



The Councilor: A Journal of the Social Studies

Volume 71
Number 2 *Volume 71 No. 2 (2010)*


Article 1

June 2010

Rethinking the Social in Social Studies

Jeffrey Manuel

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/the_councilor

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Educational Methods Commons](#), [Elementary Education Commons](#), [Elementary Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Junior High, Intermediate, Middle School Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Pre-Elementary, Early Childhood, Kindergarten Teacher Education Commons](#)

Illinois Council of Social Studies

Recommended Citation

Manuel, Jeffrey (2010) "Rethinking the Social in Social Studies," *The Councilor: A Journal of the Social Studies*: Vol. 71: No. 2, Article 1.

Available at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/the_councilor/vol71/iss2/1

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Councilor: A Journal of the Social Studies by an authorized editor of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

Illinois Council of Social Studies



Rethinking the Social in Social Studies

Jeffrey T. Manuel

Two words make up the term “social studies.” Pixel after pixel of text has been devoted to the “studies” portion of social studies. In *The Councilor* and elsewhere, social studies educators have developed exciting and challenging pedagogical approaches in history, geography, civics, and other social studies fields. But the first word has received less attention. What exactly is the “social” that our students are studying?

My goal in this article is to contextualize social studies in a longer and broader history of the social. I begin by reviewing recent scholarship in several disciplines that suggests a new orientation toward this strange thing called society. Working in history, science studies, and the social sciences, new scholarship forcefully argues that we need to stop treating “the social” as a given, stable entity. This scholarship notes that society, as a concept, has a specific and contingent history. This new critical history of the social calls our attention to how and when society was reified and reminds us that the social in social studies was created to fulfill a particular intellectual and political agenda. Recognizing the specific and contingent history of the social offers useful insights into the political and cultural controversies facing social studies educators in the twenty-first century. I conclude by emphasizing how this historical context might even point toward resolutions of long-running debates over the politics of social studies.

I should say a few words about how I came to this topic. Like my colleague, Jennifer Miller, I have experienced the whiplash of a young scholar moving between graduate school and teaching.¹ Theoretical readings about the history and nature of the social were a key component of my graduate education. As a college teacher, I now find myself in front of classrooms full of fresh-faced young men and women eager to major in history and teach this strange beast called social studies. I am now teaching the social studies teachers. What should I say to them? What useful perspectives might a person like me, a young teacher thinking about social theory, say to these other young teachers when they face their own classrooms of young men and women? This article represents my very tentative answer.

Historicizing the Social in Social Studies

Over the past decade or so, scholars in various fields have rethought the history and significance of society. Although this scholarship moves in many different directions, these writers generally argue that society is not a natural or given condition or background for human activity. In historian Thomas Bender’s words, they reject the “‘thingness’ or necessary coherence of society.”² Instead, they argue that the social is, first and foremost, a particular way of thinking about the organization of and connections between people, ideas, and things. “‘The social’ does not refer to an inescapable fact about human beings,” sociologist Nikolas Rose writes, “but to a way in which human intellectual, political and moral authorities, within a limited geographical territory, thought about and acted upon their collective experience for about a century.”³ The social was a useful mental tool for categorizing an emerging jumble of mobile immigrants,



churning factories, and changing technologies in the nineteenth century world. From this perspective, we can see that the social studies curriculum was just one of many intellectual trends that emerged amid widespread concern about society and the social. In other words, the social studies curriculum was one response to the problem of the social in the Progressive Era. Placing social studies' emergence within this broader historical context illustrates how certain assumptions about the importance of the social were written into social studies' genetic code and deeply shaped the field throughout the twentieth century.

An intellectual history of the social begins well before the nineteenth century. Historians have described a slow shift from religious conceptions of human organization to social visions. Although a full history of this complex shift is well beyond the scope of this article, it is enough to say that there was a long, slow transition in people's thoughts about why and how they should govern their conduct and the conduct of others that moved from religious to secular and social ends.⁴ Historian Mary Poovey, for example, notes how the meaning of the word "social" shifted from an adjective to a noun throughout the early modern period. By the nineteenth century, intellectuals spoke of "the social" to indicate a concrete sphere of action that had not existed in prior centuries.⁵ Thus, the social slowly emerged amid the early modern period's broad trends of rationalization, nationalism, and demystification.

During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the social—now a fully fledged noun—came to dominate thinking in the United States and Europe as politicians and bureaucrats established numerous "institutions and practices that sought to act upon individual and collective conduct in the name of the social."⁶ In other words, the social was an idea that linked a wide range of governmental activities, including education, criminal justice, and population controls. Under this model, a unified society became the overarching goal of government itself, the end toward which policies and procedures aimed. Immigrant children needed compulsory public education, for example, because the public schools were a crucial site for molding children into happy, productive members of society.

Although the United States never took social governance as far as European nations, a host of governmental reforms in the Progressive Era United States illustrate the importance of "government from the social point of view" among reformers. Broadly, progressives within the United States were motivated by dual goals based on their idea of the social. They wanted to prevent social revolution, which seemed likely at the turn of the century, and to avert social decay, expressed as fears about a declining or decaying race.⁷ Examples of such thought include prohibition and the attack on saloons, anti-prostitution campaigns, eugenics, fear about a declining Anglo-Saxon race, and anti-immigration laws highlighted by the racist and deeply restrictive 1924 Johnson-Reed Immigration Act. While these laws covered different realms of life, they were united in their overall goal of creating what Rose calls "safe and healthy social lives for normal individuals."⁸

Illinois, and especially Chicago, played a prominent role in the development of social governance in the United States. The transformation of Chicago's criminal justice system during the Progressive Era illustrates how the social came to guide the legal system and other aspects of government. As historian Michael Willrich argues, Chicago's nineteenth-century legal system was guided by atomistic and individualistic beliefs. From this older perspective, crime was the result of



an individual's moral choices and any individual was free to choose, rightly or wrongly, whether they would break or obey the law. During the Progressive Era, however, many of Chicago's lawyers and judges turned away from these notions of individual autonomy and personal responsibility for crime. Instead, they gradually embraced a social logic that emphasized how social conditions beyond any one person's control were largely responsible for crime. As Willrich describes, the new "social conception of crime and criminal responsibility" involved "recognition that much of the human behavior that society called 'crime' was in fact caused by forces of biological destiny or socioeconomic circumstance."⁹ Chicago's Municipal Court emerged as one of the nation's preeminent sites for socializing the law. The Municipal Court became a laboratory where new thoughts about the social were tested for their applicability to issues of crime and deviancy. In addition to lawyers and judges, the court invited social professionals such as psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers to evaluate criminals and judge not only the crime in question but the social conditions that created it. For "socialized criminal justice," Willrich argues, "the case was only the starting point for a much broader set of investigations and interventions that aimed not so much to punish crime but to reform criminals and the larger social world that had produced them."¹⁰ The Chicago Municipal Court illustrates how the social emerged as a key way of understanding the world through the mundane routines of daily administration.

Within the public education system, the social was created through large and small techniques, from abstract curricular theories to the humble school meal. Historian James Vernon has recently argued that the very meals served to students in twentieth-century Britain were important tools for building the social. School meals were sites for teaching students about their rights and responsibilities in a unified British society. "Meals had to teach [students] about the nature of . . . society and the appropriate socially responsible forms of behavior it now demanded," Vernon argues.¹¹ From the perspective of school officials eager to train social citizens, meals were one part of a broader social education meant to "help produce healthy, productive, and socially well-adapted citizens" who could contribute to a society "based on the principles of community, solidarity, civility, and efficiency."¹² The school meal educated social citizens in several ways. The daily practice of the communal meal with shared food was intended to train students in manners and civility appropriate to British society. The lunchroom's physical setting would train students in socially acceptable eating behaviors, such as using silverware and eating while seated.¹³ Vernon's example of how school lunches contributed to building the social illustrates how even small practices within the schoolhouse were aimed at building the good society in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Social studies followed a similar path at the level of curricular development. Like the social sciences, social studies emerged from the fertile soil of reformist thought in the late nineteenth century and developed into a fully articulated curriculum in the early twentieth century. As described by educational historians such as David Warren Saxe, the social studies curriculum emerged in the 1910s and 1920s around organizing principles such as "a meaningful integration of history, geography, civics, and the various social sciences," "a program that emphasized direct/active student participation," and interdisciplinary, experimental courses.¹⁴ By the 1920s, the term social studies was widely used in curricular circles. Although there was tremendous debate over social studies' rise to prominence over older disciplines such as history, the significant point



for the longer history of the social is that the social studies curriculum brought several different disciplines under the umbrella of the social.¹⁵

It is difficult to remember today, but during the early twentieth century social studies was viewed as a radical and experimental curriculum that broke free from stodgy older models to grapple with the challenges of the new century. As Saxe describes, the field “emerged to cultivate reflective citizens amid a context of problems associated with rapid urbanization, massive immigration, social unrest, and other political, economic, and cultural issues.”¹⁶ In other words, social studies complimented many socializing trends in the early twentieth century. Responding to these issues, social studies proponents moved in different directions. Some, including John Dewey, focused on social studies as a tool for justice. Others emphasized how social studies prioritized the social order above individual students. David Snedden, who was instrumental in creating the field of social studies in the United States, typified this approach. For Snedden, education’s fundamental purpose was not to provide individual students with skills or knowledge, but rather to instill “proper social conduct” among young people “with the overarching aim of fitting the child to the needs of society.”¹⁷ This was an educational theory that emphasized society over the individual and imagined schools as “agencies that existed to serve the social order.”¹⁸ Within the history of the social, social studies was a curricular component of a broader trend in which institutions emphasized the social as the overall goal of their interventions in daily life. Creating and maintaining a well-disciplined society was the main aim of the era.

This broad historical overview of thinking and acting in the name of the social points out that social studies was just one of many different attempts to govern, think, and educate in the name of the social. Social studies did not emerge solely in reaction to curricular concerns, but was the response of educators struggling to calibrate a nineteenth-century educational system to an increasingly social world.

Social Studies in a Post-Social World

Placing social studies’ emergence amid a broad trend of socializing thought in the early twentieth century is not just a historical curiosity. Social studies’ origin within social thinking explains, in part, the conflicted role of social studies in the twenty-first century, when our collective vision of the social has been drastically reduced. Throughout the late twentieth century, there was a growing sense that the social no longer fully explained the modern world. Several interconnected processes worked with intellectual currents to challenge previous assumptions that the social was, as historian Patrick Joyce describes, “bounded, static, firm and enduring.” Globalization, the collapse of Fordist industries, increasing global mobility of people, goods, and capital, and the end of state-sponsored socialism all pushed intellectuals to question their previous assumptions about the social’s relevance in the post-World War II world.¹⁹ British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher succinctly summarized this viewpoint in 1987 when she famously argued “there is no such thing as society.”²⁰ By the turn of the twenty-first century, the social had lost much of the prominence it had a century earlier.

Social studies, as an idea, was not immune to these changes. As early as the 1940s, the radical promise of the social studies curriculum was fading for many educators. Saxe argues that



World War II augured the end of social studies' prominence as an innovative and dynamic educational field. "Social studies," he notes, "never recovered the spirit and excitement of its prewar days." Social studies since the Cold War has been hollowed out and drained of its innovative, experimental, and reformist possibilities.²¹ This is not solely the fault of social studies, but rather indicative of the social's diminishing importance over time.

Social studies may have lost its radical and experimental promise, but it is still very much alive today. How can this historical context help us understand the state of social studies in the twenty-first century? I believe the above historical perspective is useful to today's social studies educators because it illuminates the historical process that created social studies and enshrined the social as a key outcome of public education. However, developments in recent decades have de-centered the social as the necessary or appropriate end goal of education. To cite just two examples, the growth of charter schools and homeschooling reveals that public education in the twenty-first century United States faces challenging questions about its purpose and direction, especially its assumptions about socializing students.

Charter schools offer an excellent example of how education's social function has been challenged in recent years. There is little doubt that charter schools have grown dramatically since they first appeared in the early 1990s. In 1995 there were only one hundred charter schools in the United States. By 2006, over one million students attended one of the nation's 3,500 charter schools, which are popular with liberal and conservative critics of public education.²² In a recent overview of the charter school movement in the United States, Jack Buckley and Mark Schneider define charter schools as "publicly funded schools that are granted significant autonomy in curriculum and governance in return for greater accountability." Each school is defined by its charter, or contract, which stipulates "the school's mission, its program and goals, the population served, and ways to assess success (or failure)."²³ This technical description obscures the fact that charter schools do not presume that a well-functioning society is the appropriate outcome or goal of public education. Instead, charter schools often rely on a market-based vision to explain their purposes. The ideology of many charter schools imagines students and parents as consumers of education, while educators and school administrators are purveyors of this product—education—in a competitive marketplace.²⁴ Educational reforms based on market models leave little room for citizenship education and social studies, which are seen as a costly investment of time and energy with little direct return to individual students.

Charter schools' focus on student achievement also illustrates their post-social pedagogy. An educational ideology emphasizing student achievement challenges the traditional socializing function of social studies. Critics of public schools have argued that public education's socialization goals are detrimental to student achievement. Political scientist Kevin B. Smith summarizes this view among critics, who argue that curriculum meant to socialize students produces "a package of compromises that guide the socialization of children rather than producing graduates with solid academic foundations."²⁵ On a basic level, charter schools' emphasis on student achievement challenges the socialization function of public schooling. From the social perspective, public education's primary function was to shape effective social citizens. This meant conveying specific content and skills, but individual achievement was secondary to the larger goal of socialization.²⁶ Thus, the charter school debate is connected to a philosophical difference over



the ideology that should guide public education. While charter schools have produced significant debate, what is significant within the historical context described in this article is that charter schools illustrate an emerging pedagogical model that does not see the social as the primary or even necessary goal of education.

Homeschools offer another example of a growing educational trend that does not aim to produce social citizens. Although precise numbers are hard to determine, it is clear that a growing number of families in the twenty-first century see homeschooling as a viable option for educating their children.²⁷ In his history of the homeschool movement, education historian Milton Gaither notes that the recent homeschooling movement is qualitatively different from earlier home-based education. Early home education was done primarily for practical purposes—schools were hard to reach or certain racial groups or ethnicities were forbidden from attending public schools—while the recent homeschooling trend is a coordinated movement often intended as a political protest.²⁸ Indeed, Gaither defines modern homeschooling as “the use of the home to educate as a deliberate act of political protest against, and alternative to, formal educational institutions.”²⁹ Historically, modern homeschooling emerged during the 1970s out of developments on the countercultural left and the Christian right. On the left, counterculture families emphasized authentic, communal living arrangements such as communes and wanted to educate their children within this communal environment. Typical of this approach was counterculture educational leader John Holt, who published *Growing Without Schooling*, the first homeschooling magazine. Similarly, the 1970s saw the full flowering of modern Christian conservatism, which included numerous Christian separatist organizations intent on creating parallel institutions—including schools—that emphasized normative conservative values.³⁰ In recent years, homeschooling has expanded beyond these groups to include numerous families who simply find it more convenient and flexible than school-based education. “Ironically,” Gaither points out, “a movement born in opposition to public schools might offer public education one of its most plausible reform paradigms for the twenty-first century’s post-industrial, virtual, destabilized global soul.”³¹ Homeschooling, then, is a growing educational movement that directly challenges public education’s core principle of socialization.

Many homeschool advocates, especially among conservative Christians, argue that homeschooling offers an educational model that is not based on social outcomes. Fundamentally, homeschooling emphasizes a private focus because advocates believe the appropriate setting for education is the private home and not the public school. This deeply private focus is indicative of homeschooling’s deeper motivation of focusing on individuals and families—and not society—as the appropriate units of measure in debates over education. Nor do private religious schools suffice for homeschool advocates. Many disagree with the premise that students should learn in a public environment of any kind. So private Christian schools are equally as problematic as government-run public schools. As historian Colleen McDannell notes, homeschool proponents “argue that both private and public education is wrong because it occurs in the wrong place.” They believe “God intended education to take place at home” and that sending your children to school outside the home is an unacceptable “compromise with non-Christian society.”³² The contrast between an outside society and an inside home is intentional. For homeschool parents and students, “the home is no longer portrayed as a society writ small; now it must be a forceful alternative.”³³



Homeschooling does not primarily aim to create social citizens, socialize students, or, in many cases, promote academic achievement. On the deepest level, the end goal of Christian homeschooling is religious salvation.³⁴ The small but growing body of Christian homeschoolers may be an extreme example, but it indicates a larger trend; the social function of public education today faces significant challenges from educational models that neither assume the social as a starting point nor attempt to produce social citizens as education's output. Charter schools and homeschooling are educational models that do not presume society as the end goal of education and, thus, they are examples of how the connection between the social and public education has broken down. I do not mean to take sides in these debates, but rather to point out that these arguments are symptomatic of a deeper uneasiness about the social goals of education.

This is not to say that social studies educators have not reflected critically on the overall mission and goals of social studies. The National Council on Social Studies [NCSS] website, for example, illustrates how social studies educators have grappled with these defining issues. The "primary purpose" for teaching social studies, according to the NCSS's 1992 definition, "is to help young people develop the ability to make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world." Going further, the NCSS notes "social studies programs have as a major purpose the promotion of civic competence—which is the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required of students to be able to assume 'the office of citizen' . . . in our democratic republic."³⁵ *Public good, civic competence, citizenship*: these are noble and important goals for educators, but it is telling that the NCSS's definition of social studies barely mentions *society*. When an organization named the National Council on *Social* Studies cannot explain why students should study the social, is it surprising that others question the entire endeavor?

Conclusion

What should we do with this new, critical awareness of the social? One option would be to return to social studies' founding principles laid out at the beginning of the twentieth century. Yet I imagine that few of today's social studies educators would be comfortable with the statist and totalizing impulses that ran beneath social studies' founding decades. It is difficult to imagine how David Snedden—the early social studies advocate who put society above students—would fare in today's educational ecosystem driven by metrics of individualized achievement. Educating in the name of the social has always been motivated by a certain anti-individualism that feels out of synch with our post-social present.³⁶

The turn toward issues of citizenship, engagement, and public good as key principles in social studies education signals not just the weakening of the social in the twenty-first century, but suggests that a different organizing principle, community, now animates social studies pedagogy. I take my cue from Nikolas Rose, who artfully describes how community has replaced society as the key terrain for politics today. In place of the older society, we now find linked networks of communities that interact and overlap but nonetheless move in a fundamentally different direction than the social.³⁷ Although the turn toward community represents one possible avenue



for social studies education—one that I suspect is already well underway in practice—it is not the only possible route.³⁸

Another intriguing option is the possibility of rethinking social studies along the lines described by scholars who have suggested a new, radically inclusive definition of the social. Philosopher Bruno Latour, for example, argues that we should “reassemble the social” using updated tools that allow for social actors beyond humans. Just as the social sciences once “welcomed the working masses in the nineteenth century,” Latour argues that today’s social sciences and social studies should “welcome crowds of nonhumans with open arms.”³⁹ Latour’s provocative model for studying the social involves the slow, carefully tracing of associations between people, ideas, and things. Sociologist John Law similarly argues that an accurate study of the social must begin by acknowledging that the social is “materially heterogeneous.” “Talk, bodies, texts, machines, architectures, all of these and many more are implicated in and perform the ‘social,’” Law writes.⁴⁰ There is an emerging consensus that understanding the new social requires attention to human *and* nonhuman actors. It is too early to say what this approach might look like in a social studies classroom, but we can imagine a social studies curriculum that moves across disciplines and across materials while focusing on an ethic of discovering what binds us together instead of conveying a static body of knowledge about a pre-existing society. To cite an example familiar to every student, Facebook is clearly a social phenomenon, but it is also clearly a technological system and an economic venture. Exploring Facebook in a future social studies classroom will require us to follow social connections across people, technology, politics, and money. Social studies imagined in this way would not focus solely on humans, but instead might challenge students to determine just what and who makes up their multifaceted social lives. What kind of society do they—do we—live in? How many are we? Can we live together?⁴¹ These are difficult questions, but I believe they are precisely the questions our students will face in a hybrid twenty-first century world.

Ultimately, this article cannot offer a roadmap toward any specific destination for social studies. Instead, I hope that we social studies educators will return to an old conversation about the purposes and goals of our field. For those educators who work within the framework of the social—and here I mean all those who fall under the umbrella of the Illinois Council for the Social Studies—renewed attention to the social in social studies promises to enrich teaching and, ideally, spur deep reflection about the ultimate goals of education.

NOTES

¹ Jennifer Miller, “How Can We Teach ‘Western Civilization’ If It Doesn’t Exist? Rethinking the European History Survey Model,” *The Councilor* 70, no. 1 (2009), <https://ojcs.siue.edu/ojs/index.php/jicss/article/view/263/230>.

² Thomas Bender, “History, Theory, and the Metropolis” (Center for Metropolitan Studies Working Paper 005-2006, Center for Metropolitan Studies, Technische Universität Berlin, 2006): 11, <http://www.geschundkunstgesch.tu-berlin.de/uploads/media/005-2006.pdf>.



³ Nikolas Rose, *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 101.

⁴ Readers wishing to explore the history of the social should consider, among many possibilities, Patrick Joyce, ed., *The Social in Question: New Bearings in History and the Social Sciences* (London: Routledge, 2002); Rose, *Powers of Freedom*; or Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), especially 159-211.

⁵ Mary Poovey, “The Liberal Civil Subject and the Social in Eighteenth-Century British Moral Philosophy,” in *The Social in Question: New Bearings in History and the Social Sciences*, ed. Patrick Joyce (London: Routledge, 2002), 45-48.

⁶ Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, 99.

⁷ Gail Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995); Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, 122-23.

⁸ Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, 130-31. On the Johnson-Reed immigration law, see Mai M. Ngai, *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004), 21-55.

⁹ Michael Willrich, *City of Courts: Socializing Justice in Progressive Era Chicago* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), xxi.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, xxxii-xxxiii.

¹¹ James Vernon, “The Ethics of Hunger and the Assembly of Society: The Techno-Politics of the School Meal in Modern Britain,” *American Historical Review* 110, no. 3 (2005): 710-11.

¹² *Ibid.*, 711.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 710-23. School lunches continue to serve their social training function. During the 1990s, students who were disruptive or uncivil during meals at my middle school were banished to an “alternative” lunchroom where you ate alone without talking. Failure to behave in a socially acceptable manner led to the loss of sociability, a lesson I learned during my week of silent lunches in the alternative lunchroom!

¹⁴ David Warren Saxe, “Framing a Theory for Social Studies Foundations,” *Review of Educational Research* 62, no. 3 (1992): 260.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 261-65. Readers interested in the history of curricular debates over social studies should also consider Andrew Hartman, *Education and the Cold War: The Battle for the American*



School (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008); Ronald W. Evans, *The Social Studies Wars: What Should We Teach the Children* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2004); and David Warren Saxe, *Social Studies in Schools: A History of the Early Years* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991).

¹⁶ Saxe, "Framing a Theory for Social Studies Foundations," 260.

¹⁷ Evans, *The Social Studies Wars*, 22-23.

¹⁸ Robert Orrill and Linn Shapiro, "From Bold Beginnings to an Uncertain Future: The Discipline of History and History Education," *American Historical Review* 110, no. 3 (2005): 741.

¹⁹ Patrick Joyce, "Introduction," in *The Social in Question: New Bearings in History and the Social Sciences*, ed. Patrick Joyce (London: Routledge, 2002), 4.

²⁰ Margaret Thatcher, excerpt of interview for *Woman's Own*, September 23, 1987, reproduced at Margaret Thatcher Foundation, <http://www.margaretthatcher.org/speeches/displaydocument.asp?docid=106689>. This document could be the foundation for a very interesting lesson plan.

²¹ Saxe, "Framing a Theory for Social Studies Foundations," 259.

²² Jack Buckley and Mark Schneider, *Charter Schools: Hope or Hype?* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007), 1.

²³ *Ibid.*, 1-2.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 3, 6-8.

²⁵ Keven B. Smith, *The Ideology of Education: The Commonwealth, the Market, and America's Schools* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), 10.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 10.

²⁷ The U.S. Department of Education estimated that approximately 1.5 million students were homeschooled in the United States in 2007. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, "1.5 Million Homeschooled Students in the United States in 2007" (December 2008), <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/2009030.pdf>.

²⁸ Milton Gaither, "Homeschooling in the USA: Past, Present, and Future," *Theory and Research in Education* 7, no. 3 (2009): 331-46.



²⁹ Ibid., 332.

³⁰ Ibid., 335-37.

³¹ Ibid., 343-44.

³² Colleen McDannell, "Creating the Christian Home: Home Schooling in Contemporary America," in *American Sacred Space*, ed. David Chidester and Edward T. Linenthal (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), 194.

³³ Ibid., 198.

³⁴ Ibid., 203-4.

³⁵ Donald Schneider, et. al., *Expectations of Excellence: Curriculum Standards for Social Studies* (Washington DC: National Council for the Social Studies, 1994), <http://www.socialstudies.org/standards/introduction>.

³⁶ Rose, *Powers of Freedom*, 118.

³⁷ Ibid., 135-36.

³⁸ For an example of a pedagogical agenda that embraces community studies, see Harry C. Boyte, "Repairing the Breach: Cultural Organizing the Politics of Knowledge," *Partnerships: A Journal of Service Learning and Civic Engagement* 1, no. 1 (2009): 1-21.

³⁹ Bruno Latour, *Aramis, or the Love of Technology*, trans. Catherine Porter (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), viii. See also *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

⁴⁰ John Law, *Organizing Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994), 2.

⁴¹ Bruno Latour, *Politics of Nature: How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy*, trans. Catherine Porter (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 109. Readers interested in specific examples of post-human social sciences and social studies should consult *Reassembling the Social*.