

Typology of Scientific Contestation and Consensus in Indonesian Community of the Social Studies for Building a Shared Paradigm

Mohammad Imam Farisi*

Study Program of Social Studies, Indonesian Open University, Surabaya Regional Center, Kampus C Universitas Airlangga, Mulyorejo, Surabaya, Indonesia

Abstract

One of the important milestones in epistemological discourse is the emergence of the idea that reality is not merely the result of a psychological and personal construction of an expert, but it rather a result of social construction that is built on a shared commitment among members of scientific discipline community. At this point, contestation towards a consensus on the scientific paradigm becomes an important and decisive part in any dynamics occurring within a discipline. It is a sociological prerequisite for the achievement of normal science, genesis and sustainability of a particular scientific tradition. This article examines and describes the typology of contestation-consensus in Indonesian community of social studies to establish a shared paradigm of the social studies as a "*synthetic discipline*". Based on the Shwed and Bearman's model on "*the temporal structure of scientific consensus formation*," this article shows that contestations in Indonesian community of social studies towards a consensus about social studies as a synthetic discipline is *benign or flats*, a typology of contestation and consensus in which there is no really scientific contestation or competition, and more likely to reflect of scientist's ambition personally to exhibit the same exponential growth of papers but with flat (and low) contestation levels.

Keywords

Scientific Contestation and Consensus, Social Studies Community, Sociology of Science, Shared Paradigm

Received: April 8, 2015 / Accepted: April 24, 2015 / Published online: May 27, 2015

@ 2015 The Authors. Published by American Institute of Science. This Open Access article is under the CC BY-NC license.

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

1. Introduction

Until the mid-1900s, the discourses on scientific truth are always attributed to Bacon's and/or Popper's logic and epistemology of verification, justification or falsification (Popper 1970; Kuhn 1970). The emergence of Kuhn's critical-reflective thought about the role of scientific community in the scientific process as a whole has created a new perspective on the scientific truth from a sociological perspective. The scientists consider that Kuhn's epistemology is an antithesis to the Piaget's "*genetic or objectivist*" epistemology, which puts scientific truth on the structure, function, and operation of individual cognitive of scientists (Campbell, 2006). It also rejects the "*dualism*" in science that

separates between "subject" and "object" in the Plato, Kant or Cartesian views (Russell, 1993; Strauss, 2012).

According to Kuhn (1970), "The scientific community is a supremely efficient instrument for maximizing the number and precision of the problem solved through paradigm change" (p.169). Therefore, there are no domains of science, normal science, scientific traditions, ethics, or the like, can function effectively "without agreement/commitment over rationalization or without any attempted rationalization pursued by the scientific community at all" (p.49); and "there is no standard higher than the assent of the relevant community,...and to examine not only the impact of nature and of logic, but also the techniques of persuasive argumentation effective within the quite special groups that

* Corresponding author

E-mail address: imamfarisi@ut.ac.id

constitute the community of scientists" (p.94). The scientific community presents through '*a historical being*' in the process formation are grown and develop in the realm of scientific traditions, and creative for the advancement of science, present and the future (UCMP, 2012). They are a "*social institution*" which has a fundamental role in the continuity of all scientific processes and traditions, also in make constructive changes to it (Dewey, 1964; Dryden, 1956; UCMP, 2012). Shortly, in Kuhn's epistemology, the existence of scientific community is very important even they determine the continuity and dynamics of a discipline (Gibbon, et al., 1994; Pierce, 1991).

As asserted by Berger and Luckmann (1966:13), "Reality is socially constructed, and that the sociology of knowledge must analyses the process in which this occurs." The validity of any scientific endeavor not only determined by the objectivity of the evidence produced, but it also "must be committed to the relevant scholarly public" of each discipline (Parsons, 1968:17). Therefore, a sociology of science and a social epistemology are "to deal not only with the empirical variety of 'knowledge' in human societies but also with the processes by which *any* body of 'knowledge' comes to be socially established as 'reality'" (p.15).

In sociology of science and a social epistemology, contestation is a sociological mechanism for the scientific community to give considerations, approvals, positions, and opinions on every collective endeavor and/or on the scientific paradigm; and to build shared commitments on their initiatives and paradigm(s) that they will use as a shared model or exemplar. Configuration of both contestation and consensus is a "prerequisite for normal science, i.e., for genesis and continuation of a particular research tradition" (Kuhn, 1970:11). Contestation and consensus are also used by the scientific community to "determine core set of practicing scientists who negotiate results; demarcate knowledge claims; to construct the boundary objects for concealing a conflict; to employ micro-politics of translation; to fortify bandwagon practices; and to develop a strategy that allows for easy comparison across cases" (Shwed & Bearman, 2010:819).

The degree of contestation and consensus is determined by the stringency of the internal divisions within the scientific community, and how the central issue is important to be contested and committed. In a number of the scientific community, contestation towards a consensus is often preceded by fierce contestation or competition among of them, although it is not so exclusive. On the one case, contestation towards consensus is only indicated by "flat contestation, in which there is no really scientific contestation" (Shwed & Bearman, 2010:818). On the other case, history suggests that the road to a firm consensus is

extraordinarily arduous, colored by harder, fierce, fully controversy and rivalry between factions within scientific community. Kuhn (1970), for example, describes contestation toward consensus within scientific community as the '*fundamental disagreements*, the '*essential tensions*' (p.15, 79), or the '*fundamental tensions and contradictions*' (Ross, 2006:17), which involved many scientists from different streams, beliefs, and theories/philosophies. Contestation often indicated by some personal unconstructive behaviors in problematic situations such as the intellectual attack (e.g. denial, repression, withdrawal, protection, regression), and psychosomatic illness (Somantri, 2001:2-3, 72-73; Hunt & Metcalf, 1955:51). Within this situation, the expected scientific consensus is often not occurred. Instead, it triggers to the "*seamless web of confusion...with conflict and confrontation; a held of ambiguity and chaos, choked with competing claims*" (Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1977:10).

This paper analyzes and describes the dynamics of contestation and consensus in Indonesian community of social studies about the social studies paradigm as a "*synthetic discipline*," during periods 1960s-1998. It also analyzes and describes its implications in the development of social studies thought and in the school curriculum. This study in social studies discipline is a new and started since 1970s, e.g. by Barr *et al.* (1977), Evans (2004), Ross (2006), and Saxe (1991). In Indonesia, such as study has never been done. Therefore, their study very important and provide useful exemplars for the study of sociology of social studies community in Indonesia.

2. Research Method

This study uses a qualitative content analysis focused on the themes and main ideas of the text as primary content (Mayring, 2000). The primary source is Somantri's book entitled "*Initiating a Renewal of Social Studies*" (2001) which contains a complete his bibliography of the social studies paradigm as a "*synthetic discipline*, and the dynamics of social studies thoughts, which has evolved in the Indonesian Social Studies Scholars Association (HISPIPSI) meetings over the period 1990-1998. Secondary sources are the academic papers of the social studies scientists (books, proceedings, journal articles, theses and/or dissertations) substantively related to Somantri's thought. Both sources collected using an '*annotated bibliography technique*' (Galvan, 2006; Mongan-Rallis, 2006) and '*literature review*' or '*literature research*' (Cooper 1988; Evans & Kowanko, 2000).

In the sociology of science, expert's thoughts "are not the only mechanisms for consensus declaration, but also the most authoritative and frequently used mechanism, and the one

most often cited as proof. They provide accumulated important scientific repertoires and exemplars in any dynamics occurring within a discipline" (Shwed & Bearman, 2010:836-837). They also "ought to be studied as a possible index to the occurrence of revolutions" (Kuhn, 1970: ix). Furthermore, Kuhn asserts "historical research that displays the difficulties in isolating individual inventions, and discoveries gives ground for profound doubts about the cumulative process through which these individual contributions to science were thought to have been compounded" (Kuhn, 1970:3).

The data were analyzed and interpreted using a model of qualitative analysis of Shwed and Bearman's "*the temporal structure of scientific consensus formation*" (2010). '*Temporal*' is a highly dynamic contestation-consensus formation, moving from one contestation-consensus model to another reflexively. Contestation-consensus formation changes are largely determined by the degree of difference of thought or theory "can/cannot be" anticipated among the scientist who contested according to a shared paradigm they committed. This model is not the first and the only one that provides an analysis on the contestation-consensus formation on the community level. Some scientists, such as Kuhn (1970), Ritzer (1975, 1992), and Abbott (2001) has also developed analytical models which they use for their scientific discipline. Shwed-Bearman's model used, because it deemed capable for mediating controversies and overlapping terms used between quantitative and qualitative research in analyzing the scientific dynamics; and for complementing Kuhn's structure of scientific revolution.

As Kuhn's model, Shwed and Bearman also classify the dynamics of scientific contestation and consensus into two periods, pre-paradigm and paradigm. In the pre-paradigm period, the scientific contestation and consensus are containing and producing literature or scientific theories based on the idea of each expert individually. Contestation among scientists is more a personal effort each scientist to provide theoretical-empirical answers to the scientific problems, issues, or enigmas, without based on shared paradigms. Shwed and Bearman (2010) call it as a "*benign*" or "*flat*" contestation that more focused on creating a literatures' network, and a reflection of scientist ambition personally to "exhibit the same exponential growth of papers but with flat (and low) contestation levels" (p.821), or the extent of the scientist struggle personally "to establish their own niches in growing literatures" (p.824).

In the paradigm period, the scientific contestation and consensus are characterized by harder, fierce, fully controversy and rivalry between factions within scientific community. Debates also more focused on the core issues which have not been satisfactorily explained and solved by a

common paradigm. Shwed and Bearman call it as an "*epistemic rivalry*," a real contestation-consensus, "in which strongly entrenched camps disagree on core issues" (p.836). In this period, each faction also contested to build a mutual scientific citation networks structure with the characteristics of each, and fight together become a "*most excellent*." Furthermore, Shwed and Bearman distinguish the epistemic rivalry at the community level in the post-paradigm into three types.

First, '*spiral consensus*', "in which substantive questions are answered and revisited at a higher level" (p.818). The consensus can be achieved through an academic contestation-consensus among scientists continually on the "higher level" questions, problems, and/or scientific enigmas. Consensus reached also has "higher value" problem-solving (re-unification, re-align, re-definition, or re-vision of the old-consensus to the new-consensus). In spiral consensus, initially intense contestation generates rapid settlement and induces a spiral of new questions to which scientists become oriented. Here the settlements of earlier contestation provide scaffolding for new communities of research (p.835).

Second, '*cyclical consensus*', "in which similar questions are revisited without stable closure" (p.818). The consensus can be achieved through continuing academic controversies/contestation among scientists over a long time. The problems and/or scientific enigmas are proposed constantly return to initial states. Each reduction in contestation levels was followed by reoccurring contestation—on the same plane, reformulating around different statements of similar substantive questions (p.835). The answers given do not provide a stable settlement for new communities of research to explore a fresh problem independently. The periods indicated a series of battles. Consensus has been achieved was again refuted, even destroyed, so create a situation "decline or displacement." Kuhn (1970) calls 'anomalies,' a period in scientific revolution is brushed aside or left as problems for future research, and the paradigm has faced with frustration; the field enters a state of "crisis".

Third, '*flat consensus*', "in which there is no really scientific contestation" (p. 818). Consensus can be achieved without any contestation/real academic controversy among scientists even their academic works are growing exponentially. Within this type, there is no contestation towards the formation of a higher "new consensus." By contrast, there is no contestation towards prolonged conflicts that can create a "decline or displacement," anomalies and crises. This type is between "spiral" and "cyclical" consensus. According to Shwed and Bearman (2010:835), flat consensus can mean two main things case by case. First, scientific community no coherent research agenda, in which scientific papers are largely the

accidental by-product of large research efforts respectively. Contention around the core issues does not arise, and articles cite other articles seemingly at random. Second, scientific community speak with a single voice in opposition to a lay critique. The drive to new studies arises exogenously, but there is no real debate. Articles that refute the connection cite other similar articles. Here too, as a consequence, communities of contention within science fail to arise.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Contestation and Consensus in Pre-Paradigm Period (1960-1980s)

In this period, the dynamics of social studies is characterized by two developments simultaneous: (1) the initial conceptualization of the social studies as "*synthetic discipline*"; and (2) the experiment and implement on the results from the research and innovations in the social studies curriculum development for the school (1975-1984).

As far as can be traced to the social studies bibliographies, during the period 1966-1988, at least, has produced 10 scientific works on the initial social studies thought as "*synthetic discipline*." They produced by the founding fathers of Indonesian social studies such as Nu'man Somantri, Saidiharjo, Hartshorn, Achmad Sanusi, Ahmad Nasution, Kosasih Djahiri, Tjokrodikardjo, Nursid Sumaatmadja, and Supardjo Adikusumo. Something that prominent in their scientific works is the emergences some terms/names and conceptual definitions of the social studies, which have been divided them into two groups. The first group uses the terms/names such as '*Social Knowledge*', '*Social Science*', '*Social Science Education*', and '*Teaching the Social Sciences*' for subject matter in school curriculum. This group defines the social studies as (1) learning materials for preparation/introduction to the further study of social science disciplines at the next level; (2) a simplification of the social sciences, ideology of the state and other disciplines as well as social issues related to educational purposes; and (3) subjects who examine a set of events, facts, concepts, and generalizations related to social issues. The second group uses the terms/names such as '*Social Studies*,' and '*Social Science Education (SSE)*' for courses at all levels of education (elementary to the university). This group defines the social studies as a combination, blend or fusion of a number of subjects or concepts of the social sciences in school.

In relation to their scientific works, there are no found records or analyze shown contestations, dialogues, debates, or academic controversies among of them on the initial social studies conceptualization as '*synthetic discipline*'. Each of

them more focuses on thought about social studies individually. A fierce contestation or competition only occurs between Somantri and Sanusi through their manuscripts. Somantri and Hartshorn written a manuscript entitled "*Challenges in Teaching Social Sciences*" (1970). As a respond to the manuscript, Sanusi written a manuscript entitled "*Strengthening Fundamentals of Teaching Social Studies in Indonesia: Toward a Comprehensive System*" (1971) (Al-Muchtar, 2007:272).

The fierce contestation or competition between them is related to old issues, which had always been a subject of debates among Indonesian community of social studies since the beginning of the development. Such issues are the clarity of the name/official term used for social studies; the clarity of conceptual definition of social studies as a shared paradigm of community facing problems, issues, and challenges forward; and demarcation of pedagogical purposes and contents of the social studies for every level of education. Including, the patterns in selecting and organizing of learning themes, which is considered the most essential and relevant to the challenges, problems, needs, demands, and changes being faced by the people of Indonesia. Even, academic debates Somantri versus Sanusi also initiated social studies community to organize a National Seminar on Civics Education in Tawangmangu Solo 1972. In addition, it was also triggered by the results of the national survey in the framework of the National Education Assessment Project (PPNP) 1969/1970 who report that instructional practices have not been satisfactory. It is also the efforts of the social studies community to anticipate the government's program in educational reforms in all units and levels of education through a number of pilot projects in curriculum revision, teaching methods and materials; and upgrading the skills of teachers (Al-Muchtar, 2007:272; RI, 1970).

During the seminar, debates are focused on three names/terms such as "*Social Knowledge*, *Social studies*, and *Social Science Education*" are used interchangeable. Finally, "*Social Studies*" (*Pendidikan Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial*) agreed as the formal term/name to adjust the name/term 'Natural Science Education' (*Ilmu Pengetahuan Alam*) that has also used in academic discourse that time (Winataputra, 2011:11). The seminar also agreed that the social studies are the "study of social problems is chosen and developed using an interdisciplinary approach, and the aim is the student can be understood social problems." The same as the previous period, "the seminar 'agrees' over the conceptual definition of social studies without prolonged debate and academic controversy among participants" (Winataputra, 2001:42; 2011:11).

The phenomenon of contestations, dialogues, debates, or academic controversies above, which are reflected in both

scientists' works individually as well as in the national seminar, has been confirmed the Shwed and Bearman's view (2010) that in the pre-paradigm period, the community contestation-consensus among scientists tends to be "*benign contestation-consensus*." They reflect the struggles of each scientist to create and strengthen their expert's works, and build the literature citations network for their communities.

However, unlike the Shwed and Bearman's view, actually, benign contestation-consensus during the pre-paradigm period is not because the Indonesian community of social studies did not really have a paradigm as a reference or mode of thought. The social studies thought growing in America, which has developed by the National Commission for Social Studies (NCSS), Wesley, Wronski, and Kenworthy is very clear coloring their conceptualization about the social studies. NCSS (1935) conceptualizes the social studies "as the subject matter of academic disciplines somehow *simplified, adapted, modified, or selected* for school instruction" (quoted in Somantri, 2001:73); Wesley and Wronski define it as "the social sciences are *simplified* and *reorganized* for instructional [pedagogical] purposes" (Wesley, 1942:6; 1946:22; Wesley & Wronski, 1950:34); and Kenworthy (1962) also defines the social studies as "subjects *selected or drawn* from all the social sciences and related disciplines for educational objectives" (p.3).

Conceptually, their thoughts or definitions about the social studies are equally developed from "*the social sciences' tradition*" or "*social studies taught as social sciences*" which are indicated by acquire "the knowledge, skills, and devices of particular social science disciplines" (Barr *et al.*, 1977:61-62). This tradition is a '*mainstream tradition*' in the US social studies thoughts over 70 years (1890s-mid 1960s); and it is still actively developed today by the Social Science Education Consortium (Barr *et al.*, 1977:61). The tradition is the impact on the revival of the new social sciences' movement during years 1880-1890an; and it is typified by the historian and the scholarly committees of the American Historical Association (Longstreet & Shane, 1993; Barr *et al.*, 1977:61). According to this tradition, the social sciences are "the hearth of discipline [social studies]" (Wesley & Wronski, 1950:3), and "the core of the curriculum" (NCSS, 1935). Based on the similarity of the paradigmatic thought, this can be understood if the contestation-consensus among the Indonesian community of social studies in the pre-paradigm are benign, and they just do adaptation and contextualization the ideas into the Indonesian context.

As stated by Adikusumo (1989), continuing debates and contestation in Indonesian community of social studies about the conceptualization of social studies during the pre-paradigm period is almost never done, both in the school community as well in study program and faculty members.

Consequently, their understanding on the social studies considered "floating, and cause confusion between social studies practitioners at the school level" (p.5). The hidden contestations, dialogues, debates, or academic controversies in the early period on the development of social studies though, also presented by Somantri at the first meeting of HISPIPSI in 1990 in Bandung.

"Continuing academic debates and dialogues about social studies...are hardly growing, both among the faculty and the members to foster and develop social studies responsibly,...especially among their graduates. Various obstacles so that discussion underdeveloped...is because their understandings on the social studies are less, so the social studies itself is not only a problem, but it also the *obstacles*, the problems which have been involved the psychological aspects (Somantri, 2001:71).

3.2. Contestation and Consensus in Paradigm Period (1990-1998)

In this period, the dynamics of social studies is characterized by two important phenomena at the community level: the birth of professional organizations of social studies (HISPIPSI) year 1990 in Bandung; and the annual meetings of HISPIPSI to discuss and debates and build a shared consensus about the '*paradigmatic definition*' of social studies as '*synthetic discipline*' (1990—1998).

Within the history of Indonesian social studies, HISPIPSI is the first professional organization for Indonesian community of social studies. In Kuhn's perspective of social epistemology, they are one of the essential social institutions and infrastructure for the development of social studies as a *scientific discipline*; and of the academic forum for members of the social studies community to exchange their best thoughts, experiences, practices, and research to others; and to discuss, debate, dialogue, and build a shared consensus about the conceptualization of social studies as a collective thought, not a personal thought. As Somantri (2001) asserts that one of the objectives of establish HISPIPSI is to "roll social studies problems to all members of the Indonesian community of social studies so it becomes continuous debates, dialogues and research among of them" (p.72).

The first meeting of HISPIPSI in 1990 is the early milestone to open academic contestations and consensus continually on the conceptualization of social studies at the professional community level. In the meeting, Somantri (2001) recommends—and agreed by participants—to discuss the issue on "defining the social studies" (p.72). He proposes three definitions of social studies to be used as a reference of debates or discussions, who adapted from Wesley and Wronski; Frasser and West; NCSS; and the Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors. Basically, three definitions are the same

developed from the social sciences' tradition. The social studies are "*a simplification and selection of the social sciences*," "*the social sciences simplified and selected*," or "*comprised and selected of those aspects of social sciences*" for instructional/pedagogical/educational purposes in schools and colleges (Somantri, 2001:73-74).

The participants agreed to discuss and criticize "defining the social studies" as the first and main issue during the meeting. Somantri (2001) states that the clarity and firmness of a definition are a significant and fundamental for the scientific community, so they can develop and communicate among of others with the same of thought and understanding about the social studies" (p.72). Somantri—quotes from Dufty—claims that a definition should become "a body of thought, speaking, and above all, writing by these scholars who consist of facts, concepts, generalizations, and theories" (p.17, 29, 72-93). Sanusi (1988) states that clarity definition of the social studies is very significant to anticipate a number of theoretical and practical constraints; develop teachers' horizon on the social studies; identify problems and solutions faced social studies all this time. Another scientist, Al-Mochtar (2007) also argues, the effort toward achieving a shared commitment on a definition of the social studies is very important and fundamental to the professional community of the social studies to "set the direction to the development of social studies as the field of study and scientific disciplines" (p.271). The HISPIPSI document describes the agreement to discuss the conceptual definition of social studies also shown the rising of common awareness among members of the social studies community, that "the conceptual foundation of the social studies in Indonesia is still weak, and became an obstacle in development and stabilization of social studies at all levels of education (Al-Muchtar, 1991:12).

The phenomenon of contestation within the first meeting of HISPIPSI in 1990 on conceptual definition of social studies is "not so fierce, except, there are objections by a number of participants against to the use of the term '*simplified or simplification*'. They criticize the use of the term are considered has degraded the social studies position, and they propose to be replaced by the term "*selection*" (Al-Muchtar, 2007:274). To mediate the controversies, Somantri (2001) explains that both terms are actually used to distinguish social *studies* with social *sciences* are usually used at the university and the school" (p.92, 102-103), and no more questions concerning about it by the participants.

Discussions and debates on defining the social studies are continuous at the second meeting of HISPIPSI in 1991. Finally, all participants agreed to the Somantri's conceptualization about the social studies as '*synthetic discipline*' to be shared paradigm for the Indonesian

community of social studies. According to Winataputra (2001) consensus achieved without fierce debates and controversies among of participants, it "easily accepted with little comment; there are no professional, academic, adequate, widespread responses or academic controversies among participants" (p.11).

The contestation and consensus during the forum are not much different from the pre-paradigm period, normative, benign, and flat. In fact, the same phenomenon also occurs when Somantri communicates the definition of social studies to the members of faculty, scientist forums, institutes/universities, and to the national organizations of education such as Indonesian Education Scholars Unity (ISPI), Education Consortium, and Indonesian Science Agency (LIPI) during years 1991—1998. Contestation to consensus did not indicate to an "*epistemic rivalry*" or "*as if passing away*" (Somantri 2001:131-132). Instead, some scientists consider that Somantri's effort as a "*rhetorical tautology*" (Winataputra, 2001:121).

In response to this Winataputra's view, at least there are two arguments can be put forward. *First*, definition(s) is not merely a linguistic. Epistemologically, one of the strengths of a definition contained in rhetorical tautology, an argument constructed and stated by assertion using different phrasing in which logically irrefutable, and cannot be corrected piecemeal. So, the nature of community commitment is also a stronger, more resilient and resistant to correction, rather than a commitment to the law or generalization (Kuhn, 1970:183). *Second*, if we analyze of the context of disclosure, there are actually reasonable and strong arguments for Somantri to explain the definition of social studies repeatedly. It should be seen as Somantri's efforts to provide a reminder, affirmation, trust and foster the spirit within the scientists' community on identity of social studies as a '*new discipline*' (Becker, 1965; McCutcheon, 2001) is strongly influenced by the development of "*the new philosophy of science*" and "*the hermeneutic case*" movements, which allows the discipline using a variety of scientific methods from several disciplines to interpret the data, including actions, customs, and social practices; and to anticipate the excessive specialization of the old disciplines was often escaped from problems or general issues related to public interest (Somantri, 2001:41, 265). As a '*new discipline*', social studies in Somantri's view is an "*advance knowledge*," the result of a synergistic engineering (inter, trans, and cross-disciplinary) that are potential to be a flagship and a mainstay for faculty or study program of social studies at the university (p.28-9, 65).

The silent response to Somantri's efforts can be understood. On the one hand, social studies are a "new concept" for scientist's community and for scientific nomenclature of Indonesia. The same phenomenon also occurs in the social

studies community in US during the early development until mid-1970s (Barr *et al.*, 1977; Saxe, 1991). On the other hand, this phenomenon is predicted will have the impact on the low quality achieved in improvement efforts undertaken. Community's expectations about social studies in the future are very vague (Al-Muchtar, 1991; Sanusi, 1998; Winataputra, 2001). The reality illustrates that Shwed and Bearman's (2010) typology of contestation-consensus, which presuppose the existence of "epistemic rivalry" or "strongly entrenched camps disagree on core issues" (p. 836) in the paradigm period does not occur. Contestation-consensus is indicated by factional rivalry among scientist groups to build a network structure of the scientific community with their own characteristics does not occur too. Contestation-consensus among the community members of social studies during the paradigm period are just "a flat consensus, are not really controversial among scientists" (p.821); and only creates "a normal fragmentation and specialization" (p.833).

This phenomenon most likely caused by a number of factors. First, Somantri's definition may consider by scientists "are the most authoritative and frequently used mechanism, and the one most often cited as proof" (Shwed & Bearman, 2010:836-7, note 11). Second, the structure of experts' networks in each community group of social studies is not so vast and complex, and they also do not have a strong community character which can make them a clearly differentiation to others. Third, the controversies among scientist groups merely focused on secondary issues, not on the main issues of paradigm, such as the technical terms like 'simplified', or they tend to simplify the issue related to the 'method versus content' (Somantri, 2001:18). Fourth, there are no scientists who have '*counter or comparison definition*' of social studies beyond the Somantri's definition, in terms of arguments, the level of problem-solving, precise, accurate, and of their quality (theoretical and practical). Fifth, there is the impression that appearances of "silent consensus" among the community of social studies are merely to make the social studies traditions appropriate and contextual to the needs and aims of education in Indonesia.

The benign or flat contestation-consensus above is something unusual in the community of social science's discipline, including social studies, which is often characterized by hard and full contestation or conflicts among of them to formulate a superior paradigm, as illustrated by Barr *et al.* (1977) and Kuhn (1970) as follows.

"We have attempted to demonstrate that social studies is a '*seamless web*' of confusion. It is a field alive with conflict and confrontation; a held of ambiguity and chaos, choked with competing claims by theoreticians and curriculum designers" (Barr *et al.*, 1977:10).

"Even more important, spending the year in a community composed predominantly of social scientists confronted me with unanticipated problems about the differences between such communities and those of the natural scientists among whom I had been trained. particularly, I was struck by the number and extent of the overt disagreements between social scientists about the nature of legitimate scientific problems and methods" (Kuhn, 1970: vii-viii).

The phenomenon above is also much different from the scientific contestation-consensus within the professional community of social studies, such as in the Committee on Social Studies (CSS) or NCSS always loaded with fierce academic debates approximately 50 years (1920-1970s) (Barr *et al.*, 1977; Saxe, 1991). Evans (2004) and (Ross, 2006) describe it as the '*social studies wars*' or as the '*culture wars*, a history of social studies of turf wars among competing camps, each with its own leaders, philosophy, beliefs, and pedagogical practice. Shwed and Bearman (2010) categorized this type of contestation-consensus as a "*spiral contestation*," in which substantive questions are answered and revisited at a higher level. The Kuhn's scientific revolutions are an exclusive exemplar of this model (p.821).

3.3. Social Studies Curriculum: Professional Consensus Versus Policy

The fact, between the "scientific community" under HISPIPSI and "curriculum developer community" for the school under the Ministry of Education is not consistent in terms of the development of a social studies framework. Theoretically, the scientific consensus on a definition of social studies should also really have implications for the curriculum developer community as part of community of social studies in a whole. Every scientific enterprise, including curriculum development, is also a product of academic activities, which cannot be separated from social studies as a "*synthetic discipline*" in the social sciences' tradition, a shared paradigm which has been committed by HISPIPSI members since 1991. Moreover, the social studies are also "a type of curricular approach to social sciences in schools" or a "model of curricular approach" to social sciences for educational purposes (Saxe, 1991:17).

Historically, since the beginning period, until now, between the development of social studies conceptualization and the development of curriculum of the school, each of them runs through two different paths, namely the "*professional consensus*" path coordinated by HISPIPSI and the "*policy consensus*" coordinated by the Curriculum Development Center (*Pusbangkur*). Both paths have a framework or paradigm respectively. Based on the reality, we can be understood if the academic consensus about social studies paradigm as a "*synthetic discipline*" does not have a lot

implications for the curriculum developer community to the school, although HISPIPSI has formulated a social studies conceptualization for the school level. It appears in the use of terms/names and concepts are varied and inconsistent at school curriculum 1972-1973, and in 1975.

In the curriculum 1972-1973, the terms/names and concepts are used such as (1) *Civics Education/Social Studies*” used to the social studies curriculum at the elementary and secondary schools as an integrated subject is developed based on the “citizenship transmission tradition” and “social sciences’ tradition” (2). “*Civics Education and Civics and Law*” used to the social studies curriculum at the secondary and high schools as a separated subject is developed based on the “citizenship transmission tradition” (3) “*Social Science Education*” used to the social studies curriculum at the secondary and high schools as a separated subject is developed based on the “social science’s tradition” (Winataputra, 2011:11-12). According to Winataputra (2011:11-12), the development of curriculum of the school that time is strongly influenced by Sanusi’s thought and interpretations (1972). Meanwhile, the community of social studies in the National Seminar 1972 have committed to use the name/term “*Social Science Education*” (Al-Muchtar 2007:272; Winataputra, 2011:11).

In the Curriculum 1975, the terms/names and concepts are changed such as (1) “*Pancasila¹ Moral Education*” used to replace “*Civics Education and Civics and Law*” as part of the separated subject of social studies curriculum for all school levels. It developed based on the “citizenship transmission tradition,” especially to transmit of *Pancasila* values as a philosophy, ideology and the foundation of the state. (2) “*Social Science Education*” as an integrated subject at the elementary school; a correlated/confederated subject at the secondary school; and a separated subject at the high school. It developed based on the “social sciences’ tradition. In the Curriculum 1985, the terms/names and concepts are still used.

Besides that, there is also a subject that developed as part of the separated subject of social studies curriculum for all school levels, namely the “*National Struggle and History Education*.” It developed based on the “citizenship transmission tradition,” especially to transmit values and attitudes of national heroism. The development of “*Pancasila Moral Education*” and “*National Struggle and History Education*” as subjects in school curriculum of this period is shown that the curriculum development cannot be separated from the government policy “back to *Pancasila* and the States’ Constitution 1945” after the state of Indonesia is strongly influenced by ‘*Nasakom*’ (*Nationalist, Religious, and Communist*) ideologies during 1959—1965 (Belen, 2010). Mulder’s critical studies on the social studies textbooks

(1997) used students from elementary to high schools in Indonesia are a concrete example of such policy. In the context of social studies as a citizenship transmission tradition, this policy is reasonable to educate and develop a student as a good and loyal young citizen who can transmit, maintain, and continue of ideal and central values of *Pancasila* and the States’ Constitution 1945 in their daily live.

The uses of the names/terms and concepts of social studies are varied and inconsistent as a *synthetic discipline* continued to the curriculum 1994, 2004 and in 2006. The names/terms such as “*Social Science Education*” and “*Social Knowledge*” used as an integrated, correlated/confederated, and a separated subject of social studies curriculum for each level of school, and developed based on the “social sciences’ tradition. “*Pancasila Moral Education*” replaced by “*Citizenship and Pancasila Education*” are used as an integrated, correlated/confederated, or a separated subject of social studies curriculum at all school levels. Both developed based on the “citizenship transmission tradition,” Since year 1994, the “*National Struggle and History Education*” removed as a curriculum subject for all schools level (Belen, 2010; Depdiknas, 2007; Hasan, 2010).

Development of the social studies curriculum above shown, that adoption of the identity of social studies as a “*synthetic discipline*” which has been committed to the National Workshop on Development of Social Science Education Curriculum 1993 (Somantri, 2001:80), also seems to have not been fully influential on the development of school curriculum. The results from the research about the history of curriculum development and school learning periods 1947—2006 clearly shown the ‘conceptual confusions and inconsistencies’ associated with the names/terms, goals, content organization of social studies (Belen, 2010; Depdiknas, 2007; Hasan, 2010; Winataputra, 2011).

Even, in the school curriculum 2013, the social studies as a school subject at Grades 1—3 removed, and merged into other subjects such as ‘Civics and *Pancasila* Education,’ “Indonesian Language,” and “Mathematics.” At grades 1—12, the social studies suggested not have “a structural-functional linkage to the content and competence of social science disciplines,” in terms of contents and competencies. The basic competencies of social studies are interpreted as a unified content and competency, and integrated into all subjects. This means to establish “a balance quality between the achievement of hard skills and soft skills, including learner’s attitudes, skills, and knowledge in a whole” (Kemendikbud, 2012:14). The core competencies of curriculum are also applied to all subjects, including the social studies. The curriculum developers suggest that all curricular competencies are “not the concepts, generalizations, topics or something has drawn from a

'disciplinary-based curriculum' or 'content-based curriculum', but it is an organizing element of various basic competencies vertically and horizontally" (Kemendikbud, 2013:5). It means, that the social studies curriculum for all levels of school does not adhere to or does not develop based on anything tradition or integration of all traditions (citizenship transmission, social sciences or reflective traditions) (Barr *et al.*, 1977; 1978).

The fact above shown that the social studies are no longer as autonomous or independent subject or the "field of study" at all levels of schooling, and are not a "*synthetic discipline*" as developed from the social sciences' tradition which has been a shared paradigm and consensus within the community of social studies (HISPIPSI) since 1991 (Somantri, 2001). This is also not accordance with the NCSS consensus as a center of excellence in development of the social studies (NCSS, 1994; 2010). Shortly, the development of social studies curriculum all levels of schooling are still strongly influenced by individuals and/or groups of scientists' understanding, though, philosophical belief, who tasked incidentally to develop it, in accordance with the "*policy consensus*" coordinated by the Curriculum Development Center (*Pusbangkur*), the Ministry of Education and Culture (*Kemendikbud*) (Winataputra, 2011:10-11). If this view is correct, the academic consensus is achieved at the national community of social studies (HISPIPSI) is not fully obeyed or do not get a high commitment of individual members from the curriculum developer community on the school level.

The low-level influences of professional consensus within the curriculum developer community at the school levels are may be caused by a number of factors:

First, conceptually, the urge to apply the constructivist, co-constructivist, and socio-cultural approaches in education is stronger (Winataputra, 2011:1). Meanwhile, Somantri's conceptualization on social studies as "*synthetic discipline*," since the beginning formulated, until now, remained consistent or steady referring to the Wesley's thought. Somantri and/or the scientist member of HISPIPSI have never made a reconstruction or reconceptualize of the social studies paradigm according to new trends in science development, especially in the social studies development as a scientific discipline since the mid-1950s until the recent era of NCSS.

Second, the social studies conceptualization for primary and secondary education is still not solid. An integrated framework of social studies also has not been communicated properly, clear, and comprehensive to the community of curriculum developers and practitioners (Winataputra, 2011). As a result, the penetration rate academically is slow; their impacts up to the level of praxis are less, including in the

curriculum development (Somantri, 2001:112). This raises the policy discretion in decision-making by the respective curricular curriculum developers only.

Third, HISPIPSI as a professional organization of the Indonesian community of social studies, since the beginning, until now, is not directly related to the development of school curriculum. This is very different from the CSS or NCSS is concerned about the development of social studies curriculum in the school since the beginning. Under the coordination of the two professional organizations, at least they have more than 50 curriculum development and teaching materials projects are based on three traditions, either separately or as an integrated approach (Barr *et al.*, 1977; NCSS, 1935, 1989, 1994, 2010; Saxe 1991).

3.4. A Reflection on the Existence of Social Studies Community

In the sociology of science perspective, the low-level of contestation-consensus within the social studies community in Indonesia as described above, at least have two important implications. On the one hand, benign contestation-consensus between scientists is highly contributed to the cohesiveness among members of HISPIPSI. Among of them does not show up experts' or practitioners' groups, which can lead to fierce conflicts and divisions in internal to community, which is potentially for the collapse of the structure networks of social studies community for a whole. On the other hand, in the context of the development and progress of social studies as a scientific discipline, such as a benign contestation-consensus is very unfortunate, because it is not a positive impact upon the quality and expansion of theory production, methods/models, and the scientific practices within the social studies community. It was also not allowing emerging '*counter or compare paradigms*', which are able to alter or reconstruct the old paradigm to the new paradigm(s) that has a level of solving problems (theoretical and practical) more precise, more accurate, and better quality.

This reality can be seen from the absence of continuous revisions or reconstructions on the social studies definition since the first approved as a shared paradigm in 1991 until now. The Indonesian community of social studies are not skillful for coloring dynamics of science and practice so rapidly; and not able to develop specializations the field of study within, that it is very important for the maturity of social studies as a *synthetic discipline*. In this regard, it also can be said that they are as "social institution" did not have a solid and credible sociological significance in the process of continuity and change constructively to the scientific life and tradition of social studies as '*synthetic discipline*'.

The Indonesian community of social studies are emerged through a '*historical being*' processes in a social formation;

grown in the realm of scientific tradition; and to be creative for the progress of social studies as a '*synthetic discipline*' has lost the meaning. They have not an essential part of and direct roles in the processes of science as: (1) *fact checker/critic*: evaluate evidence and ideas; ensure that evidence is explored meets high standards of quality, and that judgments are not based on flawed reasoning; (2) *innovator/visionary*: generate to spark ideas about new lines of evidence, interpretations of existing data, applications, questions, and alternate explanations—which all of them help science moves forward; (3) *watchdog/whistle blower*: eliminate bias and fraud by keeping watchful eye; (4) *cheerleader/taskmaster*: motivate, provide recognition, awards, and scientific heritage to scientists in their endeavors and above (UCMP, 2012:1-2).

In Somantri's (2001) critical reflection, benign and flat contestation-consensus among the Indonesian community of social studies is caused by many factors, internal and external, namely the sense of social studies identity has not been socialized, not yet understood and lived within the community of social studies. Academic developments of social studies are undeveloped, still confusing. Their confidence on social studies status as a '*synthetic discipline*' is less. Most of them also seem shy, reluctant, and do not care to think about social studies identity. Academically, the penetration rates of the definition of social studies within the community are also very slow, so it does not have much impact to the praxis, e.g. in curriculum development practices. Research on social studies did also not focus for the development of fundamental ideas, generalizations, and theories for strengthening social studies as a '*synthetic discipline*' as shared identity and shared paradigm.

Within the Indonesian community of social studies are still found some obstacles such as expertise, administration, research, scientific spirit, community dynamics, and globalization, that effect upon their development as a mature scientific community. They have also '*academic crime*' attitudes, the attitudes that are not willing talk to others about their idea or program scientifically, efficiently, and appropriately. They trapped in an atmosphere of '*the silent academic society*'; they have not become '*the productive academic society*' which can create or produce the best academic works for social studies as a '*synthetic discipline*' (Somantri, 2001:37), and can develop scientific discussions in academic forums of the community (Winataputra, 2011:10). Instead, if any academic debates conducted, among of them tend to personal unconstructive behaviors such as an intellectual attack (e.g. denial, repression, withdrawal, protection, regression), and psychosomatic illness (Somantri, 2001:2-3, 72-73; Hunt & Metcalf, 1955:51). Academic communication among members of the community of social

studies is also still limited to the annual and incidental meetings of HISPIPSI (Winataputra 2011:10). In this regard, the purpose of HISPIPSI to "roll social studies problems or issues to all members of the social studies community so that it becomes continuous debates, dialogues and research among of them" (Somantri, 2001:72) are not fully effective.

Flat and benign contestation-consensus since periods pre and post-paradigm as described above, are not also proven capable to strong binding of constellation and commitment among members from the community of social studies. The fact, in a number of literatures published after 1991, some scientist still discourses on the terms and conceptual definitions of social studies. Hasan (1996) for example, uses the terms '*social sciences education*' and '*study of social*.' Sumaatmadja (2006) also at the same time uses the term '*study of social*,' which has been used for his book published in 1980.

In the dynamics of science, the phenomenon of partial irregularities on the common consensus of community is an ordinary and normal, especially within the social sciences' discipline (Ritzer, 1975, 1992; Kuhn, 1970). Moreover, social studies which have structural and functional relations with social sciences, and has the real and matter in '*ill-structured domains*' (Cornbleth, 1985:29) or '*the less clearly structured*' (Welton & Mallan 1988:67). In the social epistemology and sociology of science, the partial irregularities can be seen from two sides.

On one hand, any form deviations cannot be justified. "Once a first paradigm through which to view nature has been found, there is no such thing as research in the absence of any paradigm. To reject one paradigm without simultaneously substituting another is to reject science itself" (Kuhn 1970:79). Every member of the scientific community has socio-professional obligations to be faithful, obedient, and committed to upholding the scientific paradigm/tradition; be critical and innovative; even if it was rejected. Extremely, it can be said that it is 'arbitrative', and hence, there are no scientific endeavors and works without scientific paradigm/tradition at all. The quality, reliability or validity of every scientific endeavor and work is not only measured in terms of "*originality*" or "*authenticity*," but also of "*level of conformity*" to the existing shared paradigm/tradition (Shils, 1981:15). Every scientific endeavor and work, no matter how the creator(s) is brilliant and creative; it must "be realized in the context of a scientific paradigm/tradition. When a scientist has entered into the mainstream of certain tradition, there is no freedom for them whatever willing or not to accept and submit to the paradigm/tradition; it must be chosen and faced" (Shils, 1981:13-14). On the other hand; the partial irregularities can be understood. As a sociological phenomenon, every member of the scientific community,

however, has various layers, so “the strength of group commitment varies” (Kuhn, 1970:184), and highly dependent on “the degree of closeness and loyalty of each to the paradigm/tradition” (Shils, 1981:14).

The scientific community may have multiple paradigms agreed upon and used in their internal communities, such as in the social sciences and humanities (Ritzer, 1975; 1992). History of social studies also shown the fact, there are three traditions or paradigms growing and used in parallel (Barr *et al.*, 1977, Evans 2004; Ross 2006; NCSS, 1994; 2010). So far, however, we cannot look at the development of social studies in Indonesia the ‘counter paradigms’ developed and approved as a shared paradigm(s), except ‘Somantri’s social studies paradigm’ which has been agreed upon and become an internal commitment in the HISPIPSI since 1991, and have become a ‘*position paper*’ of HISPIPSI in 1998. In this context, a general thesis in the social epistemology and sociology of science applied and valid, that “paradigm(s) that is used as a shared commitment within the community of science—including within the HISPIPSI—should be developed in accordance with socially constructed rules and conventions. These social formations shape the theory and direct theorists’ interpretations” (Berger, & Luckmann, 1966, Kuhn, 1970; Popkewitz & Maurice, 1991). Based on this thesis, Al-Mochtar’s (2001:52; 2007:274) opinion that tolerates on “diversity of terms and definitions, just based on everyone’s conceptualization of a scientist” without a shared consensus or commitment of social studies community (HISPIPSI) need to be considered. If this view is maintained, feared would create a seamless web of confusion, as happened during 50 years the development of social studies in the US (Barr *et al.*, 1977).

So far, about the partial deviations, we are not found any records and analyze that describe a rejection or academic controversy. In fact, after the definition of social studies has become one of the essences of the HISPIPSI’s position paper are proposed to the Indonesian Science Agency (LIPI) in 1998, contestation is no longer associated with the issue. Since this time, and since the HISPIPSI has changed to Indonesian Social Sciences Scholars Association (HISPIISI) in 2002, academic dialogues and discussions within the Indonesian community of social studies moved to the new issues, phenomena, and trends such as the development of social studies faces multicultural education, the global era, building a civil society and the national character, and the like.

4. Conclusions

The study shown that on contestation-consensus of social studies paradigm as a ‘*synthetic discipline*’ within the Indonesian community of social studies is ‘benign/flats, both

in the pre-paradigm and paradigm periods. The dynamics of contestation-consensus, on the one hand, is a strongly contribute for creating and maintaining a social cohesion within the community of social studies. On the other hand, it is considered very unfavorable for the development and progress of social studies as a ‘*synthetic discipline*’. So this is not much of a positive impact on the quality and expansion in production of theories, methods/models, and scientific practices; and on the development of social studies curriculum in the school, which since the beginning of both developed through two different paths, by the “*professional consensus*” and “*political consensus*.”

The benign/flat contestation-consensus are also very difficult for a paradigm revolution. While, encouragements toward social studies thoughts more constructivist, co-constructivist, and grounded in the socio-cultural context of national education are very strong. Unfortunately, until now, no one ‘*counter paradigm*’ and/or a “*compare paradigm*” are capable of revise or reconstruct on the existing paradigm, which has become a shared paradigm within the HISPIPSI since 1991.

Finally, we hope HISPIPSI (now HISPIISI) can revitalize his identity as a professional organization of social studies community in Indonesia, so they are able to roll problems or issues developed in the field of social studies to all members of the community. This is in line with Somantri’s expectation, one of the founding fathers of social studies in Indonesia; that HISPIISI should be able to facilitate and continue the debates, dialogues and research among of them for the progress of social studies as a ‘*synthetic discipline*’.

Furthermore, important to be considered by HISPIISI for the future is how to build a professional partnership with the government, especially with Department of Education and Culture for developing social studies curriculum that has an orientation to inquiry-reflective tradition.

Notes

Note 1. ‘*Pancasila*’ is consists of two Old Javanese words (originally from *Sanskrit*), “*pañca*” meaning five, and “*sīla*” meaning principles. It comprises the Five Basic Principles of the Republic of Indonesia held to be inseparable and interrelated: 1) Belief in one supreme God (*Ketuhanan Yang Maha Esa*), 2) Just and civilized humanity (*Kemanusiaan yang adil dan beradab*), 3) The unity of Indonesia (*Persatuan Indonesia*), 4) Democracy guided by the inner wisdom in the unanimity arising out of deliberations among representatives (*Kerakyatan yang dipimpin oleh hikmat kebijaksanaan dalam permusyawaratan perwakilan*), and 5) Social justice for all the people of Indonesian (*Keadilan sosial bagi seluruh rakyat Indonesia*). These principles

contained in the preamble of the State Constitution 1945. Today, *Pancasila* has also declared by the People's Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia as one of the Four National Pillars (*Empat Pilar Kebangsaan*).

Note 2. “*Nasakom*” is a Soekarno’s conception of the unity of Indonesia to integrated various political streams in Indonesian society. It developed by Soekarno as part of his political concept on “back to the presidential system” in accordance with the State’s Constitution 1945 and the “*Guided Democracy*” (Sundhaussen, 1986). Culturally, the concept of “*Nasakom*” is a further evolution of a typology on Javanese culture (Geertz, 2013) into the national political practices. ‘*Nationalist*’ party is represented by National Party of Indonesia (*Partai Nasional Indonesia—PNI*); the “*Religious*” parties are represented by Awakening of Religious Scholars (*Nahdlatul Ulama—NU*) and Indonesian Moslem’s Consultative Assembly (*Majelis Sjuro Muslimin Indonesia—Masjumi*); and “*Communist*” is represented by Communist Party of Indonesia (*Partai Komunis Indonesia—PKI*).

Note 3. All references are indicated by [IND] originally in Indonesian language.

References

- [1] Abbott, A. (2001). *Chaos of disciplines*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [2] Adikusumo, S. (1989). Results of research on social studies. Unpublished research report, Education Consortium, Bandung. [IND]3
- [3] Al-Muchtar, S. (1991). Development of thought skills and values in social studies: A socio-cultural study of education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Post Graduate Faculty of Education and Teacher Training, Bandung. [IND]
- [4] Al-Muchtar, S. (2007). Social studies. In Education Development Team Faculty of Education, Indonesia University of Education (FIP-UPI). *Science and education in applied* (part 3: scientific discipline education, pp. 271-296). Bandung: IMTIMA. [IND]
- [5] Barr, R. D., Barth, J. L., & Shermis, S.S. (1978). *The nature of the social studies*. Palm spring: An ETS Publication.
- [6] Barr, R.D., Barth, J.L., & Shermis, S.S. (1977). *Defining the social studies*. Virginia: National Council for the Social Studies.
- [7] Belen, S. (2010). *History of elementary curriculum in Indonesia*. Jakarta: Puskur-Reseach and Development Agency the Ministry of Education and Culture. [IND]
- [8] Berger, P.L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Harmondsworth. Middlesex. England: Penguin Books.
- [9] Campbell, R.L. (2006). Jean Piaget's genetic epistemology: Appreciation and critique. Retrieved November 15, 2004, from <http://hubcap.clemson.edu/~campber/piaget.html>
- [10] Cooper, H. M. (1988). The structure of knowledge synthesis. *Knowledge in Society*, 1, 104-126.
- [11] Cornbleth, C. 1985. Critical thought and cognitive processes. In W. Stanley (Ed.), *Review of research in social studies education: 1976-1983* (pp. 11-64). New York: NCSS.
- [12] Dewey, J. (1964). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: McMillan Co.
- [13] Dryden. (1956). *Social foundations of education*. New York: The Dryden Press, Inc.
- [14] Evans, D., & Kowanko I. (2000). Literature reviews: Evolution of a research methodology. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 18(2), 33-38.
- [15] Evans, R.W. (2004). *The social studies wars: What should we teach the children?* US: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- [16] Galvan, J. (2006). *Writing literature reviews: A guide for students of the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Glendale, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.
- [17] Geertz, C. (2013). *The religion of Java: Red and white Moslem, bureaucracy in Javanese culture*. Jakarta: Komunitas Bambu. [IND].
- [18] Gibbons, M. et al (1994). *The new production of scientific knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary society*. London: Sage.
- [19] Hartshorn, & Somantri, N. (1970). *Challenges in teaching social sciences*. Unpublished monograph, Bandung. [IND].
- [20] Hasan, S.H. (1996). *Social sciences education*. Bandung: Department of History Education, Faculty of Social Studies, Institute of Education and Teacher Training. [IND].
- [21] Hasan, S.H. (2010). *Development of junior high-school curriculum (from Dutch East Indies, Japan occupation and independence age)*. Jakarta: Puskur-Reseach and Development Agency the Ministry of National Education. [IND].
- [22] Hunt, M.P. & Metcalf, L.E. (1955). *Teaching high school social studies: Problems in reflective thought and social understanding*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publisher.
- [23] Kenworthy, L.S. (1970). *Guide to social studies Teaching*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.
- [24] Kuhn. T.S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed., enlarged). London: The University of Chicago Press, Ltd.
- [25] Longstreet, W.S., & Shane, H.G. (1993). *Curriculum for a new millennium*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- [26] Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative Content Analysis. *Forum Qualitative Social Research*, Vol. 1(2). Retrieved April 4, 2014, from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1089/2385>.
- [27] Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemendikbud). (2012). *Document of curriculum 2013*. Jakarta: Puskur-Reseach and Development Agency. [IND]
- [28] Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemendikbud). (2013). *Curriculum 2013: Basic competencies for elementary school*. Jakarta: Puskur-Reseach and Development Agency. [IND]

- [29] Mongan-Rallis, H. (2012) Guidelines for writing a literature review. Retrieved December 5, 2012, from <http://www.d.umn.edu/~hrallis/guides/researching/litreview.html>
- [30] Mulder, N. (1997). Individual, society and history according to Indonesian school texts. Yogyakarta: Kanisius. [IND]
- [31] National Council for Social studies (NCSS). (1935). Social sciences as the core of the curriculum. Washington: NCSS.
- [32] National Council for Social studies (NCSS). (1989). Charting a course: Social studies for the 21st century, a report of the curriculum task force of the national commission on social studies in the schools. Washington: NCSS.
- [33] National Council for Social studies (NCSS). (1994). A vision of powerful teaching and learning in the social studies: Building social understanding and civic efficacy. Retrieved October 23, 2013 from <http://www.socialstudies.org/>
- [34] National Council for Social studies (NCSS). (1994). Expectations of excellence: Curriculum standards for social studies. Washington, D.C.: NCSS.
- [35] National Council for Social studies (NCSS). (2010). National curriculum standards for social studies: A framework for teaching, learning, and assessment. Silver Spring, MD: NCSS.
- [36] National Council for Social studies (NCSS). 1994. Curriculum guidelines for social studies teaching and learning. Retrieved October 23, 2013, from <http://www.socialstudies.org/>.
- [37] National Departement of Education (Depdiknas). (2007). Academic manuscript on the study of social studies curriculum. Jakarta: Puskur-Reseach and Development Agency. [IND].
- [38] Parsons, T. (1968). Intellectual specialization and compartmentalization. In T.O. Buford (Ed.), *Toward a philosophy of education* (pp.16-39). New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, Inc.
- [39] Pierce, S. J. 1991. Subject areas, disciplines and the concept of authority. *LISR-Library and Information Science Research*, 13, 21-35.
- [40] Popkewitz, T.S. & Maurice, H.St. (1991). Social studies education and theory: Science, knowledge, and history. In J.P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 27-40). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- [41] Popper, K. (1970). Normal science and its dangers, In I. Lakatos and A. Musgrave (Eds.), *Criticism and the growth of knowledge* (pp.51-58). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [42] Republik of Indonesia (RI). (1970). State Address President of Indonesia Generals Suharto at Assembly House of Representatives (DPRGR). Jakarta, August 16, 1970. Retrieved January 13, 2014, from <http://www.bappenas.go.id/data-dan-informasi-utama/pidato-kenegaraan-tahun-1970/> [IND].
- [43] Ritzer, G. (1992). *Sociological theory* (3rd ed.), Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
- [44] Ritzer, G.. (1975). Sociology: A multiple paradigm science. *The American Sociologist*, 10(3), 156-167.
- [45] Ross, E.W. (Ed.). (2006). *The social studies: Curriculum purposes, problems, and possibilities*, (3rd ed.), New York: SUNY Press, Albany.
- [46] Russell, D.R. (1993). Vygotsky, Dewey, and externalism: Beyond the student/discipline dichotomy. Retrieved March 20, 2003, from <http://archive.org/web/20010617154226/http://jac.gsu.edu/Jac onl.html>.
- [47] Sanusi, A. (1971). Strengthening fundamentals of teaching social studies in Indonesia: Toward comprehensive system. Unpublished monograph, Bandung. [IND].
- [48] Sanusi, A. (1998). Alternative education: Touching fundamental problems of education and social. D. Supriadi & R. Mulyana (Eds.), Bandung: Post Graduate Program, Institute of Education and Teacher Training - Grafindo Media Pratama. [IND].
- [49] Saxe, D.W. (1991). *Social studies in schools: A history of the early years*. New York: State University of New York.
- [50] Shils, E. (1981). The intellectuals. In D. Hartoko (Ed.). "The intellectual groups: Those who have a home in the wind" (pp.....). Jakarta: PT. Gramedia. [IND].
- [51] Shwed, U., & Bearman, P.S. (2010). The temporal structure of scientific consensus formation. *American Sociological Review*. 75(6), 817-840.
- [52] Somantri, N. (2001). Initiating a renewal of the social studies. D. Supriadi & R. Mulyana (Eds.), Bandung: Post Graduate Program, University of Education & Remaja Rosdakarya. [IND].
- [53] Strauss, J.D. (2012). Thomas Kuhn's concept of paradigm: Narrative displacement in history of science. Retrieved November 30, 2012 from <http://www.worldvieweyes.org/resources/Strauss/KuhnsConceptPar.htm> Sumaatmadja, N. (2006). a perspective on study of social. Bandung: Alumni. [IND].
- [54] Sundhaussen, U. (1986). *Indonesian Military Policies 1945-1967: Toward Dual Function of Military*. Jakarta: LP3ES. [IND].
- [55] University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP). (2012). Understanding science: How science really works. Retrieved November 30, 2012 from <http://undsci.berkeley.edu/> Wesley, E.B. (1942). *Teaching the social studies* (2nd ed.), Boston: D.C. Heath and Company.
- [56] Wesley, E.B. (1946). *Teaching social studies in elementary schools*. Boston: D.C. Heath and Company.
- [57] Wesley, E.B., & Wronski, S.P. (1950). *Teaching social studies in high schools* (3rd ed.), Boston: D.C. Heath and Company.
- [58] Winataputra, U.S. (2001). Indentity of citizenship education as a systemic vehicle for democracy education: A conceptual study in social studies context. Unpublised doctoral dissertation, Post Graduate Program, Indonesia University of Education, Bandung. [IND].
- [59] Winataputra, U.S. (2011). Dynamics in conceptualizing of social studies and citizenship education (civics) in primary and secondary education: A study in collective mindset in historical-epistemological domains. *Journal of Education*, 12(1):1-20. [IND].