Teaching Students in New York about China: An Educational History of the Recent Past

Introduction

Over a decade ago, in the National Council for Social Studies’ flagship journal, Social Education, a history professor from the University at Buffalo named Kristin Stapleton published a brief article titled, “What I Wish My College Students Already Knew About PRC History.”¹ The article outlines five core competencies: “the significance of Maoism, experiments in governance, economic development, conformity and diversity, and China’s foreign relations and global impact.”²

Coincidentally, that same year the NCSS launched their recommended (and totally voluntary) C3 Standards for Social Studies, as a suggested model for states to implement, or emulate.³ New York State aligned to the C3 standards in 2014 and particularly integrated C3’s “Inquiry Arc.” Explained in the state standards as thus:

“The Inquiry Arc is integrated into the NYS Framework. The C3 is built on the foundation of an inquiry arc, “a set of interlocking and mutually reinforcing ideas that feature the four Dimensions of informed inquiry in social studies: (1) Developing questions and planning inquiries; (2) Applying disciplinary concepts and tools; (3) Evaluating sources and using evidence; and (4) Communicating conclusions and taking informed action” (p17)”⁴

Both the article on what a student should ideally know about modern China and the C3 standards, assume things about the average New York State social studies teacher and classroom. The first, and perhaps most important, is that the teacher has academic experience,

² ibid.
³ https://www.socialstudies.org/standards/national-standards-preparation-social-studies-teachers#:~:text=As%20a%20collaborative%20effort%20that.interdisciplinary%20applications%3B%20(4%20)%20social
deep knowledge in Chinese history and motivation to teach something that will not be assessed by the regents. The second, is that the teacher is well resourced in developing and refining their classroom curriculum and independent in the assessment of said curriculum. (Provided with or co-creating relevant, engaging and meaningful curricular materials, including and beyond a high quality textbook and aligned assessments). The third, that the student has the necessary reading and writing skills to comprehend a wide variety of texts and communicate their comprehension in a meaningful way.

The National Council for Social Studies defines the primary purpose of social studies, “to help young people develop the ability to make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world.” A goal not shared by any other subject in secondary school. A goal that, if achieved, should act as a foundation for: future (read collegiate) education, a better informed and prepared citizenry and ultimately, a healthy democracy.

To investigate the state of New York State global studies classrooms this research will be broken into two parts - the first an overview of the history and development of social studies and eventually, global studies in New York. The second, a review of curricular materials and instructional practices impacting global studies classrooms. The curricular review will be focused on the teaching of China in 9th and 10th grade global studies.

I began this research with the simple goal of understanding what New York State requires to be taught about China, how that information is assessed, and if it fulfills Stapleton’s five core competencies. That goal to me now is woefully incomplete.

**Framing the Research**

**What influences what students educated in New York State public schools learn about China?** Hidden in this seemingly simple question is a complex web of definitions, institutional
pressures, professional experiences and available resources. This research hopes to illuminate, and maybe, disentangle this web.

Most students in New York State encounter lessons on China through social studies lessons and/or in social studies classrooms. Part one of this research examines the recent history of Social Studies instruction in New York State, which mostly maps to national trends, but does take some divergences. This history includes: an overview of the adoption, rejection and re-adoption of instructional practices suggested by the NEA’s 1916 Report, a review of the history of New York State Regents exams pertaining to either Social Studies, World History or Global Studies and a brief analysis of the current New York State K-12 Social Studies Framework, ending by examining how China is incorporated into New York State secondary social studies classrooms from the nineteen seventies to today.

Part two explores what teachers do. Teachers publish very little about what they think should happen in their classrooms through official magazines, journals or non-anonymous websites. Determining what they think can be challenging, however, is important because teachers are the natural bridge in this paper between the theory of social/ global studies in New York State, the standards and assessments, and the daily classroom experience or the curriculum. The argument of this paper emerges from a curiosity about what teachers think should be taught about China and the spaces where they share their teaching practices and seek advice.

What materializes in the conclusion is a hypothesis about what is taught about China in the majority of social studies classrooms in New York as influenced by standards and assessments and readily available curricular materials. As I hope this research shows, teachers use a combination of school provided textbooks, their professional community(ies), free online materials, and state assessments to shape their instruction. For this reason, more than anything, what a teacher teaches about China may heavily rely on what a textbook says, what
they can cobble together from the web, what the New York State Regents exam asks, infused with their own personal experiences or biases and the perceived biases of the teacher’s evaluator.

Through an analysis of teacher conversations on Reddit, I’ll imperfectly gauge the popularity of some of the more widely adopted online resources. This research concludes that much effort and investment is spent on defining social studies, outlining what should be taught and developing assessments and curricular materials that only sometimes support teachers. I conclude that not enough time, nor energy, is spent on actually supporting day-to-day classroom instruction through curricular material development and meaningful professional development.

The most interesting part of this research is my exploration of teachers’ resourcefulness. They have found unofficial solutions to the system’s deficiencies. Three curriculums that are not officially adopted by the state, appear to be widely implemented, particularly by less experienced teachers, based on my reddit research. Functionally, the popularity and adoption of open education resources online creates de facto curriculum consistencies across the state of New York. This means that high school students in New York may actually be learning about China in very similar ways as their teachers cobble together a classroom curriculum to prepare students for the Global Studies regents. Finally, I will review the three most popular online curriculums and their treatment of China: Open Educational Resources (OER), Stanford History Education Group (SHEG) and New Visions for Public Schools Social Studies Curriculum.

Ultimately what emerges is a theory of social studies education in New York State that features teachers as curriculum and content creators. I believe that teachers take seriously their responsibilities to the education of their students, and that in spite of intentional institutional ambiguity and resource constraints, most offer thoughtful social studies instruction in their classrooms, whether teaching about China or another topic.
Part I: Social Studies in New York

Reform and Social Studies in America

In all education there is a tension; to teach is to construct the bounds of knowledge for your students,⁵ and to recognize that students construct their own knowledge, their agency and choice in a classroom will ultimately dictate what they learn.⁶ From Rousseau’s Emile to Emma Willard’s "Plan for Improving Female Education" to Maria Montessori’s The Montessori Method to John Dewey’s Democracy and Education to James Baldwin’s “A Talk to Teachers” to Foucault’s The Archeology of Knowledge debates on the tension between teacher and knowledge construction abound, specifically how the teacher comes to know, respect and teach the child and how knowledge relates to power, both between the student and the teacher and also within society.

Perhaps the responsibility of knowledge creation is one of the reasons why, in the United States, schools and teachers are often caught in the crosshairs of curriculum creators, politicians and parents, sometimes taking center stage in culture wars.⁷ The most known battles of these wars are over policy, standards, assessments, teacher evaluations and funding. Do schools exist to transmit culture? To develop knowledge and skills? To create model citizens? To communicate new norms in social justice? To encourage students to think for themselves? As Joel Spring asks in Wheels in the Head, are schools, “sources of freedom and political power …[or]… institutions of social control and political despotism.”⁸ These questions push the

---

⁵ Piaget argued, against Locke, that not all knowledge comes from sensory experience alone and that knowledge depends on developmental stages and must be organized for students to access it. (See: Origins of the Intelligence of a Child (1936) and Structuralism (1968).)
⁶ Paulo Freire outlined this eloquently in Pedagogy of the Oppressed (1970), a work that continues to shape ideas of constructivism in the philosophy of education.
conflict(s) at the heart of American Public Schools and more to the point for this research, the
shaping of social studies classrooms.

The purpose(s) of public school, and the purpose(s) of teaching social studies in
schools, are philosophical in nature. They are difficult to translate into macro structures (like
standards and assessments), and much more difficult to translate into individual teachers'
decisions in their classrooms (daily curricular choices). This has been true through all three
periods of major school reform efforts in the United States: The progressive era (1890s -
1930s), the civil rights era (1950s to 1970s), and the standards and privatization era (1980s to
eyear 2000s). The report “A Nation at Risk” (1983), defined new problems facing public
schools, and subsequently launched experiments in privatization, evaluation, and funding
resulting in the bipartisan national reform legislation “No Child Left Behind” (NCLB) enacted in

Perhaps this is the nature of public schools? Because they are funded by the public,
managed by and beholden to the public, and constituted of the public, they are mirrors of
society. The era’s of reform demonstrate this point. No defined school reform era exists without
a societal counterpart. Look no further than John Dewey, an adamant educational reformer who

---

9 This periodization was informed by David Tyack and Larry Cuban’s seminal work *Tinkering Toward
Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform* (1995) and Larry Cuban’s later reflective and investigative
10 While “A Nation at Risk” looms large in the collective conscious of reformers and their discontents
writing in the last few decades, Ronald Evans work in *The Social Studies Wars* (discussed in greater
detail later) shows us it is just the first in a long line of public facing inflammatory reports aimed at
curtailing educations progressive impulses by conservative American factions.
11 It’s worth noting that most scholars list three major educational reforms in America: The progressives,
civil rights reformers (1950s-1970s) and the standard reformers (1980s - present). This is the argument of
Larry Cuban in *Tinkering Toward Utopia*, 1995 (w/ David Tyack) and reiterated in *Confessions of a
School Reformer*, 2021 (read the summary here:
However, I see meaningful differences between the types of privatization pushes from vouchers and
charters launched by “A Nation at Risk” (1983) and the roll-out and the post NCLB (2001) implementation
of the Common Core Standards, accompanied by a push for new and experimental technologies. A
different research paper could challenge the prevailing periodization of “educational reform” in America.
wrote extensively about public schools as a mirror of society.\textsuperscript{12} Larry Cuban, a former teacher, professor and chronicler of American public schools, pointed out the tension that exists when public education is both a mirror of society, and a potential engine for change, and that this tension shapes how Americans think of schools, and has for over a century. He compares the past to the present, and plays with the ideas of stability and change in public schools throughout his body of work.\textsuperscript{13}

Social Studies was born from the progressive reforms of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and it has evolved through each subsequent reform era. In that way, the development of public schools is closely linked to the development of social studies in public schools. David Warren Saxe wrote, \textit{Social Studies in Schools: A History of the Early Years} (1991) to address the origins of Social Studies. His work addresses what he perceives to be the misunderstanding of the origins of Social Studies. Saxe contends that social studies “did not begin with nor extend from the development of the traditional history curriculum. Instead the birth and growth of the social studies movement had its own set of unique beginnings.”\textsuperscript{14} He traces the work of the newly formed National Education Association (NEA) in the late nineteenth century. In the 1890’s there were not one, but two committees on the instruction of History in schools: the NEA’s 1893 Committee of Ten and the American Historical Association’s (AHA) 1899 Committee of Seven; both sought to establish and refine norms and recommendations for teaching traditional history in schools.\textsuperscript{15} Saxe, Ronald Evans and Michael Lybarger, all map major trends in a century of Social Studies instruction to the publication of what is most often referred to as the \textit{1916 Report}, published by the Committee on Social Studies on the

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{12} As argued by John Dewey in: \textit{The School and Society} (1899) and more in depth in \textit{Democracy and Education} (1916).
  \item \textsuperscript{13} First in “Tinkering Toward Utopia” (1995), then most centrally in, “Teaching History, Then and Now” (2016) and again revisited in “Confessions” (2021)
\end{itemize}
Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Schools in the NEA. However, they do not agree on the weight nor the impact of The Report.

In the conclusion of his study, Saxe claims an “inconclusive” explanation on the origins of social studies, unwilling to attribute what he calls a “big bang” moment to the 1916 Report.\(^\text{16}\) Evans, on the other hand, refutes the centrality of the report all together. Instead calling it a compromise between progressive factions: scholars that belong to the social meliorists and social efficiency movements of the progressive era.\(^\text{17}\) He sees decades of continuing conflict between a splintered progressive camp and those that advocated for a return to traditional history. His argument is that these conflicts continued to shape social studies in a way that meaningfully altered the vision of the 1916 report, thus diminishing its impact. Lybarger, conversely, saw the publication of the 1916 Report as, “a form of social control focused exclusively on the deterministic, racialist thinking of its authors”\(^\text{18}\) as summarized by Fallace. In his own words Lybarger believed that the social studies curriculum was “not a democratic one. Rather it sought to legitimate social, economic, and political inequality.”\(^\text{19}\) He argues that a movement whose leaders\(^\text{20}\) participated in bigoted and classist intellectual spaces should not be misrepresented as the ideological foundation for modern Social Studies classes, that little more than the name Social Studies should be attributed to that time. It’s easy to nod along with the idea that The 1916 Report and its authors reflected a time so different from our modern time.

\(^{16}\) Saxe (1991) offers a very detailed account of the people and work that produced the 1916 Report. At the end however, her waffles on its impact (pgs 176 and 177).
\(^{17}\) Chapter 2 of his work is titled “The 1916 Compromise” and details the different schools of thought, scholarly and from the private sector, that compete for dominance in the social studies conversation and also the refusal to acknowledge the report, or curricular shift from the traditional historians camp. Ultimately, producing a more well rounded picture of the time period and peerage surrounding the report.
\(^{20}\) INCLUDE BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF JONES AND OTHERS IF TIME PERMITS!
that there doesn’t exist a throughline between their pedagogical work and current scholars’ work.

However, I believe there are three important foundational concepts that link modern social studies paradigms of instruction to the past that act as a throughline to the development of modern Global Studies, and ultimately, affect the way students learn about China. These throughlines all have some kind of relationship to the progressive reform era. After all, “The past is never dead. It’s not even past.”21

The first is the acceptance and prominence of the thought (or misrepresented thoughts) of John Dewey. This line of thinking is best captured by Thomas Fallace in his article, “John Dewey’s Influence on the Origins of Social Studies: An Analysis of the Historiography and New Interpretation.” In the article, after a meticulous examination of how Dewey’s ideas influenced the authors of *The 1916 Report* and subsequent scholars, Fallace concludes that, “The ideas in the CSS did not originate with Dewey, but he gave them credence and coherence; his ideas were crucial to achieving its consensus position.”22 As we’ve seen Evans argue, this consensus, or compromise, is what pushed social studies out of the theoretical report and into classrooms across the United States. Importantly, the prominence of Dewey’s thought as a key concept in understanding modern Global Studies is because of its evolution and continued relevance. In 1938 in his work, *Experience and Education* Dewey writes, “There is, I think, no point in the philosophy of progressive education which is sounder than its emphasis upon the importance of the participation of the learner in the formation of the purposes which directs his activities in the learning process.”23 This idea of student centered education is a cornerstone of New York State’s K-12 Social Studies Framework and the National Center for Social Studies (NCSS)’s Inquiry Framework.

---

The second foundational concept is that, from its birth, Social Studies has been controversial. As a discipline it has attracted criticism by conservative factions in and outside of education, often debating its merits, and real or perceived, demerits in the public forum. Ronald Evans masterfully, and convincingly, captures a century of conflict in and around Social Studies in his book, *The Social Studies Wars*. He argues in his conclusion that, “what began as a struggle among interest groups gradually evolved into a war against progressive social studies that has profoundly influenced the current and future direction of the curriculum.”

Each time New York State has modified its social studies standards and assessments, it has coincided with a major national conversation either about education reform or reforming (or replacing) social studies. These debates have shaped the arch of the discipline.

The third and final foundational concept for analyzing the evolution of Global Studies, is that teachers are the ultimate arbitrators of what they teach in their classrooms. Stephen J. Thornton develops this argument in, *Teaching Social Studies That Matters* by referring to teachers as Gatekeepers of the in class student experience. He writes, “While theorists have argued back and forth over [defining social studies] for a century, practitioners seldom express great interest in it…I argue that while social studies educators [in academia] may have overrated the significance of which form the curriculum takes, they may correspondingly have underrated the significance of teachers’ curricular-instructional gatekeeping.” This concept is both reinforced by Dewey, and reinforces the first concept of our framework, when he writes, “It is…advisable that the teacher should understand, and even be able to criticize, the general principles upon which the whole educational system is formed and administered. He is not like a private soldier in an army, expected merely to obey, or like a cog in a wheel expected merely to

---


respond to and transmit external energy; he must be an intelligent medium of action.”26 We
learn from Thornton and Dewey that teachers are curricular gatekeepers and thus need to be
intellectuals critically analyzing the choices they make for their classrooms and students.
Together the intersection of these three foundational ideas creates a framework for
analyzing the development of Global Studies in New York.

**Part II: Global Studies in New York State**

**The Emergence, adoption and dismantling of Social Studies 1916 to 1954**

When *The 1916 Report* was published New York State offered many different courses
that would come to be housed within the framework of Social Studies. The New York State,
Office of Assessment Policy, Development and Administration has a list of Regents Exams
offered in 1920, including: American History, Science of Government, Political Economy,
General History, Classical Geography and Antiquities, Physical Geography, Natural Philosophy,
moral Philosophy, Economics, History of Music, History of Education.27 These educational
opportunities offered to bright secondary school students in New York state, are decidedly not
an expression of the emerging field of the social sciences. In his book *Learning to Divide the
World: Education at Empire’s End*, John Willinsky argues that the predominant forces that
shape our education, both the system and the actual learning-stuff, are products of imperialism
and colonialism and the myriad of ways the west justified those brutal policies and regimes. He
explains, “This book is about the accumulation of learning that proved eminently useful to
Europe and often detrimental to the larger body of humanity. It is concerned with what remains

---

of that crime...in the lessons we continue to teach the young and in the way many of us still see the world."

The classes, and correlating exams, offered by New York State in 1920, perpetuated the oppressive histories born of a post-enlightenment colonial past that intellectualized subjugation of minority and marginal groups in society. These courses were not cross disciplinary, nor did they share the goal of improving society, a goal shared by both the social meliorists and social efficiency authors of the 1916 Report, although their means differed. In other words, in 1920, New York State didn’t offer a class in the social sciences to secondary school students.

As an example, The New York State Library’s Digital Archive offers us a more detailed account of the post-enlightenment epistemology that defined difference, othered non-European descended nations and people, and perpetuated problematic concepts of European dominance in the New York State Curriculum. The exam, included in Appendix I, part one does not ask a single question about non-western countries, unless they are British colonies (ex: South Africa and Shanghai) and in part two of the exam students are asked: “a. Explain why the most progressive countries are found in the temperate zones. b Name two progressive countries in the eastern hemisphere and two progressive countries in the western hemisphere that are situated in temperate zones.” It’s easy to read through this exam, and its prompts, today and find it problematic if not repulsive, but would the progressives produce a different exam? One that asked students to examine the world differently?

Harold Rugg, often considered a disciple of John Dewey, might offer us clues through his textbook work as to how the social meliorists as progressive educators planned to change global education. Harold Rugg embodies the three foundational concepts of the development of global studies argued in the first part of this paper. His relationship to John Dewey and Dewey’s

---

29 See Appendix 1: Example 1: 1907 Geography Regents
thought underscores that John Dewey looms large, in spirit and interpretation. Rugg was the first progressive to look to the classroom and try to influence the way teachers approached teaching. He worked with a group of professors from Columbia’s Teachers College to create a series of textbooks to effect, and redirect, classroom instruction in traditional subjects like geography and various history classes offered. He primarily left lobbying the state for changes to policy or assessments to other members of his intellectual coterie as he focused on creating curricular materials to support teachers as they transitioned to teaching social sciences. He recognized, as Thornton did almost a century later, that teachers are gatekeepers. His hypothesis was that only when teachers are supported with high quality and engaging classroom materials will their instruction change.

Putting the theory behind the 1916 Report in writing embedded in curricular materials, came with risks Rugg didn’t foresee at the onset of his project. In the 1940’s, after wide adoption, his text book series Man and His Changing Society came under an intensely critical media campaign, led by The New York Times. This media campaign is the first public, virulent attack on social studies. Evans argues it sets a model for subsequent conservative attacks on progressive education initiatives - many of which focus on social studies in the curriculum, reinforcing our final foundational concept: the subject of social studies is controversial.

Rugg believed that change was required, he wrote “Not once in a century and a half of national history has the curriculum of the school caught up with the dynamic content of American Life.” The question remains, before the controversies of the 1940s, did the progressives succeed in changing instruction in History and Geography to align it more closely to social science educational theory? It’s a hard question to answer and change takes time. An analysis of the 1936 Geography Regents, especially in comparison to the 1907 Geography

30 For a detailed overview of the controversy and see Evans (2004) Chapter Four: The War and The War on Social Studies. Of particular interest is The Storm Unleashed pgs. 79-84.
Regents, offers a tentative conclusion. In 1936, students in New York were asked to answer questions about non-western and not majority white countries, with less frequency than their western counterparts, but not in insignificant ways. Questions like: Name the largest river in South America, the largest river in South America is, A great rice-producing country is (Italy, Germany, Japan) and, A possession of the United State in the Pacific Ocean is (Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico). Question eight of the exam is a short reading selection on Japan which covers its relationship to peers in East Asia, its access to raw materials, its population density and its status as an island nation. The selection claims that, “Japan, an island country off the coast of Asia, is the most progressive country of the Orient” and then lists modern advances like hydroelectric power.\(^{32}\)

As compared to the 1907 Geography regents, it would appear that the progressives were gaining ground, and that ground did not go unnoticed. However, after 20 years of success and celebration, Rugg’s textbooks were increasingly criticized. Linda Simcox writes in *Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in America’s Classrooms*, that they “were suddenly attacked as unpatriotic…accused of debunking heroes, criticizing our Constitution, condemning the American system of private ownership and capitalism, and undermining traditional morality.”\(^{33}\) But it took a decade, and a war, to reverse the changes implemented by progressives in the 1920s and 1930s.

On April 27, 1941 the New York Times published a review of Harold Rugg’s book *That Man May Understand* under the headline, “Dr. Harold Rugg Replies to His Critics” accompanied by a wide-grinning picture of Dr. Rugg, staring directly into the camera with a copy of his textbook *Changing Government and Changing Cultures* open in one hand, and a cigarette, burnt down low, in the other. This portrait seems to be communicating an air of nonchalance to

\(^{32}\) The entire 1936 Geography Regents can be reviewed in Appendix I: Regent Exam Examples  
his critics, but more importantly, a pleasantly human demeanor. The article defends against
people who accuse him of producing “subversive” propaganda, whose work is, “burrowing into
the schools of America, teaching doctrine …to flower in a scholastic, even communistic state.”

Rugg’s smile in his portrait is almost saying, “Who me? A communist? Couldn’t be!” The article
captures a key tension for schools, and the social studies, in New York when it states, “What is
far more serious at the moment is that the whole “progressive” trend in American education,
grown powerful through several decades, should now be trounced by a variety of enemies for
“fellow-traveler” attitudes. For on this issue democracy is divided against itself.”

This level-headed defense of progressive education came just months before the
Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, and other British and American holdings in the Pacific, which
would launch the United States into World War Two. The post-war years were less kind to
progressive educators. In 1949 the Board of Regents created a “special committee to devise
means to implement provisions of the Feinberg Law that requires the board to purge the school
system of teachers with subversive leaning.” In 1951 the times ran a short article titled,
“Regents Assailed for History Test” claiming the “American and World History” exams were
“failing to contain questions on improving democracy and overlooking ‘many fundamental areas
of inquiry’” which does sound like cause for alarm! What areas were overlooked? “The impact of
Far Eastern problems on American Life” and “no questions to test pupil understanding of the
meaning of democracy, the struggle to achieve it, the vigilance required to keep it.”

35 Ibid.
37 "REGENTS ASSAILED FOR HISTORY TEST: SCHOOL BOARD PUBLICATION SAYS IMPROVEMENT OF DEMOCRACY WAS IGNORED IN QUESTIONS FUNDAMENTALS LEFT OUT TEACHER SEES DANGER OF WRONG EMPHASIS IN CLASSROOMS BECAUSE OF OMISSIONS MUCH MATERIAL OVERLOOKED STRESS ON DEMOCRACY URGED." New York Times (1923-), Jan 16, 1951.
critiques were less a genuine cause of alarm and more a dog whistle for the McCarthyists, worried about the rise of Mao and the CCP, committed to indoctrinating a fear of communist China. Between the Feinberg Law and Anti-communist critics the progressive, interdisciplinary opening of the study of the past in New York State, schools began a stark reversal.

By September 1952 conservative forces for traditional, and a new patriotic education, were gaining sway in New York State education. The Board of Regents announced a revised History Syllabus, with great “emphasis on Colonial Era” study promising that “American history students will begin with colonial history and work their way through to current events…devot[ing] more than forty-five recommended class-room periods to study of events leading up to the Declaration of Independence, to the Constitutional Convention and to the Constitution itself.”

Replacing topical study in New York, with chronological. There was no mention of world history in the article.

However, by assessing the World History regents of 1954, it becomes clear that there was a drastic shift in both the intent of studying the world outside the United States and the politics of that study. In Part I of the exam students identify countries in Europe and Euroasia, around the Mediterranean Sea. See the map image of the question below:

---

38 “REGENTS REVISE HISTORY SYLLABUS: PUT NEW STRESS ON COLONIAL ERA -- FAVOR EXTENDED STUDY OF HERITAGE OF CONSTITUTION TEACHER REACTION ASKED METHOD CHANGED FROM TOPICAL TO CHRONOLOGICAL -- PROGRAM BASED ON 3-YEAR SURVEY.” New York Times (1923-), Sep 27, 1952.

39 Review the test in Appendix I: Regent Exam Examples, Example 3.

40 Source: [https://www.nysl.nysed.gov/regentsexams.htm](https://www.nysl.nysed.gov/regentsexams.htm)
The language in the statements asks the students to identify countries based on their adversarial relationship to American global interests and politics. The rest of the test is a mix of the classics (ex: An important influence of ancient Greece was (2) development of philosophy), traditional Western Civilization concepts (ex: After the Napoleonic wars, the rulers of Europe united to (4) oppose liberal ideas), and progress (ex: Which one of these has generally been an immediate result of the Industrial Revolution? (C ) growth in the factory system.) There are very, very few questions on parts of the world that are not European or European descended countries and none on any country in the far east, including China. The 1954 World History regents represents the culmination of a decade of attacks on the progressive founders, and the subject of Social Studies in New York State. The tide would not turn again for another two decades. In the 1950’s New York State offered three regents exams in social studies, or at least social studies adjacent courses: American History, (1,2 and 3), World History and for a brief two
years, Citizenship. It wasn’t until the year 1968 that a combined Social Sciences regents would replace the newly re-minted, conservative minded regents of the 1950s.\textsuperscript{41}

The Return of Social Studies and the Emergence of Global Studies - 1968 to 1989

Why did the Regents Board change their minds and return to the study of social studies? As of this writing, it’s unclear. The digital archives in the state library offer little clues, and the New York Times Historical archive also doesn’t appear to cover the transition from traditional World History back to Social Studies in New York State Assessment, and by proxy, policy communities.

Larry Cuban notes in his work, Teaching History, Then and Now, which chronicles what he blithely refers to as “The New Social Studies and the New, New History” period of social studies instruction. He begins his New, New History in the 1960s when university professor Edwin Fenton decided to teach an AP course in a highschool. As the Cold War simmered and American citizens were actively engaged in domestic struggles, notably the civil rights movement, Fenton became a leader of a very different kind of movement. A movement in which the main goal, according to Cuban, was to “revitalize history and social studies in the 1960s … to inject zest into studying the past and present social issues in public schools.”\textsuperscript{42}

Cuban goes on to claim that the impulse to inject “zest” into the curriculum is linked to “progressive academic elites” who authored “the highly influential National Education Association’s Committee on Social Studies report issued in 1916.”\textsuperscript{43} He describes the leaders of the New History movement, James Harvey Robinson and Charles Beard as possessing “political influence as progressive historians extend[ing] to various national committees meeting

\textsuperscript{41} https://www.nysl.nysed.gov/regentsexams.htm
\textsuperscript{43} Cuban. 2016. Pg. 75
to revise the social studies during and after World War I.”44 This is not incorrect, but it is also not the whole story. He omits that both Beart and Robinson came under intense scrutiny at their elite institution (Columbia University), over their political views, one was forced to resign, the other did in protest and with John Dewey they co-founded The New School.45 He also didn’t discuss how heavily influenced Harold Rugg was by Dewey. While their personal ties mattered, the only theorist who put his ideas into action in classrooms was Harold Rugg, through his early-explored textbook series.

By omitting John Dewey and Harold Rugg, Cuban is choosing what not to tell in the history of social studies. He writes that the failure of the 1920-1940 social studies reforms were due to “conflicts between academics over the place that history should have in the social studies curriculum.”46 Not due to conservative societal forces pushing back against the voices and concerns of the oppressed and banning textbooks they accused of being a subversive communist doctrine. It’s as if he read about the internal definitional bickering of the NCSS, who were caught up in definition issues, and decided that was the fate of the field.47 His explanation is depoliticized, lacking depth and, ultimately, unconvincing.

However, Cubans focus on the stability and change of history instruction has an important contribution to the argument of this paper. He unequivocally recognizes that teachers are the gatekeepers of the classroom and control what is taught, something stable across his time analysis. To demonstrate this point he writes, “The gap between adoption of a policy and its implementation in classrooms (and there always is one) varies from an inch to a mile wide between…high school history teachers…[who have] limited but nonetheless crucial autonomy when they close their classroom doors. Teachers, in short, are policy makers and exercise

44 Cuban. 2016. Pg. 75
45 https://www.newschool.edu/about/history/
46 Cuban. 2016. Pg. 81
choice in both content and pedagogy when they determine what to accept, modify and reject…”

This might be a better explanation for the reintroduction of Social Studies in New York, or at least a clue about why there is so little available written academic work on why the New York State Board of Regents decided to re-introduce the Social Studies exam in 1968?

The new regents opened with a bang! The first question reads: “Which is the most valid conclusion to be drawn from a study of the Negro civil rights movement in 20th-century United States?” The answer? “1. More actual progress has been made in the last 15 years than in any other 15-year period since 1900.” Another example: “Which conclusions can be drawn from the statement ‘Peace demonstrations may be regulated by local ordinances’? The answer? “(3) Freedom is a relative rather than an absolute term.” This test is a statement, in so much as a test can be, and also, I think, it is evidence of a cultural shift in teaching and the teaching force that often goes overlooked.

During the 1960s and 1970s classrooms were affected by the riotous and righteous social changes happening in society and the world. Teachers too were swept up in new strands of activism and relatively new social theories. Heady academic theories on differing approaches to pedagogy (Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Jerome Bruner On Knowing, Maxine Greene’s Dialectic of Freedom) or social histories that were elevated to best sellers that challenged accepted historical narratives (Howard Zinn A People’s History of the United States of America, James Baldwin The Fire Next Time, Lerone Bennett, Jr Before the Mayflower: A History of the Negro in America, 1619 - 1692) or anti-colonial tracts that force the reader to examine their quiet complacency. (Edward Said Orientalism, Frantz Fanon The Wretched of the Earth).

48 Cuban. 2016. Pg. 163
All of this intellectual ferment certainly affected teachers Zeitgeist. Dewey still loomed large. This is the argument of Thomas Fallace in “John Dewey and the New Left, 1960-1988”, a heady intellectual history of influential thinkers during the interim-reform years, the period between the Civil Rights Era reforms and the privatization reforms, and their resurrection of Dewey. Fallace proves that these years were not stagnant but overflowing with copious ideas and new approaches to teaching. Many inspired by a rediscovered (and sometimes re-interpreted) Dewey.49

During this height of seventies leftist social studies, something somewhat miraculous happened, as universities were building out cultural studies departments. Another factor might have been that the Social Studies test barely asked questions about Asian and African countries, even if on an elective basis. In 1965, the Regents board rolled-out an elective course and corresponding test called, “Asian and African Culture Studies.” A sample of the test is included in Appendix II: Asian and African Culture Studies Regent Exam Examples. In the digital archives there is only access to two exams 1976 and 1977. The state also released a sourcebook to support classroom instruction, titled, “Social Studies Grade 9: Asian and African Culture Studies.”

Then in 1987, the New York State Board of Regents announced a plan to revamp the general single social studies exam and create two distinct exams, one for United States History and Government and the other in Global Studies. A New York Times article described the new program as one that “stresses 20th-century American history at the high school level and abandons the topical methods of the 1970’s in favor of a more chronological approach. The new plan calls for a ‘global perspective’...” The article describes the curriculum and tests as generally well received by teachers and community members, although it does note that a “…controversial

aspect of the new...curriculum has been the increased emphasis on Latin American and other areas, especially in the 9th and 10th grades. Critics assert that such a change would result in the loss of an in-depth treatment of Western Civilization.”

The first Global Studies exam was offered in New York State in June 1989. This test is closer to the current World History and Geography exam than it was to the Social Studies regents. The other big change, 1989 is the first time, a passing grade on the Global Studies exam is required for a New York State high school diploma. Suddenly the stakes for teaching and learning about the wider world were higher than ever before in the state, and because every student in New York would have to take the test, the Regents board was in a position to dictate what approximately three hundred thousand students a year learned about the world.

It’s also the first test that affords time and space to China, primarily modern communist China. Five multiple choice questions and one written prompt all require the student to demonstrate knowledge of East Asian geography, Confucius, Mao and the Chinese Revolution of 1949. A new era of social studies education begins in New York, one specifically concerned with students’ global awareness and knowledge, assessed across disciplines, a modern manifestation of the pedagogical theories of the progressives, that is mandated for all New York State students.

China in the New York State Global Studies: Standards and Assessments

Amazingly, before 1989, China was mostly absent from the New York State Social Studies Regents exams.

The Global studies regents changed again in 1998, this change was to accompany the new “Core Curriculum”[51], a detailed curricular document broken into eight units of study that

---

instructs teachers to create global connections and linkages across six themes: Cultural Diffusion, Belief System, Migrations, Trade, Multi-Regional Empires and Conflict. In Social Studies Resource Guide with Core Curriculum the committee and principal contributors to the report put forward the case for Social Studies, writing: “In social studies classes students confront questions about the wonder and excitement of humankind in the world…Courses of study should give students the knowledge, intellectual skills, civic understandings, and dispositions toward democratic values that are necessary to function effectively in American Society.” A social meliorist case if I’ve ever read one! It’s a true social studies course. The guide defines Intellectual Skills, Multidisciplinary Approaches, Depth and Breadth, Unity and Diversity, Multiculturalism and Multiple Perspectives, Patterns to Organize Information, Multiple Learning Environments and Resources and, lastly, Student-Centered Teaching, Learning, and Assessment. In this section the state puts forward a clear purpose of a social studies class:

“Social studies courses must help students understand both the specialized process and approaches of certain academic disciplines and the connections of ideas, information, issues and perspectives across the disciplines. In drawing on history, the social sciences -- particularly geography, economics, government and civics -- the humanities and, to a lesser degree, the sciences, social studies provides a perfect opportunity for curriculum integration.”

The Core Curriculum presented teachers with a vision for social studies, not just history, not just pedagogical theory, and also not total instructional freedom. It codified concepts of Global Studies into the state Global curriculum. However, according to Grant et al. it did come with a big organizational change: “The regional and cultural emphasis has been replaced with a chronological approach. The curriculum now features eight units, seven of which highlight an

---

52 [https://www.nysed.gov/sites/default/files/sscore2.pdf](https://www.nysed.gov/sites/default/files/sscore2.pdf)
53 [https://www.nysed.gov/sites/default/files/ssovervi_0.pdf](https://www.nysed.gov/sites/default/files/ssovervi_0.pdf)
historical theme set within a chronological period." The researchers surveyed teachers across New York State about the changing curriculum. Many expressed anxiety about the planned change, some expressed planning to adjust their curriculum, however most were committed to teaching as they had been or with only minor changes. Grant’s findings reinforce Larry Cuban's reaffirming study on teachers’ power as gatekeepers.

The state outlined how social studies should be taught in New York, with clear and explicit skills, a unit breakdown of study and then a summative assessment in the new regents exam. The 1998 exam that corresponds to the Core Curriculum is different from prior regents’, has forty-eight multiple choice questions and a second part of the exam where the student was expected to write short form responses to documents and prompts. In 2000, the test evolved to include 50 multiple Choice questions, a thematic essay and a series of what became known as “Document Based Questions” or DBQs. Under the Core Curriculum, students in New York State had to study with some fidelity key moments in Chinese history and a multidisciplinary approach to understanding China through Social Studies. I analyzed one hundred questions across twelve exams and discovered trends in the content students needed to learn to do well on the exam. Below is a table summarizing that analysis:

55 The 1998 Regents is included in Appendix 1 as the sixth example. You can review the launch of DBQs on the regents website under archived exams: https://www.nysedregents.org/GlobalHistoryGeography/archive-ghg.html
The question category asked with the greatest frequency across types of questions is Geography. This question type was most often analyzing a map, or asking the student to indicate the importance of river valleys and terrace farming for the emergence of Civilizations in China. The question category asked with the greatest frequency in multiple choice questions alone, and second greatest frequency across all categories is Unequal Treaties/ Colonial Exploitation. This category of question is most often assessed through demonstrating knowledge about the Opium Wars and “Spheres of Influence.” Mao is the only other category of question that has appeared with enough regularity to examine in detail. The questions about Mao either relate to his role as a revolutionary/dictator or as a policy maker (establishment of the PRC, great leap forward and marriage equality). It’s an interesting tension, that Mao himself had a hard time reconciling. It’s important to note that this content analysis was conducted on regents exams aligned to the “Core Curriculum” standards in New York State between the years 1998-2018.

*Source: Appendix III: Global Studies Regents Review - China*
While it is unclear, based on Grant et al's research whether teachers in New York State responded to this test by changing what they teach, if they did, Students in New York would be introduced to a disconnected story about China that vaguely touches on some of the “wishlist” items for Buffalo State Professor Kristin Stapleton. For example, The standards and assessment would require that students are taught about Mao, but Prof. Stapleton was actually outlining something different in her article, she wants students to understand the cult of Mao and the larger than life presence he has on the Chinese psyche. That is, of course, one of the more interesting things about Mao and China. Instead of offering color, the Standards ask that a student merely understands Mao as the first dictator of communist China.

In 2014 New York State updated the standards document again, this time dubbing it “The New York State K-12 Social Studies Framework.” This new framework accomplishes two things for the state, it aligns to the national C3 Inquiry standards and it aligns to Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts. Accompanying the new Framework is an updated World History and Geography II Regents Exam, first administered in 2019. See Appendix 1, Example 7 for the most recently offered assessment. This test has changed, and appears to require less discipline knowledge and more reading comprehension skills as the multiple choice questions are replaced with passages and other documents to analyze rather than questions requiring discrete disciplinary knowledge.

The newest K-12 Framework standards and assessment shifted expectations of what students should study about China in 9th and 10th grade classrooms in New York. For example,

56 [https://www.nysed.gov/curriculum-instruction/k-12-social-studies-framework](https://www.nysed.gov/curriculum-instruction/k-12-social-studies-framework)
57 [Grant, Kathy Swan, and John Lee. Bringing the C3 Framework to Life. Social Education. Vol. 79. Arlington: National Council for the Social Studies, 2015. Pg. 7. Discuss the alignment, goals and anticipated impact of aligning to the C3 standards and in this promotional video from EngageNY it’s clear that the standards were revamped for CCSS alignment: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rtdGpIpbmEA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rtdGpIpbmEA). Not of importance for this investigation, However, in 2017 New York State transitioned from the Common Core State Standards to the NYS Next Generation learning standards. It is unclear how different they are from the CCSS and how this change has affected daily instruction in the classroom.
China is no longer included in the Ancient Civilization Units, removing emphasis on the study of ancient dynasties, like the Tang and the Song, China was also removed from World War Two study. There’s some unclear associations, and perhaps false equivalences, made in the new standards between the rise of nationalism in the first half of the twentieth century. The K-12 Framework seems to imply that nationalism is the same in Europe, as it is in Israel, India and China. Under Standard 10.7: Decolonization and Nationalism (1900 - 2000) section c. and d. Could cause confusion:

10.7 c Nationalism in the Middle East was often influenced by factors such as religious beliefs and secularism.

- Students will investigate Zionism, the mandates created at the end of World War I, and Arab nationalism.
- Students will examine the creation of the State of Israel and the Arab-Israeli conflict.

10.7 d Nationalism in China influenced the removal of the imperial regime, led to numerous conflicts, and resulted in the formation of the communist People’s Republic of China.

- Students will trace the Chinese Civil War, including the role of warlords, nationalists, communists, and the world wars that resulted in the division of China into a communist-run People’s Republic of China and a nationalist-run Taiwan.
- Students will investigate political, economic, and social policies under Mao Zedong and Deng Xiaoping and compare and contrast these policies.


The thematic approach, as opposed to chronological, has the potential to avoid the examples of “Nationalism” becoming false equivalencies, but I believe the word itself is problematic when used together across completely divergent cultural contexts. Also odd, under standard 10.7 is the lack of emphasis on Mao in the standard that lays out the framing for the birth of communist China. The mandate to have students “tract the Chinese Civil War” is hard to understand. Will the state expect that a teacher prepares their classes to learn about Sun Yat Sen and the May fourth movement, or the defeat and exile of the KMT and the “division” of China. Or does Mao only appear prominently after the KMT exile, as the standards wording may suggest?
Conclusion: What do Current Global Studies Teachers Think?

The goal of the final part of research is to find the voices of teachers. What do they think about teaching? Curiosity drove this search more than anything. If a teacher is not provided with high quality materials for teaching about China in their Global Studies classroom, where do they go? Our three pillars for teaching social studies in the global context in New York still remain, but in the conclusion, when I am most concerned with Teacher voice and experience, the investigation begins with: Teacher as Gatekeeper. In a state with standards and a standardized test how true is that? If teachers truly are gatekeepers, do they embrace parts of social studies that can feel controversial? And Finally, do teachers actually think about Dewey in their classrooms or are their Deweyan experiences limited to graduate school or moments of theoretical reflection rather than the everyday?

Teaching to the Tests and Teacher Surveys

When the New York State Board of Education Office of Assessment released a new regents exam for Global History and Geography II in 2019, the test represented an entirely different approach for assessing Global History and Geography classrooms.

In 2018 Dana Faye Serure submitted a dissertation to the University at Buffalo for a Doctor of Education on “The Current State of Secondary Social Studies in Western New York.” Serure chose to represent the current state of social studies by launching a survey (titled WNY S4) and holding two focus groups. Her conclusions were that:59

- 99% of respondents reported being unaware of their state/district standards

---

● When asked what the respondents reported that their primary instructional goals were, 100% reported developing critical-thinking skills and 64% reported content knowledge.

● The respondents ranked their instructional practices as: 87% teach political history; 83% teach social history; and 82% examine sources.

In 2020 R.V. Papandrea completed a dissertation for St. John’s University with the goal of understanding how teachers feel about mandated curriculum changes, specifically the New York State K-12 Framework, both the standards and the end of year Regents exam. Papandrea chose to conduct a “qualitative, exploratory case study analysis” with 12 secondary social studies teachers and one administrator from a suburban high school in New York. What he discovered is that the teachers participating in his study expressed hesitation around three themes: 1. Social Studies Content vs. Literary Skills. The 2017 K-12 Framework outlines expectations for literacy instruction for social studies teachers and many teachers are “frustrated.” One teacher expressed this by sharing: “It is less focused on content and more focused on reading text, and how to write, what to write, how to compare two types of texts, the analysis of it. And it’s kinda sad to leave the content behind for the skill.”60 2. Impact of Assessments. — reports that “there was consensus amongst experienced teachers that they did not feel the new assessments were an effective measure of what the students learned throughout the year…”61 particularly because of the test’s emphasis on literacy skills. An experienced teacher lamented the changes to the Regents, saying:

“I cut content that may or may not be on the Regents, like the Irish Potato Famine, the battles of World War I and World War II, the generals, the leadership. I’ve eliminated that so I can spend two more days on the Holocaust. I spend less time on Southeast Asia so

I can spend more time discussing Gandhi or Nelson Mandela. To hold onto the idea of molding kids to be ethical and empathetic, I’m potentially harming them on their Regents scores.”

When a teacher vaguely says that they have to cut content for literacy work, the fear is that they are cutting some of the most important, Deweyan inspired, parts of the curriculum. This teacher’s response is a good reminder of what happens when the teacher as a gatekeeper pillar is removed, it’s hard to maintain the best parts of the progressives in the curriculum and the curriculum runs the risk of losing the important lesson of debate in History and the Social Science. Of building empathy, as the quoted teacher points out, but he’s building more than empathy: awareness, a foundation for human rights, a sense that we have rights AND that other people around the world, who may or may not have anything in common with us, do too. Taking that lesson for granted could be one of newest social studies standards biggest mistakes.

Both dissertations demonstrate how teachers react when they feel like their role as gatekeeper is taken from them. In Serures research they take a Deweyan approach, ignoring their standards and focusing on critical thinking skills. In Papandrea’s research the teachers express frustration at the changed assessment, in no small part because they feel like that change was imposed on them and their classrooms from the state, and in some cases hinders their ability to teach well. In the next section we turn to the materials teachers use in their classrooms.

The Tyranny of Textbooks, Freedom of Reddits, and Open Curriculums… Oh my!

Larry Cuban once referred to classroom practice as a “black box” and asked his readers:

*With so many major structural changes in U.S. public schools over the past century, why have classroom practices been largely stable, with a modest blending of new and old teaching*

---

practices leaving contemporary classroom lessons familiar to earlier generations of school-goers?\textsuperscript{63}

He argues in the book that many pro-teacher thinkers in America tend to oversimplify the problem and suggest platitudes for the solutions, like trusting teachers or strengthening teacher unions. Through an analysis of case studies, Larry Cuban delves into the ‘black box’ of the classroom, and rather than prescribe policy recommendations, he illuminates the complexity of teaching by describing the myriad relationships a teacher holds and decisions teachers navigate daily. Decisions around activities, materials, assessments, and classroom dynamics/classroom management. As an example, he offers a really interesting, three hundred and sixty degree view of the plurality of what seems like a single curriculum when a teacher is live in a classroom with students - they are teaching lessons aligned to the intended curriculum, what should happened, implemented curriculum, what actually happened, experienced curriculum how the students interacted with the curriculum and tested curriculum assessments gauging what the students learned.\textsuperscript{64}

Keeping this model of multiple different angles of analysis for a curricular tool, in this case, the textbook and alternatives when the teachers feel like the textbook fails. We’ll start our conversation with textbooks, discuss their perceived failures and alternative uses and then end on what teachers seem to be turning to instead, Open Online Education Resources.

In the last three decades a spate of publications have confirmed what veteran teachers have long known, you cannot rely on a textbook for your entire curriculum. James W. Loewen reinvigorated liberal criticism of textbooks with his work, \textit{Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong}, published first in 1995. His work provided a source to many misconceptions or fabrications that were taken for truth by most Americans. Suddenly

\textsuperscript{63} Cuban, Larry. \textit{Inside the Black Box of Classroom Practice: Change without Reform in American Education}. Boston, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2013.pg. 8

\textsuperscript{64} Cuban, Larry. \textit{Inside the Black Box of Classroom Practice: Change without Reform in American Education}. Boston, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2013.pg. 50 - 54.
the arguments in *A People’s History of the United States: 1492 - Present* by Howard Zinn, published in 1980 had a clear and persuasive origin story. Both books were bestsellers and continue to sell well.

These works primed the liberal leaning American public for a renewed and specific distrust in traditional curricular materials, like textbooks. As Part I of this research documents, the controversy over Harold Rugg’s textbooks, and McCarthyist witch hunts for subversive curricular materials, primed conservative leaning Americans to distrust traditional curricular materials, like textbooks. Which side was right? Can textbooks be so misleading about the past, a bestseller can accurately demonstrate they are full of lies and then at the same time be so liberal that they push subversive communist ideas? The obvious answer is that one book cannot exist at both extremes. With the enormous profit growth in educational publishing companies are incentivized to sell as many textbooks as they can, this means they must make them totally unremarkable to both the liberal leaning and conservative leaning factions in America. In the early 2000s two books were published with the goal of exposing censorship and corruption within American textbook companies: *The Language Police*, by Diane Ravitch published in 2003, and *Tyranny of the Textbook* by Beverlee Jobrack published in 2012. Ravitch’s book, while not a bestseller like Zinn or Leowen’s work, was widely circulated in education and education adjacent circles.

I will not be summarizing these works, rather my goal is to point out that teachers, administrators and other school officials are exposed to the idea that textbooks are fundamentally inadequate and should be questioned. Grant and Gradwell in their article, “The Sources Are Many: Exploring History Teachers’ Selection of Classroom Texts,” published in 2005, argue that the two teachers they shadowed, did use textbooks, but not as curricular

---

guides nor as sources of historical narrative. Instead, they used them as sources of primary documents. If textbooks do not help teachers build a daily curriculum where do they turn?

When I asked a classmate this question, she recommended Reddit, the anonymous social media platform. I created an account and started looking for teachers who were asking the subreddit commons for curricular resources for their room, specifically for lessons on China. As a means of legitimating the Reddit approach, what follows is a brief literature review of scholars who have had a similar idea. Academic Reddit analysis is a relatively recent activity, the first article I could find published in a scholarly journal exploring teachers use of Reddit is titled, “A tale of two subreddits: Change and continuity in teacher-related online spaces”, published in 2021 in the British Journal of Education Technology, the article framed the usefulness of mining teacher data on Reddit and analyzing it for examples of teachers self-directing their professional development.

The second article is also interested in teachers seeking out self-directed learning, analyzing data across two subreddits: r/Teachers and r/education. Carpenter and Willet found that r/Teachers functions more like a teachers’ lounge and that r/education functions more like a debate hall on education policy. Thus the name of their article, “The teachers’ lounge and the debate hall: Anonymous self-directed learning in two teaching-related subreddits” also published in 2021. Central to Carpenter and Willet’s investigation is the anonymity of Reddit. I agree that teachers are more honest and less guarded in an anonymous space.

66 Grant, S. G., and Jill M. Gradwell. “The Sources Are Many: Exploring History Teachers’ Selection of Classroom Texts.” Theory and research in social education 33, no. 2 (2005): pgs. 250 - 253 < see pages for a list of selected primary documents and their rational and reason for using the textbooks as a primary source read. Spoiler - it’s because it’s there and free.
In my own reddit investigation I found the subreddit r/historyteachers\textsuperscript{69} to be most helpful for curriculum suggestions, particularly for global history, geography, and world history. A future project would be to create a quarriable database of the Reddit threads that suggest curricular sources on the r/historyteachers subreddit. Some threads are asking really flushed out questions, like a page long inquiry with the subject: “How do you explain Philosophy to a middle schooler.”\textsuperscript{70} This thread has unique lesson ideas. Things like, “I like to use Kung Fu Panda to explain the differences between Confucianism and Taoism. You don’t need the whole movie; there’s a scene between Oogway and Shifu that draws a contrast in their philosophies fairly clearly. Plus, middle schoolers love this movie!” Followed by an enthusiastic second!: “The peach tree scene? It's such a good depiction of Taoist thought!! I also use Mulan clips for Confucianism and Sagwa the Chinese-Siamese cat for Legalism.” However, the majority of threads are brief and warrant equally brief responses. Something like: “Ancient China and India - Hi all, I teach 9th grade world history (I cover roughly the rise of Homo sapiens to the Mongols/Black Death) and was wondering if anyone had any sources (secondary and primary) for Ancient China (especially before the Han) and India. Last year was my first time teaching high school and while most of it was a disaster, my units on China and India were particularly bad.”\textsuperscript{71}

This post received some individual teachers sharing their lesson plans and others sharing resources. Two resources of note were New Visions and Stanford History Education Group (SHEG)\textsuperscript{72}. In addition to New Visions and SHEG, the OER Project is referenced often. All three resources are free and easy to access. All are well organized and easy to navigate, and via the

\textsuperscript{69} https://www.reddit.com/r/historyteachers/
\textsuperscript{70} https://www.reddit.com/r/historyteachers/comments/nx3drj/how_do_you_explain_philosophy_to_a_middle_schooiler/?share_id=hvgjPSmBMEDwGogrMTyaU&utm_medium=ios_app&utm_name=iossmf&utm_source=share&utm_term=10
\textsuperscript{71} https://www.reddit.com/r/historyteachers/comments/p2mng8/ancient_china_and_india/?share_id=yrDdEDONZ0eC2MPhi737x&utm_medium=ios_app&utm_name=iossmf&utm_source=share&utm_term=10
\textsuperscript{72} https://sheg.stanford.edu/search?search_api_fulltext=china&sort_by=search_api_relevance&sort_order=DESC
Reddit hive wisdom, they’ve been vetted by other teachers and recommended. Both New Visions for Public Schools\(^{73}\) and the OER Project\(^{74}\) are designed as yearlong curriculums. SHEG is a repository of rich primary source document lessons. Both OER Project and New Visions are created for New York State and aligned to the New York State K-12 Framework.

New Visions for Public Schools is a nonprofit Charter network in New York City, that created their curriculum to prepare their students for the regents exam and ensure homogeneous teaching methods. On reddit teachers like how organized, simple to navigate, clear and complete it is, there is also praise for the age-appropriate reading level. Complaints are that it’s scripted and lacks the creativity to truly engage a class.

The OER Project is a nonprofit founded by Bill Gates and David Christian. It is a totally free member community with a high-quality curriculum that is rigorous yet flexible. OER has some bells and whistles that other free offerings cannot provide to users like high quality multimedia (movies, music, VR tours) to accompany lessons. OER additionally offers state by state standards alignment and advice from other teachers in your state. Teachers like the high production quality, the inquiry lessons and the teacher tools. They most often complain that the material’s reading level is too high for their students.

SHEG is the acronym for the Stanford History Education Group (SHEG) and teachers on Reddit love suggesting their materials, particularly for lessons on East Asia. It is a different curricular material than the other two resources, SHEG is a primary document repository with high quality engaging lessons, PowerPoints and activities to guide student inquiry.

It is my hypothesis that if a teacher needs resources and they start to search the web or ask for recommendations, they will more than likely use either New Visions, OER Project or SHEG to augment or replace most of their traditional textbook work. Validating this hypothesis is a suggestion for future work.

\(^{73}\) [https://curriculum.newvisions.org/social-studies/course/9th-grade-global-history/]

\(^{74}\) [https://www.oerproject.com/] To view the OER Project you’ll need to create a free account.
So... What do students in classrooms in New York State learn about China?

It's a hard question to answer. Teachers are the ultimate gatekeepers regarding what happens in their classrooms. Many teachers, whether they realize it or not, are influenced by the social meliorist progressives, like Dewey. This is particularly true for some social studies teachers, those who find controversies of history (and sometimes the field) invigorating.

When I started this research, I believed it would be a rather linear path to the answer of the question: What do students in classrooms in New York State learn. I've discovered it is anything but straightforward. It's easy to assume it's not straightforward because every teacher is the proverbial snowflake, but as Larry Cuban reminds us, there are a myriad of factors, always at play in a classroom. It's not just that each teacher is the proverbial snowflake, it's that each student is too, and the teacher is interacting with each student and they react and then interact with each other. It's a busy space, literally full of potential.

I have a sense of what students in New York learn about China, especially if a teacher shapes their experience to the Standards or implements the New Visions curriculum (which is very closely aligned to NYS K-12 Framework standards). If that's the case, then they'll learn about Geography, answering questions about how river valleys, mountains and port cities shaped the early civilization and subsequent development of China. They'll learn about Confucianism, usually its deep traditions in education and family. They'll learn about Taoism, and its deep connections to nature, and maybe they'll connect it to philosophy? They'll learn about two to three ancient dynasties, usually the Zhou, Han, Tang or Song. Then the timeline will jump to the Ming and Qing dynasties. They'll learn about the Opium Wars, Unequal Treaties, the Boxer Rebellion and Spheres of Influence (which are poorly positioned in most school materials). Sometimes, although much more rarely, students will learn about China's involvement in World War II. And just as rarely, they might learn about Sun Yat Sen and his (as New York defines it) pro-democracy government. Then enters Mao, but not in the way Kristin
Stapleton would want. Mao is taught like any other dictator, weakened by his autocratic tendencies, planning failed centralized policies and only very rarely as an influential figure that looms large over Modern China. With Mao, students learn about the Chinese Civil War, the Great Leap Forward (almost always in conjunction with Stalin's five-year plan, which I think Mao would've hated), and the cultural revolution. Then Mao exists stage left and is replaced by Deng Xiaoping. Sometimes, curricular materials present Deng as a moderating force in Chinese society because of his economic policies. Sometimes, curricular materials present him as an authoritarian despot who violently suppressed the Pro-Democracy Tiananmen Square protests.

Sometimes, during a CRQ (formerly DBQ) or essay, students will be asked to reflect on much more detailed policies from China, or global concerns. Examples include the one-child policy and environmental justice or human rights. The China that is presented in most New York State Classrooms is neutral, much more so than in the past, a country filled with people and potential, and a problematic past.

Beyond China, I believe this research demonstrates that New York State public school social studies teachers are the gatekeepers to their classroom curriculum, that these teachers have an awareness of controversies surrounding history and social studies, and that Deweyism is embedded in much of what they do in a social studies classroom that makes it unique from a history classroom. However, it would seem based on the research presented here, that most teachers are not explicitly aware of the founding of their subject nor the impact of its founders on what and how they teach. Whether they are teaching a lesson on ancient China, World War II or NAFTA, social studies teachers embrace a cross disciplinary approach to these subjects, encouraging an opportunity for Deweyan inquiry, that is least Deweyan when it searches for one answer (critical thinking) and most Deweyan the inquiry searches for the problem, clearly defined. It’s a lesson all those who teach about the past must engage with, in John Dewey’s words:
“The essence of critical thinking is suspended judgment; and the essence of this suspense is inquiry to determine the nature of the problem before proceeding to attempts at its solution. This, more than any other thing, transforms mere inference into tested inference, suggested conclusions into proof.”

Most students engage deeply when attempting to solve a problem that interests them, a problem they have come to understand through definition, this is most powerful when the student themselves creates that definition.

If professors like Kristin Stapleton at University at Buffalo, or the authors or the C3 Inquiry Arc, want students to know that Mao is an omnipresent figure in both Chinese History and modern-day China, the way to encourage that understanding, is not through a textbook, nor a scripted teaching curriculum, but through a deeply cultivated curiosity and an interesting problem to solve. It is the highest goal of an academic education and the hardest to achieve, particularly for a general student population in public school.

The history of Social Studies means that the very act of teaching is applying at least a century of educational philosophy to a classroom of students. I’m not sure if any student realizes this as the goal of their social studies work. Most will focus on content, today some are probably talking vaguely about “literacy,” but I doubt any understand that the goal of their secondary education in social studies is not that they memorize dates and major biographical figures but to attain a chronology of human experience that supports their life-long inquiry, in the most Deweyan of senses. At the end of this journey, I’ll leave you with one of my favorite poems, one I think about almost every day, especially when I think about teaching.

*We shall not cease from exploration - And the end of all our exploring
Will be to arrive where we started - And know the place for the first time.* - T.S. Eliot
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