to take civic action. For instance, women's

suffrage leads students into discussions about the fundamental issue of who deserves the

right to vote and who decides who actually has this right. Identification and discussion of

the public issue, the right to vote, provides an opportunity for bridging the civic

indicators of Dimension 2 to the taking informed action indicators of Dimension 4

established in the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013). These indicators can be bridged through

a course assignment such as the following:

The Right to Vote. In the public issues discussion carried out in class, we argued the merits of whether women in the early 20th century should have the right to vote. This is a closed issue. The issue of women's suffrage was settled with ratification of the 19th Amendment. However, the fundamental question of whether the right to vote should be limited for certain groups is still an open public issue. Other groups in the U.S. have been denied the right to vote for various reasons. Two groups I would like you to explore are convicted felons who have served their sentence and immigrants. Investigate (that includes laws pertaining to limits on the right to vote in your own state) claims that these individuals should not have the right to vote. Once you have completed your investigation, write a letter to one of your state legislators advocating your position on limits to the right to vote for selected groups. Your letter must include text evidence from at least three of the primary sources used in your investigation.

The culminating project used for the intervention is a set of prompts relating public issues to taking civic action. The purpose of the culminating project is to bridge the skills used in previous instructional units to the skills needed to compose an argument for taking civic action on a contemporary issue. Students discuss the public issue of limiting the right to vote several times throughout the semester. The following are examples of how that could be accomplished in a contemporary U.S. history course:

1. In a unit on social and cultural changes of the early 20th century, students discuss the Women's Suffrage Movement and the struggle for the right to vote.

2. In a unit including the internment of Japanese Americans, students question whether the U.S. government violated its own Constitution when it authorized the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II.

3. In a unit on the Civil Rights Movement, students question why segregation, a clear violation of democratic principles, was permitted.

Student responses to the prompts must build upon the three stages: civic literacy, civic thinking, and civic argumentation. The following is a prompt used as a final culminating activity:

Freedom of Speech. Throughout history, the United States has been willing to sacrifice certain groups in the name of progress. African Americans built the foundations of the U.S. economy by providing free labor in the form of slavery for centuries. Native Americans were forcibly removed from ancestral homes to occupy land deemed undesirable only to be forced to move again. The Irish and Chinese built the Transcontinental Railroad. Using your knowledge of civics concepts and practices, trace violations of the First Amendment of the U.S. Bill of Rights, specifically the right to freedom of speech, including at least three different examples from different time periods covered in class. In each example, you must devise a method of taking civic action for the group whose rights have been violated or oppressed. Additionally, you must connect the past examples to a contemporary instance of violations of free speech. Devise your own plan to take action in response to the contemporary example. *For example: women, African Americans, and young adults 18- 20 years of age have all been denied the right to vote at some point in U.S. history. People in the U.S. are still denied the right to vote. If you are a convicted felon in some states, you can be denied the right to vote. My plan to take civic action is to identify a state which denies former felons their right to vote. I intend to find out who represents the state in the U.S. Senate and House of*

Representatives and write them a letter. In the letter, I include information supporting reasons for reinstating the right to vote to former felons, and I also ask the senator or representative to support the Democracy Restoration Act.

This culminating activity benefits students in several ways. The most obvious way is that it helps teachers incorporate taking informed action indicators from the C3 Framework into their social studies instruction (Clabough, 2018b). Students incorporate the use of argumentation skills stipulated in the taking civic action indicators of Dimension 4 within the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework (Clabough, 2018a; NCSS, 2013). Another way that students benefit from this activity is by increasing their understanding of the content through in-depth analysis of sources. Developing differing perspectives of the issue is another way that students benefit from such an activity (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Clabough et al., 2016; Oliver & Shaver, 1966).

Significance of the Study

Using public issues in the social studies classroom is not a new proposition. Oliver and Shaver (1966) called activities using public issues as tools for understanding in the social studies classroom jurisprudential teaching. When students are allowed to analyze the different positions and perspectives of public issues, they develop the skills necessary to participate as future democratic citizens in a democratic society (Barr et al., 1977). Building on the foundations of Oliver and Shaver's (1966) approaches, Hess (2009) and Hess and McAvoy (2015) suggested using controversy in discussions of public issues. However, although many social studies teachers acknowledge the importance of using controversial public issues as part of the curriculum, they rarely implement it (Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Journell, 2016; LeCompte & Blevins, 2015; Oliver

& Shaver, 1966; Philpott et al., 2011). Social studies teachers believe that discussing controversial issues improves instruction and provides students with needed skills for participation in a democracy, but social studies teachers tend not implement the controversial public issue model in their classrooms (Byford et al., 2009). The need for this study arose from the lack of research focused on using best practices of discussing public issues with best practices of taking civic action advocated by the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013). Oliver and Shaver (1966) chose not to extend their work into ways that citizens can actively apply knowledge about public issues in their communities. However, students who have high political efficacy have high rates of political participation (Levy, 2018). An excellent way to improve students' political efficacy is by engaging students in discussions of controversial public issues (Hess & McAvoy, 2015; Journell, 2016). These two activities are inextricably linked because discussing controversies surrounding public issues will lead students to take civic action. Students become more motivated to take civic action as they learn more about the values, beliefs, and perspectives of public issues. Through the analysis of public issues, students develop their own identities in relation to the public or social issue. Teachers using Dimension 4 of the Inquiry Arc are in a unique position to capitalize on the relationship between discussing public issues and taking civic action (Clabough, 2018a; NCSS, 2013).

The study has the potential to add to the body of literature by creating a framework for teachers to use for implementing discussions of controversial public issues and taking civic action in the social studies curriculum. Despite the acknowledgement that bringing discussions of controversial public issues into the classroom has positive results on students' content knowledge retention, civic literacy skills, and its role in

preparing students for an active role in a democratic society, the practice is infrequently carried out in the classroom (Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Journell, 2016; LeCompte & Blevins, 2015; Oliver & Shaver, 1966; Philpott et al., 2011). The framework for the study comes from the need for scaffolding the dimensions of the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework to activities that support and facilitate the discussion of public issues. Another series of bridges can help students turn discussions into informed action. The proposed study has the potential to add to the body of literature on public issues by preparing and providing students with the necessary skills for being effective and informed citizens in a democratic society.

The study is designed to create a framework to help teachers bridge discussing public issues with taking informed action as described in the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013). Teachers and students benefit from this framework because it helps achieve the goal of preparing students to become effective and active members of a democratic society. It also provides the tools to help students navigate the "toxic political environment" (Clabough, 2017, p. 2) created in the current political climate. Students are equipped with the skills needed for active and effective participation in democratic society. Skills such as distinguishing among diverse perspectives of an issue and analyzing local, state, and federal laws for their impact on their community and the communities of others are important for active participation in democratic society. Other skills such as citing examples of civic action taken by historical and contemporary figures and forming their own political identities as it relates to public issues in their community prepare students for participation in democratic society. This benefits students by instilling the habit to think about the effects of perennial public issues on a democratic

society, and the possibilities and limits of certain groups' ability to participate in

democracy. Students also benefit by critically examining issues to gauge whether actions

directed against some groups reflect the laws and principles of the U.S. Constitution

(Clabough, 2018a). Opportunities to engage in authentic discussions about perennial

public issues benefit students by preparing them to be active participants in a democracy

(NCSS, 2013).

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the researcher discusses the steps and procedures used during the research study. The steps and procedures include a description of the site and participants, approval of the research study by the associated university's Institutional Review Board (IRB), collection of data, a description of the research intervention, and analysis of the data. In the following sections, the researcher explains the steps and procedures used during the research study.

The proposed study aims to qualitatively measure the effectiveness of an intervention designed to assist teachers in implementing the best teaching practices advocated for in the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013). Using a qualitative bounded instrumental case study design the researcher utilized qualitative measures to explore teachers' perceptions of the intervention and its effectiveness. The intervention proposes to help a teacher implement the four dimensions of the Inquiry Arc in the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013) by integrating the discussion of public issues and having students take civic action on the topics through writing prompts. During the intervention, students explore all aspects of a public issue related to basic democratic values as espoused in the U.S. Constitution. Then, the teacher provides students with writing prompts related to the

content of the discussion and the unit of study that asks the students to create a plan for taking civic action. The goal of the intervention was to help students synthesize their understanding of public issues enough to enable taking civic action.

Rationale

This qualitative bounded instrumental case study focused on the classroom teacher's use of the learning intervention using the discussion of public issues to foster approximately 30 students' desire to take civic action and how they could have enacted it. The rationale for using the instrumental case study was to see whether discussing public issues that were designed to foster civic action contributed to the greater understanding of how students learn to apply transformational civic ideals in secondary social studies settings. In that respect, the results from this study may have informed the understanding of how secondary teachers may implement more effective social studies instruction. The following research questions were used in the instrumental case study.

Research Questions

1. What ideas about taking civic action manifest in student artifacts from the research intervention when discussing public issues as part of a C3 Framework based lesson?

2. How do the classroom teacher's perceptions about implementing the designed research intervention change over the course of the study?

The data collected in the research study were analyzed to answer the research questions. This analysis may have provided important insight into how secondary social studies teachers could improve social studies instruction.

Providing a framework for implementing all four dimensions of the C3 Framework has the potential to add to the literature on using public issues in the social studies classroom (NCSS, 2013). Particularly, the research literature has indicated that teachers support using discussions of public issues to provide students with practice using the skills needed to participate in a democracy; however, they rarely implement these discussions due to fears of increased classroom disruptions, inability to effectively implement discussions of public issues, and backlash from administration, district, and community (Avery et al., 2013; Byford et al., 2009; Segall et al., 2018). Other researchers have discovered that social studies teachers are cautious when using discussions of public issues because of their potential controversial nature (Hess, 2009; Hess & McAvoy, 2015; Journell, 2016). However, as Journell (2016) noted avoiding discussions of controversial issues in the classroom is "akin to malpractice" (p. 29). Furthermore, it thwarts the responsibility of social studies teachers in fostering democratic discourse among students who are the voters and active citizens of the future. Oliver and Shaver (1966) criticized the traditional form of teaching social studies which focuses on coverage of historical topics. They supported more in-depth study that prepares students for the rigors of discussion in a democracy. Additionally, Oliver and Newmann (1992) argued that using the public issues approach in teaching social studies deviates substantially from the traditional "encyclopedic corpus of substantive content to covered" (p. 6). Such comments substantiate the need for finding new ways to implement discussions of public issues in the social studies classroom.

Site and Participants

The resarch study took place in a second-year U.S. history course usually taken in the students' junior year of high school. The school is situated on the periphery of a major metropolitan area in a Southeastern state. There are approximately 1,241 students enrolled with a teacher-student ratio of 18:1. The school is located approximately 21 miles from the city center. Despite its location, the school has many urban characteristics. For instance, the free and reduced lunch rate of the school is 62%, the result of a steady increase over the last several years. The racial and ethnic composition of the school is 73% African American, 26% white, and 7% Latinx. The demographics of the school reflect a shift from a predominantly white student population to the current population comprised mostly of BIPOC students.

Performance data about the school reveal low testing scores in measures of College and Career Readiness (CCR). The most recent data on test performance reveal that 29% of students are proficient in reading and 32% of students are proficient in math. Other data show that the CCR ACT rate is 39% and the CCR AP rate is seven percent for those enrolled in AP courses. The school scored achieved an 89% graduation rate. This information was based on the most recent data available on the state's accountability site.

The research study included Mr. Lankford, the classroom teacher who implemented the designed research intervention. There were approximately 30 students who consented to participate in the research study. The race and gender composition reflected the demographic statistics of the overall population of the school.

IRB Approval and Ethical Considerations for the Proposed Study

The researcher of the proposed study has taken several steps to ensure ethical and confidentiality guidelines. The researcher obtained approval from the institutional review board (IRB) before starting the proposed study. The IRB reviews the proposed study to ensure that several steps are taken to protect human subjects in the proposed study. For instance, the researcher obtained informed consent from students' parents and/or guardians to participate and use their work in the study. Informed consent notifies participants of the nature of the study, and it officially solicits participants' involvement. It is imperative that the researcher protects the participants from any harm and deception during the course of the proposed study. Additionally, the researcher maintained the privacy and confidentiality of the participants' information. It is also the responsibility of the researcher to protect special groups from harm, particularly children (APA, 2020).

According to the American Psychological Association (APA), the researcher is obligated to maintain the confidentiality of participants (APA, 2020). There are two methods for maintaining the confidentiality of participants. The first is to present the case study report to the subject of the case study and obtain written consent. However, caution is needed to avoid exploiting any type of supervisory relationship between the researcher and the participant. The second way of maintaining confidentiality is to use pseudonyms for the participants of the study. This helps disguise personal details and identifying information of the participants in the research study. Participants' names and other identifying information are removed from artifacts and archival records to further protect the privacy and confidentiality of the participants in the study.

Data Collection

The proposed research study used qualitative methods of data collection. The researcher collected information via interviews and student artifacts. The processes used throughout the intervention aligned with the best practices emphasized in the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework. The Inquiry Arc reflects student-centered practices developed from constructivist theory (Lefrançois, 1991; NCSS, 2013). The four dimensions of the Inquiry Arc are:

Dimension 1: Developing questions and planning inquiries;

Dimension 2: Applying disciplinary concepts and tools;

Dimension 3: Evaluating sources and using evidence; and

Dimension 4: Communicating conclusions and taking informed action (NCSS, 2013).

Students moved through the different dimensions in both linear and non-linear ways. For example, they may have found themselves going back to the developing questions dimension when encountering a dead end in their own research. As students proceeded through the different steps of the intervention, students cycled through the skills and disciplinary thinking of the different dimensions of the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013).

The intervention was designed for use at a diverse high school in a major Southeastern city. It was designed for high school juniors taking an American history course. The intervention included a series of steps representing the four dimensions of the Inquiry Arc in the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013) culminating with students writing about taking informed action. Students proceeded through different stages of civic learning:

civic literacy, civic thinking, and civic argumentation (Clabough, 2018a). Discussion of public issues was vital to the learning process. Originally, students were to participate in different types of discussions, including Socratic seminars. They also were to engage in the dialogical process with their peers throughout the unit. However, due to the restrictions on in-person learning caused by the COVID-19 Pandemic, students engaged in these activities virtually using digital devices, the Internet, and online learning management programs.

The study was designed to create a framework to help teachers integrate the discussion of public issues and assist them in taking informed action as described in the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013). Teachers and students benefit from this framework because it may help achieve the goal of preparing students to become effective and active members of a democratic society. It also provides the tools to help students navigate the "toxic political environment" (Clabough, 2017, p. 2) created in the current political climate. Therefore, the steps of data collection are correlated very closely to the four dimensions of the Inquiry Arc in the C3 Framework.

Interviewing the Teacher Participant

The researcher interviewed Mr. Lankford at three different points in the intervention: prior to implementation, during the intervention, and after the intervention. Interviewing Mr. Lankford at three different points in the research study gave the researcher important information about the teacher's expectations and perceptions about the intervention. Another important reason for collecting interview data at these three points was to allow the researcher to see how these expectations and perceptions evolved

throughout the intervention. Therefore, the researcher engaged the participating teacher in a series of informal interviews using an interview guide protocol with the same questions for each interview. The following is a list of the questions that were in the interview protocol.

1. How does discussing perennial public and current issues in social studies instruction connect to taking civic action in this setting?

2. How do the teacher's perceptions of the level of ease in implementing the proposed intervention impact the results of the study?

3. Why does the intervention lead to students taking civic action?

4. How does the discussion of public issues factor into the implementation of the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework?

5. How does analyzing citizen participation in the United States political system relate to civic education?

6. How does the intervention help students evaluate democratic principles in different historical eras?

7. In what ways, if any, does helping students evaluate public policies contribute to their motivation to take civic action?

The questions in the interview protocol are adapted from the civics indicators in the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013). The research presented in chapter two indicated that teachers tend to not implement public issues discussions in their classrooms (Byford et al., 2009; Gould et al., 2011; Hess, 2009; Hess & McAvoy, 2015; Journell, 2013, 2016; Levinson, 2012; Levy, 2018; Stern, 2011). The purpose of the interview questions was to measure Mr. Lankford's perceptions of the effectiveness of intervention's framework.

Interviewing Mr. Lankford served several purposes for the study. The intervention provided opportunities for the researcher to gather important data about the intervention.

Interviewing Mr. Lankford allowed the researcher to collect information about his perspectives before, during, and after the research intervention.

   The intervention took place over the course of a semester in a high school level U.S. history class. The three components of civic thinking, civic literacy, and civic argumentation skills were used to design the intervention. The first is civic literacy. In this component, students build background knowledge of the principles, values, and laws of the United States (Clabough, 2018a). Also, they become more familiar with the background of a public issue related to the unit of study. An important component of civic thinking is to provide students with examples of historical figures actively engaged and taking part in a democracy. Seeing historical figures struggle with the core values at the heart of public issues help students develop their own identities about the public issue. Civic thinking may help students master the skills of analyzing primary and secondary sources with the lens of a political scientist. Students look for the political and social effects of a public issue in the primary sources, not just the historical effects related to a public issue. For instance, the primary sources in the second unit of the research unit came from the *Plessy v Ferguson* (1895) U.S. Supreme Court opinions, including the dissenting opinion by Justice Harlan. Students compare the opinions to the Preamble in the U.S. Constitution to evaluate whether the Supreme Court opinions fulfill the principles found in the Preamble. Students broke down the sources for information about the author's beliefs, biases, and perspectives about the public issue and its relationship to democratic principles of American democracy. They also analyzed the author's words and actions for whether they positively or negatively reflect democratic principles. The third phase is civic argumentation. In this stage of the intervention, students used the

information that was analyzed in the previous stage to develop their own position on the public issue.

Student Artifacts

The most comprehensive data about student performance came from student artifacts which were made up of completed student formative and summative assessment handouts from the research intervention (see Appendix C). Student artifacts help measure possible student growth at different points throughout the course of the intervention. As mentioned previously, there are three stages to the intervention. In the following section, the researcher describes the types of student artifacts that would be produced in each unit of the intervention. The purpose of collecting student artifacts was to capture data about students' learning during the intervention. By gathering this type of data, the researcher collected important evidence about the effectiveness of the intervention. Student artifacts also allowed the researcher to obtain data about students' metacognitive processes during the intervention. The details of the different types of student artifacts are presented below.

Table 1. Activities from the Research Intervention.

	Child Labor Unit	Segregation Unit	Final Assessment Unit
Civic Literacy	• Preamble Activity • Background on the Gilded Age Graphic Organizer	• Comparing Equality in the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Bill of Rights Activity • Discussion of the Definition of Equality Activity • Summary of *Plessy v Ferguson* (1895) U.S. Supreme Court Decision Activity	
Civic Thinking	• Child Labor Activity with Graphic Organizer • Child Laborer Journal Entry activity • Lewis Hine Activity with Graphic Organizer	• Primary Source Analysis of the Majority and Dissenting Opinions from the *Plessy v Ferguson* (1895) Activity • Primary Source Analysis Activity of Washington's Booker T. Washington "Atlanta Compromise" • Primary Source Analysis of Du Bois's *Souls of Black Folks*	
Civic Argumentation	• Child Labor Ted Talk Graphic Organizer Activity • Child Labor Ted Talk Script	• Two Paragraph Summary and Critique of either Washington or Du Bois.	• Public Issues Review Graphic Organizer • Public Issues Review Prompts

The first stage of the intervention was civic literacy. During this stage, students build background knowledge about the public issue. This includes knowledge about pivotal court cases, as well as local, state, and national laws. The civic literacy stage correlates to the first two dimensions of the C3 Framework: Developing Questions and Planning Inquiries and Applying Disciplinary Skills and Concepts (NCSS, 2013). During

this stage, students engaged in a variety of different activities to ask questions, define the public issue, research democratic values and concepts, and apply these ideas to the different disciplines of the social studies. For instance, students used documents such as the Preamble to the U.S. Constitution to examine the phrase "promote the general welfare." Below are the analysis prompts that the students used to analyze the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights.

1. How would you define the phrase "promote the general welfare?"

2. What do you think the authors of the U.S. Constitution meant by "promote the general welfare?"

The type of student artifacts collected during this part of the intervention were graphic organizers with prompts to help students analyze the documents for definitions and examples of equality. As students define the public issue and investigate the different perspectives of the definition of equality, they also develop their own beliefs regarding equality. An additional benefit is that students build background knowledge about the perennial public issue.

Additional student artifacts were collected during stage two of the intervention. Stage two of the intervention's framework is civic thinking skills. Civic thinking skills are akin to historical thinking skills. For instance, using historical thinking students analyze primary source documents for the author's biases, values, beliefs, and perspectives (Nokes, 2013; Wineburg, 2001). Students engage in historical thinking by understanding and evaluating the effects of change and continuity over time. Evidence of change and continuity over time is found in primary sources from the time period in which it was written (NCSS, 2013). Essentially, students are taught how to think like an

historian. Like historical thinking, civic thinking encourages students to think like a political scientist. Students analyze public policies related to the public issue within its historical context. Unlike historical thinking, civic thinking goes a step further by analyzing whether the actions of individuals, organized groups, laws, or court cases are consistent with the democratic values and principles of the U.S. Constitution and other government documents that articulate U.S. citizens' rights. Additionally, civic thinking encourages students to examine the role of citizen participation in the context of historical events (Clabough, 2018a; NCSS, 2013).

The types of student artifacts produced in the civic thinking stage of the intervention framework are short writing pieces. Students merge their understanding of the perennial public issue of equality with the content from a unit of study. Opportunities for students to engage in civic thinking can be found in the unit on Progressivism. For instance, the Progressive movement is largely considered a success in reforming political and social institutions in American society. Most historians also acknowledge that a major failure of the Progressive movement was its lack of focus on civil rights for African Americans in the early 20th century. Students analyzed the opinions from the Supreme Court case *Plessy v Ferguson* (1895) for evidence of democratic principles. Prompts such as the ones below helped students analyze the primary source according to democratic principles of the United States.

1. How does the primary source reflect democratic principles of equality as outlined in the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution, and the Bill of Rights?

2. What is the perspective of the author on equality?

3. How does the author define equality?

4. Does the author's definition match your definition of equality?

5. What are the intended or unintended outcomes of the decision?

6. What evidence in the text supports democratic principles of equality?

7. Does the information present in the primary source match democratic principles of equality in American society?

The purpose of using these prompts was to support students as they develop civic thinking skills. The questions reflect the two layers of analysis present in civic thinking: analyzing how people's ideas, action, and policies manifest American democratic principles and analyzing whether those actions positively or negatively reflect the laws, principles, and values of equality.

Following the analysis of *Plessy v Ferguson* (1895), students looked at examples from two early 20th century civil rights leaders, Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois. They analyzed the leaders' writings for clues about their perspectives on segregation. The purpose of the activity was to provide students a model of how to conduct a discussion with people who disagree about a public issue, in this instance, segregation. Complicating the segregation issue was women's suffrage. During this time period, women suffragettes were parading, protesting, and starving for the right to vote. Du Bois was a strong supporter of the right to vote for women. With the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment, Du Bois had hoped that the African American women would double the African American vote. However, that was not to be the case (Pauley, 2000; Yellin, 1973). In the intervention, the researcher focused on the public issue of segregation. As a result, references to W.E.B. DuBois's work with Women's Suffragettes was not included in the activity comparing Washington's and DuBois's views on segregation (Anderson, 1988). Nevertheless, students would benefit from a similar lesson on women's suffrage that includes Du Bois's perspective of the right to vote for women.

An important goal of quality civics education is providing students with opportunities to participate in authentic practices for taking an active part in democracy (Barr et al., 1977). Therefore, discussion of the different perspectives of equality within the context of the time period helps prepare students for participation in democracy (Engle, 1960; Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Oliver & Shaver, 1966).

The next step of the process engaged students in writing. After students analyzed the perspectives, words, and actions of each civil rights leader, they wrote a paragraph stating each individual's position on equality. Then, based on their analysis of primary sources, students argued which civil rights leader's position on equality better matched the principles of equality in the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. Furthermore, in the paragraph, they argued for the civil rights leader who positively or negatively reflects democratic values. The researcher analyzed students' paragraphs for how well they engaged in civic thinking. The writing products of the students serve as artifacts for this stage of the intervention.

The second part of the civic argumentation stage was taking informed action. For this part of the intervention, students responded to a writing prompt that asked them to develop a plan for taking civic action in relation to the public issue and unit of study in which the discussion takes place. For instance, students' investigations of Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois provided examples of civic action taking place. Whether students supported Washington or Du Bois, both individuals took civic action by taking an active role in the civil rights movement of the early 20th century. Each civil rights leader published their views on segregation in the face of rulings such as *Plessy v Ferguson* (1895). The following is an example of a possible prompt in the same unit:

1. Choose one of the leaders of the early civil rights movement at the turn of the 20th century: Booker T. Washington or W.E.B. Du Bois. Pretend that you are the selected civil rights leader. Write two paragraphs in the voice of your selected civil rights leader. In the first paragraph, summarize your position on segregation. In the second paragraph, criticize the position of the other early civil rights leader.

Students' written responses to the writing prompt serve as student artifacts for this portion of the intervention. Their responses are accompanied with another paragraph called the director's cut. In the director's cut, students are asked to think about their own thinking. They write a short metacognitive piece in which they explain their reasoning behind the plan they developed for taking civic action. The purpose of the director's cut is to provide the researcher with information about students' perceptions and participation in the intervention (Yancie & Clabough, 2017). The director's cuts are also student artifacts.

Students repeated a similar process in the second unit. Activities closely mirror those outlined above using different perennial public issues and content. The public issues explored in the intervention was child labor in the Gilded Age and segregation established by the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Plessy v Ferguson* (1895). At the conclusion of the intervention, the students took part in a culminating activity in which students applied their knowledge of public issues, foundational concepts of democracy, and ways of participating in a democracy and develop a plan to take civic action. The purpose of the culminating project is to help students bridge what they learned about the discussion of public issues with taking an active role in democracy. The shorter writing prompts from the previous stages have also helped to bridge the process of taking civic action in the final project. In essence, students make a presentation of a democratic value, such as equality, that has historically been ignored or violated and their plan to take civic

action to help make it right. The following prompts serve as an example of what the

culminating prompts would look like.

Directions: This semester we have explored the connections among democratic ideas and principles, public issues, public policy, and taking civic action in the context of the Second U.S. Industrial Revolution. We have also explored how individuals took civic action when those ideas were compromised. Read the two prompts below. Each of them represents a different public issue from the early 20th century. Choose one and complete the task described in the prompt.

1. *Imagine that you are a member of the National Child Labor Committee created in 1904. Now, the year is 1912, and you have been asked to testify before Congress about the problem of child labor. Write an opening statement to read to the members of Congress. In your opening statement, explain what child labor is, describe what public policies, if any, are in place to stop child labor, explain how child labor violates principles of the U.S. Constitution, provide examples of actions people have taken to expose the problem of child labor, and justify a federal law banning child labor. Use the primary sources used earlier in the lesson to help you. Your opening statement should be at least one page.*

2. *Imagine that you are an African American living under segregation in the South during the early 20th century. You have just learned about the verdict in the* Plessy v Ferguson (1895) *Supreme Court decision. You are outraged about the ruling. You write a letter to your cousin who lives in Chicago. In the letter, explain the verdict in the* Plessy v Ferguson (1895) *decision, describe the public policy that was created as a result of the ruling, explain which principles of the U.S. Constitution are in jeopardy, and provide examples of actions taken by early civil rights leaders. End the letter by justifying to your cousin why you have decided to stay in the South and not move to Chicago. Use the primary sources used earlier in the lesson. Your letter should be at least one page.*

Students' culminating projects provided the researcher with valuable data about their

learning throughout the intervention and served as artifacts for the researcher. The

culminating activity also served as student artifacts in the research study. Data collected

from student artifacts were compared to data from the other qualitative measures. The

researcher used the data to reach conclusions about the effectiveness of the intervention,

and how the data were used to answer the research questions.

Data Analysis

Several steps were involved in analyzing the data collected throughout the intervention. According to Creswell (2015), there were six steps for analyzing and interpreting qualitative data. The first step was to compile data from the different sources into meaningful information. In addition to preparing and organizing the collected data, the researcher must also conduct an initial read-through looking for preliminary codes (Creswell, 2015; Saldaña, 2016). Then, she conducted a more thorough analysis for codes connected to the effectiveness of the intervention, Mr. Lankford's perceptions of students' performance discussing public issues, and taking civic action. The next step in the process required the researcher to draw a general picture of the data by using descriptions of codes from the data (Geertz, 1973). A second-cycle coding process helped the researcher clarify the themes from the codes (Saldaña, 2016). The remaining steps included interpreting the data and validating the findings (Creswell, 2015).

Yin (2018) presented four general strategies for conducting data analysis in qualitative case study research. The most preferred strategy was relying on theoretical propositions. The purpose of this strategy was to use the theoretical assumptions driving the proposed research study. The propositions in the proposed research study should be tied to the study's research questions. They not only guided the case study, but they also helped organize data collection and analysis. Additionally, the propositions guiding the research study led the researcher to look at the "how and why" during data analysis (Yin, 2018). According to Yin (2018), researchers using the case study approach should utilize a protocol to help target the topic of the case study. A case study protocol should include at least four sections:

1. an overview of the case study project,

2. field procedures,

3. case study questions, and

4. a guide for the case study report (Yin, 2018).

Interviews

The researcher interviewed Mr. Lankford before, during, and after implementation of the intervention. Following each interview with Mr. Lankford, the researcher transcribed verbatim the information recorded during the interview. The data were then analyzed for codes and themes pertinent to the intervention. Each interview was analyzed using the same process but independently of one another. The data were also organized into categories according to the case study protocol. As the researcher analyzed the data, she coded and categorized the data. She also coded for description so that she could provide the thick description required in qualitative analysis (Geertz, 1973). After data from the interview were transcribed, it was important to compare findings for trends in the data. The researcher also looked at the relationship among different themes. Additionally, she presented the transcript data to the teacher participant to ensure the validity of the information in the interviews.

Student Artifacts

The researcher organized the data and prepared it for analysis. The data collected from student artifacts were analyzed as codes and themes which were identified through the processes. The researcher looked for connections among the data in the student

artifacts and to the other data collected during the intervention. The artifacts also helped the researcher measure content knowledge acquisition and comprehension throughout the intervention. The researcher looked for examples in the artifacts to support developing categories and themes from the intervention. Examples from the artifacts also served the need for the rich description necessary for qualitative research (Geertz, 1973).

In each stage of the intervention, students responded to various prompts. They responded to analysis prompts helping them to analyze primary sources to better understand the public issue of segregation, writing prompts illustrating civic thinking of active participants in society, writing prompts using civic argumentation to support a position on a public issue, and metacognitive prompts showing students' thinking during the process. Student artifacts were collected in every stage of the process.

The student artifacts were analyzed for information about student performance, their understanding of civic concepts and thinking, and their perceptions of how individuals took an active role in society. Each set of prompts was related to different functions of civic education. The analysis prompts from the civic literacy stage of the framework helped students break down primary sources by looking at democratic principles evident in the sources. The researcher coded the data for insight into students' understanding of the democratic principles of U.S. society. The writing prompts used in the civic thinking stage of the intervention encouraged students to explore how the public issue was applied, or not applied, throughout different time periods in history. In this example, they wrote about how leaders like Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois responded to segregation affirmed by the *Plessy v Ferguson* (1895) Supreme Court decision in the early 20th century. Additionally, students responded to another writing

prompt that asked students to develop a plan for someone in the context of the early 20th century to take civic action. The metacognitive prompt asked students to think about their own thinking when they designed their plan to take civic action. The culminating activity at the conclusion of the intervention helped students put the process all together. Students turned their discussions of public issues into plans to take civic action. These student artifacts were analyzed for students' perceptions before, during, and after the intervention. Student artifacts were analyzed separately and then compared against each to focus on growth, if any, of civic literacy, civic thinking, and civic argumentation skills over the course of the intervention. Data were organized into different categories. The researcher used *a priori* and In Vivo coding throughout the process to help identify codes and themes during analysis of the data. In Vivo coding used the participants' own re-occurring words or phrases as codes (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2018; Saldaña, 2016). Using *a priori* codes helped the researcher connect to best practices in secondary social studies education. As a result, the codes more accurately represent the data gathered through interviews and observations. For these reasons, the researcher chose to use *a priori* and In Vivo coding during data analysis.

Establishing the Credibility of the Findings

In qualitative research, the accuracy and credibility of the research was established in several different ways. An important component of qualitative research was providing the rich description that describes and supports the researcher's findings. Geertz (1973) established that the thick description of qualitative research provides meaning for the researcher. Additionally, transferability was established in thick

descriptions of the context, procedures, site, and participants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Credibility was also supported by statements from the researcher admitting her own

biases, assumptions, and limitations of the research (Creswell, 2015). Other strategies for

validating the data included member checking and triangulation. Member checking was

the process where the researcher asked one or more participants to review the findings for

accuracy. Triangulation was corroborating evidence across different methods of data

collection and different types of data (Creswell, 2015). In this study, the researcher used

member checking (Creswell, 2015) by asking Mr. Lankford to review transcripts of

interviews for accuracy of the transcriptions. Triangulating the results from the three

different interviews and student artifacts was another way of establishing the credibility

of the findings (Creswell, 2015).

Summary

The researcher described the steps and procedures used during this qualitative

bounded instrumental case study. She explained the steps and methods used during the

research study including, but not limited to, the selection of the site and participants, the

methods of collecting data, the process of analyzing the data, and establishing the

credibility of the findings. A thorough description of the research study intervention was

also included in the discussion.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The purpose of this case study was to examine the possible benefits of including

the discussion of public issues with the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013).

The research study answered the following research questions:

1. What ideas about taking civic action manifest in student artifacts from the research intervention when discussing public issues as part of a C3 Framework based lesson?

2. How do the classroom teacher's perceptions about implementing the designed research intervention change over the course of the study?

In this chapter, the researcher briefly restated the demographics of the sample, its

significance to the research study, and the limitations of the research study. The

researcher presented the findings by discussing their relevance to the research questions.

The researcher's interest in conducting this study arose from research on using the

discussion of public issues as a vehicle for improving social studies instruction. She

hoped to more actively engage students in real discussions about real public issues that

appear perennially in American society. This desire to engage students in discussions of

public issues also arose out of a desire to empower her students to take civic action to

bring about change in their local communities. This desire to empower her students to

take civic action reflected the influence of the transformative research paradigm that

examined the role of power in learning.

Sample

The research intervention was comprised of thirteen different components and was conducted with one teacher and 30 students in four 11th grade U.S. history courses. Thirty of the 82 students turned in the signed consent forms. The researcher only used data from students who had returned the consent forms. The teacher, whose pseudonym was Mr. Lankford for the purposes of confidentiality, was a White, middle-aged male who had been teaching for four years at the high school where the research study took place. All of the names in this research study were changed to pseudonyms to protect participants' confidentiality. The demographics of Mr. Lankford's classes were as follows: 82 students were enrolled in the classes in which the research study took place. Sixty-four of the students identified as African American. Ten of the students were white, and another eight identified as Latinx. Forty-seven of the participants were male, and thirty-five were female. The student sample accurately represented the population of Forestwood High School. The demographic population of the school included 1,241 students in which approximately 73 percent of the students identified as African American, 26 percent who identified as White, and seven percent who identified as Latinx. Additionally, the school was characterized as a high poverty school because of its high free and reduced lunch rate of approximately 62 percent.

Limitations

There were many factors that could have affected the findings in the research study. First, the researcher designed the research intervention to take place in the fall semester, giving the teacher and the researcher time to collect and analyze the data.

However, the school year started in the midst of a national pandemic. Another factor was transferability. Due to the limited nature of this case study, the results should not be extrapolated and applied without further research being conducted (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The potential effects of the limitations on the research study were discussed in the next section.

COVID-19

A limitation that developed out of the data was COVID-19. In this context, it was defined as a flu-like illness called coronavirus that was deadly for those with underlying health conditions. Additionally, obstacles created by COVID-19 were included. For instance, online learning was an obstacle to learning created out of the COVID-19 pandemic. Teachers and students were forced to use digital devices, Wi-Fi connections, and the Internet to create an online learning environment. In the conversation about whether Mr. Lankford thought the intervention was hard to implement, Mr. Lankford gave his thoughts about online learning:

> The only issue was just the online, the Corona, them being on there device and not being able to interact as well as in a normal year, it would've been better, not that this was bad. I think I was able to reach some of them. I just think in a normal year with everybody sitting here day after day after day, then I think it would've got even better results.

Certainly, no one could have predicted a worldwide pandemic. However, COVID-19 was related to the research intervention because Mr. Lankford's perceptions about the impact of the coronavirus and its effects on the research study could have influenced the results of the research study.

Time Gap

Similarly, the term "time gap" served as another example of an obstacle to

learning created by COVID-19. The researcher defined time gap as a large amount of

time elapsing between units in the research intervention. The basis of this definition came

from the opening conversation in the third interview with Mr. Lankford:

> I think the students, once I explained it to them again, because there was little bit
> of, through my doing, not yours or anything else, but there was a little bit of a
> time gap, which was not ideal. We were able to hook right back in.

Comments such as these clarified the meaning of *time gap*. The *time gap* that Mr.

Lankford referred to in his remarks was caused by the series of unfortunate events

beginning with his diagnosis with COVID-19 and ending with the dissolution of his

mother's and uncle's business following their deaths from COVID-19. Both of these

codes were demonstrated in another part of the interview when Mr. Lankford responded

to the question about whether he encountered difficulties in implementing the research

intervention. He explained,

> No, there was just times when I was trying to get some of this stuff done from a
> very difficult situation. I was off campus and in a very difficult situation mentally,
> and so it might've been hard for me to focus. Yet, I was still able to. Again, it was
> so good that I was able to, without 100 percent brain power, still get it going from
> off campus.

It was clear from Mr. Lankford's comments that he was concerned about online learning

and the *time gap* affecting the efficacy of the research intervention. Mr. Lankford referred

to the *time gap* caused by COVID-19 with the following comments in response to a

question about whether confusion about the C3 Framework impacted the results of the

research intervention:

> No, I think it's workable. If I can understand it, again, I'm a teacher that doesn't
> normally do this kind of thing that you handed me, and I was able to pull it off,

and again, in a non-corona, non-death in the family year, pull it off relatively
easily.

 The relevance of COVID-19 was also demonstrated by Mr. Lankford's experiences

implementing the research intervention. He noted that

> One thing to your advantage, you have so many disadvantages with the situation
> with COVID, and my situation and all that, just to make sure it's still going, yeah,
> it's still going. One positive, I think for you is that there are so many issues right
> now that the students are interested in, and the country is dealing with that, I think
> that played into your hands. You do get a positive checkmark over here in that I
> think they do say, 'Hey, you know what, there's all these issues out there that I
> care about.' Then we're looking at similar, not the exact same, but similar issues
> in history class. I that is a positive for you in the midst of all the COVID
> negatives. I think them seeing it was good for them to then know what's
> happening today, there can be some changes made.

Although the COVID-19 pandemic proved troublesome for the research intervention, it

provided an opportunity to put taking civic action on display for the students in this

research intervention. According to Kahne and colleagues (2006) students need exposure

to compelling civic and political role models discussing their own experiences so they

can see themselves taking civic action in the future (Blevins et al., 2016; Endacott, 2010;

Kahne & Sporte, 2008).

Table 2. Summary Table of Research Findings.

Research Questions	Findings
What ideas about taking civic action manifest in student artifacts from the research intervention when discussing public issues as part of a C3 Framework based lesson?	Theme 1: Civic Literacy (*civic principles, public policies*) Theme 2: Civic Empathy *("what if I was one?" "violates Constitution," "big enough to work," "power over us," felt responsible," "empathy," "children's income source of family income," "actions resulted in policies," "this isn't right," he was really dirty," "he had ripped clothes and torn up shoes," "It brings tears to my eyes knowing this is what we are and how they affect the children," "They didn't have time to play around or behave like children normally do," "some people still can't do certain things that other people can do," "I am so mad, this ruling was so unjust"* Theme 3: Civic Identity Related to Democratic Citizenry (*public issues, awareness, civic agency*) Theme 4: Ideas about Civic Action (*civic action, civic participation*)
How do the classroom teacher's perceptions about implementing the designed research intervention change over the course of the study?	Theme 1: Evolving Definition of Awareness (*awareness*) Theme 2: Making Connections (*connecting past and present, interdisciplinary connections*) Theme 3: Workability (*teacher-centered instruction, urban challenges, deficit model of urban schools, ease of implementation, COVID-19*)

Findings for the First Research Question

The first research question asked, "What ideas about taking civic action manifest in student artifacts from the research intervention when discussing public issues as part of a C3 Framework based lesson?" The research question was designed to elicit data about how students responded when discussing public issues and taking civic action in the role of historical figures. The researcher analyzed the student artifacts completed during the research intervention. Many different codes were used during the descriptive and *a priori* coding process which the researcher organized into themes. There were four themes relevant to the first research question: *civic literacy, civic empathy, civic identity*, and *civic action*. The themes are discussed in the following sections.

Theme 1: Civic Literacy

The theme *civic literacy* arose from the *a priori* codes related to best practices in social studies learning (Clabough, 2018b). *Civic literacy* means building a robust base of knowledge about democratic ideals and institutions in the United States as well as the analytical skills needed to analyze differing perspectives, to compare people's words and ideas to their actions, and to evaluate truth claims. An explanation of the codes that emerged during analysis for this theme were discussed in the next section.

Civic Principles

The code *civic principles* appeared during the analysis of the student artifacts from the final assessment unit. The researcher defined this code as the fundamental ideas of a democratic society, like justice, human dignity, equity, and the importance of due process as described by Ochoa-Becker (1996). This definition was highlighted in Julia's response to the question of which democratic principles were violated by the public issue of segregation, "It violated the 14th Amendment which forbids states from denying to any person within the jurisdiction the equal protection of the law." Julia's response to the question of how one can justify civic action for or against the public issue also illustrated the definition for this code, "You can't justify it because it is denying a person basic human rights just because of their skin color." Aniyah offered a more nuanced answer to the question of whether the public issue of segregation violated democratic principles in her response, "The document seems to have a biased opinion towards equality. Although it mentions the word equality, it still is sensitive to the nature of separation and keeping the other race comfortable, opposed to blacks." However, I think David's response

summarized the definition for *civic principles* quite well. He started by quoting the

Preamble to the U.S. Constitution. Then, he followed up the quote with this comment,

"How can a more perfect union be formed if children are abused at work? And Justice?

Children deserve justice, for every child who died at work, for not sleeping well, or for

falling asleep while working." The code, *civic principles*, was also evident in the final

summative assessment at the end of the intervention. Several students commented on

how either the public issue of child labor or segregation violated fundamental democratic

values. For instance, Farah felt that child labor violated both the 13th and 14th

Amendments, "This horrible torture to young kids violates constitutional rights such as

the 13th Amendment restricting slavery. This also violated the 14th Amendment that says

that every U.S. citizen shall be lawfully protected." Students seemed to engage in the

second layer of civic literacy discussed by Clabough (2018b) where students analyzed

people's thoughts, beliefs, and actions for ways that they positively or negatively

reflected democratic principles, laws, or public policies. Students' comments also seemed

to affirm Ochoa-Becker's (1996) assertion that maximizing these values are of central

concern to a democratic society.

Public Policies

The code *public policies* was the second most prolific code that arose in the data

collected from the first unit. The researcher defined this code as rules and guidelines

issued by some type of governmental agency in response to a problem that is a public

concern. Support for this code came from the data collected in the formative assessments

from the first unit. For instance, in an activity on the Gilded Age in which the student had

to write a summary of the era, many of the students accurately used the phrase "laissez-faire" to describe a public policy of the Gilded Age. Other students provided more detail. For example, Martha said, "there were no public policies, or Medicare, or anything." Other students defined *public policies* by stating which ones were not present during the Gilded Age, "It says it was a society without Social Security, Medicare, health insurance, and government regulation on business." It was clear that Aiden meant that the Gilded Age was a time period in history in which industrialization and technology outpaced the growth of the government and its ability to regulate big business. Andrew helped define this code when he responded to the question of whether the actions of Lewis Hine led to the creation of public policy: "His actions did lead to the creation of public policy. Because of what Lewis did, it made it so that children would no longer be abused by being forced to work." Once this student defined *public policies*, he could better explain why one was needed to address child labor. Other students described the public policies that were created as a result of the work of Lewis Hine and others opposed to child labor. "Yes, after more and more people saw the pictures and quotes from these children, the National Child Labor Community [sic] made sure things changed. Laws were put forth to prevent kids under a certain age from working." Most of the students' responses indicated an understanding of public policies.

Theme 2: Civic Empathy

The theme, *civic empathy*, came from a variety of different types of codes that appeared in the first unit. Codes like "*What if I was one* [child laborer]?" and "*violates Constitution*" supported the *civic empathy* theme. The definition for the theme, *civic*

empathy, was influenced by information from Colby (2008), as well as an article by Endacott and Brooks (2013) in which the authors explained the three components comprising historical empathy. Endacott and Brooks (2013) explained that students demonstrated historical empathy when they showed historical contextualization, perspective taking, and affective connection. Historical contextualization referred to the student's ability to discuss the social, cultural, and political norms within the context of the time period. Perspective taking was emulating the lived experiences of persons in the past to better understand the thoughts and beliefs of those in the historical situation. Affective connection referred to students making connections between their own lived experiences and the lived experiences of the people being studied. Students developed a more complete view of the past when using all three components during learning (Endacott & Brooks, 2013). However, the definition for this theme differed from Endacott's and Brooks's (2013) in that the students viewed the lesson in a civics perspective and contextualized the information in terms of political participation and civic action. During second level code analysis, the researcher looked for examples of the three components of civic empathy. For instance, In Vivo codes like "*big enough to work*" and "*power over us*" showed evidence of students engaged in perspective taking as described by Endacott and Brooks (2013). Student artifacts also yielded values codes like *felt responsible* and *empathy* which provided evidence for making affective connections with the historical figures, in this case, child laborers in the early 19th century. Codes like *children's income source of family income* and *actions resulted in policies* indicated contextualization as described by Endacott and Brooks (2013).

The theme, *civic empathy*, was evident on many of the summative assessments. Ellis's journal entry, in the voice of a child working during the Gilded Age, displayed all three components of the *civic empathy* theme:

> It's almost sunrise and I'm starving. I haven't eaten in days. One of the older guys at the factory gave me a bite of his sandwich, but it filled up my stomach as much as a single grain of rice would, although I am grateful. Yesterday was payday—25 cents for 14 hours, if I counted correctly—doesn't quite add up, but the bossman says it's correct. I do not wish to challenge him on that. I am considered to be the smart kid between me and my buddies, seeing as though I did finish the third grade, and they did not go past the first grade. I am finally 'big enough' to work but that means nothing to them. It is almost time for work, hopefully today brings us luck. –Tired, Luke.

The student showed an understanding of the public issue by contextualizing child labor within the context of the Gilded Age. Students engaged in perspective taking when writing from the point of view of the working children. This helped students make an affective connection with the children working in the Gilded Age. Beckett wrote,

> Every day gets worse and more difficult. I freeze throughout the nights and wake up surprised that death didn't take me. This is my 34th day working in the mines, and my hands are almost no use to me anymore. They're chapped and have cuts and little flesh to them. I'm only nine years old, this isn't right. I have no home. I'm starving, and I want this hell to end. I'm so tired, and I'm so hungry. I hope and pray Spring comes soon, and that my life, and the thousands of others like me, improve.

Again, Beckett demonstrated all three components of the definition for the theme of *civic empathy*. The student showed excellent understanding of the public issue of child labor. Her demonstration of perspective-taking was quite accurate. The details in her journal entry provided the contextualization for the public issue. Beckett's comment of "this isn't right" indicated an affective connection with the historical figure, in this case, a fictional child laborer during the Gilded Age.

A curious trend was identified when analyzing the codes relevant to this theme. Many of the students had one or two examples of the components of the three-pronged definition of *civic empathy*. In the first summative assignment, only three of the students' responses showed all three of components of the definition for *civic empathy*. Many more of their responses indicated one or two of the components, but not all three. Sam started his response by engaging in perspective taking, but by the end of the journal entry, he had slipped into using a third person perspective in his response as seen here: "During the Gilded Age, child labor was out [present]. If I was a kid working in the factory, I would be very upset and confused because no kid should go through anything like that at a young age or working like a slave at a young age." Then, he slipped into a third person perspective of the issue, "You have all your life to work, and babies shouldn't be out there doing hard work. Their life was very hard and unfair, but they had to keep pushing because they had no choice." The student artifacts from the first summative assessment in the child labor unit indicated that most of the students could not engage in the three-pronged definition of *civic empathy*. Several of the student artifacts from the first summative assessment seemed to show that the students were developing a rudimentary understanding of *civic empathy* that they had not quite mastered.

Analysis of student artifacts from the second summative assessment in the child labor unit also revealed the theme *civic empathy*. For example, Dean wrote,

> There were three children who really touched my heart and opened my eyes wider than before. There was a boy at the age of six, he was really dirty. The second child was around nine, he had ripped clothes and torn up shoes. He had a big gash across his cheek, a small cut above his eyebrow. The third child was around twelve. She had matted hair and dirt all over her face. The environment of where the children worked was horrible. It tears me apart and wounds me deeply to see these young and innocent children to be put through something they do not deserve. It brings tears to my eyes knowing this is what we are living with and

that other think this is ok. I need to show the public how bad these conditions are and how they affect the children. I'm going to do the best I can to show the public that this needs to be stopped and stopped now.

Dean's artifact from the second summative assessment showed all three components of the definition for the theme *civic empathy*. He provided contextualization for the public issue, child labor. His comments focused on the neglect most child laborers of the Gilded Age with statements like "he was really dirty," and "he had ripped clothes and torn up shoes" to provide contextualization for child labor. He made an affective connection with his comment of "It brings tears to my eyes knowing this is what we are and how they affect the children," which appealed to people's emotions when they believe children are being abused.

Like the analysis of the data in the first summative assessment, analysis of the data from the second summative assessment showed similarities in students' use of *civic empathy*. Their use of all three components of *civic empathy* varied. Some students only demonstrated one or two of the three required components for *civic empathy*. For instance, Sally's artifact lacked an affective connection, but showed evidence of perspective taking and contextualization.

> Today I've seen a numerous number of kids under 12 with ripped clothes, muddy faces, and a musty smell to them. These kids aren't being taken care of or even being paid enough to do these jobs. These jobs are hazardous. Honey, I can't work my job and help these kids, so I'm quitting my job. I feel that the only way to help these children is for me to get a bigger audience to see what's going on. They need my help to end this era of child labor, and I will get the public behind me with my pictures.

While the response in this student artifact reflected excellent perspective taking and some contextualization, it was clear that Sally had not made what Barton and Levstik (2004) call a personal connection to the public issue through Lewis Hine. Most of the student

artifacts from the second summative assessment lacked one or two of the three required components for the definition of *civic empathy*.

The analysis of student artifacts from the third summative assessment of the child labor unit differed from the pattern as the previous two summative assessments. In the third summative assessment, students were asked to write a Ted Talk script about child labor. There were 14 student artifacts. None of the student artifacts from the third summative assessment exhibited the three components of *civic empathy*. Only Brandon made an affective connection in the summative assessment by saying, "They didn't have time to play around or behave like children normally do." The student seemed to make an affective connection to his own childhood by defining what children normally do. Only four of the fourteen student artifacts from the third summative assessment showed evidence of perspective taking. The lack of perspective taking and making an affective connection could be connected to the importance of helping students develop their own civic identity as discussed by Clabough (2017).

Codes supporting the *civic empathy* theme were found throughout data from the formative and summative assessments in the segregation unit of the research intervention. Although the definition of the theme, *civic empathy*, included all three components, examples were chosen based on how well they fit the definition of the theme. For example, after learning about the *Plessy vs Ferguson* U.S. Supreme Court case, students were asked what was different back then, and what was the same today, as part of a formative assessment in the segregation unit. Sarah indicated that she made an affective connection when she replied, "some people still can't do certain things that other people can do." The researcher took this to mean that discrimination based on skin color still

happened regularly, and the student probably experienced it. Sarah's own experiences

helped her to better understand the lived experiences of African Americans in the past.

However, Sarah's responses did not show contextualization of the U.S. Supreme Court

case. Maria's responses showed no perspective taking or affective connection, but she did

provide contextualization for the U.S Supreme Court case,

> It essentially established the constitutionality of racial segregation. As a
> controlling legal precedent, it prevented constitutional challenges to racial
> segregation for more than half a century, until it was finally overturned by the
> U.S. Supreme Court in Brown v Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas.

Examples like this helped support the researcher's definition of the theme *civic empathy*.

The student's use of contextualization appeared to connect to Clabough's (2018a)

assertion that students needed instruction grounded in the study of civics principles and

government processes.

In another formative assessment from the segregation unit, Anne's response

showed civic contextualization in this response, "The Fourteenth Amendment should

have protected Plessy in this case . . . these two amendments, if enforced according to

their true intent and meaning, will protect all the civil rights that pertain to freedom and

citizenship." Charles made an affective connection with the information about the *Plessy

v Ferguson* (1895) Supreme Court case when he wrote, "one of the main things that stuck

with me was 'we're separate but equal' which to me does not make sense because

nothing changes when they say that," and "They want us to stay the way we were with no

equality." This emotional connection to the public issue helped the student make better

sense of the ruling in the U.S. Supreme Court case.

In the summative assessments from the segregation unit, students more frequently

demonstrated perspective taking and made affective connections with the civil rights

leaders, which were two of the components of the definition of the theme *civic empathy*.

Students less frequently included the third component of *civic empathy*, which was

contextualization. The following example, from Chris, included all three components of

the definition for the theme for *civic empathy*:

> I, Booker T. Washington support the public policy of accommodation because my African American people need to understand racial prejudice and concentrate on economic self-improvement. I, as an African American man, have to abide by this policy, too. African American people you have to stop demanding to vote and ending racial segregation. It is a goal that we have to cooperate with others to get to the equality we deserve. I am with the people.

The student's comments about focusing on economic self-improvement and the calls to

stop asking for the right to vote indicated contextualization of the public issue from

Washington's perspective. Additionally, the use of the pronoun "we" in the summative

assessment and comments like "It is a goal that we have to cooperate with others to get to

the equality we deserve. I am with the people" indicated that the student had made an

affective connection with the historical figure's civic actions. These examples helped

support the definition of the theme, *civic empathy*. The data seemed to suggest a

connection between the data and Endacott's and Brooks's (2013) concept of historical

empathy and Clabough's (2018a) concept of civic literacy. Whereas Endacott and Brooks

(2013) focused on historical empathy enriching students' understanding of the past, the

data suggest that a similar process, also based on the concept of civic literacy described

by Clabough (2018a), could help enrich students' learning of important civics concepts

needed for participation in a democratic society.

    The theme, *civic empathy*, appeared again in the analysis of the student artifacts

from the summative assessment at the end of the research intervention. After coding the

student artifacts, the researcher assigned the student artifacts to the theme *civic empathy*

if their responses included at least one of the three components mentioned earlier, civic contextualization, perspective taking, and making an affective connection. For example, Justin showed affective connection in his justification for civic action against the public issue of child labor when he said, "I go against this issue because children are working in horrible conditions and are not studying to become better because they don't have time for school." In the summative activity for the final assessment, Enrique also made an affective connection with his comment that "child labor is taking away a child's childhood, it robs them of time, and happiness, especially when hours are too long, and work conditions are unbearable."

Another component of historical empathy described by Endacott and Brooks (2013) was perspective taking. Perspective taking appeared frequently in the summative activity in the final public issues assessment unit. In Francine's letter to her cousin about segregation, she voiced the concerns about racism by saying,

> I don't know if you have been keeping up with what's been going on with us down south or not, but they decided on the *Plessy v. Ferguson* case. I hate to say it, but I just cannot get with the ruling on this. How do you let something like that go down and still not give us our rights? The man wanted to get on a train for God's sake. Equal but separate accommodations for the white and colored races was their stupid ruling, meaning, if I need to go to the restroom, it just can't be the same one the white lady uses. Or I can get a sip of water, it just can't be from the same fountain as the white ladies. What about all men are created equal, they didn't say anything about bathrooms in that, or the fourteenth amendment saying that no state should turn away a man based on the color of their skin? They can't even stick with rules they made.

This student's response provided an excellent example of perspective taking and making an affective connection. These comments exemplified the use of perspective taking like that described by Endacott and Brooks (2013) and Barton (2012) for demonstrating care and the lived experiences of those experiencing the effects of the public issue.

Students also made comparisons between child labor of the early 20th century and contemporary child labor laws. For example, a couple of students seemed to be quite familiar with the public policies concerning contemporary child labor laws when one of them wrote, "kids at a certain age can't work past a certain time, and they have to be at least 16 to work because it keeps kids younger [than] that from being able to work." Several students were able to compare the experiences of the children described in the child labor activities to their own experiences. This affective connection to history helped students better understand the lived experiences of the children of the Gilded Age (Endacott & Brooks, 2013).

Several students displayed all three components of the theme for *civic empathy*. The definition for the theme was influenced by historical empathy as described by Endacott and Brooks (2013). Roderick responded to the prompt on the public issue of child labor. He started strongly with perspective taking by saying,

> Many people might not think that child labor is a problem, and they see nothing wrong with it. Here at the National Child Labor Committee, we try [to] make people realize that child labor is not right. Child Labor is the use of children in the workplace.

Then, he continued with an affective connection, "Many of these places are dangerous for these children. We see this as an inhumane act, and we want rules put in place to protect these children." This comment called on the common emotions and fears that everyone experienced as children, while at the same time, communicating the lived experiences of the child laborers. Roderick followed up with contextualization, the third component of *civic empathy*. In the voice of a member of the National Child Labor Committee, he explained,

> There are currently no policies against child labor in place, but we think policies must be put in place. People have tried to raise awareness about this issue. Lewis Hine is an investigative reporter for the National Child Labor Committee. He takes pictures of children in these hazardous places. He also talks to some of them and asks them questions about their experience in the places. Most of these kids can't even read, but we allow them to work in these dangerous places instead of allowing them to attend school. We want to propose a federal law banning child labor.

Javier's more colloquial approach in his response to the segregation prompt also showed the use of all three components of *civic empathy*. Like the previous example, he started with perspective taking by greeting his cousin in character. He moved into contextualization with his comments to his imaginary cousin about the ruling in the *Plessy v Ferguson* (1895) Supreme Court ruling establishing segregation,

> This case started from one of our brothers named Homer Plessy. He refused to sit in the car for African Americans, and he argued by saying that it was his constitutional right. Cousin, since the 13th Amendment, 14th Amendment, and 15th Amendment were added to the Constitution, doesn't it mean he did have his right?

Clearly the student had knowledge about the case, and he was able to provide his cousin with the context needed to understand what he was trying to communicate to his cousin in the letter. From this point in the letter, Javier slipped into making an affective connection by saying, "I am so mad, this ruling was so unjust." The sentence ended with more contextualization about the type of segregation imposed upon people like him and his cousin and cited court documents where the court ruled that intrastate travel was not a civil or political right, and therefore, the separate but equal doctrine was upheld by the court. Towards the end of his letter, he once again made an affective connection by telling his cousin in the letter, "So I'm going to stay in the South to fight back for what is right, cousin, and win our true equality and freedom." The student's decision at the end of the letter reflected Endacott's and Brooks's (2013) conception of historical empathy

which helped the student develop a deeper and richer understanding of the content of the time period and civic principles of American democracy which were essential for developing the skills needed for participation in a democratic society (Clabough, 2018a). This seemed to suggest that like historical empathy, as defined by Endacott and Brooks (2013), civic empathy played a role in how students viewed their place in a democratic society.

Theme 3: Civic Identity Related to Democratic Citizenry

The theme of *civic identity as it related to the responsibilities and actions of being a democratic citizen* was developed out of several different codes associated with the first research question. *Civic identity* was defined as the ability to make decisions on one's own using all of the facts and perspectives about a public issue. This definition was influenced by Engle's and Ochoa's (1988) assertion that students needed a broad base of knowledge and understanding about the varied perspectives in a democratic society. Codes such as *public issues*, *awareness*, "*first-hand experience*," *civic agency*, and *equality of opportunity* informed this theme. The following discussion of the codes clarified this theme.

Public Issues

The most prevalent code throughout the student artifacts from the first unit of the research intervention was *public issues*. This code was defined as problems arising from some type of conflict common to a group of people. The definition for *public issues* was influenced by Oliver and Shaver (1966) who argued that public issues were "situations

over which individuals as well as the society are in conflict" (p. 13). This aligned with the data from the first unit. For instance, Lola defined *public issues* as problems that "are a mutual concern to an organization and one or more of its stakeholders." Her definition supported the definition of the code *public issues* as problems arising from some type of conflict common to a group of people.

Several of the students identified *public issues* by name, like Sarah, who listed public issues like housing and food. Many students felt like safety was a *public issue*, but several students also listed poverty, unemployment, and corruption as *public issues*. When trying to define the concept of general welfare, Jeff identified "issues such as poverty, housing, food, and other economic and social welfare issues facing the citizenry were of central concern to the framers." Bobby, when identifying the problems of the Gilded Age, wrote, "some of the problems were corruption, scandal-plagued politics, obvious consumption, and unregulated capitalism." When summarizing the Gilded Age, Lierin commented, "Most cities were unprepared for rapid population growth. Housing was limited, and tenements and slums sprung up nationwide. Heating, lighting, sanitation, and medical care were poor." The students' responses indicated that they could easily identify the public issues of the Gilded Age. Ochoa-Becker (1996) focused on the tension between self-interest and the common good providing the social bond for a free society. The students' comments about the poor working conditions, child labor, and corruption reflected the tension between self-interest and the common good.

Once students became more involved in the child labor unit, they used more specific answers. For instance, at the beginning of the unit, students were much more apt to give simple one-word responses like "poverty," "food," or "happiness." Yet, Phil's

response to the question of why child labor was a public issue provided more detail. "The children were not able to go to school and were often relied on by their families to help the family survive. Most of the working children were homeless. They also most of the time worked in bad conditions." The code *public issues* seemed to indicate that as students learned more about the public issues, they became more aware of their own perspectives about the public issues. Students' responses in their artifacts showed that they were developing their own opinions about the public issues as they learned more about them.

Awareness

The code, *awareness*, was identified out of the data from the formative and summative assessments in the last unit. The definition for this code came from students' responses to a question about the effectiveness of the actions taken by the historical figure in the selected prompt. In this example, Alice selected the child labor prompt and argued that Hine's actions were effective because "a lot of people later started to see the pictures and realized what was happening, and then the government got word of what was happening." Based on this student's excerpt, *awareness* meant becoming knowledgeable about the public issue. Another question in the same graphic organizer asked students to explain the civic action taken by someone in associated with the selected prompt. Eric's response indicated that raising awareness was one of the civic actions taken by Lewis Hine, "He helped by taking pictures and putting in newspapers to spread awareness." Comments such as these showed that students were familiar about the public issue of child labor. The code, *awareness*, also appeared in the summative

assessment for the final assessment unit. In Trey's Ted Talk script, he noted that Lewis

Hine was hired "to become an investigator photographer to help the abuse of the children

as workers. He, with his wife and son, travelled across the country photographing

working conditions of children working in coal mines, meat-packing houses, textile mills,

and canneries." This code was also identified in the analysis of the metacognitive

reflection activity.

Civic Agency

Civic agency was defined as the ability of people to work collaboratively with

others, despite differences, to explore solutions to problems by finding common ground

among all parties. The definition of the code was informed by research conducted by

Harry Boyte (2008) for the Kettering Foundation. The Kettering Foundation was a non-

profit organization devoted to gathering research on democracy and what makes it work

(https://www.kettering.org/). The definition of the code *civic agency* was influenced by

information from the Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools. For example, the

authors provided goals for civic education that require the skills, knowledge, and attitudes

that prepare student for participation in a democratic society. The definition of the code

civic agency was also influenced by information from Boyte (2008) and Barton (2012) on

the same subject. Boyte (2008) suggested that civic agency arose from the desire to bring

about social change through collective action. Barton (2012) believed that agency

involved making decisions to bring about changes in society. Support for this definition

came from students' responses in the formative and summative assessments. Henry

justified action against the public issue of child labor by saying this, "It was most

definitely the right thing to do. He [Hine] saw that it was a problem and did something about it. I respect that." Victoria wrote in the summative assessment from the final public issues unit that raising awareness about the public issue of child labor helped "inspire people to speak out and express their opinion on the matter." Gould and colleagues (2011) believed that the attitudes requirement for civic participation were called dispositions which included ideas such as "concern for others' rights and welfare, fairness, reasonable levels of trust, and a sense of public duty" (p. 17). This student's comments about raising awareness and taking action against child labor reflected the desire to bring about social change through collective action like the "concern for others" (p. 17) disposition promoted by Gould and colleagues (2011) and that mentioned by Barton (2012). One student's response to the prompt focused on the public issue of segregation. Byron said,

> Due to segregation being rampant in Chicago, I will not be moving there and will instead reside in the South where I can continue to be truly equal with all races instead of being segregated by those who wish to have us beneath them.

Although the student made an error about the status of equality in the South during the time period, comments such as these revealed students' own burgeoning civic agency as a result of studying how historical figures used their own civic agency in response to conflicts in society (Barton, 2012; Boyte, 2008; Gould et al., 2011).

The code *civic agency* appeared several times in the formative and summative assessments from the segregation unit. *Civic agency* was defined as the ability to make decisions collaboratively for the good of others. This definition was based on Barton's (2012) article on the use of agency to help prepare students for the decision making required for participation in a democratic society. An example of this code was found in

Henry's response in one of the formative assessments from the segregation unit, "He [Du Bois] wants the blacks to further educate themselves, he roughly speaks on the topic of how African Americans were not educated." This data showed that students could see historical figures making decisions that benefitted the whole community. Another excellent example of the code, *civic agency*, was Makayla's response to what he thought Du Bois suggested should be done about segregation,

> That they should strive to a future where it is no longer a thing. In that sense they want to send a message about how segregation is wrong, and how it is limiting the rights that the negros deserve as much as the rest of the world.

Comments such as these showed historical figures using civic agency to work with others in their local communities. The implication was that democratic societies depend on the decision-making skills fueled by civic agency which was defined as decision making for the good of the community or society.

Civic agency also appeared in the data in the second interview with Mr. Lankford in response to the prompt do you think that the kids will be motivated to take civic action as they get older. Mr. Lankford answered

> I hope so. It's hard to tell, honestly. It's hard to predict, but yeah, I think so. There's little glimmers of hope and little pieces of insights, so yeah, I think so. You know, I think just there with social media and all that's going on today, they're aware so much more than I was when I was in school, anyway. I think stuff like these activities just help connect in those things that they're already seeing and being bombarded with.

In a discussion of whether Mr. Lankford thought discussing public policies helped motivate the students to take civic action, he stated,

> It kind of depends. It depends on if there isn't something or it's clearly wrong. Like, oh, this was a big mistake that wasn't being addressed or a big problem, then yeah, I think it does. If it's something where it's not clear-cut or it's kind of vague and there's an issue, then I don't think it does. If it was something like, hey,

we got a huge issue, like you said, child labor, and there's really nothing – anybody can just do to whatever they want, then yeah, I think it does.

This statement provided evidence for defining the code *civic agency* as the ability to make decisions collaboratively for the good of others in relation to a public issue. Mr. Lankford's remarks suggested that the students became more aware of their own abilities in making decisions not only for themselves, but for others in their communities, to bring about change in their communities.

Several of Mr. Lankford's comments during the third interview also demonstrated the definition of *civic agency* quite well. For instance, when the researcher asked Mr. Lankford about whether the research intervention led to students taking civic action, he said,

> I think it helps them see that regular people can make a difference and see that there is a connection between learning the past and what's happening today. If somebody was able to draw attention to something like child labor in the past, then, I can draw attention to stuff. Or maybe not even them personally because they're still high school students, and they still see themselves as that, but that it is possible to draw attention and make changes today.

Still talking about whether the research intervention would lead to students taking civic action, he said,

> I do, I still think they see people they study in history class as somehow, they were different, so there's still that. I don't think they're all like, 'Oh, wow, I could be Booker T. Washington.' I wish they would see it that way. I do think it helps to knock down the idea that only somehow Superman can make a change. No, I do think it's positive. I don't think that they're all the way there like, 'I can be Booker T. Washington,' some of them, but it certainly helps and gives them an idea that 'Hey, you know what? Maybe you don't have to be Superman to still make a difference or Wonder Woman, whatever.

Mr. Lankford's statements seemed to contradict the master narrative that movements must be led by larger-than-life figures like Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr, Malcolm X, and

Winston Churchill. Authors like Ashley Woodson (2016) suggested that the role played by everyday regular people in major movements like the Civil Rights Movement was much greater than what has been recorded in history books. According to Mr. Lankford, whose classes were predominantly comprised of BIPOC students, they were able to empathize with the protestors because they shared lived experiences of discrimination which were at the heart of the BLM protests. Mr. Lankford believed that seeing models of historical and contemporary figures demonstrating civic agency helped students foster their own civic agency. This sense of the students that regular people could make a difference worked with the students' knowledge and values to help them develop their own civic identity.

Theme 4: Ideas about Civic Action

The theme *ideas about civic action* was identified as emergent from the data analysis of student artifacts in the research intervention. The theme was defined as ideas about actions taken in response to a public issue in an historical context. The theme *ideas about civic action* was an extension of the theme *civic identity*. As students' sense of civic agency grew, it seemed that they were motivated to take civic action to support their positions on a public issue. The codes supporting this theme were discussed in the following section.

Civic Action

The code *civic action* was another frequently occurring code in the data collected from the first unit. *Civic action* meant taking some action in response to a public issue. In

one of the formative assessments about child labor, students were asked about the relationship between public issues and taking civic action. Jan gave this simple definition for *civic action*, "when people have public issues, such as problems with child labor, they can take actions such as voting." Many of the students gave answers that equated taking *civic action* with trying to solve a problem related to a public issue. For instance, Haley's answer to the question about the relationship between public issues and taking civic action involved solutions. She said, "they both deal with an issue that needs to be resolved. They help come up with different solutions on how to resolve that particular issue." In a similar vein, Matt said that "civic action is I'll say is when something is done about the problem." Paul's response to the same question summed up the definition of the code *civic action* quite well. He said, "a public issue is different from taking [civic] action in that the issue can be an issue without it being solved but taking [civic] action is trying to fix it."

  Civic action was the most prevalent code that was found in the analysis of the formative and summative assessments of the student artifacts in the segregation unit. Many of the students' responses indicated some type of civic action, whether they recognized the actions of historical figures engaging in civic action, or they called for action themselves in their responses. For instance, David's response showed that he understood the actions taken by Booker T. Washington, "the actions he took was [sic] Washington spoke up against segregation, lynching, and voting." He could clearly explain the actions that Booker T. Washington took in response to the public issue of segregation. Rita noted Washington's civic action which seemed to amount to no action. In response to the question of what actions Washington took, she said, "He would give

speeches at meetings to white people and tell them how loyal black people were to them, and he would tell black people they should get used to the harsh treatment." Echoing this sentiment was her response to the next question which asked how Washington viewed equality,

> I feel as if he is trying to convince the white people that blacks and whites should be equal. Like he's trying to tell them all the things they did for them to make them like black people. It doesn't really sound like he's all for it to me.

Again, Rita's response to the question of what Washington thought should be done in response to the public issue of segregation showed that she had a good understanding of Washington's beliefs and actions related to his policy of accommodation. However, Rita doubts Washington's efforts. "He thinks that African Americans should just sit down and take it. He thinks that they should just get used to it. He thinks that he can be separated but still be equal." Clearly Rita recognized that the civic actions of Booker T. Washington promoted accommodation which the student viewed as inaction. However, Marcia saw the absence of overt civic action differently, "Washington did publicly speak out against the evils of segregation, lynching, and discrimination in voting. He secretly participated in lawsuits involving voter registration tests, exclusion of blacks from juries, and unequal railroad facilities." All of his actions, public and private, were responses to the public issue of segregation. The students' differing views on Booker T. Washington's civic actions seemed to connect to assertions made by Clabough (2017) in which he said students need to struggle with public issues to develop their own civic identities. Upon analysis of Washington's policy of accommodation, some students identified with him as taking an important stand to prevent possible clashes between the races while others did not identify with Washington because they felt he was capitulating to white people.

Responses in the student artifacts on Du Bois's reaction to Washington's accommodation also confirmed the definition of the code *civic action* as actions taken in response to a public issue. The students' most frequent answer to the question about the actions Du Bois took in response to Washington's accommodation policy was "He says that even if the Black community and the other races come together, Mr. Washington accepts that the black people are inferior." Donna answered that Du Bois suggested that "They [African Americans] should fight for their rights and make everyone realize black people aren't below them." Students consistently indicated that Du Bois took more active civic action against segregation than Washington's accommodation policy. For example, Cecil echoed the same idea about Du Bois, "Du Bois thinks that Black people should not stand for the way they are being treated. They shouldn't listen to Washington and just give up their rights. They should go to school and get educated." Clearly, the data indicated that students felt like Du Bois had taken more active and consistent civic action in response to segregation than Mr. Washington.

The code *civic action* was also found in the summative assignments from the segregation unit. In this summative assignment, students were asked to write a five-sentence paragraph in the voice of Booker T. Washington defending the policy of accommodation. The following example accurately depicts the civic actions taken by Washington in response to segregation:

> I am Booker T. Washington. I support the public policy of accommodation because if I just stoke the flame that our people have burning inside of them, the violence will only get worse and will get to a point where we can no longer go back. Becoming agitated over this folly is nothing but a distraction, and if we can look past it, we can attempt to improve ourselves and become better people, not only economically, but morally, as well. I hope that this policy will ensure that we are truly equal, and we are at the point where we can put all of this pointless anger

behind us. I truly believe that a day like this will come but only if we can put our anger aside for a moment to improve on ourselves.

Jatarrious's more eloquent response indicated a more nuanced understanding of Washington's actions.

In another summative assignment, students were asked to compose a 30-word telegram, in the voice of Du Bois, responding to Washington's Atlanta Compromise Speech. The difference in the students' responses this time was instead of describing the actions of Du Bois, they urged people to take civic action, in the voice of Du Bois. For instance, Greg's telegram said, "Mr. Washington, please use your influence to stand with your people. Although 'giving in' worked well for a while, things are different. We must grow. We must do things differently." Nehemiah put it more forcefully when he wrote, "Don't settle for this my brothers and sisters, we haven't been brought this far to still be treated like dirt [STOP]" In these examples, students provided support for the definition for the code *civic action*. Additionally, as suggested by Clabough (2017), students' analysis of Washington's policy of accommodation helped them develop their own sense of civic identity regarding the public issue.

In the final summative assessment of the segregation unit, the students had to pick one of the two civil rights leaders, Washington or Du Bois, and write two paragraphs in the voice of that leader. In the first paragraph, the students had to summarize the civil rights leader's position on segregation. In the second paragraph, the students had to critique the position of the civil rights leader not chosen, in the voice of their chosen civil rights leader. The following excerpt in the voice of Du Bois was from the second paragraph of the summative assessment from William's artifact in the segregation unit of the research intervention:

> Mr. Washington needs to step up instead of stepping down. Sitting back during this time and just accepting that this is how things are for now. Mr. Washington and the black community need to stand up for what's right and get our basic rights as we deserve. I respect Mr. Washington as a man and for the most part what he stands for, but like I said, it's time to stand up and fight. We deserve rights just as much as the whites do.

It was evident that William showed understanding of Du Bois's position on Washington's accommodation policy because he used Du Bois's arguments to call on others to take civic action like Du Bois.

The code *civic action* was identified in the data from the interviews with Mr. Lankford. Mr. Lankford's response to whether he thought that students would take civic action as they became older provided support for the definition of the code. Mr. Lankford said, "I hope so. It's hard to tell, honestly. It's hard to predict, but yeah, I think so. There's little glimmers of hope and little pieces of insights, so yeah, I think so." Although the code taking *civic action* appeared only twice in the data collected from the second interview, it was an important part of the research intervention. Mr. Lankford's comments also suggested an affective connection with taking civic action. Additionally, using historical empathy prepared students for the decision making required for participation in a democratic society (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Endacott & Brooks, 2013) which connected the premise suggested by Engle (1960) that the goal of social studies was to prepare students for active participation in a democratic society. Therefore, taking civic action became an important part of democratic participation (Barr et al., 1977; Croddy & Levine, 2014; Engle & Ochoa, 1988).

Data related to the code *civic action* was also seen in the third interview with Mr. Lankford. Mr. Lankford's response seemed to indicate that his students were more motivated to take civic action after discussing public issues in the segregation unit. For

example, students analyzed the responses of Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois

to segregation. Both leaders took civic action by making speeches and writing books. The

public policy was segregation, and the public issue was inequality. Examples like these

were the ones that Mr. Lankford spoke of when he said, "There were issues that did get

changed and not because the government just all of a sudden decided to do it, but because

there was action taken by individuals." This statement was his response to the question of

whether the research intervention led to students taking civic action. The definition of the

code *civic action* was directly related to Dimension 4 of the Inquiry Arc of the C3

Framework (NCSS, 2013). Ideally, taking civic action would demonstrate the skills

needed for participating in a democratic society. The historical figures who were included

in the activities served as models of citizens taking civic action. Mr. Lankford's response

to a question about whether giving students opportunities to evaluate public policies

motivated them to take civic action provided more support for the definition of the code

civic action when he said,

> Yes, because you can show them that there was a problem. People took action. This was the action they took, and then they were able to fix it. Then, I think, yes, it definitely helps them be more motivated, and again, some of them are not going to [participate]. I think it definitely helps them be more motivated sometime in the future, because that's really what we're trying to do is educate them and then make them better citizens, I think.

Still discussing whether providing opportunities to evaluate public policies motivated

students to take civic action, Mr. Lankford continued

> I think the more you can expose them and show them this idea that there were issues, they got addressed by regular folks, and then they were able to make a change, forced the government to make a change, or encouraged the government to make a change, then I think it does help them realize the importance of getting involved now. Because a lot of students don't – 'I'm just one person. Nothing can be changed.' I really liked that. In some of them, I saw that.

The *a priori* code *civic action* as defined by the researcher was connected to a large body of research on taking civic action. Authors like Shirley Engle (1960), Barr and colleagues (1977), and Engle and Ochoa (1988) promoted a new way of teaching social studies that prepared students for participation in a democratic society. In order to prepare for participation in a democratic society, students must master a variety of skills including taking civic action (Blevins et al., 2016; Levine, 2007; NCSS, 2013). Mr. Lankford's comments about regular people taking action indicated opposition to the master narrative which often disregarded the role of everyday people in taking civic action (Bickford & Clabough, 2019; Clabough & Bickford, 2020; Woodson, 2016, 2017).

Civic Participation

Civic participation was another code identified from the segregation unit. The researcher defined this code as participating in some type of activity for or against a public issue, whether an overt action like speak up, or a more passive action like accommodation. The definition of this code was influenced by information presented by Flanagan and Levine (2010) about civic engagement. They believed that helping students develop civic engagement, like participating in activities such as community service, helping neighbors, or protesting injustice, were important skills needed for the health of democracy. This code appeared in the last two activities in the segregation unit. In both activities, students were asked to engage in perspective taking to express the historical figures' thoughts, actions, and beliefs about segregation. In many of the students' responses, students called on their hypothetical audiences to engage in some type of civic activity. For example, speaking in the voice of W.E.B. Du Bois, Bobby said, "Mr.

Washington, I think that you have it all wrong. This is the time to stand up and continue

fighting, not the time to sit back and just want things." The same trend with this code

continued in the next activity in which students had to choose a civil rights leader, voice

his position on segregation in the first paragraph, and critique the opposing civil rights

leader in the second paragraph. In the following example, Peyton voiced Washington's

position on accommodation and why it should be supported, "My name is Booker T.

Washington, and I feel that segregation is something that won't come easy. I have made a

public policy of accommodation that I feel is the key to overcoming segregation." Then,

she defended Washington's position with this statement, "Segregation is something we

don't have enough resources to overcome right now." In the paragraph critiquing W.E.B.

Du Bois, she stated, "Du Bois has accomplished things educationally, but what has he

done for the people other than to promote education as a primary focus?" Comments such

as these showed that students recognized the importance of civic participation in response

to public issues such as segregation.

Differences between the First Unit and the Second Unit

Several differences emerged from the data in the student artifacts between the first

unit on child labor and the second unit on segregation. The data from the student artifacts

of the segregation unit showed a different pattern of codes than that of the first unit on

child labor. In the analysis of the student artifacts from the first unit of the research

intervention, there was a clear distinction between the codes that emerged in the

formative assessments than those in the summative assessments from the unit. However,

the codes that emerged from the student artifacts from the second unit were more homogenous. The codes were then analyzed for themes related to the research questions.

Civic Empathy

The biggest difference was the increase in students' demonstration of *civic empathy*. There were a greater number of students who demonstrated use of all three components of *civic empathy* in the segregation unit than in the child labor unit. Students' use of *civic empathy* was limited mostly to the summative assessments in the child labor unit of the research unit, whereas their use of *civic empathy* in the segregation unit was more consistent. It was interesting to note that students made affective connections more in the segregation unit than in the child labor unit. For instance, comments made by students in the child labor unit tended to focus on factual details such as the children were used as tools and public policies were created to deal with child labor. However, in the segregation unit, students tended to say things like "Washington was wrong" or "Du Bois wanted true equality." Comments like these indicated that some of the students made more of an affective connection with the examples from the segregation unit than in the child labor unit.

Making Connections

Another major difference that emerged from the analysis of the data from the segregation unit was the indication of connections among the discussion of public issues, analysis of public policy, and the development of civic literacy. The most common connection was to the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s. This could have

been due to students' familiarity with topics from the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s.

Differences in Codes amongst the Three Sections of Student Artifacts Differences in Codes

There were many differences in identified codes among all three groups of student artifacts collected from the units in the research intervention. Similar to the findings in the first child labor unit and the segregation unit, there was an increase in the number of students using all three components of the definition for historical empathy. This trend repeated itself in the analysis of the data from the segregation unit and the public issues and assessment unit. Another way that the summative assessment at the end of the intervention differed from the first two units was the increased use of affective connections. Students made many more affective connections in the summative assessment at the end of the intervention than those in the child labor and segregation units of the research intervention. Additionally, the code *civic agency* appeared in the segregation unit and the summative assessment at the end of the project, but it did not appear in the analysis of the child labor unit. Similarly, the code *civic principles* appeared in the summative assessment at the end of the project but not in the other two units. However, a code that appeared in all of the units of the research intervention was *awareness*. This code consistently appeared across all of the student artifacts from each of the units in the research intervention.

Findings for the Second Research Question

The second research question asked, "How do the classroom teacher's perceptions about implementing the designed research intervention change over the course of the study?" The purpose of this research question was to explore the teacher's experiences using the discussion of public issues in a research intervention based on the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013). The codes from the three different interviews showed how Mr. Lankford's perceptions about the research intervention changed over the course of the research study. The themes that emerged from the analysis of the interview data related to the second research question were *awareness, making connections*, and *workability*. These themes were discussed in the following sections.

Themes from Interviews with Mr. Lankford

The researcher analyzed data from three different interviews with Mr. Lankford. Each of the interviews were coded individually before the data was aggregated. The researcher used *a priori* codes influenced by the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013). Codes like *interdisciplinary connections* and *connecting past and present* were concepts promoted in the indicators of Dimension Two in the Inquiry Arc (NCSS, 2013). The themes were not exclusive to individual interviews. Rather, they tended to appear in the data from the other interviews. Axial coding was used to organize the codes from the three different interviews into categories that helped the researcher structure the themes of the interviews (Saldaña, 2016). According to Saldaña (2016), axial coding was a transitional coding process that helped the researcher look for relationships among the data across the different types of data. It helped connect codes from first level coding to

second level coding. The codes from the interviews with Mr. Lankford coalesced into three themes: *awareness, making connections*, and *workability*. Each of the themes were discussed in the next section.

Theme 1: Evolving Definition of Awareness

The theme *evolving definition of awareness* developed out of changing definitions of the code *awareness*. The code *awareness* appeared in the data from all three interviews with Mr. Lankford. The definition for *awareness* shifted as the research intervention progressed which contributed to the definition of this theme. At first, the code *awareness* was defined as sudden enlightenment or understanding akin to having your eyes opened. When discussing the question of how perennial public issues in social studies connected to taking civic action, Mr. Lankford illustrated the definition of *awareness* with a story of how he engaged with students about the reforms of the Progressive Era:

> I talk about how the average American had no idea what was going on, so they weren't upset about it. I used the analogy like 'If you came into my room and it was pitch black dark—when you came in and sat down, you couldn't see anything, you would've been 'Okay,' but then if I flipped on the switch and you saw that there was [sic] roaches and rats and stuff everywhere, then you would freak out. Well, okay, understanding what's going on helps you see that there are problems that need to be fixed. Gaining knowledge helps you understand that.

Statements like these supported the researcher's definition of *awareness* as sudden understanding or enlightenment. In another part of the interview, Mr. Lankford added additional support for his definition when he said, "the more you know, obviously, the more informed you are, but the better understanding you have of what's going on, and then that would inspire you to take action." Later, when Mr. Lankford was asked the question whether he thought students would be motivated to take civic action, he

responded "Would hope so. Again, the more information you have, the better." His comments in this dialogue suggested that sudden enlightenment or understanding, the definition for the code *awareness*, could be achieved by obtaining more knowledge. Developing an awareness of public issues was an important step in preparing students for participation in a democratic society (Hess, 2009; NCSS, 2013, 2016a; Oliver & Shaver, 1966; Parker, 2008).

Then, the meaning of the code *awareness* shifted. The new definition for *awareness* became knowing about different public issues in society. The definition was bolstered by comments like "You know, I think with social media and all that's going on today, they're aware so much more than I was when I was in school." Clearly, Mr. Lankford felt that students were informed about public issues via social media. *Awareness* sometimes depended on the public issue. Mr. Lankford noted that the clarity of the public issue was a factor in students' motivation to take action. For instance, in response to the question of whether analyzing public policies motivated students to take civic action, he said,

> It kind of depends. It depends on if it's clearly wrong. Like, oh, this was a big mistake that wasn't being addressed or a big problem, then yeah, I think it does. If it's something where it's not clear cut or it's kind of vague and there's an issue, then I don't think it does. If it was something like, hey, we got a huge issue, like you said, child labor, and there's really nothing—anybody can just do to whatever they want, then yeah, I think it does.

Mr. Lankford believed that students were less likely to take civic action when the controversy around the public issue was murky with many different perspectives.

The meaning of the code *awareness* shifted one more time by the third interview. The definition for *awareness* from the data of the third interview was to draw attention to perennial public issues. This definition came from Mr. Lankford's own words in response

to whether he thought the intervention led to students taking civic action. He stated that

"If somebody was able to draw attention to something like child labor in the past, that I

can draw attention to stuff." Mr. Lankford's remarks in response to how discussing

perennial public issues led to students taking civic action provided additional evidence

for the definition of the *awareness*:

> Okay, so again, my thought is that the more you talk about things that happened in the past and then take them and realize I can do the same thing in modern time, just like some of these people we looked at, like Booker T. Washington, for example, or some others.

When the researcher asked Mr. Lankford whether discussing perennial public issues

helped students evaluate democratic principles in our society. He responded:

> Yes, because you can show them that there was a problem. People took action. This was the action they took, and then they were able to fix it. Then, I think, yes, definitely help them be more motivated, and again some of them are not going [to see it]. I think it definitely helps them be more motivated sometime in the future, because that's what we're trying to do is educate them and then make them better citizens, I think. It's the whole point of it. I think, yes, it definitely was a positive impact on that.

Again, his comments supported the idea that the code *awareness*, as it was defined from

the data of the third interview, meant to draw attention to perennial public issues. The

definition for the code was more evident in Mr. Lankford's comments provided below:

> I think the more you expose them and show them this idea that there were issues, they got addressed by regular folks, and then they were able to make a change, forced the government to make a change, or encouraged the government to make a change, then I think it does help them realize the importance of getting involved now. Because a lot of students say—'I'm just one person. Nothing can be changed.' I did see them that said, 'Hey, it is possible to make a change.' I really liked that. In some of them, I saw that.

This definition of *awareness*, drawing attention to perennial public issues, was not

limited to students drawing the attention. The definition also applied when the teacher

was the one drawing the attention to historical figures taking civic action. As mentioned

by Mr. Lankford above, when students became aware of historical figures taking civic action, they were able to see that they were able to do it themselves. Although this theme was well connected to the research literature on preparing students for active participation in a democratic society, Mr. Lankford's comments seemed to argue against the master narrative of history which focused on the significant leaders of an historical movement, as opposed to the rank-and-file members of an historical movement (Bickford & Clabough, 2019; Woodson, 2016, 2017). Furthermore, using counter-narratives to give voice to the role of regular people in history helped prepare students for active participation in democracy (Barton, 2012; Levine, 2007; Levinson, 2012). Drawing attention to or giving students opportunities to explore perennial public issues also helped prepare them for the decision making needed for participation in a democratic society (Barr et al., 1977; Engle, 1960; Engle & Ochoa, 1988).

Theme 2: Making Connections

This theme was influenced by codes in the first and second interviews, and to a lesser extent, in the third interview. It reflected the different ways people make connections (NCSS, 2016a). The theme meant linking people, events, and ideas in the past, across time periods, or past and present. An important part of *making connections* included reflecting on personal connections to the material. Codes like *connecting past and present* and *interdisciplinary connections* supported the definition of the theme. The theme *making connections* meant helping people see the relationships between important ideas and developments in history, which included looking at those people, ideas, and events through historical, civic, geographical, or economic lenses.

Connecting Past and Present

The first code that came out of the data in the interviews was *connecting past and present*. *Connecting past and present* meant linking people, events, and ideas in the past, across time periods, or past and present. An example of the importance of helping students make connections was found in Mr. Lankford's answers to the question of how discussing perennial public issues connected to taking civic action. He was asked a follow-up question about the clarity of the intervention. Mr. Lankford replied "I wouldn't say super-clear, but yeah, I think it helps. Any time you can make them think is a good thing. Then, make them think about history, even better. Then connecting it to today, triple good." This concept of *connecting past and present* came up again when discussing whether he had seen any evidence of students' intentions to take civic action when they got older in their work. He replied,

> If you can study what happened and what people did in the past, you're so much better prepared for dealing with it in the future, or at least have a better idea. As a history teacher, of course I think studying the past is important and connecting it to today. I think the better history teachers are the ones that can constantly – even in just a little way – this is a very specific, targeted way, but even in just a normal conversation of their class. The more they can connect whatever it is their talking about to the present, the better their students are going to grasp it.

Observations like these reinforced the definition of the code *connecting past and present*. In the conversation about whether Mr. Lankford had seen evidence of students' motivations for taking civic action when they are older, he mentioned "I think stuff like these activities just help connect in those things that they're already seeing and being bombarded with, and just, oh, okay, there is a connection there." Another example of *connecting past and present* was this response by Mr. Lankford, "I try and show students the big picture in history and explain –the way I say to them is 'Everything happens today

because something happened in the past.' " Mr. Lankford's statements provided support

for the definition of *connecting past and present* which was defined as making

connections between past and present events as well as connections among past events

(NCSS, 2013; Nokes, 2013; Wineburg, 2001).

Interdisciplinary Connections

Another code that developed from the data in the first interview was

interdisciplinary connections. The researcher defined this *a priori* code as linking people,

events, and ideas in the past, across time periods, across disciplines, or past and present

(NCSS, 2016a). The difference between this code and the code *connecting past and*

present was the connection across the different social studies disciplines: history, civics,

geography, and economics. The definition of this code was linked to the Inquiry Arc of

the C3 Framework because of its connection to the design of the research intervention

(NCSS, 2013). The basic premise of Dimension 2 in the Inquiry Arc of the C3

Framework was that the four core disciplines of social studies, civics, geography,

economics, and history, each offered a unique set of disciplinary concepts and tools. For

history, that included concepts such as continuity and change over time and evidence-

based arguments garnered from the analysis of primary and secondary sources (Nokes,

2013; Wineburg, 2001). When describing his own role as it related to student learning,

Mr. Lankford described how he tried to cultivate those concepts in his students: "You're

giving them the tools that they will hopefully use to then go to take [civic] action;

whereas, right now, their toolbox is empty." He clarified further by saying, "the more

information you give them, the more they can then connect over different disciplines and

time periods." In this statement, the teacher acknowledged that helping students to see the connections among historical events, ideas, and people across the different time periods, across disciplines, and to present-day, whether those connections were good or bad, helped students to see the overall big picture of the lesson or topic. The ability to make connections across social studies disciplines, time periods, and to present day was a core theme of the research in developing students' disciplinary literacy skills (NCSS, 2013; NCSS, 2016a; Ochoa-Becker, 1996; Parker, 2008).

Theme 3: Workability

The theme *workability* was identified in the data from all three interviews. *Workability* was a reference to how useful the research intervention was when added to Mr. Lankford's toolbox of teaching strategies. Several codes coalesced to form this theme. The codes supporting this theme were discussed in the following sections.

Teacher-Centered Instruction

A code from the first interview was *teacher-centered instruction*. This code was found in Mr. Lankford's response to the question of how he would describe his classroom teaching style. *Teacher-centered instruction* referred to the type of activities in which the teacher controlled the flow of learning as opposed to the students controlling the flow of learning. Mr. Lankford's response below elaborated on how he articulated his teacher-centered practices, "I like to guide their discussion. My favorite day in class is when I'm talking and then responding to their questions, and we're having a discussion. I'm leading

the discussion." Such remarks further supported Mr. Lankford's preference for using teacher-centered instruction.

Urban Challenges

Another code revealed from the first interview data was *urban challenges*. The code *urban challenges* was defined as the unique problems faced by students who attended schools in economically-depressed metropolitan areas. When asked if he faced any special challenges teaching in an urban high school, Mr. Lankford described it this way:

> The biggest challenge I see is—well, there's multiple. One, they don't have a lot of background information. A lot of what I say that they should already have a foundation, they don't. They're not watching the news. They don't get a lot of information from their parents. The majority of my students –you throw out a term or a person or an expression, and they're like 'What?' that you would hope they would already know. That's one is they don't have a lot of foundation knowledge. Two, there isn't a lot of support at home. Not just giving them the foundation knowledge but encouraging them to do their work and how important studying for a test is and that kind of—there's some . . . there's some great parents. There's not a lot of parent involvement in their kids.

Comments like these indicated several unique challenges for students in Mr. Lankford's urban high school. The challenges mentioned by Mr. Lankford included lack of prior knowledge of social studies concepts and low parental involvement.

Deficit Model of Urban Schools

Another *a priori* code used during this conversation was *deficit model of urban schools* which was based on the work of Gorski (2008) on how teachers perceived the strengths and weaknesses of students in urban schools. The researcher defined *urban schools* as schools serving a student population that was predominantly comprised of

Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) and usually located in metropolitan

areas marked by high rates of poverty (Henig et al., 1999). The classroom teacher tended

to define *urban schools* by the challenges they faced. For instance, when responding to

the question about whether there were special challenges he faced teaching in an urban

school, he said the following:

> The biggest challenge I see is—well, there's multiple. One, they don't have a lot of background information . . . Two, there isn't a lot of support at home. There's not a lot of parent involvement in their kids.

Remarks like these supported the idea that Mr. Lankford defined *urban schools* more by

their challenges rather than those in the researcher's definition. An apt description of this

code would be that the two definitions were flip sides of the same coin. On the one side,

the definition of *urban schools* reflected characteristics like higher rates of qualification

for free and/or reduced lunch, which is an indicator of poverty in schools, lower scores on

standardized tests, and a student population predominantly made up of students of color.

On the other side of the coin, the challenges students in *urban schools* experienced.

The codes *teacher-centered instruction*, *urban challenges*, and *deficit model of

urban schools* supported the idea that Mr. Lankford may have been nervous about

starting the research intervention. He may also have been anxious about switching from a

teacher-centered approach to a student-centered approach in his teaching style. However,

teacher-centered instruction, *urban challenges*, and *deficit model of urban schools* did

not appear in the last two interviews with Mr. Lankford.

Ease of Implementation

One more code that emerged from the data of the third interview was *ease of implementation*. This code was defined as the level of difficulty, for the participating teacher, to implement the two units included in the research intervention. It appeared several times in the data for the third interview. Mr. Lankford's comments in response to a question about the level of ease in implementing the intervention impacting the results of the study provided evidence for the definition: "No, I don't think there was any problem at all. I understood what you were trying to do, I think. I understood the activities. They were very self-explanatory." When the researcher asked a follow-up question about whether he thought other teachers in his school would have the same experience, he replied,

> It might be even easier. This kind of stuff is not my comfort zone. I don't do it a lot. The teacher that already does things like this, I think would just boom, piece of cake. Then, the fact that I don't do it a lot and still found it easy to implement is a testament to your activities.

Mr. Lankford's comments about the ease of discussing public issues implied a connection to Ochoa-Becker's (1996) appeal for examining democratic values, including justice, worth of the individual, equality, and due process and the tension between these values that sometimes arises. The activities in the research intervention were based on the structure of the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013). The code *ease of implementation* could be applied to information in the research literature about the difficulty for social studies teachers using traditional instruction methods to shift to the inquiry-based methods promoted in the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework (Herczog, 2014; Marino & Crocco, 2020; NCSS, 2013; Thacker et al., 2017).

Differences from the First Interview to the Second Interview

There were several differences between the first two interviews. The same interview questions were used in both interviews. There were fewer codes generated from the data collected in the second interview than in the first interview. The codes generated from the data in the first interview were *facilitator*, *teacher-centered instruction*, *urban challenges*, *awareness*, and *interdisciplinary connections*. The codes generated from the second interview were: *connecting past and present*, *awareness*, *civic action*, and *civic agency*. The discrepancy in the number of codes generated from the second interview could be attributed to a series of unfortunate events that took place in between implementation of the first unit in the research intervention and implementation of the second unit of the intervention. For instance, Mr. Lankford was quarantined at home because he was exposed to the coronavirus by a family member. He had not yet started the first unit in the research intervention. Then, Mr. Lankford tested positive for the coronavirus at about the same time that his mother and mother's brother became sick with the coronavirus. Mr. Lankford recovered. Unfortunately, Mr. Lankford's mother and uncle passed away from complications due to COVID-19. Mr. Lankford's mother and uncle had owned and operated a successful wedding catering business, but it fell upon Mr. Lankford to fulfill the obligations of the company before shuttering the business. All of this took place between the start of the first unit in the research intervention and the start of the second unit in the research intervention, as well as between the first and second interviews. Mr. Lankford's tragedies were the suspected reason behind the discrepancy in the number of codes between the first and the second interviews.

Awareness

One of the codes where there were differences between the data from the first interview to the second interview was *awareness*. In the first interview, the code *awareness* was defined as sudden enlightenment. The example of Mr. Lankford's story about turning on the light switch in a rodent infested room was used to support its definition. In essence, people were literally in the dark about the problem until made aware of it. In the second interview, there were fewer examples of the code *awareness*. This code was defined as knowing about different public issues in society. An example used earlier was Mr. Lankford's comments about students' motivation to take civic action as they get older. He mentioned that students were much more aware of public and social issues these days because of "social media and all that's going on today." This shift in meaning from the first interview or the second interview could be attributed to several factors. One was that the first interview took place at the beginning of the school year following a global pandemic that had shut schools down from March to September 2020. Mr. Lankford's comments reflected typical concerns for teachers at the beginning of the school year, such as starting the new school year, knowledge level of the students coming in for the new school year, and getting to know the new students. Another factor was that Mr. Lankford was not familiar with implementation of the intervention during the first interview. This could have had an influence on Mr. Lankford's answers. By the second interview, the shift in the definition of the code from sudden enlightenment to awareness of public issues reflected Mr. Lankford's familiarity with the intervention.

Interdisciplinary Connections/Connecting Past and Present

There were some interesting connections between the codes in the first interview, *interdisciplinary connections* and the code from the second interview, *connecting past and present. Interdisciplinary connections* was the code that was identified from the data of the first interview. It was defined as linking people, events, and ideas in the past across time periods, across disciplines, and to present day. This code was related to Dimension 2 of the C3 Framework which suggested that social studies instruction should include the four core disciplines of the social studies: civics, geography, economics, and history. Each of the disciplines offered unique skills and opportunities for students to practice the skills needed to be an active citizen in a democratic society (NCSS, 2013).

In the second interview, Mr. Lankford was asked the same question about whether he thought the intervention might lead to students taking civic action. His response was similar in that he felt that by learning from the past, the students were better prepared for the future as evidenced by his statement,

> Change the names, maybe change a little bit here or there, but it's basically the same. If you can study what happened and what people did in the past, you're so much better prepared for dealing with it in the future, or at least have a better idea.

However, he continued,

> I think the better history teachers are the ones that can constantly—even in just a little way—this is a very specific, targeted way, but even in just a normal conversation of their class. The more they can connect whatever it is they're talking about to the present, the better their students are going to grasp it.

Mr. Lankford's response indicated that *making connections* was important for students taking civic action in the future. In the literature on students taking civic action, several authors acknowledged that discussing public issues prepared students for participation in a democratic society because it helped with the complexities of social issues and public

policies (Avery et al., 2013; Clabough, 2017, 2018a; Levstik & Barton, 2015; NCSS, 2013; Ochoa-Becker, 1996; Philpott et al., 2011). Support for the code *connecting past and present* and its definition was found in the literature. For example, Clabough (2018a) argued that not only did students need opportunities to examine public issues in depth, but they also needed to be able to analyze the complexities of contemporary issues and public policies.

Differences among the First Two Interviews and the Third Interview

Many new codes emerged out of the data collected from the third interview. The same interview questions were used in the third interview as those in the first and second interviews. The codes *COVID-19* and *ease of implementation* were the only codes from the data of the third interview that were not seen in the data for the other two interviews. The codes *civic action* and *civic agency* appeared in the data from the first two interviews with Mr. Lankford. The code *awareness* appeared in all three interviews with Mr. Lankford. These differences indicated a trend across the three different interviews. In the following sections, the researcher discussed the differences and evolution of the codes from the first interview to the last interview with Mr. Lankford.

COVID-19

The code *COVID-19* came out of the conversation about whether Mr. Lankford could see the connections between the two units in the research intervention. The code *COVID-19* represented the obstacles caused by a flu-like illness called coronavirus leading to a global pandemic in 2020. The code was relevant because COVID-19

impacted the results of the research intervention. The effects were both positive and

negative. On the one hand, Mr. Lankford's unfortunate experiences contracting the

coronavirus and the deaths of his mother and uncle that delayed implementation of the

second unit of the intervention. On the other hand, the examples of taking civic action

that took place during the quarantine period of the pandemic in 2020 that students used to

make connections to the public issues in the research intervention. There were many

Black Lives Matter protests that took place across the country during the 2020 quarantine

period. From Mr. Lankford's perspective, although the coronavirus had wreaked

considerable personal damage in his own personal life, he saw the positive effects of the

coronavirus in the civic awareness and civic action on display during the Black Lives

Matter protests.

Time gap. The sub-code *time gap* emerged from the COVID-19 code data. As a

result of Mr. Lankford's extended absences due to COVID-19, there was an extended

period between the two units of the research intervention. Mr. Lankford had been able to

post the assignments to the digital learning platform used by his school. However, Mr.

Lankford was not able to provide face to face instruction (in terms of in-person

instruction and instruction via video meeting) for the activities until he returned. This was

demonstrated by comments in the third interview like

> I think the students, once I explained it to them again, because there was a little
> bit of, through my doing, not yours or anything else, but there was a little bit of a
> time gap which was not ideal. We were able to hook right back in.

Mr. Lankford offered more support for this code. Later, when Mr. Lankford was asked

whether he had any difficulty implementing the research intervention, he said, "The only

issue was just the online, the coronavirus, and them being on their device and not being

able to interact as well as in a normal year." Mr. Lankford reiterated that support in the same conversation when he said that "the issues with me this semester was corona related and then my personal issues." Furthermore, he added some additional detail:

> No, there were just times when I was trying to get some of this stuff done from a very difficult situation. I was off campus and in a very difficult situation mentally, and so it might've been hard for me to focus. Yet, I was still able to. Again, it was so good that I was able to, without 100 percent brain power, still get it going from off campus.

Comments like this one indicated that Mr. Lankford, despite terrible circumstances, was committed to completing the research intervention.

Ease of Implementation

The code *ease of implementation* was another code that shifted in meaning across all three interviews with Mr. Lankford. It was defined as the level of effort expended, by the teacher, to implement the activities of the research intervention. The code *ease of implementation* did not appear as a code in the data from the first two interviews with Mr. Lankford. However, he was asked the same set of questions during each interview. The differences described in the next sections were discovered when comparing Mr. Lankford's responses to the same question about his perceptions about how easy the research intervention was to implement in his classroom.

First Interview. When asked about his perceptions about the ease with which he was able to implement the activities from the units in the research intervention. He said,

> Well, that's yet to be seen. I don't know. It depends on if I'm able to connect with the kids and get them to buy in. With the whole corona, I don't know if that factors in. By the time we cover this, are we still all online? Which I think we will be. That'll be difficult. Normally, by the time I would cover this, they've already bought into the class and understood what's going on. It could be difficult to get them to see it as more than just a busy work assignment.

The teacher's concerns were not uncommon for a first interview taking place at the beginning of the school year.

Second Interview. During the second interview, Mr. Lankford was asked the same question about his perceived level of ease in implementing the two units of the research intervention. Mr. Lankford's response indicated that he was getting acquainted with the lesson plan and its activities. Comments such as the ones below suggested a shift in his response in the first interview where he acknowledged that it had gotten easier to implement the activities from the research intervention. The tone of the response in the second interview was less apprehensive than in the response in the first interview.

> Yeah. It's getting easier because the more you do something easily—for, okay, I'm old school, so the more I do something, the easier it gets. Yeah, I would say it's getting easier for me. I think the students — 'catch on' a little bit to what's going on.

It was clear from Mr. Lankford's statements and the tone of the conversation that he was more confident in the activities for the research intervention.

Third Interview. By the time Mr. Lankford answered the same question in the third interview, his responses to the question were quite positive. To illustrate this definition, the researcher used the following quote from Mr. Lankford about how easy the activities were implemented:

> This kind of stuff is not my comfort zone. I don't do it a lot. The teacher that already does things like this, I think, would just boom, piece of cake. Then, the fact that I don't do it a lot and still found it easy to implement is a testament to your activities.

This was further demonstrated by Mr. Lankford's comment: "I wasn't ever sitting going, 'Oh my goodness, what in the world am I supposed to do?' I was also never sitting around going, 'the students are not going to'—I thought it was all well-thought out."

Later, when discussing the C3 Framework and its relationship to the activities in the

research intervention, Mr. Lankford said this about implementing the activities from the

two units of the research intervention:

> No, I think it's workable. If I can understand it, again, I'm a teacher that doesn't normally do this kind of thing that you handed me, and I was able to pull it off, and again, in a non-corona, non-death in the family year, pull it off relatively easily.

Remarks such as the ones made by Mr. Lankford supported the definition of the code

ease of implementation as the teacher's perception of how easy it was to implement the

activities in the research intervention.

Civic Action

The code *civic action* appeared in the data from the second interview and the third

interview. The code had similar definitions. In the second interview, the code *civic action*

was defined as engaging in some type of action in response to a public issue. In the third

interview, the code was defined as any action taken in response to a perceived wrong

related to a perennial public issue. In the second interview, Mr. Lankford believed that

there were "glimmers of hope" in response to the question of whether students would be

motivated to take civic action. Later in the same interview, when discussing whether

analyzing public policies motivated students to take civic action, he said, "it kind of

depends. It depends on if there isn't something or it's clearly wrong. Like oh, this was a

big mistake that wasn't being addressed or a big problem, then yeah, I think it does." In

the third interview, in response to the same question, Mr. Lankford said,

> Because a lot of them, I think, feel like that whatever is going on, there's just no way to change it. You can show them that, okay, there were issues that did get

changed and not because the government just all of a sudden decided to do it, but because there was action taken by individuals. I think that's positive.

Comments like these supported the definitions for the code *civic action*. The consistency of the definitions for the code demonstrated the similarity in Mr. Lankford's responses to the same question in each interview.

Civic agency

Civic agency was the next code that had a discrepancy between one or more of the interviews conducted with Mr. Lankford. *Civic agency* was defined in the second interview as being aware of the circumstances related to public issues. For instance, when Mr. Lankford answered the question whether he thought students would be motivated to take civic action as they got older, he replied, "I think just there with social media and all that's going on today, they're aware so much more than I was when I was in school." In the third interview, *civic agency* was defined as working collaboratively with others, despite ideological differences, to find solutions to benefit all collaborators. In response to whether Mr. Lankford believed the intervention led to student taking civic action, he said, "I think it helps them see that regular people can make a difference and see that there is a connection between learning the past and what's happening today." Later in the third interview, when he was asked whether analyzing citizen participation in the U.S. political system relate to civic education, he said,

> I think that is a positive for you in the midst of all the COVID-19 negatives. I think them seeing it was good for them to then know what's happening today there can be some changes made. Who knows, maybe they will in the next year or so go out and some of students, because of this project, go out and actually get more involved.

Mr. Lankford's comments echoed information found in the research literature on civic agency. Barton (2012) believed that agency involved making informed decisions and taking civic action to achieve the desired goals for change in society. According to Barton (2012), helping students foster their own sense of civic agency can be accomplished by exposing them to historical figures making informed decisions. The statement made by Mr. Lankford seemed to reiterate the idea that seeing people demonstrating their civic agency provided students with models to shape their own sense of civic agency.

Awareness

Awareness was one of the codes that appeared in all three interviews. In the first interview, *awareness* was defined as sudden enlightenment or understanding, as if a covering had been removed from a person's eyes. In the second interview, this code was defined as having knowledge about a variety of public issues in society. Mr. Lankford hypothesized that social media played a role in this type of awareness demonstrated by students. By the third interview with Mr. Lankford, the code *awareness* meant drawing attention to perennial public issues. For example, one could think of *awareness* from the second interview as knowledge about issues akin to something a person might read about on social media. The *awareness* from the third interview could be likened to taking civic action through posting information to social media about the public issue.

The evolution of the code's meaning could be ascribed to several factors. First, the shift from sudden understanding and knowledge about public issues to taking civic action on public issues could have simply been the process of becoming familiar with the

processes in the research intervention. Mr. Lankford's comments in the first interview focused more on helping students gain the information for sudden understanding or awareness. In the first interview, Mr. Lankford likened students' lack of awareness to having an empty toolbox. The more that students became aware of the problems in society, the more quickly students filled up the toolbox. Mr. Lankford felt that it was his responsibility to provide students with the information needed to become aware of those problems and help them make connections to past and present issues.

Second, Mr. Lankford's comments in the second interview reflected a shift in responsibility for developing students' awareness. Mr. Lankford believed that students were much more aware of social issues due to access to social media in terms of contemporary issues. This shift to contemporary issues revealed a dichotomy in responsibility for students' awareness of public issues. When discussing public issues in the past, Mr. Lankford felt that it was his responsibility to provide as much information as possible, even making connections across time periods and to the present. When discussing contemporary public issues, he felt that students were more in tune with what was going on in society, particularly when there was a clear violation or wrong related to the public issue.

Lastly, by the third interview, Mr. Lankford's confidence in the work produced by the students was evident. Since the third interview took place after the conclusion of the research intervention, Mr. Lankford's confidence in his students' work could have been attributed to the benefit of hindsight. It was clear that Mr. Lankford was pleased that his students had connected with the historical models of taking civic action in the activities of the research intervention. Mr. Lankford commented on how using historical figures

like Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois as models for discussing public issues and taking civic action helped students connect to taking civic action on contemporary public issues. Mr. Lankford's new-found confidence seemed to be the result of seeing his students recognize that they can make a change in the world.

Summary

In this chapter, the researcher presented the data from 30 students and one classroom teacher in the form of student artifacts and teacher interviews. She analyzed and organized the data according to the two research questions in the research intervention. The coding process involved identifying codes and themes relevant to the research questions. The first research question asked, "What ideas about taking civic action manifest in student artifacts from the research intervention when discussing public issues as part of a C3 Framework based lesson?" The responses in both the student artifacts and the teacher interviews showed a direct relationship between discussing public issues and taking civic action. Analysis of the data revealed that discussing public issues made students more aware of the public issues in the past and present. The meaning of awareness shifted across the different interviews and units in the intervention. Awareness began as becoming knowledgeable about a public issue and then, evolved into raising awareness about the public issue, which was a form of taking civic action. Data also indicated that students had greater understanding of a public issue once they had analyzed the public policies surrounding the public issue. Participants frequently mentioned taking civic action as it related to the public issue. Additionally, students started developing empathy for people taking civic action, whether in the past by

historical figures like Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois or present-day Black

Lives Matter protestors protesting for racial justice. However, many of the student

artifacts did not show all three components of the definition for historical empathy as

articulated by Endacott and Brooks (2013).

Mr. Lankford's responses in the teacher interviews indicated that he believed that

students would be motivated to take civic action as a result of participating in the

research intervention. Both Mr. Lankford and the students agreed that it was easier to

take civic action on public issues where there was a clear-cut wrong related to the public

issue, like segregation. For example, students struggled with Washington's seeming

passive response to segregation in comparison to Du Bois's more outspoken critique of

Washington's response. Additionally, comments from Mr. Lankford during the teacher

interviews showed that he believed that students were starting to become motivated to

take civic action in their responses that called on people to work together to solve the

problems in society.

Responses on student artifacts revealed that students started developing a sense of

civic agency. Students demonstrated a sense of what was right or wrong based on the

civic principles of a democratic society. Students' analysis of the public policies

associated with the public issue also helped students build empathy for those taking civic

action. Awareness played a large role in helping students construct empathy. Another

frequent response in the student artifacts was taking civic action. Students frequently

mentioned how taking civic action was a solution to a problem in society related to the

public issue.

Another potent response in the student artifacts was civic empathy. In the metacognitive reflection, students reflected on their choices for the final public issues assessment. Many of the students indicated that they had made an affective connection with the subject of the prompt in the activity. Many students indicated that they chose the segregation prompt over the child labor prompt because of their race. They identified with the struggle against racism and discrimination, especially in light of issues connected to race over the summer of 2020. Other students who chose the child labor prompt because they identified with someone who was poor who had to work or had to have a job to help the family. Students' responses in the final summative assessment also showed that they had developed a stronger sense of historical empathy by demonstrating all three components of the definitions for historical empathy.

The second research question asked, "How do the classroom teacher's perceptions about implementing the designed research intervention change over the course of the study?" Mr. Lankford's responses indicated that he was nervous about implementing the research intervention because he was not familiar with some of the concepts and framework of the intervention. However, by the final interview, he was quite pleased with how easy the units were to implement and execute. Specifically, he was impressed by the ease of implementation in the face of extreme adversity. The significance of this data suggested that integrating the discussion of public issues into the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013) was easy to implement.

CHAPTER 5

IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of the research study was to examine the effects of discussing public

issues on taking civic action with the Inquiry Arc in the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013).

The following research questions were present in the research study:

1. What ideas about taking civic action manifest in student artifacts from the research intervention when discussing public issues as part of a C3 Framework based lesson?

2. How do the classroom teacher's perceptions about implementing the designed research intervention change over the course of the study?

The questions were designed to give feedback on the relationship between discussing

public issues and taking civic action.

The researcher recruited a high school U.S. history teacher to implement the

research intervention on the effects of discussing public issues on taking civic action. Mr.

Lankford was asked to assent to participating in the research study. After Mr. Lankford

assented, students were given consent forms to sign and return for participation in the

research study. Only 30 of 83 students returned the consent forms. Two methods of data

collection were used to gather data: teacher interviews and student artifacts. The teacher

was interviewed at three different points in the research intervention: at the beginning, the

middle, and the end. There were 13 different formative and summative assessment at the

end of the intervention. The student artifacts were collected and sorted according to those

who had turned in consent forms. The researcher did not use data of students who did not turn in consent forms. Once the data were collected, the researcher organized and analyzed the data for codes. The codes were used to look for trends in the data. Codes were defined and supported by data from the teacher interviews and student artifacts. Codes were analyzed for themes related to the research questions. The trends were used to reach conclusions about the data. Finally, the data were organized and presented under the relevant research questions.

Findings

Conclusion #1: Discussing Public Issues Encourages Civic Empathy

Students' responses throughout the research intervention seemed to show students engaging in historical empathy as defined by Endacott and Brooks (2013). Endacott and Brooks (2013) argued that students must demonstrate three components for historical empathy: making an affective connection, historical contextualization, and perspective taking. However, student samples appeared to show students engaged in slight variations of these components. For instance, instead of historical contextualization, students used civic contextualization. Students' analysis of public policies helped them to better situate the public issue in the context of the Gilded Age. Furthermore, it appeared that students could make affective connections with people taking civic action like Lewis Hine, Booker T. Washington, and W.E.B. Du Bois. Students' own lived experiences with poverty and racism helped them understand the civic principles being violated in previous time periods. The findings suggested discussing public issues encouraged students to engage in civic empathy. Civic empathy was a combination of three components: civic

contextualization, perspective taking, and making an affective connection. The findings suggested similarities between concepts such as the historical empathy model as articulated by Endacott and Brooks (2013) and the civic thinking model that can be interpreted through the results of the study.

With developing the civic empathy model, social studies teachers needed to see this modeled in concrete terms. Scholarship was needed to articulate the essence for each of these three civic empathy components. Several practitioner articles building on a civic empathy curriculum would provide guidance for social studies teachers wishing to develop students' civic empathy skills. The articles would build on the model of historical empathy expressed by Endacott and Brooks (2013). The data from the research study suggested that the civic empathy model contained three components: 1) civic contextualization; 2) perspective taking; and 3) making an affective connection. The practitioner articles would include activities similar to the ones used in the research study. For example, a social studies teacher could integrate the discussion of public issues into a unit on internment camps for Japanese Americans during World War II in the United States. Students could analyze the public policy that resulted from President Roosevelt's Executive Order 9066, which would strengthen students' contextualization skills. Another part of the article would describe perspective taking activities from a person of Japanese American descent forced to move to the internment camps. Looking at this perspective would help students practice the skill of examining differing perspectives on issues. The students' experiences contextualizing the public issue of unlawful imprisonment of Japanese Americans in internment camps as well as the perspective taking exercises could allow them to make an affective connection with their own lived

experiences facing discrimination as BIPOC students. Making an affective connection also helped build their own civic identity in terms of the public issue. A series of activities similar to those described would fulfill the components of civic empathy as suggested from the data in the research study.

Conclusion #2: The Development of Civic Empathy was Hampered by a Lack of Civic Identity.

One of the trends that appeared in the data was some students' inability to develop civic empathy because they failed to build their own civic identity. For instance, student artifacts in the child labor unit showed fewer students using all three components of civic empathy than student artifacts from the segregation unit. During the child labor unit, students engaged in civic contextualization and perspective taking activities. However, they did not consistently make a connection with the child laborer or Lewis Hine. Additionally, responses in the summative assessment at the end of the research intervention lacked depth in their responses indicating that the student had not developed a civic identity in relation to the public issue. For instance, student artifacts from the child labor unit showed fewer students using all three components of civic empathy than those responses in the segregation unit. Students who did not develop a civic identity through the activities gave more superficial responses in the final summative assessment of the research intervention. To encourage more thoughtful responses, the teacher should isolate the different components of civic identity and create opportunities for students to practice each component before using all three components together. This trend seemed to suggest

that a research study focusing on the development of students' civic identity as it related to civic empathy would be beneficial.

Due to the complexity of building students' civic identity, teachers should develop a variety of activities to build each component separately. Students should weigh both the pros and cons of policy solutions to develop their own beliefs about the issue. A research study investigating why some students do not strengthen civic identity when participating in activities designed to build civic empathy would prove beneficial for teachers, pre-service teachers, and students. The intervention at the heart of the proposed research study would be a series of activities designed around a public issue integrated into the social studies curriculum. For instance, in a historical unit on President Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal programs, students could analyze policies emanating from the public issue of limited government as well as New Deal programs that challenged the same civic principle. The formative activities in the intervention offered supports for the summative assessment of the intervention. Students would be supported by prompts that encourage students to test the veracity of the claims made by the different perspectives surrounding the public issue. The evaluation of the different perspectives and their arguments helped students construct their own civic identity about the impact of public policies on people's lives. This could also apply to pre-service teachers. Pre-service teachers should construct their own identities by examining the different perspectives and arguments about a public issue. The summative assessment would provide additional data on students' ability to consistently construct their own civic identity in terms of the civic principles under discussion.

Conclusion #3: Civic Action Is Strengthened by Pedagogy That Is Culturally Relevant.

The data seemed to suggest that students benefitted from lessons encouraging civic action by using connections to the local community and culturally relevant pedagogy. Culturally relevant pedagogy was defined by Gloria Ladson-Billings (1995) as a "pedagogy of oppression" (p. 160). The concept reflected the motive in the curriculum to collectively empower students and was based on three propositions: 1) academic success was essential; 2) historical and cultural knowledge of the local culture was fostered and supported; and 3) the development of students' critical consciousness to challenge injustices in a democratic society. Another implication of the data suggested that more research was needed to study how a civic action model using culturally relevant connections to the local community could empower students to take civic action. Student artifacts showed less interest and engagement in the child labor unit than in the segregation unit. One reason that may account for this difference was the lack of culturally relevant materials in the child labor unit as opposed to the materials in the segregation unit. The racial composition of the class was predominantly BIPOC students and had lived experiences that made the segregation unit more culturally relevant. Fewer students had lived experiences with child labor, and the lack of a culturally relevant pedagogical focus in this unit could have contributed that effect.

The data from the research intervention suggested that additional research was needed on using culturally relevant pedagogy in the discussion of public issues as a means for fostering civic action. For instance, a research intervention focused on the problem of food deserts in high poverty urban areas would be relevant for many BIPOC

students because this was a problem frequently experienced by students living in urban areas. According to Samuels (2018), food deserts were areas where there was a lack to access to fresh fruits and vegetables or other nutritious foods due to what he called "oppressive and negligent practices" (p. 170). Selecting public issues that were culturally relevant to the students' community, like food deserts, could strengthen students' civic identities through their shared life experiences. First, students would research food deserts and their impact on the local community. The teacher should provide the supports needed for students to complete the activity using formative assessment activities including perspective taking activities. Then, students would take the perspective of an African American entrepreneur looking to invest in their community and would write a proposal to build a new supermarket in the area. The summative assessment would be the city council's determination of whether to approve or reject the entrepreneur's request to support the project. This research study could provide valuable information on the importance of culturally relevant pedagogy when designing lessons fostering civic action.

Conclusion #4: Discussing Public Issues Develops Civic Literacy Skills

The data from the research study seemed to suggest that public issues were valuable learning tools that helped students develop civic thinking skills similar to how primary sources strengthened students' historical thinking skills. Student artifacts from the research study indicated that students used the discussion of public issues as a means for situating the public issues in their historical contexts. After discussing and analyzing the public policy of child labor during the Gilded Age, students could articulate whether child labor lived up to the civic principles inherent in American democracy. Many

viewed it as slavery or a violation of the basic rights to life and the pursuit of happiness. Others viewed it as a necessary evil for a family to survive. Additionally, students' evaluations of how Washington's and Du Bois's actions positively or negatively reflected democratic civic principles was further evidence supporting future research on the use of public issues to develop civic literacy skills.

More research was also needed to help social studies teachers better prepare their students for active participation in a democratic society. A potential future research study on the discussion of public issues and its connection to civic literacy would provide more data on the topic. The future research study would be modelled similarly to the research intervention in the research study. Within the context of a high school U.S. history class, students could research information about women gaining the right to vote and passage of the Nineteenth Amendment. The intervention would include primary sources from those who supported and opposed women's suffrage and examples of women taking civic action in the form of suffrage parades and silent protests. Students would analyze the primary sources and public policies regarding women's suffrage. A perspective taking activity in the intervention would serve two purposes: 1) would allow students to evaluate the validity of the claims made by the differing perspectives on women's suffrage; and 2) would allow students to see examples of historical figures taking civic action in response to a conflict over a public issue. Students should be given writing prompts which gave them a choice of contemporary issues related to women's suffrage. The results from the research study should be analyzed to see if the data confirmed the conclusion that discussing public issues was a valuable learning tool akin to the value of analyzing primary sources for preparing students to participate in a democratic society.

Conclusion #5: Civic Literacy Is Essential for Civic Thinking

The data from the research study suggested that the development of students' civic thinking skills was dependent on building civic identity. Data from student artifacts showed that when students analyzed public policy encompassing the public issue, they exhibited greater depth of knowledge in their responses. Additionally, students' responses showed evidence of civic thinking by providing evidence to support their reasoning for supporting or opposing a public issue. Greater depth of knowledge of civic principles, like those suggested by Ochoa-Becker (1996), were also evident. Students effectively used text evidence from the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights to explain how a policy plan in response to a public issue supported or violated democratic principles of American democracy. Furthermore, students could make connections across time periods and to present-day issues. For instance, they made connections between the push to ban child labor and present-day federal laws restricting the hours teenagers under 18 could work based on their lived experiences and information from the primary sources. Students also made many comparisons between Washington's and Du Bois's actions and the actions of notable figures of the modern Civil Rights Movement, such as Rosa Parks and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

A series of practitioner articles that defined civic identity and civic thinking along with highlighting the connections between civic literacy and civic thinking would provide social studies teachers with guidance on how to better prepare students for participation in a democratic society. Civic thinking included the discussion of public issues, analysis of the public policies surrounding the public issues, civic contextualization, development of civic identity, examination of multiple sources and perspectives, and evidence to

support claims. One such article that would help teachers included a learning activity focused on the coded language used by President Nixon during his 1968 presidential election campaign. Activities in the article would include the analysis of primary sources from Nixon's 1968 campaign speeches. During this analysis, students would look for ways that Nixon used coded language like "law and order" and "lawlessness" to take advantage of public backlash to protests of the Civil Rights Movement and those opposed to U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War during the 1968 U.S. presidential election (Perlstein, 2008). Next, students would look for examples of how Nixon's speeches supported or violated democratic principles essential for U.S. democracy. This summative assessment would provide a choice of case studies of people using coded language in a manner that supported or violated civic principles of a democratic society. This could set students up to compare corollaries of modern political leaders using coded language including examples such as Newt Gingrich's calling of President Obama as "the food stamp president" and Donald Trump's use of the birther movement during his 2012 U.S. presidential campaign (Halperin & Heilemann, 2013). The summative assessment would be a culmination of civic thinking fostered by civic literacy activities.

Issues for Transferability

Throughout this qualitative bounded instrumental case study, the researcher attempted to provide the thick description required for rigorous and trustworthy data for transferability as described by Lincoln and Guba (1985). Each stage of the research study was discussed extensively in order to thoroughly explain the processes of each stage for transferability for other research studies. Although every effort was made to provide thick

description so that other researchers could replicate the results found in this research study, the results should not be generalized to other populations. However, the rich description of the processes should help future researcher replicate the findings in similar locations and populations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Afterthoughts

Analysis of the data from this research study provided much insight into how the discussion of public issues helped improve secondary students' understanding of U.S. history while at the same time learning the skills to participate in a democratic society. Two important developments came out of the research study. The first was a comparison between the historical literacy and historical thinking model by Wineburg (2001) and a new civic thinking model that fostered the use of civic thinking. Another important finding was civic empathy. Civic empathy helped students in Mr. Lankford's classroom better understand the complexities of public issues and their impact on individuals in U.S. society. Additionally, consideration should be given to which public issues are relevant to the students' culture when choosing public issues to discuss in the U.S. history classroom.

These findings were important because social studies teachers must be able to strengthen students' civic thinking, civic empathy, and civic literacy skills. As the influence of the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013) continued to grow in K-12 social studies classrooms, activities like the ones in this research study supported teachers trying to implement the indicators from the C3 Framework. The civic thinking, civic empathy, and civic literacy skills fostered in the activities described in this study prepared students to

be active participants in a democratic society in a world impacted by a worldwide pandemic, protests against racial injustices, and violence at the U.S. Capitol. The next generation of social studies teachers should be the torch bearers and should prepare their students for participation in an increasingly politically divisive world.

References

Anderson, J.D. (1988). *Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935*. University of North Carolina Press.

APA. (2020). *Publication manual of the American psychological association* (7th ed.). Author.

AMLE. (2010). *This we believe: Keys to educating young adolescents.* Author.

Appiah, K.A. (1997). Cosmopolitan patriots. *Critical Inquiry, 23*(3), 617-639.

Appiah, K.A. (2005). *The ethics of identity*. Princeton University Press.

Avery, P.G., Levy, S.A., & Simmons, A.M. (2013). Deliberating controversial public issues as part of civic education. *The Social Studies, 104*(3), 105-114.

Banks, J. A. (2016). *Cultural diversity and education (6th ed.).* New York: Routledge.

Barr, R.D., Barth, J.L., & Shermis, S.S. (1977). *Defining the social studies* [Bulletin 51]. NCSS.

Barton, K.C. (2008). Research on students' ideas about history. In L.S. Levstik & C.A. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 239-258). Routledge.

Barton, K. (2012). Agency, choice, and historical action: How history teaching can help students think about democratic decision making. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning, 7*(2), 131–142.

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

Erlbaum Associates.

Bickford, J.H., & Clabough, J. (2019). Civic action, historical agency, and grassroots

advocacy: Historical inquiry into Freedom Summer. *The Social Studies, 111*(1),

39-49.

Blevins, B., LeCompte, K., & Wells, S. (2016). Innovations in civic education:

Developing civic agency through action civics. *Theory & Research in Social

Education, 44*(3), 344-384

Bohan, C.H. & Feinberg, J.R. (2008). The authors of the Harvard Social Studies Project:

a retrospective analysis of Donald Oliver, Fred Newmann, and James Shaver.

Social Studies Research and Practice, 3(2), 54-67.

Boyte, H.C. (2008). Against the current: Developing the civic agency of students.

Change, 40(3), 8-15.

Byford, J., Lennon, S., & Russell, W.B. III (2009). Teaching controversial issues in the

social studies: A research study of high school teachers. *The Clearing House,

82*(4), 165-170.

Clabough, J. (2017). Helping develop students' civic identities through exploring public

issues. *The Councilor, 78*(2), 1-9.

Clabough, J. (2018a). Civic literacy: The building blocks for creating an active and

informed citizenry. In J. Clabough & T. Lintner (Eds.), *No reluctant citizens:

Teaching civics in K-12 classrooms* (pp. 9-22). Information Age Publishing.

Clabough, J. (2018b). Analyzing Richard Nixon's "Political Death and Resurrection" to

strengthen students' civic thinking skills. *The Social Studies, 109*(4), 177-185.

Clabough, J. & Bickford, J.H. (2020). Freedom Summer and the foot soldiers of the Civil Rights Movement: Bottom-up historical inquiry to combat the master narrative. *The History Teacher, 53*(2), 319-353.

Clabough, J. & Turner, T.N. (2015). Citizenship education: The common core meets the common good. In T. Turner, J. Clabough, & W. Cole (Eds.), *Getting at the core of the common core with social studies* (pp. 277-294). Information Age Publishing.

Clabough, J., Turner, T., Russell, W., & Waters, S. (2016). *Twice told social studies: Unpuzzling history with primary sources.* Information Age Publishing.

Colby, S.R. (2008). Energizing the history classroom: Historical narrative inquiry and historical empathy. *Social Studies Research and Practice, 3*(3), 60-79.

Creswell, J.W. (2015). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (5th ed.). Pearson.

Creswell, J.W. & Plano-Clark, V.L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research.* (3rd ed.). Sage Publishing.

Croddy, M. & Levine, P. (2014). The C3 Framework: A powerful tool for preparing future generations for informed and engaged civic life. *Social Education, 78*(6), 282–285

Doolittle, P. E. (1997). Vygotsky's zone of proximal development as a theoretical foundation for cooperative learning. *Excellence in College Teaching, 8*(1), 83-103.

Endacott, J.L. (2010). Reconsidering affective engagement in historical empathy. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 38*(1), 6-47.

Endacott, J.L. & Brooks, S. (2013). An updated theoretical and practical model for promoting historical empathy. *Social Studies Research and Practice, 8*(1), 41-58.

Engle, S. H. (1960). Decision making: The heart of social studies instruction. *Social Education, 24*(7), 301-306.

Engle, S.H. & Ochoa, A.S. (1988). *Education or democratic citizenship: decision making the social studies*. Teachers College Press.

Fields, S.S. (2017). Classroom writing community as authentic audience: The development of ninth-graders' analytical writing and academic writing identities. In E. Ortlieb, E.H. Cheek, & W. Verlaan (Eds.), *Writing instruction to support literacy success* (pp. 157-181). Emerald Group Publishing.

Fields, S. S. (2020). From "Painstaking" to "Open and Loose": Using a discursive-cognitive lens to ease a frustrated adolescent writer's process. *Reading and writing quarterly*, *36*(5), 462-479.

Flanagan, C. & Levine, P. (2010). Civic engagement and the transition to adulthood. The Future of Children, 20(1), 159-179.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum International Publishing Group.

Freire, P. (1974). *Education for critical consciousness*. Sheed & Ward, Limited.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. Basic books.

Gorski, P.C. (2008). Peddling poverty for profit: Elements of oppression in Ruby Payne's framework. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 41*(1), 130-148.

Gould, J., Jamieson, K.H., Levine, P., McConnell, T., Smith, D.B., McKinney-Browning, M., & Cambell, K., (2011). *Guardian of democracy: The civic mission of schools*. Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools.

https://www.carnegie.org/publications/guardian-of-democracy-the-civic-mission-of-schools/

Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princeton University Press.

Halperin, M. & Heilemann, J. (2013). *Double down: Game change 2012*. Penguin

Hartwick, J.M.M. & Levy, B.L.M. (2012). Teaching about big money in elections: To amend or not to amend the U.S. Constitution? *Social Education, 76*(5), 236-241.

Henig, J.R., Hula, R.C., Orr, M., & Pedescleaux, D.S. (1999). *The color of school reform: Race, politics, and the challenge of urban education*. Princeton University Press.

Henning, M.B. & Kruger, T. (2012). Oliver, Shaver, and Newmann's public issues model: Promoting productive civic discussions. In S. Totten & J.E. Pedersen (Eds.), *Educating about social issues in the 20th and 21st centuries: A critical annotated bibliography* (pp. 135-148). Information Age Publishing.

Herczog, M.M. (2014). Implementing the C3 Framework: Monitoring the instructional shifts. *Social Education, 78*(4), 165-169.

Hess, D.E. (2009). *Controversy in the classroom: The democratic power of discussion.* Routledge.

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

iCivics. (2018). *iCivics: Our story*. Retrieved from https://www.icivics.org/our-story.

Journell, W. (2010). Standardizing citizenship: The potential influence of state curriculum standards on the civic development of adolescents. *PS: Political Science and Politics, 43*(2), 351-358.

Journell, W. (2013). What preservice social studies teachers (don't) know about politics and current events—and why it matters. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 41*(3), 316-351.

Journell, W. (2016). Teaching social issues in the social studies classroom. In W. Journell (Ed.), *Teaching social studies in an era of divisiveness: The challenges of discussing social issues in a non-partisan way* (pp. 1-12). Rowman & Littlefield.

Kahne, J., Chi, B., & Middaugh, E. (2006). Building social capital for civic and political engagement: The potential of high-school civics courses. *Canadian Journal of Education, 29*(2), 387-409.

Kahne, J.E., & Sporte, S.E. (2008). Developing citizens: The impact of civic learning on students' commitment to civic participation. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*(3).

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! *Theory into Practice, 34*(3), 159-165.

LeCompte, K. & Blevins, B. (2015). Building civic bridges: Community-centered action civics. *The Social Studies, 106*(5), 209-217.

Lefrançois, G.R. (1991). *Psychology for teaching* (7th ed.). Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Levine, P. (2007). *The future of democracy: Developing the next generation of American citizens*. Tufts University Press.

Levinson, M. (2012). *No citizen left behind*. Harvard University Press.

Levstik, L.S. & Barton, K.C. (2015). *Doing history: Investigating with children in elementary and middle schools* (5th ed.). Routledge.

Levy, B.L.M. (2018). Youth developing political efficacy through social learning experiences: Becoming active participants in a supportive model United Nations club. *Theory and Research in Education, 46*(1), 410-448.

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

Marino, M.P., & Crocco, M.S. (2020). The pre-service practicum experience and inquiry-oriented pedagogy: Evidence from student teachers' lesson planning. *The Journal of Social Studies Research, 44*(1), 151-167.

McAvoy, P. (2016). Preparing young adults for polarized America. In W. Journell (Ed.), *Teaching social studies in an era of divisiveness: The challenges of discussing social issues in a non-partisan way* (pp. 31-46). Rowman & Littlefield.

Myrdal, G. (1944). *An American dilemma: The Negro problem and modern democracy*. Harper Brothers.

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers (2010). *Common Core State Standards*. Author.

NCES. (2015). *Civics overview of the 2014 civics assessment*. https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/hgc_2014/#civics.

NCSS. (2013). *The college, career, and civic life (C3) framework for social studies state standards: Guidance for enhancing the rigor of K-12 civics, economics, geography, and history*. Author.

NCSS. (2016a). A vision of powerful teaching and learning in the social studies: Building social understanding and civic efficacy. *Social Education, 80*(3), 180-182.

NCSS. (2016b). Academic freedom and the social studies educator: A position statement of National Council for the Social Studies. *Social Education, 80*(3), 167.

Nokes, J. D. (2013). *Building students' historical literacies: Learning to read and reason with historical texts and evidence*. Routledge.

O'Brien, J. & Mitchell, P. (2019). Outcasts . . . outliers . . . oppressed: Civic advocates in U.S. history worth investigating. *The Social Studies, 109*(5), 276-283.

Ochoa-Becker, A.S. (1996). Building a rationale for issues-centered education. In R.W. Evans & D.W. Saxe (Eds.), *Handbook on teaching social issues* (pp. 6-13). NCSS.

Oliver, D.W. & Shaver, J.P. (1966). *Teaching public issues in the high school.* Houghton Mifflin Company.

Oliver, D.W. & Newmann, F.M. (1992). Teaching public issues in the secondary school classroom. *The Social Studies, 83*(3), 100-104.

Parker, W.C. (1996). Assessing student learning of an issue-oriented curriculum. In R.W. Evans & D.W. Saxe (Eds.), *Handbook on teaching social issues* (pp. 280-288). NCSS.

Parker, W.C. (2008). Knowing and doing in democratic citizenship education. In L.S. Levstik & C.A. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in Social Studies Education* (pp. 65-80). Routledge.

Parker, W. (2015). Social studies education ec21. In W. Parker (Ed.), *Social studies today: Research and practice* (pp. 3-13). Routledge.

Pauley, G.E. (2000). W.E.B. Du Bois on woman suffrage: A critical analysis of his crisis writings. *Journal of Black Studies*, *30*(3), 383–410.

Perlstein, R. (2008). *Nixonland: The rise of a president and the fracturing of America.* Scribner.

Philpott, S., Clabough, J., McConkey, L., & Turner, T.N. (2011). Controversial issues: To teach or not to teach? That is the question! *The Georgia Social Studies Journal, 1*(1)*, 32-44.*

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1895). https://www.loc.gov/item/usrep163537/

Ross, E.W. (2014). Remaking the social studies curriculum. In E.W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (pp. 375-388). State University of New York Press.

Saavedra, A.R. (2012). Dry to dynamic civic education curricula. In D. Campbell, M. Levinson, & F. Hess (Eds.), *Making civics count: Citizenship education for a new generation* (pp. 135-159). Harvard Education Press

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Samuels, G.L. (2018). Integrating service learning to foster a social justice approach. In J. Clabough & T. Lintner (Eds.), *No reluctant citizens: Teaching civics in K-12 classrooms* (pp. 163-184). Information Age Publishing.

Segall, A., Crocco, M.S., Halverson, A., & Jacobsen, R. (2018). Lessons learned about the challenges of classroom deliberation. *Social Education, 82*(6), 336-342.

Singleton, L.R. & Giese, J.R. (1996). Preparing citizens to participate in democratic discourse: The public issues model. In R.W. Evans & D.W. Saxe (Eds.), *Handbook on teaching social issues* (pp. 59-65). NCSS.

Sklarwitz, S., Fields, S., Seider, S., & Didier, B. (2015). Changing attitudes, motivating action: Global citizenship identity among privileged adolescents. In J. Harshman,

T. Augustine, & M.M. Merryfield (Eds.), *Research in global citizenship education* (pp. 189-213). Information Age Publishing.

Stanley, W.B. (2005). Social studies and the social order: Transmission or transformation? *Social Education, 69*(5), 282-286.

Stern, B.S. (2010). Reflecting on the Common Good: Harold Rugg and the Social Reconstructionists. *The Social Studies, 92*(2), 56-59.

Stern, B.S. (2011). Citizenship education using rational decision: Donald Oliver, James Shaver, and Fred Newmann's public issues model. In *Teaching and studying social issues: major programs and aproaches* (pp. 43-66). Information Age Publishing.

Teitelbaum, K. (2011). Critical civic literacy in schools: Adolescents seeking to understand and improve the(ir) world. In J. DeVitis (Ed.), *Critical civic literacy: A reader* (pp. 11-26). Peter Lang Publishing.

Thacker, E.S., Lee, J.K., & Friedman, A.M. (2017). Teaching with the C3 Framework: Surveying teachers' beliefs and practices. *The Journal of Social Studies Research, 41*(1), 89-100.

Vansledright, B.A. (2011). *The challenge of rethinking history education: On practices, theories, and policy*. Routledge.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language* (A. Kozulin, Trans.). MIT Press.

Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts: Chartering the future of teaching the past*. Temple University Press.

Wineburg, S., Martin, D., & Monte-Sano, C. (2013). *Reading like a historian: Teaching literacy in middle & high school history classrooms.* Teachers College Press.

Woodson, A. (2016). We're just ordinary people: Messianic master narratives and Black

youths' civic agency. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *44*(2) 184–211.

Woodson, A. (2017). There ain't no white people here": Master narratives of the Civil

Rights Movement in the stories of urban youth. *Urban Education, 52*(3), 316–

342.

Yancie, N. & Clabough, J. (2017). Enabling gifted students to actualize their potential

through social studies writing activities. In M.G. Hickey & J.C. Clabough

(Eds.), *Activities for enriching and expanding social studies instruction K-12* (pp.

215-230). Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Yellin, J.F. (1973). Dubois's "Crisis" and woman's suffrage. *The Massachusetts

Review*, *14*(2), 365-375.

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.).

Sage Publications.

APPENDIX A

IRB Approval Form

UAB THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALABAMA AT BIRMINGHAM

Office of the Institutional Review Board for Human Use

470 Administration Building
701 20th Street South
Birmingham, AL 35294-0104
205.934.3789 | Fax 205.934.1301 |
irb@uab.edu

APPROVAL LETTER

TO: Bidwell, Rebecca M

FROM: University of Alabama at Birmingham Institutional Review Board
Federalwide Assurance # FWA00005960
IORG Registration # IRB00000196 (IRB 01)
IORG Registration # IRB00000726 (IRB 02)

DATE: 27-Dec-2019

RE: IRB-300003613
The Marriage of Public Issues and Taking Civic Action: A Case Study on Integrating Public Issues into the C3 Framework

The IRB reviewed and approved the Revision/Amendment submitted on 19-Dec-2019 for the above referenced project. The review was conducted in accordance with UAB's Assurance of Compliance approved by the Department of Health and Human Services.

Type of Review: Exempt
Exempt Categories: 1
Determination: Exempt
Approval Date: 27-Dec-2019

Documents Included in Review:

- praf191218

APPENDIX B

Table of Codes

Table 1

Codebook from Student Artifacts and Teacher Interviews

Code	Type of Code	Definition	Examples
Civic principles	*a priori*	fundamental ideas of a democratic society, like justice, human dignity, equity, and the importance of due process as described by Ochoa-Becker (1996).	"It violated the 14th Amendment which forbids states from denying to any person within the jurisdiction the equal protection of the law."
"Public policies"	In Vivo	rules and guidelines issued by some type of governmental agency in response to a problem that is a public concern.	"laissez-faire" "there were no public policies, or Medicare, or anything." "His actions did lead to the creation of public policy. Because of what Lewis did, it made it so that children would no longer be abused by being forced to work."
"What if I was one?"	In Vivo	The student was questioning what it would be like to be in the 19th century child laborer's place.	"I chose to talk about child labor because I thought about what if I was one of those kids working in those dangerous places."
Violates Constitution	*a priori*	The practice is in violation of the principles of the U.S. Constitution (Danzer et al., 2012).	"Even though the Separate Car Act violated the 14th Amendment, the Supreme Court found a way to consider it legal by saying White people

			and Black people could be 'separate but equal."
"big enough to work"	In Vivo	This is a reference to the common practice of using a child's size as a determination for fitness for work.	"If the children were 'big enough' to work, meaning physically and ability to make good judgements."
"power over us"	In Vivo	A feeling that the government has control over our lives.	"The government having power over us."
Felt responsible	values	A feeling of not doing enough to help child laborers.	I saw this girl that was working with some machines with strings on it it and moving pretty fast . . . Imagine her one day casually working on those machines and her hair getting stuck in that machine. Sometimes I feel like I'm not doing enough to help these kids.
empathy	values	The ability to place oneself in the same perspective as another person.	"He photographed children in coal mines, meat packing plants, in textile factories, and in canneries. He put himself in the place of the children and wanted to help."

Children's income source of family income	*a priori*	This is a reference to the contextual information about why child labor existed (Danzer et al., 2012)	"Families were so poor that children were seen as a resource of income." "Child labor violates [the U.S. Constitution] by allow [sic] parents to exchange the labor of the child in return for training by former slave owners" (Danzer et al., 2012).
"Actions resulted in policies"	In Vivo	This is a reference to civic action leading to changes in policy related to a public issue.	"Him [sic] and the Child Labor Committee set out to abolish child labor."
Perspective taking	*a priori*	Putting oneself in the shoes of another person, esp. an historical figure. It is also one of the three components of civic empathy (Endacott & Brooks, 2012).	"During the Gilded Age, child labor was out [present]. If I was a kid working in the factory, I would be very upset and confused because no kid should go through anything like that at a young age or working like a slave at a young age."
contextualization	*a priori*	Placing information in its proper time period and context. It is also one of the three components of civic empathy (Endacott & Brooks, 2013).	"he was really dirty," "he had ripped clothes and torn up shoes" It essentially established the constitutionality of racial segregation. As a controlling

			legal precedent, it prevented constitutional challenges to racial segregation for more than half a century, until it was finally overturned by the U.S. Supreme Court in Brown v Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas.
Affective connection	*a priori*	Making an emotional connection or recognition of shared life experiences (Endacott & Brooks, 2013)	"They didn't have time to play around or behave like children normally do."
Public issues	*a priori*	problems arising from some type of conflict common to a group of people. The definition for public issues was influenced by Oliver and Shaver (1966) who argued that public issues are "situations over which individuals as well as the society are in conflict" (p. 13)	"issues such as poverty, housing, food, and other economic and social welfare issues facing the citizenry were of central concern to the framers." "some of the problems were corruption, scandal-plagued politics, obvious consumption, and unregulated capitalism." "Most cities were unprepared for rapid population growth. Housing was limited, and tenements and slums sprung up nationwide. Heating, lighting, sanitation,

			and medical care were poor."
awareness	Descriptive	becoming knowledgeable about the public issue.	"a lot of people later started to see the pictures and realized what was happening, and then the government got word of what was happening." "He helped by taking pictures and putting in newspapers to spread awareness."
Civic agency	*a priori*	the ability of people to work collaboratively with others, despite differences, to explore solutions to problems by finding common ground among all parties (Barton, 2012, Boyte, 2008).	"It was most definitely the right thing to do. He saw that it was a problem and did something about it. I respect that." Due to segregation being rampant in Chicago, I will not be moving there and will instead reside in the South where I can continue to be truly equal with all races instead of being segregated by those who wish to have us beneath them.

Civic action	*a priori*	taking some action in response to a public issue (NCSS, 2013).	"when people have public issues, such as problems with child labor, they can take actions such as voting." "civic action is I'll say is when something is done about the problem."
Civic participation	*a priori*	Helping students develop civic engagement, like participating in activities such as community service, helping neighbors, or protesting injustice, were important skills needed for the health of democracy (Flanagan & Levine, 2010).	"Mr. Washington, I think that you have it all wrong. This is the time to stand up and continue fighting, not the time to sit back and just want things."
Awareness #1	Descriptive	sudden understanding or enlightenment.	I talk about how the average American had no idea what was going on, so they weren't upset about it. I used the analogy like 'If you came into my room and it was pitch black dark—when you came in and sat down, you couldn't see anything, you would've been 'Okay,' but then if I flipped on the switch and you saw that there was [sic] roaches and rats and stuff everywhere, then you would freak

			out. Well, okay, understanding what's going on helps you see that there are problems that need to be fixed. Gaining knowledge helps you understand that.
Awareness #2	Descriptive	knowing about different public issues in society	"You know, I think with social media and all that's going on today, they're aware so much more than I was when I was in school."
Awareness #3	Descriptive	to draw attention to perennial public issues.	I think the more you expose them and show them this idea that there were issues, they got addressed by regular folks, and then they were able to make a change, forced the government to make a change, or encouraged the government to make a change, then I think it does help them realize the importance of getting involved now. Because a lot of students say— 'I'm just one person. Nothing can be changed.' I did see them that said, 'Hey, it is possible to make a change.' I really liked that. In some of them, I saw that.

Interdisciplinary connections	*a priori* (NCSS, 2013)	linking people, events, and ideas in the past, across time periods, across disciplines, or past and present. The definition of this code was linked to the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013).	"I try and show students the big picture in history and explain –the way I say to them is 'Everything happens today because something happened in the past."
Connecting past and present	Descriptive	linking people, events, and ideas in the past, across time periods, or past and present.	"I wouldn't say super-clear, but yeah, I think it helps. Any time you can make them think is a good thing. Then, make them think about history, even better. Then connecting it to today, triple good."
			If you can study what happened and what people did in the past, you're so much better prepared for dealing with it in the future, or at least have a better idea. As a history teacher, of course I think studying the past is important and connecting it to today. I think the better history teachers are the ones that can constantly – even in just a little way – this is a very specific, targeted way, but even in just a normal conversation of their

			class. The more they can connect whatever it is their talking about to the present, the better their students are going to grasp it.
Teacher-centered instruction	Descriptive	Teacher-centered instruction referred to the type of activities in which the teacher controls the flow of learning as opposed to the students controlling the flow of learning.	"I like to guide their discussion. My favorite day in class is when I'm talking and then responding to their questions, and we're having a discussion. I'm leading the discussion."
Urban challenges	*a priori*	the unique problems faced by students who attend schools in economically depressed metropolitan areas (Henig et al., 1999)	The biggest challenge I see is— well, there's multiple. One, they don't have a lot of background information. A lot of what I say that they should already have a foundation, they don't. They're not watching the news. They don't get a lot of information from their parents. The majority of my students –you throw out a term or a person or an expression, and they're like 'What?' that you would hope they would already know. That's one is they don't have a lot of foundation knowledge. Two, there isn't a lot of support at home. Not

			just giving them the foundation knowledge but encouraging them to do their work and how important studying for a test is and that kind of— there's some . . . there's some great parents. There's not a lot of parent involvement in their kids.
Urban schools	*a priori*	schools serving a student population that is predominantly comprised of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) and usually located in metropolitan areas marked by high rates of poverty (Henig et al., 1999)	The biggest challenge I see is— well, there's multiple. One, they don't have a lot of background information . . . Two, there isn't a lot of support at home. There's not a lot of parent involvement in their kids.
Ease of implementation	Values	the level of difficulty, for the participating teacher, to implement the two units included in the research intervention.	"No, I don't think there was any problem at all. I understood what you were trying to do, I think. I understood the activities. They were very self-explanatory." It might be even easier. This kind of stuff is not my comfort zone. I don't do it a lot. The teacher that already does things like this, I think would just boom, piece of cake.

			Then, the fact that I don't do it a lot and still found it easy to implement is a testament to your activities.

Table 2

Codebook for Interviews with Mr. Lankford

Code	**Type of Code**	**Definition**	**Examples**
Civic agency	*a priori*	the ability of people to work collaboratively with others, despite differences, to explore solutions to problems by finding common ground among all parties (Barton, 2012, Boyte, 2008).	"It was most definitely the right thing to do. He saw that it was a problem and did something about it. I respect that." Due to segregation being rampant in Chicago, I will not be moving there and will instead reside in the South where I can continue to be truly equal with all races instead of being segregated by those who wish to have us beneath them.
Civic action	*a priori*	taking some action in response to a public issue (NCSS, 2013).	"when people have public issues, such as problems with child labor, they can take actions such as voting." "civic action is I'll say is when something is done about the problem."

Awareness #1	Descriptive	sudden understanding or enlightenment.	I talk about how the average American had no idea what was going on, so they weren't upset about it. I used the analogy like 'If you came into my room and it was pitch black dark—when you came in and sat down, you couldn't see anything, you would've been 'Okay,' but then if I flipped on the switch and you saw that there was [sic] roaches and rats and stuff everywhere, then you would freak out. Well, okay, understanding what's going on helps you see that there are problems that need to be fixed. Gaining knowledge helps you understand that.
Awareness #2	Descriptive	knowing about different public issues in society	"You know, I think with social media and all that's going on today, they're aware so much more than I was when I was in school."
Awareness #3	Descriptive	to draw attention to perennial public issues.	I think the more you expose them and show them this idea that there were issues, they got addressed by regular folks, and then they were able to make a change, forced the

			government to make a change, or encouraged the government to make a change, then I think it does help them realize the importance of getting involved now. Because a lot of students say— 'I'm just one person. Nothing can be changed.' I did see them that said, 'Hey, it is possible to make a change.' I really liked that. In some of them, I saw that.
Interdisciplinary connections	*a priori* (NCSS, 2013)	linking people, events, and ideas in the past, across time periods, across disciplines, or past and present. The definition of this code was linked to the Inquiry Arc of the C3 Framework (NCSS, 2013).	"I try and show students the big picture in history and explain –the way I say to them is 'Everything happens today because something happened in the past."
Connecting past and present	Descriptive	linking people, events, and ideas in the past, across time periods, or past and present.	"I wouldn't say super-clear, but yeah, I think it helps. Any time you can make them think is a good thing. Then, make them think about history, even better. Then connecting it to today, triple good." If you can study what happened and what people did in the past, you're so

			much better prepared for dealing with it in the future, or at least have a better idea. As a history teacher, of course I think studying the past is important and connecting it to today. I think the better history teachers are the ones that can constantly – even in just a little way – this is a very specific, targeted way, but even in just a normal conversation of their class. The more they can connect whatever it is their talking about to the present, the better their students are going to grasp it.
Teacher-centered instruction	Descriptive	Teacher-centered instruction referred to the type of activities in which the teacher controls the flow of learning as opposed to the students controlling the flow of learning.	"I like to guide their discussion. My favorite day in class is when I'm talking and then responding to their questions, and we're having a discussion. I'm leading the discussion."
Urban challenges	*a priori*	the unique problems faced by students who attend schools in economically depressed metropolitan areas (Henig et al., 1999)	The biggest challenge I see is— well, there's multiple. One, they don't have a lot of background information. A lot of what I say that they should already have a foundation, they

			don't. They're not watching the news. They don't get a lot of information from their parents. The majority of my students –you throw out a term or a person or an expression, and they're like 'What?' that you would hope they would already know. That's one is they don't have a lot of foundation knowledge. Two, there isn't a lot of support at home. Not just giving them the foundation knowledge but encouraging them to do their work and how important studying for a test is and that kind of— there's some . . . there's some great parents. There's not a lot of parent involvement in their kids.
Urban schools	*a priori*	schools serving a student population that is predominantly comprised of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) and usually located in metropolitan areas marked by high rates of poverty (Henig et al., 1999)	The biggest challenge I see is— well, there's multiple. One, they don't have a lot of background information . . . Two, there isn't a lot of support at home. There's not a lot of parent involvement in their kids.

Ease of implementation	Values	the level of difficulty, for the participating teacher, to implement the two units included in the research intervention.	"No, I don't think there was any problem at all. I understood what you were trying to do, I think. I understood the activities. They were very self-explanatory."
			It might be even easier. This kind of stuff is not my comfort zone. I don't do it a lot. The teacher that already does things like this, I think would just boom, piece of cake. Then, the fact that I don't do it a lot and still found it easy to implement is a testament to your activities.

APPENDIX C

Handouts from the Research Intervention

Unit One: Child Labor Lesson Plan 1 Handouts

Name _____Date _____Period _____

Directions: Read the excerpt below and then answer the questions that follow.

We the People *of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence [sic], promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.*
(*Source: The Preamble of the U.S. Constitution (1789). Retrieved from* https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/constitution-transcript)

1. How would you define the phrase "promote the general welfare?"

2. What do you think the authors of the Constitution meant by "promote the general welfare?"

Gilded Age Graphic Organizer

When and where did the Gilded Age take place?	
What were some of the problems associated with the Gilded Age?	
What public policies, if any, were in place to address those problems of the Gilded Age?	
What is the historical significance of the Gilded Age?	

Unit One: Child Labor Lesson Plan 2 Handouts

Name _____ Date _____ Period _____

Directions: Use the reading handout to answer the following questions. Write your answer in the space provided.

Child Labor Graphic Organizer

When and where is child labor taking place?	
Why was child labor a public issue?	
What public policies were in place to deal with child labor?	
What is the historical importance of child labor?	

Unit One: Child Labor Lesson Plan 3 Handouts

Name _____Date _____Period _____

Part I Directions: Use the reading on Lewis Hine to answer the following questions. Answer in the space provided.

What is the public issue?	
Which principle from the Preamble of the U.S. Constitution is connected to the public issue? Make a text to text connection between the two texts.	
How did Lewis Hine respond? Explain his actions.	
Did his actions lead to the creation of public policy regarding the public issue? Explain your answer.	

Part II Directions: Discuss the following questions with your partner. Write down your partner's responses to the questions. Your partner writes your responses on his or her sheet.

1. What is the relationship between public issues and taking civic action? Explain your answer.

2. Do you think Lewis Hine was a good citizen? Explain why or why not.

Unit One: Child Labor Lesson Plan 4 Handouts

Name _____Date _____Period _____

Directions: Answer the following questions using the reading handouts given to you during class. Write your answers in the space provided.

Child Labor Ted Talk Script Graphic Organizer

What is child labor?	
Who supported and who opposed child labor? Why?	
What civic action did Lewis Hine take?	
Which public policies were put in place to protect children? Why?	

Name _____Date _____Period _____

Directions: Read the excerpts from the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Bill of Rights. When finished, answer the questions in the graphic organizer. Do not forget to include text evidence.

<div align="center">

Excerpt from the Declaration of Independence

</div>

The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America, When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, --That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect [sic] their Safety and Happiness.

(*Source: National Archives. Retrieved from https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript*)

<div align="center">

U.S. Bill of Rights

</div>

Amendment 1: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Amendment 4: The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Amendment 5: No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment 9: The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment 10: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

1. How is equality defined in each document?

2. Give text evidence from each document connecting to its definition of equality.

3. Do the definitions match? Explain.

Name _____ Date _____ Period _____

Directions: Read the excerpts from the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Bill of Rights. When finished, answer the questions in the graphic organizer. Do not forget to include text evidence.

Summary of the *Plessy v Ferguson* Supreme Court Case

That [plaintiff] was a citizen of the United States and a resident of the state of Louisiana, of mixed [parentage], in the proportion of seven-eighths Caucasian (White) and one-eighth African blood; that the mixture of colored blood was not [evident] in him, and that he was [allowed] to every recognition, right, privilege, and immunity secured to the White citizens of the United States by its constitution and laws. On June 7, 1892, he [bought] and paid for a first-class passage on the East Louisiana Railway, from New Orleans to Covington, in the same state, and entered a passenger train, and took possession of a vacant seat in a coach where passengers of the white race were accommodated. The railroad company was [designated] by the laws of Louisiana as a common carrier, and was not authorized to distinguish between citizens according to their race, but [the plaintiff] was required by the conductor, under penalty of [removal] from the train and imprisonment, [to exit the coach designated for Whites and move to the Colored coach]. Upon [his] refusal to comply with such order, he was, with the aid of a police officer, forcibly [removed] from the coach, and hurried off to [the parish jail of New Orleans]. [The Plaintiff was jailed] to answer a charge that he was guilty of having criminally violated an act of the general assembly of the state, approved July 10, 1890. [He was jailed for refusing to give up his seat in the White Coach.]
(*Source: The Gilder Lehrman Center for the Study of Slavery, Resistance, and Abolition. (2020). Plessy v Ferguson. Retrieved from* https://glc.yale.edu/plessy-v-ferguson)

Answer the following questions:

1. When and where was the document created?

2. What was different then?

3. What was the same?

4. How might the conditions when the document was created affect its content?

Name _____Date _____Period _____

Directions: Read the judgement (called opinions) from the Supreme Court in *Plessy v Ferguson*. The majority opinion is the winning side. The dissenting opinion is the losing side. Write down the answers for each question in the correct boxes provided.

Plessy v Ferguson		
What was the verdict in the case?		
	Majority Opinion	Dissenting Opinion
How does the document address equality? Give text evidence to support your answer.		
How does the author's definition of equality compare to your earlier definition of equality compare to your earlier definitions of equality? Explain.		
What public policies resulted from the verdict in the case? Explain.		

Name _____ Date _____ Period _____

<center>Booker T. Washington's Atlanta Compromise Graphic Organizer</center>

Directions: Provide text evidence to support the authors' perspectives and definitions of equality.

Atlanta Compromise Booker T. Washington	
How does the author view the public policy of segregation? Provide text evidence to support your answer.	
What actions did the author take? How do you know?	
How does the author view equality? Provide text evidence to support your answer.	
What does the author suggest should be done in response to segregation? Explain.	

Name _____Date _____Period _____

W.E.B. Du Bois's *The Souls of Black Folk*

Directions: Provide text evidence to support the authors' perspectives and definitions of equality.

Souls of Black Folks W.E.B. Du Bois	
What does Du Bois say about Washington's policy of accommodation? Provide text evidence to support your answer.	
What actions did the author take? How do you know?	
How does the author view equality? Provide text evidence to support your answer.	
What does the author suggest should be done in response to segregation? Explain.	

Name _____ Date _____ Period _____

Part I Directions: Choose one of the leaders of the early civil rights movement at the turn of the 20ᵗʰ century: Booker T. Washington or W.E.B. Du Bois. Pretend that you are the selected civil rights leader. Write two paragraphs in the voice of your selected civil rights leader. In the first paragraph, summarize your position on segregation. In the second paragraph, criticize the position of the other early civil rights leader.

Part II Editing Prompts:
Directions: Use the following prompts to peer edit your classmate's work. For each question remember to do the following: Answer the questions, then offer a suggestion for improvement. If no improvement is needed, then state what your classmate did well. Do this for every question. No yes or no answers are allowed.

1. Did the author provide a thesis (position) statement that answers the prompt?

2. Is the author's argument clear and organized?

3. Did the author use evidence from the primary sources to support his or her argument?

4. Does the author accurately represent either Washington's or Du Bois's perspective on civil rights issues?

Name _____ Date _____ Period _____

Public Issues and Taking Civic Action

Directions: This semester we have explored the connections among democratic ideas and principles, public issues, public policy, and taking civic action in the context of the Second U.S. Industrial Revolution. We have also explored how individuals took civic action when those ideas were compromised. Read the two prompts below. Each of them represents a different public issue from the early 20th century. Choose one and complete the task described in the prompt.

1. *Imagine that you are a member of the National Child Labor Committee created in 1904. Now, the year is 1912, and you have been asked to testify before Congress about the problem of child labor. Write an opening statement to read to the members of Congress. In your opening statement, explain what child labor is, describe what public policies, if any, are in place to stop child labor, explain how child labor violates principles of the U.S. Constitution, provide examples of actions people have taken to expose the problem of child labor, and justify a federal law banning child labor. Use the primary sources used earlier in the lesson to help you. Your opening statement should be at least one page.*

2. *Imagine that you are an African American living under segregation in the South during the early 20th century. You have just learned about the verdict in the* Plessy v Ferguson *Supreme Court decision. You are outraged about the ruling. You write a letter to your cousin who lives in Chicago. In the letter, explain the verdict in the* Plessy v Ferguson *decision, describe the public policy that was created as a result of the ruling, explain which principles of the U.S. Constitution are in jeopardy, and provide examples of actions taken by early civil rights leaders. End the letter by justifying to your cousin why you have decided to stay in the South and not move to Chicago. Use the primary sources used earlier in the lesson. Your letter should be at least one page.*

Name _____ Date _____ Period _____

Directions: Review the materials that were returned to you. Answer the questions below to help you write your answer to the prompt you selected.

Day One Public Issues Review Graphic Organizer

Which public issue is associated with the prompt you chose?	
Which individuals are associated with the prompt you chose? How did the individual(s) associated with the prompt take civic action?	
Were the actions taken by the individual(s) associated with the prompt effective?	
Which democratic principle(s) does the public policy associated with the prompt violate?	
How can you justify action for or against the public issue?	

Name _____ Date _____ Period _____

Directions: Use the following prompts to help you peer edit your classmate's work. For each question remember to do the following: Answer the questions, then offer a suggestion for improvement. If no improvement is needed, then state what your classmate did well. Do this for every question. No yes or no answers are allowed.

Editing Prompts: Use the following questions to help you critique your partner's work.

1. Did the author create a thesis (position) statement that answers the prompt? Write it down in the space below.

2. Did the author accurately use text evidence from primary sources to express the historical figure's perspective about a public issue?

3. Did the author use text evidence from primary sources to support his or her argument?

4. Did the author accurately represent the information learned in the unit?

Day Two Culminating Activity Handout

Director's Cut

Part Two: *Why did you choose the selected prompt? Why did you choose a specific example or text? Think of it like commentary on footage of a video game or YouTube video that explains how you completed the activity. (Think of it like commentary on a video game, movie, or YouTube video.)*

Type your response here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____