Secondary Social Studies Teachers' Time Commitment When Addressing the Common Core State Standards

Joshua L Kenna[1] & William Benedict Russell III[2]

Abstract

In 2010 the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) were officially released in America for mathematics and English language arts and soon adopted by 45 of the 50 states. However, within the English langue arts domain there were standards intended for secondary social studies teachers under the title, Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects. Moreover, the CCSS have been advertised as being able to transform the way teachers teach. That is, social studies teachers are expected to alter their instructional practices as a direct result of the implementation of the CCSS. Therefore, this study examined, using a self-reporting survey, whether the instructional practices of secondary social studies teachers in one Southeastern state had been "transformed" by the CCSS.

Keywords: *Standards, Social Studies, Testing, Common Core, Teaching*

Introduction

In 2009 the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) Initiative was launched and funded in the United States by the National Governors Association (NGA), a bipartisan organization of the America's 50 state governors, and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization of America's state education officials, and from various business leaders including the Gates Foundation and the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation among others (Anderson, 2010) in order to develop new college and career readiness standards in mathematics and English language arts (download the standards at http://www.corestandards.org). Approximately a year later the CCSS were officially released and soon adopted by 45 of the 50 states[1] (Kenna & Russell, 2014); however, within the English language arts domain there were standards intended for secondary social studies teachers under the title, *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects* (Hereafter simply referred to as CCSS).

---

[1] Assistant Prof., Texas Tech University, joshua.kenna@ttu.edu
[2] Associate Professor, The University of Central Florida, Russell@ucf.edu

The framers of the CCSS believe that students need to develop disciplinary literacy skills, such as those used in social studies, because the types of texts adults interact within college and a career are primarily informational in nature (Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008; National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers [NGA & CCSSO], 2010). Nonetheless, the creation of the CCSS indicates, at least from the perspective of the NGA and CCSSO, that the majority of students are not receiving the necessary disciplinary literacy instruction from content teachers, including those in the social studies (Kenna & Russell, 2015; Lee & Spratley, 2014). Moreover, the CCSS have been advertised as being able to transform the way teachers teach (Florida Department of Education, 2012; Shanahan, 2013). Thus, social studies teachers are expected to alter their instructional practices as a direct result of the CCSS (Kenna & Russell, 2014).

Studies have suggested that there are a host of variables that influence one's instructional practices such as: the subject and grade level being taught, one's personal beliefs, high-stakes assessments associated with a course, one's training/education, parental involvement, or administrator supervision (Cimbricz, 2002; Konzal, 1997; Vogler, 2005). Yet, this study is utilizing a theoretical framework that focuses on standards-based education reform and instructional practices. As a result of educational standards, teachers' instructional practices are believed to be influenced in three distinct ways: (a) content selection, (b) time allotment, and (c) pedagogical methods of instruction (Heafner, Lipscomb, & Fitchett; 2014). However, since the CCSS do not include any content-based standards for social studies or any other subject matter, this study focused on examining the influence that the CCSS have on social studies teachers' pedagogical methods of instruction and time allotment. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to examine the amount of time secondary social studies teachers devoted to meeting the CCSS. Furthermore, this study sought to discover if there were any differences between secondary social studies teachers' based on the following independent variables: (a) whether they graduated from a teacher preparation program or not, (b) whether they received formal training on how to implement the CCSS or not, and (c) their years of teaching experience.

When framing this study in the literature it is important to point out the various pedagogical methods of instruction that have been identified, and to determine what pedagogical methods of instruction the CCSS value. Second, it is vital to review previous research that has been done on secondary social studies teachers and the pedagogical methods of instruction that

they have been using in recent years, including the time allotment devoted to them. Third, it is essential to examine what influence standards and assessments have had on secondary social studies teachers' pedagogical methods of instruction and how social studies teachers have conformed to such reforms.

Literature Review

Pedagogical Methods of Instruction

There are a plethora of pedagogical methods of instruction in which teachers can utilize; however, they are often categorized in one of two ways, teacher-centered or student/learner-centered, and each category has its advantages and disadvantages. In a teacher-centered pedagogy the "teacher assumes primary responsibility for the communication of knowledge to students" (Mascolo, 2009, p. 4). As such, the teacher is the active agent necessary for learning to occur and thus students become passive learners. Common pedagogical methods of instruction that are categorized as teacher-centered include: demonstration, direct instruction, lecture, and lecture-discussions. On the other hand, a student/learner-centered pedagogy is based upon the idea that the student is the active agent and the teacher functions as a facilitator assisting students who construct their own learning (Ahn & Class, 2011; Mascolo, 2009). Common pedagogical methods of instruction that are categorized as student/learner-centered include: case studies, cooperative learning, discussion, inquiry, role-play, simulations, and problem-based to name a few (Russell, et al, 2014; Turner, et al, 2013).

Educational standards, including the CCSS, do not explicitly state what pedagogical method of instruction teachers should utilize. That is, educational standards do not inform teachers if they should use a lecture or an inquiry-based lesson in order to address a specific standard. However, there are certain kinds of methods that are favored based on the verbs being utilized in the standard. For example, if a standard utilizes a verb that requires students to demonstration lower-order thinking skills (e.g. identify, list, name) then a teacher-centered method of instruction, such as a lecture, may be deemed an appropriate method of instruction, because students should be able to learn the necessary skill or information in such a manner. In contrast, if a standard utilizes a verb that requires students to utilize higher-order thinking skills (e.g. analyze, synthesize, evaluate) then a student/learner-centered method, such as an inquiry-based lesson, would be favored because students would be the active agent utilizing those skills.

This is not to suggest that a student/learner-centered method of instruction would not suffice to meet lower-order thinking skills.

When examining the CCSS it is clear to see, based on the large number of higher-order thinking verbs, that student/learner-centered methods of instruction are favored over teacher-centered methods of instruction. Additionally, the CCSS supports the use of a framework of inquiry-based learning, as opposed to a reliance on direct instruction, as it promotes and fosters independent learners (NGA & CCSSO, 2010). In fact, for secondary social studies teachers, the CCSS focuses on the skill acquisition and cognitive process associated with disciplinary literacy. Shanahan and Shanahan (2008) contend that improving the disciplinary literacy of secondary students is at the heart of the CCSS, and Conley (2011) states that:

> The ideal result of [the CCSS] implementation will be to move classroom teaching away from a focus on worksheets, drill-and-memorize activities, and elaborate test-coaching programs, and toward an engaging, challenging curriculum that supports content acquisition through a range of instructional modes and techniques, including many that develop student cognitive strategies (p. 18).

Furthermore, Florida's Department of Education (2012) stated in a newsletter to parents that the "[Common Core State Standards] will impact the way children are taught, how they learn, and how they will be assessed" (p. 1). Educational officials in Florida suggested that children will be taught with a greater amount of cooperative learning, an increase in the amount of reading and writing they do, a more defined focus on the integration of technology, and an emphasis to have the standards overlap and intertwine between subject areas; including social studies (Florida Department of Education, 2012). Florida officials contextualized the environment in which social studies educators are teaching by adopting the CCSS, providing professional development for teachers, and implementing a new state assessment that aligns with the CCSS[2] (Yi, 2013; Solochek, 2014). However, secondary social studies educators are still expected to teach their content and prepare their students for an end-of-course exam[3] (Florida Department of Education, 2015).

Secondary Social Studies Teachers' Pedagogical Methods of Instruction

Although, the CCSS may favor student/learner-centered methods of instruction social studies instruction, has long been dominated by teacher-centered methods of instruction and

"…continues to be driven by an overriding emphasis on information coverage…resulting in a fragmented approach to teaching that privileges the acquisition of facts over in-depth study" (Caron, 2005, p. 51). The dominance is undoubtedly attributed to the large amount of content secondary social studies teachers feel they must teach versus the amount of time they are provided to teach that information. Thus, many teachers have succumbed to relying on the teacher-centered methods of instruction as a means of dealing with the depth versus breadth debate (Parker et al., 2011; Saye & Social Studies Inquiry Research Collaborative [SSIRC], 2013; Vogler 2002; 2005; Vogler & Virtue, 2007).

Additionally, many social studies educators rely heavily on textbooks, which promote fact-driven instruction but often neglect skill acquisition (Caron, 2005; Levstick, 2008; Misco & Patterson, 2009; Russell & Waters, 2010). In fact, Beck and Eno (2012) state that "textbook readings, lectures, and the memorization of textbooks" (p. 70-71) are the primary pedagogical activities in the social studies profession. They go on to state that there is a "significant gap" (p. 73) between the methods of instruction that social studies teachers use and the methods of instruction emphasized by research, which has primarily focused on student/leaner-centered methods of instruction (Barton & Levstik, 2003; Saye & Brush, 2006). Furthermore, Beck and Eno (2012) assert that "…student-centered learning, particularly in the form of inquiry, leads to a much deeper, authentic understanding of social studies issues [and content]" (p. 84).

In 2010, Russell sought to determine if social studies teachers had or were in the process of transforming their teaching practices in order to help their students compete in a 21st century global marketplace. After surveying the "frequency with which teachers used various instructional methods and practices when teaching social studies content" (p. 67), he concluded that the dominate forms of instruction being utilized in the 21st century, by secondary social studies educators, were still the teacher-centered methods of teaching (i.e. lecture, homework from textbooks, and seatwork). In fact, 90% of the social studies teachers Russell surveyed "[illustrate] a solid favoritism for teaching using the lecture method" more than half the time (p. 68). Furthermore, Russell states that the results "are troubling" (p. 68) and "continue to demonstrate that teachers are more inclined to encourage passive learning than engaged, active learning" (p. 70).

According to Leming, Ellington, and Schug's (2006) national study, social studies teachers rated student/learner-centered methods of instruction as their preferred method of

instruction but the survey also indicated that "…whole class teacher presentation/discussion…" (p. 324) was the most dominate instructional form used. While other scholars have concluded that inquiry-based instruction in social studies classrooms is a rarity (Nystrand, Gamoran, & Carbonara, 1998; Van Hover & Yeager; 2003; VanSledright, 1996). Although social studies teachers' prefer student/learner-centered methods of instruction, such as inquiry-based lessons, the reality is teacher-centered methods of instruction dominate the social studies classroom often because teachers feel a need to "cover" all the material with which their students will be assessed.

Influence of Standards and Assessment on Instructional Practices

Therefore, "the impact of high-stakes tests…on teachers' instructional practices is a very relevant concern…" (Vogler, 2005, p. 19). There is a certain degree of clarity about the existence of a clear relationship between the standards-based educational reform movement; with the unified curriculum, rigorous standards, and high-stakes assessments; and the instructional practices of teachers, regardless of the content (Barksdale-Ladd & Thomas, 2000; Vogler, 2008; 2005). High-stakes testing has actually encumbered the efforts to reform teachers' instructional practices. As secondary social studies teachers are just as reliant today, if not more so, on utilizing teacher-centered instructional practices than in years prior to high-stakes testing (Fischer, Boi, & Pribesh, 2011), because high-stakes assessments "tend to focus on [the standards] that are easiest to test" (Chudowsky & Pelligrino, 2003, p. 78), which is namely low level, factual information (Horn, 2006).

High-stakes assessments then have fueled teachers, including those in social studies, to help students pass a required examination, despite their personal beliefs regarding what constitutes student success (Stern, 2005; Vogler, 2005; Vogler & Virtue, 2007; Segall, 2003; 2006; Yeager & Van Hover, 2006). In Vogler's 2005 study, 96% of the respondents stated that their instructional practices were influenced by their "interest in helping…students attain test scores that will allow them to graduate high school" (p. 23). While, 94% stated that their instructional practices were also influenced by their "interest in helping [their] school improve high school graduation examination scores" (p.23). Social studies teachers' instructional practices then are unlikely to be altered without evidence that such teaching will positively impact student performance on high-stakes assessments (Saye & SSIRC, 2013). To phrase it another way, social studies teachers will more likely alter their instructional practices to address

rigorous standards, such as the CCSS, if the high-stakes assessments students take align to those standards.

Methodology

A survey research design was implemented and the selection procedure for this study was designed to parallel the methods outlined by Creswell (2005). The National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), which maintains a large database of publicly-funded schools from across America, was utilized to randomly select 134 publicly-funded schools (67 middle schools and 67 high schools) from Florida, using a numbering chart that corresponded to an alphabetical list retrieved from the NCES website. Each school's website was accessed in order to obtain the email addresses of the social studies instructors. In total, 737 secondary social studies teachers' emails were obtained. In order to acquire the highest return rate possible the Tailored Design Method (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009) was utilized, and 75 social studies instructors completed the questionnaire (~10% return rate).

Instrument

The questionnaire consisted of 30 line items, which utilized a five-scale continuous interval that were designed to correspond to the 20 *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies*. Where one indicates "very little of the time/never" and five indicates "almost all of the time/always". The focus of the questionnaire was not set on asking what amount of time they spend on specific instructional methods (e.g. lecturing, group work, note taking, etc…). Rather, the goal was to uncover the amount of time they spend trying to meet the CCSS. For example, the first question reads, "When I teach social studies, I have students read and comprehend complex texts" (see Appendix A for the complete survey). There are several instructional methods a teacher can utilize to accomplish such a task but rather then guess the amount of time for each instructional strategy that was devoted to reading complex texts the questionnaire gets straight to the point. Therefore, when a teacher answers the question, "about half the time" it indicates that they believe that they are attempting to meet the standard about half the time, regardless of what strategy or strategies they end up utilizing on a regular basis.

A pilot study was utilized to test the instrument's reliability and validity, which reported a Crohnbach Alpha of .943. The total mean score was calculated to determine if there were any statistically significant differences based on the independent variables. A high total mean score

indicates that secondary social studies teachers believe that the instructional practices they utilize meet the demands set forth by the CCSS. Furthermore, the questionnaire collected demographics and descriptive statistics, which were completed anonymously.

Data Analysis

A t-test was utilized to test the null hypotheses associated with the first two research questions as only two groups' (i.e. graduates vs. non-graduates and trainees vs. non-trainees) mean scores were being compared. An ANOVA was utilized to test the null hypotheses associated with the last research as three groups' mean scores were being compared. Statistical significance was set at .05.

Limitations

Despite the efforts to reduce the limitations of this study, it is evident that a larger or smaller sample size could have produced different results. A greater return rate could have also altered the results. Additionally, the questionnaire relied on self-reported data; although, the participants completed the questionnaire anonymously; providing them no reason to misrepresent the data concerning their instructional practices, some participants' responses may not provide an accurate depiction of the frequency in which they utilize certain instructional methods or the correct implementation of certain instructional methods. Additionally, some participants may have consulted resources but again the anonymity of the questionnaire should have suggested that sources were not necessary. Moreover, some participants may teach multiple subjects including non-social studies courses, which may have affected their responses. Finally, a significant limitation to the study could be the teachers' lack of knowledge concerning the *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies*. Although, the CCSS had been out for three years at the time the participants received the questionnaire, many teachers had not received adequate training and therefore may of lacked the necessary knowledge to complete the survey as accurately as possible.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

The results of the questionnaire revealed that secondary social studies teachers believe their pedagogical methods of instruction meet the CCSS a little more than "half the time", based on the total mean score (M = 3.4). A line-by-line analysis revealed that there were nine standards

secondary social studies teachers reported meeting "less than half the time" (see Table 1). While, there were six standards they reported meeting "more than half the time" (see Table 2).

Table 1. Instructional Practices Used Less Than Half the Time

Analyze the structure of texts, including how specific sentences, paragraphs, and larger portions of a text relate to each other.	**M=2.9**
Analyze how specific word choices shape meaning or tone in a text.	**M=2.9**
Integrate and evaluate content presented in diverse formats and media.	**M=2.9**
Analyze how two or more texts address similar themes or topics.	**M=2.9**
Utilize valid reasoning and relevant evidence when writing to support or deny claims found in a text.	**M=2.5**
Write narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events.	**M=2.7**
Use technology to produce and publish writing.	**M=2.9**
Conduct short research projects.	**M=2.8**
Conduct more sustained research projects.	**M=2.3**

Note: 1 = very little of the time/never, 2 = less than half the time, 3 = half the time, 4 = more than half the time, and 5 = most of the time/always

Table 2. Instructional Practices Used More Than Half the Time

Read and comprehend complex texts.	**M=4.0**
Make logical inferences from a text	**M=4.1**
Determine central ideas or themes of a text	**M=4.1**
Summarize the key supporting details and ideas of a text	**M=4.2**
Interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text.	**M=4.1**
Read closely to determine what the text says.	**M=4.1**

Note: 1 = very little of the time/never, 2 = less than half the time, 3 = half the time, 4 = more than half the time, and 5 = most of the time/always

Additionally, approximately 10% of the participants reported that they were "Not Familiar" with the CCSS, while about 90% said they were either "Somewhat or Very Familiar" with the CCSS. Moreover, roughly 41% of the participants reported that they had received no professional development with regards to implementing the CCSS. Lastly, approximately 30% of the participants were able to correctly identify the proper number of anchor standards (i.e. 20) within the *Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies*.

A crosstab analysis, between the participants' familiarity with the CCSS and their estimation of how many standards there are, revealed that about 35% of those who were "Very Familiar" with the CCSS knew the correct number of standards, while roughly 30% and 14% of those who were "Somewhat Familiar" and "Not Familiar" with the CCSS knew the correct number of standards respectively. In addition, 65% of those who were "Very Familiar" attended two or more professional development sessions as compared to 20% for those who were "Not Familiar" and 32% for those who were "Somewhat Familiar". A correlation efficient was used to examine the relationship between secondary social studies teachers' self-reported familiarity with the CCSS and the number of professional development sessions they attended. A moderate positive correlation was calculated between the two groups ($r = 0.47$, $p < .01$), which indicates that secondary social studies teachers who attend more classes about the CCSS would report a strong familiarly with the CCSS.

Inferential Statistics

A *t*-test revealed that there was no statistically significant differences based on whether secondary social studies teachers graduated from a teacher preparation or not ($t = -0.41$, df = 73, $p > .05$). Although, teachers who graduated from a teacher preparation program had a slightly higher total mean (M = 3.5) compared to those who did not graduate (M = 3.4). Additionally, a *t*-test revealed that there was no statistically significant differences based on whether secondary social studies teachers received any formal training on the CCSS or not ($t = -1.23$, df = 73, $p > .05$). Yet, those who did receive training had a slightly higher total mean (M = 3.6) than those who did not receive training (M = 3.3). Finally, an ANOVA showed that again there was no statistically significant difference based on secondary social studies teachers' years of teaching experience ($F = 0.01$, df = 2, $p > .05$). Furthermore, the total means of the three groups (i.e. 0-4 years, 5-9 years, and 10+ years) were the same at 3.4.

The list of independent variables was expanded to include the two variables, (a) the number of professional development sessions attended and (b) self-reported familiarity with the CCSS; as a moderate relationship was found between the two. An ANOVA revealed that there was no statistically significance difference based the number of professional development sessions attended (F = 0.92, df = 4, p > .05) Yet, an ANOVA discovered that there was a statistically significance difference based on secondary social studies teachers' familiarity with the CCSS (F = 3.96, df = 2, p < .05). A post hoc analysis showed that secondary social studies teachers who reported being "Very Familiar" with the CCSS (M = 3.8, SD = .95) believe they use pedagogical methods of instruction that met the CCSS significantly more than teachers who reported being "Not Familiar with the CCSS" (M = 2.9, SD = .63). While teachers who were "Somewhat Familiar" with the CCSS had a total mean of 3.4.

Discussion

The findings provide several valuable insights. First, they suggest that the majority of secondary social studies teachers feel as if they are utilizing pedagogical methods of instruction to meet the CCSS, at least half of the time. Second, the findings indicate that perhaps secondary social studies teachers were utilizing the pedagogical methods of instructions that meet the CCSS prior to the implementation of the actual CCSS; which leads one to question whether secondary social studies teachers feel CCSS are even necessary. Finally, the findings point to the fact that either more or better training has to be made available to teachers in order to increase the frequency with which they utilize pedagogical methods of instruction to meet the CCSS in secondary social studies classrooms.

Meeting the CCSS

It's interesting that the participants feel they are meeting the CCSS (at least half the time) when about 70% of the participants did not correctly identify the number of anchor standards they must reference. Additionally, roughly 41% of the participants reported that they had not received any training about the CCSS. One can infer then that the majority of the participants have not or are not interacting with the CCSS. Moreover, there was no significant difference found between those who attended four or more training sessions versus those who did not attended a training session. At first, one might point to the lack of effectiveness of professional developments offered by school districts but perhaps the fault lies with teachers and their desire not to know, especially when coupled with their already busy schedules. Furthermore, the

findings lead one to question whether secondary social studies teachers believe there is a correlation between the teaching of their content and the implementation of the CCSS, even after attending professional development sessions.

Prior Training

Despite the new focus on literacy standards in the CCSS the idea of having content teachers teach literacy skills is not new. In fact, districts from across America have invested vast amounts of resources (i.e. time and money) into the improvement of content area literacy instruction (Valli & Stout, 2004). In addition, teacher preparation programs have long required pre-service teachers to take content area reading courses (Moje, 1996; O'Brien & Stewart, 1990; Simonson, 1995). Perhaps, then teachers, as a result of prior trainings, feel they are already utilizing the pedagogical methods of instructions preferred by the CCSS. Although this is not in the scope of the study, the results may indicate at least to some degree, that the effort to implement content area literacy is paying off. The findings may also suggest that the investment to incorporate content area literacy has not fully accrued, as the pedagogical methods of secondary social studies teachers are not meeting the CCSS enough (i.e. social studies are only meeting the CCSS a little more than half the time).

Finally, the fact that the majority of secondary social studies teachers are already utilizing pedagogical methods of instruction that meet the CCSS, a little more than half the time, with little to no training on how to implement the CCSS leads one to question whether secondary social studies teachers even believe CCSS are necessary. Does the adoption and implementation of the CCSS; at least to some degree, belittle the teaching profession? Many educators feel that good teachers have already been meeting the CCSS but now they have to cut through more bureaucratic red tape to prove it. Thus, perhaps the unfamiliarity with the CCSS is a silent resistance to change.

Professional Development

Once more, 65% of the secondary social studies teachers who reported that they were "Very Familiar" with the CCSS could not correctly identify the number of anchor standards required of them to reference; and this may be a sign of several points. First, this may point to the fact that there are not enough professional development sessions, about the CCSS, being offered to secondary social studies teachers, and quite possibly to teachers in general. Second, this may indicate that the professional development sessions that are provided are not effective;

this is even more apparent given the fact that no significant difference was discovered between those who received no training and those who received much training. Finally, this could speak to secondary social studies teachers' interest and support of the CCSS. As they perhaps do not value the CCSS reform and thus they do not care enough to either attend voluntary professional development sessions or, if forced to attend a session, do not put in the amount of focus and attention necessary to properly learn about the CCSS.

Therefore, school districts may not only benefit from offering more professional development sessions to teachers but they may benefit to emphasize the value of the CCSS in the teachers' day-to-day duties. Of course, addressing such an issue is easier said than done, as the instructors in charge of the professional development sessions may also have begrudgingly assimilated the CCSS. Moreover, there is no doubt that there is a contingence of teachers who believe that the CCSS, and perhaps all previous standards-based educational reform movements, devalue their decision making ability as teachers and professionals; thus making it difficult for school districts to properly train them.

Finally, it should come as a no shock that those who feel familiar with the standards tend to utilize pedagogical methods of instruction that meet the CCSS more frequently than those who are not familiar. Nonetheless, how can there be a positive correlation between ones' self-reported familiarity with the CCSS and the number of training sessions they attend but no correlation between the number of training sessions one attends and the frequency in which they feel their pedagogical methods of instruction meets the CCSS? This signifies that in order to feel "Very Familiar" with the CCSS one must not only attend several professional development sessions but they must also have some confounding variable or variables, at which this questionnaire did not uncover. Perhaps secondary social studies teachers who are "Very Familiar" with the CCSS hold a high value towards the CCSS and this may also speak to their willingness to attend so many professional development sessions.

Conclusion

The literature suggests that there are several factors that influence teachers' instructional practices (Cimbricz, 2002; Konzal, 1997; Vogler, 2005). When it concerns standards-based educational reform movements, like the CCSS, the influence is primarily focused on three areas (a) content selection, (b) time allotment, and (c) pedagogical methods of instruction (Heafner, Lipscomb, & Fitchett; 2014). Yet, the CCSS has been billed as being able to transform the way

teachers teach. For secondary social studies teachers and all teachers for that matter, the CCSS offer up no new content standards and thus this study focused on answering the question, how much time does a secondary social studies teachers devote their pedagogical methods of instruction to meeting the CCSS? Participants were asked to quantify the time they spend engaging students with the instruction favored by the CCSS such as, "When I teach social studies, I have students assess how point of view or purpose shapes the content and style of a text". Furthermore, the total mean scores were analyzed to determine if there were any differences based on three independent variables: (a) whether participants graduated from a teacher preparation program or not, (b) whether participants received any training about the CCSS or not, and (c) participants years of teaching experience.

The analysis of the data found no significant difference in the total mean scores based on the independent variables. Participants believed their pedagogical methods of instruction met the CCSS with equal frequency; yet, the study found that the majority of the participants could not correctly identify the number of anchor standards they must reference (i.e. 20). Upon further exploration of the data there was a significant difference in the total mean score found based on participants reported familiarity with the CCSS. Specifically, participants who felt "Very Familiar" with the CCSS believed that the pedagogical methods they utilized meet the CCSS more often than participants who were "Not Familiar".

The findings of this research study warranted several discussion points; namely, as it concerned 'what' teachers were doing with regards to what they believed about their pedagogical methods of instruction. Specifically, the data revealed that secondary social studies teachers felt as if they were utilizing the pedagogical methods of instruction preferred by the CCSS a little more than half the time (M = 3.4). The results come as no surprise though, as any professional would believe they are competent in their field. However, once explored deeper, the data exposed a particularly troubling issue, which was that a high percentage of secondary social studies teachers were unfamiliar with the CCSS. Additionally, the data did not seem to align with previous studies, which suggested that secondary social studies teachers' instructional practices were dominated by teacher-centered methods of instruction (Leming et al, 2006; Russell, 2010). The discrepancy between how a teacher wants to teach and how a teacher actually teaches is not simply an American problem but one that stretches across boundaries. Additionally, high-stakes tests are not an essential ingredient, though; it may be a quickening agent. Teachers have an

ideology that pits the long-term success of students in the center of their decision-making; yet, those decisions are often overridden due to more pragmatic and pressing issues (i.e. passing the class, passing the test, etc…), and this is a fundamental issue all educators.

Notes

1. The authors understand that Minnesota only adopted the ELA standards; while an additional twelve states have introduced legislation to repeal the standards, including Oklahoma and Indiana, which have officially opted out (Markell & Perdue, 2014; Turner, 2014).

2. At the time the survey was sent to teachers Florida was part of the PARCC consortium but has since opted out and adopted a new state assessment titled Florida Standards Assessment (Yi, 2013; Solochek, 2014). Florida also made some revision to the CCSS and renamed them Florida Standards (McGrory, 2014).

3. In Florida, the only end-of-course exams social studies teachers are responsible for include 11th grade American history and 7th grade civics (Florida Department of Education, 2015).

Appendix A

Q: *When I teach social studies, I utilize pedagogical methods of instruction that require students to…*

1.	Read and comprehend complex texts.	**M=4.0**
2.	Make logical inferences from a text	**M=4.1**
3.	Cite specific textual evidence when writing to support conclusions drawn from a text.	**M=3.2**
4.	Determine central ideas or themes of a text	**M=4.1**
5.	Summarize the key supporting details and ideas of a text	**M=4.2**
6.	Analyze how and why individuals, events, or ideas develop and interact over the course of a text.	**M=3.9**
7.	Interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text.	**M=4.1**
8.	Analyze the structure of texts, including how specific sentences, paragraphs, and larger portions of a text relate to each other.	**M=2.9**
9.	Analyze how specific word choices shape meaning or tone in a text.	**M=2.9**
10.	Assess how point of view or purpose shapes the content and style of a text.	**M=3.1**
11.	Integrate and evaluate content presented in diverse formats and media.	**M=2.9**
12.	Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text.	**M=3.4**
13.	Analyze how two or more texts address similar themes or topics.	**M=2.9**
14.	Read closely to determine what the text says.	**M=4.1**
15.	Utilize valid reasoning and relevant evidence when writing to support or deny claims found in a text.	**M=2.5**
16.	Write informative or explanatory texts.	**M=3.5**
17.	Write narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events.	**M=2.7**
18.	Produce clear and coherent writing in which are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.	**M=3.6**
19.	Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning.	**M=3.5**
20.	Use technology to produce and publish writing.	**M=2.9**
21.	Use technology to interact and collaborate with others.	**M=3.5**

22.	Conduct short research projects.	**M=2.8**
23.	Conduct more sustained research projects.	**M=2.3**
24.	Gather relevant information from print sources.	**M=3.5**
25.	Gather relevant information from digital sources.	**M=3.4**
26.	Assess the credibility and accuracy of their sources.	**M=3.2**
27.	Integrate information while avoiding plagiarism.	**M=3.6**
28.	Draw evidence from literary texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.	**M=3.3**
29.	Write routinely over shorter periods of time.	**M=3.7**
30.	Write routinely over extended periods time.	**M=3.0**
	Total Mean Score	**M=3.4**

References

Ahn, R. & Class, M. (2011). Student-centered pedagogy: Co-construction of knowledge through student-generated midterm exams. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *23*(2), 269-281.

Anderson, N. (2010, March 10). Common set of school standards to be proposed; Achievement is chief goal Governors, state chiefs develop blueprint. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/03/10/AR2010031000024.html?hpid%3Dtopnews&sub=AR

Barksdale-Ladd, M. A., & Thomas, K. F. (2000). What's at stake in high-stakes testing: Teachers and parents speak out. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(3), 384-397.

Barton, K., & Levstik, L. (2003). Why don't more history teachers engage students in interpretation? *Social Education*, *67*, 358–361.

Beck, D. & Eno, J. (2012). Signature pedagogy: A literature review of social studies and technology research. *Computers in the Schools*, 29:70–94

Caron, E. J. (2005). What leads to the fall of a great empire? Using central questions to design issues-based history units. *Social Studies, 96*(2), 51.

Chudowsky, N., & Pellegrino, J. W. (2003). Large-scale assessments that support learning: What will it take? *Theory into Practice*, *42*, 75–83.

Cimbricz, S. (2002). State-mandated testing and teachers' beliefs and practice *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, *10*(2). Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/281

Conley, D. (2011). Building on the common core. *Educational Leadership*, (*68*)6, 16-20.

Creswell, J. (2005) *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored-design method.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Education Week. 2006. Quality counts, January 5.

Fischer, C., Boi, L., & Pribesh, S. (2011). An investigation of higher-order thinking skills in smaller learning community social studies classrooms. *American Secondary Education*, *39*(2), 5–26.

Florida Department of Education. (2012, September). Common core and the classroom: What can I expect for my child in the classroom? *Just for Parents*, (*1*)3, 1-3. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/newsletter/JustForParents/2012/JFP_September_Newsletter.pdf

Florida Department of Education. (2015). End-of-course (EOC) assessments. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/assessments/k-12-student-assessment/end-of-course-eoc-assessments/

Heafner, T. L., Lipscomb, G. B., & Fitchett, P. G. (2014). Instructional practices of elementary social studies teachers in North and South Carolina. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, *38*(1), 15-31.

Horn, C. (2006). The technical realities of measuring history. In S. G. Grant (Ed.), *Measuring history: Cases of state-level testing across the United States* (pp.105-132). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Kenna, J. L. & Russell, W. (2014). Implications of common core state standards on the social studies. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues, and Ideas, 87*(2), 75-82.

Kenna, J. L. & Russell, W. (2015). How did we get here? Common Core and the history of standards in social studies education. In T. Turner, J. Clabough, & W. Coles (Eds). *Getting at the Core of Common Core Standards with Social Studies* (5-24). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Konzal, J.L. (1997, March). Attitudes: How parental attitudes may influence classroom instructional practices. Paper session presented at the *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, Chicago, Il.

Lee, C. D. & Spratley, A. (2010). *Reading in the disciplines: The challenges of adolescent literacy*. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Leming, J. S., Ellington, L., & Schug, M. (2006). The state of social studies: A national random survey of elementary and middle school social studies teachers. *Social Education*, *70*(5), 322-327).

Levstik, L.S. (2008). What happens in social studies classrooms? Research on K-12 social studies practice. In L. S. Levstik & C. A. Tyson (Eds.) *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 50-62). New York: Routledge.

Markell, J. & Perdue, S. (2014, February 10). Common core isn't a government conspiracy. Bloomburg Business. Retrieved from http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2014-02-10/common-core-isn-t-a-government-conspiracy

Mascolo, M. F. (2009). Beyond student-centered and teacher-centered pedagogy: Teaching and learning as guided participation. *Pedagogy and the Human Sciences, 1*(1), 3-27.

McGrory, K. (2014, January 19). Renaming 'Common Core' standards does little to end Florida's education debate. *Tampa Bay Times.* Retrieved from http://www.tampabay.com/news/education/k12/renaming-common-core-standards-does-little-to-end-floridas-education-debate/2161811.

Misco, T. & Patterson, N. (2009). An old fad of great promise: Reverse chronology history teaching in social studies classes. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, (*33*)1, 71-90.

Moje, E. B. (1996) "I teach students, not subjects": Teacher–student relationships as contexts for secondary literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 31*, 172–195.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE). 1983. *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Retrieved from http://datacenter.spps.org/uploads/SOTW_A_Nation_at_Risk_1983.pdf

NGA & CCSSO. (2010). *Common core state standards (English language arts).* Washington D.C. Retrieved from http://www.corestandards.org/articles/9-nga-and-Common Core State Standardso-comment-on-Common Core State Standardsi-governance-suggestions

Nystrand, M., Gamoran, A., & Carbonara, W. (1998). *Towards an ecology of learning: The case of classroom discourse and its effects on writing in high school English and social studies*. Albany, NY: National Research Center on English Learning and Achievement.

O'Brien, D. G., & Stewart, R. A. (1990). Preservice teachers' perspectives on why every teacher is not a teacher of reading: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, *22*, 101–129.

Parker, W., Mosborg, S., Bransford, J., Vye, N., Wilkerson, J., & Abbot, R. (2011). Rethinking advanced high school coursework: Tackling the depth/breadth tension in the AP US Government and politics course. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *43*(4), 533-559.

Russell, W. (2009). Social Studies, the lost curriculum: A research study of elementary teachers and the forces impacting the time spent on social studies. *Curriculum and Teaching, 24*(2), 75-86.

Russell, W. (2010). Teaching social studies in the 21st century: A research study of secondary social studies teacher's instructional methods and practices. *Action in Teacher Education, 32*(1), 65-72.

Russell, W. & Waters, S. (2010). Instructional methods for teaching social studies: A survey of what middle school students' like and dislike about social studies instruction. *The Journal for the Liberal Arts and Sciences, 14*(2), 7-14.

Russell, W., Waters, S., Turner, T. (2014). *Essentials of middle and secondary social studies.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Saye, J. W. & Brush, T. (2006). Comparing teachers' strategies for supporting student inquiry in a problem-based multimedia-enhanced learning environment. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *34(2)*, 183–212.

Saye, J. W. & SSIRC. (2013). Authentic pedagogy: Its presence in social studies classrooms and relationship to student performance on state-mandated tests. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *41*(1), 89-132.

Segall, A. (2003). Teachers' perceptions of the impact of state-mandated standardized testing: The Michigan educational assessment program (MEAP) as a case study of consequences. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 31*(3), 287-325.

Segall, A. (2006). Teaching in the age of accountability: Measuring history or measuring up to it? In S. G. Grant (Ed.), *Measuring history: Cases of state-level testing across the United States* (pp.105-132). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Shanahan, T. (2013). Letting the text take center stage: How the Common Core State Standards will transform English language arts instruction. *American Educator,* 4-11. Retrieved from http://www.aft.org/pdfs/americaneducator/fall2013/Shanahan.pdf

Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content-area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, *78*, 40-59.

Simonson, S. D. (1995). A historical review of content area reading instruction. *Reading Psychology*, *16*, 99–147.

Solochek, J. S. (2014, June 30). Florida unveils new but unfinished test to replace the FCAT. *Tampa Bay Times*. Retrieved from http://www.tampabay.com/news/education/testing/florida-unveils-a-new-test-to-replace-the-fcat/2186630.

Stern, B. S. (2005). Debunking the myth: The social studies and rigor. *International Journal of Social Education, 20*(1), 52-60.

Sullivan, P., Yeager, M., Chudowsky, N., Kober, N., O'Brien, E., & Gayler, K. (2005). *State high school exit exams: States try harder, but gaps persist*. New York: Center on Educational Policy.

Turner, C. (2014, December 30). Common core repeal, the day after. NPR Ed. Retrieved from http://www.npr.org/blogs/ed/2014/12/30/371654882/common-core-repeal-the-day-after

Turner, T., Russell, W., & Waters, S. (2013). *Essentials of elementary social studies*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Valli, L. & Stout, M. (2004). Continuing professional development for social studies teachers. In S. Adler (Ed.), *Critical issues in social studies teacher education* (pp.165-188). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Van Hover, S., & Yeager, E. A. (2003). Making students better people? A case study of a beginning history teacher. *International Social Studies Forum*, *3*, 219–232.

VanSledright, B. (1996). Closing the gap between school and disciplinary history: Historian as high school teacher. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in research on teaching* (Vol. 6, pp. 257–289). Greeenwich, CT: JAI.

Vogler, K. E. (2002). The impact of high-stakes, state-mandated student performance assessment on teachers' instructional practices. *Education, 123*(1), 39–55.

Vogler, K. E. (2005). Impact of a high school graduation examination on social studies teachers' instructional practices. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, *29*(2), 19-33.

Vogler, K. E. (2008). Comparing the impact of accountability examinations on Mississippi and Tennessee social studies teachers' instructional practices. *Educational Assessment, 13,* 1-32.

Vogler, K. E., & Virtue, D. (2007). "Just the facts, ma'am": Teaching social studies in the era of standards and high-stakes testing. *The Social Studies, 98*(2), 54-58.

Walker, T. (2012) In standardized testing era, civic education getting left behind. *NEA Today*. Retrieved from http://neatoday.org/2012/10/17/in-standardized-testing-era-civic education-getting-left-behind/

Yeager, E. W. & Van Hover, S. (2006). Virginia vs. Florida: Two beginning history teachers' perceptions of the influence of high-stakes tests on their instructional decision-making. *Social Studies Research and Practice, 1*(3), 340-358.

Yi, K. (2013, September 23). Gov. Scott wants state to withdraw from PARCC. *Sun Sentinel*. Retrieved from http://articles.sun-sentinel.com/2013-09-23/news/sfl-gov-scott-announces-decision-to-withdraw-from-parcc-20130923_1_education-summit-core-standards-education-system.