

November 2017

The Common Core State Standards and the Elementary Social Studies Curriculum: A Case Study of Teacher Perceptions in Florida

Kacie M. Nadeau

University of South Florida, kacienadeau@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Elementary Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Other Education Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

Nadeau, Kacie M., "The Common Core State Standards and the Elementary Social Studies Curriculum: A Case Study of Teacher Perceptions in Florida" (2017). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.
<http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/7067>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

The Common Core State Standards and the Elementary Social Studies Curriculum:
A Case Study of Teacher Perceptions in Florida

by

Kacie M. Nadeau

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Curriculum and Instruction with an emphasis in
Interdisciplinary Education
College of Education
University of South Florida

Co-Major Professor: Barbara Shircliffe, Ph.D.
Co-Major Professor: Sherman Dorn, Ph.D.
Deirdre Cobb-Roberts, Ph.D.
Bárbara C. Cruz, Ed. D

Date of Approval:
November 6, 2017

Keywords: Common Core State Standards, curriculum, elementary, social studies

Copyright © 2017, Kacie M. Nadeau

DEDICATION

This manuscript is dedicated to my husband Matthew, my daughter Ava, and my mother Cheryl. There has been no world complete without your presence and your inspiration has been beyond measure. I could not imagine a day without you, yet I have endured. There are endless moments when I feared I could not persist. Somehow, you have all made this moment possible. This was not only my dream, but a dream each of you have had for me. I do hope that I have made all of you proud, not only in this life, but in the next. Thank you for believing in me and proving that love always protects, always trusts, always hopes, and always perseveres.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To begin, I must thank that the participants in this study for their commitment not only to this study, but the sacrifices and successes you encounter daily. Your efforts have made the future of social studies education more promising and I am privileged to be a member of your profession.

I could not have accomplished this process without the continuous support of my professor, Dr. Sherman Dorn, who kept faith in my long journey and inspired many paths, including one in social foundations. This was not the path I envisioned, but found a desire based on your wisdom. Dr. Barbara Shircliffe was my first professor as a doctoral student and I will always be grateful for her guidance and passion in the history of education. When Dr. Deirdre Cobb-Roberts assigned the analysis of primary sources, I knew she had to be a member of my committee. She has been steadfastly supportive. And when Dr. Bárbara C. Cruz knew more about me than I ever thought possible, I could not have been more fortunate. Your maternal support will always be remembered. The four of you have provided a dream very much needed and often thought impossible.

I would also like to acknowledge my dearest friend, Dr. Jennifer Jaso, who provided professional and personal support knowing how hard this journey would be. Your endless love has made many dreams come true. I must also thank Stephanie White who became a source of reason and faith, and Kelly Vest for keeping me grounded. You always understood and made the end achievable. Lastly, my father Howard McFarlane, who shared in my passion for scholarship. Thank you each for being there for me despite all odds, and believing that I could be an

inspiration for others.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	iv
Abstract	v
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction.....	1
Background/Rationale	1
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Purpose of Study	9
Research Questions	9
Operational Definition of Terms	10
Significance of Study	11
Overview of Study	13
Summary.....	14
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	16
Introduction.....	16
Common Core and the Modern Accountability Movement	17
Standards-Based Educational Reform (SBER)	17
Race to the Top, Federal Incentives, and CCSS	20
How Today’s Debates Reflect a Longer Debate over Curriculum	23
The Role of the Progressive Movement	23
Politics and Policy	25
Social Studies Education and Historical Debates over the Curriculum	26
The History of Social Studies Education	26
Reflection of Long-Term Dynamics over Curriculum	31
Debates over the Common Core’s Relationship with Social Studies	33
CCSS and Social Studies Standards	33
Interdisciplinary Literacy and Text Complexity	34
The Use of Informational Texts	36
District Teachers’ Response to Curriculum Pressures	38
State Response in a High-Stakes Era.....	38
Impact of Testing Policies on Elementary Social Studies	39
Impact of Testing Policies on Secondary Social Studies	40
Impact of Standards-Reform on Elementary Social Studies.....	42
Elementary Social Studies in an Era of High-Stakes Assessments	43

The Open Question: How Do Elementary Teachers Understand the Relationship Between CCSS and Social Studies, in a District Context?.....	46
Disposition.....	49
Conclusion.....	49
CHAPTER 3: METHODS	52
Introduction.....	52
Research Questions	53
Case Study Design	53
Data Collection-Archival Materials	56
Data Collection-Interviews	58
Participants	58
Participant Recruitment	58
Procedures.....	59
Interview Protocol	60
Journal	61
Data Analysis	62
Analysis of Archival Materials.....	62
Analysis of Interviews	62
Assumptions and Limitations	65
Epistemological Assumptions.....	65
Assumptions.....	65
Limitations	66
Delimitations.....	67
Transferability	67
Ethics	67
Summary.....	69
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	70
Introduction.....	70
Research Questions	71
Participants	72
Archival Curriculum.....	78
Interviews	80
Alignment between CCSS and the Social Studies Curriculum	85
Higher order thinking skills	85
Historical thinking skills	89
Reading and writing skills	91
Informational text.....	93
Using reading skills during social studies instruction.....	98
Social studies taught during reading instruction	102
Gaps Over the Alignment between CCSS and the Social Studies Curriculum	105
No Support for Alignment between CCSS and the Social Studies Curriculum	110
Instructional Time and Resources	115
Instructional Time	118
Effects of high-stakes testing	118

Less priority.....	122
Instructional Resources.....	127
Textbook.....	127
Additional Resources	130
Student Interest.....	133
District Level Professional Development.....	135
Standards Training	136
Curriculum Delivery and Integration	138
CCSS and Social Studies Integration.....	140
Future Professional Development	147
Civic Responsibility	150
Fostering Curriculum Awareness.....	154
Reflective Journal.....	159
Conclusion	162
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION	165
Summary of Study.....	166
Findings	168
Analysis of Research Question 1	169
Analysis of Research Question 2.....	171
Instructional time.....	171
Socio-economic status and instructional time	172
Instructional Resources.....	173
District Level Professional Development.....	174
Analysis of Research Question 3	177
Civic Responsibility and Social Studies Education.....	178
CCSS and Social Studies Integration	178
Changes in Teaching Perspectives	181
Recommendations	181
Recommendations for Professional Development	181
The Expansion of Elementary Social Studies	183
Further Research	184
Conclusions and Implications	186
REFERENCES	190
APPENDICES	197
Appendix A: Adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) By State	197
Appendix B: IRB Letter of Approval	198
Appendix C: Teacher Recruitment Email.....	200
Appendix D: Interview #1 Protocol.....	201
Appendix E: Interview #2 Protocol.....	202
Appendix F: Social Studies Curriculum K-5 with CCSS	203

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Participant Demographic Data.....	72
Table 2: Process of Coding and Development of Themes	82
Table 3: Participant Perceived Alignments and Its Relationship to Reading and Writing Skills	92
Table 4: Participant Perceptions of Expectations and the Perceptions the Effect of CCSS	117
Table 5: Instructional Time Allocated for Elementary Social Studies	119
Table 6: Participant Perceptions of Hearing about CCSS and Influences in Understanding	134

ABSTRACT

The most recent phase of curriculum reform in the era of accountability is the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) which have essentially reshaped the landscape of public education. Its objective of preparing K-12 students for college and career upon high school graduation have prioritized English language arts, mathematics, and science over social studies, which is not part of widespread high-stakes testing for elementary students. This qualitative case study investigated eleven intermediate elementary teachers' perceptions of alignment between CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum. Data gathering analysis included two semi-structured interviews and an archival analysis of the mandated curriculum. The data revealed that perceptions of alignment vary among teachers and were influenced by the perceived effects of inadequate instructional time and resources, lack of content knowledge, and insufficient district levels of professional support. Teachers perceived some similarities between the methods of thinking skills, such as historical thinking and higher-order thinking, and the English/Language Arts standards of the Common Core and their district social studies curriculum. Despite perceived inadequate instructional time and resources, teachers believed that elementary social studies must be an instructional priority and found ways to include social studies through interdisciplinary approaches. Recommendations include district-level professional development focused on an integration between CCSS and social studies modeled in classroom practices. These approaches may improve use of instructional time and resources and reduce the marginalization of elementary social studies.

CHAPTER 1: THE PROBLEM

Introduction

“Mrs. Nadeau, why are we doing social studies during Language arts?” a precocious fifth grader inquired one morning several months ago. I was immediately delighted by this observation, as it affirms one of many propositions within this dissertation. I remember well a faculty meeting during the 2013-2014 school year which was ripe with groans and lamentations over Florida’s response to the Common Core State Standards (hereafter CCSS): another shift in curriculum when teachers have just hit their stride with existing expectations. The feeling of adding another task to an already overflowing plate. Why are teachers given more things to do, when nothing is ever taken away? I could not sympathize with the chatter, when in my world, the Florida Standards seemed to make complete sense. As a language arts and social studies teacher of 14 years, I sensed the possibility of validation and affirmation that my passion for primary and secondary sources and historical content would become a more common feature within language arts classrooms, and why social studies instruction is important. A quick review of the language arts standards used phrases such as informational text and the citation and evaluation of multiple sources. These standards reflect the historian’s craft including historical thinking skills. Not only had I been emphasizing these skills in social studies for years, they were in black and white as

part of our state's language arts curriculum. Florida's adoption of CCSS was an opportunity to demonstrate that quality social studies instruction advocated for literacy and that reading, writing, speaking, and research have been natural complements to the social studies teachers' discipline. The perceptions of teachers are critical when interpreting how curriculum and curriculum reform is understood. The perceptions of professionals with the responsibility of accessing, interpreting, and implementation curriculum standards informs a broader audience of how instructional decisions are made at the ground level. State and district policy is more than objectives and expectations of skills and content. The ways in which teachers perceive curriculum directives influences their curriculum knowledge, as do their attitudes towards high-stakes assessment, professional development, instructional resources, and use of instructional time. Research that considers the ways in which teachers engage with curriculum, especially the marginalized elementary social studies curriculum, cultivates awareness on the field of social studies, as well as possibilities for future development. This study focuses on the perceptions of elementary social studies teachers.

For nearly the past two decades, in the era of accountability, education in the United States has endured tremendous tension over the selection of content, methods of instruction, and measures of assessment. As part of the movement, English language arts, mathematics, and science have been a primary focus, while social studies, which is not part of widespread high-stakes testing, has been deemed less important through legislative policy for America's students. For elementary K-5 students, social studies education is even less accessible. The decisions made about curriculum, namely what is to be taught, how, and how often, occur at national, state, and local levels, as well as in the classroom. When widespread curriculum reform occurs, teachers

forge new meaning with new standards. The effects of curriculum reform at the ground level impact the complex context of teaching.

The most recent phase, CCSS, is a shared core of concepts and procedures, reflecting student performance expectations and skills (Gardner & Powell, 2013). As America's first comprehensive set of performance standards and content, the CCSS has been integral in reshaping the landscape of public education through its objective of preparing K-12 students for college and career upon high school graduation. Its creators intend the CCSS to provide a sophisticated framework for English language arts and literacy in history/social studies, science and technical subjects, categorized for grade K-5 and 6-12 (Applebee, 2013). It explicitly references content to provide shared expectations, curricular focus, increased efficiency, and improved quality of assessment (Porter, McMaken, Hwang, & Yang, 2011). Since 2010, the current phase of the accountability movement has increased academic rigor and standardized curriculum within the United States, as CCSS provides a more integrated and interdisciplinary approach between content areas. Specifically, the CCSS emphasizes literacy in reading, writing, and speaking and listening within all subjects. The standards require students to know both the content and use of content across multiple disciplines. Furthermore, CCSS provides end-of-year expectations and cumulative progression to ensure students have mastered previous grade-specific standards by the end of high school. Previous content area curriculum has focused primarily on a single discipline with little attention towards literacy or integration of other subjects. CCSS attempts to address a systemic concern over American education's curriculum that is a "mile wide and an inch deep" (Porter et al., 2011, p. 103) by scaffolding intended disciplinary knowledge with the function of that knowledge. As one of the largest reform efforts, CCSS initially received little attention towards its historical development, and Swan, Lee, and

Grant (2015) have noted its existence “as the educational equivalent of the Manhattan Project” (p. 3).

With the wide adoption of such standards by states, though, what emerged was significant conflict and controversy. Zacanella and Moore (2014) suggested a more recent evolution of the standards, having emerged in response to the accountability movement designated through legislation such as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2001. However, as I will argue, the standards are a product of longer-term curriculum reforms involving political, economic, and socio-cultural entities since the American Revolution. In the beginnings of American education preparation for life beyond high school was not a rigorous standard in curriculum. However, attention towards civic preparedness and participation in a democratic society has prevailed as a goal for American children (Gross & Dynneson, 1983; Journell, 2011; National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), 2010). The CCSS exemplifies an intensified interest in education for students as they progress into adulthood. Arguments for nationalized standards have increased over the years which underscore how the national interest must be served by what is taught in schools (Kliebard, 1995; Rudolph, 1965). The curriculum standards are just the latest example in this history, not the first attempt.

The discourse around CCSS has revealed that social realities permeated the function of educational institutions. The political nature of curriculum has not only shaped debates over CCSS, but also social studies education. Although CCSS refers to history and social studies on a peripheral level for grades K-5, the standards reflect inclusion, if not validation, and promotion of the field. The K-5 standards focus on higher level thinking skills, involving greater levels of interdisciplinary literacy, as opposed to specific social studies content (Kenna, 2013). The omission of social studies standards from K-5 CCSS superficially appears to marginalize the

discipline. If CCSS existed for K-5, would social studies be considered a more relevant subject, especially if attached to a high-stakes assessment? Due to the lack of high stakes testing in social studies for elementary students, teachers may continue to focus on English language arts and mathematics. However, CCSS emphasizes skill acquisition, as opposed to factual recall (Kenna, 2013), a hallmark of best practices in social studies education. In fact, the longevity of elements of CCSS and the presence of social studies education over several centuries, promotes the presence of social studies content in the curriculum. As a reflection of popular social values, CCSS and the social studies involve important conversations about roles and responsibilities of America's schools.

The Problem

In June 2009, 46 states and the District of Columbia pledged support for the nationalized curriculum prior to its official release. Widespread backlash from educators, parents, and policy - makers created fierce exchanges, particularly with respect to the high-stakes assessment measures. Thus, states have reconsidered their previous acceptance. Since 2014, some states have rescinded the adoption, while other states, such as Indiana and Missouri, have revised CCSS and developed new learning standards within their state (Ujifusa, 2016). It is clear that state-by-state adoption generated a powerful conversation over alignment to nationalized standards, including how states perceived their voice and position in this process. The examination of proficiency standards at state and national levels have sparked strong debates. CCSS has received extensive attention and a myriad of opinions among educational professionals (See Appendix A, Adoption of the Common Core State Standards by State). Middle school math teacher and coach Jose Vilson (2015) blogs:

I was willing to give them a chance, because the old New York standards looked like a laundry list compared to the guideline-driven CCSS. I should have been more critical of this element, because this too posed problems. For all intents and purposes, the CCSS has the same amount of standards, but they're tucked away more neatly inside the standard.

(para. 6-7)

Humanities Supervisor and *NY Times* Contributor Jonathan Olsen (2013) blogs:

With the implementation of Common Core Standards and their emphasis on informational texts, school districts are at an ideal time to incorporate print media into their curricula. While the efforts of *The Boston Globe* are certainly commendable, I think teachers need to find a balance in their classes between print and computers. (para. 6)

As educators reflect on the curricular ramifications of CCSS, their perceptions often shift, generating a professional discourse on contemporary curriculum. These perceptions offer valuable insight into how CCSS has affected existing curriculum on the ground level, and how teachers have adapted to this new relationship. Teachers are at the very center of the consequences of curriculum reform. Their perceptions offer necessary context often absent from widespread policy debates. Popular discourse features the changes in expectations of new policy, coupled with the need for new or updated resources and professional development. Curriculum changes often polarize because teaching professionals are provided directives without context, or infrequently involved in the decision-making process. Educational policy is performed on teachers and less with teachers. To better reveal how teachers experience curriculum reform, a qualitative research process explored the mindsets of these practitioners involved in the routine instructional processes. Teachers are fundamental to curricular practices, and researching their perspectives, adds a core component to understanding curriculum and instruction. Too often,

voices of district personnel or policymakers are the most prominent, silencing the daily experiences of practitioners with content and instruction. Teachers should be a featured source of information. This study involves their personal and professional insight effecting future conversations on CCSS and elementary social studies education.

Recent reform in social studies curriculum has gathered much less attention; however, intense debates over the definition and role of social studies have persisted in America's educational history. To what degree are schools responsible for fostering civic virtue? Similar discourse over an educated citizenry for democratic participation have emerged through CCSS. Therefore, both CCSS and social studies education reflect long-term national conversations about the roles and responsibilities of America's schools. Interest in the preparation for America's students for life beyond high school have included social and political discussions over time, yet limited discussion about the shared objectives within CCSS and the social studies have occurred. Because the generation of both CCSS and social studies education share remarkable histories and objectives, such knowledge may affect elementary social studies educators' perceptions of their social studies curriculum.

The history of curriculum in the United States has reflected an interaction of local, state, and federal initiatives, as well as various stakeholders interested in the social, economic, and political opportunities involving America's institutionalized education. As a field of study, education is difficult to define and even more challenging to evaluate based on the evolving state of curriculum research, the relationship between curriculum and society, the process of curriculum selection and organization, and lastly of curriculum creation (Ravitch, 2014). Often, there is inadequate attention to historical and philosophical analyses of proposed educational reform (Vinovskis, 2000). Standards-based reform has continued to trouble the field of

education, due to its lack of empirical testing to confirm the validity of curriculum, standards, or assessment measures (Vinovskis, 2000). Likewise, during implementation, CCSS did not include a recalibration of the standards, preventing measures in efficacy of the language or intentions of the standards (Levin-Epstein, 2016).

The curriculum landscape has featured a series of political wars based on competing ideologies during historical eras. In particular, social studies education has often been at the heart of these debates, focusing on the definition, purpose, and place of social science disciplines in education (Evans, 2015). Therefore, research was warranted how the impact of CCSS on existing social studies curriculum occurs at the district level and how teachers perceive this relationship. My study has offered valuable insight into the dynamic culture of curriculum reform.

As in many other previous attempts to reform the curriculum, the lack of direct empirical evidence for CCSS is remarkable; no one has yet determined whether the knowledge and skills required by CCSS will translate into college and career proficiencies (Gardner & Powell, 2013). The fact that most states adopted CCSS indicates that the continuity of performance standards and content across the nation, as well as civic responsibility with preparedness post-secondary education within America's educational system is of social relevance. Social studies education emphasizes civic competence, encouraging an understanding and interaction at local, national, and international levels. The presence of social and cultural diversity for today's students warrants consistent exposure to information and intellectual processes for participation in public life (NCSS, 2010); therefore, daily instruction should possess social studies content as a core component. However, legislation passed during the accountability movement has encouraged a marginalization of the social studies for other subjects such as reading and math (Fitchett & Heafner, 2010). Based on the similarities between the objectives of CCSS and the field of social

studies, a reduction of social studies may not be as profound as experienced during previous phases of the accountability movement. Therefore, additional research is needed to determine in what ways CCSS has reduced social studies curriculum and what has influenced such assertions.

An analysis of curriculum reform situates the ways in which primary values, beliefs, and positions of power present in society are visible in America's classrooms. It bears considering how district elementary social studies curriculum has been affected by CCSS and how elementary teachers understand the relationship between CCSS and social studies curriculum, including the sources of influence in determining this relationship.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the alignment between CCSS and social studies curriculum, and what influences guide educators' understanding of this relationship. The study specifically analyzed how CCSS has affected elementary social studies curriculum at a district level, the adoption of the Language Arts Florida Standards (LAFS) and Mathematics Florida Standards (MAFS) in 2014, which represented changes to elementary social studies curriculum. To provide this context, the research investigated how elementary social studies teachers perceived the influence of CCSS on the enacted social studies curriculum. Although CCSS does not provide direct standards in history or social studies for elementary students, the researcher has provided evidence of the extent to which CCSS and elementary social studies curriculum share certain characteristics which guide and influence elementary social studies teachers.

Research Questions

1. How do elementary teachers in a medium-sized district in the Southeast with responsibilities for teaching social studies perceive the alignment between CCSS and the

district's social studies curriculum and, what, if any, gaps do they see between CCSS expectations and social studies expectations for elementary students?

2. What influences the ways in which elementary social studies teachers in a medium-sized district in the Southeast address the degree of alignment they perceive between CCSS expectations and the district's elementary social studies expectations?
3. How do teachers' perceptions inform our understanding between CCSS expectations and the district's elementary social studies expectations?

Operational Definition of Terms

Accountability movement: This period in American education begins with the 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk*, eventually leading to the passage of No Child Left Behind (2001), increasing the academic rigor, particularly in reading, mathematics, and science.

Common Core State Standards (CCSS): Academic standards in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics providing a framework for student knowledge and ability at the end of each grade level, preparing students for life in college and career (NGA, 2014).

High-stakes assessments: Test scores are used for accountability measures such as funding, grade promotion, graduation, or school or district effectiveness or compensation (Great Schools Partnership, 2014).

Florida Standards: Language arts (LAFS) and mathematics (MAFS) standards that provide a framework for student knowledge and ability in grades K-12 fully implemented in 2014-2015 school year; Florida's adoption and revision of the Common Core State Standards (FLDOE, 2016).

Informational text: nonfiction resources including biographies, autobiographies, content area books, technical texts, and literary nonfiction (NGA, 2014).

Medium-sized school district. The state of Florida has 67 counties which operate 73 school districts. There is one district for each of the 67 counties, as well as six additional schools classified as a special school district. The district with the largest student population is Dade with a total 357, 249, and the smallest is Washington Special with a total of 109. The average student population among Florida districts in the 2016-2017 school year is 38, 586, placing the district of this study in the medium-sized range (FLDOE, 2016).

Social studies education: program of study incorporating the disciplines of anthropology, archaeology, economics, geography, history, law, philosophy, political science, psychology, religion, and sociology, aimed at promoting civic competence for future participation in public life (NCSS, 2014).

Text structure: author's use of structures such as chronology, comparison, cause /effect, problem/solution, to communicate events, ideas, concepts or information (NGA, 2014).

Significance of the Study

Advocates of CCSS deny that the standards are a national curriculum, but rather “a clear set of shared goals and expectations for what knowledge and skills will help our students succeed” (National Governors Association (NGA), 2014, para.37). When curriculum theory is applied towards the construction of CCSS, one can identify and contextualize the connections between CCSS and social studies education in elementary classrooms. Reform movements involve distinct agendas of predominant interest groups, often reacting against but also in conversation with each other (Kliebard, 1995). Much of the modern curriculum debate in the past few decades has surfaced in response to widespread erosion in confidence of the nation's schools and the political tension among local, state, and the federal governments over education (Kaestle, 1982). The current state of curriculum reform on local levels should consider the historical

production through which the existing curriculum was conceived (Popkewitz, 2009).

Contemporary curricular discourse among practitioners often fails to acknowledge the historical evolutions (Schneider, 2015). Thornton (2005) suggested that curriculum is more than a product and script for teachers, but “a classroom enactment, properly differing from one classroom to the next” (p.6). Understanding teachers’ perceptions of the relationship between CCSS and social studies curriculum contributes to a more robust awareness of how teachers determine district curricular initiatives, and how it manifests in their understanding of curriculum. The highly social texture in the development of educational standards is evident in the relationships present in curriculum reform. The educational policy responsible for CCSS captures the professional, public, and political friction of curriculum and instruction (Applebee, 2013). Curriculum as a fixed point has never truly existed, and it is important to recognize how practitioners have made sense of this reality in terms of their perceptions of enacted curriculum.

The establishment of institutional reform is derived jointly from manners of thinking and reasoning about the community at large and the individual. The institution of schooling involves a centrality of key players: teachers, students, various interest groups, and political entities. As Thornton (2005) suggested, theory and practice are not mutually exclusive, and therefore decisions made by teachers require a more thorough reflection. Educational reform reflects the social climate, and educators are positioned in many ways at the center of this critical discourse. As Moreau (2004) wrote, “As they have at several times in their history, Americans are now struggling to reinterpret their past and forge a new consensus about it” (p. 333). The social and political contexts in which CCSS and the social studies emerged constructs a viable argument reflecting how CCSS situates the expansion of social studies education. The social context of American education occurs through a relational perspective produced out of economic, political,

and cultural struggles (Apple, 1986). CCSS is part of a continued conversation over curricular debates throughout American history, while sharing in the long term-dynamics of social studies education. CCSS addresses the widespread concern of inconsistency and rigor among standards across the nation. Social studies education reflects national interests in the role of civic competence within America's schools. Together, these curriculums exhibit how social and political pursuits within the United States become embedded within institutionalized education. Given the collective objectives of both CCSS and social studies, it bears recognizing the role of curricular understandings from the ground level. Therefore, this study formally acknowledges the relationship of CCSS with the field of social studies at elementary levels.

Overview of the Study

The study utilized a qualitative case study method to examine the perspectives of elementary teachers with responsibilities of teaching social studies. Semi-structured interviews with 11 teachers were conducted with a focus on CCSS and its alignment with elementary social studies curriculum, as well as what influences an understanding of this relationship. Participants were teachers of elementary social studies in a medium sized school district of 43,000 students in the Southeast. Eleven participants were interviewed for this study. The criteria for participation required that selected teachers have taught elementary social studies (Grades K-5) during the 2015-2016 or 2016-2017 school years.

The qualitative case study method determined the effect of CCSS on social studies curriculum at a district and classroom level. Interviews were designed to probe the teachers' perceptions of alignment between CCSS and their social studies curriculum, and the district's social studies expectations for elementary students. The interviews exposed influences of how their perceptions of alignment were determined. Additionally, I examined district curriculum

prior to the adoption of CCSS in 2014 and compared this data with the current elementary social studies curriculum.

Summary

At times, educational reform has involved widespread national attention and CCSS adds yet another layer to this professional discourse. Components of social studies have been prominent features of American education, yet the conversation involving the effects of CCSS on elementary social studies have overlooked this history. CCSS has left an indelible imprint on existing curriculum, and the scholarship regarding its influence on elementary social studies education is just beginning. This study has offered insight into how district elementary social studies curriculum is affected by national reform, and how this relationship was shaped and understood by classroom practitioners. Chapter Two provides a review of the literature which contextualizes CCSS including its historical evolution, as well as how the development of social studies education shares in much of this history. Additionally, the literature review considers the relationships between CCSS and social studies, particularly a focus on how standards-based education reform (SBER) has affected social studies at elementary and secondary levels. Chapter Three discusses the methodology of the qualitative case study research in which 11 elementary teachers with the responsibilities of social studies were interviewed. In addition, existing district curriculum was analyzed and compared to curriculum in place prior to the adoption of CCSS in 2014. Chapter Four shares the findings of the case study, in which data was coded, consolidated, and then themes developed based on the literature and further associated to each of the three research questions. Research Question One shares two major findings over alignment between CCSS and elementary social studies curriculum, and how the gaps over this alignment were determined. Research Question Two also shares two major findings regarding the influencing

factors for teachers over the alignment of CCSS and social studies curriculum at the elementary level. The influencing factors were based on instructional time and resources and district level professional development. Chapter Four closes with three findings for Research Question Three regarding how teachers' perceptions inform broader understandings of the expectations of CCSS and elementary social studies. These findings reveal a required integration of CCSS and the social studies curriculum and the role of professional development has in this process. Lastly, Chapter Five presents conclusions based on the data including the critical level of inadequate instructional time and resources for elementary social studies and how ongoing district support can regain an instructional priority for social studies education.

CHAPTER 2:

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Educational reform in the United States is highly complex, contentious, and contingent upon the social, economic, and political climate at any given time. The current phase, standards-based educational reform (SBER), has sometimes inflamed the opinions of educators, academics, policymakers, and parents. These debates explore the diverse perspectives on the roles and responsibilities of institutionalized education in the United States. Debates over the purposes of public education (Warren, 2001) have persisted throughout American history and have often revolved around safeguarding citizenship and the preservation of cultural integrity. The most recent topic in the accountability movement has included CCSS, which seeks to provide a commonality of standards for students in preparation for life beyond high school. Interestingly, the evolution of CCSS and its current impact on American education shares similarities with the field of social studies. Both the targets of CCSS (English language arts and math) and social studies embrace commitments to foster an informed citizenry for participation in a democratic society, but debate remains whether CCSS positively impacts the role of social studies in America's classrooms. Specifically, the pedagogical perspectives of teachers have yet to be fully explored particularly at the elementary level.

The first three sections of the literature review examine the role of CCSS as part of the modern accountability movement, how the Progressive Era fostered this movement, and how the history of social studies education intersects with the evolution of standards-based education reform (SBER). The last sections of the literature review examine the relationship between CCSS and social studies curriculum, how states and teachers have responded to reform during an era of high-stakes standardized assessments, and ends with a focus on elementary teachers' understandings of CCSS and social studies. The literature frames the study by merging the socio-political contexts of curriculum reform involving CCSS and social studies education, while suggesting that empirical research for elementary teachers with the responsibility of teaching social studies has yet to be fully explored.

Common Core and the Modern Accountability Movement

Standards-Based Educational Reform (SBER)

Conventional stories of the origins of CCSS cite its inspiration with the 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk* (1983) (Gewertz, 2012), a report that asserted a host of crises in America's schools, including a lack of consistent academic rigor, apparent in declining achievement data (Angus & Mirel, 1999). *A Nation at Risk* also urged more uniformity in education (Warren, 2002) and denounced America's schools for not responding adequately to the social and economic shifts of the country, thus jeopardizing the nation's social fabric (Ravitch, 2000). By 1989, President George Bush along with state governors, led by Arkansas governor Bill Clinton, assembled to establish a series of clear performance objectives for an internationally competitive population (Angus & Mirel, 1999). To remedy the growing sense of educational inferiority, federal involvement included the funding of various curriculum standard-based projects

sponsored by specific agencies and councils. This process has often been muddied, controversial, and political.

Serious proposals to adopt national standards or at least encourage common curriculum standards began in the 1990s, first for mathematics, followed by tumultuous attempts of reading and history standards. The Improving America's School Act (IASA, 1994), which reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Vinovskis, 2000), resulted in school improvement through the introduction of a core of challenging state standards (Schneider, 2015). One of the goals of IASA was to ensure high standards for all students in preparation for social and economic success beyond high school. According to Riley (1994), "ESEA programs will now be integrated into a state's overall school improvement efforts...now promote the alignment of all education components—curriculum and instruction, professional development, school leadership, accountability, and school improvement--..." (para. 4). The IASA renewed efforts to increase academic rigor, homogenize standards, and expand accountability measures. The release of the national history standards in 1994, which intended to provide collective guidance and unify America's historical narrative, instead fostered greater divisiveness. Political jockeying and the vilification of the standards by former director of the project, Lynne Cheney, crushed the initiative (Moreau, 2004). Curriculum developers and textbook writers became vulnerable to debates over national identity and how race, class, and gender had shaped this historical narrative. The socio-political discourse would influence the direction for commonality among standards well into the twenty-first century.

The formal genesis of CCSS occurred during the Clinton and Bush administrations, whose appointed officials in the U.S. Department of Education underscored what they and others often argued was the need for standards-based reform. During this period, the National

Governors Association (NGA) created a nonprofit organization, Achieve, Inc., which sought to establish K-12 academic standards, assessments, and accountability for student performance. Achieve became an advocate for national standards (Schneider, 2015). The heterogeneity in standards was advanced through federal funding which provided collaboration and recommendation of national standards during the 1990s and gave states some frameworks for use in their own state (Ravitch, 2000). This process led to greater state regulation and oversight by the end of the decade. Legislative movements inspired by globalization, such as Goals 2000, regenerated academic rigor within state-level standards (Applebee, 2013). Initiatives supported by federal interest have often caused apprehension within educational communities and the general public, as education historically has been controlled at state and local levels. Even though the Goals 2000 desire for national standards elevated attention and public distrust towards federal interference (Schneider, 2015), NCLB became an ultimate reality in 2001 (Applebee, 2013).

NCLB, a reauthorization of ESEA, which introduced Title I funding to assist children in poverty hoping to increase graduation rates, sought to elevate academic standards and increase standardized assessments (Vinovskis, 2000). Title I funding per ESEA was conditional on states agreeing to specified requirements. Due to the accountability measures prescribed by NCLB, each of the fifty states designed curriculum and assessments to meet this challenge (Applebee, 2013). The differences in student expectations and proficiencies, particularly upon entrance to college, varied from state to state, alarming ESEA critics of America's educational system. New standards created incongruities in expectations and measuring student proficiencies across the country. The lack of consistency in standards among the states and confidence of student ability exiting high school generated widespread discussion about American student proficiency

at national and international levels. A more unified approach to a national high school diploma was clearly underway (Schneider, 2015). By 2001, Achieve produced the American Diploma Project (ADP), which released reports in 2004, denouncing the value of America’s high school diploma (Schneider, 2015). The *Ready or Not* (ADP, 2004) report suggested the anchoring of high school graduation requirements and assessments to the knowledge and skills recommended in both college and career, through conducted research indicating an “important convergence around the core knowledge and skills that both colleges and employers-within and beyond ADP states-require” (Achieve, 2004, p. 4). The widespread initiative to revise standards and establish similar expectations in the United States would garner even further attention in the years to follow.

Race to the Top, Federal Incentives, and CCSS

Several years later, the Obama administration designed a state competition known as Race to the Top (RTTT, 2009), providing federal funding to states if college and career ready standards were adopted (Ravitch, 2014). Funding for RTTT was provided through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), which Congress designed to stimulate the economy in 2009. The Obama administration’s proposal for reauthorizing the ESEA designed a blueprint for rigorous college and career ready standards, “the administration is calling on all states to adopt state-developed standards in English language arts and mathematics that build toward college and career readiness by the time students graduate from high school...” (USDOE, 2010, p. 2) Two organizations, the NGA and the Council for Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), aided financially by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and politically supported by the U.S. Department of Education, established a consortium in 2009. The December 2008 release of *Benchmarking for Success: Ensuring U.S. Students Receive a World-Class Education* report by the NGA, CCSSO, and Achieve is credited with not only securing the fiscal support of Gates, but

authorizing a “standards-dependent package of reforms” (Schneider, 2015, p. 69) constructed through five action steps. The action steps included adoption of the curriculum at the state level, alignment of the standards with resources, teacher and school preparation and accountability, and the use of international standardized assessments. According to Schneider (2015), CCSS is more than a series of standards. It included a framework memorandum of understanding (MOU) that suggested states were committing in advance to the standards and related assessments. The report states,

Fifty-one states and U.S. territories signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) committing them to participate in the development process. The stated goal was to develop academic standards that would be based on research and evidence, be internationally benchmarked, be aligned with college and work expectations, and include rigorous content and skills (Grossman, Reyna, & Shipton, 2011, p.8).

Although the objective was to develop a more uniform set of expectations throughout the country (Peterson & Kaplan, 2013), it was apparent that a state’s agreement to use the standards included agreement to use the as-yet undeveloped common assessments (Schneider, 2015). CCSS for K-12 language arts and mathematics was officially released on June 2, 2010. The District of Columbia, the U.S. Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and 44 states had adopted the standards by late-2011 (Grossman, et al., 2011).

The MOU explicitly described the development of CCSS as a state-led process, but the role of the federal government was well entrenched in its adoption. “Never forget, CCSS is birthed out of test-driven, federally created NCLB. The point of having CCSS is to bring states under uniform standards tied to uniform assessments” (Schneider, 2015, p. 92). Au (2013) wrote

that CCSS was packaged as state standards to avoid political controversies of national standards and curriculum. A large majority of the states accepted the new standards, in some cases sight unseen. To be eligible for RTTT funds, states had to accept certain conditions including improvement in student test scores and adoption of college and career ready standards (Ravitch, 2014). Federal incentives to adopt the standards, as well as significant grants of \$360 million dollars offered by the U.S. Department of Education to two groups of states to develop tests by 2011, strengthened the economic influences of institutionalized education reform in the SBER vein.

The development committee responsible for CCSS was headed by David Coleman and contained more representatives from the testing industry than educators (Ravitch, 2014). This imbalance later resulted in friction over policy among various interest groups and systems in the pursuit for power over curriculum systems. The involvement of NGA and the CCSSO in the creation of a national curriculum standard reflected political systems imposing the means and measurement in accountability for America's school children. This dynamic is apparent in what Apple (1986) suggested as increased state control over curriculum, often "packaged" systems resulting in more widespread assessments. Accountability measures under CCSS set a higher bar for K-12 education than previous state assessments, and the new assessments purported to assess higher order thinking skills, not readily present in NCLB-era testing (Jochim & McGuinn, 2016). According to Mathison, Ross, and Vinson (2006), the standards-based education reform (SBER) movement is the most powerful modern force in schooling and education.

Because of state commitments through Race to the Top grants, in the 2014-2015 school year the majority of states began testing with a shared set of standards. The start of CCSS testing was not smooth. Most states adopting CCSS joined either the Smarter Balanced Assessment

Consortium or the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), and testing under both consortiums quickly gained criticism either for practical difficulties during testing or because of the politics of the CCSS. Critics assert that the assessments tied to CCSS were funded and supported by a host of special interests (Jochim & McGuinn, 2016). This criticism of common standards originated in our history of largely decentralized system of schooling (Franklin, 1999). The accountability measures of CCSS—and their criticism—have also followed these historical patterns. The social function of institutions including the purpose of accountability have persisted as legitimate concerns (Apple, 1993). The development of and controversy over CCSS reflects the growing influences of federal organizations and major philanthropic support for SBER (Jochim & McGuinn, 2016).

How Today's Debates Reflect a Longer Debate over Curriculum

The Role of the Progressive Movement

For almost 100 years, the Progressive Movement effectively shifted the direction of America's schools, including progression towards a more consistent, centralized core of academic expectations. According to Ravitch (2000), progressive reformers did not individualize curriculum or differentiate social classes but rather formalized schools as institutions for social reform. Specifically, social stability was conceivable through institutions for education. The leading theorist, American sociologist Edward A. Ross, professed in his 1901 publication *Social Control*, that education was an effective weapon in securing greater control over social order (Kliebard, 1995). Curriculum became a social construction reflecting perceptions of the political and social spheres in which children and schools resided (Franklin, 1999). The reemergence of social values and citizenship would gradually replace history with social studies, signifying the reformative role of schools in American society (Angus & Mirel, 1999). American society,

infatuated with social disintegration and traditional values, permeated the curriculum for most America's students.

Eventually high schools progressed into custodial institutions providing both academically and vocationally oriented curriculums in preparation for adult life. "School could act as a critic with respect to other social agencies and could undertake new tasks when those social institutions were not functioning successfully" (Kliebard, 1995, p. 168). According to Angus and Mirel (1999), the collapse and recovery of the youth labor market due to the World Wars and the Great Depression had the most profound effect on secondary education during the second quarter of the twentieth century, as teenagers gradually replaced full-time work with attendance in school. Attention towards global economic competition resulting from the release of international assessments in the early 2000s increased efforts to set higher standards and standardize student expectations across the states (Rothman, 2012), renewing an emphasis in academic coursework for America's schools and initiating CCSS.

Other landmark events impacting shifts in curriculum include the launch of Sputnik in 1957 and the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958, which underscored a need to return to academic disciplines, such as science, mathematics, and foreign languages (Kaestle, 1982; Kliebard, 1995). Additionally, one year after the passage of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the Coleman Report of 1966 identified the effects of racial segregation by implementing standardized tests to measure educational success (Schneider, 2015) forging an accountability movement (Kliebard, 1990). The consequences of these socio-political events reflect the cyclical nature of curriculum and how political posturing influenced the role and function of schools. Previous reform beliefs merged with new ones, emphasizing more competency based instruction (Angus & Mirel, 1999). "At one time and the same time, the

curriculum in the twentieth century has come to represent a reasonably faithful reflection of the intellectual resources of our culture and its anti-intellectual tendencies as well...” (Kliebard, 1995, p. 230). Curriculum theorists have demonstrated how these shifts were influenced by historical contexts, scientific advancements and presence of quantitative methods, and the changing social structures of schools. These were not necessarily chronological shifts, but rather ones that morphed into others and even created hybrid curriculums (Kliebard, 1995). CCSS echoes similar sentiments as the standards identify specific skills, not content, in preparing K-12 students for college and career. The controversy surrounding CCSS speaks to the heart of conflicting social and academic expectations in American education.

Politics and Policy

Curriculum as a fixed point has never truly existed. The primary controversy involving CCSS are not the standards, but the method of assessment, the purpose of accountability, and the role of the federal government in this process (Kenna, 2013). The values of equity, fairness, competition, individualism, and self-sufficiency have inspired corporate interest and the zeal of many Americans (Ross, Mathison, & Vinson, 2014). To feel better prepared for the standardization of assessment, school districts are more likely to adopt curriculum materials created by the same companies creating the tests, potentially at the expense of teacher and student creativity and authentic learning (Brooks & Dietz, 2014). Although shrouded in controversy over the methods and intention of assessment and the implication of implementation of CCSS, this new wave of reform mirrors much of the same discourse over curriculum in the history of American education. Although instructional methods are not designated, the standards influence classroom pedagogy as advocates of CCSS affirm greater attention towards the processes of learning over content (Gardner & Powell, 2014). Knowledge within a subject area

has long been required for student comprehension. Acquiring and utilizing skill sets within or among disciplines, such as literacy, has been less emphasized for student proficiency. The debate of whether schools in the United States should focus on skills or content has not relented. As Au (2013) notes, curriculum is situated within a political and policy context and reform movements are subject to popular and powerful interests present in society. NCLB was the result of bi-partisan support, Civil Rights groups, and teacher unions (Au, 2013). CCSS can be considered a 2.0 version of previous standards movement, “and like the last standards movement will undoubtedly lead to NCLB 2.0 in terms of high-stakes, standardized testing” (Au, 2013, p. 5). Reform in America has involved various interest groups, and curriculum in “never simply a neutral assemblage of knowledge” (Apple, 1993, p. 222). As a reflection of candid and prominent belief systems, curriculum will continue to recycle and renew the convictions of American society. Consequently, curriculums legitimate a particular knowledge and are not understood in isolation (Apple, 1993). The controversy surrounding CCSS is simply another chapter in the long term socio-political dynamics within education

Social Studies Education and Historical Debates over the Curriculum

The History of Social Studies Education

The first national curriculum standards for the social studies, *National Curriculum Standards for Social Studies*, were published by the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) in 1994. These standards have been widely adopted for curriculum alignment and development. A revised set of standards were created in 2010 to reflect shifts in education and globally (NCSS, 2010). According to NCSS (2010), civic competence and a commitment to ideas and values of a democracy have shaped this national curricular framework. The curricular purpose also included classrooms which accept and address the diversity of students as well as content, “embracing pluralism to make social studies classrooms laboratories of democracy”

(2010, p. 9). The standards encourage an awareness and analysis of civic issues from interdisciplinary perspectives. Based on the purpose statements, NCSS considers social studies as a platform from which to explore principles involved in the creation and continuation of an American democracy. The contemporary aim for social studies education is premised on historical movements dedicated towards fostering an educated and competent citizenry. For the social studies, which became a formal school subject by the 1940s, content was directly influenced by a series of Progressive movements from the 1890s, shaping the very purposes and functions of schools (Thornton, 2005). Prior to the 1850s, the social studies aligned more with geography, and elements of biblical, European, and colonial histories, and promoted citizenship education in both private and public life (Gross & Dynneson, 1983).

Yet, elements of the social studies appeared even earlier in America's classrooms. The presence of Enlightenment sentiments after the Revolution fostered a rising concern of American identity as distinctive from that of European. The search for an American identity, including its place in the modern world, and its connection to education, were revealed through national plans for education proposed in the early republic (Rudolph, 1965). Early Republican education essayists submitted plans in 1795 on behalf of the American Philosophical Society which sponsored a contest for developing a national plan for America's education (Justice, 2008). The diverse ideas in the plans collectively suggested that the Revolution would not resolve tensions over curriculum, intellectual freedoms, and diversity in formal institutions in the new nation (Justice, 2008). The frameworks provided in each of the submitted educational plans reflected an early nation's concern in the restoration of political and social coherence, and the development of a national identity. The American Revolution was a pivotal moment for education demonstrating the power of human agency, particularly for the rationalization of knowledge. It

was a national problem and a national opportunity (Rudolph, 1965). The attention towards morality and civic virtue dominated the educational landscape illustrating that post-Revolutionary America was instrumental to social and political livelihoods, still very much under construction within the new republic (Justice, 2008; Rudolph, 1965). As Friedrich et al. (2010) have noted, developing a citizenry had been a main priority in schools, privileging the notion of citizens as being made, not born. From the beginning, the early republic was concerned with which populations would be served, who would control schools, and what would be taught. These questions fueled discourse on civic education. “The general diffusion of learning might unleash a radical individualism that would make the new nation ungovernable” (Warren, 2001, p. 244). Academies, colleges, and churches would be tasked with creating a citizen statesman for leadership positions in government, commercial or religious enterprises (Warren, 2001). The period following the American Revolution cultivated a social order through republican ideology, and fostered a climate of virtue and intellectualism of citizenry (Kerber, 1980). Schools, either public or private, nurtured notions of a democratic society that led to common characteristics of social studies education.

The Civil War, considered a major turning point in America’s educational institutions, also directly affected public and social studies education. Textbooks featured forms of citizenship, moral and religious virtues, and patriotic history. By the 1880s, the Industrial Revolution elevated attention towards social ills, sponsoring social reform (Gross & Dynneson, 1983). This era landscaped social studies education through two professional bodies. The social efficiency approach embraced by social science educators advocated for the social studies as preparation for adult life. On the other hand, during the Progressive Era, social scientists focused more on subject-matter knowledge, developing a more conscious connection between common

school history curriculum and the future needs of students as members of American society (Thornton, 2005).

As Thornton (2005) noted, national committees dedicated to legitimizing the content of the social studies curriculum addressed both social science content and social education. The National Education Association (NEA), created after the Civil War, and American Historical Association (AHA), established in 1884, demonstrated a concern over the professionalism for both scholars and teachers (Gross & Dynneson, 1983). Shifts towards history and away from geography after the Civil War reflected the impact of the Industrial Revolution and immigration on education. Schools functioned as institutions to socialize a culturally diverse nation, while historical content emphasized patriotism in an effort to rally the common man in belief of the American dream (Gross & Dynneson, 1983). Likewise, the NEA Committee of Ten (1893) and the AHA Committee of Seven (1899) placed an emphasis on history in the curriculum. But by 1916, the NEA Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education began the official use of social studies to include history and related subjects. The “new history” approach based on social efficiency and social history, created by historian James Harvey Robinson between 1900 and 1916, truly dedicated social studies towards citizenship education. Arthur Dunn recommended an expansion of the discipline in 1907 to include more than just history, constructing a pattern of instruction still present today (Gross & Dynneson, 1983). Perhaps the most influential report for general education and the social studies is The Final Report of the NEA Commission of the Reorganization of Secondary Education, including the Seven Cardinal Principles of Education in 1918 (Gross & Dynneson, 1983). The report emphasized social studies, not history, in American curriculum. This emphasis included a 12th grade capstone course, Problems of Democracy (POD), which integrated social issues, government, economics,

and society (Parker, 2015), marking social studies as a direct reflection of and desired influence on national social conditions.

The formal integration of social studies in the 1930s was followed quickly by a textbook controversy involving Harold Rugg. Rugg advocated schools as sites for civic and social reform, reflecting progressive ideology of social and economic inequality. According to Moreau (2004), Rugg intentionally placed himself into the acrimonious debate over the definition of a national community. Popular historians of the 1920s and 1930s like Charles Beard sought to refocus on economics and government, hoping to diminish citizenship in social studies (Gross & Dynneson, 1983). This attempt failed, and the prior dedication towards fostering effective citizenship within social studies curriculum remained. Popular opinion inundated school boards and publishing companies. Critics asserted that citizens should determine what schools teach and that textbooks should not be responsible for representing both sides; in this view, teaching unbiased perspectives was deemed inappropriate for children. Moreau (2004) wrote, “the meaning of nation has never been fixed, and articulating one idea of the nation has generally meant subordinating or rejecting another” (p. 18). NCSS produced the first of a series of curriculum publications in 1939, *The Future of the Social Studies*, edited by James A. Michener, which prompted social studies educators to submit suggestions for approaches and designs for social studies curriculum. Proposals included a *Civic-Centered Approach*, *Social Problems Approach*, *World Approach*, *Child-Centered Approach*, and *Good Citizenship Approach* (Gross & Dynneson, 1983).

During the Cold War years, attacks on progressive education sometimes focused on the social studies, and as Parker (2015) noted, it “amounted to the villianization of the social studies as a kind of national sport” (p. 30). The arrival of arguments for a “new social studies” in the

1960s ignited debates over inquiry-based approach to teaching and learning, a return to social science disciplinary perspectives due to concerns over anti-intellectualism during the Progressive Era (Evans, 2015). Educators responded to social scientists and explored new tools and methods such as inquiry based learning where students engaged in problem solving and critical thinking (Gross & Dynneson, 1983). The new social studies movement experimented with new methodological approaches which addressed society's shortcomings through social studies instruction. However, divisions between academics and educators climaxed by the late 1970s moving away from the "new social studies" and the emphasis on citizenship education. In the 1980s, the conservative Bradley Commission and historians such as Diane Ravitch blamed Americans' weak historical knowledge on an ambiguous social studies coursework. This concern forced NCSS to redefine the social studies and develop standards. The result of the NCSS standards reduced alternative courses for a return to history and the social sciences (Parker, 2015).

Reflection of Long-Term Dynamics over Curriculum

The field of social studies education has been subject to power relationships that have historically shaped and redefined the field. Its objectives and methods have been subject to a lack of consensus mainly on the meaning of citizenship education (Ross, Mathison, & Vinson, 2014). Despite an evolving definition of social studies, some consensus has emerged about the inclusion of American history courses as required in the curriculum (Thornton, 2005). Importantly, the varied meanings of social studies and citizenship differed between social studies academics, curriculum specialists, and social studies teachers (Thornton, 1989). These competing viewpoints have recently shifted towards more historical mindedness and the ways in which social and historical disciplines are constructed and how this knowledge is used. In the era of SBER,

political agendas directly influence school practices, including the overwhelming use of high-stakes standardized tests (Ross et al., 2014). The role of high-stakes testing and the social studies will be detailed in a later section, but it is important to note that SBER exerted social control by standardizing the school process and promoted an economic and occupation sorting mechanism (Mathison et al., 2006; Ross et al., 2014). In several ways, the political posturing dictating social studies education is an outcome of long-term national conversations about the roles and responsibilities of America's schools.

The accountability movement of the 1990s provoked discussions about academic rigor and the status of American schools in an international landscape. However, CCSS did not emerge just from short-term concerns over global economic competitiveness. It is truly a product resulting from complex social processes in American education occurring over several centuries. In the United States, the history of curriculum debates is evidence of a nation constantly reinvented by political structures and institutions, economic changes, and traditions of decentralization (Warren, 2001). As a consequence of local, state, and federal regulation in the traditional and contemporary notions of schooling, CCSS reflects both federal and state mobilization on local district curriculum, as well as one long-term outcome of the Progressive Movement.

These examples have demonstrated how CCSS and social studies curriculum are the cyclical products of novelty and criticism pressured by money and political interest groups. Social education has encouraged political enlightenment and civic competency (Parker, 2015), and CCSS bears threads of this same vision. These long-term controversies represent “a tangible forum through which Americans have struggled over competing visions of the good society and the desirable future” (Evans, 2015, p. 32). The influence of citizenship on the politicization of

school curriculum is reflected in the ongoing discussions about American education. Detailing the socio-political influences responsible for the emergence of the social studies and CCSS adds a new dimension to their dynamic and yet underexplored relationship.

Debates over the Common Core's Relationship with Social Studies

CCSS and Social Studies Standards

For many social studies educators, the development of civic skills emerged from traditional historical and democratic discourses in American classrooms (Journell, 2011). NCSS (2010) has identified ten themes defining the instructional framework for social studies content. Three of the ten themes are clearly devoted to civic responsibility within the social studies curriculum. The tenth theme is directly dedicated to civic ideals and practices, endorsing an appreciation in the importance of active citizenship, and may include course work in “civics, history, political science, cultural anthropology, and fields such as global studies, law-related education, and the humanities” (NCSS, 2010, p. 4). In addition to those, one can see the presence of organizations, such as educational, governmental, religious, and even families and civics on individual lives in theme five: individuals, groups, and institutions. Lastly, theme six is dedicated to power, authority and governance reiterating the necessity for citizenship education for understanding historical and contemporary contexts of government. NCSS identifies civic competence as the knowledge, intellectual processes, and democratic dispositions suggested for students, as a core component to the curriculum. CCSS shares in the intention to prepare students for life beyond high school, including participation in an economic and business world (Schneider, 2015).

As previously noted, American educators have frequently argued that curriculum had to include a repository of civic education, which sought to harmonize diverse groups into traditions of the White minority (Warren, 2001). Interest in employment readiness rested in America's

dedication to apprenticeship during the social-efficiency era in which vocational education was infused with teamwork and collaboration. Franklin (1999) wrote, “They were in other words, using the curriculum to first shape the attitudes and values of Americans toward work and through those beliefs to control their behavior as workers and citizens” (p. 473). According to NCSS (2010), social studies is an integrative discipline of the social science and humanities to promote civic competence, allowing “young people to make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world” (p. 9). Based on the literature, CCSS has surfaced in response to expanded American ideals of citizenship and its relationship with adult economic enterprises. Educational emphasis on citizenship and human development are equally important to economic participation (Levin, 1994). “The skills and knowledge captured in the ELA/literacy standards are designed to prepare students for life outside the classroom...students will learn to use cogent reasoning and evidence collection skills that are essential for success in college, career, and life” (NGA, 2014). CCSS emphasizes college and career readiness to promote economic participation and political awareness in American society.

Interdisciplinary Literacy and Text Complexity

In an era of high-stakes testing in subjects including reading, writing, and mathematics, social studies has suffered a reduction in instructional time, and is considered a less relevant subject (Fitchett & Heafner, 2010; Swan et al., 2015). Although CCSS was assumed to contribute to this reality, the interdisciplinary nature and focus on literacy have reshaped this assumption (Swan et al., 2015). In assessing the standards for social studies content, it is evident that CCSS has immediate effects on social studies instruction. Although there are no standards explicitly referencing social studies or history in grade K-5, literacy in history/social studies, science and technical subjects’ standards do exist in grades 6-12 (NGA, 2014). Thus, a discourse

involving the relationship between reading and writing and history and social studies has since developed. The standards deviate from grade-specific content understandings but still preserve the social studies as an interdependent and self-contained discipline (Hermeling, 2013). Altoff and Golston (2012) stated, “They offer a vision of twenty-first century literacy in which the social studies classroom plays an important role in the development of certain kinds of literacy skills...” (p. 5). CCSS emphasizes an increase in interdisciplinary literacy instruction (Lee & Swan, 2013) by illustrating the importance of reading instruction while focusing on a diverse world, including knowing its history, geography, government and economic realities, through reading fluency. These literacy skills develop responsible and effective participation in a democracy (Altoff & Golston, 2012) through academic inquiry and civic action (Lee & Swan, 2013).

One of the key shifts in English language arts and literacy is to ensure routine practice with complex texts and their academic language through progressive development so students are ready for college and career level reading by the end of high school (NGA, 2014). Text complexity represents an unprecedented specificity than previous standards and CCSS establishes this objective through qualitative, quantitative, and reader-task analyses (Hiebert & Mesmer, 2013). College and career literacy readiness has begun as early as third grade. Students in primary grades are tasked with greater levels of text complexity, sparking concern over the appropriateness of beginning so early (Hiebert & Mesmer, 2013). Furthermore, debates also exist about the relationship between text complexity and college literacy readiness. For the field of social studies, the inclusion of more diversity and rigor with texts, especially primary sources, offers a renewed sense of respect and focus on historical content. The use of literacy through informational texts aligned to social studies content, along with the inquiry based nature of the

standards, promotes existing historical thinking skills within social studies curriculums (Swan et al., 2015). Text complexity may in fact be the conduit into historical thinking now sanctioned by CCSS. It is yet determined if language arts' courses using historical texts to reinforce literacy, or whether the social studies using primary and secondary sources to reinforce literacy skills are more successful (McHenry, 2014). Continued research is needed to determine the impact of CC ELA on social studies at all grade levels.

The Use of Informational Texts

The intentions of CCSS's shared responsibility in reading, writing, speaking and listening was motivated by "extensive research establishing the need for college and career ready students to be proficient in reading complex informational text independently in a variety of content areas" (NGA, 2010, p. 4). Reading standards for literacy in history/social studies begins in grade 6, while these standards are integrated into the K-5 reading standards. Therefore, the instructional use of informational texts is considered a component of ELA and/or social studies at elementary levels, depending on district and school initiatives. For secondary teachers, reading and writing skills, including critical thinking for evaluating content-area text, are necessary for social studies instruction (Evans & Clark, 2015). The C3 Literacy Collaborative (C3LC) which partnered with the National Center for Literacy Education (NCLE) produced learning modules which promote the use of the College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework that align to CCSS, including informational texts (Griffin, 2016). The 2016 NCSS Position Statement on teaching and learning the social studies includes a diversity in texts and use authentic documents to promote critical and reflective inquiry. Some literature suggests that social studies is a means by which to teach literacy other than for pure social studies content (Au, 2013). The use of document based question (DBQ) activities for grades 3-12 have been a useful way to merge historical thinking and CCSS literacy skills (Nowell, 2017). Widespread empirical evidence is

lacking on elementary teachers with the responsibility for teaching social studies. Brugar and Robert's (2017) study reported student difficulties with interpreting graphical texts impeding comprehension with social studies content. Less instructional time has long-term implications about instructional decision-making in social studies classrooms. Britt and Howe (2014) also explored the effect of CCELA on elementary social studies in South Carolina, a state with standardized social studies testing, and although conducted several years ago, encourages an integration of CCSS with social studies content. Their research focused on the perceptions of one South Carolina elementary teacher and how this one teacher developed instruction to implement CCELA, while preparing students for the state assessment in social studies. Their article does not reference a specific research study method, but shares vignettes of the teacher's perceptions on the natural integration between social studies and language arts. The authors conclude that social studies and CCELA can be aligned and that elementary classrooms should foster meaningful interdisciplinary literacy which prepare America's students as future global citizens (Britte & Howe, 2014). Recent search of the literature reveals more content on CCSS ELA on secondary social studies (Gilles et al., 2013; Kenna & Russell, 2015; McHenry, 2014), and much less for elementary social studies. The degree to which either informational text related to historical content is used during ELA or social studies instruction incorporating literacy skills requires substantive research and was addressed marginally within McHenry's (2014) study.

The literature remains consistent on the assessment that SBER has led to the reduction in teaching social studies in favor of teaching tested subjects, and transforming teaching into more technical than professional work (Ross et al., 2014). However, the emphasis of literacy skills in CCSS has furnished a new dimension of the impact on social studies instruction. Ross et al. (2014) argue that control over content and teacher-driven assessments

have been severely modified because of high-stakes testing. What role CCSS has played and will continue to play on social studies education will be an ongoing area of research.

District Teachers' Responses to Curriculum Pressures

State Responses in a High-Stakes Era

The era of high-stakes testing has affected social studies differently than other core subjects and varies per state. With a focus on accountability measures, legislation such as NCLB has been criticized for what it encompasses and omits (Burroughs, Groce, & Wobeck, 2005), specifically excluding social studies as a mainstream tested subject. Some research points to the lack of testing as a cause of further marginalization of social studies, whereas other research on states with testing note that social studies is treated superficially (Burroughs et al., 2005). Regardless of perspective, the current condition of social studies education reflects presence and power of the accountability movement. National and state interests in the testing of social studies is considered a recent phenomenon, as most large-scale assessments emphasize other school subjects (Grant & Salinas, 2008). In some states as Texas, Virginia, Mississippi, and New York, graduation depends on passing high-stakes tests in history. Other states, such as Michigan and Kentucky, use student performance on history tests in school assessments (Grant, 2007). It is important to differentiate between states that have high-stakes assessments and those that do not when evaluating how teachers respond to tests and what influences the level of teacher perceptions of subject matter and learners (Grant, 2001). However, a large-scale consensus about the influence of testing on social-studies instructional methods and content does not exist (Grant, 2007; Vogler, 2005). Based on the variables ever-present in classrooms, it is hard to determine exactly to what degree instructional changes have occurred as a result of high-stakes testing. Grant (2001) wrote, "Because tests are but one of several interacting influences on teachers' instructional practices, none of which is primary at all times...it has important

implications for reformers who continue to place their faith in testing as a lever for educational change” (p. 422).

Impact of Testing Policies on Elementary Social Studies

Although some states have high-stakes testing in social studies at elementary levels, most states do not (Nowell, 2017). The effect of high-stakes tests on elementary social studies has been explored by comparing states that focus on tests in language arts and mathematics, such as South Carolina, with mandated state testing. However, Heafner and Fitchett (2012) caution readers about drawing too much about the impacts of high-stakes testing on a state by state basis. To infer that tests cause instructional change is unclear at this point, but tests do in fact enter into the pedagogical equation. Because states are currently revising standardized assessments for compliance with CCSS, it is too early to determine to what degree this new phase of accountability will have on social studies content and instructional methods. Fitchett and Heafner (2010) argued that the effects of high-stakes testing in the last 20 years has marginalized social studies education at the elementary levels, a trend intensified by the accountability movement (Heafner & Fitchett, 2012). Heafner and Fitchett’s study published in 2010 predates CCSS, synthesizing data from 1988-2004, and fails to include a reintegration and interdisciplinary approach in tested subject areas such as reading and writing. Burroughs et al. (2005), whose study also predates CCSS, noted that the widespread reduction on instructional time forced elementary social studies teachers to integrate content with reading. Legislation such as the Goal 2000 and NCLB have intensified the trivialization of social studies reducing instruction by an average of 30 minutes a week (Fitchett & Heafner 2010; Vogler, et al., 2007). Instructional time in social studies reflects teacher responses to external policy and high-stakes tests in ELA and mathematics (Heafner & Fitchett, 2012).

These examples demonstrate a relationship between social studies instruction in elementary classrooms and high-stakes testing, and that teacher perceptions of this relationship are a considerable factor. These studies do not explicitly examine the role of CCSS as part of the accountability movement. Social studies instruction appears subject to the impact of practitioner interpretations of a myriad of elements and the empirical evidence suggests that the relationship between assessment and accountability remains ambiguous (Grant & Salinas, 2008). Responses to high-stakes testing depends on district initiatives and teacher interpretation. The sources of influence on interpretation are both professional and personal. As Fitchett, Heafner, and Lambert (2014) noted, instructional time does not automatically mean quality instruction. The relationship between instructional time and instructional autonomy offer a better measure of the impact on high-stakes assessment policies for elementary education (Fitchett, et al., 2014). Although CCSS is part of the high-stakes accountability movement, the interdisciplinary focus of the standards may affect social studies differently than previous reform measures.

Impact of Testing Policies on Secondary Social Studies

High-stakes assessment in social studies occurs more frequently in middle and high school, and therefore secondary students benefit from more instructional time. Assessments have often created a test preparedness mentality, but when social studies is not tested, teachers lament its marginality when compared with tested subjects (Burroughs et al., 2005). The effect of testing policies on secondary social studies education reflects yet another dynamic component of curriculum reform. Two case studies conducted by Grant (2001) on high school social studies teachers preparing students for the New York State Regents test revealed that classroom pedagogy was influenced far beyond the test itself. The teachers were most compelled by their knowledge of subject matter and student learning of the content, using traditional lecture and use of the textbook over audio-visual sources and student participation. High-stakes tests did not

influence pedagogy in any particular direction, but tests may in fact influence very little at all (Grant, 2001). Because CCSS is part of the modern accountability movement, it is necessary to examine the role of high-stakes tests on curriculum. Present curriculum reform considers the impact of standardized assessments on tested and non-tested content areas and students.

According to Ross et al. (2014), reducing the teaching of social studies to comply with high-stakes tests, policymakers, or textbook companies reinforces what others deem as knowledge worth knowing. Perhaps policymakers are less aware of the value social studies education has already placed on interdisciplinary literacy. A study of secondary social studies teachers indicated that at least half of their instructional time was dedicated to existing pedagogical methods addressing the CCSS curriculum (Kenna & Russell, 2015). Gilles et al.'s (2013) research on middle school social studies teachers reported that social studies teachers had knowledge about reading instruction and frequently used reading strategies with social studies materials. These teachers considered their own reading approach to social studies texts and naturally employed the use of questions, made connections, and marked texts during social studies instruction. This evidence reflected an alignment of the literacy skills within CCSS and existing social studies content and instruction. According to McHenry (2014), the emphasis on expository text in CCSS may cause great changes in both ELA and history. There holds promise that history education may become more meaningful, restoring “in-depth teaching instead of mere coverage” (McHenry, 2014, p. 92). However, the way the standards are interpreted and implemented in individual school districts may in fact further marginalize current history content and instruction. Research conducted by McHenry (2014) in California suggested that history instruction is on the verge of significant change in which “the study of history may shift in such a way that privileges English/language arts objectives over historical understanding” (p. 93). The

inherent connection between CCSS and the essence of the historian's craft demonstrate how CCSS can support social studies education. This relationship is only apparent when states and school districts evaluate the role of high-stakes testing on all subjects and to what degree CCSS shapes social studies' standards.

Impact of Standards-Reform on Elementary Social Studies

Shifts in curriculum standards affect content and pedagogy, but the ramifications of the effect of CC ELA on elementary social studies has yet to be fully examined. As previously noted, the emphasis on disciplinary literacy skills throughout CCSS requires social studies instruction to focus on reading and writing (Gleeson & D'Souza, 2011). The mixed methods study conducted by Swan et al. (2015) on state social studies coordinators indicated a general consensus in support of the CC ELA standards and minimal optimism about its impact on elementary and secondary social studies due to the skills embedded within CC ELA. CCSS does not specify social studies content, opting for a framework to develop content knowledge through literacy instruction. Gleeson and D'Souza's (2011) study of teacher candidates preparing for elementary social studies instruction concluded that there was a need to blend social studies content knowledge and historical thinking skills, aligned to CC ELA reading, writing, and listening. The explicit connection between social studies content and literacy instruction was less apparent for preservice teachers, and Gleeson and D'Souza recommended development between historical thinking and disciplinary literacy skills. Thus, the new standards have affected social studies content and instruction. Thornton (2005) stated, "A curriculum presents teachers with images and aspirations, not with a script" (p. 74). It is necessary to consider the nuanced nature of curriculum reform, apart from the influence of the standards themselves.

The study by Heafner, Lipscomb, and Fitchett (2014) on the perceptions of elementary teachers in North and South Carolina reveals that a confluence of factors including pedagogical

methods, time allowance, and content selection affected instructional practices. Curriculum standards were an incentive to teach social studies in both states; however, instructional time increased when tests for social studies were associated with social studies courses. (Heafner et al., 2014; Vogler, 2011) and showed a statistical relationship based on the grade level (Vogler et al., 2007; Vogler, 2011). These studies also suggest that high-stakes testing influenced gatekeeping (Heafner et al., 2014, Vogler, et al., 2007; Vogler, 2011) and that CCSS may provide a “more inquiry-based, discipline-specific pedagogy in the social sciences” (Heafner et al., 2014, p. 26). Elementary teachers’ instructional decision-making is tied to state-testing, the ability to integrate curriculum, and an innate value attached to content, such as fostering citizenship (Vogler, et al., 2007). Despite a reduction in students being tested, social studies instruction increased because some grade levels were still tested (Vogler, 2014). In the age of accountability, there is an apparent relationship between the effects of standards and assessments on social studies content and instruction.

Elementary Social Studies in an Era of High-Stakes Assessments

The social studies in elementary grades has endured changes in curriculum as a result of the accountability movement. Elementary teachers feel compelled to spend more instructional time teaching subjects associated with state and/or national assessments, resulting in social studies taking a backseat to ELA, mathematics, and more recently science (Heafner & Fitchett, 2012). The literature reveals mixed results of the impact of high-stakes standardized assessments and current curriculum reform in elementary education. The impact of accountability in an untested subject such as social studies at elementary levels involves discourse on instructional gatekeeping. As the central figure of determining content, sequence, and method, teachers engage in a decision-making process based on a personal frame of reference. As Thornton (1989) continues, “Curriculum-instructional gatekeeping (hereafter gatekeeping) is educationally

important because it determines both what content and experiences students have access to and the nature of that content and those experiences” (p. 6). A qualitative study of five classrooms in California involving grades four through seven suggested that high-stakes accountability affects instructional gatekeeping differently based on the socio-economic classes of schools (Pace, 2012). The qualitative nature of this research study indicated that teachers’ gatekeeping in social studies was influenced beyond factors related to NCLB. The study concluded that accountability marginalized social studies and furthered educational inequality by reducing autonomy in social studies instruction in lower performing schools. Studies have also concluded that instructional time spent in and exposure to social studies content is lower for students in lower income and more diverse backgrounds (Pace, 2012; Wills, 2007). However, Fitchett, Heafner, and Lambert’s study on intermediate (Grades 3-5) social studies teachers did not suggest a marginalization of instruction in low socio-economic environments (2014). Fitchett et al.’s (2014) study determined that the prioritization of social studies was based more on pedagogical decisions made at school and personal levels, and not conclusively linked to socio-economic status.

Because high stakes testing is more limited in elementary grades, and generally focuses on English language arts and mathematics, social studies instruction varies based on state and district responses to these assessments. If state-testing includes social studies, it is more likely that instructional time remains consistent with other tested subjects. Furthermore, when curriculum is more content specific, especially in higher grade levels (3-5), teachers are more likely to integrate social studies with other content (Vogler, 2011). Several states, including South Carolina since 2003, include social studies as part of high-stakes testing for elementary students (Britt & Howe, 2014; Vogler, et al., 2007; Vogler, 2011). As noted, although much research posited the reduction of social studies instruction and focus because of NCLB, states

that have adopted CCSS have recognized the inclusion of literacy strategies within content areas, such as social studies (Britt & Howe, 2014). Vogler (2011) also noted that teachers use social studies to address standards in reading and language arts. As one South Carolina elementary social studies teacher reported, “I realized I knew a lot more about the Common Core Standards than I thought. The best practices that have influenced my teaching for many years are standards-based and integrate literacy across the curriculum, and are also at the heart of Common Core” (Britt & Howe, 2014, p. 59). The response to literacy across content areas is varied as some districts have opted for team-taught social studies/ELA blocks, while other districts have encouraged teaching content literacy (Gilles, Yang, Smith, & Johnson, 2013).

Specifically, the literacy skills emphasized in grades kindergarten through fifth grade include reading and writing standards that encourage use of multiple sources and quoting directly from a text or answering questions based on text evidence, as well as understanding how authors use reasons and evidence to support claims, including illustrations. The 50-50 balance between informational and literary texts in K-5 grades (NGA, 2014) and an increase in a student’s capacity with complex text (Hiebert & Mesmer, 2013) facilitates greater focus on literacy skills in social studies. Although social studies is apparent in the CC ELA, “the listing of history/social studies as a literacy tool for promoting ELA goals relegates social studies content standards to the periphery” (Heafner & Fitchett, 2012, p. 210). High stakes accountability affects social studies teachers’ gatekeeping, both directly and indirectly, as teachers’ perspectives, resources, and contexts regarding testing influence the delivery of social studies content. When high-stakes testing is present, social studies teachers still demonstrate agency within their content, but to varying degrees (Pace, 2012). Heafner and Fitchett (2012) report that the standardization of time reduced teacher autonomy, as state and/or national assessment pressures have increased. A study

conducted in elementary social studies' classrooms in California in 2002-2003 revealed that a reduction in instructional time affected the scope of the history curriculum and prompted "the squeezing of opportunities for classroom thoughtfulness from the curriculum" (Wills, 2002, p. 2041). Prior to CCSS, the integration of literacy skills within history lessons was recommended by educational professionals. The inclusion of CC ELA has transformed approaches to social studies instruction (Nowell, 2017). Pace's qualitative study in 2007 and 2008 predates CCSS, but it recommended further qualitative research on the relationship between social studies and literacy and the role teachers should play in the responsibility of literacy across disciplines (2012). The marginalization of social studies because of policy testing mandates contextualizes instructional gatekeeping (Heafner & Fitchett, 2012). The effect of new standards on existing curriculum is often difficult to isolate from accountability measures; therefore, CCSS is framed within the context of widespread use of high-stakes assessments. Specifically, the relationship between CCSS on elementary social studies across the states in the era of high-stakes testing deserves considerable attention.

The Open Question: How Do Elementary Teachers Understand the Relationship between CCSS and Social Studies, in a District Context?

Educational change is inevitable, and although teachers are generally charged with the responsibility of executing changes, their input in curriculum reform is limited (Burks et al., 2015). Educational reform movements, including CCSS, must be defined within a political context and cannot be viewed otherwise (Au, 2013). The consideration of instructional gatekeeping as an interactive belief system explains why social studies reform, as isolated from other factors, is rarely successful (Thornton, 1989). Therefore, examining the relationship between CCSS and social studies must consider the political context in which both curriculums emerged. Teachers with the responsibility of teaching elementary social studies are subject to the

political context from which districts enact educational reform. Elementary teachers of the social studies are subject to the accountability movement. The context may help understand how elementary teachers make sense of relationship between CCSS and their social studies curriculum. Research has noted that teachers and college students entering the teaching profession during the age of CCSS lack preparation in merging literacy skills with social studies content (Evans & Clark, 2015; Gleeson & D'Souza, 2016). The lack of and support of the shift towards informational text, analysis of complex texts, and evidence-based reasoning has created inconsistent implementation of CCSS and confusion about the role of social studies and literacy instruction (Evans & Clark, 2015; Gilles et al., 2013). Au (2016) wrote, "A striking aspect of the Social Studies/History CCSS is that they essentially exchange the pure content of previous era's ossified standards for a new focus on pure skills" (p. 7). How do teachers see the relationship between the objectives of CCSS and social studies curriculum in a district context, and what might be the sources of influence in these perspectives?

A qualitative study conducted by Nowell (2017) during the 2012-2013 school year in Oklahoma examined teacher perceptions of the implementation of CCSS on their social studies curriculum. Oklahoma modified their standards for alignment with CCSS, which required social studies content to be presented with an increase in document analysis, literacy, and technology and writing skills. With only one of three participants from elementary grades, it is difficult to generalize the findings. The teachers described growing comfort with the curriculum changes, but they had limited understanding of the specific content standards, despite access to professional development with CCSS. This study also revealed that teachers among grade levels and schools across the district built support networks and relied heavily on the district's Teaching American History (TAH) grant (Nowell, 2017). Furthermore, a teacher's degree of

autonomy, specifically control over content, pedagogy, assignments, and assessments, was a considerable factor in determining instructional time devoted to social studies (Fitchett et al., 2012). Overall, teachers who favored CCSS noted how the standards could improve teaching but lamented the lack of adequate professional development provided at a district level (Burks, et al., 2015). How can elementary teachers' understanding of the relationship between CCSS and social studies be better understood?

According to Au (2016), CCSS is currently in the honeymoon phase in which the standards exist and promise greater curricular freedom, but the attachment to high-stakes assessment has yet to fully materialize. States and districts have recognized the shift to teaching content literacy skills, and now content teachers are left to meet these new literacy standards. Content area professional development with the advent of CCSS is best accomplished *with* content area teachers and not imposed *on* content area teachers (Gilles et al., 2013). But how do content area teachers understand the impact of CCSS on their discipline, specifically in elementary levels on an untested subject such as social studies? With limited empirical evidence on the effect of CCSS on elementary social studies, it is difficult to ascertain the degree to which teachers understand the relationship between CCSS and enacted social studies curriculum. Most research involves a discussion within a middle school context as history/social studies standards exist for grades 6-12. For elementary teachers with the responsibility of teaching social studies this exchange is less understood, if not at all. Therefore, it bears examining how elementary teachers perceive their social studies curriculum aligning with CCSS, and what sources of influence developed this understanding.

Disposition

According to Adler (2008), research in social studies teacher education includes not only the development of content, practices, and dispositions but assisting in the craft of “thoughtful decision makers, or reflective practitioners” (p. 332). To conduct research on the lived-experiences of teachers teaching social studies and CCSS, I have opted for a case study method. Although I have advanced professional experience of both CCSS and social studies education, I am seeking to attain a higher level of learning which may be attained considering my own personal experiences as a practitioner of CCSS and social studies education. Cases will advance my own learning processes and develop my skills in conducting quality research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013). Research in social science involving the study of human behaviors, including understandings of curriculum, has not produced predictive theories or universals (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013), therefore a case study method allowed me to consider the independent learning and understandings of teachers. I was aware of my own dispositions and am vested in how the dispositions of educators influences their understanding of curriculum.

Conclusion

The review of the literature affirmed how social, political, and economic forces shaped CCSS during the modern accountability movement and how current debates about the standards reflect long-term conflicts over curriculum in the United States. Furthermore, the emergence of the social studies shares contexts with the general curriculum over the purpose and function of American schools. Lastly, the research focused on how high-stakes testing and standards reform has affected social studies education at elementary and secondary levels and why further research is needed to understand the relationship between CCSS and social studies in K-5 education.

This study has enhanced understanding of how the relationship between CCSS and social studies curriculum is perceived by elementary teachers having allowed teachers to reflect on this relationship. The study considered how teachers perceive relationships between CCSS and the field of social studies in elementary classrooms as CCSS for social studies for K-5 students does not exist. As Thornton (2005) noted, social studies teacher education programs must share in the purposes and in models of existing curriculum, which have been shaped over time. The field of social studies has been informed by shifting conceptions of the social sciences, and that the definition of the field of social studies is an ongoing debate (Thornton, 2005). Gatekeeping is critical to this conversation and is not only present in the planning and delivery of social studies content but varies considerably from teacher to teacher. As a gatekeeper, the teacher is the primary source of content and pedagogy as the curriculum is interpreted and actively constructed as a product of a teacher's frame of reference (Thornton, 1989). Most studies have considered the impact on student achievement, but less attention has been granted towards the implementation of content and analysis of instructional methods (Grant, 2001). Because most social studies courses are not part of high-stakes testing, particularly at the elementary level, even less consideration has focused on this impact. CCSS has introduced a new and meaningful dimension in the relationship between accountability discourse and social studies education.

Given the social complexities and nuanced nature of curriculum, it bears consideration of how curriculum at a district level has affected the perceptions of curriculum on classroom teachers, and what and how these relationships are determined. The study investigated the relationship between CCSS and elementary social studies curriculum at a district level and how teachers perceived this relationship. Because CCSS for the social studies or history in grades K-5 does not exist, it was necessary to examine how elementary teachers with the responsibilities for

teaching social studies perceived the alignment between the objectives of CCSS and social studies curriculum, including any gaps between a district and classroom level. In addition, the research examined the guiding influences of this alignment acknowledging how elementary social studies teachers perceived the expectations of CCSS and the district's social studies expectations.

CHAPTER 3:

METHODS

Contemporary curriculum reform has affected the purpose and function of social studies education. The absence of CCSS for K-5 social studies has generated an important discourse on the role of literacy skills in content areas and the consistency of interdisciplinary approaches (Altoff & Golston, 2012; Au, 2013; Evans & Clark, 2015; Griffin, 2016; Hiebert & Mesmer, 2013; McHenry, 2014; Swan et al., 2015). Additionally, we need to further explore how teachers understand and respond to state and district initiatives because of large scale curriculum reform. How and why are decisions made in a district and classroom context and how is the relationship defined? This study further explored how standards-based educational reform affects teachers at the ground level when the standards are less explicit in their relationship to existing curriculum. A qualitative approach of the case study determined the perceived alignment between CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum, including any gaps between the expectations of CCSS and the social studies from a district level. The study also determined what influenced elementary social studies teachers' perceptions of this alignment and how these perceptions contextualize the understanding between CCSS expectations and the district's elementary social studies expectations.

Research Questions

1. How do elementary teachers in a medium-sized district in the Southeast with responsibilities for teaching social studies perceive the alignment between CCSS and the district's social studies curriculum and, what, if any, gaps do they see between CCSS expectations and social studies expectations for elementary students?
2. What influences the ways in which elementary social studies teachers in a medium-sized district in the Southeast address the degree of alignment they perceive between CCSS expectations and the district's elementary social studies expectations?
3. How do teachers' perceptions inform our understanding between CCSS expectations and the district's elementary social studies expectations?

Case Study Design

A case study provided a detailed, contextually rich understanding of the relationship between CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum from the district's elementary social studies teachers. Yin (2014) defined a case study as an inquiry that investigates contemporary phenomenon when the boundaries between the context and phenomenon are not precise. The case study design assisted in exacting how CCSS has affected elementary social studies curriculum from elementary teachers' perspectives. As Yin (2014) explains, an ideal case explores important questions in a messy real-world context. Given the limited understanding of CCSS's influence on elementary social studies curriculum, I chose to explore the issues in Common Core and social-studies curriculum through a case study focused on a single, medium-sized district in Florida. The case study focuses on the unit of study within context (Denzin &

Lincoln, 2013), the alignment between CCSS and the district's elementary social studies curriculum.

Ideal case study research defines both the unit of analysis within the context of the research questions and this design was selected to identify a “real-life phenomenon that has some concrete manifestation” (Yin, 2014, para. 24). Teachers with the responsibility of teaching elementary social studies were the unit of analysis. Recently adopted Florida Standards in 2014, which reflected the states' acceptance of CCSS, created an environment of curriculum reform. To understand how district curriculum reform affected classroom teachers, I researched the teachers' perceptions of alignment between CCSS and the district's social studies curriculum. These responses reflected the perceived expectations of CCSS and social studies for elementary students. As stated previously, the purpose of this study was to determine the perceived alignment between CCSS and social studies curriculum at a district level. The research also explored what influences the ways elementary teachers addressed the degree of alignment between CCSS expectations and the district's social studies expectations, especially in light of the lack of explicit CCSS for K-5 social studies curriculum. Analyzing the perceived degree of alignment between CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum revealed gaps in expectations for CCSS and elementary social studies students which broadened an understanding of CCSS on K-5 social studies. Additionally, the perceived degrees of alignment were determined by the teachers' perceptions, a critical area of needed research to develop the discourse on curriculum reform. Particularly, elementary grade levels and social studies content have been less explored during the era of accountability. Previous research utilized case study design to determine the perceptions of teachers on curriculum reform (Grant, 2001; Pace, 2012; Wills, 2007). The qualitative design effectively captured teachers' perceptions of the relationship

between CCSS and elementary social studies curriculum, as well as the guiding influences on how these perceptions were set. The case study method allowed for understanding the critical context-dependent knowledge in the study of human behavior. The case study itself became the final result giving depth and detail while accounting for within-case variance (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013) and this case study design used a semi-structured or guided interview method to generate a *purposeful conversation* (Lichtman, 2013). The narrative of how teachers understand the alignment of CCSS and district expectations for elementary social studies curriculum needed to be told. Because the researcher was interested in the relationships between CCSS and the social studies on teachers' curriculum understandings, the use of interviews generated a clearer understanding of this relationship.

Prior to conducting the study, the interview questions were piloted with three teachers prior to the formalization of each of the two Interview Protocols used in this study. These teachers were not participants in the case study. Rather, the responses assisted in revising and developing the language and sequence of original interview questions. The responses during the pilot interviews indicated knowledge of an integration of language arts standards and the elementary social studies curriculum. As a result, I adjusted questions to reference reading and writing skills to elicit more depth in responses. Additionally, the responses reflected a noted degree of marginalization of elementary social studies. These early conversations further legitimized the content and method for my qualitative research study.

The case study was further strengthened through the analysis of archival evidence of elementary social studies curriculum before and after the adoption of CCSS. Case-study research should use documents to assist in the corroboration of other collected evidence (Yin, 2014).

Data Collection – Archival Materials

In 2014, the Florida State Board of Education adopted the Florida Standards and were fully implemented across grades beginning in the 2014-15 school year (Florida Department of Education, 2016). The Florida Standards affecting this study were the Language Arts Florida Standards (LAFS) and the Mathematics Florida Standards (MAFS). This study included a review of existing elementary social studies curriculum in a medium-sized district of 43,000 students in Florida. I accessed each grade level curriculum through the district’s public online portal which provides curriculum for every subject and grade level. The curriculum is accessible by navigating the curriculum and instruction department on the district’s website. From there, a hyperlink provides direct access to “Course Descriptions and Standards (CPALMS),” which brings visitors to the homepage of the Curriculum Planning and Learning Management (CPALMS) website. The CPALMS acronym is used widely across the state by teachers, curriculum specialists, and school administrators to reference curriculum and curriculum resources. The homepage introduces grade levels first. After clicking on the desired grade level, each elementary course is listed alphabetically. From this point, I clicked on social studies and downloaded the course descriptions which provided a brief overview of intended goals and specific standards. For social studies, standards are coded for content, the grade level, the strand within the content, and the number or sequence of the standard. For example, SS.K.A.1.1 represents social studies, kindergarten, American history, Historical Inquiry and Analysis, Standard number one.

In conducting the curriculum review, I clicked on every grade level from K-5 and downloaded every course description for social studies. Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) generates course descriptions to provide grade specific (K-8, 9-12) standards. The

social studies course description is divided into four strands: American history, civics and government, economics, and geography. Each strand also has a series of standards as noted above. The most current (2015 and beyond) course description for elementary social studies also references all LAFS and MAFS benchmarks that should be integrated into social studies, instructional practices, which more directly correlate to literacy strategies of CCSS, and English Language Development (ELD). The references to language arts and mathematics are prefaced to the existing social studies strands and standards. Language arts and mathematics are not integrated within social studies strands or standards, but rather listed prior to social studies standards. The only shift from 2014 to the current description is the inclusion of ELD standards. The social studies standards reference standards from language arts including reading and writing, as well as from mathematics. As noted, ELA and mathematics standards are not integrated with the social studies strands as units or content of study, but rather listed above the existing social studies standards. Prior to 2014, the medium-sized district under study strictly used the state of Florida's course description for elementary (K-5) social studies. Now, the district includes ELA and mathematics standards as part of the social studies course as dictated by FLDOE. To describe the changes, I created a table (see Appendix F) organized by grade level that first lists each of the existing social studies standards organized by strand. I then listed the LAF and MAF standards, also organized by strand, added to the social studies standards for grades K-5 to compare the differences as a result of Florida's alignment to CCSS.

In Florida, the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSS) were replaced in 2014 with the Florida Standards to provide students better opportunities “to graduate high school with knowledge and skills they need to succeed in college, careers, and life” (FLDOE, 2016, para. 1). Although NGSSS encouraged academic gains, leaders across the state decided to generate new

expectations in content and performance for students, resulting in the unanimous adoption of the Florida standards in 2014. The emphasis on critical thinking, communication skills, and problem solving for life beyond K-12, prompted the shift, a feature shared in many of the same visions of CCSS (FLDOE, 2016).

Data Collection – Interviews

Participants

Participants included eleven current certified elementary (K-5) teachers who also taught social studies in 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 in a medium-sized district of 43,000 students in the Southeast. I established a range prior to the study for 10-15 teachers. Fourteen teachers responded with interest in participation, and 11 were available to participate for interviews. Having worked in the school district for fourteen years, I had personal and professional contact with district personnel, including participants for the study. Teachers in this district have been offered professional development on curriculum shifts involving CCSS, as well as opportunities for increasing historical content and social studies instruction. I have advanced knowledge of CCSS and social studies, as well as professional teaching experience of elementary social studies within the district. Four participants were my colleagues having worked on the same campus for at least two years. Two other participants were familiar with my areas of expertise with CCSS and social studies education.

Participant Recruitment

The district's K-12 social studies program specialist supported and anticipated district use of the study; and the request to conduct research was approved by the district's executive director of the Department of Research, Assessment, and Evaluation (RAE). The study was also approved by the University of South Florida's Institution Review Board (Appendix B). A letter

to the district's 25 elementary school principals solicited their agreement to contact teachers at their school, and with one exception, all principals approved the recruitment of their schools' teachers.

In all, 872 elementary faculty were invited to participate via an email with information about the study (see Appendix E, Teacher Recruitment Email). In total, 14 teachers expressed interest, and 11 responded to my follow-up confirmation in their interest in participation and stated they were available for two 30-minute semi-structured interviews in the coming weeks. In all, five district schools were represented.

Procedures

Participants had the option to be interviewed in their personal classrooms, a public space, or my home office. Interviews were arranged to accommodate participant schedules, outside their assigned duty time. Six were conducted in the participant's classroom, two over the phone, two at public venues, and one in my home office for both rounds of interview. Interviews were conducted in two thirty-minute sessions for each participant over a two-week period, recorded with a consumer cell phone. In all, the data collection process took three weeks. I utilized hard copies of the interview questions which were annotated during every session. I also kept a personal reflective journal in which I documented behaviors, environment, and biggest "take away" after every session. The interviews were personally transcribed by me within 48 hours. This was required due to the limited data collection window and needed data from Interview #1. The response from Interview #1 Question #11 began Interview #2 Question #1 which probed further and clarified noted similarities between CCSS and the social studies curriculum. Transcriptions were offered by request to each participant for review, but no participant requested these files. Data files were transferred to the researcher's computer and backed up on

two external hard drives. All data files are kept locked and secured in a filing cabinet in the researcher's home. The USF IRB requires data files to be stored for five years, and may be later destroyed.

Interview Protocol

An interview protocol for practitioners was developed and was modified after field testing in the district with three elementary teachers with the responsibilities of teaching social studies. The three teachers who helped pilot the interview protocol were known to the researcher and were not participants in the full study; none of the interview data used in findings come from the pilot interviews. For the 11 participants in this study, each of the interviews was transcribed and a reflective journal was kept which lead to the revision of some research questions. The structured Interview #1 Protocol and Interview #2 Protocol appears as Appendix D and E. Interview #1 Protocol began with demographic data seeking information on the length of professional experience in elementary and social studies, socio-economic status of the school, time spent on social studies on a weekly basis, knowledge of implementation of CCSS, and professional development on CCSS and social studies. It then included questions to understand Research Question One. Research Question One examined the perceptions of teachers on the alignment between CCSS and elementary social studies. These series of questions examined the role of instructional gatekeeping within the context of curriculum reform at a district level. Research suggests that a myriad of variables, including instructional time, emphasis on high-stakes testing, and school responses to district initiatives, affect instructional perspectives. The unique relationship between CCSS and elementary social studies curriculum, because CCSS does not specifically denote standards for social studies at a K-5 level, was explored through these questions. The questions included reference to Common Core English Language Arts

(CCELA), for Florida teachers is LAFS, which investigated the presence and role of literacy skills during social studies instruction. It is assumed that teachers associate LAFS as the state of Florida's response to CCSS.

Interview #2 Protocol overlapped Interview #1 to provide continuity. The first interview had asked participants to state any similarities between the expectations of CCSS and the expectations of the social studies curriculum. Each participant's response was then inserted into the sentence frame for question #1 of Interview #2 Protocol. If a participant did have a response to question #11, I asked if this perspective had changed. The protocol then continues with the difference in the expectations of CCSS and the expectations of the social studies curriculum. These two questions concluded the data collection for Research Question One. The remaining questions address Research Question Two: What influences the ways in which elementary social studies teachers in a medium-sized district in the Southeast address the degree of alignment they perceive between CCSS expectations and the district's elementary social studies expectations? The responses to each of the interview protocol questions yielded data for Research Question Three: How do teachers' perceptions inform our understanding between CCSS expectations and the district's elementary social studies expectations?

Journal

I kept a reflective journal which documented observations made during and after the interviews about the process, participants, and personal reflections. The journal recorded feelings about the interview process and conclusions made about the participants' responses. This reflective journal clarified my assumptions, theories, and beliefs (Ortlipp, 2008). I then prepared a reflexivity statement which introduced Chapter One. This narrative denoted my personal bias. I

then included some other statements from the Reflective Journal in Chapter Four which discussed the needed transparency of the research process.

Data Analysis

Analysis of archival materials

The district's K-5 social studies curriculum adopted the same course descriptions provided by the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE). The K-5 social studies course descriptions in use during the 2013-2014 school year, prior to the adoption of Language Arts Florida Standards (LAFS) and the Mathematics Florida Standards (MAFS) in 2014, were compared to those for the 2015-2016 school year. I developed a comparative table (See Appendix F) that categorizes each grade level by the social studies strands while providing standards per strand. The table sorted data by (a) grade level (K-5), (b) social studies strands, (c) social studies standards per strand, and (d) standards added because of CCSS. For the most part, the added standards were LAFS and several MAFS which varied per grade level. The final category in the comparative table clearly records curriculum changes from the Florida Standards adoption. This district uses the same social studies course description documents for each grade level for each school year. The CCELA standards can then be further categorized into reading, writing, speaking and listening skills. The table also includes Common Core Mathematics (CCMA) added to the course description for social studies. Each grade level has reported additions of CCELA and CCMA to the social studies curriculum.

Analysis of interviews

All interviews were transcribed by the researcher. Interviews were word processed and then printed. To make meaning for the descriptive data, a codebook was created which provided the code's abbreviation, the code, the code's description, and example quotes from the

participants' interviews. To begin, I created codes and applied these to data that emerged from the theories derived from the review of the literature. For example, research on CCSS and its relationship to social studies has stated the use of informational text, citation and evaluation of text evidence, and how to reinforce reading skills when teaching social studies concepts. Codes were developed from these theories and applied as they appeared during the interview.

Additionally, CCSS and its possible effects on social studies pedagogy includes discourse on professional development, instructional time, and prioritization of tested subjects. These theories were also used in the development and application of codes. This process of coding allowed me to convert the raw data from the interviews and begin building connections to existing theories on the relationship between CCSS and elementary social studies (DeCuir-Gunby, Marshall, & McCulloch, 2011). I added these codes, an abbreviation for simplification, and a working description to the codebook. I then added the participant number and specific quotations to the codebook. These theory driven codes were developed after careful reflection from relevant themes related to the effects of curriculum reform such as the marginalization of social studies and shifts in pedagogy based on increased rigor in standards.

In addition, several tables were created that identified coded evidence associated with each participant. Each of these tables utilized codes described in the codebook and reflected prominent topics having emerged from the interviews. These tables represent major topics, but also note the frequency of themes. The observation and reflection notes in the reflective journal were also analyzed and cross-referenced with transcription data. For example, if a participant discussed in detail the present lack of instructional resources, I ensured the participant's example in Chapter Four. When participants spoke to their perceived alignment between CCSS and the social studies curriculum, I noted this in my journal. I was particularly interested in any

perceived alignments between CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum, and wanted to contextualize these perceptions in Chapters Four and Five. Observations about the participant's demeanor was also recorded. The emotional nature of the conversations with participants was presented in Chapter Five.

I wanted to organize data based on the emergence of themes for each of the three research questions, but also sought to cross-reference content that may arise across each of the three questions. For example, discussions over professional development occurred within different contexts. I established two different themes related to professional development: district level professional development within the context of how CCSS and social studies curriculum was shared with participants, and future district professional development that suggested needed training for the integration of CCSS and the social studies curriculum. The process of coding and categorizing reflected data for each of the three research questions. Table 2 demonstrates how this process occurred, as well as which themes, and how many of each theme aligned to each research question. Once all printed transcripts were reviewed for possible codes, I color coded the text of each transcript to reflect evidence of a code. Any text in red text was the example used in the codebook and become a direct quotation for Chapter Four. Green, purple, or blue text was data used in the tables. All transcripts were digitally color coded and reprinted. The codebook, tables, and transcripts were reviewed by a peer qualified in data analysis and social studies education. The peer reviewer has been a social science educator for 12 years, earning her doctor of education degree in 2014, and completing her doctoral dissertation in Florida. Her comparative study on secondary social science teachers' perspectives researched instructional methods related to historical literacy. We collaborated over the phone, and she provided written

feedback. Based on the collaboration, I revised several descriptions of the codes and code categories.

Assumptions and Limitations

Epistemological Assumptions

In 1929, John Dewey argued for the necessity for the science of education, namely that systemic approaches of inquiry that propose various characteristics of methods within the field promote more intelligible control and better understanding. For Dewey, education was considered both an art and a science, that both subject matter and practical application coexist, and that stimuli upon teachers determine too often rushed theories of proper instructional practices. A pragmatic theoretical perspective was used to determine how curriculum reform as in CCSS, shaped the perspectives of elementary social studies teachers on their curriculum, and how understanding the perspectives of teachers contributed to recognizing current instructional practices within a district. As stated previously, a qualitative approach using the case study method of semi-structured interviews provided evidence of teacher perspectives on the alignment of CCSS and the district's elementary social studies expectations, and the influences in how teachers addressed the degree of alignment. Noddings (2003) notes, "teaching is a practice that encourages intellectual growth in its practitioners" (pp. 250-251). The participant interviews permitted a more open dialogue about the intellectual mindsets when determining the relationships between district elementary social studies curriculum and the objectives of CCSS.

Assumptions

This study assumed that all teachers in the study were qualified, taught in-field, and were certified to teach elementary social studies by the state of Florida. Certification was confirmed by the district program specialist. It is assumed that those interviewed were comfortable sharing

their perspectives, and the researcher had provided a proper environment through which to respond to questions about understanding the CCSS and the social studies curriculum. It was also assumed that each participant understood all the interview questions and answered the questions honestly.

Limitations

The researcher was not able to control the demographics of participants in the school district; therefore, years of teaching experience, grade level taught, socioeconomic status, school, and student population were limiting factors. Two teachers did not have experience teaching elementary social studies prior to the adoption of the Florida Standards. Therefore, they could not provide evidence of how their curriculum has changed. All participants taught intermediate elementary grade levels (3-5). Only grade levels with high-stakes testing are represented in the study. Six participants taught at schools of low socio-economic status, four participants with high socio-economic status, and one classified as middle socio-economic status. More data from schools of middle socio-economic status is needed. Out of 25 elementary schools in the district, only five schools are represented. Teachers in four gifted, one average, six below average classrooms participated in the study. Average classrooms are least represented. The number of teachers included in the study was based upon the permission of site supervisors and teacher responses to the request of participation. One school chose not to accept the invitation to contact teachers, and low interest in this study, timing of the recruitment at the end of the year, or perceived time commitment may have shaped the number of initial respondents. In addition, those who participated may have elevated interests in research or social studies education. I had personal and professional contact with district personnel, in which six the participants were known to me. Teachers were contacted via the district's email. It is possible that participants

presented themselves favorably or addressed current social norms, known as socially desirable responding (SDR) (Zerbe & Paulus, 1987). As a result, participant knowledge of me, my coursework, or SDR may have influenced their interview responses.

Delimitations

This study examined one medium-sized school district in the Southeast. Data only addressed the perspectives of elementary teachers with the responsibilities of teaching social studies, not teachers that teach solely social studies, including secondary (Grades 6-12) social science teachers. All participant names and schools were replaced with pseudonyms and are not identified in this dissertation or will be in future publications.

Transferability

This study focused on elementary teachers with the responsibilities of teaching social studies. The results may not apply to secondary social studies' educators. Although the formal generalization of knowledge may not occur, the data can still "enter into the collective process of knowledge accumulation in a given field or in a society," (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013, p. 177). Although, simple random sampling would have promoted greater generalization (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013) of elementary teachers with the responsibilities for teaching social studies, this process was not utilized based on the minimal expression of interest.

Ethics

Participants in this study were considered minimal risk, as the possibility of harm or discomfort did not exceed the occurrences of conversations about curriculum on school campuses on a daily basis. The IRB issued an Expedited Review (Level 2) approval because teacher perspectives of the influence of CCSS on elementary social studies curriculum, and the influences of these perspectives, only involved adults. The research did not include individual

student data. The participants were provided written consent. In addition to the university's IRB approval, the district required a conditional IRB, that requested permission for individual school participation from principals, prior to district approval. The RRF form and site supervisor permission were secured. Participants had the right to decline participation or refuse to answer questions at any time. No known discomfort occurred during the interview process and no one suspended their participation. Participants had researcher contact information at all times. Some participants expressed interest in the results of the study, but none have requested to review the final transcription. The final analysis was provided to participants.

Participant data and all identifying factors were anonymized to maintain confidentiality. Participant names were replaced with numbers and school names were not used in the dissertation. Any references to district personnel, the schools, or the district mentioned in a direct quotation from participants in Chapter Four were replaced with pseudonyms. Future publications and conference presentations of the data may be used to inform a broader audience on teacher perceptions of CCSS and the alignment to social studies curriculum. All protective measures, such as replacing participants' names, places of employment, and references to district entities, were used to ensure as much confidentiality as possible, and participants must give consent indicating the possibility of future publication. If a breach of confidentiality occurs, immediate notification to participants will occur via email and disclosure of this breach will transpire. Participants will have the right to cease all participation.

Data was secured solely by the principal investigator. Audio files were saved under secured personal devices that were password protected. All transcriptions were personally conducted by the researcher. Transcribed data was coded and password protected by the principal investigator. Data stored on the researcher's laptop will continue to be kept in locked

rooms at all times. Audio files will be kept for no longer than five years and destroyed and confirmed via Eraser. The files will be securely and permanently deleted manually without a trace on the researcher's laptop. Consent forms and any other specific paperwork to participants will be permanently destroyed through shredding.

Summary

This study sought to demonstrate how the national reform effort of CCSS has affected district and classroom level curriculum by examining the teacher perceptions of this reform. Furthermore, the study explored the degree to which teachers perceived an alignment between CCSS and district expectations of elementary social studies, and what guides this understanding. The current lack of research on the effect of CCSS on elementary social studies curriculum warranted additional discourse on how the role of social-political reform efforts influenced social studies curricular understandings by classroom practitioners at the elementary level.

CHAPTER 4:

RESULTS

Introduction

As stated previously, the purpose of this study was to examine the alignment between CCSS and social studies curriculum, and what influences guide educators' understanding of this relationship. Specific social studies standards within K-5 CCSS do not exist., so the research focused on understanding to what degree a correlation between the objectives of CCSS aligned with the elementary social studies curriculum. The research also considered how the perceptions of educators inform our understanding of the expectations of CCSS and the social studies.

The archival analysis noted the presence of added language arts and mathematics standards to the elementary social studies curriculum. The interview analysis revealed nine major themes which were categorized and aligned to each of the three research questions. The results section correlates to themes with its division of nine major sections. The first two sections discuss the alignment of CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum referencing higher-order thinking and historical thinking skills. Section three addresses how reading and writing skills are perceived alignments between CCSS and social studies. Section four examines a perceived gap over alignment based on a lack of curricular knowledge and district sponsored

support. Section five discusses two types of professional development affecting perceived support over the curriculum alignment and section six specifies perceptions over instructional time and resources. Section seven provides evidence for an integration of CCSS and the social studies curriculum, followed by ways in which the integration can be supported through district level professional development in section eight. The last section examines the importance of civic responsibility and the role CCSS and social studies education share in this endeavor. I close the chapter by offering participant reflections on some of the guiding influences when determining an understanding of CCSS and the social studies curriculum and how fostering curriculum awareness is critical to the future of social studies education particularly at elementary levels.

Research Questions

1. How do elementary teachers in a medium-sized district in the Southeast with responsibilities for teaching social studies perceive the alignment between CCSS and the district's social studies curriculum and, what, if any, gaps do they see between CCSS expectations and social studies expectations for elementary students?
2. What influences the ways in which elementary social studies teachers in a medium-sized district in the Southeast address the degree of alignment they perceive between CCSS expectations and the district's elementary social studies expectations?
3. How do teachers' perceptions inform our understanding between CCSS expectations and the district's elementary social studies expectations?

Participants

Each of the 11 participants were currently employed as elementary teachers within a medium-sized district in Southwest Florida. Table 1 displays key information about the interview participants.

All participants had been teaching in the district for at least two years; however, two participants had not been teachers prior to the adoption to CCSS in Florida in 2014. Their

Table 1

Participant Demographic Data

<u>Participant</u>	<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Teaching Experience</u>	<u>Teaching Experience in SS</u>	<u>School SES</u>
1	4	2	2	Low
2	3	10	10	Low
3	5	30	24	Low
4	5	2	2	Low
5	5	23	23	Low
6	4	28	28	Low
7	3	12	9	Middle
8	5	23	23	High
9	4	8	8	High
10	4	10	10	High
11	3	14	14	High

Notes: Teaching Experience is represented in years. School socio-economic status (SES) was determined by the district's 2016-17 percentage of economically disadvantaged students. Percentages above 60% are classified as low and below 30% are classified as high.

knowledge of curriculum prior to CCSS was most familiar from school experiences as a student or as a parent. The range in teaching experience was from 2 to 30 years, and all participants taught in grades three, four, or five. Six of the eleven participants taught advanced work classes.

Participant #1. This participant teaches grade four in a Title I school and has been a teacher in the district for two years. She has taught social studies for two years and teaches an average of 60-90 minutes of social studies a week. Her school is large and includes an autism wing. CCSS was introduced to her while in college to become a teacher, although she also had

experiences as parent. The district shared CCSS via Blackboard, an online portal to access standards and lessons, and she has attended trainings for unpacking the CCSS and how this can be applied to her content. She has also attended several workshops on the performance arts, via a district initiative known as ArtsNow. Participant #1 has not attended any trainings for CCSS and social studies curriculum, although she reports that perhaps 5% of language arts trainings references social studies content.

Participant #2. This participant is a third-grade teacher at a Title I school, but has taught many grade levels in her ten-year career with the district. She has taught social studies for ten years and averages 800-900 minutes of social studies instruction over a nine-week quarter. This amount averages to 90-100 minutes a week of social studies taught during a designated week. The block afforded to social studies is also split with science, and is therefore taught every other week. Therefore, social studies instruction occurs only four-five weeks a quarter. Participant #2's school has a large population of ESE students and remediates the lowest 25 percentiles based on reading and mathematics performances. CCSS became familiar to her from curriculum maps provided to her by her grade level at her school. CCSS had been embedded within these maps. The district provided CCSS training and professional development on subject areas, and she attended many for ELA and math. She is also involved in a book study referencing CCSS and its use towards thinking maps and accountable talk. She is not aware of any district sponsored trainings for CCSS and the social studies.

Participant #3. At a Title I school, Participant #3 teaches an advanced work fifth grade class. Students in the advanced work class are either identified as intellectually gifted or identified as above average intellectually requiring accelerated pacing and academic rigor. She has thirty years teaching experience, and 24 years of experience teaching social studies.

Participant #3 divides her social studies time with science, as science is a tested subject in 5th grade. She teaches social studies 225 minutes a week for four weeks of a nine-week quarter. On average, social studies is taught 25 minutes a week. Her school is a relatively modern facility with a large population and she describes her school's staff as positive, hard-working, and strives to meet expectations. The Common Core was introduced to her at a faculty meeting, as well as hearing this through media outlets. District personnel, including her administrator, shared the district's expectations of CCSS via a faculty meeting. She has attended numerous trainings on CCSS, first with ELA, and more recently with math. She does not recall a formal training on CCSS and social studies curriculum, although she has one document integrating the reading textbook series with some social studies standards.

Participant #4. A recent college graduate of two years, Participant #4 teaches an advanced work class in 5th grade at a Title I school. Both of her years teaching in the district have included experience in elementary social studies. Her classroom experiences 60-90 minutes of social studies instruction a week. Participant #4's school has a high free and reduced lunch population, a large minority population, and the number of minority staff members are small compared to the student minority population. Many students are performing below grade level expectations and struggling to make expected academic gains on state testing. Thus, reading and math have become main focuses on campus. As a new teacher, most of her experience with CCSS was introduced in college, with tasks discussing and writing the standards into K-12 student language. She has personally secured copies of LAFS and MAFS as these were not provided to her from the district. She has attended frequent trainings on math, as this is the district's current initiative, but not a single training directly focused on social studies and CCSS.

Her only experience has been through the ArtsNow integration where an informational text may be used, but it is not the main topic for discussion.

Participant #5. Participant #5 is a veteran teacher of fifth grade students at a Title-I school. She has taught 23 years. These years of experience have included elementary social studies instruction and she averages 60-120 minutes a week for social studies. Her school has a high rate of free and reduced lunch, with students performing below grade level expectations. She admits that reading, math, and science are heavily focused content areas, but has not been made aware of the Common Core from the district. She has attended no trainings on CCSS.

Participant #6. Participant #6 is a fourth-grade teacher at a middle-low socio-economic school. She has 28 years of teaching experience. She has also taught social studies for 28 years and averages 450 of minutes of social studies instruction a week, three times over a nine-week quarter. She replaces her language arts block with social studies every three weeks. The school is on a block schedule where 90 minutes of language arts and 60 minutes of math is required every day. Staff meetings are held once a month and collaborative planning meetings are held weekly. There is good communication between parents, students, staff, and administrators. She first heard about CCSS through her principal and had the opportunity to write curriculum at the district level. However, she has not attended any trainings at the district level for CCSS, and she is unaware of any trainings devoted to CCSS and the social studies.

Participant #7. Teaching an advanced work third grade class at a mid-sized neighborhood school, Participant #7 has taught in the district for 12 years and has 9 years of experience teaching social studies. On average, 180 minutes a week of social studies instruction occurs in her classroom. Her school has strong business partners and has a very positive working and learning environment. The Common Core was introduced to her at a district level as she was

a member of a reading and writing curriculum committee. The district formalized the outreach to staff by building up the Blackboard resources, including an Instructional Focus Guide (IFG), for all content areas and grade levels. The IFG is a weekly pacing calendar designed around standards to be taught per week. She was a part of these small focus groups and curriculum and lesson building committees. Participant #7 was also a prior member of the Teaching American History Grant cohort awarded to the district between 2010-2014. Her experience with this grant surfaced frequently in her responses and she is the only participant who identified any district offerings of professional development related to CCSS and social studies curriculum.

Participant #8. Participant #8 has been a teacher for 23 years, including 23 years teaching social studies at the elementary level. He teaches gifted fifth grade and averages 300 minutes a week of social studies instruction. His school is a full-time gifted school for grades 2-12 that accelerates grade level curriculum by teaching above grade level above in reading and math. He teaches at the same school as Participants #9, #10, and #11. His classroom has one ELA block and three rotations of social studies for a total of 60 students. He first heard about CCSS through his administration, which was followed by its release through Blackboard on the district's website. He has also been involved in discussions lead by his administration and at team meetings. He was not aware of attending any trainings on the Common Core.

Participant #9. With eight years of teaching experience, Participant #9 teaches gifted fourth graders. She has spent five years within this district, and eight years with the responsibility of teaching elementary social studies. Her school is a full-time gifted school for grades 2-12 that accelerates grade level curriculum by teaching above grade level in reading and math. For example, fifth grade students receive sixth grade language arts and math instruction. She teaches an average of 240-270 minutes of social studies weekly. Her first exposure to CCSS

was through teacher forums and blogs from other teachers. She does not feel as though the district formally announced the adoption of CCSS with staff and it was made more aware to her through media reports on a national level and its eventually arrival to Florida schools. She had attended several multi-day trainings the first few years of implementation sponsored through the district. None of these trainings was devoted to social studies.

Participant #10. Participant #10 is a fourth-grade gifted teacher of both ELA and social studies. She has ten years of teaching experience, six of which has included elementary social studies. Her school is a full-time gifted school for grades 2-12 that accelerates grade level curriculum by teaching above grade level above in reading and math. The use of a bell system, higher socio-economic group, and parent involvement offers greater flexibility to teach every subject. She teaches 240-270 minutes of social studies weekly and teachers enjoy great communication on her grade level. She became aware of CCSS through her parents who both worked at the district. She then became a member of a CCSS committee at her school. She does not recall receiving notification about CCSS from the district level, and believes that her administrator organized physical copies of the standards which were shared with the staff. Theresa has not attended many district level trainings on CCSS, but does recall one involving teacher interpretation of the standards. She knows of no trainings for CCSS and social studies offered by the district.

Participant #11. Currently a 3rd grade teacher of gifted students, Participant #11 has taught many grade levels. She has been a teacher within the district for 14 years with the same time period of elementary social studies experience. Her school is a full-time gifted school for grades 2-12 that accelerates grade level curriculum by teaching above grade level in reading and math. She teaches a grade level above, but teaches in a self-contained classroom. On average,

she teaches 120 minutes of social studies weekly. She recalls learning about the Common Core being adopted in the state of Florida through media outlets, her administrator, and meetings. She attended a workshop in which the district forwarded this information through documents that compared the prior standards and CCSS the summer prior to full implementation. She has attended numerous trainings, mostly in math, but also in ELA, specifically addressing an integration of the reading textbook. Participant #11 says that at first there were no professional development opportunities at the district level for social studies, but more recently there have been some offered that she has attended. Math and reading continue to be a primary focus at the district level.

Archival Curriculum

The analysis of the elementary social studies curriculum at every grade level (K-5) after the adoption of the Common Core State Standards in 2014, revealed that there is an addition of Language Arts Florida Standards (LAFS) and Mathematics Florida Standards (MAFS) to the original curriculum. Every social studies standard that existed in its original format prior to 2014 currently exists in the same format. Revisions to the language or the number of standards did not change because of CCSS. Instead, each grade level has a series of LAFS and MAFS that are added to the original social studies standards. Every district in the state of Florida uses the Florida Department of Education's (FLDOE) grade level course descriptions. The courses are adopted and implemented in every grade level. Private schools do not necessarily use these course descriptions. This information was confirmed by the district's K-12 program specialist (Personal communication, September 4, 2017). Therefore, changes made at the state level to social studies curriculum, as in adding LAFS and MAFS, affected the prior social studies curriculum at the district level. The district's curriculum changed because the state of Florida

changed the course descriptions as a result from the adoption of the Florida Standards. The number of LAFS and MAFS varies per grade level, but include references to reading, writing, and speaking and listening skills. Except for second grade which has fewer LAFS than first grade, the number language arts standards increases per grade level from 14 in kindergarten to 24 in grade five. The number of LAFS increases from 13 in kindergarten to 24 by grade five. For example, grade five has 24 standards for language arts and five standards for language arts. Ten of the language arts standards reference reading skills, specifically informational text.

Specifically, the LAFS included with the elementary social studies curriculum focuses on text structure, such as main idea and details and text features, such as headings, glossaries and electronic menus. For example, LAFS.5.RI.2.5 expects students to compare the structure of events, ideas, or concepts and LAFS.5.RI.1.2 expects students to determine the main ideas of multiple texts using key details and appropriately summarize. Additionally, students are encouraged to read and use informational texts appropriately, which can also be presented orally or through other forms of media. For example, four of the 24 language arts standards in grade five focus on speaking and listening skills. LAFS5.SL.1.2 requires students to summarize a written text read aloud or information presented in diverse media formats including visually, quantitatively, and orally (FLDOE, 2017). Writing skills are also heavily emphasized, as ten of the 24 LAFS in grade five reference writing. Various forms of writing including informative/explanatory, narrative, and argumentative are expected across the grade levels. For example, second graders are not only expected to write informative and explanatory texts, but also write narratives that provide sequence and closure. Writing skills as part of the language arts standards increase from three in kindergarten to nine in grade three and up to ten in grades four

and five. Each grade level has dedicated language arts standards for informational reading, speaking and listening, and writing.

The elementary social studies curriculum also includes added MAFS. The MAFS skills associated with the elementary social studies curriculum encourages problem solving, reasoning, data interpretation, and precision. Specifically, the MAFS added to the social studies standards include the broad skills of mathematical practice (MP) and measurement and data (MD). For example, MAFS.K.MD.1 requires students to describe and compare measurable attributes, while MAFS.2.MD.3 requires students to work with time and money. Intermediate grade levels are expected to represent and interpret data, such as in MAFS.5.MD.2 represent and interpret data, which is a natural complement to the use and interpretation of timelines, graphs, charts, and maps during social studies instruction. Appendix F includes a table organized by each grade level (K-5) with a brief course description, as well as every standard categorized by one of four strands: American history, civics, economics, and geography. The final column in the table represents each of the added LAFS and MAFS which Florida adopted in 2014. As previously described, the district uses the course descriptions provided by the state of Florida.

Interviews

As noted in Chapter Three, interview data was initially coded based on the theories derived from literature review. After reviewing the initial theory driven codes, codes were then categorized and consolidated in which major themes developed. Themes were then aligned to each of the three research questions and categories or subthemes for each research question emerged. Participants were asked to consider their perceived alignment of CCSS and their social studies curriculum. The discussions over alignment generated four major themes: higher order thinking, historical thinking skills, reading and writing skills, and discrepancies over the

alignment between CCSS and social studies curriculum. The degree of alignment was influenced by two major themes, instructional time and resources and district level professional development. The perceptions of the participants in this study revealed a needed integration of CCSS and social studies and district level professional development to support an integration. Table 2 provides the initial coding, consolidation, theme development and association to each of the three research questions guiding the study.

After the codes were consolidated and aligned to themes developed from the literature review, I aligned each code to one of each of the three research questions. After organizing the themes and their alignment, I determined that four codes referenced Research Question One. I further determined that two opposing aspects of Research Question One emerged. Research Question One asks, how do elementary teachers in a medium-sized district in the Southeast with responsibilities for teaching social studies perceive the alignment between CCSS and the district's social studies curriculum and, what, if any, gaps do they see between CCSS expectations and social studies expectations for elementary students? Three of these four codes: high order thinking, historical thinking skills, reading and writing skills addressed alignment, while one code, discrepancies over the alignment between CCSS and social studies curriculum, addressed the gap, or discrepancies over expectations from Research Question One. I initially used three theory driven codes when describing the gap. After review of the transcripts, I simplified the notion of a gap in expectation by developing the code of gap. This process was also used when reviewing all remaining theory driven codes. Table 2 also provides the categorization and alignment to each of the three research questions.

<u>Theory Driven Code</u>	<u>Code Consolidation</u>	<u>Themes Developed from Codes</u>	<u>Association to Research Questions</u>
Higher Order Thinking Webb's Depths of Knowledge Deep Thinking	Higher Order Thinking	Higher Order Thinking	RQ 1 (Alignment)
Historical Thinking Skills Close Reads	Historical Thinking Skills	Historical Thinking Skills	RQ 1 (Alignment)
Informational Text Text Evidence Integrating Knowledge Visual Literacy Primary/Secondary Sources Reading Skills Taught During Social Studies Instruction Social Studies Content Used During Reading Instruction Text Complexity Text Structures Research	Informational Text	Reading & Writing Skills	RQ 1 (Alignment)
Already Integrated No Support for Alignment Lack of Curriculum Knowledge	Gap	Gap Over the Alignment Between CCSS and SS Curriculum	RQ1 (Gap)
Curriculum Delivery and Integration Standards Training	District Professional Development	District Professional Development	RQ 2 (District Professional Development)
Student Interest Additional Resources High-Stakes Testing Lack of Time Less Priority Textbook	Instructional Time and Resources	Instructional Time and Resources	RQ 2 (Instructional Time and Resources)
Awareness	Interpretation and Review of Standards and Pedagogy	CCSS and SS Integration	RQ 3 (Integration)
Social Studies Must Be Taught Global View	Dedication and Passion for Elementary SS	Civic Responsibility	RQ 3 (Civic Responsibility)
Future Professional Development Opportunities		Future Professional Development	RQ 3 (Future Professional Development)

Based on the need to determine how the CCELA has influenced social studies curriculum, I knew I needed to look for terms related to text complexity, interdisciplinary

literacy, and informational text within the context of social studies instruction. As a reading standard, informational text reflects a relationship with the use of primary and secondary sources of the social studies curriculum. Other codes related to curriculum knowledge, professional development, and instructional resources were also used. Therefore, code development utilized knowledge of existing research and changed overtime revisiting transcripts and processing the data. To provide cohesion and clarity from the data, the codes were then categorized and reorganized based on major themes from the literature review. Initially thirty codes were determined and used over the course of the coding process. Once examples were selected from several readings of the transcriptions, a revision of original code descriptions and conceptual understandings of the terms emerged. As De-Cuir-Gunby et al. (2011) note, definitions must reflect the concept in context, reflecting enough specificity without confusing future coding. Reviewing terms within context not only revised the description, but determined clearer and more useful categories on emerging themes inspired through the literature review. The thirty codes were then grouped into nine broader categories, and consolidated based on prominent larger themes relevant in the literature. For example, concepts related to manners of thinking emerged from the literature. Three manners of thinking: higher order thinking, Webb's Depths of Knowledge, and deep thinking, were initially used as theory driven codes. After review, these codes did not offer enough variation to stand alone and were consolidated into just one category labeled "higher order thinking." This code was broad enough to cover all references to thinking that moved beyond memorization and expressed student expectations of evaluation and explanation.

Based on interview data, participants referenced language arts skills, but did not specifically state an awareness of these standards as added to their social studies curriculum.

There was no mention of MAFS to their elementary social studies curriculum. Instead, participants shared various reading and writing skills as complements to their social studies curriculum. Two participants felt that the integration between CCSS and social studies was stated in their social studies curriculum, yet could not elaborate as to what this integration meant. Participant #2 did not note any initial alignment between CCSS and social studies, although when prompted to share any reading or writing skills, she stated that social studies content was used during reading instruction, and that students wrote for informative purposes. As Participant #2 states, “Well, the students, I mean it’s a curriculum that we do have them write. We did an economics day and the students actually sold their own items, make their own items and sold them, and then we have them write why someone should buy their items” (Participant #2, Interview 1, para. 73). Further discussion over participant perceptions over alignment between CCSS and social studies, specifically thinking and reading and writing skills, are detailed in later sections. In addition, further elaboration of the perception of one participant that did not recognize alignment of CCSS and their social studies curriculum is discussed with respect to a lack of curriculum knowledge. Two additional participants were less able to specify ways in which CCSS was aligned with their social studies curriculum because they thought integration was in effect already. Regarding the archival analysis, it is important to acknowledge that additions to the existing social studies curriculum were not readily, if at all, recognized by the participants in this study. References to informational text, text structures, or use of social studies content during reading instruction surfaced, but were not framed with knowing this as an addition, but rather a sensible use of reading and social studies instructional time. It was not apparent if participants knew of the additional language arts standards present in the social studies course descriptions, and no participants referenced any MAFS as part their social studies

curriculum. Although use of graphs and timelines surfaced during some conversations, this was not included as a known mathematics standard. The analysis of the archival curriculum as well as participant responses over alignment developed themes which emerged from the research. The following discussion reflects evidence over perceived alignment between CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum, gaps of this perceived alignment, as well as the role of professional development and effects of high-stakes testing on understanding CCSS and the district's expectations of elementary social studies elementary teachers with the responsibilities of teaching social studies.

Teacher perceptions over alignment between CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum emerged in several ways. First, interview data denoted alignment when referencing increased rigor in methods of thinking which resulted in the categories of higher order thinking and historical thinking skills. The greatest alignment between CCSS and the social studies occurred when referencing reading and writing skills and specifically informational text. Participant's also discussed ways in which reading skills were used to reinforce social studies instruction and how social studies content was used during reading instruction. Participants also reported varying degrees in awareness of alignment based upon their perceptions on district level support in determining ways in which CCSS was or should be aligned to the elementary social studies curriculum.

Alignment Between CCSS and the Social Studies Curriculum

Higher order thinking skills. Higher order thinking within the context of this study was defined as thinking that moves beyond memorization and includes higher levels of Webb's Depths of Knowledge (DOK), student evaluation and explanation of thought processes using academic vocabulary. The prior codes of DOK and deep thinking (DT), were merged into this

theme to better classify the participant data. As noted through the literature review, academic rigor is a featured component of SBER (Gardner & Powell, 2014; NGA, 2014; Schneider, 2015, Vinovskis, 2000). Two participants frequently used the concept of higher order thinking in their responses.

Participant #9 reported the way in which she expected her students to think clearly when using CCSS during social studies instruction.

I like their deep thinking. I like the rigor. That's it feels like it's embedded in there. Now, what teachers do with that inside of their classrooms is a different thing. But I feel like by their nature they are very complex which history is for kids. Which social studies is in my opinion. You know as a kid, I struggled with sequencing of it and all of that and finding a way to store all that information. I think that supporting those strategies really helps the kids.” (Participant #9, Interview 1, para. 36)

She continued by explaining how higher order thinking has developed in her classroom: I think just going deeper. (I feel like I’m saying the same thing). So, we tell them in the beginning of the year, we’re not here to memorize dates or names. We are really looking at these complex events that were happening that molded, you know, that, that history and in 4th grade, our state, and how do we get to where we are? ... Yeah and just the expectations of following those standards. You're hitting all that complexity and depths of knowledge that sometimes the textbooks lack. Because there’s a lot of content and a lot of information. What can I do with that so that they understand that it's not just memorize event one through ten, but let’s look at how we got really got here and how we understand each of those events. (Participant #9, Interview 1, para. 41, 44)

When asked specifically about reading skills stated in CCSS that also align to the social studies curriculum, Participant #9 said:

So, with the reading Common Core standards, we're heading into those deeper levels of understanding because we're branching off from the memorization and the regurgitation of, you know, vocabulary words, you know, dates in social studies. So, we're looking to make connections between events or between the causes and effects of different wars. (Participant #9, Interview 1, para. 68)

Participant #4 also perceived levels of higher order thinking as an alignment between CCSS and the social studies curriculum. She stated:

I think the overall expectations are kind of the same. The student still have [sic] to explain what they're doing and we have to be able to present it to them in a way this is of what is expected of you. You have to be able to do this, know this, understand this, right? Using those keywords to tell them exactly what we want from them whether defining the vocab words or demonstrating a certain topic of knowledge. (Participant #4, Interview 1, para. 44)

Like Participant #9, Participant #4 shared personal experiences as a student that affected her current teaching practices. Both participants reflected manners of thinking as students and compared this to methods of thinking used in their teaching:

In an eighth grade, we did the Civil War camp and reenact [reenactment] at a Civil War battle and so that always stuck with me and I think that that's what I remember most about social studies. That it was a real-life application, but we

definitely weren't going in as deep into, especially the literature part of it, and the general application skills that we are today. (Participant #4, Interview 2, para. 30)

The presence of CCSS has shifted thinking skills towards more depth and rigor. As presented in the literature review, students will have routine practice with complex texts established through qualitative, quantitative, and reader-task analyses (Hiebert & Mesmer, 2013; NGA, 2014).

Participant #10 acknowledged how CCSS has affected levels of thinking within her classroom and how the lack of aligned resources has prevented a full CCSS implementation within her social studies instruction. She noted:

So, well I would say the way we read the textbook has changed. We're looking at it in a deeper way, and deeper questions. Honestly though, as far as like the tests go, that hasn't changed at all and it should, but we just haven't done that. If I'm being 100% honest, but we're giving the same test that we were giving before we even got here. That's coming right from the textbook and those questions have not been updated in a Common Core way whatsoever. Like in reading you see the questions are asked in a deeper level part A and Part B and we don't have any of that in social studies. I don't want to say it's more...I don't want to say it's regurgitation, but almost, where they're having to memorize and we're not having them do like deeper activities like we should be. (Participant #10, Interview 1, para. 26)

These three participants associated higher order thinking as an objective of CCSS and a necessary instructional method for their social studies curriculum. Approaches to reading historical content now include higher order thinking which develops historical context.

Historical thinking skills. The historical thinking skills (HTS) theme emerged through conversations delving into perceived alignments between reading and writing skills stated within CCSS. No participants in this study directly used the phrase HTS, but five participants noted an awareness of close reading and the use of multiple texts to build context and arguments. CCSS does not specifically use the concept of HTS, but based on the literature (Mc Henry, 2015; Swan et al., 2015) many language arts standards within CCSS reference skills of the historian’s craft such as close reading, contextualization, corroboration, and sourcing (Stanford History Education Group, 2017). For example, LAFS.2.RI.1.3 requires students to describe the connection between a series of historical events, scientific ideas or concepts, or steps in technical procedures in a text (FLDOE, 2016), which uses the historical thinking skill of corroboration. The HTS of sourcing is directly related to LAFS.5.RI.1.1 which asks students to quote accurately from a text when explaining what the text says explicitly and when drawing inferences from the text (FLDOE, 2016). In fact, each of the thinking skills of the historian’s craft could be aligned with one of the informational reading skills stated within CCSS. Participant #4 identified several historical thinking skills used within her classroom., “So, okay, so how do we get from this to this? So, what was wrong with this article and what was right with this one? Is it a good primary source? (Participant #4, Interview 1, para. 48). She continued to elaborate on how students explain what they’re doing:

So, it's no longer just, students can do this can, demonstrate this. It's specific words like evidence based...a lot of that. Where's your proof? Where'd you get this from? Citing your sources and just having the students elaborate on the topics that there talking about. So, it's no longer just the American Revolution was this. It's this first-hand account says that the American Revolution was... So just

teaching students to make stronger writings and stronger articles of their own through that evidence. (Participant #4, Interview 1, para. 6)

Likewise, two other participants identified varying interpretive perspectives as stated objectives of CCSS and within their social studies curriculum. Participant #5 said:

But again, using that text evidence and being able to have your own opinion about something. How it affected history. So really having them pull things apart, understanding why this may have happened. Or question why it happened. And come up with their own reasons as to why it would have happened. (Participant #5, Interview 1, para. 42)

And Participant #9 relayed:

I think that primary secondary sources are. We spent a long time on that in beginning of the year, yeah and helping them look at there's different points of view to every event and when we look at something in the textbook this is just one perspective about what happened and what can we do to see other perspectives and pull information and make sure that information is credible information that we're looking at and that are credible sources. (Participant #9, Interview 1, para. 38)

Historical thinking skills were also evidenced in broader discussions over the use of informational texts. Coding for methods of higher order thinking and historical thinking skills established a greater foundation for the perceived alignment of reading and writing skills which provided the highest degree of perceived alignment between CCSS and the social studies curriculum for participants in this study.

Reading and writing skills. The greatest evidence of perceived alignment between CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum involved informational text which developed into the theme of reading and writing skills. As noted by the archival curriculum analysis, every elementary grade level has added LAFS to the social studies standards, including reading informational text. Eight participants noted some use of informational texts (such as research or primary and secondary sources), while five participants directly noted this concept during the interview process. The data in Table 3 presents perceived degrees of alignment between CCSS and social studies, and provides specific reading and writing skills identified by each participant.

The data in Table 3 also shows both concepts such as text complexity and text structures, or skills such as research and reading skills taught during social studies instruction. The participants identified forms of informational text and reading and writing skills as perceived alignments between CCSS and the district expectations for social studies curriculum. Originally, ten codes were used during the analysis process. These ten codes were reduced to seven: informational text, primary and secondary sources, research, reading skills taught during social studies instruction, social studies content during social studies instruction, text complexity and text structure. These seven codes were then consolidated into informational text based on the evolving code description. Informational text within the context of this study was described as a broad category which includes forms of texts and skills as cited under the CCSS literacy standards for informational text. After reviewing the CCSS literacy standards, it

<u>Participant</u>	<u>Alignment of CCSS and SS</u>	<u>Reading Skills Identified</u>	<u>Writing Skills Identified</u>
1	Social Studies Content During Reading Instruction Informational Text	Research Primary and Secondary Sources	Research Historical Thinking Skills
2	None	Social Studies Content During Reading Instruction	Informational Text
3	Higher Order Thinking Global View Historical Thinking Skills	Social Studies Content During Reading Instruction	Informational Text Primary Sources
4	Primary Sources	Social Studies Content During Reading Instruction Informational Text Historical Thinking Skills	Informational Text Primary Sources
5	Already Integrated	Informational Text Historical Thinking Skills	Research Informational Text
6	Text Complexity Research	Research Text Structures	Research Informational Text
7	Already Integrated	Social Studies Content During Reading Instruction	Research Informational Text
8	Text Structures Primary Sources	Informational Text Text Structures	Informational Text
9	Informational Text Text Structures	Text Structures	Text Structures Informational Text
10	Informational Text Primary and Secondary Sources	Social Studies Content During Reading Instruction Informational Text Historical Thinking Skills	Research Informational Text Primary Sources
11	Reading Skills Taught During Social Studies Instruction	Informational Text Text Structures Primary and Secondary Sources	Informational Text Historical Thinking Skills

made sense to integrate primary and secondary sources, research, reading skills taught during social studies instruction, social studies content during social studies instruction, text complexity and text structure into the consolidated code of informational text. Eventually, informational text developed into the theme of reading and writing skills based on the review of the literature.

Informational text. Six participants in this study aligned informational texts as part of reading and writing skills of the CCSS to their social studies curriculum. Using text evidence along with sourcing during writing instruction was noted by four of the participants. Participant #9 indicated:

Writing persuasively, yes, but not the FSA way at all in terms of giving them different sources and having them cite. It asks them to do none of that, but we are doing that obviously, because we know that expectation of the writing curriculum and the writing standards. It needs more, more of a correlation for sure.

(Participant #9, Interview 1, para. 52)

Participant #11 said:

Well definitely text evidence, responding to comprehension questions using text evidence. All of those things definitely tie in, but also like maps, diagrams, timelines, and photographs All of those great juicy things for reading which can also, you know, be transferred into social studies. (Participant #11, Interview 1, para. #4)

Participant #4 explained:

Main idea. All of our writing standards are anymore based on text evidence. Evaluating primary sources as opposed to secondary sources. Problem and solution, cause and effect...it's really easy to tie the two together, I just wish we

had more time to really go in-depth on what these things mean rather than this caused this and this caused this you, know? (Participant #4, Interview 1, para. 54)

Participant #3 reported:

Then if you are in 4th or 5th grade, the intermediate grades, in particular, we are very aware that the writing has shifted now, from absolutely no creative writing, to integrating reading and writing. The students being required to read three or four non-fiction passages and be able to extrapolate information necessary to respond to any prompt almost. (Participant #3, Interview 1, para. 57)

Each of these four participants referenced the use of text evidence and recognized shifts from prior expectations in writing as in being more creative or imaginative to using multiple texts to explain or inform. Some of these texts also come in the form of visual non-fiction formats such as maps, diagrams, charts, and timelines. As Participant #6 informed, “Timelines. Using encyclopedias. Using online resources. Using media resources. Integrating knowledge. I know that was a big thing this year. All the text features because I think you have to do those for your research” (Participant #6, Interview 1, para. 54). Using non-fiction texts also lends itself to writing skills needed for the research process. As participant #8 noted:

I have my students writing...writing, researching, reading constantly every day, you know, they are creating PowerPoints, they're sharing them and sharing them with the class and having class discussions. They are learning note-taking skills which is one of the requirements in the Common Core and there's things about where they have to do describe. It doesn't necessarily say where (the methodology) with which to describe, but that they have to be able to relate in

some fashion what demonstrating their comprehension and knowledge of the material being taught. (Participant #8, Interview 1, para. #50)

Research, as part of the writing process was identified by four participants, and identified twice within reading skills. Examples from the following participants reflect the presence of research as a perceived alignment of CCSS and their social studies instruction. As Participant #11 said:

From my end the research piece is really strongly aligned for both subjects areas because you have to use correct evidence, you have to know what your resources are. Are they relevant and that crossovers quite a bit. You can pretty much focus on both skills. (Participant # 11, Interview 1, para. 64)

Participant #7 used three examples of research during her interview. She remarked, “And a lot of like the research, research, the kids being history detectives,” (Participant # 7, Interview 1, para. 38). She continued, “Yes, for sure. They have been incorporated into the social studies, not just in content. The pieces of the research skills, whether it's text complexity, that kind of thing” (Participant #7, Interview 1, para. 40). We continued the conversation to specify any writing skills stated in CCSS that also aligned to the social studies curriculum:

For example, would be to compare the cultural characteristics of the five regions in the United States, Canada, Mexico and the Caribbean. And then there you can incorporate that for example into the ELA... The research pieces. The students making their own projects and showing that through technology, power point, and then presented their projects. (Participant #7, Interview 1, para. 42)

Participant #11 identified ways in which research was used to organize information, including primary and secondary sources. She stated, “I would say research, and in research there is writing, like when we teach immigration. There needs to be an understanding of immigration to

Florida and we can use primary and secondary sources to develop this history” (Participant #11, Interview, 1, para. 45). She continued, “In writing, we do editing, revising, and even outlining in research. We teach the kids to understand different kinds of information and how to determine if something is appropriate or reliable” (Participant #11, Interview 1, para. 47). As noted, discussions of research also highlighted some use of primary and secondary sources. Five participants cited the use of primary and secondary sources as an alignment between CCSS and their social studies instruction or for use during reading and writing skills instruction. As Participant #5 recounted:

I just stop and ask is that primary or secondary? And there are some documents on good old Edhelper where you are getting primary sources. Where it may be the actual photograph from the past or a journal that someone wrote when they were fighting in a war. I try to make sure I find those things, so they see it and they remember it. How do we know that? It has I, the pronoun, so that part of the lesson. So, if I can find a piece of text that can teach everything out of it that I possibly can, that's my goal. (Participant #5, Interview 1, para. 31)

Additionally, primary sources were shown to be a source of text evidence as noted by Participant #4 who explained, “A lot of text evidence. Again, I like to try to tie in that opinion writing with a primary source and that’s basically our writing standards in the text evidence and the on-grade level vocabulary,” (Participant #4, Interview 1, para. 68). Visual literacy and visual text formats are prominent features of history classrooms and were also viewed as another form of text evidence. Participant #11 spoke to the connection between CCSS and social studies curriculum with use of visual texts:

I think for me [what]...I remember is just the idea of the visual literacy and how it connects to primary sources and secondary sources and that sort of thing. I remember thinking that was a cool bridge between the two subjects because for me that's what I remember about the Common Core was a visual literacy.

(Participant #11, Interview 1, para. 48)

And when considering the types of text utilized within either language arts or social studies classrooms, two participants also spoke about text complexity as having an impact on their instructional decision making. Participant #7 discussed text complexity an integrative method between reading and social studies:

By looking at all the pieces in the ELA. Looking at the reading, writing, listening and speaking skills. Looking at finding deeper levels of text and using the social studies, like if we're working on American Revolution. Looking at the higher-level text complexity for the ELA piece. (Participant #7, Interview 1, para. #38)

When probed further about text complexity she explained:

So, you have a text that is higher level. Higher Lexile level. And is also a text that is engaging. Somehow, it's like real life making a connection to real life. We do want to make them ready for what [is] there for them in the future. (Participant #7, Interview 2, para. #2)

This participant was a former member of the Teaching American History (TAH) grant. Her perceptions mirrored some of the same training experienced during her participation with TAH, which focused more on historical content and less on pedagogy. Text complexity was perceived as an alignment between CCSS and social studies, as well as adding more possibilities for depths

of meaning and context. As a result, when more rigorous primary and secondary sources were used, social studies were more likely to be taught. Participant #11 described:

Let's see...well, I'm trying to respect social studies for what it is, more. And luckily where I teach now...there's definitely more of a respectful, respect...it's treated as [a] subject on its own. Which is wonderful, but luckily with the Common Core and it's more complex and they're real text and not watered down text. It tries to lend itself more with social studies, which I think is a great thing. (Participant #11, Interview 2, para. 32)

Using reading skills during social studies instruction. To organize interview data, the codes of primary and secondary sources, awareness of text complexity, research, text evidence, and visual literacy were consolidated under the code of informational text. The theme of reading and writing skills used a separate code to identify the use of reading skills to teach social studies content. This code was specifically mentioned by four participants. Given the noted lack of instructional time allocated to elementary social studies at the district level, and the marginalization nationwide in favor of tested subjects (Fitchett & Heafner, 2010; Fitchett et al., 2014; Heafner & Fitchett, 2010; Swan et al., 2015), the inclusion on reading skills during social studies instruction was expected. Participant #5 demonstrated her ability to align reading skills stated in CCSS and her elementary social studies content.

Well, if anything I am taking the reading Common Core and putting it, meshing it with social studies topics. And again, we haven't had new social studies books, in I don't know... who was president? I do keep them, because like the Bill of Rights hasn't changed, the Constitution hasn't changed. And I think that's the only time I pulled them out. But other than that, there's things that I've created myself, but I really use the reading standards to teach...social studies more than anything.

But again, not having the social studies Common Core...Of course, I could always go look it up for myself, but I haven't. There's just a million other things to do. But I do try to align with reading. (Participant # 5, Interview 1, para. 27)

This evidence demonstrated the use of reading skills to teach social studies and a lack of awareness of CCSS for elementary social studies curriculum. The lack of curriculum knowledge will be detailed in a later section. Based on her responses, she admitted that she was less prepared and aware of CCSS for social studies because the textbook was not aligned. As we continued our conversation, she indicated that social studies was taught with a language arts focus. She said:

Again, it's just the ELA standards and making sure that I touch on those ELA standards. Just touching on those ELA standards but getting the social studies across. But the weird thing about it is, I might have kids who have a C or D in language arts, but they have an A in social studies. And it's the same skills pretty much, but their comfort with a topic, there's a whole lot more discussion and social studies vs. sit and get it in reading. If that makes sense? Children are not afraid of social studies but adults are. (Participant #5, Interview 1, para. 57)

As Participant #5 indicated, social studies instruction was perceived as more successful when aligned with language arts standards. She also identified how connections made during social studies instruction produced more comfort and success for students. This evidence is furthered in a later section discussing the possibility and importance of an integration of language arts with social studies content. Participant #4 also perceived an alignment between CCSS and social studies by considering the overall expectations between each subject:

I think the overall expectations are kind of the same. The[students] still have to explain what they're doing and we have to be able to present it to them in a way this is of what is expected of you. You have to be able to do this, know this, understand this, right? Using those keywords to tell them exactly what we want from them whether defining the vocab words or demonstrating a certain topic of knowledge. (Participant #4, Interview 1, para. 48)

Participants identified ways in which reading was used to reinforce their social studies content. Components of the literacy standards of reading informational text of CCSS appeared throughout the interview process. Participant #10 added:

I know that main ideas [are]...huge in ELA and writing (I mean I know that's part of the ELA), but that's something we teach in every subject and definitely in social studies to just try to find the author's main idea or the main idea on a certain topic or subject. (Participant #10, Interview 1, para. 57)

One participant did not recognize specifics of CCSS, but noted an integrative approach, “No I've integrated a lot of language arts through that unit. I don't know... I would have done the same before Common Core. I would have integrated as much as possible too” (Participant #6, Interview 2, para. 20).

Based on the evidence, reinforcing text structures were perceived as viable and relevant methods for use during social studies instruction. The description of text structures, in the context of this study, considered the way in which an author sets up the text with an intended purpose (main idea, compare/contrast, problem/solution, sequencing, author's purpose). Four participants specified the use of text structures as an alignment between CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum. Participant #9 said:

I think they parallel by nature. I mean if we look at the reading standards, there is, you know, text structure: sequencing, comparing and contrasting. The textbook does a decent job in identifying those text structures. There's one on every assessment part of it. Primary and secondary sources. That is part of the reading curriculum. You could even go with point of view on that. So, I feel like they, by nature, they parallel one another. It's the teacher's job is to sit down and look at the two sets of standards that connect them. Okay, so what is textbook lacking and then they can pick up with...finding supplemental resources to merge the two together. (Participant #9, Interview 1, para. 34)

The conversation with Participant #9 continued to include examples of text structures with the use of visual literacy, “Definitely text structure. Compare and contrast is huge. They do a lot of that. Charts, maps, sequencing, cause and effect. Yeah, we do those a lot. Over and over again, in every chapter,” (Participant #9, Interview 1, para. 50). Further evidence of text structures from Participant #10 showed, “The standards is to look at the text structure that the author uses when setting up informational text and we always make that connection with our social studies textbook. The way the author presents information,” (Participant #10, Interview 1, para. 48). She continued her explanation of the use of text structures.

But when we really [look]...at the different articles, or passages and in the textbook, we can see that the authors will set up cause and effect like in the Seminole Wars, or comparing contrasting Venice, Florida to Venice, Italy. And so the author is using the text structure so the students can read it easier and understand how to read non-fiction. And I think before Common Core, I never read it like that. I just read it as nonfiction text, so I would just read it and I would

understand it, but, it just really helped me as a teacher and a reader, to be able to look at something non-fiction, oh and say the author set this up in a compare and contrast type of way or sequencing of events. (Participant #10, Interview 2, para. #16)

The perceived alignment between language arts skills and the district's expectations of the elementary social studies curriculum was determined through instructional decision making. Pedagogical decisions, like those made by Participant #10, indicate that known alignments between CCSS and elementary social studies referenced elements of literacy skills. As described, participants in this study reinforced reading skills when teaching social studies content.

Social studies taught during reading instruction. Another way in which participants perceived an alignment between CCSS and their social studies curriculum was using social studies content, such as informational texts, during their reading instruction. This method varies from using reading and writing skills during social studies instruction. The arrival of CCSS has opened relevant discourse on the direction and integration of language arts and social studies courses. The research is still developing on whether social studies content should be used to reinforce literacy skills, or if literacy is best integrated through historical texts (McHenry, 2014). Again, given the reduced instructional time afforded to elementary social studies, participants in this study used historical texts and content during their dedicated language arts instruction. Seven participants specified an alignment between CCSS and social studies content by using social studies informational texts, such as primary and secondary sources, during reading. As Participant #7 noted, "In my ELA block, I find the minutes for social studies because they go hand-in-hand. And trying to be very active and finding resources that align to the social studies

and to the ELA that I'm teaching,” (Participant #7, Interview 2, para. 26). Likewise, Participant #11 explained:

Like I said it's more placed into our reading, so I'm really trying to hit those main topic areas. We read the Constitution. We read parts of the Bill of Rights. We study the Preamble but sometimes miss the things that are more specific because we're aligning those big ideas in our ELA curriculum rather than hitting them specifically goal by goal by goal. So, the standards are more chunked rather than met individually. (Participant #11, Interview 1, para. #38)

Two other participants also commented on the use of social studies content during reading instruction often due to reduced instructional time. For example, “Yes, it’s more possible to use historical figures for example through language arts, because of the limited time we have, to use in reading passages, or a variety of other sources. I mostly teach SS during language arts,” (Participant #1, Interview 1, para. 37). “We do pull it in especially if we’re short on time. And definitely pull social studies in during our reading or ELA or something like that,” (Participant #2, Interview 1, para. 67). Based on this evidence, teachers feel more able to address their social studies curriculum but utilizing social studies content during their reading instruction, as opposed to reinforcing reading skills during social studies time.

The shift towards more informational text for standardized testing has also encouraged use of social studies content during reading as stated by Participant #8:

With the FSA testing they are using elements of social studies for the reading passages. So, in that regard I believe that there are applying reading. From everything I've seen uh the state standards I have not read anything that says that

this is specifically covering reading requirements (like in language arts).

(Participant#8, Interview 1, para. 44)

Three participants perceived that CCSS was permitting more social studies instruction by using the literacy skills stated within CCSS to teach historical content, and building an integration between the two subjects. As Participant #11 said:

So, to me those same skills even though we're learning about Florida history and honoring those standards, we are also honoring the ELA standards of analyzing and dissecting multiple ways to see text and learn about things to get a better understanding of it. (Participant #11, Interview 1, para. 50)

She continued to explain the effect CCSS has had on her social studies instruction and shared, "But I feel like with the Common Core and social studies, the Common Core is kind of inviting us to include social studies in the reading block," (Participant #11, Interview 2, para. 24).

Although not all participants recognized the interdisciplinary language stated within CCSS, some teachers have moved forward with integrating social studies and reading skills. A greater awareness in requiring more informational text and evaluating text complexity, as part of CCSS, was perceived as an alignment to several social studies standards. The notion of how CCSS has affected social studies instruction is explained by Participant #9.

To be honest, actually doing it. Like I mentioned before, I taught 3rd grade in Appleton in Forest County which is high poverty, high crime, all of that, okay? I would not do social studies every day because I felt as though those kids needed a lot of reading and a lot of math and at the time, Common Core was not out. Had I the Common Core standards of reading and social studies in front of me I would have merged those two together when I address reading, okay? So, I think now it's

made me realize I, number one, I have the time to address all subject areas that I'm required to teach and, number two, how they overlap. How an educator can very easily do social studies or science in a reading format. But not completely because you know in science you are going to want to do labs you want to do other simulated activities, but you could address certain things in you're reading block if you understood both sets of curriculum. (Participant #9, Interview 2, para. 29)

Questions #10 and #11 of Interview Protocol One asked participants to describe ways in which they have aligned CCSS to their elementary social studies curriculum, and to explain any similarities between the expectations of CCSS and the expectations of the social studies curriculum. As evidenced, eight participants perceived an alignment in the form of types of thinking used during instruction or integrating language arts and social studies content. When prompted further, all participants identified both reading and writing skills that aligned to their social studies curriculum. Although the district has added CCSS for language arts and math to the social studies curriculum at every grade level, not one participant noted this design when discussing the social studies curriculum. I was interested in determining why three participants did not perceive an initial alignment.

Gaps over the alignment between CCSS and the social studies curriculum. As previously noted, CCSS does not exist for K-5 elementary social studies, and Florida adopted a version of the standards in 2014. The district currently uses the LAFS and the MAFS at the elementary level. Chapter Two revealed several ways in which CCSS and the social studies share common objectives, including similar instructional skills in language arts and social studies. The perceived alignment was heavily influenced by how participants evaluated the district's

expectations of the CCSS versus the expectations of the social studies curriculum. Every participant recognized the emphasis of language arts and mathematics at the district level. This circumstance was based on the instructional time allocated for both language arts and math, professional development, and textbook adoptions, all of which prepared teachers and students for yearly standardized assessments in these two content areas. The participants did not necessarily have to teach ELA to understand the district's desire to perform well on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA).

Three participants did not perceive the same levels of alignment between CCSS and the social studies curriculum as the other eight participants in this study. Although evidence has been provided to suggest perceived alignments between CCSS and elementary social studies, one participant was not familiar enough with CCSS or her social studies curriculum to make such an association. Two other participants perceived that their social studies curriculum was already integrated, and therefore aligned with CCSS, but were less able to denote specific changes to their social studies curriculum as a result of CCSS. When coding this data, three codes were used when alignment was less prevalent. These three codes, being already integrated, with no support for alignment, and lacking curriculum knowledge, were then consolidated into the concept of gap. Gap was then associated with relevant literature and emerged into the theme of gap and evidenced discrepancies over alignment between CCSS and the district's elementary social studies curriculum. Based on these codes, the data evidenced three participants that could not clearly articulate ways in which CCSS was aligned to their social studies curriculum. Only when further probing into which reading or writing skills might be aligned to social studies, were these participants able to report a sense of alignment.

Participants #6 and #8 determined an alignment to their social studies curriculum but could not specify objectives or skills. Instead, their responses provided evidence that teachers perceived curriculum as being fully integrated. The code already integrated was described as the belief that CCSS was fully integrated with the social studies curriculum. For example, “I just assumed that the curriculum I’m teaching...they’re called the Florida standards, that’s supposedly based on the Common Core...but they don’t call it Common Core in Florida. They call it the Florida Standards,” (Participant #6, Interview 1, para. 44). Participant #8 added:

Well you know what? I guess I would have to be just quite frank and that is I don't think I've ever really made a parallel or put them next to each other or tried to parallel them. I guess I'm mostly operating off of C-Palms which is the state standards and I'm under the assumption that the Common Core is built into the state standards. (Participant #6, Interview 1, para. 34).

We then continued the conversation about how CCSS has affected the social studies curriculum.

He stated:

Once Common Core came out they altered the curriculum that I was familiar with, that being the standard or really what I found looking back at the time was that the standards for fifth grade social studies was a national standard and the state was in alignment with that standard, but when Common Core came they altered those standards and I don't know if those standards, the state standards or the Common Core Standards now are, uh, equal across the nation. I don't know.

I’m not sure. (Participant #8, Interview 1, para. 36).

Participants that perceived either no alignment or CCSS as already integrated, demonstrated a lack of curriculum knowledge. For the purpose of this study, a lack of curriculum knowledge

was described as a lack of awareness of existing social studies curriculum or identifying the source of curriculum as the textbook or other available resources. When asked if Participant #8 had any questions for me at the conclusion of Interview #1, he asked what I knew about how CCSS has affected the social studies curriculum. I confirmed that language arts standards had been added, along with some math standards. I noted this observation in my reflective journal recording the following:

Participant #8 is not entirely sure what is meant by alignment. He thinks that CCSS has altered his curriculum by taking social studies content out. He believes that CCSS has reduced the scope of content, as opposed to including more standards (as in LAFS) or a suggested integration. There is confusion over what is meant by CCSS affecting the social studies curriculum. (Researcher Reflective Journal, May 24, 2017)

As previously noted, the two participants who felt that CCSS and the social studies curriculum as already integrated were unable to denote any specific CCSS or social studies skills or content prior to being prompted to identify any reading or writing skills that were identified as aligned to the elementary social studies curriculum. Participant #2 was not able to specify the social studies curriculum as mentioned in the following, “The curriculum that we have, the actual curriculum... we don't we don't really have per say... they don't have books or anything like [what]...we use. I mean as far as finding that stuff ourselves and everything,” (Participant #2, Interview 2, para. #5). Based on this response, Participant #2 does not acknowledge the existing course descriptions and associates the social studies curriculum with a textbook. I annotated this association of textbook as equivalent to curriculum during the interview. I reflected on this in my journal and recorded the following:

The textbook is perceived as the curriculum, not the standards themselves.

Considering the textbook is over 10 years old, this is even more interesting. The textbook can't include reference to CCSS, and it's possible that participants have not accessed or reviewed their social studies curriculum recently. (Researcher Reflective Journal, May 29, 2017)

Accordingly, Participant #8 was not sure how CCSS had affected the language of his social studies curriculum. Participant #8 shared a similar response:

Well, I have gone and studied C-Palms and printed it out. The Common Core, what the state standards are for social studies. They're a little bit hazy. I have talked to a couple of people who have said that there are some other places that I can look for information related to Common Core or the state standards and the relationship to social studies. Plus, I talked with my colleagues, such as yourself, and are very informative and helpful...but, yeah other than that I'm not getting any guidance or direction from anybody. It's pretty much an independent exercise. (Participant #8, Interview 1, para. #2)

Based on this response and reflections in my journal regarding an awareness of existing social studies curriculum, Participants #2 and #8 are not fully aware that social studies standards exist or that social studies standards (as part of CCSS) exist as part of their curriculum. The lack of curriculum knowledge affected their ability to determine specific alignments between CCSS and their elementary social studies content. Then, when asked about CCSS has affected his teaching perspective, Participant #8 said,

My perception of what has transpired is that or how I'm dealing with it, if that's how I read your question... is that we are left to our own devices. We are just

expected to look up the... in fact, I don't think there was even ever a directive. If it wasn't for the fact was that I was working on my master's degree and plus 45, I don't think I would have even done any research into the standards of either the Common Core or for district standards. I think I would have just continued to follow the textbook outline, because communication is almost non-existent. But because of some of my coursework, I've gone and researched and looked into elements of standards and looked at the standards. And then with discussing with you and other colleagues, I have made my own decisions about what I will do, the best to align with the requirements and meet them to the best of my ability. Because the resources are so outdated, it's almost...as if I have to, in some instances, make up material for the curriculum or for the standards. (Participant #8, Interview 2, para. 11)

The degree of perceived alignment and district level communication are discussed in Chapter 5, but this evidence indicates that teachers feel unsupported about curriculum changes in both knowledge of district level expectations and instructional resources. Participant #8 was less able to describe specific standards of the Common Core and its relationship to his social studies curriculum as other participants in this study.

The two participants who felt the curriculums as already integrated revealed a belief that CCSS reduced the breadth of the social studies curriculum. Participant #8 also attributed CCSS to having reduced the scope of social studies content. Both participants associated the reduction in instructional social studies content to the adoption of CCSS. However, these changes occurred before 2014 and are not a result of Florida's adoption of CCSS. For example, "They've taken stuff out of the curriculum as you well know. It used to go through all the current and now

they've cut it back to just before the beginning of the Civil War," (Participant #8, Interview 1, para. 38). Similarly, Participant #6 perceived the same effect of CCSS on her social studies curriculum. She stated:

The only thing that I can remember that is different is that we used to teach in 5th grade, because I did teach 5th grade for a while, we used to teach the Civil War, and we don't teach that anymore or any of that time period. (Participant #6, Interview 1, para. 48)

Each of these three participants perceived an alignment between CCSS and their social studies curriculum differently than the rest of the participants in the study. Participant #2 was not familiar enough with either CCSS or her social studies curriculum to determine an initial alignment. Participants #6 and #8 saw their social studies curriculum as already integrated with CCSS, but could not specify how. A lack of curriculum knowledge was conflated with a lack of support from the district level.

No support for alignment between CCSS and the social studies curriculum. When discussing shared objectives between CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum, six participants perceived a lack of pedagogical support. Even when participants denoted an alignment between CCSS and their social studies curriculum, they identified discrepancies between the expectations of CCSS and the social studies which emanated at the district level. The practitioners' perceived a degree of alignment was often based on the district's communication of expectations of the standards with district personnel. When Participant #4 remarked about pedagogical training processes for tested subject areas, social studies practitioners have not received the same experiences. She explained:

So, when we're analyzing things, we're analyzing text, we're analyzing scientific methods, we're analyzing math problems. But that time to analyze for social studies, and really take it beyond that step of just understand and then explain, and then analyze. We're not getting to that third step, because it's an afterthought. And where not being trained on how to get to that third step. (Participant #4, Interview 2, para. #12)

According to Participant #10, the district has not provided support on current instructional practices for elementary social studies. She explained that CCSS and social studies were not referenced on instructional levels, “Well, to be honest, I never really hear the district talk about how we *should* teach social studies... Honestly, I never hear them used together. I never hear Common Core and social studies in the same sentence” (Participant #10, Interview 2, para. 19-21). She had explained during Interview 1 how she has personally aligned CCSS with her social studies curriculum. She said:

The standard is to look at the text structure that the author uses when setting up informational text and we always make that connection with our social studies textbook...it happens for us organically, but I've never been asked to look at the connection between the reading Common Core standards and the ways we teach social studies, if that makes sense? (Participant #10, Interview 1, para. 48)

Participant #10 did not reference a district directive when establishing an integration between CCSS and social studies instruction. Similarly, Participant #3 perceived an alignment, but felt unsupported in implementing instructional methods and resources. She remarked:

I do. I think that the curriculum is well aligned with the Common Core expectations. However, and this may be another question on your list as well...the

problem is we do not have adequate resources. We do not remotely have adequate resources to instruct from the current social studies curriculum as it aligns with the Common Core. For example, there are minimal primary resources that come with our social studies curriculum. And that means that either the teacher has to be very passionate in pursuing materials to teach from, online primarily, and construct her own lessons, and that is very rare. (Participant #3, Interview 1, para. 59)

She continued with her perception of district personnel and district expectations for elementary social studies. She said:

I'm sure she (K-12 program specialist) would say everything that we are doing for social studies is closely aligned with Common Core and that we are carrying that out. However, I can tell you from many years of experience that we are not carrying it out and it is sorely neglected. So, in theory we align everything in Pineapple County with Common Core and whatever the other current expectations are because we are always in the lead. In reality, however, those of us do the very best we can do with what we have to work with, as my mother would say. And we have very little to work with in terms of resources for social studies. And we have very little time because we are state testing in other areas. (Participant #3, Interview 1, para. 75)

Teacher perceptions suggested a discrepancy between the experiences of practitioners and district expectations. The gap that exists indicates a perceived lack of clarity of expectation or communication of curricular expectations.

Discussions over the district's curriculum, the instructional focus guides (IFG), surfaced during the interview process. Participant #1 noted the presence of IFGs, but not for social studies, and pointed to a lack of focus on social studies at the district level. She asserted,

I do look at the IFGs that we have for the county and I'll see everything that we're going through reading and then I do have the social studies standards. And I will try to plug in... There's not really a focus calendar for the social studies. So, I try to create my own focus calendar where I can tie in social studies into any of the skills, and genres, and any of the stuff that we are going to be learning about. And honestly, I think if social studies was a little bit more, you know, supported in the district I really believe that they could create an alignment. You know for every grade. (Participant #1, Interview 2, para. 19)

Participant # 7, who worked on creating the district's IFGs, spoke to the lack of practitioner knowledge and implementation.

So, I think the district tries with the IFG. We have created those lessons to help, but then there's the question of if the teacher is looking at the IFG and how well they are doing it. Also, I think the collaboration piece of social studies. I don't think it's there the way it should be... The collaboration piece between colleagues. You would collaborate a lot with math and ELA, ...social studies may not be as well. (Participant #7, Interview 2, para. 8)

Two other participants referenced a perceived lack of instructional support which prevented an understanding of widespread alignment between CCSS and social studies curriculum. The alignment of CCELA and social studies was affected by resources and dedicated instructional time. Instructional time and resources are described in a later section, but the following evidence

illustrates that acknowledgement district level support is needed to integrate CCSS and social studies. Participant #9 stated:

And I think if the district addressed that with teachers and provided them with resources and assistance, you might get teachers to actually teach social studies during their reading block. Because you get a lot of especially in third grade, I don't have a lot of time to teach it. I'm prepping kids for FSA. They have to pass the FSA, and I'm doing a lot of math and a lot of reading. You could merge science, no not science, social studies, into reading if they saw that connection between the standards. (Participant #9, Interview 2, para. 26)

Similarly, Participant #5 noted that pedagogical awareness of social studies was also inhibited:

But I couldn't tell you what she taught in social studies. No she did *Time for Kids*. Because that's comfortable when you don't know anything else. And not that she didn't do a great job whatever that cover story, but that's not social studies. It's current events, which is a part of social studies. But you know you have to have a beginning and an end to you whatever you are teaching. So, it's not being addressed, and I feel bad, and they're not going to get it until they get to middle school. (Participant #5, Interview 1, para. 61)

Not one participant praised the district for clarity in changes or expectations for the Common Core and few professional development opportunities for the social studies were known to be offered, or taken, by any of the participants. All participants lamented the fact their social studies was not important to the district. This is evidenced by the lack of instructional time, nonexistent integration of either LAFS or MAFS with social studies curriculum, physical resources such as textbooks, or professional development opportunities devoted to social studies. All participants

knew that reading and math were high priorities, but had difficult reconciling why social studies was not considered more relevant. The lack of standardized testing downgraded the presence of social studies as an equal to reading and math and almost disregarded it as a content area. Nine of eleven participants noted how easily ELA and social studies could and should be integrated to increase its prominence for elementary students. The following section details the participants' evidence on the effects of high-stakes testing and district level professional development.

Instructional Time and Resources

Initial coding of the interview data determined six theory driven codes as affecting the perception of alignment or understanding the expectations of CCSS and the district's social studies curriculum. The codes, high-stakes testing, lack of time, less priority, textbook, additional resources, and student interest, were consolidated into the category of instructional time and resources. The theme of instructional time and resources, emerged after reviewing the literature on the marginalization of social studies, particularly at the elementary level, due to favored tested subjects such as reading, writing, mathematics, and science. Two teachers felt that utilizing existing test scores could improve the importance of social studies across the district. Two participants proposed social studies becoming a tested subject. As a tested subject, social studies would receive equitable instructional time, resources, and respect.

The data in Table 4 shows how teachers in this study comprehended similarities between CCSS and their social studies curriculum. Table 4 also indicates how participants perceived the effect on their social studies curriculum with the adoption of CCSS.

As previously noted, the most frequent themes emerging from data over the perceived alignment between CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum was the use of higher order thinking, historical thinking skills, and reading and writing skills (and concepts merged

within the theme of informational text under reading and writing skills). Teachers in this study also perceived varying degrees of the effect of CCSS on their social studies curriculum, ranging from no effect as with Participants #2 and #10, to affecting the instructional methods used during reading and/or social studies. Two participants indicated the inconsistencies between social studies versus tested subjects with regards to resources and instruction. The concept of high-stakes testing surfaced frequently and noted by six participants. Much of this conversation reflected priorities for tested subjects over social studies, reducing instructional time perceived irrelevance for social studies instruction.

<u>Participant</u>	<u>Similar Expectations Between CCSS and SS</u>	<u>How Adoption of CCSS Has Affected SS</u>
1	Research	Need to Secure Additional Resources
2	None	No Effect
3	Primary Sources Global View	More Higher Order Thinking
4	Higher Order Thinking	Social Studies Content During Reading Instruction Frequent Use of Historical Thinking Skills
5	Informational Text Primary and Secondary Sources Global View	Less Instructional Social Studies Time Lack of Consistency for Social Studies Instruction Across District Schools
6	Already Integrated	Reduction in Scope of Social Studies Curriculum
7	Research Text Complexity Informational Text	Increased Awareness of Curriculum Standards
8	Already Integrated	Reduction in Scope of Social Studies Curriculum Social Studies Text Altered for Political and Culturally Sensitivity
9	Higher Order Thinking Primary and Secondary Sources Historical Thinking Skills	More Higher Order Thinking
10	Text Structures	No Effect
11	Historical Thinking Skills Informational Text	Frequent Use of Historical Thinking Skills Reading Skills Taught During Social Studies Instruction

Instructional Time

Effects of high-stakes testing. Allocated instructional time across the district varied per school and per classrooms for the participants in this study. Instructional time for social studies is not mandated by the district. The district mandates that reading, mathematics, and physical education is taught on a weekly basis. Four hundred and fifty minutes is allocated for reading, 300 minutes for math, and 225 minutes for physical education per week. The district complies with Florida statute 1008.25, requiring the student progression of social studies content from one grade to another, but the official instructional time is not mandated (K-12 Program specialist, Personal communication, September 13, 2017). Participants did not feel there was adequate instructional time allotted for social studies because it is not a tested subject at the elementary level. As Participant #5 stated,

It's not stressed. It's not stressed at all. You might as well say it's not even important and I wish we had a test. I really wish we did because my kids would do really well on it. But it's not. It's like why even have a social studies department? It's not even pushed. (Participant #5, , Interview 1, para. 48)

Three other participants had similar sentiments based on the presence of high-stakes tests and its effect on instructional time. For example, "The bottom line is that there is no state test for social studies, so it is the very last subject to be addressed and often gets completely squeezed out by language arts, math, and science in the state of Florida," (Participant #3, Interview 1, para. 57). The association between instructional time and standardized tests was evidenced by Participant #7, "Because it's not tested. (Laugh) And when we are looking at the 5th grade, we test the science, ELA, and math. But you don't test social studies," (Participant #7, Interview 1, para. #60). The effects of high-stakes testing resulted in the instructional time allocated for elementary

social studies. One variable considered when addressing the degree of alignment between CCSS and elementary social studies was the allocation for instructional time for social studies. When asked to discuss the district's expectations of CCSS and social studies, participants shared that a lack of dedicated time influenced their evaluation of district expectations. Their perceptions suggest that the district values language arts and math more than the social studies curriculum most often because of the absence of fully dedicated blocks of instructional time across the district. The data in Table 5 reflects instructional time teachers averaged on a weekly basis.

<u>Participant</u>	<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>School SES</u>	<u>Minutes per week</u>
1	4	Low	60-90
2	3	Low	9-10
3	5	Low	10
4	5	Low	60-90
5	5	Low	60-90
6	4	Low	150
7	3	Middle	180
8	5	High	300
9	4	High	240-270
10	4	High	240-270
11	3	High	120

Notes: School SES is primarily determined by the district's reporting of the proportion of students receiving free and reduced lunch.

The minutes per week was reported by the individual participants. These times are determined at the discretion of the school or individual teachers. Participant #9, who previously taught in a low

socio-economic status school, disclosed how school socio-economic status impacts time spent on teaching social studies. She acknowledged,

So, I taught in Floral County for 3 years. The first year of three years were very low socioeconomic, high poverty, high drug, you know crime rates, all of that, so our main focus was reading and math. So, we would spend all day doing that. So, I guess the expectation was to teach all the subjects but realistically math and reading. (Participant #9, Interview 1, para. 14)

School rankings were not part of this study; however, school-level socio-economic status was reported by each participant. The status was confirmed by the district's 2016-2017 data report which included the percentage of economically disadvantaged students. Percentages above 60% are classified as low and below 30% are classified as high. Based on this data, schools in this district with lower socio-economic status, as in Title-I, had the lowest weekly averages of social studies instruction. As discussed in the literature review, low SES students are less likely to receive as much social studies instruction as their more economically advantaged peers (Pace, 2012; Wills, 2007), but more instructional time does not always equate to quality instructional time (Fitchet et al., 2014). Four participants explained how instructional time for social studies was managed when perceived as less important to tested subject areas. For example, one teacher shared, "Because we are given a choice of 30 minutes of science or social studies a day, social studies doesn't always get priority, but I try with reading," (Participant #1, Interview 1, para. 35). Furthermore, two teachers revealed that they alternate social studies instruction with science, resulting in weeks where no social studies instruction occurs. Participant #6 explained her scheduling where she alternated between ELA and social studies instruction.

I do a fusion of social studies. So, every two weeks, I do a whole week of social studies instead of the language...it's the language arts instruction, but it's a fusion of the social studies, so I go out of the designated reading book and I do social studies for a whole week. So, I do two weeks in the reading book and then I do a week of social studies. (Participant #6, Interview 1, para. 16)

Alternating social studies and science was mentioned only from teachers from lower socio-economic schools and was reported from two of the five teachers at these schools. It was reported that reading and mathematics were a top priority until the high stakes state testing in late winter or spring. Alternating between science and social studies, or replacing language arts with social studies scheduling, is one of several designs that social studies teachers employ, but is not always replicated by other colleagues within a school. Instructional time for social studies was also affected by the knowledge of CCSS and the social studies curriculum. Participant #7 stated,

Well, there's a big piece of time. There is not time for having to meet all those good social studies standards and in the amount of time we have in the day. And that's why you have to integrate them. And if you're not very knowledgeable yourself, it's very hard to integrate the subject. (Participant #7, Interview, 1, para. 58).

Participant #5 teaches at a very low socio-economic status school and although she did not see much alignment between CCSS and social studies, her instruction was influenced by district level expectations that she did not perceive as consistent. She stated:

...but when you talk about Common Core, you're speaking about commonalities. That's not happening in social studies because what I feel is important and curriculum per se, and you can't teach anything without a broken hand.

Whereas in math, every math teacher is teaching the same thing. And in ELA we're teaching the same thing. And in science [as]...well. But that's not happening in social studies, because it becomes a time thing. Like mine, where we have kids that are just so far behind. Social studies is just not your priority. Honestly, it's not. It's on the schedule and many times *Time for Kids*, that was your social studies grade...(Participant #5, Interview 1, para. 35)

The evidence on reduced amounts of social studies instructional time illustrates the perceived negative effect of high-stakes testing for elementary social studies. An associated consequence of the accountability movement has generated the perception of unimportance and lack of priority for social studies content across the district.

Less Priority

As previously discussed, participants had an opinion on the district's expectations of the field of social studies and their curriculum. All participants expressed that social studies was not a district priority. The code of less priority was an initial code used and consolidated with instructional time and resources. This code was described as the perception of social studies as less of a priority based on the lack of an associated high-stakes test. Greater attention towards reading, writing, math, and science often occurred across the district. Participant #1 explained:

I really don't see the district really having a lot care at all with social studies and if that's because of the testing. The state doesn't require social studies on anything until students get into high school. You know there's just there and of course, but I don't see the district having a strong expectation for social studies at all.

(Participant#1, Interview 1, para. 63)

The conversation with Participant #1 continued on the influences of expectations between CCSS and social studies. She said:

I don't think they would unless we could incorporate some kind of scores because everything seems to be about testing and scores now unfortunately. I think it would be more of a thing where if they had a few different teachers who were just kind of doing it on their own and found their way, but I really do think there needs to be some kind of assessment for the county to go, yeah, this is worth it.

(Participant #1, Interview 2, para. 32)

When considering the role of accountability measures for students and teachers Participant #7 discussed how high-stakes testing could be advantageous towards increasing perceived levels of importance for the subject across the district.

I think it has to start somewhere and...I do think that it can be more level if teachers are aware of how they can teach, how they can integrate ELA with social studies. And then when you do an ELA test, maybe even have that, we are teaching this in the social studies and in ELA. Can we have a little assessment piece for the social studies? A small little assessment piece. So maybe you can quiz your children, your students, for the standards they are being taught. Because right now we don't really have any assessment in the social studies. (Participant #7, Interview 1, para. 84)

Similarly, changes to social studies curriculum, as a result of CCSS and associated high-stakes, reflected a discomfort in pedagogy as Participant #5 explained:

For me, it hasn't changed because it's like I love social studies. I have colleagues who aren't comfortable. The joke is, you teach my writing, I'll teach your social

studies...Because everybody's not comfortable. Who does research? I do my own thing. Everyone is not willing to do that. Social studies is not tested. It's not enforced. It's not important to the district. But I think if they were going to put social studies with the ELA department I think that would be a great match. But as a stand-alone, it does not exist. (Participant #5, Interview 1, para. 51).

Testing on subjects other than social studies has had effects on the importance and resources for social studies instruction. Participant #11 stated:

a lot of us in the district were driven by the FSA movement, the testing movement. And right now, unfortunately, and in some ways it's cool because you don't have to worry about the major testing for social studies. But on the other hand, but if we did have social studies in the FSA game, we'd probably have a lot more resources. We'd have a lot more books. And I don't know who makes those decisions. I think it's bigger than us. I think you know, there has to be a shift in mindset I guess in general because really that's what it's about. (Participant #11, Interview 2, para. 55)

As Participant #4 put it:

I don't see it being pushed from the district. I see it in the in the Common Core Standards. I don't see it being pushed by the district because, like I said last time, social studies has become that afterthought. Let's plug it in science or let's just plug it in into reading. It's no longer its own course. (Participant #4, Interview 2, para. 12)

Similarly, Participant #9 stated:

All the emphasis is put [on] Common Core reading and math. I really feel [as] if those two subjects are put on the forefront and social studies, and I feel that science as well, get put on the back burner. I've heard from, this is the only school that I've taught in this district, I've also taught in another district for a few years, but we've heard from other elementary teachers that they don't even get a textbook. We get a textbook at least. They have no materials. They get the Florida weekly paper and it feels as though it's not there's not an extreme emphasis on the expectation to teach social studies. (Participant #9, Interview 2, para. 23)

Participant #11 stated:

Do you understand math? Do you understand English language arts? And then a few years later because we do have some amazing people at our district level who are incredible social studies folks but it first we got to do math we got to do reading and then later it came. (Participant #11, Interview 1, para. 34)

She continued to describe the differences in expectations for social studies versus tested content areas in elementary grades.

I just feel so bad for social studies because it is kind of like the red-head stepchild. Science gets its own textbook. Science gets its own FSA. ELA gets its own FSA. Math gets its own FSA. You don't even see social studies coming into 7th grade and it's not even that much...it doesn't hold that much weight. So, I feel like it's always with I know I always felt social studies, eh, it's good to know. You know as far as the state of Florida, and not sure about the other states, but I always feel like we're trying to create citizens here which I feel like it just a big part of

teaching in general. And again it's part of on the backburner. You know what I mean? (Participant #11, Interview 2, para. 26)

When asked about first hearing about CCSS, Participant #5 shared:

I have to be honest with you, I have not heard about the Common Core State Standards for social studies. Of course science is pushed at us, reading is pushed, math is pushed at us. It's almost like you put social studies on your schedule and if you get to it you get to it, and if you don't... But it's something I just love so much so I just try to add things where I can within the reading block, ...I hate to say that I'm comfortable with or things that I know that they need to know in middle school. (Participant #5, Interview 1, para. 11)

She continued to explain how CCSS has affected her social studies curriculum.

Well, it would be the fact that we don't have it. The kids are not learning the same thing. Kids at Willow School and Oak School are not learning the same thing in social studies. Because it's not pushed by the district, there is no concern for it. That's the thing. The concern again comes under reading. (Participant #5, Interview 2, para. #35)

The findings do not deduce if participants felt as though the district intended for social studies to be addressed through language arts, or if social studies should be used as a vehicle to reinforce reading and writing. Participants more often felt that it was sensible, often because of their passion for the content, to infuse social studies into language arts, even if this was not necessarily the intention of the district. Participant #3 discussed specific reading skills that aligned to her social studies curriculum and then explained that by grade five, science as a tested subject area, received more priority. She said:

The students being required to read three or four non-fiction passages and be able to extrapolate information necessary to respond [to] a prompt almost. And so, from the social studies standpoint, ideally, it would be very helpful to have a variety of primary resources at our fingertips in the form of reading passages. So that students can at the same time practice getting those writing skills, reading and writing skills under their belts, while at the same time getting their social studies content. Typically, those prompts that we get for writing practice, or the writing test or the literature material we get, is often science related which is good, or other current events. And not, in fact, the dozens of the samples used over the last three years, I can't think of one that was history related, as far as social studies.

(Participant #3, Interview 1, para. 68).

Based on the examination of the social studies curriculum after the adoption of CCSS, the perceived discrepancies over alignment and expectations is logical. The addition of LAFS and MAFS to the existing social studies curriculum does not resolve the district's expectation and the lack of integration of LAFS and MAFS and does not indicate if the intention of social studies is to reinforce reading, writing, or math skills. Most participants agreed that the district considers social studies content as an effective method when infused into the language arts instructional block. However, given the lack of instructional time and priority to teach social studies, participants often addressed their instructional resources.

Instructional Resources

Textbook. The consolidated code of instructional resources developed from three initial codes of textbook, additional resources, and student interest. The district has not adopted a new social studies textbook in over 10 years. The available textbooks are not aligned with CCSS, and

in some cases, there are no textbooks in use at the elementary level. None of the participants reflected that their social studies instruction relied solely on the textbook, but the lack of a recent adoption, and with no adoption in sight, was disappointing. Per the perceptions gathered in the study, if social studies mattered at a district level, teachers would have physical resources from which to build their instruction. One teacher explained, “A new source of teaching social studies, a new textbook, for lack of a better of a better word, is not happening. It's not on the horizon,” (Participant #8, Interview 1, para. 56). The discussion of the textbook, or lack thereof, was often associated or a consequence of reduced instructional time and prioritization at the district level.

Participant #5 stated:

If you're going to be serious about social studies, and needs to be given the same respect as science does and that reading does... You don't have to go from page 1 to page 300, but the kids have something to turn to... You could go on the Internet all day long and find information, but having a physical book in hand... I mean honestly, we haven't had a textbook in a long time. (Participant #5, Interview 1, para. 65).

I responded that the district had not adopted a new textbook since 2006. She continued

See? Why? I think you could really strengthen reading by having that social studies curriculum because they're going to try and find that academic vocabulary, those vocabulary words in there to really talk about those eight ways of thinking. Again, marrying those two things. You would strengthen reading. (Participant #5, Interview 1, para. 67).

Three other participants expressed the importance of having an aligned social studies text to CCSS. However, without perceived support on alignment between CCSS and the elementary

social studies curriculum from the district level, some teachers are unsure how to address CCSS within their social studies content. Participant #8 stated:

Also, that we have not adopted you know... Haven't had a new textbook in a while now. And many, many years that is updated to the Common Core State Standards. So, we cannot really rely on the pieces. Teachers are resourceful and they're looking for their own pieces. (Participant #8, Interview 1, para. 62).

Additionally, the lack of an aligned text represented a lack of respect for the social studies.

Participant #6 recalled:

A few years ago... I don't know what happened... but a few years ago I was on the social studies textbook adoption committee. And we went through a whole thing and then we even had it down to a book and then it didn't get funded. And I remember working on that for a long time and it was quite a disappointment. So, ...we have not had a new social studies textbook for I don't know? Is it going on 15 years now? It's really...laugh... something. (Participant #6, Interview 2, para. 32).

The textbook is viewed as a viable resource. When asked about future opportunities to impact the district's expectations of the CCSS on social studies, aligned resources was often stated, especially in light of limited trainings or other professional development at the district level.

Participant #11, a veteran teacher of 14 years, expressed the frustrations teachers have faced:

I think the biggest thing, and I don't know if the district has any control over this, but we've GOT to get more resources. Luckily again, in our district, we've got some, incredible, incredible social studies professional development people. But I don't think that's everywhere. And it'd be nice to have and our textbooks are

probably like 20 years old? And ya know, third grade curriculum is totally different from what it used to be. And I don't know I just feel like we need more support that way. I mean they tell us that we have these readers or with *Reading Wonders*. But it's still not aligned 100% with what we need to cover. So, there's a lot of preplanning we have to do. And I'd love to have more and I know we're trying. I know we have the IFGs or whatever, but we've got to have more accessibility to resources for the teachers. We're just pulling our hair out all the time? (Participant #11, Interview 2, para. 53)

As described, the presence and use of physical resources was considered a priority for elementary social studies teachers. However, not all teachers in this study, perceived the textbook as a staple resource or of instructional value. Interview data was also coded to reflect additional resources reported by classroom practitioners, which also evidenced the effects of high-stakes testing on social studies instruction.

Additional resources. The description of additional resources, for the purpose of this study, was the use of sources outside of the textbook, including Teachers Pay Teachers (TPT), online lessons and documents. TPT is a popular online educational marketplace featuring original educational resources. As noted, the lack of a recently adopted textbook, unfamiliarity the social studies curriculum, and the perceived alignment between CCSS and the social studies, determined the use of additional resources. For example, the awareness of informational text and its relationship to social studies content was explained in the following, “We, I, try to move outside of the reading text, to pull in additional resources for reading instruction. Specifically, I use informational text to align to the history standards,” (Participant #1, Interview 1, para. 35). Some of those texts come in the form of educational publishers. For example, “Well in that case

it would be more like non-fiction, nonfiction text or paragraphs and we use a lot with *National Geographic*, or *Scholastic News*, or *Time for Kids*. Also *Readworks*,” (Participant #7, Interview 1, para. 55). The lack of social studies curriculum knowledge and available text has influenced not only the resources, but the approach to integration between CCELA and the social studies.

As Participant #2 stated:

I did not align it. It's all drawn out for me. Like I said, they give us a map that gives us... every day mapped out what is the lesson and then the standards for every day of the week. We use a lot of Teachers Pay Teachers. There is no third-grade social studies text, just to let you know. We really don't have a specific direction. We make it ourselves. (Participant #2, Interview 1, para. 57).

When asked to consider any differences between CCSS and the district’s social studies expectations, Participant #2 explained how an integration between language arts and social studies has occurred because their instructional decision making has been based on the lack of district sponsored resources. Resources beyond a textbook are required to teach their curriculum.

I feel like our social studies curriculum is mostly embedded into everything else. So, if we’re doing it, and in language arts if we were teaching women’s rights then usually that’s when we bring something like that into social studies...and that’s why we try to do that because we don’t actually have the books or the curriculum, or the supplies we need, so that’s how we do it. (Participant #2, Interview 2, para. 17 and 19)

Generating additional resources was often dependent on the available textbook and the perception of alignment between CCSS and social studies content. As Participant #1 stated

In social studies, the standards are based on previous standards. We don't have a current text that integrates the Common Core. Therefore, teachers need to be creative and figure out how to blend the two together. It's not really clear.

(Participant #1, Interview 1, para. 41)

The perception that district sponsored resources directly influenced instructional decision making was also evidenced by Participants #9 and #10. Both teachers felt that tested subjects were greater priorities and received better resources at the district level. Preparing social studies materials aligned to CCSS was influenced by existing materials for tested subjects such as reading or math. Participant #9 stated:

And if we're being completely honest, we don't really like social studies... we don't like teaching it. We struggle with it because there's not a lot of resources. There's not a lot of things at the district's giving us, so we crafted these subjects of reading and...math and we're so good at it, and that we have mastered that, we want to move over to other subject. I think it's just our expectations have just spilled over into other subjects. (Participant #9, Interview 2, para. 59)

The ways in which the social studies curriculum is different today after the adoption of CCSS also generated discussions over resources. Experiences with resources prior to CCSS, and recent experiences with the digital educational marketplace known as Teachers Pay Teachers (TPT), was also noted by Participant #10:

So different. Because when I was working at another school and it wasn't Common Core driven, I just remember opening up a reading textbook, going over vocabulary terms, reading the story that was in the textbook, asking the comprehension questions that the book gave us, and then giving a test on

Fridays. And so when Common Core came along, it really forced me to look at what I was doing. It has forced me teach deeply and really Teachers Pay Teachers has also forced me to teach more rigorously because people are making resources that align to the Common Core curriculum, so I'm able to see what other teachers are doing in other states to meet those standards. And then from there, I was able to make my stuff way more challenging for my students and get them [thinking]...deeper, and like I said before, it carries over into social studies.

(Participant #10, Interview 2, para. 64)

Participants in this study explained how instructional resources impacted the quality of their social studies instruction. The perceived lack of aligned resources influenced teacher's awareness over alignment between CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum and influenced their perceptions of the district's expectations for their social studies content.

Student interest. Instructional decision making was also predicated on an awareness of student interest. The lack of instructional time for social studies versus tested subjects encouraged one participant to develop real world connections for the social studies experiences in her classroom. Working in a Title 1 school which was not seen as encouraging the same priority for social studies, as reading or math, inspired the participant to rely on student interest.

As Participant #4 expressed:

I'm just trying to get the kids to see the importance of it and kind of teach them skills that are going to help them. If it's something that they're interested in being able to learn outside of our social studies block and outside of ELA block. So, for example we take our 5th graders to EPCOT. And we take them to EPCOT for the specific reason, you can go to the American Experience there, which teaches the

American Revolution, which is our main thing in 5th grade. So, I kind of point out to them how we can find social studies and analyze historical events all around us.

(Participant #4, Interview 2, para. 22)

She then continued:

So, I had students that were interested in that Weekly Wrap and wanted to know what was going on in the world. I probably wouldn't do that with a class that wasn't as interested with it because with only so much time, I want to make sure we're hitting on the events, the themes, and the other things that applied to again them. And things that they're actually going to look into in their future because, with limited time, you want to make sure you're hitting the things that are going to stick with them. (Participant #4, Interview 2, para. 26)

As previously described, the perceived effects of high-stakes testing was associated with the instructional time for social studies and availability and quality of instructional resources.

Participants either noted a degree of alignment between CCSS and social studies and could secure appropriate resources, or felt the strong need for an aligned social studies text.

Instructional decision making was also based on knowledge of resources and developing connections between resources and student interest. Participants also reported varying degrees of curriculum awareness based on perceived availability or attendance of district level professional development. The following section discusses the influence of professional development on the ways in which elementary social studies teachers addressed the degree of alignment they perceived between CCSS expectations and the district's elementary social studies expectations.

District Level Professional Development

Initial coding of interview data determined two different codes when referencing professional development. An awareness of CCSS and social studies curriculum, along with any perceived degrees of alignment, was determined by two themes which emerged, standards training and curriculum delivery and integration. Participants' discussion of future needs of district level professional development is provided in a later section. Participants were asked about how they learned about CCSS, and how the district shared CCSS with instructional personnel. Two follow up interview questions asked about attendance to CCSS trainings and trainings devoted to social studies curriculum. The data in Table 6 identifies how participants first heard about CCSS, how the district shared CCSS, and what they perceived as influencing their understanding of the expectations of CCSS and their social studies curriculum.

The data in Table 6 shows variances in how participants first became aware of the adoption of CCSS. The most frequent method of becoming informed was through faculty meetings, although media outlets, college coursework, and curriculum activities were also represented. One participant does not recall having ever been informed of CCSS. The most popular method noted by participants in which the district shared CCSS was through the curriculum itself, though the district's portal known as Blackboard or provided in hard copy format, or through curriculum activities such as trainings and writing opportunities. Two major themes then emerged: standards training and curriculum delivery.

Participant	First Heard about CCSS	District Sharing of CCSS	Influences in Understanding Expectations of CCSS and SS
1	College Parent	Blackboard Standards Trainings	Peers Florida Humanities Council (FHC)
2	School Curriculum Map	Standards Trainings Book Study	Trainings Team Members
3	Faculty Meeting News Media	Faculty Meeting	Workshops and Trainings at District and School Levels
4	College	District Did Not Share	Team Leader Student Interest
5	Not Aware of ever hearing	District Did Not Share	Personal Dedication for Social Studies
6	Faculty Meeting	Curriculum Writing	Understanding/Interpreting Standards
7	District Curriculum Committee	Blackboard Curriculum Writing for the Instructional Focus Guide (IFG)	Teaching American History Grant (TAH)
8	Faculty Meeting	Blackboard Faculty and Team Meetings	Extra Coursework Higher Education
9	Online Forums and Blogs	No Distinctive Directive News Reports about the State and County Adoption	Schedule of School Day (Dedicated Block of Instructional Social Studies Time) Student Interest
10	Parents (District Employees)	No Distinctive Directive Facilitated by Site Administrator and Provided Hard Copy of Standards	Understanding/Interpreting standards
11	News Media Faculty Meetings	Standards Trainings	Understanding/Interpreting Standards Teachers

Standards Training

This code was described as any professional development offered at district or school levels in English language arts, math, science, social studies, or visual arts. The various training

offerings often included detecting differences in the language of previous standards by unpacking the current standards. Awareness over alignment and district expectations was evidenced when referred to training on CCSS. Five participants reflected on some of the training they attended. For example, “So, trainings have been on unpacking and how to apply the standard to our content,” (Participant #1, Interview 1, para. #20) and “Initially language arts because that’s what we rolled out first, and then a great deal of math training...I’ve probably been to two or three math trainings a year for the last 3 years. Some half day, some full day,” (Participant #3, Interview 1, para. 49) Additionally, Participant #11 recalled,

I remember seeing documents where they had the typical Florida standards and then the Common Core standards and then there was a workshop. It wasn't a mandatory workshop that you could go to over the summer where they were trying to break it down in a true professional development they were trying to break it down for us and...” (Participant #3 Interview 1, para. 20)

Only one participant identified training devoted to the social studies curriculum and CCSS. Responses referred most often to no trainings, or trainings that involved a minor inclusion of social studies content as noted in this statement, “I don't think I've been to a single training that has been like directed really focused on social studies. Sometimes that arts integration will include an informational text that will be historical, but it's never the main topic of discussion,” (Participant #4, Interview 1, para. 28). Descriptions of district level training was positive, but extremely limited for social studies content and instruction. Similarly, Participant #3 confirmed:

The training is excellent. We bring in, in my opinion, some of the best trainers out of cases the best trainers in the nation. We have access to, in addition to our own trainers in the county. I'm constantly, we're constantly doing professional

development. Constantly growing and learning and we have access to that through workshops and training. I just love going to conferences. As far as the social studies, however, again, that has been minimal. I'm trying to think right now if I recall any specific professional development on social studies. And I don't.

(Participant #3, Interview 1, para. 85)

Although recollected social studies training at the district level was rare, Participant #2 benefitted from some training at her school level. She said:

I'd have to say none, but I'd have to say that Dr. Hollen is one of the trainers and she does the thinking maps and always, always pull social studies in. So, includes it into thinking maps and shows you how to include the Common Core with social studies. And also I believe the Unpacking, the Unpacking the Common Core and they show you how you can work in ELA into social studies together. And it's not like it is for social studies. (Participant #2, Interview 1, para. 49)

As previously noted, participants in this study either identified an awareness of CCSS as a result of training on the standards sponsored by the district or through digital access to the standards, without any specified training.

Curriculum Delivery and Integration

The description of this initial code included district level professional development in which teachers were provided training on the language of ELA and SS standards, including the online repository of Instructional Focus Guides (IFG) and asked to provide lessons matching the standards. Some teachers worked with integrating the district adopted reading textbook with social studies content. This code was eventually consolidated into district level professional development along with standards training, and identified as the theme of district level

professional development. Two teachers in this study wrote curriculum for the district, but only one of those two teachers identified this as an attempt to align CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum and provide teachers with updated resources. Examples from Participant #1, “It would have been online through Blackboard. We can access this as teachers,” (Participant #1, Interview 1, para. #18) and Participant #7, “They were released through the district website, through administration discussion, and team meetings,” (Participant #7, Interview 1, para. #19) demonstrate the participants’ perceptions on how the district shared CCSS with elementary practitioners. Only a few dozen teachers in the county were invited to participate in this development. The district placed these lesson plans and guides on their employee curriculum portal. There was no recollection that any training at the district level was provided to instructional personnel in using these guides. However, some teachers within the district were former members of the district’s Teaching American History (TAH) grant and have brought advanced social studies pedagogy to their school sites. I had been a member of the same TAH cohort as Participant #7 and facilitated similar trainings and curriculum writing opportunities. Participant #7 was the only teacher in this study who reported participating in training for CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum. She was part of the district’s initiative to develop social studies lesson plans and instructional guides referencing CCSS. She reported the IFG as the district’s method for sharing an alignment between CCSS and social studies content by stating, “They started to build up the Blackboard resources for us. The IFG. The instructional Focus Guide. Created small focus groups and create lessons and integrate that in ELA. Sharing through workshops” (Participant #7, Interview 1, para. 24). Additionally, she perceived an integration of CCELA and social studies through the adopted reading textbook as evidenced by, “I have done the social studies that was part of integrating...Actually was it two years ago,

where we integrated the social studies with the reading series? I have been doing the IFG on Blackboard with social studies,” (Participant #7, Interview 1, para. 26). Although two other participants referenced Blackboard as a method of sharing CCSS from the district level, it was never mentioned as a source of influence in understanding alignment between CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum, or the district’s expectations for CCSS and social studies instruction. Based on the intimate association with the TAH cohort, and the intensive training received over three years as a member of the program, the findings of this study reflect an awareness of historical thinking skills and aligned reading and writing skills with the social studies curriculum.

CCSS and Social Studies Integration

Based on the overall lack of knowledge or use of the district’s IFGs, the code of awareness was used to denote the frequency and degrees of awareness of CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum. For the purpose of this study, though, this code was described as the teacher awareness of curriculum standards (close read, evaluation, and interpretation of standards for routine implementation) and the integration of reading and social studies standards, including historical thinking skills and civic mindedness. As previously described, participants acknowledged an alignment between reading and writing skills and their social studies curriculum. Nine participants identified an alignment, but did not specify a district expectation for this alignment. Participant #1 conveyed:

Yes. I will be honest with you. I don't personally believe that the district really has a lot of expectations for social studies, which is a big bummer for me. I just don't think that they have it there. The Common Core, the alignment they're looking for though, when it comes to reading, informative text, being able to do research,

even the speaking and listening, which is just so huge now. You need the students to be able to present and to create technological projects and stuff that all deal with language arts, could be so easily incorporated into the social studies standards. And be a way to really boost social studies in the district, but I don't see them doing it. I don't see it as being something that's really important.

(Participant #1, Interview 1, para. 59)

Unless the district established a clear directive through professional development integrating CCSS and social studies, participants observed an inability for teachers to establish this alignment organically as stated by Participant #1.

...And I also do a lot of Arts integration in my classroom and so social studies is another opportunity for me to really use the social studies in there. But, a lot of you know, most teachers, that I know, don't have that focus. (Participant #1, Interview 1, para. 69)

The integration of CCELA and social studies was identified by Participants #3, #9, and #10.

Participant #3 said:

They certainly can be easily interrelated. As I recall it is not specified in the social studies curriculum, per se. I think it's highly assumed there was reading skills are going to come into play. The great news is that the old textbook that we have, and I think I'm the only one that still uses it at our school and I'd have to say anyway, does align beautifully anyway with the reading standards, with reading skills and content. A true integration would require more time than I have because I have to teach all subject areas including reading and math and science as well. It would be wonderful to have a new social studies series that was up to date as far as the

Common Core standards. Because this one is not. It does relate well to language arts, both reading and writing, and it offers a variety of projects and ways to approach teaching. (Participant #3, Interview 1, para. 63)

The alignment was also discussed by Participant #9. She stated:

Yes and I mean the reading is there by nature. There's so much text in that textbook and sometimes it's really good stuff, while other's... the textbook is very vague. They'll shoot from one point to another, when we'll be like, wait a second... how did we go from here to here. Or they'll reference a certain time and then they'll go back 50 years and they don't realize it when they're reading. And then we have to discuss and make those connections about now we're going back to where we were just talking about. So there's a lot of...that reading comes in with the comprehension. Trying to make those connections other than just memorizing. (Participant #9, Interview 2, para. 13)

Participant #10 added:

Yeah, I really think all of the reading skills come back to social studies. Going back to the text structures, the standards in reading. I know for social studies is to compare and contrast two Native American tribes and so I think that goes hand-in-hand with text structure standard in ELA...I think generally we do cover all of the Common Core Standards and social studies like context clues and figuring out word meanings and information like that. (Participant #10, Interview 1, para. 71)

Participant #10 also shared her teaching experiences of language arts and social studies. She believed that she had an advantage on perceiving an alignment between CCSS and social studies

as evidenced by, “I think because of the way I teach reading leaks into the way that I teach social studies,” (Participant #10, Interview 1, para. 50). She also stated:

No, and so if I didn't teach ELA with the Common Core, or I don't know that I would ever see that connection to see how deeply I should teach social studies.

But because I do teach ELA and Common Core because, because, I can see that there is such a connection between reading and reading social studies.

(Participant #10, Interview 2, para. 24)

An integrative approach between CCELA and social studies curriculum would also promote the importance of elementary social studies at the district level. As Participant #4 shared:

I think it's going to take a lot for them to change their mind about the social studies especially if it continues to be a non-tested subject. I think that we would see the largest shift in social studies expectation and instruction if it became a tested subject. But short of that, I think really a better integration of the social studies standards with the reading standards and the science standard and even the math standards when you're reading about talking about reading and math and stuff like that. I think if we saw at the Common Core level and interaction between crossover standards, that would make a huge difference in the way that we train our teachers. Because like I said you don't have to have a social studies training. You could have an ELA training, but how to integrate social studies into ELA. And then talking about that analyzing piece. You've already got analyzing ELA standards. So, I think that would cause a shift in the way the district sees it too... just by seeing where those standards connect. (Participant #4, Interview 2, para. 32)

Awareness over alignment or district expectations was also recognized in ways in which thinking skills had changed in elementary classrooms. Specifically, participants noted an increased rigor in student expectations of thinking which required a more critical and evaluative approach. Participant #3 had the most diverse perspective of how CCSS aligned to the elementary social studies curriculum. Her awareness was credited to decades of teaching experience, and her previously described work experience in an advanced work class of fifth grade students. She stated:

It has made me more aware, because my peers are also now doing higher order thinking and now doing Greek and Latin roots and Webb's depth of knowledge. Now that my peers are teaching the way I've been teaching for years towards the advanced students, I think that is a positive. That whole perspective where we're digging deeper. We are focusing on depth of knowledge. We are teaching kids to use academic vocabulary and do true accountable talk to express their thoughts and ideas, really is improving my teaching and improving education in general.

(Participant #3, Interview 1, para. #79)

CCSS was also thought to be affecting ways of interpreting and implementing the standards themselves, as noted by Participant #7, "I think how the Common Core has affected is that you are more aware of the standard...So working really closely with a standard. So, you see that all those objectives are being met," (Participant #7, Interview 1, para. 44). Considering ways in which thinking were affected by the Common Core were also evidenced by Participant #4. She identified that a singular approach to teaching social studies, such as reinforcing reading or informational text skills, was limiting to the field. She saw CCSS as affecting social studies by focusing more on tested subjects, such as reading. With this approach, the necessary historical

context is often missing when attempting to use historical documents to teach reading. She stated:

I think it's [CCSS] affected of lot in because we're kind of condensing it into like the reading block like I said before so the kids aren't really getting to experience the details of it so much, as like and I'm trying to fit in the in between, like the struggles that our forefathers had to go from the Articles of the Confederation to the Constitution. When really what we're being expected is to read the Articles of Confederation and then let's read the Constitution and let's do reading skills within those, and I'm like wait, there's like this huge gap and I'm trying to fill that in. So, okay so how do we get from this to this so what was wrong with this article what was right with this one. Is it a good primary source? So, I'm trying to expand it more than what we're kind of being expected to because we really are just expected to get it in and that ELA block rather than giving it its own block of time and our day. (Participant #3, Interview 1, para. 48)

She later continued:

You caught me on a day where social studies is probably not the best topic to talk about because I just found out today that I'll be teaching three periods of reading next year. And our principal has decided, like I've shared before, that social studies now falls under the area of reading. So, I'll be teaching reading, writing, and social studies to three separate classes in one and a half hour blocks. So, our hour to an hour and a half a social studies is going to get cut down even more next year because the way it was presented to me is that social studies was going to be taught through informative text next year and I just don't feel like that a

comprehensive curriculum for social studies. So, so not a good day to be talking to me about social studies. (Participant #3, Interview 1, para. 70).

Participant #3 did not agree with school site administrative decisions that categorized social studies content solely as a means to communicate informational text. Teaching social studies content without context and strictly to reinforce exposure to informational text does a disservice to the field of social studies by not allowing students to embrace the historical relevance and circumstances of events. A comprehensive curriculum for social studies includes a dedicated time to teach the context of events. For Participant #3, social studies is more than text on paper, but rather an opportunity to build meaning for events that have happened in the past.

Professional development was one of several guiding influences for the participants in this study. Little to no district level professional development was reported as being offered or attended by the participants. According to the district's curriculum specialist, the district has sponsored 45 social studies professional development opportunities between August 2014 and June 2017. As described earlier, the state adopted CCSS in January 2014. Twenty-four of these opportunities were available to elementary practitioners, and five were geared only towards elementary teachers. Opportunities ranged from integrated elementary math and economics to the myths of George Washington. Based only on the titles of the workshops, only one appears to be directly related to language most closely associated with the Common Core, *Non-Fiction, Disciplinary Literacy and Depth of Knowledge*. Teachers were invited to attend district sponsored professional development via the district's internal email (Personal communication, August 2, 2017). None of the participants in this study specifically named any of the professional development titles provided to me. Yet, when prompted to share what future opportunities could make an impact on the district's expectations of the Common Core on the social studies

curriculum expectations, professional development was stated by four participants. The code was then consolidated into dedication for elementary social studies, and developed into the theme of future professional development.

Future Professional Development

This code varies from the previous professional development code and is described as training provided at school or district sites that model teacher use and integration of resources during language arts and social studies instruction. Teachers in this study did not perceive district opportunities for social studies, although various opportunities have been provided in the last three years. The perceptions indicate that training needs to include practical experiences, moving beyond unpacking the language of CCSS and how this could be integrated with elementary social studies. Four participants suggested that training at the district level would be incredibly helpful, and one participant recommended that this training should be mandatory. Two other teachers suggested a series of school site trainings, including observing teachers who are comfortable teaching social studies and be models and mentors for others. Participant #10 suggested:

I think that professional development is the biggest key. And it's almost like they need to force us to go to it...I want to see other resources. I want to see examples.

I want to see certain standards or examples of lessons. We should be going around and observing other teachers who feel comfortable teaching social studies and learning from other teachers. (Participant #10, Interview 2, para. 73)

Similarly, Participant #1 said:

I just think that there's a great opportunity there. We have such a wealth of knowledge in this county with the teachers who teach social studies or have a

passion for it, who I really think could make a huge impact on our scores in other areas that are important, if they were given the opportunity to drive the curriculum and to drive the correlation of the different subjects together. (Participant #1, Interview 1, para. 83)

It was also perceived by Participant #3 that social studies would continue to be less prioritized without an integrative approach for CCSS and elementary social studies. She expressed:

We have a lot to work with as far as training in general. Because of the Common Core and because of opportunities available in Pineapple County that may or may not be available everywhere else. And however, we still have not caught up, and don't seem to have any plans, to pull social studies into that net and address it as thoroughly as we do other subject areas. (Participant #3, Interview 1, para. 81)

Likewise, district level expectations for social studies was perceived as originating from dedicated professional development at the district level. If training is not known to be offered, social studies continues on the path of marginalization. Participant #9 stated:

I wish they offered professional development and support. And number one, addressing that there is an expectation. I think a lot of teachers don't feel like there is an expectation. I would like in all subjects, and not just social studies, ...more of a planning across the grade levels and looking at content. What is appropriate, what isn't.? what can we do to fuse the grades together? Offer some support and some assistance. (Participant #9, Interview 2, para. 72)

Participant #3 echoed similar sentiments:

We need to find people that are working on this and hopefully already have training available and we need to bring them here. And it has not even crossed my

mind frankly until this conversation with you, but I know they're out there because of the good work that Dr. Hollen and Mrs. Temple we're able to do through the social studies grant that they have been involved in for a number of years. That needs to become more readily available to all the teaching staff and those of us that do teach social studies and history. (Participant #3, Interview 1, para. 86)

The Teaching American History (TAH) grant was awarded to the district for three years. The TAH grant was noted as a guiding influence in understanding expectations of CCSS and the social studies by Participant #7. She shared:

I was blessed to be a part of the American history grant. And that helped me a lot gaining the knowledge and the collaboration between colleagues. To have that opportunity to integrate my social studies through my reading. I think that is not the norm. I'm trying to because I was part of creating those lessons for 3rd grade and even on my own team, I have a hard time to change the way they teach. Social studies seems to be like easy. You do like *Scholastic News* and you take a little grade on the questions on the back, instead of having a meaningful integration of the two. (Participant #7, Interview 1, para. 64)

Awarded to the district prior to the state's adoption of CCSS, the format of training was noted as having a positive impact for integrating CCSS and elementary social studies. The marginalization of elementary social studies was frequently recognized by the participants, and despite access to resources and adequate instructional time, their dedication to the subject was clearly evident. My personal and professional contact with six participants may not have only influenced their responses, but my interpretation of their responses. I have advanced knowledge

of social studies curriculum and pedagogy reinforced via the review of the literature. I believe that there is a natural alignment between CCSS and the social studies curriculum, and that both share similarities in their historical evolutions. Participant awareness of CCSS and the alignment of the CCELA with social studies curriculum was determined because I had an original interest and awareness. I have always been a passionate practitioner and advocate for social studies education. As I interpreted the raw data, I made conclusions based on relevant theories from the literature, my professional experiences, and experiences from the interview process. The last prominent theme to arise from the interview data was the development of civic responsibility.

Civic Responsibility

Three participants in this study viewed social studies as more than an opportunity to reinforce reading and writing or research skills. Their awareness of how history and current events interact with one another and builds civic responsibility surfaced during the interviews. Developing a civic mindedness for America's youngest citizens was of primary interest and included during their instructional decision making. Evidence presented in the literature review stated that the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) has dedicated several themes for social studies content to address civic responsibility and competence (2010). Likewise, key design considerations for CCSS build cross-disciplinary literacy skills for students to meet college and career readiness by the end of high school (NGA, 2014). Participant #1 related:

As a teacher, but also as a parent, I really do wish we did put social studies as a focus. Not just on the history part of it, but civics and being good citizens. Really educating students from when they're younger. Put more of a focus on being better people, which is what I think history really can give. (Participant #1, Interview 1, para. 87)

Similarly, Participant #5 stated:

So, we live in our children. Through social studies you can teach everything. Through science and social studies. But the district has to get serious about it. We're giving them even more to think about because they're going to be our leaders. Because in education this is the way we did it? And this is the way you're going to do it, or we're never going to change. We have to give them other experiences. (Participant #5, Interview 1, para. 68)

Participant #3 shared her perspective of using broad and universal themes through her social studies instruction.

We have universal themes posted in the room and everything we do, as...social studies is constantly connected being connected to universal themes such as power, and structure, and change, chaos vs. order, just to name a few...Hopefully accurate background knowledge, so that by the time they're adults, they not only have the basic background knowledge, but how that applies to them personally. My thrust in instruction, and in lessons, is to help them understand the big ideas, the universal themes, as they apply to it. (Participant #3, Interview 1, para. 57)

She also cautioned that the current status on social studies could have long term impacts, "And in general, having a broad world view of history itself and current social events interplay and affect not only individually, but as a nation And we are woefully, woefully, inadequate in that area in our school system," (Participant #3, Interview 1, para. 61). These examples demonstrate that practitioners have advocated for their content when faced with the consequences of high-stakes testing and perceived inadequate professional development. Six participants provided strong evidence in the belief that social studies must be included as often as possible despite a lack of

adequate instructional time. For example, “My personal love of social studies. I always had to figure out how I’m going to get it in because I had to do it,” (Participant #5, Interview 1, para. 59) and “I love teaching social studies. It is my passion. I believe history is very, very important. I wrote a Top Teacher Grant this year,” (Participant #6, Interview 1, para. 75)

Participant #6 indicated a conviction to make time and resources during an era of high-stakes testing. The desire to teach social studies for both skills and content was noted by Participant #4.

She said:

It just disappoints me that we are at a point where oh social studies aren’t stressed because it’s not a tested subject. But it does matter, it does matter that these kids learn the American Revolution if not only to assess how to assess a primary document. (Participant #4, Interview 1, para. #73)

The participants’ self-proclaimed passions directly influenced their instructional decision making regarding the expectations of CCSS and the district’s elementary social studies curriculum. As

Participant #1 said:

For me, because of the Common Core, I'm one of those people who absolutely I love everything that deals with social studies. So, I have taken it upon myself. I go the extra step and I look at a Common Core standards, whether it's writing, reading, even math, and I find ways to put the social studies into it. But honestly if I was a teacher who didn't have that passion for it, I'd probably be more focused on trying to get in during that little half an hour time that we have for either social studies or for science. I'd probably be more focused on the science because I know that that's what students are going to be tested on [in]...5th grade.

(Participant #1, Interview 1, para. 67)

The perception that social studies can and should be interdisciplinary and taught daily was also noted by Participant #8. He said:

Well, it's merely an opinion, but I think social studies is really the core of all subject matter and that it is not viewed that way and the focus of today's public education seems to be driven by mathematics and science solely. That the diminishing of the arts and history is played out on a regular basis. As a result, social studies seems to be taking a backseat. (Participant #8, Interview 1, para. 56)

The perceptions of the teachers in this study inform a broader understanding between the expectations of CCSS and the district's elementary social studies expectations. The influences guiding these perceptions included instructional time and resources and little to no awareness on district directives or professional support. Teachers were guided more often by personal decisions to maintain social studies within their classrooms. Considering the nature of the study probing teacher perceptions about elementary social studies, reliance upon the district for support and direction was not expected. The teachers in this study were strong advocates for their social studies discipline and welcomed the opportunity to speak about content often ignored in mainstream conversations. Having prefaced our interviews with an interest in elementary social studies education, I felt each participant would provide an honest and open dialogue. I noted the following after Interview #1 with Participant # 4:

It has been a blessing and a curse to teach elementary social studies. We are not subject to high-stakes testing which has afforded greater flexibility with little accountability. But I am lucky. I have a dedicated block of instructional time of 52 minutes a day. Participant #4 is fighting an uphill battle. She is told that social studies is not important and recognizes that teaching content without context is nearly

pointless. She is right. Why can't district level personnel recognize what is so obvious to some teachers in the district? (Researcher Reflective Journal, May 30, 2017)

The following section discusses how fostering curriculum awareness for both CCSS and elementary social studies is critical to empowering educators and preserving social studies education.

Fostering Curriculum Awareness

Participants revealed that the sources of influence guiding their understanding of CCSS on their social studies curriculum varied from a personal commitment to professional development, a conviction to teach social studies, student interest, and even collaboration among colleagues. It is important to share how their perspectives were shaped by the curriculum they felt they knew and ways to improve their pedagogical understanding of CCSS and the district's social studies curriculum. As Participant #1 explained:

It has been more honestly peers, then it is anything else. Because there's not really any additional trainings that are given for social studies. Unless you are really willing to go out on your own time and stuff to do some things. But honestly, my peers. I have a couple of peers who are very involved in they've taught me a lot of that. Also, the Florida History's Council. Being able to do information from their site has helped influence my understanding of, I would say, more of a global view what we should have tied in with the Common Core for social studies.

(Participant # 1, Interview 2, para. #73)

The influences in understanding the expectations of CCSS and social studies was associated with how the participants perceived first hearing about CCSS and their recollection of the district disseminating CCSS to instructional personnel. Given the overall lack of perceived adequate

professional development for CCSS and elementary social studies at the district level, participants relied on their school sites or outside sources for support. When asked about sources of influence in understanding the expectations, Participant #8 did not mention any support from the district level. He recalled being informed about CCSS through a casualty meeting and having access to the IFG via Blackboard, but did not reference this as an guide in understanding the standards themselves. He said:

Then I would have to reiterate that by taking extra course work, higher education. The extra course work has caused me to spend more time researching, reading up, and applying...learning about the Common Core Standards, that are essentially the state of Florida state standards, and what the district also wants to see in the curriculum. So, I have personally, individually aligned that stuff and made my in class curriculum applicable to those standards. (Participant #8, Interview 2, para. 90).

Likewise, Participant #9 who had perceived alignments between CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum did not credit the district as influencing her understanding of expectations.

She stated:

I mean what influenced it... is really just having to sit down and reading Common Core standards. Really understand what they were asking kids to do. And it happened by accident. I mean we were just reading the social studies textbook and just the way I started asking them questions shifted because I was teaching reading more rigorously. (Participant #9, Interview 2, para. 58)

The lack of physical resources such as textbooks and dedicated instructional time, implicated the district as an indirect influence. In general, teachers with the responsibilities of elementary social

studies were confused about how their subject area has been affected by the CCSS in Florida. The lack of perceived direction at the district level has left some teachers completely unaware of the actual shifts, or possible alignment, between CCSS and elementary social studies. Only one of the district level social studies professional development opportunities was titled with language more closely associated with CCSS and was offered in September 2014 (K-12 Program specialist, personal communication, August 2, 2017). Awareness of shared objectives between language arts standards and their social studies curriculum included language arts skills, thinking skills, and development of civic responsibility. Participants could identify expectations for CCSS, but this was not always the same as for social studies. Most participants knew that reading skills, such as text structures and the use of informational text, was a shared objective for both CCSS and their social studies curriculum. But not all participants could identify this shared expectation. This lack of awareness shows the participants' perception that the district does not include an emphasis on social studies, even as a vehicle to reinforce reading strategies. The views also suggest that a lack of a true integrated curriculum of ELA and social studies, or a more explicit ELA curriculum that includes social studies content, personifies the disregard for use of social studies content to teach reading and writing.

As described earlier, eight participants identified changes to their elementary social studies course descriptions after 2014. Not one participant was aware of the inclusion of MAFS to their social studies curriculum. In fact, when asked about changes to their curriculum because of CCSS, two participants were truly not aware of any, and one was not even aware of any existing social studies curriculum, pre-or post CCSS. Two participants also reflected that they do not know if the district even employed a social studies curriculum specialist. Lastly, two

participants shared that their belief in changes to the social studies because of CCSS resulted in the reduction of scope in the curriculum.

The participants' responses are mixed on the alignment between CCSS and the district's elementary social studies curriculum. Responses indicate diverging opinions over alignment, and their perceptions of district's expectations and their knowledge of the curriculum they teach. All participants believed that the district does not value social studies as much as tested subjects, and they have either accepted the status quo by continuing to do what they have always done, or found ways to integrate their interest in social studies by integrating language arts. These perceptions confirm the research that the accountability movement in elementary grades has resulted in ELA, mathematics, and science prioritized over social studies (Heafner & Fitchett, 2012). Thus, gaps do exist for between CCSS expectations and social studies expectations for elementary students.

The coded interview data reveals a variety of influences in the perceptions of teachers on district's expectations of the Common Core and their social studies curriculum expectations. Teachers sought to make sense of their social studies curriculum, and how the adoption of CCSS shifted this understanding. Overall, the participants relied very little on direction from the district, because they felt they received little support. Instead, they chose to internalize what a focus in language and mathematics would mean, and if this would cause widespread change in their current social studies instruction. Outreach generated at a personal level to secure curriculum knowledge and instructional resources appeared to be most effective in reconciling the expectations of CCSS and the district's elementary social studies. One commonality persisted in the participants' perceptions that the district assigned very little value for elementary social studies. This opinion was based on a lack of professional development, instructional resources,

and allocated instructional time. Despite some clearly aligned objectives and expectations between CCSS and elementary social studies, three participants were not initially able to come to this conclusion. When prompted to share any reading or writing skills stated in CCSS that also aligned to their social studies curriculum, only then were they able to determine an alignment. Nine participants recognized that the district has expectations for elementary social studies, but are less clear about what these expectations look like. Two participants were too unfamiliar with their social studies curriculum to specify district expectations.

The K-5 social studies course descriptions in use for each of the districts in Florida include added Language Arts Florida Standards (LAFS) and Mathematics Florida Standards (MAFS) as part of their social studies objectives. The course descriptions were modified after the adoption of CCSS in 2014 across the state of Florida. These social studies teachers in this study did not reveal if the district's social studies curriculum included the LAFS or MAFS. Participants rarely mentioned professional development or communication from the district that would inform practitioners of this shift, and no acknowledgement of integrated math standards was reported. One participant noted CCSS as preparing American students for civic competence as it aligned to critical and reflective inquiry with their social studies content. Two other participants believed that social studies was essential for fostering citizenship. The insights of teachers in this study suggest that the district's assessment of CCSS and social studies are unequal, jeopardizing an already marginalized field of social studies and of CCSS, in addition, elementary social studies is complex and further complicated by a lack of guidance from the district level. Should language arts include more informational text and primary and secondary sources to reinforce an already limited block of time allocated for social studies? Should social studies time be used to

practice reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills? What does CCSS mean to practitioners in their content area?

Reflective Journal

As a qualitative researcher, it was critical that I reflected on the data collection process, as well as my shared experiences with many of the participants. I am a doctoral student in Curriculum and Instruction in Interdisciplinary Education and a teacher within the district for 14 years. I was fortunate to blend two areas of personal interest: the history of curriculum and social studies education. I had attended or facilitated several professional development opportunities, and worked on the same campus as some of the participants. Many of the participants were known to me. Therefore, we already had a relationship prior to the start of this study. Our collegiality helped in the recruitment process as well. I believe that many of the participants trusted me to capture their voices and welcomed the opportunity to be a part of the study.

I began each interview with a review of the consent, which separated myself to a degree, as their colleague, and introduced myself as the researcher. Beginning with the collection of demographic data made each participant comfortable with being able to provide data. Prior to four interviews, participants informed me that they feared not being able to offer much relevant information for my study. Speaking about the Common Core State Standards and social studies education had not been a frequent topic of conversation within our local educational community. I reassured each participant that all data collected was of tremendous value, and their personal and school identities would not be used. One participant still hesitated, but remained in the study.

I closed both rounds of interviews with two questions. First, is there anything else you would like to add? And second, do you have any questions for me? Initially, these two questions

were part of Interview #2 Protocol. However, after conversing over the questions from Interview #1 Protocol, it was evident that these two questions provided a more open ended and less taxing response. Some participants simply replied no in both cases. Other participants felt compelled to share their passion, frustrations, and sheer confusion. In several cases, participants realized that they had not made many connections between CCSS and their social studies curriculum. The interview had officially shed light on this possibility.

I was not prepared that participants would be as interested as many have seemed in the outcome of the study. I have been asked by three of five participants to this point about what research has been done on this topic and that I should be commended for my efforts. However, I am not entirely surprised. These practitioners are overwhelmed by the emphasis on ELA and mathematics. Too many trainings and data analyses that have become overdone. Why not engage in meaningful and even “novel” conversations about social studies? Some feel empowered. (Researcher Reflective Journal, May 31, 2017)

As noted, some participants asked me more about my research, specifically if any studies had been conducted on this topic. Others asked me to describe what I knew about any shifts in the curriculum. One participant admitted that our conversation inspired her to attend any professional development offered on social studies. She was beyond excited that research that she participated in may prompt discourse and trainings.

The coding process resulted in many challenges. I had such intimate knowledge of the data, having completed the transcriptions personally. Data was initially coded and added to the codebook which resulted in over 30 codes. To improve the clarity and better organize data, codes were reduced and consolidated. This process was repeated constantly as were the descriptions.

My goal was to provide a broader audience a way to interpret the data as I had done, moving beyond words on paper. The analysis of data determined that teacher perceptions yielded valuable results. Teachers had first knowledge of how curriculum reform effected their daily practices. The coded data categorized their instructional decision making along with their sources of influence. In the end, I was able to effectively capture the ways in which teachers perceived alignment and how this alignment was determined. These results would not have been possible without this study

I am effectively changed as a student and teacher because of this study. My years of teaching experience with language arts and social studies, as well as participation and leadership in the Teaching American History grant for four years, shaped a version of social studies instruction that aligned closely to CCSS, well before the adoption in 2014. My intense passion for history and commitment to sustain social studies within the district, offered a unique perspective towards my research. Furthermore, my fascination with the historical evolution of curriculum brought forth less traditional discussions throughout the literature review. Most discourse on social studies education and CCSS centers on the marginalization of the field and the damaging effects in the era of high-stakes testing. More recently, connecting shared objectives with CCELA and social studies is gaining momentum, but preparing students for civic competence has received much less attention. I believe making CCSS more transparent in its intentions for cross-disciplinary literacy in preparation for success in life beyond high school would make significant changes for social studies education.

My Reflective Journal allowed me to view myself as a student, teacher, and colleague as separate entities, but also simultaneously. It is impossible to extract a prior identity, but tracking my thoughts and the thoughts of my participants, allowed me to maintain impartiality

during the data collection, but foster an appreciation for the research process. I could compartmentalize information, such as perceived alignments and expectations, but then rationalize connections overtime. Additionally, I could reflect on my own frustrations over the clarity in communication about CCSS and social studies across the district. Most importantly, I recognized how proud I was to be a member of this social studies teacher's cohort, and how much work is truly needed in this field.

Conclusion

In this chapter, participants perceptions on alignment between CCSS and social studies curriculum, along with perceived gaps between CCSS and expectations of the district for social studies are reported. Specifically, three ways in which they perceived CCSS as aligned to their social studies curriculum are presented: higher order thinking skills, historical thinking skills, and use of reading and writing skills. These reading and writing skills were reported in the use of informational text, conducting research and citing text evidence, and emphasizing text structure which can be accomplished during both language arts and social studies instruction. Gaps over the alignment were determined by a lack of curriculum knowledge and district support in professional development. The educators' understanding of the relationship was influenced by instructional time and resources, including the effect of high-stakes testing. All participants reported a district commitment to teaching reading and mathematics, but much less importance was placed on the field of social studies. The perception of the marginalization of social studies content was based on reduced instructional time, lack of resources, such as a recently adopted textbook, and professional development opportunities. The district mandates instructional time for reading and math, provides numerous updated resources, and has frequent training workshops on CCELA and CCMA. This was not the same for elementary social studies. The analysis of the

elementary K-5 social studies curriculum pre-and post-adoption of Florida's version of CCSS, the Florida Standards, in 2014 revealed that the language of the elementary social studies curriculum remained the same. The perceived alignment and understanding of district expectations was also influenced by how CCSS and social studies curriculum is shared and supported by training with instructional personnel. The district has added several LAFS and MAFS to each grade level, but there is no integration of the social studies curriculum and the LAFS and MAFS. It is not clear which social studies standard aligns with a LAF or MAF standard. These standards are expected to be taught at some time over the course of social studies instruction.

The participants' perceptions illustrated three major findings about CCSS expectations and the district's elementary social studies expectations. Elementary teachers favored an integration of CCSS and their social studies curriculum and would prompt the district to reconsider the importance of social studies education. The marginalization of social studies was thought to threaten the necessary development of civic responsibility, and despite inadequate instructional time, the general perception from participant was that social studies must be taught. Furthermore, the consensus was that in order to accomplish an integration between CCSS and social studies, district level professional development must be offered that promotes an interpretation and review of curriculum standards and pedagogy. This could be accomplished by providing professional development that models ways in which CCELA and social studies could be integrated with an emphasis on thinking skills, and then move towards CCMA and civic oriented alignment. If necessary, student test scores in reading could be utilized to determine a positive effect of an integration of CCSS and social studies or prompt a standardized assessment for the social studies.

Whether social studies content is used to reinforce reading, writing, speaking, and listening, or embedded language arts skills within social studies instruction, remains open for discussion. The participants did not collectively share the same vision of the expectations of CCSS and the district's social studies expectations.

Fostering curricular awareness is possible when the teachers' perceptions are valued. The ways in which teachers were informed about CCSS also guided their understanding of alignment and district expectations. Teachers reported many variables when developing an understanding of the relationship between CCSS and their elementary social studies curriculum including collaboration among their peers, personal interest in social studies, higher education, and interpreting the standards themselves. This was rarely prompted at a school or district level. Each participant felt the need to develop their own understanding of CCSS and their social studies curriculum. Thus, the participants suggested the district reconsider the necessary value of the field of social studies. The varying degrees of alignment and expectations from elementary teachers with the responsibilities for teaching social studies demonstrates the sheer complexity of curriculum reform and its effects at the ground level.

Chapter 5 provides a discussion of the research findings, recommendations, and implications of the research.

CHAPTER 5:

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of alignment between the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and the social studies curriculum from the perspectives of elementary teachers with the responsibility of teaching social studies in one medium-sized district in the Southeast. Elementary social studies has faced increased marginalization during an era of accountability where high-stakes testing of language arts and mathematics takes greater instructional priority (Burroughs et al., 2005; Fitchett & Heafner, 2010; Grant & Salinas, 2008; Heafner & Fitchett, 2012). CCSS does not provide direct standards in history or social studies for K-5 elementary students, so investigating perceptions of alignment helps to understand how social studies has been affected by widespread curriculum reform. The study also explored what guided educators' understanding of this relationship and how the perceptions of educators inform our understanding of CCSS and the elementary social studies. By analyzing the degree of alignment between CCSS and elementary social studies from archival materials and teacher interviews, the research determined varying degrees of alignment and of expectations between CCSS and the district's social studies curriculum. According to the participants in this study, there are perceived gaps in the alignment between CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum. The understanding of the relationship between CCSS and social studies was

influenced by instructional time and resources and district level professional development about curriculum. The teachers in this study stated challenges of reduced instructional time and resources for elementary social studies. These challenges influenced curriculum awareness and prompted discourse for integrating CCSS with the social studies curriculum. The educators noted a need to prioritize social studies and found ways in which to address social studies even when they felt unsupported at the district level. As a result, the participants recommended future district professional development and strategies that would promote their understanding of CCSS and the social studies curriculum, as well as encourage the daily inclusion of social studies content in their classrooms. Existing research addresses the role of CCSS on secondary social studies students as 6-12 social studies/history standards exist and high-stakes testing occurs more frequently in secondary social science education (Kenna & Russell, 2015; Mc Henry, 2014). Limited research has examined how CCSS has affected elementary social studies in states like South Carolina that has a standardized assessment in social studies (Britte & Howe, 2014), versus states, such as Florida, that do not. This chapter discusses how the research findings contributes to the existing literature. I will also make recommendations for future research and address the implications of the study's findings.

Summary of Study

This research used a qualitative case study design to examine the relationship between CCSS and the elementary social studies curriculum from the perspectives of teachers with the responsibilities of teaching elementary social studies. Given the limited understanding of CCSS's influence on elementary social studies curriculum, the case study was utilized and focused on a single, medium-sized district in Florida. Eleven teachers participated in two semi-structured 30 minute interviews over the course of three weeks, and were selected based on their availability to

participate in the research study. An archival analysis of the district's existing elementary social studies curriculum was compared to curriculum prior to the Florida's adoption of CCSS in 2014, resulting in the Language Arts Florida Standards (LAFS) and the Mathematics Florida Standards (MAFS). The following research questions guided this study.

1. How do elementary teachers in a medium-sized district in the Southeast with responsibilities for teaching social studies perceive the alignment between CCSS and the district's social studies curriculum and, what, if any, gaps do they see between CCSS expectations and social studies expectations for elementary students?
2. What influences the ways in which elementary social studies teachers in a medium-sized district in the Southeast address the degree of alignment they perceive between CCSS expectations and the district's elementary social studies expectations?
3. How do teachers' perceptions inform our understanding between CCSS expectations and the district's elementary social studies expectations?

The eleven participants taught an intermediate grade-level, 3, 4, or 5. Five different schools were represented in the study. Six teachers taught from low SES schools, one from a middle SES school, and the remaining four taught at a high SES school. Each of the participants participated in two 30 minute semi-structured interviews over a two-week period. Six interviews were conducted in the participant's classroom, two over the phone, two at public venues, and one in my home office, all recorded by a consumer cellphone. I annotated copies of each interview protocol and kept a notebook in which I reflected after the interview. Interviews were transcribed with 48 hours personally, and then a theory driven code approach was used to analyze the data based on the review of the literature. A codebook was developed to assign codes and then reorganized to classify and simplify data. The codebook was an iterative process that shifted over

time in the both a reduction and the definition of codes. Categorizing and consolidating codes developed a broader picture of how the information could better be applied to themes related to the literature and presented in a clear way. To confirm any findings to the research questions, I associated the themes to one of the three research questions. Based on this alignment, I determined that there were multiple categories or sub-themes within each of the research questions. These subthemes became the main headings for reporting the results. Research Question One yielded two subthemes, alignment and gaps. Research Question Two subthemes, instructional time and resources, and district level professional development. Research Question Three yielded three subthemes, CCSS and social studies integration, civic responsibility, and future district professional development.

Findings

The data produced four significant findings. First, varying degrees of perceived alignment exists between CCSS and elementary social studies within this district. Teachers in this district proposed two sets of opposing opinions. Ten teachers perceived an alignment between CCSS and their social studies curriculum, specifically with an emphasis on the use of informational text, text structures, text complexity, research, or historical thinking skills, although to varying levels. Two teachers felt CCSS had already been integrated with their social studies curriculum, and could not initially specify standards related to the Common Core or their social studies curriculum. Only when prompted to share any CCSS reading or writing skills could these two participants perceive an alignment. One teacher did not perceive an alignment because she was too unfamiliar with CCSS and her social studies curriculum. Secondly, instructional time and resources and the perceived lack of support from the district influenced the teachers' perceptions of alignment and expectations of CCSS and their social studies curriculum.

The teachers' interviews reveal that district does not directly contribute to an understanding of the expectations of CCSS and their elementary social studies curriculum. Thirdly, teachers indicated a strong desire to see an integration between CCSS and their social studies curriculum. Based on knowledge of CCSS, the integration would include language arts standards. However, this integration could also involve the math standards and civic mindedness. Only one participant perceived CCSS and social studies as having a shared objective of civic responsibility. However, three participants noted the importance of social studies in preparation for life as responsible citizens. Lastly, CCSS does have an effect on teaching perspectives towards elementary social studies curriculum. Eight of the 11 participants stated that their teaching perspective changed as a result of CCSS, reporting greater use of higher order thinking, increased use of informational text, using social studies content during reading instruction, or reinforcing reading skills during social studies instruction. Out of three participants who reported no change to their teaching perspective, two stated that an integrated approach towards language arts and social studies had always occurred in their classrooms.

Analysis of Research Question 1

How do elementary teachers in a medium-sized district in the Southeast with responsibilities for teaching social studies perceive the alignment between CCSS and the district's social studies curriculum and, what, if any, gaps do they see between CCSS expectations and social studies expectations for elementary students?

The teachers in this study perceived differing degrees of alignment between CCSS and their district's social studies curriculum. Standards-Based Education Reform (SBER), in which CCSS is the most recent example, has generated impassioned discourse over curricular policy, including the association of high-stakes standardized assessments. However, because elementary

social studies is often not part of widespread assessment measures, the alignment between CCSS and K-5 social studies remains ambiguous. The literature noted that high-stakes testing has affected social studies differently than other core subjects (Burroughs et al., 2005). The research affirmed that an emphasis on interdisciplinary literacy promoted social studies content, and that social studies content could be used to promote literacy, but this directive was not perceived at the district level. When there is no perception of alignment between CCSS and elementary social studies curriculum, it was based on a lack of curriculum knowledge. There was no awareness that LAFS or MAFS had been added to social studies course descriptions. Archival analysis of the elementary social studies curriculum reflected no change in language for any of the standards because of CCSS. The course descriptions in use by the district are those adopted by FLDOE. The social studies curriculum has been prefaced with a series of reading, writing, listening, speaking, and math standards. The social studies standards and added language arts and math standards are provided in Appendix F. Although eight participants stated shared objectives between LAFS and the social studies curriculum, it is unclear whether the participants were aware of these additions, or if this interdisciplinary instructional approach occurred organically. No participant recognized Common Core math standards that could align with their social studies curriculum. Literature involving CCSS and social studies has yet to involve conversations with math integration. Teachers are more likely to align CCELA with social studies, than with CCMA, based on the greater number of shared objectives in language arts and social studies. This data is also evident in the archival analysis which reflects more LAF standards, than MAF standards per grade level of the social studies curriculum.

Based on the perceptions of participants in this study, reading and writing were natural complements to social studies content and can be utilized on a routine basis. However, because

the district has not provided a full integration of language arts skills with social studies standards, which was determined during the archival analysis, participants felt that other district teachers could not make this connection. Four participants reported that an integration became more apparent to them personally during and after the interview process. The current course descriptions include these added language arts standards, so the district expects that social studies teachers address these standards during instruction. Ten participants within the study noted an alignment between language arts and social studies, but three expressed that many of their peers were not as knowledgeable or committed to social studies instruction. Without clear directives, ongoing support, or adequate instructional time and resources, social studies teachers across the district are less likely to be aware of these changes. My conclusion is that social studies teachers have not accessed or reviewed the curriculum frequently since 2014. Clearly the expectations to reference math standards during social studies instruction has not been made clear to elementary social studies teachers in this district.

Analysis of Research Question 2

What influences the ways in which elementary social studies teachers in a medium-sized district in the Southeast address the degree of alignment they perceive between CCSS expectations and the district's elementary social studies expectations?

Instructional time. Thornton's literature on gatekeeping (1989) describes the pedagogical decisions teachers routinely engage. Gatekeeping is evident for the elementary social studies teachers interviewed in this district. Determining what and when to teach social studies involves factors beyond the curriculum. As indicated through this study, social studies could also be an opportunity to reinforce reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills emphasized in CCSS. Because the district does not officially mandate minutes for social studies

instruction, these decisions are made at individual schools and classrooms. The teachers reported the number of minutes of social studies instruction occurring in their classrooms on a weekly basis. These minutes are reported values and not confirmed as actual instructional minutes. It is likely that social studies would receive more instructional time if the district provided a social studies curriculum with integrated language arts skills. Mandating instructional time for social studies is needed to regain any sense of priority within the district. If not required to teach a dedicated block of social studies, it is less likely this will occur, as elementary social studies is not associated with a high-stakes assessment.

Socio-economic status and instructional time. This study also confirmed existing literature on how instructional time for social studies varied based on a school's socio-economic status. Studies by Pace (2012) and Wills (2007) indicated lower levels of exposure to social studies content for lower socio-economic populations. On average, weekly time spent on social studies was lower for schools identified as low SES, and greater for schools identified as high SES. Participants who taught low SES populations were challenged with poor student growth on standardized assessments in reading and math and significant student achievement gaps. Therefore, an emphasis on reading and math instruction occurred more often. However, it is not conclusive if SES was the determining factor for social studies instructional time allocation. Findings in this study also support conclusions by Fitchett et al. (2014) that social studies instruction is based on school and classroom pedagogy, and not exclusively linked to SES status. Despite mandated instructional time for social studies, teachers at low SES schools effectively incorporated social studies content, beyond school objectives and persuasions that informational text was equivalent to adequate social studies instruction. Although socio-economic status may influence the allocation of instructional time for social studies, it does not define the quality or

method of instruction. Committed elementary social studies teachers found ways to incorporate their content despite the perceived school and district's focus on tested subject areas.

Instructional resources. Participants also desired adequate instructional resources, especially those aligned to CCSS. The outdated textbook and perceived lack of aligned CCSS and social studies instructional resources perpetuated even greater stigmatization of social studies as inferior to other subjects. It is assumed that teachers across the district are less likely to teach social studies when not provided with social studies resources that reinforce language arts and/or math standards especially when social studies instructional time is not enforced. The teachers reported little support in securing their curriculums and were encouraged to digitally access through the district website. It is suspected that most elementary social studies teachers have continued to use curriculum prior to 2014 because textbooks have not been adopted since 2006 and the absence of noticeable professional support.

Teachers in this study rarely mentioned the district as having influenced their knowledge of alignment or expectations. Although several participants noted reading the standards, and building personal knowledge of their intentions, this was not mandated or supported by the district. Teachers found greater support at school or personal levels. Collaboration among their peers, particularly because their peers experienced similar levels of frustration over lack of available and appropriate resources and instructional scheduling for social studies. The perceptions of the textbooks in use provided limited effectiveness, forcing teachers to secure other materials, such as Teachers Pay Teachers (TPT), or developing their own. The review of the literature denoted a lack of preparation in blending literacy skills with social studies content for teachers new to the teaching profession (Evans & Clark, 2015; Gleeson & D'Souza, 2016). However, the two recent college graduates in this study effectively communicated the alignment

of CCSS and social studies education. Their recent coursework required an unpacking of the standards and an interdisciplinary literacy vision. The two participants that perceived CCSS as already integrated with their social studies curriculum had been teaching over 20 years. They have not noted any shifts to their social studies curriculum and have continued to teach the way they have always done. This data suggests the ineffective communication of the district's expectations and was not pursued further at school levels. Therefore, these teachers were unaware of any characteristic of the district's initiative for CCSS and elementary social studies. Other teachers were guided by their personal commitment for social studies and how this could be imparted to their students. Designing instruction to activate student interest elevated the perceived quality of either language arts or social studies instruction.

The results of this qualitative study echo the nuanced nature of curriculum reform. Many of the same primary values, beliefs, and positions of power present in society manifest into the culture of America's classrooms. If a teacher feels unsupported at a school or district level, such professionals will seek alternative sources of support. One of the very cornerstones of the teaching profession is fostering a passion for knowledge and an appreciation for the learning process. Many of these teachers felt ignored by the district, causing levels of frustration and discontent. The implications over the district's perceived lack of support is discussed in a future section. From an educational standpoint, it is alarming, but not entirely surprising. The analysis of these findings reiterates the complicated discourse over curriculum that persists today.

District level professional development. Findings in this study support conclusions about how the lack of professional development caused confusion over the role of social studies and literacy instruction (Evans & Clark, 2015; Gilles et al., 2013). Nowell's (2017) study examined teacher perceptions on the implementations of CCSS on social studies curriculum and indicated

increased comfort over curricular changes, but less knowledge of specific standards. With 11 elementary participants in my study, findings support Nowell's (2017) conclusions from only one elementary participant. Nowell's study also affirms the influence of the Teaching American History (TAH) grant on a teacher's comfort over content and pedagogy. One participant in my study noted the large degree of influence her participation in the district's TAH grant provided over her ability to align CCSS and social studies content. Furthermore, five participants referenced strong professional development at their school site. Two of these trainings were facilitated by prior members of the TAH cohort. Some teachers were invited to draft curriculum and resources at the district level which were made available to all teachers via Blackboard. Little discussion signified widespread use over these resources by elementary social studies teachers. Although the district involved classroom teachers in instructional resource opportunities, it occurred with a select group and without ongoing support, including the modeling of lessons or exemplars. Without adequate training or continuing discourse, these efforts have gone unnoticed and insufficiently implemented. I believe that most teachers across the district have not recently reviewed their grade level social studies course descriptions and that most teachers within the district are unaware of the instructional resources via Blackboard. The textbook has continued to be the main source for curriculum, and when the adoption did not occur, teachers abandoned much of the existing instruction.

The findings in this study assert a pervasive perception that the district has not been explicit enough with their expectations and alignment of CCELA and CCMA with elementary social studies. Therefore, the diversity of perceived alignment and subsequent expectations between CCSS and K-5 social studies is quite logical. Elementary teachers in this district require guidance and explicit support of curriculum changes which did not occur after Florida's adoption

in 2014. The archival analysis of the social studies curriculum confirms these assumptions. It remains unclear what the most appropriate integration methods for social studies content with language arts and math standards, and which instructional resources provide the greatest support.

Analysis of Research Question 3:

How do teachers' perceptions inform our understanding between CCSS expectations and the district's elementary social studies expectations?

Civic responsibility and social studies education. One of the major findings of this study revealed a disconnect between some prevailing objectives of CCSS and social studies education. As discussed throughout the review of the literature, several commonalities between CCSS and social studies include developing civic competence, academic rigor, and global awareness for students as they progress into adult life. Preparation and widespread adoption of common standards nationally, furthers a desire for uniformity of diverse populations and possibly a more singular American identity. Curriculum reform has been used to shape beliefs and values of American citizens (Franklin, 1999; Warren, 2001). NCSS has dedicated three of ten themes towards civic responsibility. In this study, all participants advocated for social studies education. It's exclusion for young students should not be predicated on associated high-stakes assessments. If students are not made aware of historical content or current events in a structured course, the civic future of students remains in question. However, social studies teachers could not make connections between similar intentions for CCSS. Only one participant perceived civic competence for students as an alignment between CCSS and the social studies curriculum. If social studies teachers could not make this connection, it is unlikely that elementary teachers observe these shared objectives. The unfamiliarity of teachers regarding some intentions that both CCSS and social studies education offers students represents a greater disconnect within

American society. The lack of awareness of commonality between CCSS and the field of social studies prevents trust within American schools. So often educators are blamed for the inadequacies of students. Or society is accused as the main saboteur against educators. This discourse casts blame to various groups with proposed solutions void of political or social context. Curriculum is a reflection of social and political interests vying for control at any given moment. When policy makers fail to acknowledge the perspectives of educators, or when teachers neglect to consider the historical or social context for curriculum reform, combative discourse prevents positive relationships and sensible solutions. There is a possibility that Americans might unite in a shared vision for education. Social studies teachers may offer the solution to this possibility.

CCSS and social studies integration. Instead of listing the LAFS and MAFS before the social studies standards, it would be more instructionally apparent and beneficial if specific reading standards were integrated with social studies standards. For example, SS.5.A.3.1 requires that students describe technological developments that shaped European exploration (FLDOE, 2016). A complementary reading standard is LAFS. 5.RI.3.7. This informational text reading skills encourages that students draw on information from multiple print or digital sources, demonstrating the ability to locate an answer to a question quickly or solve a problem efficiently (FLDOE, 2016). If each of these standards appeared next to each other in the elementary social studies course descriptions, teachers would be more aware of language arts integration. Additionally, more elementary teachers have greater teaching experience in reading and writing because more time is afforded to teaching this content. When social studies instructional time was reduced, teachers incorporated historical content into their language arts blocks. As needed, social studies teachers can support language arts by referencing text structures and text evidence,

and language arts time can be used for reinforcing social studies content. Ranges among integration methods support the discrepancies over alignment.

Changes in teaching perspectives. The teaching profession is both political and personal. Existing research intimates how a confluence of factors consistently affect the daily experiences of teachers. At any one time, curriculum is being invented and reinvented through the social, economic, cultural, and political norms. Specifically, the perceptions of practitioners at the ground level, responsible for the interaction and interpretation of standards, reveals a powerful narrative. The adoption of CCSS in 2014 has affected social studies education. Eight participants reported pedagogical shifts that ranged from using social studies content during reading instruction to increasing rigor and forms of texts. When elementary social studies is not associated with a high-stakes assessment, the priority for instruction diminishes. Performance on reading, math, and science tests in intermediate grades has become a greater focus for elementary educators. CCSS has delivered a possibility that a greater awareness in the expectations of CCSS an awareness of an alignment and expectations of elementary social studies may expand the discipline. CCSS varies from other standards-based reform. One of the many goals of CCSS is to develop an interdisciplinary instructional approach and prepare students for success beyond high school. When educators realize an alignment, specified social studies instructional time will become more opportunities to further these goals. Together, CCSS and social studies can accomplish this goal. Participants in this study recognized that CCSS increased interdisciplinary literacy. Participants that perceived themselves as strong social studies teachers responded positively to the perceived alignment between CCSS and their social studies curriculum. In effect, best practices in social studies education, were now clear objectives of the Common Core.

The era of accountability has forced educators to be more reflective, especially with student data. For some in the educational field, the analysis of standardized performances and planning for use of data is the driving force and definition of successful teaching. Others feel that knowledge and experience can simply not be measured. Florida adopted CCSS in 2014, replacing the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) with the Florida Standards, purporting to better opportunities for student success beyond K-12 education. Teachers continue to be divided on CCSS and those opinions generally reference the accountability measures for students and teachers. Those familiar with the standards value the emphasis on academic rigor, but worry about the frequency and focus on high-stakes testing results. Political powers have determined the legitimacy of these assessments, and greatly affected the daily experiences for teachers and students.

Teachers in the district in which this study was conducted recognize many of the changes CCSS has ushered into their classrooms. Reading and math have been primary focuses since No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2001, but the shifts in rigor of thinking skills, has intensified the priority of subjects associated with high-stakes testing. Thus, a subject such as social studies, has witnessed an even further reduction in emphasis. Requiring students to clarify their thinking by citing sources of evidence, or evaluating and integrating multiple sources of text to develop a response can be challenging for students with significant academic deficits. Thus, teachers shared that instructional time, resources, and energy are often dedicated to subject areas perceived at the district level to reinforce these skills. Is there an absence of awareness or trust towards social studies teachers in teaching these strategies? Thornton (2005) proposed that instructional decisions involve theory and practice, and curriculum reform situates teachers at the center of this discourse. Teachers communicated characteristics about their curriculums, but did

not have the full context for the expectations for the standards. Both CCSS and social studies education share in the long-term dynamics of curricular debates. Opinions on CCSS are often polarizing. Proponents strongly advocate for their ability to increase academic rigor in a meaningful way, such as evaluating an author's point of view or purpose across multiple texts. Opponents argue whether depths of knowledge are age appropriate and fully prepare students for college and career. Regardless, many conversations are void of context, and do not reflect the historical evolution of curriculum reform. Given that the teachers in this study taught history at some level, building a connection between CCSS and social studies education from a current or historical perspective, establishes the complexities over curriculum reform. States adopting CCSS have a responsibility to provide sufficient communication that is robust and clear to all districts. Districts then have an obligation to promote their expectations of curriculum and adequate professional trainings and support for practitioners. Curriculum is dynamic and assumes different roles within any given context. This shifts across schools, individual classrooms, and time.

The teachers' perceptions indicate an incomplete exposure or examination of CCSS and their social studies curriculum, resulting in incongruences over alignment. The perceptions also demonstrate the overwhelming sense of disregard for social studies content. Because the district does not fully recognize alignment and expectations, practitioners are less likely to develop these conclusions as well. Visible leadership and effective communication are desperately absent and have detrimental effects not just for social studies education, but the professional lives of elementary teachers. For those in positions of power, it may seem likely that teachers will engage with curriculum, forging connections and building new meanings. The reality for most teachers in this study was that they desired to know more explicitly the expectations for their social

studies curriculum, and had an expectation been established or guidance provided, they would feel more empowered. Despite their frustrations, each participant advocated for social studies as an instructional priority. Their consent to participate in this study and their general interest in the results may have been influenced by their personal and professional experiences with me. However, I believe I only gave a more formal voice to their perspectives. I believe that their conviction in providing appropriate social studies instruction has and will to occur in their individual classrooms. I simply provided more context. Conversations with the participants suggested that having not been informed heightens a growing disregard and chasm between practitioners and district policy. Thankfully a remedy is known and accessible.

Recommendations

Findings of this study contend that teachers' perceptions of disparities in curricular alignment and district expectations was informed through multiple factors. Florida's adoption of CCSS affected teaching perspectives. As professionals, teachers acquired resources, but felt unsupported from a district level. Responses from the study note overwhelmingly district sponsored professional development on CCSS and the social studies would improve the quality of teaching. The unfamiliarity of shared objectives with CCSS and social studies offering training opportunities would accomplish two tasks: empower educators when curriculum is reformed and expand desired elementary social studies education.

Recommendations for Professional Development

Teachers perceived a lack of district support and transparency of CCSS and their social studies curriculum. If teachers were provided clearly stated directives and ongoing support from the district, more social studies teachers would develop this recognition. If the district utilized existing personnel who demonstrate advanced knowledge of CCSS and social studies, it could

have tremendous impacts on teachers who are strong advocates for social studies education and those who feel ill-equipped to teach the discipline. Passion for social studies should be fostered. The general sense of comfort over historical content and teaching surfaced as a reason why even limited social studies instruction is further reduced. Some teachers just don't know how to effectively use primary sources or historical thinking skills as routine instructional practices. If more training focused on these skills, teachers with the responsibility of teaching social studies would experience greater levels of empowerment. A natural alignment between CCSS and social studies might organically develop, but teachers should be encouraged to reflect on practices they already use. The integration of social studies into language arts instruction might be an easier beginning transition. Teachers can then begin to reference literacy skills during social studies time. Opportunities to integrate language arts and social studies must be flexible and clear. Participants often noted that their response to alignment permitted them to teach social studies. Working with text complexity mirrors historical thinking (Swan et al., 2015). Teachers may have more pedagogical experience of CCSS and social studies than realized. If advocacy for CCSS and social studies transpires, aligned instruction is more apparent.

Teachers need to see this instruction in action at all elementary grade levels and for every student population. Attempts to align some social studies content to the district's adopted reading textbook series diminished the integrity of the field of social studies. The district most likely perceived this method as reasonable and appropriate, but was a disservice to the purpose and possibilities of social studies education. In effect, this approach reiterates an absence of awareness of best practices in social studies education. And although digital access for the district's social studies curriculum includes available resources for many standards, most participants in this study failed to acknowledge this resource. Teachers maybe be unaware of this

resource because initial training and ongoing support did not transpire, or the resources are viewed as incompatible or ineffective with their social studies curriculum and instruction.

Language arts and social studies curriculum experts must work in concert to develop a transparent alignment with practical training. Onsite classroom observations where social studies is not only taught, it's featured and parallels prioritized literacy and math skills. As noted, content area professional development is more effective *with* content area teachers and not imposed *on* content area teachers (Gilles et al., 2013). Two teachers in this study worked on curriculum development at the district level. Despite the district's efforts, one of these participants was unsuccessful in implementing an integrative approach of language arts and social studies schoolwide. Many of her colleagues had not witnessed the integration or professional collaboration and found the suggestions, such as using a primary source as informational text for which students can evaluate and cite specific evidence, challenging to incorporate. If teachers are not included frequently on the effects of curriculum reform and aided with implementation, reform becomes burdensome and divisive. Additionally, participation in professional organizations, conference attendance, and grants revealed tremendous sources of influence. Awareness and encouragement to access these sources should be encouraged. Travel stipends, professional credits for recertification, and opportunities to share acquired knowledge should be standard. The district has an obligation to foster leadership in nurturing civic responsibility for students of the twenty-first century.

The Expansion of Elementary Social Studies

Improved professional development with the district would have significant influences on the field. Advocating an alignment between CCSS and social studies could invite an analysis of student test scores in every discipline. It is likely data would reveal student growth, in turn

advocating for social studies instructional time. More instructional time would generate more interest and supply of much needed instructional resources. Even without widespread reliance on a social studies text, an updated and aligned textbook to CCSS would improve teacher comfort. If a textbook is not an option, then providing extensive training on digital repositories for sources and lesson plans is essential. Transparency over the alignment between CCSS and the social studies curriculum to all practitioners would be a tremendous step in the right direction. Although some teachers suggested a high-stakes assessment for social studies at the elementary level, the expansion does not require this route. Instead, setting clear objectives and reconfiguring and integrating existing standards can promote the widespread inclusion of elementary social studies.

The marginalization of social studies education needs to end. Given the extensive research on the interdisciplinary nature of CCSS and similarities shared with social studies education, it is quite possible to begin the reversal. The district will most likely require hard facts in the form of student data. When the district realizes that student performance on standardized tests is improved with the presence of social studies, mandated adequate instructional time and resources should return to schools. The role and responsibilities of America's schools have changed over time, as the purpose and function of social studies education. Together, CCSS and the social studies can foster the civic competence for American students.

Further Research

This study offers valuable insight about how and why CCSS and social studies education are organically aligned. The perceptions of teachers indicate a gap in this knowledge purportedly prompted by the absence of district communication over expectations, and the prioritization of tested subject areas. The district's perspective was not considered in this study and offers a

necessary element for this ongoing discourse. Specifically, the district's K-12 social studies program specialist could provide the missing context over the perceived lack of available resources and professional development opportunities. School site supervisors would also add relevant context over the allocation of instructional studies time and expectations for social studies content on a local level. What factors are considered for appropriate scheduling for social studies? Based on the differences of allocated instructional time across district schools, how much does SES influence these decisions? Do elementary school principals advocate for social studies content within an independent course, blended with language arts and math, or both? The era of accountability includes conversations over measures of effective method to address and implement CCSS and the social studies. Should more social studies content be required during language arts instruction? Should a social studies course reinforce literacy skills? How could these methods be measured? An analysis of student performances on all tested subjects might be one such way. Interestingly, utilizing student data for other subjects could improve the district relevance for social studies education. Lastly, classroom observations should be utilized in determining the presence and influence of additional variables in the instructional decision-making for elementary social studies practitioners.

Because elementary teachers were only included in this study, conducting similar research on secondary social science teachers within this district could offer significant comparative data. Knowing whether these impacts effect elementary teachers with the responsibilities of teaching social studies or social studies practitioners at all levels, would further contextualize the discourse for social studies education. In reexamining the demographic data of participants, it would be beneficial to further explore such variables as teaching experience and professional development attendance. Demographic data that was not collected,

but would be valuable in future research may focus on professional trainings attended outside the district or coursework in higher education. Lastly, analyzing the elementary teacher's daily schedule, and comparing self-contained classrooms to those departmentalized, such as teachers with the responsibilities of two subject areas like language arts and social studies, or math and science. How does the amount of course taught effect curricular knowledge and do tested subjects influence teacher perceptions over alignment and expectations? The research on the effects of standards-based curriculum reform on elementary social studies deserves considerable attention.

Conclusions and Implications

The overarching question guiding this research asked how elementary teachers understand the relationship between CCSS and social studies in a district context. This relationship is diverse and sophisticated. It can be concluded that there are teachers that do not perceive an alignment between CCSS and the social studies curriculum and those that do. The recognized alignment shared literacy skills and methods of thinking between each sets of standards validating a strong sense of curricular knowledge. There were also perceptions pointing to weaker curricular knowledge. The lack of reference to CCSS objectives of civic competence in preparation for college and career was concerning. It was expected that social studies teachers would recognize some of the well-publicized intentions of CCSS. Why was this discourse not articulated, and what does this suggest about the effects of CCSS in general, and its relationship to social studies education? The expectations for CCSS and elementary social studies also differ. There is a confusion about what the district expects for social studies instruction for elementary students. In this district, overall, teachers with the responsibility of elementary social studies felt unsupported professionally in resources and training. They

expressed levels of ignorance about their curriculum that didn't seem necessary. In general, social studies content was regarded as unimportant because it is not a tested subject. Student performances on language arts, mathematics, and science are main priorities, and thus instructional time and resources are allocated to these subject areas. Much more research is needed on the relationship between high-stakes testing and professional support on subjects not associated with a standardized test. Despite time and resources available for elementary social studies teachers, they continued to find ways to incorporate their content. This resolve is commendable and deserves attention. On several occasions, participants reminded me how much this research was appreciated and absolutely needed. The effect of CCSS without dedicated K-5 social studies standards is a critical area of concern. The marginalization of social studies is at a critical level. The fear that social studies could continue this trajectory is a serious concern for these teachers. Frustration is at an all-time high considering how important their content is regardless of high-stakes testing. Several participants expressed a need for teaching on civics and good citizenship. These students will become future leaders, and without social studies, their opportunities are more limited. Social studies experiences must occur at elementary levels.

As reported in this study, guiding influences in determining an alignment between CCSS and the social studies resulted from instructional time and resources and the lack of district transparency in the delivery and support of the curriculums. However, these teachers may not necessarily represent all elementary teachers in the district. Interest in this research study represents a dedication for social studies that other teachers may not feel. I am aware that participants were hopeful that their voices might improve the current condition of social studies education, and they may not speak for all elementary social studies teachers. Our conversations revealed a heartened obligation for advocacy and urgent need for changes. Although our

discourse involved bitterness at times, there was always a sense of optimism. Teachers encounter daily challenges which they also find ways to overcome. Realized or not, the impact of CCSS at the elementary level offers this chance for change. The professional community must bring necessary attention and effect change. Curriculum reform results from political and social-economic factors. Enacting change will also result from these factors. Practitioners must be given chances to share their perspectives and offer their insight. After all, those at the ground level must be included in policy decisions and their consequences. Standardized student data should not be the ultimate voice in instructional decisions and until policymakers and district personnel arrive at this conclusion, education in general has a dismal future. The roles and responsibilities of America's schools, and social studies place in this context, will continue to endure.

All practitioners need to feel supported from all levels. A school district can positively shape this relationship by maintaining clear expectations and consistent transparency. Assumptions were made by some teachers claiming a trust that their curriculum included the changes from CCSS, but could not further elaborate on known shifts or alignment. The district may have assumed that teachers regularly review curriculum standards and develop natural integrations without professional development. Assumptions at the top level did not reveal a positive perspective. Confusion over alignment or expectations could have been mitigated if communication to district personnel had been better. I concede that the district is most likely unaware of these sentiments and if known would make the alignment for CCSS and social studies, and their expectations understandable, manageable, and employable. Mathison et al., (2006) stated that standards based education reform is the most powerful movement in education and schooling history. Eleven years later, SBER continues to influence instructional practices

and understandings, perhaps now including a broader perspective involving a more interdisciplinary approach. Perhaps the standards, not the associated testing, will ultimately prevail. All interests in social studies education would then be served, and a positive future more than possible.

References

- Adler, S. (2008). The education of social studies teachers. In L.S. Levstik & C. A. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 329-351). New York: Routledge.
- Altoff, P., & Golston, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Teaching reading with the social studies standards*. Silver Spring, MD: National Council for the Social Studies.
- American Historical Association. (1899). *The study of history in schools report to the American Historical Association by the committee of seven, Andrew C. McLaughlin, chairman, Herbert B. Adams, George L. Fox, Albert Bushnell Hart, Charles H. Haskins, Lucy M. Salmon, H. Morse Stephens*. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/studyofhistoryin01amer>
- Angus, D. L., & Mirel, J. E. (1999). *The failed promise of the American high school, 1890-1995*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Apple, M. (1986). *Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. (1993). The politics of official knowledge: Does a national curriculum make sense? *Teachers College Record*, 95(2), 222-241.
- Applebee, A. N. (2013). Common core state standards: The promise and peril in a national palimpsest. *English Journal*, 103(1), 25-33.
- Au, W. (2013). Coring social studies within corporate education reform: The Common Core State Standards, social justice, and the politics of knowledge in US schools. *Critical Education*, 4(5), 1-15.
- Britt, J. & Howe, M. (2014). Developing a vision for the Common Core classroom: What does elementary social studies look like? *The Social Studies*, 105(3), 158-163.
- Brooks, J.G., & Dietz, M.E. (2013). The dangers & opportunities of the Common Core: Can public education emerge from the Common Core initiative with a renewed focus on student learning? *Educational Leadership*, 70(4), 64-67.
- Brugar, K.A., & Roberts, K. L. (in press). Elementary students' challenges with informational texts: Reading the words and the world. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2017.02.001
- Burks, B., Beziat, T. L. R., Danley, S., Davis, K., Lowery, H., & Lucas, J. (2015). Adapting to change: Teacher perceptions of implementing the Common Core State Standards. *Education*, 136(2), 253-258.
- Burroughs, S., Groce, E. & Wobeck, M. L. (2005). Social studies education in the age of testing and accountability. *Educational Measurement: Issues & Practice*, 24(3), 13-20.

- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2014). *Frequently asked questions*. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/frequently-asked-questions/>
- DeCuir-Gunby, J. T., Marshall, P. L., & McCulloch, A. W. (2011). Developing and using a codebook for the analysis of interview data: An example from a professional development research project. *Field Methods, 23*(2), 136-155.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2013). *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Dewey, J. (1929). *The sources of a science of education*. New York: Horace Liveright.
- Evans, M. B., & Clark, S. K. (2015). Finding a place for CCSS literacy skills in the middle school social studies curriculum. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 88*(1), 1-8.
- Evans, R. W. (2015). Social studies Education eC21. In W. C. Parker (Ed.), *Social studies today* (pp. 25-34). New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Fitchett, P. G., & Heafner, T. L. (2010). A national perspective on the effects of high-stakes testing and standardization on elementary social studies marginalization. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 38*(1), 114-130.
- Fitchett, P. G., Heafner, T. L., & Lambert, R. (2014). Assessment, autonomy, and elementary social studies time. *Teachers College Record, 116*(10), 1-34.
- Fitchett, P. G., Heafner, T. L., & Lambert, R. G. (2014). Examining elementary social studies marginalization: A multilevel model. *Educational Policy, 28*(1), 40-68.
- Florida Department of Education. (2016). Understanding Florida Standards Assessment Reports. Retrieved from http://www.fsassessments.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Understanding-FSA-Reports_2016_FINAL_508-Version.pdf
- Franklin, B. (1999). Review Essay: The state of curriculum history. *History of Education, 69*(4), 459-476.
- Friedrich, D., Jasstad, B., & Popkewitz, T.S. (2010). Democratic education: An (im)possibility that remains to come. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 42*(5-6), 571-587.
- Gardner, N., & Powell, R. (2013). The Common Core is a change for the better. *Kappan, 95*(4), 49-53.
- Gewertz, C. (2012, April 25). Advocates of the Common Core worry weak implementation could derail venture. *Education Week, 31*(29). Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/04/25/29cs-overview.h31.html>

- Gilles, C., Wang, Y., Smith, J., & Johnson, D. (2013). "I'm no longer just teaching history." professional development for teaching common core state standards for literacy in social studies: By identifying the reading strategies they regularly use within their disciplines, content area teachers are better able to teach students how to derive meaning from texts. *Middle School Journal*, 44(3), 34-43.
- Gleeson, A. M., & D'Souza, L. A. (2016). Reframing a social studies methods course: Preparing elementary teacher candidates for the Common Core. *The Social Studies*, 107(5), 1-6.
- Grant, S.G. (2001). An uncertain lever: Exploring the influence of state-level testing in New York State on teaching social studies. *Teachers College Record*, 103(3), 398-426.
- Grant, S.G. (2007). High-stakes testing: How are social studies teachers responding? *Social Education*, 71(5), 250-254.
- Grant, S.G. & Salinas, C. (2008). Assessment and accountability in the social studies. In C. A. Tyson & L. S. Levstik, (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 219-236). New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Griffin, S. (2016). Who, what, where, how, and now? The C3 Framework and the C3 Literacy Collaborative Project. *Social Education*, 80(6), 330-332.
- Gross, R. E., & Dynneson, T.L. (1983). *What should we be teaching in the social studies?* Bloomington, IL: Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation.
- Grossman, T. G., Reyna, R., Shipton, S. (2011). *Realizing the potential: How governors can lead effective implementation of the Common Core State Standards*. Washington, DC: NGA Center for Best Practices.
- Heafner, T. L., & Fitchett, P. G. (2012). Tipping the scales: National trends of declining social studies instructional time in elementary schools. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 36 (2), 190-215.
- Heafner, T., Lipscomb, G. B., & Fitchett, P. G. (2014). Instructional practices of elementary social studies teachers in North and South Carolina. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 38(1), 15-31.
- Hermeling, A.D. (2013). Social studies on the outside looking in. *District Administration*. Retrieved from <http://www.districtadministration.com/article/social-studies-outside-looking>
- Hiebert, E. H., & Mesmer, H. E. (2013). Upping the ante of text complexity in the Common Core State Standards: Examining its potential impact on young readers. *Educational Research*, 42(1), 44-51.

- High-stakes testing (2017, July 5). In S. Abbot (Ed.), *The glossary of education reform*. Retrieved from <http://edglossary.org/high-stakes-testing/>
- Jochim, A. & McGuinn, P. (2016). The politics of the Common Core assessments. *Education Next*, 16(4), 44-52.
- Journell, W. (2011). Social studies, citizenship education, and the search for an American identity: An argument against a unifying narrative. *Journal of Thought*, 46(3-4), 5- 24.
- Justice, B. (2008). The great contest: The American Philosophical Society Education prize of 1795 and the problem of American education. *American Journal of Education*, 114(2), 191-213.
- Kaestle, C. (1982). Ideology and American educational history. *History of Education Quarterly*, 22(2), 123-137.
- Kerbe, W. J., & Paulhus, D. L. (1987). Socially desirable responding in organizational behavior: A reconception. *The Academy of Management Review*, 12(2), 250-264.
- Kerber, L. K. (1980). *Women of the republic: Intellect and ideology in revolutionary America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.
- Kenna, J. L. (2013). Implications of Common Core State Standards on social studies education. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 87(2), 219-225.
- Kenna, J. L. & Russell, W. B. (2015). Secondary social studies teachers' time commitment when address the Common Core State Standards. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 6(1), 26-48.
- Kliebard, H. (1995). *The struggle for the American curriculum: 1893-1958*. London: Routledge.
- Lee, J., & Swan, K. (2013). Is the Common Core good for the social studies? Yes, but... *National Council for the Social Studies*, 77(6), 327-330.
- Levin, H. (1994). Education and workplace needs. *Theory into Practice*, 33(2), 132-137.
- Levin-Epstein, M. (2016). Common Core at a crossroads. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Language*, 16(7), 24-30.
- Lichtman, M. (2013). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Mathison, S., Ross, E. W., & Vinson, K. D. (2006). Defining the social studies curriculum: Influence of and resistance to curriculum standards and testing in social studies. In *The Social Studies Curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (Kindle). Retrieved from Amazon.com.

- McHenry, P. (2014). History's actually become important again: Early perspectives on history instruction and the Common Core, *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 1, 89-95.
- Moreau, D. (2004). *Schoolbook nation: Conflicts over American history textbooks from the Civil War to present*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (NCSS) (2016). A vision of powerful teaching and learning in the social studies. *Social Education*, 80(3), 180-182.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (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*. Silver Spring: MD.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (NCSS) (2010). *National curriculum standards for social studies: A framework for teaching, learning, and assessment*. (2nd ed.). Silver Spring, MD.
- National Education Association. (1893). *Report on the Committee [of ten] on secondary school social studies appointed at the meeting of the National education association July 9, 1892, with the reports of the conference arranged by this committee and held December 28-30, 1892*. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/cu31924030593580>
- National Governors Association for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2014). *Common Core State Standards*. Washington, DC: Authors.
- No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1425 (2002).
- Noddings, N. (2003). Teaching as practice? *Journal of the Philosophy of Education*, 37(2), 241-251.
- Nowell, S. D. (2017). "It's about the why": Social studies teachers' perceptions and pedagogy of common core literacy integration. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 41(1), 63-73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2016.03.002>.
- Olsen, J. (2013, February 8). Common Core and print. *Edutopia*. Retrieved from <http://www.edutopia.org/blog/common-core-and-print-jonathan-olsen>
- Ortlipp, M. (2008). Keeping and using reflective journals in the qualitative research process. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 695-705.
- Pace, J. L. (2012). The complex and unequal impact of high stakes accountability on untested social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 39(1), 32-60.
- Parker, W. C. (2015). Social studies Education eC21. In W. C. Parker (Ed.), *Social studies today* (pp. 3-13). New York: Taylor and Francis.

- Popkewitz, T. S. (2009). Curriculum study, curriculum history, and curriculum theory: the reason of reason. *Curriculum Studies*, 41(3), 301-319.
- Porter, A., McMaken, J., Hwang, J., & Yang, R. (2011). Common Core Standards: The new U.S. intended curriculum. *Educational Researcher*, 40(3), 103-116.
- Ravitch, D. (2000). *Left back: A century of failed school reforms*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Ravitch, D. (2014, January 18). Everything you need to know about the Common Core. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/wp/2014/01/18/everything-you-need-to-know-about-common-core-ravitch/>
- Riley, R. W. (1995, September). *The Improving America's Schools Acts of 1994: Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/offices/OESE/archives/legislation/ESEA/brochure/iasa-bro.html>
- Ross, E. W., Mathison, S., & Vinson, K. D. (2014). Social studies curriculum and teaching in the era of standardization. *Social Studies Curriculum, The Purposes, Problems, and Possibilities*, 25, 25-44.
- Rothman, R. (2012). Laying a common foundation for success. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 94(3), 57-61.
- Rudolph, F. (1965). *Essays on education in the early republic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schneider, M. K. (2015). *Common Core dilemma: Who owns our schools?* New York: Teachers College.
- Stanford History Education Group. Charting the Future of Teaching Past. Retrieved from <https://sheg.stanford.edu/historical-thinking-chart>.
- Swan, K., Lee, J., & Grant, S.C. (2015). A study of state social studies coordinators' views on the Common Core. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 40(4), Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2015.07.002i>
- Thornton, S. J. (1989, March). *Aspiration and practice: Teacher as curricular-instructional gatekeeper in social studies*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Thornton, S. J. (2005). *Teaching social studies that matters: Curriculum for active learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ujifusa, A. (2016). Map: Tracking the Common Core State Standards. *Education Week*, 36(11), 16. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/section/multimedia/map-states-academic-standards-common-core-or.html>

- United States Department of Education (2010). *A blueprint for reform: The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED514181.pdf>
- Vilson, J. (2015, July 7). The common core debate: One teacher vs. the experts. *Edutopia*. Retrieved from <http://www.edutopia.org/blog/common-core-teacher-vs-experts-jose-vilson>.
- Vinovskis, M. (2000). The federal role in educational research and development. *Brookings Papers on Education Policy*, 359-396.
- Vogler, K. E. (2005). Impact of a high school graduation examination on social studies teachers' instructional practices. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 29(2), 19-33.
- Vogler, K. E., Lintner, T., Lipscomb, G. B., Knopf, H., Heafner, T. I., & Rock, T. C., (2007). Getting off the backburner: Impact of testing elementary social studies as part of a state-mandated accountability program. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 31(2), 20-34.
- Vogler, K. E. (2011). Back on the backburner? Impact of reducing state-mandated social studies testing on elementary teachers' instruction. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 35(2), 163-190.
- Warren, D. (2001). Original intents: Public schools as civic education. *Theory into Practice*, 27(4), 243-249.
- Warren, D. (2002). From there to where: The social foundations of education in transit again. *Educational Studies*, 29(2), 117-130.
- Wills, J. S. (2007). Putting the squeeze on social studies: Managing teaching dilemmas in subject areas excluded from state testing. *Teachers College Record*, 109(8), 1980-2046.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods*. New York: Sage.
- Zacanella, D., & Moore, M. (2014). The origins of the Common Core: Untold stories. *National Council for the Teachers of English*, 91(4), 273-279.
- Zerbe, W. J., & Paulhus, D. L. (1987). Socially desirable responding in organizational behavior: A reconception. *The Academy of Management Review*, 12(2), 250-264.

APPENDIX A

ADOPTION OF THE COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS (CCSS) BY STATE

Table 1		
<i>Adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) by State</i>		
U.S. State Adoption		
<u>Adopted</u>	<u>Not Adopted</u>	<u>Rewrote/Replaced</u>
Washington	Minnesota (ELA only)	New Jersey
Oregon	Nebraska	Indiana
California	Alaska	West Virginia
Nevada	Virginia	Tennessee
Idaho		Missouri
Montana		Arkansas
Colorado		Oklahoma
Utah		South Carolina
Arizona		Louisiana
New Mexico		
Wyoming		
North Dakota		
South Dakota		
Iowa		
Kansas		
Wisconsin		
Michigan		
Illinois		
Kentucky		
Ohio		
Mississippi		
Alabama		
Georgia		
Florida		
Maine		
New Hampshire		
Vermont		
New York		
Pennsylvania		
Massachusetts		
Connecticut		
Rhode Island		
Delaware		
Maryland		
North Carolina		
Hawaii		

APPENDIX B: IRB LETTER OF APPROVAL



RESEARCH INTEGRITY AND COMPLIANCE
 Institutional Review Boards, FWA No. 00001669
 12901 Bruce B. Downs Blvd., MDC035 • Tampa, FL 33612-4799
 (813) 974-5638 • FAX (813) 974-7091

April 25, 2017

Kacie Nadeau
 Educational and Psychological Studies
 Sarasota, FL 34233

RE: **Expedited Approval for Initial Review**
 IRB#: Pro00030119
 Title: **The Common Core State Standards and the Elementary Social Studies Curriculum**

Study Approval Period: 4/25/2017 to 4/25/2018

Dear Ms. Nadeau:

On 4/25/2017, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviewed and **APPROVED** the above application and all documents contained within, including those outlined below.

Approved Item(s):

Protocol Document(s):

[Protocol Version #1](#)

Note, no research activities can begin without you receiving the required letter of support from the school district and uploading the letter in your application thru the Amendment process and then receiving approval.

Consent/Assent Document(s)*:

[Informed Consent .pdf](#)

*Please use only the official IRB stamped informed consent/assent document(s) found under the "Attachments" tab. Please note, these consent/assent documents are valid until the consent document is amended and approved.

It was the determination of the IRB that your study qualified for expedited review which includes activities that (1) present no more than minimal risk to human subjects, and (2) involve only procedures listed in one or more of the categories outlined below. The IRB may review research through the expedited review procedure authorized by 45CFR46.110. The research

f

proposed in this study is categorized under the following expedited review category:

(6) Collection of data from voice, video, digital, or image recordings made for research purposes.

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

As the principal investigator of this study, it is your responsibility to conduct this study in accordance with IRB policies and procedures and as approved by the IRB. Any changes to the approved research must be submitted to the IRB for review and approval via an amendment. Additionally, all unanticipated problems must be reported to the USF IRB within five (5) calendar days.

We appreciate your dedication to the ethical conduct of human subject research at the University of South Florida and your continued commitment to human research protections. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please call 813-974-5638.

Sincerely,



Kristen Salomon, Ph.D., Vice Chairperson
USF Institutional Review Board

APPENDIX C: TEACHER RECRUITMENT EMAIL



You are cordially invited to participate in a research study. This study will be used to satisfy partial fulfillment for doctoral dissertation at the University of South Florida. I am currently a doctoral student in the College of Education within the department of Interdisciplinary Education. I am interested in conducting research in Sarasota County. My dissertation involves how curriculum reform is understood by elementary classroom teachers. The purpose of this study is to examine the role of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) on the elementary (K-5) social studies curriculum. The IRB study number is 30119.

This study only involves teachers that have the **responsibility of teaching elementary social studies**. If you have taught **elementary social studies during the 2015-2016 or the 2016-2017 school years**, you are eligible to participate in this study. This research is asking you to complete **two 30 minute interviews over the course of three weeks**.

Your participation will take approximately **one hour** in total and is **strictly voluntary**. You may refuse to participate at all, or choose to cease participation at any point in the research, without fear of penalty or negative consequences of any kind. There will be no monetary compensation for your participation. **The interviews will not be conducted during your duty time and determined at a mutually agreed upon location**. Your **identity and school will remain anonymous** and be used for educational research purposes only. Your responses will remain secure and **not be shared with administrators, directors, colleagues, or school board members**.

If you are interested in participating in this research study, simply reply to this email message. If you are selected for participation, I will contact you with more specific information about the study.

Sincerely,

Kacie M. Nadeau

Contact Information:

Kacie Nadeau

kacienadeau@gmail.com

941-302-3677

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW #1 PROTOCOL

Pro#30119

Interview Questions

Interview Questions for K-5 Teachers with Responsibilities for Teaching Social Studies

First Thirty-Minute Semi-Structured Interview

Demographic Data:

1. What grade level did you teach during the 2015-2016 school year?
2. Please identify the socio-economic status of your school: High SES, Middle SES, or Low SES
3. How many years of teaching experience do you have?
4. How many years of teaching experience with responsibilities in elementary social studies do you have?
5. On average, how many minutes of social studies instruction occurs in your classroom on a weekly basis?
5. How did you first hear about the Common Core State Standards?
6. How did the district share the Common Core State Standards with you?
7. What types of trainings on the Common Core State Standards have you attended?
8. How much of these trainings was devoted to social studies curriculum?

Research Question 1: How do elementary (K-5) in a medium-sized district in the Southeast with responsibilities for teaching social studies perceive the alignment between CCSS and the district's social studies curriculum and, what, if any, gaps do they see between CCSS expectations and social studies expectations for elementary students?

9. Please describe the school in which you work.
10. In what ways have you aligned CCSS to your elementary social studies curriculum? Can you tell me more?
11. Do you see any similarities between the expectations of CCSS and the expectations social studies curriculum? If so, give examples.
12. Can you share an example of how CCSS has affected your social studies curriculum?
13. Are there specific reading skills stated in the CCSS that also align to your social studies curriculum? Can you share an example?
14. Are there specific writing skills stated in the CCSS that also align to your social studies curriculum? Can you share an example?
15. Is there anything else you would like to add?
16. Do you have any questions for me?

APPENDIX E: INTERVIEW #2 PROTOCOL

Pro#30119

Interview Questions

Interview Questions for K-5 Teachers with Responsibilities for Teaching Social Studies

Second Thirty-Minute Semi-Structured Interview

Research Question 1: (Continued) How do elementary (K-5) in a medium-sized district in the Southeast with responsibilities for teaching social studies perceive the alignment between CCSS and the district's social studies curriculum and, what, if any, gaps do they see between CCSS expectations and social studies expectations for elementary students?

1. You mentioned....as similarities between the expectations of CCSS and the expectations of social studies curriculum. Can you tell me more about what you mean by?
2. In what ways does the expectations of CCSS and the district's expectations of elementary social studies differ? Can you tell me more?

Research Question 2: What influences the ways in which elementary social studies teachers in a medium-sized district in the Southeast address the degree of alignment they perceive between CCSS expectations and the district's elementary social studies expectations?

3. How has your teaching perspective changed towards your social studies curriculum because of CCSS? Can you provide a specific example?
4. How have you responded to the alignment of CCSS on your social studies curriculum?
5. What has influenced your understanding of the expectations of CCSS and your elementary social studies curriculum?
6. In what ways is your curriculum different today after the adoption of Common Core State Standards?
7. What future opportunities could make an impact on the district's expectations of CCSS on social studies curriculum expectations?
8. Is there anything else you would like to add?
9. Do you have any questions for me

APPENDIX F: SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM K-5 with CCSS

The data was retrieved from Florida Department of Education's K-5 2014 and 2015 social studies course descriptions. Each description includes a brief summary of expectations, listed under grade level in this table. The LAFS and MAFS are listed before the social studies curriculum on the course descriptions, listed under changes after adoption of CCSS. The social studies curriculum is organized by strand and standard.

Grade Level	Strand	Standard	Changes After Adoption of CCSS
K Living, Learning and Working Together: Kindergarten students will learn about themselves, their families, and the community. Students will be introduced to basic concepts related to	American History	SS.K.A.1.1: Develop an understanding of how to use and create a timeline. SS.K.A.1.2: Develop an awareness of a primary source. SS.K.A.2.1: Compare children and families of today with those in the past. SS.K.A.2.2: Recognize the importance of celebrations and national holidays as a way of remembering and honoring people, events, and our nation's ethnic heritage. SS.K.A.2.3: Compare our nation's holidays with holidays of other cultures. SS.K.A.2.4: Listen to and retell stories about people in the past who have shown character ideals and principles including honesty, courage, and responsibility. SS.K.A.2.5: Recognize the importance of U.S. symbols. SS.K.A.3.1: Use words and phrases related to chronology and time to explain how things change and to sequentially order events that have occurred in school. SS.K.A.3.2: Explain that calendars represent days of the	<u>Informational Text:</u> LAFS.K.RI.1.1: With prompting and support, ask and answer questions about key details in a text. LAFS.K.RI.1.2: With prompting and support, identify the main topic and retell key details of a text. LAFS.K.RI.1.3: With prompting and support, describe the connection between two individuals, events, ideas, or pieces of information in a text. LAFS.K.RI.2.4: With prompting and support, ask and answer questions about unknown words in a text. LAFS.K.RI.3.7: With prompting and support, describe the relationship between illustrations and the text in which they appear (e.g., what person, place, thing, or idea in the text an illustration depicts). LAFS.K.RI.3.8: With prompting and support, identify the reasons an author gives to support points in a text. LAFS.K.RI.4.10: Actively engage in group reading activities with purpose and understanding.

Grade Level	Strand	Standard	Changes After Adoption of CCSS
		<p>address, city or town and that Florida is the state in which the student lives.</p> <p>SS.K.G.3.1: Identify basic landforms.</p> <p>SS.K.G.3.2: Identify basic bodies of water.</p> <p>SS.K.G.3.3 Describe and give examples of seasonal weather changes, and illustrate how weather affects people and the environment.</p>	<p>happened.</p> <p>LAFS.K.W.2.5: With guidance and support from adults, respond to questions and suggestions from peers and add details to strengthen writing as needed.</p> <p><u>Measurement and Data:</u> MAFS.K.MD.1: Describe and compare measurable attributes.</p> <p><u>Mathematical Practice</u> MAFS.K12.MP.1.1 Make sense of problems and persevere in solving them. MAFS.K12.MP.3.1 Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others. MAFS.K12.MP.5.1 Use appropriate tools strategically. MAFS.K12.MP.6.1 Attend to precision.</p>
<p>1 Our Community and Beyond:</p> <p>First grade students will expand their knowledge of family and community through explorations in history,</p>	<p>American History</p>	<p>SS.1.A.1.1: Develop an understanding of a primary source.</p> <p>SS.1.A.1.2: Understand how to use the media center/other sources to find answers to questions about a historical topic.</p> <p>SS.1.A.2.1: Understand history tells the story of people and events of other times and places.</p> <p>SS.1.A.2.2: Compare life now with life in the past.</p> <p>SS.1.A.2.3: Identify celebrations and national holidays as a way of remembering and honoring the heroism and achievements of the people, events, and our nation's ethnic heritage.</p> <p>SS.1.A.2.4: Identify people from the past who have shown character ideals and principles including honesty,</p>	<p><u>Information Reading:</u> LAFS.1.RI.1.1: Ask and answer questions about key details in a text. LAFS.1.RI.1.2: Identify the main topic and retell key details of a text. LAFS.1.RI.1.3: Describe the connection between two individuals, events, ideas, or pieces of information in a text. LAFS.1.RI.2.4: Ask and answer questions to help determine or clarify the meaning of words and phrases in a text. LAFS.1.RI.2.5: Know and use various text features (e.g., headings, tables of contents, glossaries, electronic menus, icons) to locate key facts or</p>

Grade Level	Strand	Standard	Changes After Adoption of CCSS
	Geography	<p>SS.1.E.1.3: Distinguish between examples of goods and services.</p> <p>SS.1.E.1.4: Distinguish people as buyers, sellers, and producers of goods and services.</p> <p>SS.1.E.1.5: Recognize the importance of saving money for future purchases.</p> <p>SS.1.E.1.6: Identify that people need to make choices because of scarce resources.</p> <p>SS.1.G.1.1: Use physical and political/cultural maps to locate places in Florida.</p> <p>SS.1.G.1.2: Identify key elements (compass rose, cardinal directions, title, key/legend with symbols) of maps and globes .</p> <p>SS.1.G.1.3: Construct a basic map using key elements including cardinal directions and map symbols.</p> <p>SS.1.G.1.4: Identify a variety of physical features using a map and globe.</p> <p>SS.1.G.1.5: Locate on maps and globes the student's local community, Florida, the Atlantic Ocean, and the Gulf of Mexico.</p> <p>SS.1.G.1.6: Describe how location, weather, and physical environment affect the way people live in our community.</p>	<p><u>Writing:</u></p> <p>LAFS.1.W.1.1: Write opinion pieces in which they introduce the topic or name the book they are writing about, state an opinion, supply a reason for the opinion, and provide some sense of closure.</p> <p>LAFS.1.W.1.2: Write informative/explanatory texts in which they name a topic, supply some facts about the topic, and provide some sense of closure.</p> <p>LAFS.1.W.1.3: Write narratives in which they recount two or more appropriately sequenced events, include some details regarding what happened, use temporal words to signal event order, and provide some sense of closure.</p> <p>LAFS.1.W.2.5: With guidance and support from adults, focus on a topic, respond to questions and suggestions from peers, and add details to strengthen writing as needed.</p> <p>LAFS.1.W.2.6: With guidance and support from adults, use a variety of digital tools to produce and publish writing, including in collaboration with peers.</p> <p>LAFS.1.W.3.7: Participate in shared research and writing projects (e.g., explore a number of “howto” books on a given topic and use them to write a sequence of instructions).</p> <p>LAFS.1.W.3.8: With guidance and support from adults, recall information from experiences or gather information from provided sources to answer a question.</p>

Grade Level	Strand	Standard	Changes After Adoption of CCSS
			<p><u>Mathematical Practice:</u> MAFS.K12.MP.1.1 Make sense of problems and persevere in solving them. MAFS.K12.MP.3.1 Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others. MAFS.K12.MP.5.1 Use appropriate tools strategically. MAFS.K12.MP.6.1 Attend to precision.</p>
<p>2</p> <p>Who We Are As Americans: Second grade students will investigate the impact of immigration over time in the United States, explore the geography of North America, and discover the foundations of American citizenship.</p>	<p>American History</p> <p>Civics</p>	<p>SS.2.A.1.1: Examine primary and secondary sources. SS.2.A.1.2: Utilize the media center, technology, or other informational sources to locate information that provides answers to questions about a historical topic. SS.2.A.2.1: Recognize that Native Americans were the first inhabitants in North America. SS.2.A.2.2: Compare the cultures of Native American tribes from various geographic regions of the United States. SS.2.A.2.3: Describe the impact of immigrants on the Native Americans. SS.2.A.2.4: Explore ways the daily life of people living in Colonial America changed over time. SS.2.A.2.5: Identify reasons people came to the United States throughout history. SS.2.A.2.6: Discuss the importance of Ellis Island and the Statue of Liberty to immigration from 1892 - 1954. SS.2.A.2.7: Discuss why immigration continues today. SS.2.A.2.8: Explain the cultural influences and contributions of immigrants today. SS.2.A.3.1: Identify terms and designations of time sequence. SS.2.C.1.1: Explain why people form governments.</p>	<p><u>Informational Reading:</u> LAFS.2.RI.1.1: Ask and answer such questions as who, what, where, when, why, and how to demonstrate understanding of key details in a text. LAFS.2.RI.1.2: Identify the main topic of a multiparagraph text as well as the focus of specific paragraphs within the text. LAFS.2.RI.1.3: Describe the connection between a series of historical events, scientific ideas or concepts, or steps in technical procedures in a text. LAFS.2.RI.2.4: Determine the meaning of words and phrases in a text relevant to a grade 2 topic or subject area. LAFS.2.RI.2.5: Know and use various text features (e.g., captions, bold print, subheadings, glossaries, indexes, electronic menus, icons) to locate key facts or information in a text efficiently. LAFS.2.RI.2.6: Identify the main purpose of a text, including what the author wants to answer, explain, or describe. LAFS.2.RI.3.7: Explain how specific images (e.g., a diagram showing how a machine works) contribute to and clarify a text.</p>

Grade Level	Strand	Standard	Changes After Adoption of CCSS
	<p>Economics</p> <p>Geography</p>	<p>SS.2.C.1.2: Explain the consequences of an absence of rules and laws.</p> <p>SS.2.C.2.1: Identify what it means to be a United States citizen either by birth or by naturalization.</p> <p>SS.2.C.2.2: Define and apply the characteristics of responsible citizenship.</p> <p>SS.2.C.2.3: Explain why United States citizens have guaranteed rights and identify rights.</p> <p>SS.2.C.2.4: Identify ways citizens can make a positive contribution in their community.</p> <p>SS.2.C.2.5: Evaluate the contributions of various African Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, veterans, and women.</p> <p>SS.2.C.3.1: Identify the Constitution as the document which establishes the structure, function, powers, and limits of American government.</p> <p>SS.2.C.3.2: Recognize symbols, individuals, events, and documents that represent the United States.</p> <p>SS.2.E.1.1: Recognize that people make choices because of limited resources.</p> <p>SS.2.E.1.2: Recognize that people supply goods and services based on consumer demands.</p> <p>SS.2.E.1.3: Recognize that the United States trades with other nations to exchange goods and services.</p> <p>SS.2.E.1.4: Explain the personal benefits and costs involved in saving and spending.</p> <p>SS.2.G.1.1: Use different types of maps (political, physical, and thematic) to identify map elements.</p> <p>SS.2.G.1.2: Using maps and globes, locate the student's hometown, Florida, and North America, and locate the state capital and the national capital.</p>	<p>LAFS.2.RI.3.8: Describe how an author uses reasons to support specific points in a text.</p> <p>LAFS.2.RI.3.9: Compare and contrast the most important points presented by two texts on the same topic.</p> <p>LAFS.2.RI.4.10: By the end of year, read and comprehend informational texts, including history/social studies, science, and technical texts, in the grades 2–3 text complexity band proficiently, with scaffolding as needed at the high end of the range.</p> <p><u>Speaking and Listening:</u></p> <p>LAFS.2.SL.1.1: Participate in collaborative conversations with diverse partners about grade 2 topics and texts with peers and adults in small and larger groups.</p> <p>LAFS.2.SL.1.2: Recount or describe key ideas or details from a text read aloud or information presented orally or through other media.</p> <p>LAFS.2.SL.1.3: Ask and answer questions about what a speaker says in order to clarify comprehension, gather additional information, or deepen understanding of a topic or issue.</p> <p>LAFS.2.SL.2.4: Tell a story or recount an experience with appropriate facts and relevant, descriptive details, speaking audibly in coherent sentences.</p> <p><u>Writing:</u></p> <p>LAFS.2.W.1.2: Write informative/explanatory texts</p>

Grade Level	Strand	Standard	Changes After Adoption of CCSS
		SS.2.G.1.3: Label on a map or globe the continents, oceans, Equator, Prime Meridian, North and South Pole. SS.2.G.1.4: Use a map to locate the countries in North America (Canada, United States, Mexico, and the Caribbean Islands).	<p>in which they introduce a topic, use facts and definitions to develop points, and provide a concluding statement or section.</p> <p>LAFS.2.W.1.3: Write narratives in which they recount a well-elaborated event or short sequence of events, include details to describe actions, thoughts, and feelings, use temporal words to signal event order, and provide a sense of closure.</p> <p>LAFS.2.W.2.5: With guidance and support from adults and peers, focus on a topic and strengthen writing as needed by revising and editing.</p> <p>LAFS.2.W.3.7: Participate in shared research and writing projects (e.g., read a number of books on a single topic to produce a report; record science observations).</p> <p><u>Measurement and Data:</u> MAFS.2.MD.3: Work with time and money. MAFS.2.MD.4: Represent and interpret data.</p> <p><u>Mathematical Practice:</u> MAFS.K12.MP.1.1 Make sense of problems and persevere in solving them. MAFS.K12.MP.3.1 Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others. MAFS.K12.MP.5.1 Use appropriate tools strategically. MAFS.K12.MP.6.1 Attend to precision.</p>
Third Grade: The United States	American History	SS.3.A.1.1: Analyze primary and secondary sources. SS.3.A.1.2: Utilize technology resources to gather information from primary and secondary sources.	<p><u>Informational Reading:</u> LAFS.3.RI.1.1: Ask and answer questions to demonstrate understanding of a text, referring</p>

Grade Level	Strand	Standard	Changes After Adoption of CCSS
		<p>SS.3.G.1.3: Label the continents and oceans on a world map.</p> <p>SS.3.G.1.4: Name and identify the purpose of maps (physical, political, elevation, population).</p> <p>SS.3.G.1.5: Compare maps and globes to develop an understanding of the concept of distortion.</p> <p>SS.3.G.1.6: Use maps to identify different types of scale to measure distances between two places.</p> <p>Remarks/Examples: Examples are linear, fractional, word.</p> <p>SS.3.G.2.1: Label the countries and commonwealths in North America (Canada, United States, Mexico) and in the Caribbean (Puerto Rico, Cuba, Bahamas, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Jamaica).</p> <p>SS.3.G.2.2: Identify the five regions of the United States.</p> <p>SS.3.G.2.3: Label the states in each of the five regions of the United States.</p> <p>SS.3.G.2.4: Describe the physical features of the United States, Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean.</p> <p>SS.3.G.2.5: Identify natural and man-made landmarks in the United States, Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean.</p> <p>SS.3.G.2.6: Investigate how people perceive places and regions differently by conducting interviews, mental mapping, and studying news, poems, legends, and songs about a region or area.</p> <p>SS.3.G.3.1: Describe the climate and vegetation in the United States, Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean.</p> <p>SS.3.G.3.2: Describe the natural resources in the United States, Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean.</p> <p>SS.3.G.4.1: Explain how the environment influences</p>	<p>the high end of the grades 2–3 text complexity band independently and proficiently.</p> <p><u>Speaking and Listening:</u> LAFS.3.SL.1.1: Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 3 topics and texts, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly. LAFS.3.SL.1.2: Determine the main ideas and supporting details of a text read aloud or information presented in diverse media and formats, including visually, quantitatively, and orally. LAFS.3.SL.1.3: Ask and answer questions about information from a speaker, offering appropriate elaboration and detail. LAFS.3.SL.2.4: Report on a topic or text, tell a story, or recount an experience with appropriate facts and relevant, descriptive details, speaking clearly at an understandable pace.</p> <p><u>Writing:</u> LAFS.3.W.1.1: Write opinion pieces on topics or texts, supporting a point of view with reasons. LAFS.3.W.1.2: Write informative/explanatory texts to examine a topic and convey ideas and information clearly. LAFS.3.W.1.3: Write narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, descriptive details, and clear event</p>

Grade Level	Strand	Standard	Changes After Adoption of CCSS
		<p>settlement patterns in the United States, Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean.</p> <p>SS.3.G.4.2: Identify the cultures that have settled the United States, Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean.</p> <p>SS.3.G.4.3: Compare the cultural characteristics of diverse populations in one of the five regions of the United States with Canada, Mexico, or the Caribbean.</p> <p>SS.3.G.4.4: Identify contributions from various ethnic groups to the United States.</p>	<p>sequences.</p> <p>LAFS.3.W.2.4: With guidance and support from adults, produce writing in which the development and organization are appropriate to task and purpose. (Grade specific expectations for writing types are defined in standards 1–3 above.)</p> <p>LAFS.3.W.2.5: With guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, and editing.</p> <p>LAFS.3.W.2.6: With guidance and support from adults, use technology to produce and publish writing (using keyboarding skills) as well as to interact and collaborate with others.</p> <p>LAFS.3.W.3.7: Conduct short research projects that build knowledge about a topic.</p> <p>LAFS.3.W.3.8: Recall information from experiences or gather information from print and digital sources; take brief notes on sources and sort evidence into provided categories.</p> <p>LAFS.3.W.4.10: Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of discipline-specific tasks, purposes, and audiences.</p> <p><u>Measurement and Data:</u> MAFS.3.MD.2: Represent and interpret data.</p> <p><u>Mathematical Practice:</u> MAFS.K12.MP.1.1 Make sense of problems and</p>

Grade Level	Strand	Standard	Changes After Adoption of CCSS
			<p>persevere in solving them.</p> <p>MAFS.K12.MP.3.1 Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others.</p> <p>MAFS.K12.MP.5.1 Use appropriate tools strategically.</p> <p>MAFS.K12.MP.6.1 Attend to precision.</p>
<p>Fourth Grade: Florida Studies</p> <p>Fourth grade students will learn about Florida history focusing on exploration and colonization, growth, and the 20th Century and beyond. Students will study the important people, places, and events that helped shape Florida history.</p>	<p>American History</p>	<p>SS.4.A.1.1: Analyze primary and secondary resources to identify significant individuals and events throughout Florida history.</p> <p>SS.4.A.1.2: Synthesize information related to Florida history through print and electronic media.</p> <p>SS.4.A.2.1: Compare Native American tribes in Florida.</p> <p>SS.4.A.3.1: Identify explorers who came to Florida and the motivations for their expeditions.</p> <p>SS.4.A.3.2: Describe causes and effects of European colonization on the Native American tribes of Florida.</p> <p>SS.4.A.3.3: Identify the significance of St. Augustine as the oldest permanent European settlement in the United States.</p> <p>SS.4.A.3.4: Explain the purpose of and daily life on missions (San Luis de Talimali in present-day Tallahassee).</p> <p>SS.4.A.3.5: Identify the significance of Fort Mose as the first free African community in the United States.</p> <p>SS.4.A.3.6: Identify the effects of Spanish rule in Florida.</p> <p>SS.4.A.3.7: Identify nations (Spain, France, England) that controlled Florida before it became a United States territory.</p>	<p><u>Informational Reading:</u></p> <p>LAFS.4.RI.1.1. Refer to details and examples in a text when explaining what the text says explicitly and when drawing inferences from the text.</p> <p>LAFS.4.RI.1.2: Determine the main idea of a text and explain how it is supported by key details; summarize the text.</p> <p>LAFS.4.RI.1.3: Explain events, procedures, ideas, or concepts in a historical, scientific, or technical text, including what happened and why, based on specific information in the text.</p> <p>LAFS.4.RI.2.4: Determine the meaning of general academic and domain-specific words or phrases in a text relevant to a grade 4 topic or subject area.</p> <p>LAFS.4.RI.2.5: Describe the overall structure (e.g., chronology, comparison, cause/effect, problem/solution) of events, ideas, concepts, or information in a text or part of a text.</p> <p>LAFS.4.RI.2.6: Compare and contrast a firsthand and secondhand account of the same event or topic; describe the differences in focus and the information provided.</p> <p>LAFS.4.RI.3.7: Interpret information presented visually, orally, or quantitatively (e.g., in charts,</p>

Grade Level	Strand	Standard	Changes After Adoption of CCSS
		<p>SS.4.A.3.8: Explain how the Seminole tribe formed and the purpose for their migration.</p> <p>SS.4.A.3.9: Explain how Florida (Adams-Onis Treaty) became a U.S. territory.</p> <p>SS.4.A.3.10: Identify the causes and effects of the Seminole Wars.</p> <p>SS.4.A.4.1: Explain the effects of technological advances on Florida.</p> <p>SS.4.A.4.2: Describe pioneer life in Florida.</p> <p>SS.4.A.5.1: Describe Florida's involvement (secession, blockades of ports, the battles of Ft. Pickens, Olustee, Ft. Brooke, Natural Bridge, food supply) in the Civil War.</p> <p>SS.4.A.5.2: Summarize challenges Floridians faced during Reconstruction.</p> <p>SS.4.6.1: Describe the economic development of Florida's major industries.</p> <p>SS.4.A.6.2: Summarize contributions immigrant groups made to Florida.</p> <p>SS.4.A.6.3: Describe the contributions of significant individuals to Florida.</p> <p>SS.4.A.6.4: Describe effects of the Spanish American War on Florida.</p> <p>economic boom at Ft. Brooke due to Rough Riders, Cuban immigration.</p> <p>SS.4.A.7.1: Describe the causes and effects of the 1920's Florida land boom and bust.</p> <p>SS.4.A.7.2: Summarize challenges Floridians faced during the Great Depression.</p> <p>Remarks/Examples: Examples may include, but are not limited to, the Labor</p>	<p>graphs, diagrams, time lines, animations, or interactive elements on Web pages) and explain how the information contributes to an understanding of the text in which it appears.</p> <p>LAFS.4.RI.3.8: Explain how an author uses reasons and evidence to support particular points in a text.</p> <p>LAFS.4.RI.3.9: Integrate information from two texts on the same topic in order to write or speak about the subject knowledgeably.</p> <p>LAFS.4.RI.4.10: By the end of year, read and comprehend informational texts, including history/social studies, science, and technical texts, in the grades 4–5 text complexity band proficiently, with scaffolding as needed at the high end of the range.</p> <p><u>Speaking and Listening:</u></p> <p>LAFS.4.SL.1.1: Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 4 topics and texts, building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly.</p> <p>LAFS.4.SL.1.2: Paraphrase portions of a text read aloud or information presented in diverse media and formats, including visually, quantitatively, and orally.</p> <p>LAFS.4.SL.1.3: Identify the reasons and evidence a speaker provides to support particular points.</p> <p>LAFS.4.SL.2.4: Report on a topic or text, tell a story, or recount an experience in an organized manner, using appropriate facts and relevant, descriptive details to</p>

Grade Level	Strand	Standard	Changes After Adoption of CCSS
	<p data-bbox="436 711 527 737">Civics</p> <p data-bbox="436 1295 583 1321">Economics</p>	<p data-bbox="621 272 1325 412">Day hurricane of 1935 and the Mediterranean fruit fly. SS.4.A.7.3: Identify Florida's role in World War II. SS.4.A.8.1: Identify Florida's role in the Civil Rights Movement.</p> <p data-bbox="621 418 1346 488">SS.4.A.8.2: Describe how and why immigration impacts Florida today.</p> <p data-bbox="621 495 1283 565">SS.4.A.8.3: Describe the effect of the United States space program on Florida's economy and growth.</p> <p data-bbox="621 571 1255 641">SS.4.A.8.4: Explain how tourism affects Florida's economy and growth.</p> <p data-bbox="621 647 1325 717">SS.4.A.9.1: Utilize timelines to sequence key events in Florida history.</p> <p data-bbox="621 724 1339 821">SS.4.C.1.1: Describe how Florida's constitution protects the rights of citizens and provides for the structure, function, and purposes of state government.</p> <p data-bbox="621 828 1331 898">SS.4.C.2.1: Discuss public issues in Florida that impact the daily lives of its citizens.</p> <p data-bbox="621 904 1304 1002">SS.4.C.2.2: Identify ways citizens work together to influence government and help solve community and state problems.</p> <p data-bbox="621 1008 1304 1078">SS.4.C.2.3: Explain the importance of public service, voting, and volunteerism.</p> <p data-bbox="621 1084 1304 1187">SS.4.C.3.1: Identify the three branches (Legislative, Judicial, Executive) of government in Florida and the powers of each.</p> <p data-bbox="621 1193 1314 1295">SS.4.C.3.2: Distinguish between state (governor, state representative, or senator) and local government (mayor, city commissioner).</p> <p data-bbox="621 1302 1314 1399">SS.4.E.1.1: Identify entrepreneurs from various social and ethnic backgrounds who have influenced Florida and local economy.</p>	<p data-bbox="1371 272 2007 342">support main ideas or themes; speak clearly at an understandable pace.</p> <p data-bbox="1371 381 1482 407"><u>Writing:</u></p> <p data-bbox="1371 414 2007 521">LAFS.4.W.1.1: Write opinion pieces on topics or texts, supporting a point of view with reasons and information.</p> <p data-bbox="1371 527 2049 630">LAFS.4.W.1.2: Write informative/explanatory texts to examine a topic and convey ideas and information clearly.</p> <p data-bbox="1371 636 2018 776">LAFS.4.W.1.3: Write narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, descriptive details, and clear event sequences.</p> <p data-bbox="1371 782 2060 964">LAFS.4.W.2.4: Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development and organization are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. (Grade-specific expectations for writing types are defined in standards 1–3 above.)</p> <p data-bbox="1371 971 2028 1073">LAFS.4.W.2.5: With guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, and editing.</p> <p data-bbox="1371 1079 2060 1295">LAFS.4.W.2.6: With some guidance and support from adults, use technology, including the Internet, to produce and publish writing as well as to interact and collaborate with others; demonstrate sufficient command of keyboarding skills to type a minimum of one page in a single sitting.</p> <p data-bbox="1371 1302 2039 1399">LAFS.4.W.3.7: Conduct short research projects that build knowledge through investigation of different aspects of a topic.</p>

Grade Level	Strand	Standard	Changes After Adoption of CCSS
	Geography	SS.4.E.1.2: Explain Florida's role in the national and international economy and conditions that attract businesses to the state. SS.4.G.1.1: Identify physical features of Florida. SS.4.G.1.2: Locate and label cultural features on a Florida map. SS.4.G.1.3: Explain how weather impacts Florida. SS.4.G.1.4: Interpret political and physical maps using map elements (title, compass rose, cardinal directions, intermediate directions, symbols, legend, scale, longitude, latitude).	LAFS.4.W.3.8: Recall relevant information from experiences or gather relevant information from print and digital sources; take notes and categorize information, and provide a list of sources. LAFS.4.W.3.9: Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research. LAFS.4.W.3.9b: Apply grade 4 Reading standards to informational texts (e.g., “Explain how an author uses reasons and evidence to support particular points in a text”). LAFS.4.W.4.10: Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for arrange of discipline-specific tasks, purposes, and audiences. <u>Measurement and Data:</u> MAFS.4.MD.2: Represent and interpret data. <u>Mathematical Practice:</u> MAFS.K12.MP.1.1 Make sense of problems and persevere in solving them. MAFS.K12.MP.3.1 Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others. MAFS.K12.MP.5.1 Use appropriate tools strategically. MAFS.K12.MP.6.1 Attend to precision. MAFS.4.MD.2: Represent and interpret data.
Fifth Grade:	American	SS.5.A.1.1 Use primary and secondary sources to	<u>Informational Text:</u>

Grade Level	Strand	Standard	Changes After Adoption of CCSS
<p>United States History</p> <p>Fifth grade students will study the development of our nation with emphasis on the people, places and events up to approximately 1850. Students will be exposed to the historical, geographic, political, economic, and sociological events which influenced the initial inhabitation, exploration, colonization, and early national periods of</p>	History	<p>understand history.</p> <p>SS.5.A.1.2: Utilize timelines to identify and discuss American History time periods.</p> <p>SS.5.A.2.1: Compare cultural aspects of ancient American civilizations (Aztecs/Mayas; Mound Builders/Anasazi/Inuit).</p> <p>SS.5.A.2.2: Identify Native American tribes from different geographic regions of North America (cliff dwellers and Pueblo people of the desert Southwest, coastal tribes of the Pacific Northwest, nomadic nations of the Great Plains, woodland tribes east of the Mississippi River).</p> <p>SS.5.A.2.3: Compare cultural aspects of Native American tribes from different geographic regions of North America including but not limited to clothing, shelter, food, major beliefs and practices, music, art, and interactions with the environment.</p> <p>SS.5.A.3.1: Describe technological developments that shaped European exploration.</p> <p>SS.5.A.3.2: Investigate (nationality, sponsoring country, motives, dates and routes of travel, accomplishments) the European explorers.</p> <p>SS.5.A.3.3: Describe interactions among Native Americans, Africans, English, French, Dutch, and Spanish for control of North America.</p> <p>SS.5.A.4.1: Identify the economic, political and socio-cultural motivation for colonial settlement.</p> <p>SS.5.A.4.2: Compare characteristics of New England, Middle, and Southern colonies.</p> <p>SS.5.A.4.3: Identify significant individuals responsible</p>	<p>LAFS. 5.RI.1.1 Quote accurately from a text when explaining what the text says explicitly and when drawing inferences from the text.</p> <p>LAFS.5.RI.1.2: Determine two or more main ideas of a text and explain how they are supported by key details; summarize the text.</p> <p>LAFS.5.RI.1.3: Explain the relationships or interactions between two or more individuals, events, ideas, or concepts in a historical, scientific, or technical text based on specific information in the text.</p> <p>LAFS.5.RI.2.4: Determine the meaning of general academic and domain-specific words and phrases in a text relevant to a grade 5 topic or subject area.</p> <p>LAFS.5.RI.2.5: Compare and contrast the overall structure (e.g., chronology, comparison, cause/effect, problem/solution) of events, ideas, concepts, or information in two or more texts.</p> <p>LAFS.5.RI.2.6: Analyze multiple accounts of the same event or topic, noting important similarities and differences in the point of view they represent.</p> <p>LAFS.5.RI.3.7: Draw on information from multiple print or digital sources, demonstrating the ability to locate an answer to a question quickly or to solve a problem efficiently.</p> <p>LAFS.5.RI.3.8: Explain how an author uses reasons and evidence to support particular points in a text, identifying which reasons and evidence support which point(s).</p> <p>LAFS.5.RI.3.9: Integrate information from several texts on the same topic in order to write or speak</p>

Grade Level	Strand	Standard	Changes After Adoption of CCSS
<p>American History. So that students can see clearly the relationship between cause and effect in history, students should also have the opportunity to understand how individuals and events of this period influenced later events in the development of our nation.</p>		<p>for the development of the New England, Middle, and Southern colonies. SS.5.A.4.4: Demonstrate an understanding of political, economic, and social aspects of daily colonial life in the thirteen colonies. SS.5.A.4.5: Explain the importance of Triangular Trade linking Africa, the West Indies, the British Colonies, and Europe. SS.5.A.4.6: Describe the introduction, impact, and role of slavery in the colonies. SS.5.A.5.1: Identify and explain significant events leading up to the American Revolution. SS.5.A.5.2: Identify significant individuals and groups who played a role in the American Revolution. SS.5.A.5.3: Explain the significance of historical documents including key political concepts, origins of these concepts, and their role in American independence. SS.5.A.5.4: Examine and explain the changing roles and impact of significant women during the American Revolution. SS.5.A.5.5: Examine and compare major battles and military campaigns of the American Revolution. SS.5.A.5.6: Identify the contributions of foreign alliances and individuals to the outcome of the Revolution. SS.5.A.5.7: Explain economic, military, and political factors which led to the end of the Revolutionary War. SS.5.A.5.8: Evaluate the personal and political hardships resulting from the American Revolution. SS.5.A.5.9: Discuss the impact and significance of land</p>	<p>about the subject knowledgeably. LAFS.5.RI.4.10: By the end of the year, read and comprehend informational texts, including history/social studies, science, and technical texts, at the high end of the grades 4–5 text complexity band independently and proficiently.</p> <p><u>Speaking and Listening:</u> LAFS.5.SL.1.1: Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 5 topics and texts, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly. LAFS.5.SL.1.2: Summarize a written text read aloud or information presented in diverse media and formats, including visually, quantitatively, and orally. LAFS.5.SL.1.3: Summarize the points a speaker makes and explain how each claim is supported by reasons and evidence. LAFS.5.SL.2.4: Report on a topic or text or present an opinion, sequencing ideas logically and using appropriate facts and relevant, descriptive details to support main ideas or themes; speak clearly at an understandable pace.</p> <p><u>Writing:</u> LAFS.5.W.1.1: Write opinion pieces on topics or texts, supporting a point of view with reasons and information. LAFS.5.W.1.2: Write informative/explanatory texts to examine a topic and convey ideas and information</p>

Grade Level	Strand	Standard	Changes After Adoption of CCSS
	Civics	<p>policies developed under the Confederation Congress (Northwest Ordinance of 1787).</p> <p>SS.5.A.5.10: Examine the significance of the Constitution including its key political concepts, origins of those concepts, and their role in American democracy.</p> <p>SS.5.A.6.1: Describe the causes and effects of the Louisiana Purchase.</p> <p>SS.5.A.6.2: Identify roles and contributions of significant people during the period of westward expansion.</p> <p>SS.5.A.6.3: Examine 19th century advancements (canals, roads, steamboats, flat boats, overland wagons, Pony Express, railroads) in transportation and communication.</p> <p>SS.5.A.6.4: Explain the importance of the explorations west of the Mississippi River. the Oregon Trail.</p> <p>SS.5.A.6.5: Identify the causes and effects of the War of 1812.</p> <p>SS.5.A.6.6: Explain how westward expansion affected Native Americans.</p> <p>SS.5.A.6.7: Discuss the concept of Manifest Destiny.</p> <p>SS.5.A.6.8: Describe the causes and effects of the Missouri Compromise.</p> <p>SS.5.A.6.9: Describe the hardships of settlers along the overland trails to the west.</p> <p>SS.5.C.1.1: Explain how and why the United States government was created.</p> <p>SS.5.C.1.2: Define a constitution, and discuss its purposes.</p>	<p>clearly.</p> <p>LAFS.5.W.1.3: Write narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, descriptive details, and clear event sequences.</p> <p>LAFS.5.W.2.4: Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development and organization are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience. (Grade-specific expectations for writing types are defined in standards 1–3 above.)</p> <p>LAFS.5.W.2.5: With guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach.</p> <p>LAFS.5.W.2.6: With some guidance and support from adults, use technology, including the Internet, to produce and publish writing as well as to interact and collaborate with others; demonstrate sufficient command of keyboarding skills to type a minimum of two pages in a single sitting.</p> <p>LAFS.5.W.3.7: Conduct short research projects that use several sources to build knowledge through investigation of different aspects of a topic.</p> <p>LAFS.5.W.3.8: Recall relevant information from experiences or gather relevant information from print and digital sources; summarize or paraphrase information in notes and finished work, and provide a list of sources.</p> <p>LAFS.5.W.3.9: Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</p>

Grade Level	Strand	Standard	Changes After Adoption of CCSS
		<p>SS.5.C.1.3: Explain the definition and origin of rights.</p> <p>SS.5.C.1.4: Identify the Declaration of Independence's grievances and Articles of Confederation's weaknesses.</p> <p>SS.5.C.1.5: Describe how concerns about individual rights led to the inclusion of the Bill of Rights in the U.S. Constitution.</p> <p>SS.5.C.1.6: Compare Federalist and Anti-Federalist views of government.</p> <p>SS.5.C.2.1: Differentiate political ideas of Patriots, Loyalists, and "undecideds" during the American Revolution.</p> <p>SS.5.C.2.2: Compare forms of political participation in the colonial period to today.</p> <p>SS.5.C.2.3: Analyze how the Constitution has expanded voting rights from our nation's early history to today.</p> <p>SS.5.C.2.4: Evaluate the importance of civic responsibilities in American democracy.</p> <p>SS.5.C.2.5: Identify ways good citizens go beyond basic civic and political responsibilities to improve government and society.</p> <p>SS.5.C.3.1: Describe the organizational structure (legislative, executive, judicial branches) and powers of the federal government as defined in Articles I, II, and III of the U.S. Constitution.</p> <p>SS.5.C.3.2: Explain how popular sovereignty, rule of law, separation of powers, checks and balances, federalism, and individual rights limit the powers of the federal government as expressed in the Constitution and Bill of Rights.</p> <p>SS.5.C.3.3: Give examples of powers granted to the federal government and those reserved for the states.</p>	<p>LAFS.5.W.3.9b: Apply grade 5 Reading standards to informational texts (e.g., “Explain how an author uses reasons and evidence to support particular points in a text, identifying which reasons and evidence support which point[s]”).</p> <p>LAFS.5.W.4.10: Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of discipline-specific tasks, purposes, and audiences.</p> <p><u>Measurement and Data:</u> MAFS.5.MD.2: Represent and interpret data.</p> <p><u>Mathematical Practice:</u> MAFS.K12.MP.1.1 Make sense of problems and persevere in solving them. MAFS.K12.MP.3.1 Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others. MAFS.K12.MP.5.1 Use appropriate tools strategically. MAFS.K12.MP.6.1 Attend to precision.</p>

Grade Level	Strand	Standard	Changes After Adoption of CCSS
		<p>natural hazards, tourism, climate, physical features) that influenced boundary changes within the United States.</p> <p>SS.5.G.3.1: Describe the impact that past natural events have had on human and physical environments in the United States through 1850.</p> <p>SS.5.G.4.1: Use geographic knowledge and skills when discussing current events.</p> <p>SS.5.G.4.2: Use geography concepts and skills such as recognizing patterns, mapping, graphing to find solutions for local, state, or national problems.</p>	