Democratic Citizenship Education and Inclusion: Preparing Preservice Teachers for Inclusive Social Studies

Dennis J. Urban, Jr.
Touro College

Abstract

Students classified with disabilities make up more than 13 percent of the public school population in the United States, but they remain on the margins of social studies research. Thus, we know very little about social studies education in inclusive settings. This study explores how social studies methods classes in one teacher education program prepare teachers for inclusive education. Combining theoretical perspectives from democratic citizenship education and Disability Studies in Education (DSE), this study explores how themes of democracy, community, diversity, disability, and inclusion manifested in two social studies methods classes. Findings indicate the methods instructor encouraged and practiced democratic and inclusive pedagogy, but his approach often met resistance from preservice teachers' experiences with disability and inclusion, the intransigence of a traditional special education paradigm, and the limitations of diversity education vis-à-vis DSE. Implications for democratic citizenship education, inclusive education, and teacher education are discussed.

Keywords: democratic citizenship education, inclusive education, teacher education, special education, Disability Studies in Education

Democratic Citizenship Education and Inclusion: Preparing Preservice Teachers for Inclusive Social Studies

Citizenship education is a cornerstone of social studies education. Even as K-12 education moves toward more academic and career-oriented objectives, social studies' goal of promoting the "common good" through the education of "knowledgeable, thinking, and active citizens" remains a stated aim (NCSS, 2013). For too long, however, a sizeable student constituency, those with disabilities, has been sidelined in research on citizenship education, and the common discourse connecting democratic citizenship education and inclusive education has been bisected into discrete domains. More than six million students with disabilities in the United States annually receive special education and related services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), which accounts for approximately 13 percent of the total K-12 student population. In addition, more than two-thirds of students classified with disabilities spend most their school day in general education classrooms, and 65% graduate with a high school diploma (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). Considering these facts, social studies educators cannot afford to marginalize students with disabilities in research and practice, as they must teach all students to become active participants in a democratic society. What is more, it is important to understand how and what prospective social studies educators learn in their preservice programs about teaching students with disabilities to become knowledgeable, thinking, and active citizens.

Research has shown that teacher education programs tend to exclude topics on diversity and disability, or segregate them into separate courses, instead of weaving them into the entire program (Ladson-Billings, 1999; Melnick & Zeichner, 1995). This approach can reinforce traditional paradigms of citizenship education and special education, as well as preservice teachers' apprenticeships of observation (Grossman, 1991; Kennedy, 1999; Labaree, 2000; Lortie, 1975; Zeichner & Gore, 1989; Urban, 2013). Moreover, many experts in the fields of teacher education and Disability Studies in Education (DSE) have not collaborated in meaningful ways to foster the type of educational environment that might prepare prospective teachers for inclusive education (Cosier & Pearson, 2016). And although social studies scholars have examined the teaching and learning social studies in special education and inclusive settings, very few of these studies explicitly consider the theoretical links between inclusive education to democratic citizenship education (Dieker, 1998; Donaldson, Helmstetter, Donaldson, & West, 1994; Hamot, Shokoohi-Yekta, & Sasso, 2005; Lintner & Schweder, 2008; McFarland, 1998; Sheehan & Sibit, 2005; Steele, 2007; Stufft, Bauman, & Ohlsen, 2009; Taylor & Larson, 2000; van Hover, Hicks, & Sayeski, 2012; van Hover & Yeager, 2003).

To address the absence of literature that engages the intersections between social studies, teacher education, and inclusive education, this case study seeks to explore the relationship between inclusive education and democratic citizenship education in preservice social studies methods classes to answer the question, *(How) do social studies methods classes help prepare prospective teachers for inclusive social studies?* Inclusive education is not merely a justice-oriented moral obligation to educate all students (Ashby, 2012), but it is also a federal and state mandate. In New York State, for example, where I conducted this study, preservice teachers seeking certification were required to "develop the skills necessary to provide instruction that will promote the participation and progress of students with disabilities in the general education curriculum" (NYSED, 2010, p. 2). Additionally, this study provided space for preservice students and instructors to engage with and reflect critically upon complex issues of democratic citizenship, inclusion, and disability, and to challenge the discursive contexts that allow traditional special education frameworks and narrow conceptions of democratic citizenship education to persist.

Review of Literature

Although inclusion seeks to realize a vision of democratic education that allows students access to knowledge and social settings that they had previously been denied, much of the research on inclusive social studies rests on traditional, fact-based conceptions of citizenship education (Parker, 2003). At a minimum, social studies education in an inclusive environment must provide curriculum access for students with disabilities through instructional accommodations and differentiated instruction, whereby "teachers select methods through which each individual may learn as deeply…as possible" (Baglieri & Knopf, 2004, p. 527). The existing literature does cover this aspect of citizenship education, but inclusive social studies requires teachers to go beyond the mere transmission of content and skills. Building on Parker's (2003) model of advanced citizenship and the definition of inclusive education that Baglieri et al. (2011) articulate, inclusive social studies education should foster a community of learners within the classroom and school; allow for student participation, deliberation, decision-making, and action; and embrace difference and diversity as essential elements of democracy, incorporating content and skills that reflect this orientation.

Content-Based Learning for Traditional Citizenship Education
Recent research on social studies and special education has stressed pedagogical interventions to facilitate the acquisition of social studies content and skills for students with disabilities. With an emphasis on the transmission of values, knowledge, and skills about United States history and government, this research is situated in the traditionalist camp of citizenship education, which "minimizes social and cultural heterogeneity," ignores student choice and participation, and distances matters of race, gender, class, and ability (Parker, 1996, pp. 111-113). The literature on social studies for students with disabilities stresses the transmission of content knowledge and basic social-science skills (Marshak, Mastropieri, & Scruggs, 2011), such as reading comprehension (Harniss, Caros, & Gersten, 2007; Kinder, Bursuck, & Epstein, 1992), expository writing (De La Paz, 2005), map and chart reading (Brigham, Scruggs, & Mastropieri, 1995), historical reasoning (Ferretti, MacArthur, & Okolo, 2001), and civic knowledge (Hamot, Shokoohi-Yekta, & Sasso, 2005; Hollenbeck & Tindal, 1996). While the content and skills that these authors highlight may be an important foundation for democratic citizenship education, many of these studies do not explore the potential for citizenship education in an inclusive environment by embracing difference and fostering student participation, nor do they resonate with the broader, social aims of democratic citizenship education. Moreover, it is limited because it does not address the ways in which social studies educators, or prospective educators, understand and conceptualize the relationship between democratic citizenship and inclusive education.

Inclusive Democratic Citizenship Education
A small body of research conducted in the fields of elementary education, service learning, and literacy education demonstrates the potential for integrating inclusive education and democratic citizenship education. In her analysis of social networks within an elementary classroom, Zindler (2009) found that careful teacher planning, cooperative learning groups, and social skills instruction contributed to a more inclusive classroom, in which students with disabilities "became increasingly popular as a whole across the year…but it was also clear that they had formed their own social networks within the margins of the class" (pp. 1986-1988). Alleman, Knighton, and Brophy (2007) describe techniques for creating a classroom community by making home-school connections, focusing on cultural universals, and helping students establish their own "ideal classroom." Service learning in inclusive settings also provides opportunities for students with and without disabilities to engage in advanced levels of democratic citizenship education (Dymond, Renzaglia, & Chun, 2008). Finally, research on literacy strategies in inclusive social studies classrooms demonstrates the potential for promoting democratic skills and behaviors for all students (Kliewer, Fitzgerald, Meyer-Mork, Hartman, English-Sand, & Raschke, 2004; Jacobowitz & Sudol, 2010). The emphasis on democratic dispositions, coupled with the curriculum enhancements and interventions detailed in this and other research on social studies and students with disabilities, can move teachers toward more inclusive conceptions of citizenship education.

Education for democratic citizenship must work to "extend the promise of democracy to previously excluded individuals and groups" and to promote "participatory parity" for all students (Bérubé, 2003, p. 56). This endeavor is unlikely to succeed if prospective teachers do not learn how to foster inclusive, democratic classroom environments. Although the research on

social studies and students with disabilities may pay lip service to inclusion and democratic citizenship (Slee, 2001), much of it remains situated within a traditional special education paradigm. Many of these studies continue to rely on a medical model of disability, which seeks to "develop and test professional interventions that attempt to cure or ameliorate deficits in specific areas of human functioning" (Danforth, 2008, p. 46). Social studies research on content acquisition aims to test interventions or find "treatments" for "symptoms" and "deficits" in students with disabilities (Brigham, Scruggs, & Mastropieri, 1995; Curtis, 1991; Horton, Lovitt, & Bergerud, 1990; Kinder, Bursuck, & Epstein, 1992; Lederer, 2000; McFarland, 1998). Traditional special education research for any subject area—to be sure, in this research paradigm, literature on social studies education is no different from research on math or science for students with disabilities—rests on a model of "prevention/treatment/remediation/measurement" rather than providing "a critique of the normative practices, beliefs, and assumptions about disability outlined in the bulk of the traditional special education literature" (Ware, 2005, pp. 104-107).

Pugach (2001) calls for a reorientation of special education research in a qualitative direction to reflect the interpretive nature of inquiry and the democratic potential of inclusive schooling. According to Danforth (2006), "The challenge to disability researchers and theorists is to spend less time worrying about attempting to represent 'the way things are' and more time working…to create greater equality and dignity in public schools" (p. 340). Only after researchers and practitioners redress traditional conceptions of citizenship education and special education can they begin to create greater equity and equality for all students and to move toward inclusive democratic citizenship education. There is some movement in the field of social studies to highlight the narrow focus on historical content and standardized testing in co-taught inclusive social studies classes (Urban, 2010; van Hover, Hicks, & Sayeski, 2012), and to reframe the discourse away from special education and toward Disability Studies in Education (Connor, 2013). The current study seeks to build upon these recent trends by focusing on the preparation of prospective social studies teachers for inclusive education within a theoretical framework that combines democratic citizenship education with Disability Studies in Education.

Theoretical Framework: Inclusive Social Studies

In this article I advance a theoretical framework of inclusive social studies, combining perspectives from democratic citizenship education and Disability Studies in Education (DSE). According to Parker (1996, 2003), democratic citizenship education encourages student agency, emphasizes the shared path of democracy, and balances unity and diversity. DSE seeks to foster inclusive educational communities by problematizing normative assumptions about (dis)ability, recognizing students with disabilities as a historically marginalized social constituency, and embracing a social interpretation of disability that "challenges the view of disability as an individual deficit that can be remediated" (Gabel, 2005 p. 7). Highlighting the similarities between these discrete discursive communities, I attempt to distill a theoretical framework of inclusive social studies that balances the unity and diversity of democratic citizenship; adopts a curricular vision that is flexible, participatory, and accessible to learners of all abilities; and envisions a socially democratic setting that facilitates the development of a community of learners.

Democratic Citizenship Education
Democracy is a concept of affiliation for innumerable groups, movements, and governments, but it is a concept that goes beyond merely learning about and for political participation. "It is," according to Dewey (1927), "the idea of community life itself" (p. 148). This conjoint, associated living, however, does not simply come about of its own accord. Rather, democratic communities must be "appreciated" and "sustained," for "the clear consciousness of a community life, in all its implications, constitutes the idea of democracy" (Dewey, 1927, p. 149). Moreover, as Gutmann (1987) contends, "the democratic ideal of education is that of *conscious* social reproduction," which, in accordance with principles of "nonrepression and nondiscrimination" and with consent of *all* citizens, "focuses on practices of deliberate instruction by individuals and on the educative influences of institutions designed…for educational purposes" (p. 14). To nurture this broad but purposeful conception of democracy, Parker (2003) argues for an "advanced" version of citizenship education.

Parker (2003) delineates three elements of citizenship education that constitute advanced democracy, which include encouraging student participation, treating democracy as an ongoing path, and embracing pluralism and individual difference as essential components of democracy. The first of Parker's advanced ideas about citizenship is student participation, or citizenship education that is both *for* and *through* democracy. Parker's second advanced idea of citizenship education views democracy as an ongoing path, a journey that manifests itself in the social context of the classroom, the school, or, more broadly, the public sphere. Although educators must work to foster democracy in their classroom, it is a goal that is "forever incomplete" (Greene, 1993, p. 218; see also Dewey, 1927). The third element of "advanced" democratic citizenship education embraces pluralism and difference as hallmarks of democracy. Narrow conceptions of citizenship education have minimized cultural heterogeneity and assimilated different groups into a dominant American culture. Parker (2003) argues that diversity is "a democratic necessity" (p. 26). Advanced democratic citizenship, then, must balance political and social unity with group and individual differences.

Schools can provide curricular and civic spaces for purposeful democratic citizenship education. As an educational reform conceived with democratic aims, inclusive education holds great promise for the teaching and learning of democratic citizenship education. Rather than simply providing modifications and accommodations for students with disabilities, however, inclusion requires a social setting that fosters the democratic participation of all students. According to Baglieri and Knopf (2004), "a truly inclusive school reflects a democratic philosophy whereby all students are valued" (p. 525). DSE offers great promise to citizenship education, as it views people with disabilities as a social constituency who must have access to the full benefits of democratic citizenship. Moreover, DSE affirms inclusive education as continuous "struggle against exclusion and oppression…[for] the rights of all to access, participation, and success in education" (Slee, 2011, p. 151). Like democracy, it is an ever-unfinished journey.

Disability Studies in Education
Until the late twentieth century, persons with disabilities had been denied access to the rights and privileges of full citizenship in the United States. They had been labeled "as menaces to society needing control, as children to be pitied and cared for, and as objects of charity" (Griffin, Peters, & Smith, 2007, p. 338). During the nineteenth century, disability was thought to be associated

with immorality and some people advocated that students with disabilities be "institutionalized for life" or sexually sterilized (Giordano, 2007, pp. 15-17). In the 1960s, following the Supreme Court case of *Brown v. Board of Education* and the success of the African-American civil rights movement, persons with disabilities began to organize for equal treatment under the law. The federal government responded with the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-112) and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142), but a comprehensive law protecting those with disabilities would not arrive until 1990, with the Americans with Disabilities Act (P.L. 101-336).

Even with the passage of civil rights legislation, though, disability has been used to exclude many groups of minority students from mainstream educational settings. For example, students of color, students in poverty, and immigrants are more likely to be classified as learning disabled, and race, class, ethnicity, and disability have been used to exclude students from full citizenship to maintain normative power structures in school and society (Ferri & Connor, 2005; Reid & Knight, 2006). Because the lines of demarcation regarding normalcy and ability have often been employed to exclude and stigmatize certain members of society, scholars have come to see disability as dependent on "social (rather than biological) constructions" (Ferri & Connor, 2005, p. 469).

To redress persistent inequality of students with disabilities, the critical discourse of DSE stresses a social interpretation of disability, which "promotes the importance of infusing analyses and interpretations of disability throughout all forms of educational research, teacher education, and graduate studies in education" (Gabel, 2005, p. 1). Rather than viewing disability as an innate individual deficit, this social interpretation considers the collective social, political, cultural, and educational experiences that have historically marginalized and excluded persons with disabilities (Danforth, 2008; Gabel, 2005). Moreover, DSE repositions students with disabilities and treats them as fully included members of society, promoting "democratic participation" to counter "the destructive consequences of 'Othering'" (Reid & Knight, 2006, p. 18).

In the age of inclusive education, defined broadly as a school-wide initiative for equity and equality for all students, educators must recognize students with disabilities as a social group—as fully integrated, participating citizens in American society (Baglieri, Bejoian, Broderick, Connor, & Valle, 2011). By viewing disability as both a constituency and a concept, DSE "problematize[s] a range of unexamined attitudes, beliefs, and assumptions" people hold about students with disabilities (Ware, 2001, p. 108). Stigmas, stereotypes, perceived inferiority, and other "identity threats…impair a broad range of human functioning" among various social groups (Steele, 2010, p. 15). Questioning educators' conceptions of disability, this framework addresses the ongoing stigmatization of students with disabilities, which can result in a "form of social quarantine" and a denial of education and democratic citizenship (Brown, 2010, p.186; Goffman, 1963). Moreover, a DSE approach critiques the traditional special education paradigm that is often reified in normative school settings and practices, a paradigm that seeks to identify and classify deficits in students, and to treat and cure individuals with disabilities (Pugach, 2001; Ware, 2005).

Toward a Theory of Inclusive Social Studies

While terms like "democratic citizenship" and "inclusion" have contested meanings in the field of education, both aim to extend learning opportunities so that all students may contribute to the classroom community and participate meaningfully in the broader social sphere. Parker's (1996, 2003) framework provides a starting point for the type of citizenship education that suits our increasingly diverse democratic republic, one that emphasizes the shared path of democracy and encourages student deliberation and participation. But in most literature on citizenship education, there is little consideration of the unique circumstances of students with disabilities along the unfinished journey toward inclusive education and democratic citizenship: their shared history of oppression, their recent attainment of full citizenship and civil rights, their gradual integration into mainstream educational settings, and their continued struggles with stigma and ableism. Additionally, while the goals of democratic citizenship education align closely with those of inclusive schooling, there also needs to be consideration of multilevel, differentiated, and universally-designed instruction, which "offers a wide range of learners opportunities to acquire skills, explore content, and develop conceptual understanding" (Oyler, 2006, p. 13).

Unfortunately, much of the research on social studies and students with disabilities is situated within a traditional special education paradigm, which aims to test interventions for students with disabilities to learn basic skills and content. While necessary, this approach is hardly sufficient for the democratic aims of inclusive education, which, like democratic citizenship, is more than simply "a place or a service" but is a "mode of associated living" (Oyler, 2011, p. 206; see also Dewey, 1916). That is why social studies educators and scholars must consider a more inclusive form of democratic citizenship, which incorporates a social interpretation of disability, challenges normative conceptions of both disability and citizenship, and recognizes the promise of citizenship education in the age of inclusive schooling. Moreover, teacher educators should consider what these issues mean for the next generation of social studies teachers, who must attempt to balance the democratic goals of citizenship education and inclusive education with the increasingly undemocratic, content- and test-driven realities of standards-based schooling.

Methodology

With the goal of understanding the teaching and learning of inclusive social studies during a semester of methods coursework and fieldwork—and answering the research questions, *(How) do social studies methods classes help prepare prospective teachers for inclusive social studies?*—I conducted an instrumental case study in a local social studies teacher education program and included students enrolled in undergraduate, graduate, and dual-certification programs in social studies and special education (Stake, 1995). Guided by my theoretical framework, I explored how participants engaged with complex issues like disability, democratic citizenship, and inclusive education.

Context of Study

I conducted this case study at Eastbrook University[1], a university located in the New York City suburbs, which provided access to a college of education that graduates many social studies teachers who live and work in the New York metropolitan and suburban areas, and who teach

---

[1] Pseudonym

diverse student populations at the secondary level. All undergraduate and graduate social studies majors were required to take the same social studies methods class, and each student also recorded at least 100 hours observing secondary social studies classes.

I chose to observe and select volunteers from the social studies methods courses because they represented the closest thing to a holistic view of Eastbrook's social studies program. The subject-specific methods course "has traditionally been regarded as a cornerstone of teacher education programs," and is one that "most social studies teachers are likely to have in common" (Thornton, 2005, p. 97). They provided a space where I could examine "interaction among instruction, student response, and learning within and, often, outside the methods course" (Clift & Brady, 2005, p. 313). In addition, the requisite middle- and high-school social studies observations were an opportunity for candidates "to establish connections between their university and school learning as well as to trouble the relationship between them" (Segall & Gaudelli, 2007, p. 78). Finally, in the field of social studies, research has demonstrated the impacts of methods courses on preservice teachers' beliefs and practices, particularly in democratic citizenship education (Adler, 2008; Clift & Brady, 2005; Cutsforth, 2010).

Participants
Student participants in this study included undergraduate and graduate students in the preservice social studies teacher education program at Eastbrook University. On the first day of the semester, I distributed a questionnaire to students enrolled in the required social studies methods classes, and 16 students indicated a willingness to participate further in the study, which meant sitting down for a series of three interviews and submitting all their coursework from the methods classes.

Based on students' responses to the questionnaire, their backgrounds, and their willingness to take part in the research project, I identified nine students, four undergraduates and five graduates, to participate in the interviews and to submit coursework for analysis. Participants represented a diverse cross-section of ages, genders, racial identities, abilities, and student statuses, and they had a range of viewpoints on citizenship education and inclusive education (Table 1). Along with the student participants, I interviewed the director of the social studies program, Professor Stern[2], who also taught both social studies methods courses, which allowed me to analyze what was taught versus what was learned in the methods classes.

---

[2] Pseudonym

Table 1:
Student Participant Information

Student Name*	Status	Gender	Age	Special Education Certification	Self-Identified as Disabled
Kate	Undergraduate	Female	22	Yes	No**
Michelle	Undergraduate	Female	20	Maybe	No
Kyle	Undergraduate	Male	21	Yes	Yes
Dave	Undergraduate	Male	22	Yes	No
Alicia	Graduate	Female	24	Yes	No**
Lisa	Graduate	Female	24	Yes	No
Matt	Graduate	Male	24	Yes	No
Seema	Graduate	Female	22	No	No
John	Graduate	Male	26	No	No**

* Pseudonyms
** During interviews, these participants revealed that they had been classified as students with disabilities at some point in their lives.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data sources included surveys, interviews, observations, and course documents. First, I distributed an introductory questionnaire that assessed students' attitudes, beliefs, and understandings about social studies, democratic citizenship education, and inclusive education. Next, I conducted 20 naturalistic course observations of undergraduate and graduate social studies methods classes—10 observations in each section. Although I adopted the role of peripheral observer, I occasionally took part in class activities at the request of the course instructor, establishing positive rapport with participants (Adler & Adler, 1998). By carefully recording actions and interactions, utterances and silences, and explicit and implicit curricular decisions, I collected useful data about how the methods classes prepared students for inclusive social studies.

I also conducted a series of three in-depth interviews with each of the nine preservice social studies teachers, one in-depth interview with the methods course instructor, weekly informal discussions with the instructor, and one focus group. The interviews were evenly spaced throughout the semester, and the focus group took place after the courses ended. For all interviews, I used open-ended, semi-structured interview protocols, and I recorded all interviews to ensure accuracy and to enable accurate transcription for analysis and coding (Creswell, 1998).

Finally, I collected documents and course artifacts throughout the semester, including methods course syllabi, weekly handouts, textbooks, and student coursework. I also acquired a syllabus from one of Professor Stern's previous methods courses to ensure he was not tailoring his teaching to my study. A content analysis of the course syllabi, textbooks, and assignments for the social studies methods class revealed the explicit and implicit messages about teaching social studies to all students in inclusive educational settings, and about the ways in which the program conceptualized social studies.

Data analysis was ongoing throughout the study, as I adopted Creswell's (1998) data analysis spiral. Although the emergence of meaning and analytic categories from the data was largely an inductive process, my theoretical framework of Inclusive Social Studies informed the design and interpretation of my study, and thus facilitated the instrumentality of my method. To generate codes, I used line-by-line inductive coding of the data transcripts, notes, and documents (Miles & Huberman, 1984). The theoretical framework of inclusive social studies guided my initial deductive categories of democratic citizenship education and inclusive education, and my inductive categories were subsets of these broader themes. My first round of categorical aggregation resulted in chunks of data related to democratic citizenship education, such as knowing democracy, doing democracy, creating a community of learners, and teaching and learning diversity. I also developed categories related to inclusive education, such as disability and identity, disability and stigma, ableism, inclusion as a place, differentiated instruction, and special education. During a second round of coding, I identified additional themes that were not immediately obvious within my guiding framework of inclusive social studies, such as Universal Design for Learning, reflection and critical reflection, disability and/as diversity, and apprenticeship(s) of observation. To verify conclusions, confirm findings, and eliminate threats

to analytic validity, I used data source and methodological triangulation (Huberman & Miles, 1998; Stake, 1995).

Findings

Citizenship education in the United States often emphasizes traditional themes rather than contemporary problems and social justice (Levine & Lopez, 2004). Normative conceptions of schooling, especially in the current era of high-stakes testing, can hinder democratic education and its constituent elements, such as democratic citizenship education and inclusive education. These trends have also influenced teacher education programs, which are struggling to abide by new national and state standards and to compete with efficiency models promulgated by programs like Teach for America. The goals of democratic and inclusive education are theoretically incongruous with the data-driven practices and pedagogy that currently manifest in schools and in teacher education programs (Oakes, Quartz, Ryan, & Lipton, 2000). Thus, despite the best of efforts of teacher educators who emphasize democratic and inclusive approaches to teaching social studies, these practices can be difficult to realize in the face of neoliberal education trends. A thorough analysis of observation notes, interviews, and course documents revealed that the social studies methods instructor attempted to integrate democratic and inclusive themes into his courses, but these efforts were often thwarted by participants' normative conceptions about and experiences with social studies and inclusion.

Social Studies Methods for Inclusive Social Studies

Professor Stern, Eastbrook University's social studies program director and methods class instructor, was an advocate of democratic citizenship education, and with four decades of social studies teaching experience, and more than 20 years as a teacher educator, Stern's approach to social studies education reflected his beliefs about democratic citizenship. A self-described political and social activist, Stern believed that citizenship education should extend beyond the classroom study of history, that it required student participation, deliberation, and praxis. Therefore, Professor Stern designed and enacted a social studies methods curriculum to counteract dominant, traditional conceptions of citizenship education. This approach was evident in his syllabi, assignments, and pedagogy. By fostering student participation, community, and diversity, Stern deployed a vision of democratic citizenship that countered prevailing practices in schooling and social studies education that seek to undermine democratic citizenship education. In addition, Professor Stern's approach to preparing students for inclusive social studies reflected his understanding of the theoretical consonance between democratic citizenship education and inclusive education. His conception of inclusive education went beyond the mere placement of students classified with disabilities into certain classrooms, and it often addressed issues of diversity, community, and differentiated instruction.

Professor Stern's pedagogy represented, in his words, an "activity-based" approach aimed at fostering a "classroom community," an idea that involved students "working together" and "respecting each other's ideas" to "get them active in a democratic society." Underlying Stern's desire to create a community of learners in his methods classes was a strong ethic of caring (Noddings, 1992). For example, during a mid-semester graduate methods class, I observed graduate students sharing their fieldwork experiences. One student was visibly upset, explaining, "I have a special ed. student who just sits in the corner and does nothing." She did not know how to connect or engage with this student. Stern responded, in a calm, measured, and thoughtful

voice, "Tomorrow, ask if he had breakfast." Stern then explained that when he taught high school, he would often bring snacks for students whose families could not afford breakfast. The graduate student was visibly touched, as she appreciated Stern's caring approach to her teaching dilemma and to her student's needs. In this short episode, Stern modeled a caring relation for the methods class; engaged in a reflective dialogue about teaching and learning; allowed for the student to be the *cared-for* and, potentially, the *carer* in her student teaching placement; and encouraged her to work towards being a better teacher (Noddings, 1992). Moreover, Stern's response indicated his understanding of the intricacies of disability and diversity, and of how special education classification can depend on any number of issues, including race and poverty (Reid & Knight, 2006).

Professor Stern's lessons sometimes touched upon the complexities of and relationships between continued discrimination based on race, class, and disability. In our interview at the end of the semester, Stern noted, "One of my goals as a teacher is to create a sense of community, and community means there are going to be diverse people, and that includes people with disabilities. And what I try to get kids to do is to respect each other in the class as part of a community." In fact, during methods class sessions, Professor Stern often discussed disability and inclusion in terms of diversity and community, drawing on the same principles that guided his teaching of democratic citizenship. In his methods classes, he explained to students that ability, whether actual or perceived, is often linked to a host of factors, such as race, ethnicity, and social class.

Sometimes, however, Stern tended to conflate issues related to disability with the challenges facing English language learners or students in poverty. These diversity factors play a role in how, or whether, children learn in traditional academic settings (Banks & Banks, 2004). But, there was a risk in attending to disability simply as another form of difference under the umbrella of diversity education, because it denied discussion and explication of what makes disability unique; did not address underlying and alternative assumptions about disability; and contributed to the reductionist "misconception of disability as diversity" (Artiles, 2003; Pugach, 2001, p. 447; Pugach & Seidl, 1998). For example, on the final exam, Stern, as part of an essay question he has posed for years, defined "inclusion" as "containing students from different social and economic backgrounds, with different levels of preparation and interest, and including students who had previously been programmed for…special education classes." In this way, inclusion was tantamount to creating a classroom community of learners, drawing on and attending to student diversity as an essential component of democratic citizenship. Stern also recognized that inclusion involved all students, not just those with disabilities, and that teachers must work to create inclusive learning environments within their classrooms. This partly explains why Stern did not address inclusion and disability as discrete topics during methods classes, but instead integrated them into his broader pedagogical vision regarding diversity and multiculturalism. This approach to teaching about disability and inclusion seemed to result in missed opportunities for students who were not attuned to the same theoretical framework that guided Stern's methods.

Preparing prospective teachers for inclusive social studies requires lessons in and experience with democracy, community, diversity, and flexible curriculum. Professor Stern's activity-oriented, differentiated pedagogy embraced many of these practices and incorporate elements of the Universal Design for Learning (see Appendix A), but it often met resistance from student

participants who were used to normative instantiations of social studies and inclusion, which their own educational experiences and observational fieldwork confirmed. Teacher identity is often shaped by contradictory messages that preservice students receive from prior understandings, program coursework, and fieldwork.

Learning to Teach Inclusive Social Studies?
Learning to teach takes place within a complex matrix of prior understandings, social interactions, formal and informal curriculum, and educational fieldwork. Students' prior knowledge, beliefs, and socialization influence what, how, and whether they learn in a traditional preservice teacher education program (Darling-Hammond and Baratz-Snowden, 2005; Donovan, Bransford, & Pellegrino, 1999; Feiman-Nemser, 2008; Lortie, 1975; Pajares, 1992; Zeichner & Conklin, 2005; Zeichner & Gore, 1989). In this study, student participants' attitudes, identity, and prior knowledge, as well as their apprenticeships of observation, were often reinforced by their program experiences outside of Professor Stern's methods class, including classroom observations and special education coursework, which marginalized Stern's pedagogy of inclusion and democracy and instead bolstered normative discourses of schooling. What is more, the stigma of disability and persistence of ableism obstructed students' embrace of inclusive social studies.

Identity, stigma, and ableism. All participants in the study had some personal connection to disability, either from their own educational histories or their relationships with people with disabilities, but they seemed to view disability through a lens of deficiency. In nearly every interview I conducted, participants often attempted to distance themselves from the disability label to avoid the continuing stigma of disability. Disability was a stigmatizing marker for participants. In his seminal work on the subject, Goffman (1963) defines stigma as "an attribute that is deeply discrediting" because of social definitions of what is normal and ordinary (p. 3). Often, stigmatized individuals will manage information about themselves to "pass" for what they and society deem normal (Goffman, 1963, p. 42). The stigma of disability intersects with broader trends of ableism in education, or the social "devaluation of disability" that is deeply "rooted in the discrimination and oppression that many disabled people experience in society" (Hehir, 2002, p. 3). The desire to "overcome" disabilities, or "problems," and to associate with "normal" students, were evidence of the impact that ableism had on the participants (Hehir, 2007). Of the nine student participants in the study, only one, Kyle, identified himself as disabled on the initial survey, and none mentioned their disabilities openly in the methods courses, despite being forward about race, ethnicity, and religion. During my interviews, however, three additional participants eventually revealed that they had been labeled as students with disabilities in primary and secondary school, revealing how participants views disability differently from other identity markers.

Participants dissociated themselves from disability in part because they believed they had overcome it and no longer required the services afforded to them in primary and secondary school. For example, although Kate, an undergraduate student at Eastbrook, still struggled with reading comprehension in college, she decided in high school that she no longer wanted to be associated with special education. John, a second-year graduate student who also did not identify himself as disabled, was classified with a disability in school and had access to resource room, academic services, and IEP accommodations, such as extra time on exams. When I asked why he

did not identify himself as a person with a disability on the questionnaire, he mentioned the embarrassment that comes along with a disability label.

> Interviewer: *You said you were kind of embarrassed. Do you think there was this kind of stigma attached to special education [and] disability?*
>
> John: *Definitely. Definitely. Because people see you socially as normal, per se. You have normal classes, you hang out with normal people outside of school, you're around these students socializing and then they see you in these [resource] rooms and they kind of get a negative perception: "Why were you there? You don't seem like you should be." Because they think it's like a zoo, but it's really not. It definitely has a negative perception and hopefully with time that will go away.*

John's sense of what was "normal" was shaped by social perceptions of disability as abnormal, which was, and continues to be, reinforced by traditional models of special education that label, classify, and segregate students per ability. Alicia, a graduate student seeking dual certification in social studies and special education, discussed how the stigma of disability affected her own identity as a student with Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD). She said,

> *My parents never had a problem with [resource room] because they knew that I was gifted, and I'm not saying that to toot my own horn. My IQ's like 151, I think, or 152…. I have an exceptional 99th-percentile ability. And my life is, it's always been like super-duper struggle.*

Alicia's experiences were somewhat like Kate's and John's. She acknowledged her disability diagnosis, but quickly attempted to distance herself from it to demonstrate that she was "normal," or that she was smarter than the average student classified with a disability. Even though most participants were familiar with disability through relationships or personal experiences, it was not something with which they wished to identify. Unlike other forms of diversity, like race or gender, disability manifested as a source of shame rather than pride.

Disability and/as diversity. When participants discussed their social studies observation fieldwork, many commented that a successful inclusion class was one in which they could not identify students with disabilities. This assimilationist view of inclusive education, a disability studies corollary to the colorblind perspective on race, made it difficult to realize the full potential of pluralistic educational settings (Banks, 2001; Schofield, 2004). For example, Dave, who was skeptical about inclusive education, was excited to share his observation experiences with me. He discussed how all students were fully included in the class, saying, "You didn't even know who had a disability. I didn't know. I still don't know to this day…. They were just treated like everyone's a regular student." John brought up a similar point during our second interview, recalling, "You can't tell who's who. You really can't. Is everyone special ed.? I don't think so." And Kate said of her social studies observations, "I couldn't tell [who had a disability] at all. I think I got a sense of maybe one or two and only because like we learned in special ed.…that they deviate far away from the standard or typical answer."

Participants' attitudes about disability demonstrated the shortcomings of situating disability within a diversity paradigm. Kyle, the only student who acknowledged his own identity as a person with disabilities disability on the initial survey, reflected on the nature of inclusive education: "Inclusion is extremely beneficial for the students with disabilities because it gives them a sense of…[hesitates]…not *normalness*, because no one's normal, but a typical life." As a person with disabilities, Kyle recognized that difference was normal, but his statement revealed how the default discursive mode regarding inclusion presupposes the non-disabled students as "typical."

Participants' responses to interview questions and during the focus group highlighted the challenges of balancing unity and diversity—tensions that manifest in any democratic endeavor—and how community can be misinterpreted as assimilation. Moreover, their comments revealed how disability differed from other forms of diversity. With discussions of race and gender, there were no expectations, at least not explicitly, that all groups should conform to masculine, white, Eurocentric ways of being and knowing. When discussing disability, however, participants perpetuated "the fiction that human variation is a problem that needs solving" (Bejoian & Reid, 2005, p. 221), and remarked repeatedly that inclusion should help students conform to normal academic standards, which may be impossible for some students with disabilities. Cochran-Smith (2004) argues that preservice and new teachers must "move beyond color blindness" and learn to "work effectively in local contexts with learners who are like them and not like them" (p. 62). And some preservice teachers did embrace this model, even if they remained skeptical of the efficacy of inclusive education.

Equity versus efficacy. Based on the results of the introductory survey I distributed to student participants, attitudes toward inclusion were generally favorable, a trend borne out by other research on the topic (Berry, 2010; Gately & Hammer, 2005; Mendez, 2003; Passe & Beattie, 1994; Passe & Lucas, 2011; Pugach, 2005; Stufft, Bauman, & Ohlsen, 2009; van Hover & Yeager, 2003). But participants were ambivalent about the efficacy of inclusion, a concern they expressed in interviews and during methods class discussions. For example, Seema, a graduate student, explained she was "on the fence" about inclusive education:

> *An inclusive classroom does not work for every child. I think there's a degree to what type of a need the child has that can be met in an inclusive classroom, but not every child is meant for an inclusive classroom, I think.*

Several participants had reservations about inclusion, particularly about its potential impact on the pacing and rigor of instruction. This line of thinking was indicative of broader trends in high-stakes testing, in which the deliberative, unhurried path of democratic learning is sacrificed for the sake of the fast-paced academic content coverage (Vinson, Ross, & Wilson, 2011).

Throughout the study, there was an assumption of a normal, ideal pace of instruction, a fixed body of content—a metanarrative or canon of historical knowledge—and skills that teachers must deliver within a given timeframe for class to be successful. Moreover, there was little consideration of democratic citizenship education as a conjoint, communicative experience. For example, Matt, a graduate student, wondering if inclusive social studies "might have to be…[hesitates]…not dumbed down, but maybe you have to spend more time on a specific

topic." Michelle, an undergraduate history major, wondered whether general education classes "might actually be a little too fast for them or something," and that students without disabilities "would feel the class is slowed down or something a little bit."

Participants' fieldwork—100 hours of observation in secondary schools—seemed to reinforce these assumptions, as many of them observed teachers lecturing to cover content. During the focus group, Dave said, "Out of the hundred hours I observed, I have seen one time where they weren't straight lecturing." The other participants nodded in agreement, and it teacher-centered content coverage remained a priority in the classrooms they observed. Participants' concerns about pacing and coverage seemed exacerbated by New York State's testing requirements, where all secondary students must pass two standardized social studies Regents Exams—one in Global History and Geography and one in United States History and Government—and by recent developments in standards-based educational reform. Professor Stern taught, however, there are ways of negotiating through this standardized curriculum of "official knowledge and skills" to allow students "past the gatekeepers of socioeconomic access" while still teaching democratic citizenship education, but participants remained skeptical (Beane & Apple, 1995, p. 17).

Perhaps one of the greatest obstacles to learning inclusive social studies was the belief among participants that teaching methods for students with disabilities were reserved for special education methods courses. In other words, despite the myriad examples of differentiated and Universally Designed instruction I observed in the methods classes, the student participants could not recall the examples until I pointed to them in our interviews and focus group. The dualistic nature of special education instruction—its continued segregation both in secondary schools and as a separate course in teacher education programs—led participants to think that learning to teach in inclusive environments took place in a separate department, not in the social studies program. Ironically, while the teacher education program aimed to promote inclusion by requiring a course in special education, it reinforced the normative notion that education for students with disabilities takes place in a separate environment, and it was one several obstacles to teacher education for inclusive social studies.

Discussion

Inclusive social studies envisions a socially democratic educational setting that fosters the development of a community of learners, attempts to balance the unity and diversity of democratic citizenship, and adopts a curriculum that is flexible, participatory, and accessible to learners of all abilities. Through an examination of participants' prior knowledge and the teaching and learning that took place in the program, this study investigated how social studies methods courses prepared students for inclusive education. Findings revealed that Professor Stern modeled a democratic and inclusive approach to social studies education. His methods courses taught prospective educators about teaching advanced concepts of democratic citizenship, fostering a classroom community of diverse learners, and creating a flexible curriculum for all students. Unfortunately, there was little congruence between what students learned in Stern's class and their own conceptions of social studies education and inclusive education, which their fieldwork confirmed. Participants clung to their initial perceptions about democratic citizenship education, inclusion, and disability. Moreover, the dominance of a normative special education paradigm, which segregated instruction for students with

disabilities, prevented participants from learning many elements of inclusive social studies that were presented in their methods class. Participants' prior knowledge and socialization were reinforced by program coursework and fieldwork that stressed teacher-centered pedagogy, official knowledge, segregationist schooling, and a traditional special education framework—all obstacles to realizing inclusive social studies.

Community, Diversity, and Flexibility

The practice of fostering a classroom community of learners is essential for both democratic citizenship education and inclusive education, and it is a concept that students learned throughout the program. For example, Professor Stern's methods course stressed that creating a "sense of community" in the classroom was paramount, and it hinged on elements of respect, cooperative learning, inclusion, and caring (Matusov, 2001; Noddings, 1992). Stern recognized that classroom communities are neither self-evident nor self-executing, especially given the ethos of individualism that standardized testing promotes. Rather, these democratic educational environments must be nurtured (Zindler, 2009). Data from this study revealed that students supported inclusive education on grounds of equity, even if they were suspicious of its impact on the academic progress of students, and this helps to explain why the concept of classroom community resonated with them. Students recognized the importance of purposefully integrating students with and without disabilities for purposes of socialization and, despite the ever-present subtext of the normative special education paradigm, participants decried segregationist models of schools as unfair and unjust. Others highlighted the significance of having all students work together, in groups or class, to solve problems and accomplish their goals. In this way, participants' positive attitudes about the equity of inclusive education helped them to recognize the broader democratic purposes of schooling.

Creating a flexible curriculum requires many of the same approaches that help to foster a classroom community of learners, such as cooperative learning and peer teaching, but it also demands innovative teaching strategies and classroom structures, including multilevel teaching, differentiated instruction, attention to multiple intelligences, and UDL (Sapon-Shevin, 2007). During our formal and informal interviews, Stern made explicit reference to differentiated instruction on many occasions, and UDL was evident in nearly every methods class I observed (Appendix A). Even if they did not always recognize Professor Stern's integration of differentiated instruction into his methods classes, participants incorporated differentiated instruction into the lesson plans and unit rationales that I collected and analyzed. They included art and music in their lessons to tap into students' multiple intelligences and interests, differentiated texts to facilitate literacy for students of all ability levels, and encouraged cooperative learning to allow for peer and reciprocal teaching and learning. Students sometimes misinterpreted differentiation for modification (see Broderick et al., 2005), but their willingness to integrate differentiated approaches into their lessons demonstrated the potential for inclusive social studies, despite the persistence of the traditional special education framework and the teacher-dominated pedagogy they experienced before and during their time in the program.

The Traditional Special Education Paradigm

Inclusion and special education are very different concepts. Situated in the medical model of disability, special education stresses the identification and classification of students with disabilities to be placed in an appropriate, least restrictive environment. Rather than restructuring

the educational process, schools often expect students with disabilities to adapt, with certain accommodations, to existing, normative structures of schooling with the goal of overcoming their disabilities (Hehir, 2007; Sapon-Shevin, 2007). Much of the existing research on social studies and inclusive education is situated within this traditional special education paradigm, which requires a shift toward the critical discourse of DSE to transform teachers' understandings of disability and inclusion.

The traditional special education paradigm and medical model of disability have deep roots in American education, and they influenced participants' experiences with and beliefs about disability. Nearly half of the participants were reluctant to admit that they had been classified as disabled, but they were quick to mention that they had overcome, or at least mitigated, their disabilities. Other participants, despite their ostensible support for inclusive education and diverse classroom communities, expressed concern about the presence of students with disabilities in mainstream educational settings. In this way, participants' beliefs in educational equity for students with disabilities did not correlate with their skepticism about the efficacy of inclusion as a model for excellence in schooling.

The Limits of Diversity Education
There is a risk in teaching disability in the context of diversity or multicultural education. (Pugach, 2005; Pugach & Seidl, 1998). Stern attempted to avoid this risk by highlighting links between poverty, race, and disability; by teaching lessons on flexible, differentiated instruction; and by embedding "discussion of disability within the larger framework of diversity" (Pugach, 2005, p. 570). But, efforts to weave disability into that broader pedagogy of diversity education often went unnoticed because of the persistence of a traditional special education framework, participants' narrow conceptions of diversity, and the unique challenges that disability poses compared to other forms of diversity.

Students did not view disability the same way as other forms of diversity, such as race, ethnicity, or gender, and perhaps that is because there are very real differences. No doubt, disability classification is often linked to other racial and cultural factors, resulting in the overrepresentation of certain groups, such as students of color and English language learners, in special education settings (Ferri & Connor, 2005; Reid & Knight, 2006). Disability, however, permeates all diversity categories; it weaves through and between other diversity markers, as any individual might become disabled at some point in his or her life. Teaching about disability and inclusion poses unique challenges within a framework of democratic citizenship education.

Implications

Over the past decade, democratic citizenship education has steadily been supplanted by math, science, technology, and language arts education. What is more, the current high-stakes, test-based educational climate not only narrows the social studies curriculum, but also affects the "teaching styles and activities" that social studies educators adopt (Mathison, Ross, & Vinson, 2006). Therefore, despite of Professor Stern's best efforts to move toward advanced models of democratic citizenship education—which stressed the importance of student participation, community, and diversity—participants continued to question the value of more democratic approaches to teaching secondary social studies. Within this context, one that emphasizes

objective content coverage over democratic deliberation, teachers, as curricular-instructional gatekeepers, must work "to carve out space" for the type of democratic citizenship education that inclusive social studies demands (Oyler, 2011, p. 153).

The current trends in public schooling also place students with disabilities at a measurable academic disadvantage and make inclusive education increasingly difficult to realize (Bejoian & Reid, 2005). Although legislative accomplishments like IDEA provide a legal mandate for the inclusion of students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment, the current emphasis on standards-based, high-stakes testing undermines inclusion and reinforces the traditional special education paradigm (Baglieri et al., 2011). Moreover, as priorities in education shift "from student needs to student performance, and from what the school does for the student to what the student does for the school," students with special needs become a liability (Apple, 2004, p. 20). Given participants' apprehension about the negative impact students with disabilities might have on the pace of instruction, the standardized testing bears on teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education.

Additionally, neoliberal trends in schooling have forced traditional teacher education programs to undergo changes that make democratic and inclusive education more difficult to realize. As teacher education becomes increasingly market-based and evidence-driven, "the sine qua non of good teacher-preparation policies and practices is that they ensure teachers can ensure pupils' achievement" on standardized exams (Cochran-Smith, 2005, p. 9). What is more, competition from alternative teacher education programs, such as Teach for America, have placed pressure on traditional teacher education programs, like Eastbrook University's, to become more streamlined and cost-efficient. Unfortunately, this "open-market approach to entry into teaching" has resulted in "reduced teacher confidence and efficacy" (Darling-Hammond, Chung, & Frelow, 2002, p. 297). Because time and space for critical reflection are not measurable evaluation data, perhaps schools of education are simply excising this practice, which has implications for democratic schooling within and beyond teacher education programs.

As schools continue to move toward standards-based educational reforms that demand a greater emphasis on testing objective knowledge, the space for democratic education becomes narrower. This study demonstrates how the high-stakes nature of schooling leads to apprehension among preservice teachers about embracing inclusive education and advanced models of citizenship education, which slow down the pace of curriculum and instruction to allow for student deliberation, dialogue, and discovery. No doubt, the deep channels of schooling make it more difficult to navigate against the strong normative current, but there is room to realize an inclusive and democratic version of social studies education.

Conclusion

Social studies methods classes must work to bridge the theoretical and practical divide that persists between the teaching and learning of inclusive social studies. This theoretical inconsistency between coursework and fieldwork is a longstanding problem in teacher education, evidence of the "two-worlds pitfall" that Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1985) documented over three decades ago. Overcoming this pitfall—which sent mixed messages to participants and caused them to question the efficacy of Stern's inclusive methods— "requires acknowledging

that worlds of thought and action are legitimately different" (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985, p. 64). Such acknowledgement means that teacher education programs must afford students the opportunity to reflect critically and socially on the discursive contexts that shape these two worlds.

Given the time and space to reflect critically upon the dominant conceptions of democratic citizenship education and inclusive education, and to trouble the existing special education paradigm, prospective teachers can build upon notions of classroom community and flexible curriculum, which are essential for both inclusive education and democratic citizenship education and which seemed to resonate with this study's participants. In addition, a DSE approach to teaching and learning about inclusion and disability can help to chisel away the medical model of disability, which serves to perpetuate ableism and stigma, and to complicate the diversity model, which oversimplifies the unique qualities of disability vis-à-vis other socio-cultural identities. Finally, greater collaboration between general and special education departments at schools of education could potentially result in theoretical and pedagogical consistency within teacher education programs, and might trickle down to primary and secondary schools to subvert the segregationist special education paradigm that continues to dominate schooling for students with disabilities. Despite the many barriers with which educators must contend, inclusive social studies is not necessarily a lost cause, although it is certainly a challenging one. But, for the sake of democracy, inclusion, and justice in education, it is an essential endeavor.

References

Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1998). Observational techniques. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (pp. 79-109). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Adler, S. (2008). The education of social studies teachers. In L. S. Levstik and C. A. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 329-351). New York: Routledge.

Alleman, J., Knighton, B., & Brophy, J. (2007). Social studies: Incorporating all children using community and cultural universals as the centerpiece. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 40*(2), 166-173.

Apple, M. W. (2004). Creating difference: Neo-liberalism, neo-conservatism and the politics of educational reform. *Educational Policy, 18*(1), 12-44.

Artiles, A. J. (2003). Special education's changing identity: Paradoxes and dilemmas in views of culture and space. *Harvard Educational Review, 73*(2), 164-202.

Ashby, C. (2012). Disability Studies and Inclusive Teacher Preparation: A Socially Just Path for Teacher Education. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 37*(2).

Baglieri, S., & Knopf, J. H. (2004). Normalizing difference in inclusive teaching. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 37*(6), 525-529.

Baglieri, S., Bejoian, L. M., Broderick, A. A., Connor, D. J., & Valle, J. (2011). [Re]claiming "inclusive education" toward cohesion in educational reform: Disability Studies unravels the myth of the normal child. *Teachers College Record, 113*(10). Retrieved on August 16, 2011, from http://www.tcrecord.org/content.asp?contentid=16428.

Banks, J. A. (2001). Citizenship education and diversity: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(1), 5-16.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2004). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (5th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Beane, J. A., & Apple, M. W. (1995). The case for democratic schools. In M. W. Apple and J. A. Beane (Eds.), *Democratic schools* (pp. 1-25), Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Bejoian, L. M., & Reid, D. K. (2005). A disability studies perspective on the Bush education agenda: The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 38*, 220-231.

Bérubé, M (2003). Citizenship and disability. *Dissent, 50*(2), 52-57.

Berry, R. A. W. (2010). Preservice and early career teachers' attitudes toward inclusion, instructional accommodation, and fairness: Three profiles. *The Teacher Educator, 45*, 75-95.

Brigham, F. J., Scruggs, T. E., & Mastropieri, M. A. (1995). Elaborative maps for enhanced learning of historical information: Uniting spatial, verbal, and imaginal information. *The Journal of Special Education, 28*(3), 440-460.

Broderick, A., Mehta-Parekh, H., & Reid, D. K. (2005). Differentiating instruction for disabled students in inclusive classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 44*(3), 194-202.

Brown, L. M. C. (2010). Stigma: An enigma demystified. In L. J. Davis (Ed.), *The disability studies reader* (3rd ed.) (pp.148-160). New York: Routledge.

Clift, R. T. & Brady, P. (2005). Research on methods courses and field experiences. In M. Cochran-Smith and K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 309-424). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). The new teacher education: For better or worse? *Educational Researcher, 34*(7), 3-17.

Connor, D. J. (2013). Who "Owns" Dis/ability? The Cultural Work of Critical Special Educators as Insider–Outsiders. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 41*(4), 494-513.

Cosier, M., & Pearson, H. (2016). Can we talk? The underdeveloped dialogue between teacher education and disability studies. *SAGE Open, 6*(1), 1-10.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Curtis, C. K. (1991). Social studies for students at-risk and with disabilities. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 157-174). New York: Macmillan.

Cutsforth, J. (2010). *Preservice teachers' changing understandings about teaching social studies: The role of three secondary social studies methods courses*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Danforth, S. (2008). John Dewey's contributions to an educational philosophy of intellectual disability. *Educational Theory, 58*(1), 45-62.

Danforth, S. (2006). From epistemology to democracy: Pragmatism and the reorientation of disability research. *Remedial and Special Education, 27*(6), 337-345.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Baratz-Snowden, J. (2005). *A good teacher in every classroom: Preparing the highly qualified teachers our children deserve*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., Chung, R., & Frelow, F. (2002). Variation in teacher preparation: How well do different pathways prepare teachers to teach? *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 286-302.

De La Paz, S. (2005). Effects of historical reasoning instruction and writing instruction in culturally and academically diverse middle school classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97*(2), 139-156.

Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems.* Denver: Alan Swallow Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education.* New York: Free Press.

Dieker, L. A. (1998). Rationale for co-teaching. *Social Studies Review, 37*(2), 62-65.

Donaldson, R.M., Helmstetter, E., Donaldson, J., & West, R. (1994). Influencing high school students' attitudes toward and interactions with peers with disabilities. *Social Education, 58*(4), 233-237.

Donovan, M. S., Bransford, J. D., & Pellegrino, J. W. (1999). *How people learn: Bridging research and practice.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Dymond, S. K., Renzaglia, A., & Chun, E. J. (2008). Inclusive high school service learning programs: Methods for and barriers to including students with disabilities. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities, 43*(1), 20-36.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2008). Teacher learning: How do teachers learn to teach? In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, and D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed.) (pp. 698-705). New York: Routledge.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1985). Pitfalls of experience in teacher education. *Teachers College Record, 87*(1), 53-65.

Ferretti, R. P., MacArthur, C. D., & Okolo, C. M. (2001). Teaching for historical understanding in inclusive classrooms. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 24*, 59-71.

Ferri, B. A. & Connor, D. J. (2005). Tools of exclusion: Race, disability, and (re)segregated education. *Teachers College Record, 107*(3), 453–474.

Gabel, S. L. (Ed.). (2005). *Disability studies in education: Readings in theory and method*. New York: Peter Lang.

Gately, S., & Hammer, C. (2005). An exploratory case study of the preparation of secondary teachers to meet special education needs in the general classroom. *The Teacher Educator, 40*(4), 238-256.

Giordano, G. (2007). *American special education: A history of early political advocacy*. New York: Peter Lang.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Griffin, P., Peters, M. L., & Smith, R. M. (2007). Ableism curriculum design. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (pp. 335-358). New York: Routledge.

Grossman, D. L. (2008). Democracy, citizenship education and inclusion: A multi-dimensional approach. *Prospects, 38*, 35-46.

Grossman, P. L. (1991). Overcoming the apprenticeship of observation in teacher education coursework. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 7*(4), 345-357.

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

Hamot, G. E., Shokoohi-Yekta, M, & Sasso, G. M. (2005). Civic competencies and students with disabilities. *Journal of Social Studies Research, 29*(2), 34-45.

Harniss, M. K., Caros, J., Gersten, R. (2007). Impact of the design of U.S. history textbooks on content acquisition and academic engagement of special education students: An experimental investigation. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 40*(2), 100-110.

Hehir, T. (2002). Eliminating ableism in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(1), 1-32.

Hehir, T. (2007). Confronting ableism: Improving instruction for students with learning needs. *Educational Leadership, 64*(5), 8-14. Retrieved on July 6, 2012, from http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/feb07/vol64/num05/Confronting-Ableism.aspx.

Folbre, N., Heintz, J., & Center for Popular Economics. (2000). *The ultimate field guide to the US economy: A compact and irreverent guide to economic life in America*. New York: New Press.

Hodder, I. (1998). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials* (110-129). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Horton, S. V., Lovitt, T. C., & Bergerud, D. (1990). The effectiveness of graphic organizers for three classifications of secondary students in content area classes. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 23*(1), 12-29.

Huberman, A. M. & Miles, M. B. (1998). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (pp. 179-210). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Jacobowitz, T. & Sudol, K. A. (2010). Literacy strategies that promote democratic skills, attitudes, and behaviors in the social studies classroom. *Social Studies Research and Practice, 5*(3), 62-73.

Kennedy, M. M. (1999). The role of preservice teacher education. In L. Darling-Hammond and G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of teaching and policy* (pp. 54-86). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Kinder, D., Bursuck, W., & Epstein, M. (1992). An evaluation of history textbooks. *The Journal of Special Education, 25*(4), 472-491.

Kliewer, C., Fitzgerald, L. M., Meyer-Mork, J., Hartman, P., English-Sand, P, & Raschke, D. (2004). Citizenship for all in the literate community: An ethnography of young children with significant disabilities in inclusive early childhood settings. *Harvard Educational Review, 74*(4), 373-403.

Labaree, D. F. (2000). On the nature of teaching and teacher education: Difficult practices that look easy. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *51*(3), 228-233.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1999). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A critical race theory perspective. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 211-247.

Lederer, J. M. (2000). Reciprocal teaching of social studies in inclusive elementary classrooms. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 33*(1), 91-106.

Levine, P., & Lopez, M. H. (2004). Themes emphasized in social studies and civics classes: New evidence. CIRCLE: The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement. Retrieved on July 31, 2012, from

http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/FactSheets/FS_Themes_Emphasized_SocStudies_Civ
ics.pdf.

Lintner, T. & Schweder, W. (Eds.). (2011). *Practical strategies for teaching K-12 social studies in inclusive classrooms*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Lintner, T. & Schweder, W. (2008). Social studies in special education classrooms: A glimpse behind the closed door. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 32 (1), 3-9.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marshak, L., Mastropieri, M. A., & Scruggs, T. E. (2011). Curriculum enhancements in inclusive social studies classrooms. *Exceptionality, 19*(2), 61-74.

McFarland, J. (1998). Instructional ideas for social studies teachers of inclusion students. *The Social Studies, 89*(4), 150-153.

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 E. W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (pp. 99-114). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Matusov, E. (2001). Intersubjectivity as a way of informing teaching design for a community of learners classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 383-402.

Melnick, S. L., & Zeichner, K. M. (1995). *Teacher education for cultural diversity: Enhancing the capacity of teacher education institutions to address diversity issues.* East Lansing, MI: The National Center for Research on Teacher Education. Retrieved on August 22, 2012, from http://ncrtl.msu.edu/http/rreports/html/pdf/rr954.pdf.

Mendez, M. E. (2003). *Beliefs and attitudes of preservice secondary history teachers toward inclusion and collaboration.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Illinois State University.

Miles, M. B., and Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Minarik, D. W., & Lintner, T. (2011). The push for inclusive classrooms and the impact on social studies design and delivery. *Social Studies Review, 50*(1), 52-55.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2016, May). The Condition of Education - Participation in Education - Elementary/Secondary - Children and Youth with Disabilities - Indicator May (2016). Retrieved July 12, 2016, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgg.asp.

National Council for the Social Studies (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: NCSS.

New York State Education Department. (2010). *Regulation changes for all teacher education programs and restructuring students with disabilities certification*. Retrieved on February 12, 2011, from http://www.highered.nysed.gov/pdf/memo1152010.pdf.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Oakes, J., Quartz, K. H., Ryan, S., & Lipton, M. (2000). Becoming good American schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81*(8), 568-575.

Oyler, C. (2006). *Learning to teach inclusively: Student teachers' classroom inquiries.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Oyler, C. (2011). *Actions speak louder than words: Community activism as curriculum*. New York: Routledge.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(3), 307-332.

Parker, W. C. (1996). "Advanced" ideas about democracy: Toward a pluralist conception of citizen education. *Teachers College Record, 98*(1), 104-125.

Parker, W. C. (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Passe, J. & Beattie, J. (1994). Social studies instruction for students with mild disabilities: A progress report. *Remedial and Special Education, 15*(4), 227-233.

Passe, J., & Lucas, A. (2011). Social studies teachers' beliefs and practices for teaching students with disabilities: A progress report. In T. Lintner and W. Schweder (Eds.), *Practical strategies for teaching k-12 social studies in inclusive classrooms* (pp.1-8). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Pugach, M. C. (2001). The stories we choose to tell: Fulfilling the promise of qualitative research for special education. *Exceptional Children, 67*(4), 439-453.

Pugach, M. C. (2005). Research on preparing general education teachers to work with students with disabilities. In M. Cochran-Smith and K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 549-590). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pugach, M. C., & Seidl, B. L. (1998). Responsible linkages between diversity and disability: A challenge for special education. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 21*(4), 319-333.

Reid, D. K. & Knight, M. G. (2006). Disability justifies exclusion of minority students: A critical history grounded in disability studies. *Educational Researcher, 35*(6), 18-23.

Sapon-Shevin, M. (2007). *Widening the circle: The power of inclusive classrooms.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Schofield, J. W. (2004). The colorblind perspective in schools: Causes and consequences. In J. A. Banks and C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (5th ed.) (pp. 265-288). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Segall, A., & Gaudelli, W. (2007). Reflecting socially on social issues in a social studies methods course. *Teaching Education, 18*(1), 77-92.

Sheehan, J. J., & Sibit, S. A. (2005). Adapting lessons for the special needs student. *Social Studies and the Young Learner, 18*(1), 4-6.

Slee, R. (2011). *The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling, and inclusive education.* New York: Routledge.

Slee, R. (2001). Social justice and the changing directions in educational research: The case of inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 5(2/3), 167-177.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Steele, C. M. (2010). *Whistling Vivaldi and other clues to how stereotypes affect us.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Stufft, D. L., Bauman, D., & Ohlsen, M. (2009). Preferences and attitudes toward accommodations of traditional assessment in secondary social studies classrooms. *Social Studies Research and Practice, 4*(2), 87-98.

Taylor, H. E. & Larson, S. M. (2000). Teaching elementary social studies to students with mild disabilities. *Social Education, 64*(4), 232-235.

Thornton, S. J. (2005). *Teaching social studies that matters: Curriculum for active learning.* New York: Teachers College Press.

U.S. Department of Education (2009). 28th annual report to Congress on the implementation of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act,* 2006. Retrieved on February 1, 2010, from http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/osep/2006/parts-b-c/28th-vol-1.pdf.

Urban, D. J. (2013). *Toward a framework of inclusive social studies: Obstacles and opportunities in a preservice teacher education program.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University.

Urban, D. J. (2010). *The roles of collaborative teachers in an inclusive social studies classroom.* Unpublished manuscript, Teachers College, Columbia University.

van Hover, S. D. & Yeager, E. A. (2003). Secondary history teachers and inclusion of students with disabilities: An exploratory study. *Journal of Social Studies Research, 27* (1), 36-45.

van Hover, S., Hicks, D., & Sayeski, K. (2012). A case study of co-teaching in an inclusive secondary high-stakes World History I classroom. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 40*(3), 260-291.

Vinson, K. D., Ross, E. W., & Wilson, M. B. (2011). Standards-based educational reform and social studies education: A critical introduction. In W. B. Russell (Ed.), *Contemporary social studies: An essential reader* (pp. 153-172). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Ware, L. (2005). Many possible futures, many different directions: Merging critical special education and disability studies. In S. L. Gabel (Ed.), *Disability studies in education: Readings in theory and method* (pp. 103-124). New York: Peter Lang.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zeichner, K. M., & Conklin, H. G. (2005). Teacher education programs. In M. Cochran-Smith and K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 645-735). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, J. M. (1989). *Teacher socialization.* East Lansing: National Center for Research on Teacher Education, Michigan State University. Retrieved on March 10, 2011, from http://ncrtl.msu.edu/http/ipapers/html/pdf/ip897.pdf.

Zindler, R. (2009). Trouble in paradise: A study of who is included in an inclusion classroom. *Teachers College Record, 111*(8), 1971-1996.

Zinn, H., & Arnove, A. (2007). *Readings from voices of a people's history of the United States.* New York: Seven Stories Press.

About the Author

Dennis J. Urban, Jr., Ph.D., is an adjunct professor of education at Touro College, New York, where he teaches classes on social studies methods, elementary education, history, and philosophy. He is also a full-time social studies teacher at John F. Kennedy High School in Bellmore, New York, where he has taught United States history, government, sociology, and historical research. Dr. Urban has published and presented on inclusive education, democratic citizenship education, social studies methods, local history, social justice, and educational technology.

APPENDIX A

Examples of Universal Design for Learning in Stern's Methods Courses

UDL Principle	Examples from Methods Courses
Multiple Means of Representation	- Students designed an activity sheet with rewritten and/or adapted documents from Zinn and Arnove (2007) (assignment). - In pairs, students edited a *New York Times* article for use in an inclusive High School class (observation 9/20). - Professor Stern presented examples of differentiated text: edited, adapted, and rewritten versions of Anne Hutchinson's trial (observation 9/20). - Professor Stern took students on a walking tour of the history of slavery in Manhattan, which was preceded by an interactive Web site activity (observation 10/25; field trip). - Professor Stern gave a mini-lesson on using music and song in social studies classes (observation 10/25). - Professor Stern modeled a "Gallery Walk" about the transformation of the United States during the 1920s (observation 11/8). - Professor Stern modeled a lesson on Irish immigration that included a discussion of present-day immigration issues followed by multiple sources of information, such as songs, poems, newspapers, personal correspondence, and images (observation 11/8). - Professor Stern distributed portions of a curriculum on the Irish Famine that included differentiated text (observation 11/15). - Professor Stern distributed portions of a curriculum guide on "Slavery and the Law" to provide examples of differentiated instruction, noting that teachers can incorporate these in various ways, depending on the class (observation 11/22). - Professor Stern assigned portions of an economics book in which the lessons were differentiated (Folbre, Heintz, & Center for Popular Economics, 2000), including an image, a graph, and written text for each economic theme (observation 12/6).
Multiple Means of Action and Expression	- Students created and presented a Tree of Liberty poster, which represented their understandings of American history and society (assignment). - Students performed a rap, poem, interpretive dance, or song that explained the main ideas of their Unit Plan (assignment). - Some students performed portions of the differentiated texts of Anne Hutchinson's trial (observation 9/20). - Professor Stern arranged students into a classroom assembly line to model methods for teaching about industrialization (observation 10/18).

	- During class discussions and debates, students engaged in written and oral expression (multiple observations). - Following the 1920s "Gallery Walk," students had the option of presenting a rap or a poem to the class to summarize the lesson (observation 11/8). - During discussion/debate on Occupy Wall Street, some students stood to deliver portions of a speech by Mary Elizabeth Lease (observation 11/15). - Students engaged in a role-play activity about the Civil Rights march in Selma in 1965 (observation 11/22).
Multiple Means of Engagement	- In groups, students created a Unit Plan that required differentiated teaching approaches (assignment). - In groups, students chose five significant newspaper headlines to frame study of American history (observation 9/6). - Students practiced a "writing buddies" approach for peer reviewing and editing (observation 10/11). - For many assignments and activities, students worked in groups and regulated their own progress (multiple observations).