To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Melinda Moore Davis entitled "Social Foundations in Teacher Preparation Programs in the United States: Changes in Roles and Responsibilities from the 1970s to the present." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Education.

_____
Diana K. Moyer, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

_____
Barbara J. Thayer-Bacon

_____
Cheryl B. Travis

_____
Gary J. Skolits

Accepted for the Council:

_____
Carolyn R. Hodges, Vice Provost and
Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS IN TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS IN THE UNITED STATES: CHANGES IN ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FROM THE 1970S TO THE PRESENT

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Melinda Moore Davis
May 2008

Copyright © 2008 by Melinda Moore Davis
All rights reserved.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my beloved husband, Michael Stephen Helmick, for his continual and comprehensive support during thirty years of marriage.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to sincerely thank all those persons who assisted in the completion of my Doctor of Philosophy degree in Education. I particularly wish to thank the members of my doctoral committee, Dr. Diana K. Moyer, Dr. Barbara Thayer-Bacon, Dr. Cheryl B. Travis, and Dr. Gary J. Skolits, for your inspiration through teaching and counseling during this process.

Also, a sincere note of appreciation goes to Dr. Alan H. Jones for sending original copies of pertinent resources concerning the history of the social foundations of education during the 1970s and 1980s. These materials were invaluable to me in characterizing the events of these two decades.

Last, I must thank again the eleven professors of the social foundations of education who served as members of my study group. Your time, dedication, and sharing of your expertise in responding to my questions are generous gifts that will not be forgotten.

ABSTRACT

To counteract the relative isolation and increasing de-valuation of the social foundations of education within teacher preparation programs in colleges of education in the United States, the purpose of this study was to contextualize the multi-faceted professional lives of educators who teach within this interdisciplinary academic field. Using a qualitative methodology encompassing elements of Delphi technique and grounded theory, current assessments of their employment in higher education settings included analysis of present conditions and changes they have experienced throughout the courses of their professorial careers. A comprehensive examination of the present circumstances of the foundations of education included a critique of the history of the discipline, considered foundational for scrutinizing contemporary issues.

The social foundations of education are involved in another period of marginalization due to the current political and social milieus which define schooling success through the application of narrowly-conceived, quantitative accountability measures. Internal and external pressures on teacher preparation programs within colleges of education in the United States have impacted the viability of the social foundations in the following ways: isolation of practitioners within colleges of education; separate departmental placements from teacher education programs; decreases in course requirements and in new hires in the field; declining influence in curriculum development and implementation; dearth of participation in educational policy formation; and, student resistance to content related to pluralism in schooling and society.

Recommendations centered on reconstructing a unified identity for the social foundations of education, clearly communicating the mission and purposes of its content and perspectives through collaborative efforts, and dramatically increasing the connectedness of social foundations educators to others. These diverse stakeholders included others within the discipline, teacher education programs and colleagues, other academicians, public school personnel, community members, and important national and global initiatives which affect equitable schooling opportunities for diverse individuals and groups.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Chapter One: The State of Social Foundations Today 9
- Problems and Issues in Social Foundations 11
- Perceived Relevance to Teacher Preparation 15
- A Clear Definition, A Common Core? 17
- Student Resistance to Social Foundations' Concepts and Content 19
- Balancing Adversity with Examples of Success 21

Chapter Two: A Partial History of the Social Foundations of Education within the United States 28
- Introduction 28
- Early Origins (the Nineteenth Century to the Late 1920s) 30
- The "Formative" Years – the 1930s to the Late 1950s 32
- A Period of "Dispersion" – the Late 1950s To the Mid-1970s 38
- The 1970s to the End of the Century 47
- The Twenty-First Century and Social Foundations Issues 55
- Analysis of the History 58

Chapter Three: Applying a Cultural Studies Perspective to a Study of Social Foundations Educators 67
- Introduction 67
- A Cultural Studies Perspective 68
- Personal Positioning 73
- The Merger of Cultural Studies And Education 76
- The Evolution of a Methodology 87
- Opening the Research Process 98
- Implementation of the Study 102
- Demographic and Personal Information 105
- Summary 110

Chapter Four: Social Foundations Professors Speak 111
- Introduction 111
- Language/Discourses: The Theoretical versus the Practical 113
- Roles and Responsibilities within the Colleges of Education 116
  - Teaching and Relationships with Students 117
  - Social Foundations' Generalists or Specialists? 126
  - Departmental Locations 129
  - Other Roles and Responsibilities within the Colleges of Education 131
  - Funding Issues 132
- Roles and Responsibilities within the University and/or Academia 134
  - Relationships with Colleagues 136

Professional Roles and Responsibilities: 138
Partnerships with Schools and Community Groups 138
School and/or Community Service 138
Summary of Current Roles and Responsibilities 140
Changes in Roles and Responsibilities 142
Questions for Further Study 147
Predictions Concerning the Future of the Social Foundations 149

Chapter Five: Conclusions 155
Further Implications and Recommendations 155
A Call for Activism 167
Recommendations for Future Research 170

REFERENCES 173

APPENDICES 186
Appendix A 187
Appendix B 188
Appendix C 191
Appendix D 192
Appendix E 193
Appendix F 194

VITA 198

Introduction

The interdisciplinary academic field of the social foundations of education has long been considered essential for the development of professional teacher identities, critical thinking skills, and understanding of schools as social, political, and cultural systems (Erickson et al., 2006; Gourneau, 2006; deMarrais, 2005; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; O'Brien, 2002; Rodriguez, 2002; Mirci, 2000; Warren, 1998). Within academia and more specifically, within colleges of education, social foundations has been marginalized throughout different periods of its development and implementation (see discussion and analyses in Chapter Two). It has been de-valued again in recent years (Butin, 2005; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; Warren, 1998).

However, this situation is particularly problematic now. Caught between the performance standards movement and alternative certification avenues for teacher licensure, many teacher preparation programs in the United States are decreasing course requirements in the social foundations (Martusewicz, 2006; Butin, 2005; deMarrais, 2005; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; Tozer, 1993). Scholars in these areas often find it difficult to articulate the significance and relevance of their work to colleagues and the greater public (Martusewicz, 2006; Butin, 2005; Warren, 1998; Pietig et al., 1996). So, in addition to Tozer & Miretsky's (2005) posing of this question, I am also asking: What are the critical contributions of social foundations to teacher preparation programs in accredited colleges and universities within the United States, as defined by the scholarly

literature and by practitioners within the field? How can professors in this field redefine themselves and clearly articulate the value of their work for the benefit of the discipline, for full and successful integration into teacher preparation programs, and for the professional well-being of generations of teachers to come?

Within multiple social, political, and cultural contexts which elucidate both historical and contemporary contexts, the two essential questions that I will seek to answer in this dissertation are as follows:

> **Question one**: How have the roles and responsibilities of the social foundations of education changed from the 1970s to the present?
>
> **Question two:** How have changes in areas, such as internal and external understanding of the discipline, work with students, relationships with colleagues, and professional opportunities, impacted social foundations scholars/teachers?

The dissertation applies historical perspectives to contemporary educational problems. To contextualize the social and political environments of current challenges and successes, historical perspectives are essential to illuminate factors which have influenced changing and detrimental conditions in the field (Butin, 2005b; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; Tozer, 1993; Ginsburg, 1987). Thus, this dissertation is comprised of two main components: an analysis of recurring trends and issues within the history of social foundations; and, a research study to encapsulate practitioners' perceptions of their work and professional milieus. My study investigates how tenured social foundations scholars/teachers in accredited colleges of education in the United States define themselves professionally and evaluate their relationships with students and colleagues. I also analyze their perceptions of relationships with educators and

others working in public schools within their communities. And, I note changes in the field and their varied impacts on my study participants during their careers. With the somewhat tenuous positions of social foundations in academia today, I want to gather and assess the recommendations that these professionals have for re-establishing the importance and relevance of their work.

The importance of seeking expert opinions is validated through the work of many writers (Brill et al., 2006; Pollard & Pollard, 2004/2005; Tigelaar et al., 2004; Chou, 2002; Wilhelm, 2001; Westbrook, 1997; Pollard & Tomlin, 1995, Stahl & Stahl, 1991). Emerging data will determine if the roles and responsibilities of social foundations professors have changed during recent years and how these changes have impacted the perceived relevance and currency of this profession, both within institutions of higher learning and within the larger society.

Through this rather complete statement, R. Freeman Butts emphasizes the central purpose and vital importance of social foundations content:

> "The task of educational foundations centers upon a basic and comprehensive study of the culture and of human behavior, as these are related to the total educational enterprise. It assumes that every member of the educational profession should have a fundamental understanding of the relations of education to the deepest values, traditions, and conflicts in society … The foundations process … is one which (1) deals with questions of educational direction, policy, and action in areas of unresolved problems within the culture, in such a way (2) that every available, pertinent, and scholarly resource is brought authentically into the effort, (3) with a definite view to attaining the greatest possible personal commitment to democratic beliefs, purposes, and goals, and (4) to extending the effort to gain the maximum possible community of understanding, purpose, and commitment. … this is an effort to make a discipline of the democratic process, particularly as this becomes the concern of educators in a democracy" (1993, pp. 23-24).

This definition of the discipline connects the work of preparing teachers directly to education within a democratic form of government. It emphasizes the multi-faceted, interdisciplinary nature of the search for meaningful teacher-student interactions within a cultural setting. And, the wording stresses the importance of teaching within a clearly articulated, moral structure (personal if not collective). I am using this definition to guide my discussion of social foundations within the dissertation.

Butin (2005) and others also stressed the vital importance of social foundations within teacher education programs. Discussions of the importance of ethical decision-making related to students and their educational journeys often occur in social foundations classes within teacher preparation programs (Butin, 2005; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; Tozer, 1993). Re-articulating the importance of scholarship and coursework seems vitally important to me as a beginning scholar, to the discipline, and to public education for the future. Also, it relates well to my theoretical and practical understandings stemming from my immersion in a cultural studies' philosophical base.

Cultural studies and social foundations share certain philosophical assumptions. Both investigate how people negotiate their lives within societal hierarchies. Differences in their abilities to use the power of the dominant majority often determine different outcomes for diverse individuals and groups. Also, they are both conceived as broad-based and openly-defined fields of inquiry which include interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary explorations into contemporary social, economic, political, and cultural circumstances. Historically,

social foundations based its analyses of the different positions that people occupy in society based upon socio-economic and class discrepancies (McCarthy, 2006). Adding knowledge from cultural studies that have incorporated important learning from the Civil Rights movement and the women's movement, the foundations discipline now considers multiple kinds of diversity and their effects on education. These factors include racial and ethnic separations, distinctions involving gender and sexual orientation, and forces tying individuals and groups to sets of specific circumstances (Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2004; Wright, 2001/2002).

Delving into the underlying historical conditions relating to current problems, cultural studies seeks to foster understanding of inequalities in access, treatment, and outcomes for marginalized and disenfranchised people within a society. One goal includes recovery of multiple perspectives and experiences not acknowledged in histories written by members of dominant groups. A second one seeks inclusion of diverse people through social and political transformation (Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2004; Wright, 1996, 2001/2002; Grossberg, 1996; Johnson, 1996; Storey, 1996). Within the dissertation, I combine my interests in educational research related to social foundations with my cultural studies orientation.

Gaztambide-Fernandez et al. (2004) mention the scarcity of scholarship in cultural studies in Education until recent years. They urge scholars in this combined field to enrich both areas of studies with work that shows the successful integration of this interdisciplinary marriage of the two areas of study. Using the

critical perspectives of cultural studies related to the structured and unequal nature of our capitalist society to inquire into the meaning and impact of social foundations work represents my personal merger of the two entities. I believe that my analysis of the social and political conditions surrounding the discipline from the 1970s forward and my investigation into the praxis of practitioners in this field will represent my original contributions to the knowledge available within both cultural studies and Education. In particular, critique of certain recurring themes and issues in social foundations' history will establish important parameters for understanding its contemporary circumstances. And, it will be interesting to discern if practitioners perceive the same concerns as the ones discussed prominently in modern literature.

In addition, I have not discovered a recent study of the state of the discipline, as evaluated by practitioners. Using "social foundations" as a title keyword search, I located nineteen titles in the database, *Dissertation Abstracts International*. Ranging from historical studies from 1949 to the most current title in 2006, none of the dissertations interviewed geographically-dispersed foundations educators about their work. The most recent title, *Reimagining the Place and Curricular Space for the Field of Social Foundations of Education in Teacher Education: A Call for Communication and Collaboration,* focused on interviews with non-foundations teacher educators and college of education administrators in one institution (Hill, 2006). Building on studies by Shea, Sola, and Jones (1987) and Jones (1975a, 1976), this project will possibly provide the

first analysis of this kind in approximately twenty years. With the current pressures on the field, it certainly seems to be a timely and important topic.

Evolving from my current status as a student of foundations to considering myself a beginning scholar, researcher, and teacher, I have an intimate personal connection with this subject. I tried to sensitively and carefully position myself as a researcher when asking for input from experienced foundations scholars and teachers. Operating from an "insider" position, I diligently attempted to separate my concerns and opinions from those expressed by the study respondents (not in order to impose a false "objectivity" which does not and cannot exist, but to fairly represent the positions of diverse others). A position of reflexivity is important to discern significant nuances within the content. Multiple readings and careful textual analyses should help with this process, although some bias will naturally persist. Recognition of my areas of bias should assist the reader in determining where my opinions and vested interests concur or differ from those of my participants.

The dissertation will be divided into five chapters. The first chapter will provide an introduction to the dissertation. It will also contextualize some of the current challenges to the viability of social foundations in teacher education programs (in light of the highly politicized environment in public education). The second chapter will include a critique of recurring political and social issues in social foundations through a discussion of its history. I apply this historical analysis to the evaluation of the contemporary state of the discipline and further support the need for a study of the state of the discipline now. In Chapter Three, I

will discuss theoretical frameworks, including applying cultural studies and feminist perspectives to foundations problems through a qualitative study that incorporates elements from two methodologies: the Delphi study and grounded theory. This study captures the opinions and experiences of eleven tenured professors in the field who are at varying stages in their careers. Chapter Four contains information concerning the results of the study and recommendations for the future of the discipline. It also predicts its survival as a distinct entity within teacher education programs and colleges of education in the United States. In Chapter Five, I compare insights from the historical analysis with study results to summarize similarities and differences. After discussing implications for the discipline, I suggest possible directions for future research.

Chapter One: The State of Social Foundations Today

Calling the beginning of the 21st century "a turbulent time in education," Mirci (2000) compared this period to Dante's characterization of the start of the 14th century in his *Divine Comedy*: "Midway upon the journey of our life, I went astray from the straight path and woke to find myself alone in a dark wood. How shall I say what wood that was! I never saw so drear, so rank, so arduous a wilderness" (p. 97). Although I would acknowledge multiple and twisting paths, instead of a single straight one for all to follow, I believe that this imagery of the dark wood encapsulates the feelings of many scholars and teachers who are working in schools and colleges today. Teachers are not being included in educational policy formation and implementation (Rodriguez, 2002; Mirci, 2000). The complexity of the teaching/learning process has been reduced to a "discourse of efficiency" with carefully constructed inputs which are designed to produce specified outcomes measured by standardized tests for students (Rodriguez, 2002; O'Brien, 2002). During this current period of surging immigration into the United States, I compare the national educational milieu with the factory model of educating immigrants that was promoted at the beginning of the twentieth century (Altenbaugh, 2003). And, the central purpose of education can be compared over this same one hundred year span: to prepare American workers for production in an economy which plans to continue its dominance of global interactions (Erickson, 2006; Cochran-Smith, 2005; O' Brien, 2005; Altenbaugh, 2003; Books, 1994).

Yet, another traditionally recognized purpose for public education has been the development of informed citizens for the maintenance of our democratic system of government (Cochran-Smith, 2005; deMarrais, 2005; O'Brien, 2005; Altenbaugh, 2003). But, how can we reconcile the dichotomy between a politically motivated, societal movement for greater economic wealth with a democratically-inspired education that should develop human potential? This education would seek to encourage participation in a system of government that depends upon informed, thinking adults who criticize their nation in order to improve it. This challenge was inherently recognized by O'Brien (2005) when he wrote: "The underlying function of U.S. schooling has been and still is to indoctrinate children into a system of social engineering that trains them to be quiet in the face of authority, passive in the face of adversity, and intolerant in a world of diversity" (p. 34).

Several scholars have written about the goals of education within a democratic society to urge teacher educators and teachers generally to question not only the outcomes of our educational system, but also the means that are being used to achieve those ends. These same writers insist that social foundations areas of teacher preparation should provide the specific locales for critical work on why American schools operate the way they do and what can be done to change them (Cook-Sather, 2006; deMarrais, 2005; Rodriguez, 2002; Pietig et al., 1996; Tozer, 1993). Pietig et al. (1996) encourage foundations educators to help "develop critical voice within today's … teachers to counteract the technical dominance of everyday educational activity …" (p. 11). This essential role of

foundations in contextualizing educational practice through applying ethically-determined theoretical conceptions is compromised by the problems within the field itself. The discipline is also experiencing difficulties in communicating its mission to other teacher preparation educators, to pre-service and in-service teachers, and to outside community members (deMarrais, 2005; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; Warren, 1998; Pietig et al., 1996; Books, 1994; Tozer, 1993).

Problems and Issues in Social Foundations

"Social foundations work is moving to the margins of teacher education" (deMarrais, 2005, p. 168). The role of foundations has diminished over time. The de-valuing of this knowledge within teacher education programs can be seen through reduced requirements for coursework in these content areas (Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; Tozer, 1993). For example, Zagumny (2007) discovered that "Pressure from Governor Bredesen and one of the state's two governing bodies of higher education … has already eliminated social foundations of education at Tennessee Technological University and the five other universities … governed by the Tennessee Board of Regents" (p. 2). Tozer and Miretsky (2005) document another altered mandate: "The state requirements for social foundations instruction in every teacher education program in Illinois are already history" (p. 114). In addition to disappearing courses, other problems contribute to the marginalization of this discipline.

Definitions of the social foundations of education remain contested. Various programs differ in what they include and exclude as part of this strand of learning (Books, 1994; Tozer, 1993). Butin (2005) asked an important question concerning the definition of the field when he inquired about fundamentals in the discipline. Who decides and from what perspectives? Also, course substitutions, many in the form of an introduction to education, are linked to a performance-based model of teacher preparation (deMarrais, 2005). Often, professors without doctoral degrees in foundations' specialties are teaching this content and its related perspectives to pre-service and in-service teachers (deMarrais, 2005; Tozer, 1993; Shea, Sola, & Jones, 1987). Also, dissension among scholars and teachers who specialize in varied foundations areas contributes to the fragmentation of the discipline (Warren, 1998). Perhaps most disturbing of all is the lingering question of academic legitimacy of social foundations within teacher education programs and within the larger world of academia (McCarthy, 2006; Warren, 1998).

Specifically, Martusewicz (2006) discusses the recent attack on foundations at her institution, Eastern Michigan University. She comments that other teacher education departments sought to remove required courses in social foundations from their Master's in Teaching program. Justifications for these actions center on complaints that social foundations coursework is "not appropriate for their students (too theoretical, too demanding, or too impractical) or not necessary [because other faculty members in teacher education could successfully incorporate diversity issues into their content]" (p. 211). If we cannot

clearly define and articulate our work and its importance to our professorial colleagues, how can we hope to convince pre-service and in-service teachers of the necessity of a central role for foundations in their professional preparation? And, how can we effectively participate in public forums and in policy formation concerning the process and products of schooling?

Although national and state standards for teacher licensure and program accreditation still include components from social foundations, these elements have been de-emphasized in favor of demonstrable abilities to manage classroom behaviors and to teach pre-set objectives aligned to standardized testing (Zagumny, 2007; Erickson, 2006; deMarrais, 2005; Dottin et al., 2005, Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005). Subject content knowledge is valued over expertise in theoretical perspectives and pedagogical methodologies (Cochran-Smith, 2005; Tozer & Miretsky,2000, 2005). The current political/social milieus surrounding public schooling in the United States reward narrowly-defined measures of student achievement focused on test scores. Teacher quality is also defined almost solely by students' scores on standardized tests (Cochran-Smith, 2005; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; Hostetler, 2002). Thus, the teaching/learning process has been reduced by some people and organizations to a mechanistic relationship evaluated by mathematical indicators.

In developing her model of studies which attempt to analyze faulty causal relationships in teaching, Cochran-Smith (2005) basically describes the current conception of teaching and learning as a formulaic process with inputs related to X, Y, and Z leading to some specific outcomes of A, B, and C. For example, the

Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System evaluates annual public school progress through statistical analyses of teachers' work. This program adopts the basic premise that measuring teacher effectiveness through mathematical calculations produces increasingly effective student learning, regardless of differences due to varied student characteristics in socio-economic status, racial and ethnic backgrounds, readiness for learning, and other factors (Ballou et al., 2005; Kupermintz, 2003).

Numerous authors wish to oppose what they view as simplistic reductions of the complexities of student learning. They insist that it is essential to re-claim the importance of social foundations within teacher education programs (Cook-Sather, 2006; Butin, 2005; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; Hostetler, 2002; Tozer, 1993). The present emphasis upon student progress, as almost solely defined by quantifiable outcomes, contributes to the present marginalization of foundations knowledge and work. In addition, fractured professional relationships within colleges of education and within larger public communities greatly disadvantage social foundations professors.

Foundations educators are often isolated from colleagues working in other areas of teacher preparation and they experience difficulty in articulating the essential nature and importance of their areas of expertise (Martusewicz, 2006; Butin, 2005; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; Warren, 1998; Pietig et al., 1996). For example, the Cultural Studies in Education program at The University of Tennessee is housed in the department called Instructional Technology, Health, and Cultural Studies. During a re-structuring of departmental alignments in the

spring of 2003, Cultural Studies in Education chose to remain separate from Theory and Practice in Teacher Education (re-structuring, spring semester 2003). From my experience, the two are not only physically housed in two opposite ends of the College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences building, but they are philosophically distant as well.

There are some issues causing concern within social foundations and affecting its viability within teacher education that I wish to discuss in more depth: 1) a perceived lack of relevance to the practical skills needed for daily teaching in public schools; 2) confusion over clear and concise definitions of the discipline which center on lack of consensus concerning a core body of knowledge; and, 3) student resistance to content and issues related to social justice initiatives. Some discussion of other issues, such as the hierarchial and controlling nature of education schools, the power of standardized tests for teacher certification, and foundations' role in preparing teachers to think critically and act morally, are also embedded within the main three divisions.

Perceived Relevance to Teacher Preparation

Beadie (1996) and Renner et al. (2004) critique an important problem within social foundations in their discussions of its lack of perceived relevance to teacher practice. Students have difficulty in determining how content in this discipline relates to the rest of their programs (a problem that will be further examined under the topic of "student resistance"). Professors have difficulties in

clearly articulating the necessary integration of foundations with methods courses and field experiences. These connections are not readily apparent to other teacher educators or to college of education administrators (Beadie, 1996; Hill, 2006). Beadie (1996) also acknowledges the multi-leveled structure of education schools within universities and the pressures professors face with possible professional retribution.

Not only do non-foundations educators in teacher preparation programs question the value of social foundations coursework and content, test-makers also deny the applicability of foundations understandings when constructing their standardized tests. Watras (2006) claims that researchers, such as the ones employed by the Educational Testing Service, "contended that courses in the social foundations of education did not provide practical suggestions for teachers to use in classrooms" (p. 124). Therefore, teacher education programs, whose survival is dependent upon student success rates on these tests, orient their programs towards building technical competence (Watras, 2006; Renner et al., 2004).

During the period of time when the National Teachers Examination evolved into the PRAXIS exams, social foundations did not possess a vital position within the testing movement. As of 2002, passing some form of the national teacher exams is required for certification in thirty-five states. Eighty percent of candidates must pass the state tests to qualify the teacher education program for NCATE accreditation (spring of 2003). The tests concentrate on "enabling skills," such as literacy, computation, and writing. Also, they measure

"professional teaching skills," based on subject knowledge assessment and pedagogical strategies (Watras, 2006, p. 126). They do not acknowledge any connections to the value of social foundations in preparing teachers to understand the diverse contexts of schooling or to work for a more equitable social order (Watras, 2006).

A Clear Definition, A Common Core?

Difficulties in assessing the value of foundations work within teacher education also come from a somewhat confused and amorphous notion of what constitutes social foundations. Butin (2005a) calls the problems with defining the discipline "a recursive cycle" (p. 30). In asking foundations scholars to address the problem of defining core knowledge, this author asks if a canon exists (a commonly-agreed-upon and utilized list of resources, people, and events) that social foundations teachers could effectively utilize and defend. In conversation with these scholars, the rather definitive answer is that no canon can be located or agreed upon. As Bredo suggests, social foundations traditionally represents the interests of groups of people or ideas that have been "conventionally marginalized or excluded. … we tend to be united by what we are against: narrow, prejudicial, and thoughtlessly conventional ways of thinking and doing" (Butin, 2005a, pp. 30-31). Bredo argues for a way to find some unity within diversity, without sharing a canonical core of knowledge.

In discussing the possibility of a social foundations canon, Thayer-Bacon insists that foundations continue to play a "vital role in helping people gain critical perspectives on educational practices so that they can begin to imagine what is missing or wrong" (Butin, 2005a, p. 34). And, she strongly proposes that accepting social foundations as marginalized and victimized may lead to a self-defeating attitude within the field. What good comes from characterizing this important work in this manner?

Kohli conceptualizes this issue from a localized perspective when she shared problems with finding a common core. She acknowledges that programs are different in varied locations with diverse audiences of students. She prefers to consider the characteristics and circumstances of her students and organize her teaching around current subjects and themes. Thayer-Bacon also takes this approach within the context of a "democracy-in-the-making framework" (Butin, 2005a, p. 34). Yet, Kohli expresses considerable interest in learning more about the purposes and choices in teaching foundations in different contexts.

In reaction to the diffuse understandings of the field, both by those within the discipline and by those outside it, Bredo calls for social foundations to form its own center that can be communicated within the profession and outwards to other stakeholders. He states: "The trick, I believe, is to find a balance of positive identity that works while maintaining openness, humility, and ability to change" (Butin, 2005a, p. 36). While an absence of a concrete, easily recognizable set of precepts and subjects cause significant confusion as to the location of social foundations within teacher education, its diverse, interdisciplinary origins are still

considered by many to constitute a strength within the discipline. However, Tozer commented that "if we cannot articulate what we do, then it is very difficult to defend our place" (Butin, 2005a, p. 49). One audience that foundations professors seem unable to entirely convince is that of their students.

Student Resistance to Social Foundations' Concepts and Content

Student resistance to philosophical perspectives and content in foundations areas seems to manifest itself in three primary ways which overlap in their consequences. First, pre-service teachers cannot easily discover the relevance of foundations coursework to classroom teaching - the daily struggles with creating and maintaining order and with the delivery of specific content in the different subject areas (Hill, 2006; deMarrais, 2005; Edmundson & Greiner, 2005; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; Warren, 1998; Pietig et al., 1996; Books, 1994; Tozer, 1993). Second, these future teachers struggle to understand their involvement in social justice issues related to many overlapping concerns, such as racism, sexism, ageism, and poverty. Most teacher candidates are currently white, middle-to-upper middle class females for whom schooling has been a successful environment for individual achievement (Abowitz, 2005; Butin, 2005b). Ladson-Billings characterizes language proficiency in these candidates as monolingual (2006). Although generally "well-meaning," the students are ignorant about people and circumstances different from their own (Butin, 2005b, p. 109). And, third, without significant interventions with social foundations educators, teachers

reproduce patterns of teaching and teacher-student interactions from their own backgrounds (Butin, 2005b; Edmundson & Greiner, 2005). Experiencing over 16,000 hours of instruction within K-12 schooling, undergraduates attend college with a stringent indoctrination into the hidden curriculum of what teaching and learning mean within a set of normative standards (Butin, 2005b).

Abowitz (2005) and Edmundson and Greiner (2005) all develop arguments that students cannot relate the theory of foundations class work to teaching practice and that they are very likely to teach in the manner in which they were taught. Edmundson and Greiner (2005) write: "As the climate of educational reform and politics turns again to teacher-proof pedagogies, high-stakes testing, and uniform curricula, our students may be all the more likely to dismiss teacher education courses that don't seem directly applicable to K-12 classrooms" (p. 151). The challenge is to help future teachers to understand the connections between their beliefs and their actions. Social foundations educators must assist with the critique of unexamined standards and norms in schooling, in order to encourage students to scrutinize their own pre-set assumptions. Through bringing certain unchallenged perspectives into the classrooms, teachers maintain the status quo and its attending inequalities. Self-reflection, critical thinking, and experiential learning are necessary elements to disrupting pre-conceived ideas (Abowitz, 2005; Butin, 2005b; Edmundson & Greiner, 2005). Identities must be challenged and reinvented if teachers are to reject what has been considered "normal and natural in teaching" (Butin, 2005b, p. 192).

Butin (2005b) characterizes student resistance as having four usual forms: "resistance as failure; resistance as unknowing; resistance as alienation; and, resistance as uncaring" (p. 110). Failure to understand social foundations content stems from indoctrination into a meritocratic belief system aligned with a normal Bell curve. Future teachers place the responsibility for poor academic achievement within their student's person or circumstances. They concentrate on the "best way of teaching, learning, and doing school" (Butin, 2005b, p. 112). Second, pre-service teachers fail to understand the effects of race/ethnicity on child development. And, rejecting ideas of white privilege, they cannot effectively evaluate their own positionalities in comparison with those of others. Next, they may not really wish to learn about racism, sexism, and other –isms, as these issues cause identity confusion and conflict.

Balancing Adversity with Examples of Success

Considering the multiple problems that the discipline is facing and the dearth of simple solutions, it seems easy to despair about the future of foundations. However, I found several examples of successful programs that exist within education schools in higher education. First, Provenzo (2005) wants his students to investigate the "extent with which education functions as social reproduction" (p. 65). Applying oral history interviewing techniques, teacher candidates at the University of Miami construct diverse stories of schooling. They learn to connect the history of American education with the lives and experiences

of people whom they meet. In this manner, social justice issues of race, gender, class, and sexuality come alive and become real. Using a process of action research and Schon's (1983) idea of the reflective practitioner, Provenzo connects theory to practice in the true sense of praxis. Topical studies are generated by students or through examining current events. He wants students to understand how social, political, and cultural forces interact with schooling to produce differential outcome for public school students. He wishes to reclaim the activist potential of social foundations to encourage educational reform that is opposed to the technical models of recent years.

Building on the work of Maxine Greene in aesthetic education, Greiner (2005) teaches future teachers at the Lincoln Center Institute for Arts in Education. Students experience artworks through description, interpretation and analysis. They also engage directly in creating art to forge intellectual-emotional bonds in learning. In practicing roles of "participant, guide, explorer, and teacher," these students engage in pedagogy using plays, movies, letters, visual arts, and literature as the bases for discussion. Intellectual, physical, and emotional modes of experiential learning incorporate multidisciplinary understandings of the hegemonies of race, class, and gender. At the end of each exercise, Greiner prompts student reflection to encapsulate "continual inquiry into what happened, what might have happened, what was said, and what was not said" (p. 101). The purpose is to assist teachers in forming classroom environments with many correct answers and shared authority which focus on the process of learning (Greiner, 2005).

Employing a cultural ecological approach, Martusewicz and Edmundson (2005) view foundations as the place to teach "pedagogies of responsibility and eco-ethical commitment" (p. 71). They are concerned that pre-service and in-service teachers understand the interconnectedness of all of life and consider their teaching within non-human, as well as human, contexts. Using "earth democracies" originating with indigenous peoples as models (Shiva, 2002), the goal is for teachers to dissect moral codes which are embedded in symbolic cultural systems (Martusewicz & Edmundson, 2005, p. 77). These authors expand the traditional notions of multiculturalism which focus either on foods and holidays, or on patterns of production and consumption with their attending inequalities. Emphasizing interdependency, these writers stress engagement at the "intersection of diversity, democracy, and ecology" to underscore the need for sustainable communities (p. 77). Forging intimate connections to people within specific locales, the purpose is to determine what should be conserved within a society and what should be transformed. Martusewicz and Edmundson (2005) write: "We believe that teachers must learn to think about cultural and ecological assumptions as they learn to teach – that teachers must learn to care as much as they learn to think" (p. 88).

In seeking to mend fragmentation in schools and in society which are based on artificial divisions of race, class, gender, etc., Bredo (2005) urges that social foundations is "basically about making schools more ethical" (p. 45). At the University of Virginia, teacher preparation programs are formulated with individual elements which respond to the needs of diverse students. The courses

and experiences are combined to maximize the ways that each individual can contribute to the teaching profession. Stating that this group of foundations educators operates with a common moral purpose, Bredo defines three purposes for foundations courses and content: 1) he views foundations educators as "defenders of precarious values"; 2) he wants social foundations to merge "intellectual and social fragments … into a more cooperative and continual form of education"; and, 3) he insists that foundations educators must offer perspectives on the many issues of professional teaching in today's environments (p. 51). Reclaiming the historical origins of social foundations at Teachers College, Bredo (2005) brings interdisciplinary insights into solving current social problems.

Infusing cultural studies perspectives into foundations coursework, Renner et al. (2004) engage in multicultural and antiracist education within a graduate accelerated teacher certification program. Located at Bellarmine University in Kentucky, this teacher cohort enacts a social justice discourse within service-learning projects. Citing the lack of training in diversity and the divide between predominantly white teachers and their future students, Renner et al. (2004) process their field experiences using foundational lenses. Rejecting the notion that teachers will teach as they are taught, these pre-service teachers examine how they will teach differently, as they are always cognizant of the moral implications of teaching. Using the philosophy, history, and sociology of education, they work to understand diversity in a pluralistic society. Empowered to change, the students examine how they will individually and collectively act "as transformative

agents" (p. 142). As a result of their service-learning projects, these future teachers more clearly understand the connections between theoretical constructions and practical applications (Renner et al., 2004).

So, considering these successful examples of programming in foundations, can I further explicate the critical contributions made by social foundations courses, teachers, and continuing scholarship (as determined by the scholarly literature and by experienced practitioners within the discipline)? How can these contributions be communicated effectively with other teacher educators, with teacher candidates, and with the public and lead to a renewed vitality for the field? Butin (2005) stated that foundations work examines the multiple contexts of schooling in order to prepare teachers to think critically and innovatively to solve contemporary problems. The history, philosophy, and sociology of education inform and support teachers as they confront the bewildering challenges and complexities of teaching diverse students from increasingly varied backgrounds (Erickson, 2006; Gourneau, 2006; deMarrais, 2005; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; O'Brien, 2002; Rodriguez, 2002; Mirci, 2000). From my perspective, understanding and applying concepts found in foundations work truly provide a professional base for teachers, an underlying rationale that is fundamental to excellence in teaching. Foundations work should form a central and vital component within teacher education programs in the United States. Since it is not considered central or essential in many current programs, what recommendations could be made to reverse this trend?

As part of a dissertation which will examine many of the questions and controversies surrounding the current position of social foundations, this discussion represents a beginning analysis into reasons for its current status. Starting with a partial history of the development of social foundations as an academic discipline, I will further contextualize contemporary concerns through examining the origins of the field and its development into the late twentieth century and early twenty-first century. A study of the discipline from its established twentieth-century origins in the 1930s at Teachers College, Columbia University, to the present time, indicates a recurrence of some of the same problems, both within the field and within expanded settings, such as teacher education, university communities, and the larger society. Some of the major internal and external issues that I wish to discuss include the following: 1) problems with identity (definitions and content of the field) and its perceived lack of connectedness to teacher practice (with corresponding arguments about the virtues of interdisciplinary inquiries versus single disciplinary coursework); 2) conflicting views over its proper placement and status within academia and continuing criticisms related to lack of academic rigor; 3) difficulties in justifying foundations content in terms of measurable performance objectives: and, 4) the survival of the field during several decades of increased educational legislation, decreased autonomy, insistence upon national standards for public education, and proposed alternative routes for teacher certification. Many of these concerns are linked one to the other and run concurrently throughout many of the narratives that I have examined to date. To facilitate closer scrutiny into some of the

underlying causes and lingering consequences of unresolved arguments within social foundations, they are separated when discussed in an overview of the historical development of the field within Chapter Two.

Chapter Two: A Partial History of the Social Foundations of Education within the United States

Introduction

A partial examination of the history of the social foundations of education should illuminate its periodic and cyclical problems with constructing understandable definitions and purposes for the discipline (Butin, 2005: Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; Warren, 1998). As Altenbaugh (2003) stated, "History opens the mind to our social world. Through it, we can better understand today's events, crises, and issues, because we gain a sense of perspective and a realization of the complexity and impact of change" (p. iii). However, it is difficult to develop a concise history of the social foundations in the United States. The history is considered complicated and contested with its diverse locations and different understandings of the field from many perspectives. Warren (1998) considered the history as "multiple histories" to express his understanding of the evolution of this subject (p. 117).

The content of coursework and its philosophical underpinnings have varied over time and still lack consensus. However, some important people, events, and conceptual bases can be established which inform the current status of foundations within colleges of education in the United States. Several authors also insisted upon the integral importance of the history of social foundations to understand its present dilemmas (Butin, 2005; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005;

Warren, 1998; Butts, 1993; Ginsburg, 1987). I will begin with some current statistics to set the stage for a discussion of the origins of the field.

A U.S. Department of Education report (2002) listed 1400 programs in teacher education, either with undergraduate majors or minors in education, or with master's level programs. Over 300,000 newly certified teachers graduate annually and most seek jobs within the pre-K through grade 12 system of public schooling (Butin, 2005). Rather obviously, very large numbers of new teachers enter the public school arena annually. It seems reasonable to assume that their teaching careers will affect the schooling experiences of millions of students. The quality and effectiveness of their teacher education programs within university settings (and in alternative locations) are, therefore, of significant importance to the well-being of our children, youth, and future adults nation-wide. It is my premise that beginning teachers' conceptualization of teaching as a profession will determine much of the nature of their interactions with students. So, I agree with Beadie (1996) when she writes of the importance of the social foundations of education to cultivating the "moral, civic, and social dimensions of education …" (p. 77).

Most of these recently certified teachers took some coursework in foundations areas, but questions arise concerning which content was taught and its applicability (Butin, 2005; Beadie, 1996). "The history … seems to be one of eclecticism. No singular texts, no definitive methodology, no 'best practice' formulations are to be found. The lack of a foundation within foundations in fact seems to be a foundational theme" (Butin, 2005, pp. xiii-xiv). Seeking for

intellectual and material evidence of the discipline through its history will inform me and the reader of the roots of the field's current dilemmas.

Early Origins (the Nineteenth Century to the Late 1920s)

During the nineteenth century, teachers often began their teaching duties prior to receiving formal instruction in the profession. The willingness to accept a teaching job and having more schooling than the students seemed to be some of the main criteria for teaching, whether in rural or urban settings (Altenbaugh, 2003). Summer institutes for teacher training were offered as ways to increase the person's understanding of the purposes of schooling within the growing nation and eventually, to establish credentials and licensing procedures for educators. Some of these summer programs offered single disciplinary coursework in either the history or philosophy of education (Warren, 1998).

According to Ginsburg (1987), the first teacher training institution in the United States evolved in 1821 from the Troy Female Seminary founded by Emma Willard in 1814. The first college level department of education started in 1831 at Washington College in Pennsylvania. And, in 1879, the first university professorship in education was held by William Payne at the University of Michigan (Ginsburg, 1987). With the advent of coursework designed to address foundations areas came the need for supporting texts. An early text in the foundations of education was published by Professor Seely at the New York State Normal School in 1901 (Ginsburg, 1987).

During the next three decades, significant development occurred in the number and quality of foundational courses associated primarily with liberal arts and social sciences disciplines. Also, university departments emerged as schools or colleges of education (Ginsburg, 1987). By the 1930-1931 school year at Teachers College, Columbia University, the catalogue listed single disciplinary courses in the following areas: history, philosophy, sociology, and psychology of education (McCarthy, 2006). Courses in these areas were viewed as providing beginning teacher candidates with the basic building blocks for understanding educational practice (Warren, 1998). Some prominent scholars in foundations areas were teaching the single disciplinary courses at this time, such as Cubberley who taught the history of education and MacIver who taught the sociology of education (Tozer & Miretsky, 2000).

Beadie (1996) claimed that social foundations took “institutional form” at Teachers College during the 1930s (p. 77). Certainly as one of the pre-eminent teacher preparation programs in the United States during the twentieth century, the program at Teachers College provides a lens through which to view changes in emphases through the decades. However, the recognizable, distinctive fields directly associated with academic fields of inquiry within liberal arts and social sciences areas soon combined into thematic studies emphasizing current educational problems.

The "Formative" Years – the 1930s to the Late 1950s

In 1929, William Kilpatrick, philosopher of education at Teachers College, convened an interdisciplinary study group of foundations scholars to build on the educational ideas of John Dewey. He was particularly interested in those ideas which acknowledged the social and political contexts of public schooling and their influences on student learning and achievement. The professors who participated were as follows: Edmund Brunner, John Childs, Harold Clark, F. Ernest Johnson, Jesse Newlon, R. Bruce Raup, Harold Rugg, Goodwin Watson, and George Counts. The purpose of the group was to determine commonalities within their disciplines that future teachers needed to know to be effective with students. These scholars and teachers wanted to build connections between the theoretical constructions of their respective disciplines and practical applications for teachers.

In questioning assumptions underlying the ability of all people to achieve financial success and the "American Dream," the Kilpatrick Study Group was also responding to the economic conditions of the Great Depression. They promoted ideas related to the redistribution of wealth. Called "reconstructionists," they sought ways that schools could alter the social and political fabric of American society to create more just and equitable opportunities for people within a reformed nation (McCarthy, 2006; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005).

R. Freeman Butts (1993) characterized the early history of social foundations as a "formative and fluorescent" period that corresponded with the

development of the field from the mid-1930s through the late 1950s (p. vii). In the early years of his career at Teachers College, he wrote that "the halls … were electric with the conflict of ideas, political activism, and an almost constant controversy" (p. 16). For example, as the newly elected president of the Progressive Education Association, Counts presented a speech in 1932 entitled, "Dare the School Change Society?" (McCarthy, 2006, p. 135) And, he published a text entitled *The Social Foundations of Education* in 1934 which examined the cultural contexts of education in the United States (Tozer & Miretsky, 2000). Also, in contrast with on-going conflicts with deans and educational administrators, many faculty members were engaged in cooperative curriculum design and implementation (Butts, 1993). Using a five year grant from the General Education Board to create experimental elementary and secondary teacher education programs, the "New School" at Teachers College developed cooperative curricula with Harvard University and Barnard College. These programs were operated at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City from 1932 to 1938 (Ginsburg, 1987).

Tozer (1993) also discussed the interdisciplinary origins of an academic field renamed the "Social Foundations of Education" at Teachers College during the early 1930s. He included events which demonstrated its commitment to social and political well-being for diverse groups of people. With the work of the study group, a new field or discipline was not being discovered or originally named as such, but these professors were "examining the underlying conditions and processes on which education in any culture rests" (Tozer, 1993, p. 10). However,

McCarthy (2006) directly challenged this view and stated that the faculty at Teachers College who designed a new two-semester, interdisciplinary course in social foundations "defined the field" (p. 134).

Through her history of ED200F, McCarthy pinpointed "the interaction between historical moments, their social and political realities, and the evolution of the field of social foundations" (2006, p. 134). The mission of the course and its readings and activities initially focused on educational effects and outcomes on immigrants and the poor (McCarthy, 2006). Thus, some recent writers of the history of foundations disagree concerning the exact origins of the discipline (either dating from the early courses in single disciplines offered during the nineteenth century, or from this specific interdisciplinary course required at Teachers College beginning with the 1934-35 school year).

Actually, two-four hour courses in sequence were required at Teachers College to complete the foundations component of the teacher preparation program. Team-taught at first by four Teachers College faculty in social foundations, Columbia University, and four from arts and sciences departments at Columbia University, the courses placed considerable emphasis on critical inquiry into the contextualization of contemporary educational concerns. The syllabus started with a series of questions that students were to answer for themselves (McCarthy, 2006). The course description from the 1936-37 catalogue stated the following purpose for the interdisciplinary content:

> The course is designed to give in more inclusive and integrated form the necessary orientation to education formerly offered through the History of Education, Philosophy of Education, Educational Sociology, Educational

> Psychology, Comparative Education, and Educational Economics. The effort will be so to deal with the areas common to the various fields of educational endeavor as to provide for them all a basic understanding and a common outlook and language of discourse" (Butts, 1993, as quoted in Warren, 1998, p. 119).

Constituted during the progressive era of education, the social foundations of education developed within an atmosphere of intellectual excitement and innovation through collaboration (Beadie, 1996; Butts, 1993). However, conflicts over issues of teacher autonomy and authority also characterized this period. Beadie (1996) commented that teachers were generally viewed in one of two ways: 1) as pedagogical and content experts worthy of the utmost respect from community members; or, 2) as laborers within a system of scientifically-managed schooling, directed and controlled for the collective good of the nation.

By 1941, Rugg published a textbook for the two-course sequence that stressed how educational experiences are shaped within diverse historical periods in different geographical locations. He began with the scrutiny of education from Ancient Greece and Plato's ideals and discussed education throughout succeeding ages from a western perspective. He included the history of American education and recently written essays by his "reconstructionist" colleagues. Aligned with the textbook, the course title in 1941 was now "Readings in Foundations of Education." During this time, faculty within Teachers College taught in pairs of twos (Butts, 1993).

The newer course was described by Tozer & Miretsky (2005) as a way to examine education "as a cultural process grounded in social institutions" (p. 7). The mission of the course content and its activities grounded in critical thought

had not significantly changed since the 1930s. However, within the context of World War II, the contemporary educational concerns covered within the course focused on the preservation of a democracy during a time of war. Topics included were: “Democracy and Dictatorship” and “The European roots of American culture” (McCarthy, 2006, p. 134). The original “reconstructionist” agenda of wealth distribution was replaced with a nationalistic indoctrination of American democracy fighting against tyranny in the world. The social and political overtones of foundations work were compromised during a period of conservatism and patriotism which is common during wars.

At the 50th anniversary celebration of Teachers College in 1944, professors were basically divided into two opposing camps: some promoted strong academic content preparation for teachers within arts and sciences disciplines, and others called “educationists” sought to keep teacher candidates in their very popular teacher education program. Although enrollment was very high in the teaching major, this program was considered academically inferior to other majors (Jones, 1984). Thus, the struggle to determine the proper academic home for the social foundations of education continued throughout the first half of the century, as did shifting content responding to social and political pressures.

During the period following World War II of increased prosperity, especially for middle class people, ED200F again reflected the social and political nature of society. For a short period of time, there was a renewal of the role of teacher as activist. Readings for ED200F examined situations involving conflicts surrounding social class differences and racial divides. During the 1950s,

however, those emphases were quickly superseded by the threat of communism and its possible infiltration into American society. The public perceptions that our democratic way of life could end affected teacher preparation programs, particularly the one at Teachers College (McCarthy, 2006).

Teachers College was considered a liberal place to prepare teachers. In reaction, the administration of the college focused on creating a patriotic and traditional curriculum to present to the public. Suspected of links with radical groups and espousing social and political reform, eight of fourteen senior faculty members were forced into retirement at age 65 by the Dean of the College of Education (Butts, 1993). As college administrators feared investigations and reprisals from the House of Representatives Un-American Activities Committee, they tried to connect teacher preparation to initiatives for national defense and national security. Thus, adjusting the curriculum to conform to outside political pressures, the interdisciplinary course, ED200F, disappeared (McCarthy, 2006).

During the 1950s, Butts became department head at Teachers College. He had two areas of concern that impacted foundations work: he wanted to emphasize the practical aspects of teaching in managing student learning, and he wanted to include various school-related stakeholders in the design of teacher education curricula. So, he proposed that educational researchers, professors in diverse areas of teacher preparation, and practicing teachers should enter conversations and make decisions concerning teacher education program components. As a consequence, newer faculty members once again taught

foundations courses as single disciplinary subjects (McCarthy, 2006; Warren, 1998).

A Period of "Dispersion" – the Late 1950s To the Mid-1970s

The years from the late 1950s through the mid-1970s were labeled by Butts (1993) as ones of "dispersion" (p. 28). During the final third of his career, he witnessed many competing and conflicting interests vying for prominence within teacher education programs and within foundations areas. Coupled with the challenge of Soviet technological innovations to American supremacy in math and science inventions, interdisciplinary coursework was blamed as one reason for the lack of academic integrity in teacher education programs. And, failures in the effectiveness of public school teachers were linked to deficiencies in teacher preparation programs (McCarthy, 2006).

Some corollary developments in national educational organizations during the 1950s and early 1960s also affected the direction of teacher preparation programs in the United States. In 1954, the National Council on the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) was formed. Its purpose was to act as an independent accrediting body for teacher education programs existing within institutions of higher learning in the United States. The powerful influence of this organization and its increasing dominance over program goals, curricula, and designated outcomes affected many components of teacher education programs.

Adjustments were made to align goals, objectives, content, and field experiences to NCATE standards (Dottin et al., 2005).

During the 1960s, contradictory influences in political and social circles were mirrored by opposing ideologies within social foundations. Nash (1984) summarized the theoretical orientation of some foundations scholars as focused on cognitive pursuits which connected less with teacher practice. Professors often held joint appointments in subject area disciplines, such as history and philosophy, specifically designed to form alliances that would increase their status within academia (Ginsburg, 1987; Finkelstein, 1984; Nash, 1984). While removing themselves from social and political involvement, they also joined more professional organizations that were discipline-related. And, they "retreated into abstractions, words, language, and academic boundary defining" (Nash, 1984, p. 56).

As during the mid-to-late 1950s, newer faculty members taught social foundations courses as single disciplinary subjects. They tried to counteract accusations of inferior academic quality from arts and sciences faculty and address questions about the overall effectiveness of American public education (McCarthy, 2006; Warren, 1998; Ginsburg, 1987). However, these accusations built on several decades of continuing controversy over the proper academic homes for education classes within academia (within arts and science disciplines or within colleges of education) and discussions of the prominence and value of foundations work within the confines of teacher education curricula (Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; Warren, 1998; Ginsburg, 1987).

A prominent spokesperson for the merger of educational history and philosophy with their counterparts in arts and sciences, Cremin became department head of the Department of Social and Philosophical Foundations at Teachers College in 1958. Educational psychology and assessment faculties had already disassociated themselves from the interdisciplinary foundations group of the 1930s (Warren, 1998). According to Butts (1993), Cremin "disparaged the term 'foundations' as being non-specific and confusing" (p. 4). By 1964, the name of the department changed. Omitting the term "foundations," it became known as "Philosophy and the Social Sciences" (Butts, 1993, p. 31).

Cremin worked with Bailyn, historian at Harvard University, to promote the placement of the history of education within the history department. Allegedly, this academic location would enable this specialty to achieve greater respect for its theoretical and practical utility within the academy. Other scholars disagreed with this re-positioning of the history of education or other foundations areas outside colleges of education, but they were unable to successfully validate the rigor and worth of their academic work to professors in other disciplines (Warren, 1998). Also, Warren (1998) made an important point when he asserted that aligning educational foundations areas with their parent disciplines, such as history, instead of their connectedness to colleges of education, would remove understanding of the social, political, and cultural interactions in educational environments. Also, scholars in foundations areas would no longer be accountable to the public for their research and teaching.

Contrary to the social foundations educators who seemed intent on intellectualizing the work and disassociating it from teacher practice, a humanistic orientation to the foundations of education arose as well. Integrating influences on philosophical and scientific thought since World War II, these scholars embraced a holistic approach focused on the wholeness of persons. They recognized people's differential locations within organizations and systems, such as schools. During the late 1950s and 1960s, they incorporated elements of phenomenology, existentialism, the human potential movement, and brain research into their analyses of the effects of interpersonal relationships on educational experiences. Drawing upon the civil rights movement and the women's movement, educators began to include other aspects of humanity, such as emotion, intuition, creativity, and spirituality, into educational discussions (Greene, 1993, 1995; Noddings, 1990; Martin, 1981, 1982) Consideration of racial, ethnic, gender, and sexual orientations became recognized as significant factors affecting education and schooling (Naples, 2005; Reger, 2005; Fiske, 1993; Riger, 1992; Fonow & Cook, 1991; Butler, 1990; Bordo, 1989; Collins, 1986). These newer ideas tied to more liberal social behavior and politics in a period of optimism and prosperity threatened the privileged position of the majority who emphasized issues of power and authority (Nash, 1984).

Themes in educational reform which emerged during this time included: 1) multicultural education; 2) sexism in textbooks and educational materials; 3) the need for special preparation for teaching in urban settings; and, 4) the limits of formal schooling in preparing students for life. Debates in teacher education still

centered on controversies over liberal versus technical education, “analytic versus intuitive ways of knowing, cognitive versus emotional experiences, and mental versus manual forms of labor” (Ginsburg, 1987, p. 26).

While some people emphasized a renewal of social activism through education and expressed a renewed concern for the creation of a new social order, dominant popular opinions were crafted by conservative political agendas. Pervasive fears of the rise of communism, unrest in American cities associated with the Vietnam conflict and other events, and the perceived dissolution of the American family fueled desires to return to the security and stability of earlier eras. And, these anxieties affected educational trends (Ginsburg, 1987; Spring, 1984). Thus, this period of development for the social foundations of education during the 1960s was characterized by opposing social, economic, and political forces: an increased liberalism in intellectual thought countermanded by rising federal legislation and funding for educational research tied to a “scientific” model of inquiry.

In reaction to the conservatism of some faculty work and program content during the late 1950s and early 1960s, the American Educational Studies Association (AESA) was founded by graduate students at Teachers College in 1968 (Butts, 1993). AESA formed as “an international learned society for those sharing interests in the foundations of education” (AESA, 1978, p. 327). The purpose of the organization was to “provide rationales and evaluate critically” the foundations of education, educational studies, and educational policy studies (the latter two terms naming university departments which now also housed

foundations faculty) (AESA, 1978, p. 327). Acknowledging diverse approaches to teaching and research within the social foundations of education, AESA also sought to unify people who identified with foundations work and perspectives. AESA concentrated on being responsive to members' input, as it evaluated publications by national, state, and other regulatory agencies (AESA, 1978).

The Council of Learned Societies in Education (CLSE) formed during the early 1970s as an "umbrella" organization for the specialty areas in social foundations, such as the history of education, philosophy of education, sociology of education, anthropology of education, and educational studies (Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005). Original members were: AESA, Comparative and International Education Society, History of Education Society, The John Dewey Society, Philosophy of Education Society, Society of Educational Reconstruction, and Society of Professors in Education (Jones, 1987). Scholars in foundations areas were concerned about the marginalization of their content and work and the resulting impact on three groups of students: pre-service teachers, in-service teachers, and graduate students planning research and teaching careers in foundations areas (Dottin et al., 2005). Meeting annually in conjunction with the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, CLSE promoted accreditation standards for foundations areas, cooperated with national accrediting bodies and state departments of education, and coordinated efforts among various specialty groups within the field (Jones, 1987).

One significant contribution from CLSE to the field of social foundations was the Standards for Academic and Professional Instruction in Foundations in

Education published in 1978. The Standards were re-issued in 1986 and revised in 1996 (Dottin et al., 2005, Tozer & Miretsky, 2005; Jones, 1975a, 1976, 1987). The purpose of the standards was to "use the lenses of the humanities and the social sciences to help teacher candidates [develop critical perspectives]" (Tozer & Miretsky, 2005, p. 8). Social foundations were not considered as content designed merely to acquaint beginning teacher candidates with their chosen profession. Instead, in-depth reading, thought, and writing in foundations was to teach varied levels of students to think critically about every aspect of their interactions with students, colleagues, and the community. Warren (1998) expressed it in this manner: "Social foundations should be viewed … as diversely rooted inquiry on dilemmas affecting educational thought and practice" (p. 122). He viewed the standards as a way to recover the lost emphasis on educational entrenchment in the social and political struggles of the time.

Formulated by the Committee for Academic Standards and Accreditation (CASA) within CLSE, The Standards for Academic and Professional Instruction emphasized "the development of interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives of education, including non-schooling enterprises" (AESA, 1978, p. 331). The Standards urged study of all three perspectives using both historical and contemporary viewpoints and materials. The goal was to improve social foundations within teacher education programs in the United States. The seven standards provided a broad framework for initial teacher certification with minimal qualifications in foundations. They also served as guides for professional development coursework taught by qualified faculty and for coursework included

in non-foundations majors and doctoral programs. Although the standards suggested strongly that only faculty educated in foundations' specialty areas teach this coursework, there were no specific qualifications listed. They did not prescribe goals and content for courses, nor did they require interdisciplinary instruction. Recommending that field experiences be incorporated into foundations content, the standards did not specify evaluative measures for these experiences. Also, this document did not specify a combination of courses within social foundations for different kinds of programs within higher education, but it did establish the portions of undergraduate and graduate programs that should be dedicated to this content (from 1/6th to 3/5ths depending on the level and subject concentration within the program). It also insisted that courses in educational psychology, curriculum and instruction, educational administration, and teaching methods were not acceptable substitutes for foundations courses (AESA, 1978).

Developed by professionals within the profession for use by other professors within the discipline, the Standards for Academic and Professional Instruction were not imposed from outside the field. Researchers and educators in foundations were encouraged to use this document to include minorities in schooling and to reject normative measures stemming from competency-based learning based upon behavioral objectives. They were also designed to help foundations educators enact problem-solving strategies related to educational problems. In all cases, the purpose of foundations was clearly stated as "the free and open inquiry into all normative issues; the unfettered questioning of what is, and what ought to be" (AESA, 1978, pp. 333-334). During the 1980s, the CLSE

distributed the standards and encouraged their use by social foundations educators. They also engaged actively with NCATE in promoting the inclusion of these standards into NCATE objectives (Dottin et al., 2005).

Although NCATE did not adopt standards from other groups, they would consider them in setting directions and selecting wording for their own accrediting work. Involvement with NCATE was therefore viewed as very important by members of CLSE, CASA, and the Committee on Professional Affairs of the Philosophy of Education Society. Members of these groups participated by training foundations professors for service on NCATE accreditation teams and through monitoring the activities of NCATE to assure that some interests related to the social foundations of education were represented. In an era where the dual emphasis on humanist and behavioral sciences usually resulted in required coursework in educational psychology (instead of foundations areas), approximately 100 people from social foundations served on NCATE teams (Jones, 1987).

However, the dominant conservative majority continued to control the educational hierarchy and instituted the "technicist" movement in education during the early 1970s. Jones (1987) commented on the "near total emphasis on testing, measurement, and professional training in little but practical skills and applications" (p. 305). Strongly influenced by national educational policy debates, increases in legislation controlling federal funding of public schools forced public schools, teachers, and teacher educators to acquiesce to external pressures.

Pervasive standardized testing focused on a “back to basics” curriculum (Best, 1987; Wirsing, 1987).

The 1970s to the End of the Century

Two major studies encapsulated opinions of social foundations professors and conditions in the field during the 1970s and 1980s. These large and comprehensive studies, one constructed as a Delphi study, also set important precedents for the one that I conducted. Jones (1975a) developed and distributed a survey of foundations professors to assess the state of the field. He used the 246 responses from the first survey to develop a series of predictive statements which were ranked by fifty scholars. The purposes of the research centered on encapsulating educational activities in higher education in foundations areas, determining “directions, goals, problems, and solutions” present in the discipline, and sharing results with colleagues nationally (1976, p. 2). A secondary purpose was to draft a defense for social foundations to counter threats from Competency-Based Teacher Education (CBTE). Through analysis of these two instruments, he summarized the present conditions of the social foundations in colleges of education during the early-to-mid 1970s.

Summarizing his results, Jones (1975a, 1975b, 1975c) found widely divergent programs in the field with varying foundations requirements in both undergraduate and graduate programs. He also discovered that practitioners were concerned about a definitive role for social foundations within teacher education

and within professional development for teachers (Jones, 1975a, 1975b, 1975c, 1976). Other specific concerns ranked in order of importance included: difficulty in receiving equitable funding within their institutions; incomplete research in important areas; lack of relevance to K-12 education; lack of respect and cooperation from other teacher education colleagues; lack of respect and cooperation from faculty members in other academic areas; a failure to provide professional services; and, an inability to address meaningful social issues (Jones, 1975a, 1975b, 1975c, 1976).

Explanations of concerns during the 1970s centered on some very similar issues to those existing from the beginning of the field: questions about the meaning and definition of the field; disciplinary specialists versus foundations generalists as scholars/educators; the integration or omission of contemporary social issues into foundations content; effective ways to merge theory with pedagogy and teacher practices; the long-term impact of CBTE; and, the consequences of varied institutional settings for social foundations work (Jones, 1975a, 1975b, 1975c, 1976).

During this period from the early to mid-1970s, 84% of foundations professors were housed in a department of social foundations within a teacher education program, or as part of a division within teacher education. All of them offered some required courses in foundations as part of undergraduate degree programs; less than half offered graduate degrees in social foundations (Jones, 1976). Hiring trends indicated more interest in social foundations professors trained as disciplinary specialists, rather than interdisciplinary or generalist

emphases as doctoral backgrounds. The overall attitude of the professionals polled was very positive, with over 54% pleased with the direction and progress of the field. Less than 25% reported problems with colleagues or administrators (Jones, 1976).

In response to a "national crisis in social foundations of education," a second large research study was sponsored by the CASA during the mid-1980s (Shea, Sola, & Jones, 1987, p. 47). Results indicated that major changes had occurred in the conditions of foundations professors and programs within higher education. Now housed in dispersed academic homes within colleges of education, the title "foundations" had been dropped in over 50% of the cases (Shea, Sola, & Jones, 1987).

Loss of autonomy was considered to be a significant problem, with program development, hiring, promotion, tenure, and assignments controlled by non-foundations faculty members, deans, and other administrators. Academic rigor of coursework was still being attacked by teacher education colleagues and others. Faculty members without doctoral degrees specific to social foundations areas were teaching these courses full-time in over 48% of the institutions that reported. Less than 30% of foundations faculty members who were actually trained in foundations areas were involved in scholarly pursuits, research and publishing, or curriculum development. Less than 20% were involved in community service activities or social and political activism of any kind. Only 10% were involved in interdisciplinary intellectual projects on their campuses (Shea, Sola, & Jones, 1987).

The insular nature of social foundations led to increased pessimism among scholars in the field and a defensive attitude related to survival within combined programs. An aging population of scholars led to predictions of widespread retirements during the years 1996 to 2001, with worries about declining enrollments in doctoral programs to replace these professors. Shea, Sola, & Jones (1987) urged an awakening of foundations personnel to the very real crises within the field. They actively supported dedicated efforts to restore its viability and relevance, its autonomy, and its relationships within and without teacher education programs.

During the time periods of these two major studies (1970s and 1980s), teacher education programs in general (and foundations areas as part of teacher education programs) were under public scrutiny and felt intense, internal pressures from their respective universities. The Program in Humanistic Education and Human Services at Boston University was terminated and the faculty fired. During the early 1980s, the University of Michigan attempted to close its School of Education. The school was not closed, but it was greatly reduced in scope and foundations no longer existed as an independent department within it (Jones, 1987).

During the conservative political reign of President Reagan, the mediocrity of American public schools was again touted through an influential report called “A Nation at Risk” (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). It emphasized more scrutiny of elementary and secondary education, a need for better quality classroom teachers, and more content rigor in

teacher education programs (Wirsing, 1987). The Carnegie Task Force Report on Teaching as a Profession entitled "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the Twenty-First Century was published in 1986. The Holmes Group Report, "Tomorrow's Teachers" also appeared in the same year. These two latter documents in the mid-1980s focused attention on more academic work in subject content for teachers, introduced a five year program for teacher preparation, and established a hierarchy for teacher advancement through a career ladder. Upgrading certain teacher skills tied to demonstrable performance objectives increased the technical emphasis in teacher education and decreased the relative importance of social foundations coursework and content (Best, 1987; Wirsing, 1987).

Concurrent with the increasing power of the neo-conservatives in American political arenas during the 1980s and 1990s, the federal regulation of education imposed new strictures on state education procedures. These restrictions were linked directly to federal funding sources for public schooling (Markley, 2006; Cochran-Smith, 2005). The Goals 2000 initiative strongly promoted rigorous academic standards for all students (Tozer & Miretsky, 2000). Another program started in the summer of 1992 by President George Bush gave $500 million dollars to 50 American cities for vouchers to middle and low income parents. Called America 2000, it promoted school choice between public, private, and parochial schools. And, also during the summer of 1992, The New American Schools Development Corporation selected and funded eleven design teams to reinvent schools. Citizenship education was the primary goal of this endeavor.

However, no requirements for class work in civics or government were recommended for K-12 education.

During the early 1990s, Governor Clinton of Arkansas worked with the National Governors Association to elicit national goals and standards for public schools. He opposed the use of vouchers which would take students from the public system, however. Also, in 1992, Secretary of Education Alexander funded a large grant for the Center for Civic Education to develop national standards for civics and government classes in K-12 education; they would be similar to the ones written for math, English, and science (Butts, 1993).

Occurring during the same period as increased federal legislation and regulations which controlled public schooling directions and funding, teacher education programs were again the subject of intense scrutiny and criticism. Within the barrage of commentary, the relevance of social foundations content within teacher education was questioned by students, teacher educators, and college of education administrators (Beadie, 1996). In an article whose purpose was to "reframe the purpose of social foundations within teacher education," Beadie suggested that foundations courses had failed in meeting their pedagogical objectives (1996, p. 77). She argued that teacher education students could not readily relate the content to other aspects of their teacher preparation programs. Also, social foundations educators had difficulty in clearly articulating the value of their theoretical connections to other portions of the curricula (Beadie, 1996).

As one possible solution to reconnect foundations theory to teaching practice, position papers elicited from AESA members demonstrated efforts to tie

foundations content to a model of teacher-as-decision-maker (Tozer, 1993). However, Beadie (1996) criticized that conception as too individualistic and devoid of necessary social and political contextualization that had always been essential to work in the discipline. She wanted a central purpose for the coursework related to improved decision-making as firmly couched in terms of "substantive values, such as democracy, human dignity, and pluralism" (p. 78).

As part of attacks on teacher education as a whole, Beadie (1996) understood the pressures on social foundations as particularly acute. She also wrote that acknowledging political aspects of our institutional and societal cultures were critical to retain what little was left of foundations within teacher education. A particular problem for the discipline came in communicating its purposes and values to all stakeholders. In contrast to methods courses which were naturally viewed as important, Beadie (1996) wrote:

> "The ability to improve student learning and achievement in literacy and numeracy is readily accepted as a goal of teacher education, but the capacity to critique the culture and structure of schools and the disposition to act on such critiques with moral seriousness and acumen are not objectives as easily stated or readily grasped" (p. 78).

After studying four case studies involving shared governance programs in schools, Beadie (1996) proposed solutions to the field's pedagogical and political problems through developing a different model of "teacher as participant in shared decision making" (Beadie, 1996, p. 77). Unresolved situations and even failures within shared governance systems within schools led her to consider how foundations content could address the issues inherent in building community support and participation in local schools. The individual teacher must often

choose between conflicting values in order to balance the environment within her classroom. She must maintain order, engage all students in learning, and evaluate fairly. The teachers within a school should respect each other's opinions and needs within an atmosphere of respect when resolving conflicts. Parents and other stakeholders needed to understand the roles and responsibilities of school personnel. Also, teachers and administrators must empathize with parents and others, as they express their desires for local educational improvements and reform. Examining key issues of contention and integrating underlying values would lead to more successful instances of shared governance (Beadie, 1996).

Placing teachers as participants within group settings with social and political contexts, Beadie (1996) also merged foundations coursework in teacher education programs with emphases on teaching practice. She proposed that disciplinary content contribute directly to the critical question of the decade: "What does it mean to be a 'good' teacher?" (p. 89). Coursework in social foundations would help students to "analyze problems in terms of competing values" (p. 84). Working to understand people from different backgrounds with diverse perspectives, pre-service teachers could learn to listen and include others and to speak as effective school leaders in political circumstances. Seeking the involvement and open participation of all stakeholders, these future teachers would connect historical educational problems with contemporary issues (Beadie, 1996).

Beadie's work (1996) in foundations stands as one example of calls for reform to reconnect social foundations with teacher practice during the 1990s.

Other authors also commented on the need for foundations to redefine its purposes, to communicate clearly with varied audiences, and to realign itself with teacher education programs (Warren, 1998; Pietig et al., 1996; Tozer, 1993).

The Twenty-First Century and Social Foundations Issues

The critical component of teacher effectiveness, as defined by test scores of student achievement, dominated educational policy conversations again during the very early years of the 21st century. According to Cochran-Smith (2005), the Secretary of Education presented reports to Congress during 2002, 2003, and 2004 which focused on some common themes: 1) teacher education programs housed in colleges of education in the United States were broken; 2) the verbal abilities and subject knowledge of the teachers were still the most important criteria by which to judge teacher effectiveness; and, 3) alternative routes to teacher education should be explored which build on analyses of the best non-traditional certification programs currently available. Not only have social foundations areas been less represented in teacher education programs during recent years, but traditional teacher preparation programs in colleges of education were also under attack (Cochran-Smith, 2005). As Mirci so succinctly wrote: "Teachers are besieged by a system of rewards and punishments … which ignore the development of quality relationships" (2000, p. 97). The re-authorization of the Higher Education Act as the Ready to Teach Act of 2003 defined the regulatory provision known as the "highly qualified" teacher. "Highly qualified"

teachers were defined as those who performed well on standardized tests connected to subject content (deMarrais, 2005).

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) signed into law by President George W. Bush in 2001 continued and expanded the examination of local schools by state agencies dependent upon federal dollars (deMarrais, 2005). Labeling NCLB as one example of "performance-based accountability," Bredo (2005) wrote of "outcome measures [that] are used to control funding, support, or other incentives to schools and school systems" (p. 230). The emphasis is clearly placed on the products of public education and not on the process. He analyzed the appeal of such legislation for some people and groups through his discussion of three reasons: 1) educational reform appears easy with its concentration on a simplistic system of rewards and punishments; 2) using standardized outcomes gives evaluation schemes perceived legitimacy in a culture based on "instrumental-rational values" (p. 230); and, 3) it acts as a strong tool to divide the political left, as it also reduces the autonomy of teachers and other school personnel (Bredo, 2005).

In responding to this dilemma and its effects on foundations coursework within teacher education, Bredo (2005) recommends neither a wholesale acceptance of accountability movements nor a complete rejection of them. He wanted to provide an alternative different from "straightforward conformity versus rebellion" (p. 233). He proposed that the discipline craft a central mission with a pedagogy tied to local situations and contexts. Using an interpretive role, social foundations should identify all the elements that under-gird current

educational thought and practice. Employing a critical mode, social foundations would look for problems within educational components that are destructive. And, applying a constructive role would lead to solutions to reform policies and institutions (Bredo, 2005).

"Reconceptualizing" foundations' role within teacher education places educators in this field in positions of mediation (Bredo, 2005, p. 237). Using a service orientation would produce the following results: 1) pre-service teachers would become sensitized to a wide range of perspectives on different issues; 2) they would be able to evaluate the possible effects of these viewpoints through considering varied consequences; and, 3) their actions would reflect this thoughtful process (Bredo, 2005).

Is it possible to re-conceive the discipline of social foundations within this current restricted political environment that will truly assure a viable future for the field? Hill (2006) calls for communication and collaboration between foundations educators and all their related networks to achieve this difficult task. However, contemporary issues seem complex and somewhat overwhelming. Teacher education programs have reduced foundations requirements in order to meet the objectives of NCATE and NCLB and other state-imposed regulations (Martusewicz, 2006; Butin, 2005; deMarrais, 2005; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000). Foundations scholars cannot clearly communicate their content or approaches to make their work relevant to teacher practice. This lack of understanding has led to de-valuing of the discipline by other teacher educators, college of education administrators, and community members (Martusewicz, 2006; Butin, 2005;

Warren, 1998; Pietig et al., 1996). It is also difficult for professors within the discipline to explain to their students how theoretical abstractions connect to daily work with children (Beadie, 1996). These persistent misunderstandings have left others confused and unsure of a valid placement for social foundations within teacher education or colleges of education as a whole.

Analysis of the History

Can an analysis of historical issues within foundations' origins, development, and dispersion lead us to any answers which could inform those within the field of potential solutions? Citing Gibson's (2002) use of the term "perennial criticisms," Hill (2006) uses five categories to critique the history of social foundations within the United States: "(1) relevance to practice; (2) relationship to academic disciplines; (3) faculty; (4) curriculum; and (5) pedagogy" (p. 37). She particularly discusses students' confusion over applicability to practice and their active resistance to foundations content. Examining the political positioning of the field, the social foundations of education is not easily communicated to colleagues or policymakers due to its interdisciplinary nature and breadth of topics. From its origins to the present day, foundations has wavered on its proper location within academia – should it be housed within liberal arts and social sciences disciplines to achieve scholarly acceptance and prestige, or should it be located firmly within education schools to affect the social and political environs of schooling? Faculty preparation

corresponds to the uncertainty of academic locale. Are faculty members in social foundations to major in arts and sciences disciplines, or should they complete the majority of their work in education? Content is widely disparate depending upon the backgrounds of faculty and pedagogy is similarly multi-faceted. Again, it is very difficult to get positive reactions from students when they are being asked to re-form their values according to perspectives outside their norms (Hill, 2006). Although I will make many of the same points that Hill (2006) did in her recent dissertation, I would like to approach my analysis differently.

In addition to viewing the history of the field through its cycles of development and accompanying criticisms, I see opposing ideologies which shape many of the individual and collective situations for foundations professors and programs. A caveat: I realize that constructing dichotomies greatly simplifies the complexity of overlapping factors, but I find it useful for the following discussion. I wish to focus on the periodic and cyclical problems with constructing understandable definitions and purposes for the discipline (Butin, 2005; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; Warren, 1998). As social foundations has wavered in its commitment to social activism versus scholarly pursuits and its integration into teacher education versus insularity within academia, so has the country flopped and foundered in deciding what schooling should be. It is my argument that American society has struggled to wholly conceptualize and operationalize its reasons for educating its children, youth, and adults. From the beginnings of the history of schooling during the colonial era, people have debated its purposes in the development of a new nation (Altenbaugh, 2005). Are we preparing students

for participation and leadership in a democratic society with a representative form of government? Or, are we preparing most people for employment to assure America's industrial dominance in the world (McCarthy, 2006; Altenbaugh, 2005)?

Diametrically opposed political factions have won control of the government during different periods of time. Their leadership has greatly determined the emergence of specific trends in public schooling. For example, consider the "back to basics" curriculum instituted during the 1970s. Preparing students to consider diverse viewpoints and to predict consequences of different sets of actions was sublimated to learning to read, write, and perform basic arithmetic calculations (Best, 1987; Wirsing, 1987). And, schooling for different groups of students perpetuated socio-economic and racial stratifications in society (Kozol, 2005).

The nation's schools have increasingly been controlled through legislation and funding initiatives which forced adherence to particular standards and rules on local and state levels (Bredo, 2005; Butin, 2005; Cochran-Smith, 2005; deMarrais, 2005; Mirci, 2000; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000; Butts, 1993; Wirsing, 1987; Jones, 1976). National and international events also served as catalysts, as American schools have sought to retain a prominent place in global education (i.e. the launching of Sputnik by the Soviet Union in 1957 and periodic national reports of the mediocrity of American schools, such as "A Nation at Risk" in 1983). Social movements focused on addressing inequities for minorities, women, and those with alternative sexual orientations have certainly raised awareness of

differential opportunities and access to schooling (Cozart et al., 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1990, 1996a, 1996b, 2000, 2004, 2005, 2004, 2000, 2006a, 2006b; Martin, 1981, 1982, 1999, 2006; Beauboeuf-Lafontant, 2005; Lea & Griggs, 2005; Naples, 2005; Anzaldua, 2002; Thayer-Bacon, 1998, 2000; Greene, 1993, 1995, 1996; McIntosh, 1989, 1992; Butler, 1990; Noddings, 1990; Collins, 1986). But, they have also divided people into competing factions for attention and resources, particularly as the dominant majority sought to maintain the status quo (Kozol, 2005).

Mirroring the contradictions within our social, political, and cultural educational norms, social foundations has similarly wavered in its purpose in preparing teacher educators. And, even when the purpose was clearly articulated and understood by foundations professors, teacher education colleagues, college of education administrators, and outside groups have not understood its value (Bredo, 2005; Butin, 2005; Beadie, 1996; Butts, 1993).

From its beginnings as a discipline, social foundations have alternated using single disciplinary courses or interdisciplinary courses to deliver content from varied liberal arts and social sciences areas that teachers needed to know. During the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century, the courses were taught separately, as the history of education or philosophy of education. These courses were considered truly “foundational” and they added needed substance to the newly emerging teaching profession (McCarthy, 2006; Butts, 1993). From the 1930s to the 1950s, multidisciplinary courses focused on current social inequities in schooling. They were often developed and taught

collaboratively. During this period, the content was criticized for its lack of academic rigor, which continued throughout the decades as a persistent problem. Divorced somewhat from the traditional academic disciplines, the social foundations of education struggled to regain respectability, as it became more firmly entrenched into teacher education programs (McCarthy, 2006).

During the 1950s, reports indicated that interdisciplinary coursework declined and separate courses were once more in vogue, particularly during the succeeding decade of the 1960s. Prominent foundations scholars, such as Cremin and Bailyn, argued for the return of their subjects within arts and sciences departments to promote enhanced status for the content and the professors who taught it. From the 1970s to the present time, interdisciplinary seminars for teacher candidates became popular once again. They often included strands of foundations content and learning from diverse fields of study. In some institutions, a single undergraduate course in either the history or the philosophy of education has survived intact (McCarthy, 2006).

Preparation of social foundations professors has concurrently wavered between specific subject area concentrations within liberal arts and social sciences disciplines or graduate work completed entirely within colleges of education. Respect from other academicians seemed to directly respond to whether or not the professor was trained and worked within a traditional academic discipline. Education has always struggled within academia to occupy a position of worth based on substantive research. And, social foundations, as part of programs to prepare teachers, has similarly battled criticisms of weak and dispersed

intellectual content, and lowered academic standards for student work (McCarthy, 2006).

Tensions within the profession also led to divided loyalties in presenting content. Professors basically either wished to connect it to "liberal" or "scientific" thinking. During the 1930s, the Kilpatrick Study Group at Teachers College met to formulate commonalities within their separate fields that could be helpful to teachers in understanding the social, political, and cultural contexts of their teaching. And, yet, as early as the 1940s, the faculty at Teachers College divided into two ideological camps: those promoting the relevance of theory to applied skills that could be measured (hence, a "scientific" leaning), and those who continued to promote investigations of the unequal power relationships within American public schooling (a social and political affiliation with liberal thought) (Jones, 1984). One of Butts' primary interests as department head at Teachers College during the 1950s included a strong emphasis on connecting foundations to the practical duties of teaching (Butts, 1993). Although some professors in the discipline continued to emphasize the contexts of teaching as important domains for content for teacher candidates, others focused on scholarly research and publishing within the discipline. During the latter decades of the twentieth century, significant contributions including explorations of race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientations, and other sites of oppression, have infused foundations coursework with calls for social and political activism. However, student resistance to challenging normative standards and the imposition of federal

legislation, such as NCLB, have led to increased marginalization of the social foundations of education (Butin, 2005; deMarrais, 2005; Beadie, 1996).

A return to the central question of the 1990s seems appropriate here: "What makes a good teacher" (Beadie, 1996)? All of the conflicts over preparation of scholars, intellectual locations within academia, content and purposes of foundations courses and work are interwoven with conflicts over the meaning of teaching and learning within our society. Preparation of new teachers (and renewal of and/or additions to professional knowledge for in-service teachers) hinges upon conceptions of the teaching-learning process and what sorts of results are desirable. A philosophical orientation towards cultivating thoughtful and well-informed citizens within a pluralistic society centers on an ideology of connectedness within community. The individual examines her positionality in order to relate well to diverse others. Schooling and expanded educational experiences focus on understanding multiple viewpoints to promote shared decision-making for the good of all. Not accepting "what is" and merely seeking to survive the present realities, it insists upon a vision of "what could be." Interactions of social foundations educators and other teacher educators with prospective teachers spring from philosophical constructions of mutually respectful and connected learning communities. Accounts of some periods of foundations history wholeheartedly support contextualized innovations and experimentation within educational reform efforts. Other eras partially agreed with this paradigm of free-ranging intellectual explorations linked to definite acts of social and political involvement.

In contrast, from the late 1950s through the end of the century and into the new millennium, conservative, technically-oriented, corporate models of education have dominated educational reform efforts. For scholars working today in the field, it seems as if the standards and accountability movements have increased in power and influence, but the history tells of a century of warring ideologies. Even during the progressive era of education, scientific management principles divided groups of people by race/ethnicity and socio-economic class. These distinctions, sometimes tied to intelligence testing, prevailed in determining schooling options (Altenbaugh, 2005). Controversies over theoretical foundations for teacher training versus performance of practical skills have long divided teacher educators (from at least the 1940s onward) (Jones, 1984). Foundations professors have tried to connect abstract notions of educational philosophies to the varied contexts of schooling, emphasizing social, political, and cultural factors which determine educational outcomes. Debates continue over its relevance to teacher preparation programs aligned with state standards and NCATE objectives (Martusewicz, 2006; Butin, 2005; Cochran-Smith, 2005; Dottin et al., 2005; Warren, 1998; Beadie, 1996; Pietig et al., 1996). Teacher education programs, and more definitely foundations professors and coursework, have been marginalized in favor of technical definitions of teacher training and of performance-based assessments of student achievement in public schools (Butin, 2005; deMarrais, 2005; Beadie, 1996).

Written by insiders to the discipline, whose professional well-being depended upon the viability of the field, the history contains a strong undercurrent

of self-promotion (as may reasonably be expected). The defensive tone of much of the writing may be associated with the many actual attempts to limit or omit social foundations from teacher education programs or colleges of education. But, in defending the significance of the work to ourselves, have we basically been preaching to the choir? I think so. Even as I have admitted my "insider" orientation, I have struggled to approach the history honestly and constructively to seek guidance for the future (the future of my own professional opportunities and those of the discipline). And, it seems imperative that foundations professors discover ways to communicate better with diverse audiences (Hill, 2006).

So, what are the consequences of these changes on teacher education programs and foundations coursework in particular? What characterizations of historical and contemporary concerns can elucidate discussions of the viability of social foundations as a discipline and field of inquiry within higher education? I wish to investigate the altered and marginalized state of the discipline using a study of eleven tenured foundations educators currently employed within colleges of education in the United States. This study should uncover elements of similarity and positions of difference within the group and within the historical context of the field. It should also allow the researcher to compare and contrast perspectives from the contemporary scholarly literature with those from professors who are also active and often publishing foundations journals. But, first, I will discuss my philosophical orientations as a feminist scholar working within a cultural studies paradigm.

Chapter Three: Applying a Cultural Studies Perspective to a Study of Social Foundations Educators

Introduction

In proposing my dissertation topic within the social foundations of education, I am cognizant of the complex task of attempting to understand decades of written history and current perspectives. To credibly achieve even a partial and particularly situated explanation of the many intersecting and conflicting forces that shape social foundations today, I choose to frame my arguments in language and ideas coming from several sources. First, work within cultural studies informs my view of society as hierarchial, unequal, and resistant to change (Gaztambide-Fernandez et al., 2004; Sardar & Loon, 1998; Johnson, 1996; Storey, 1996; Wright, 1996; Grossberg et al., 1992). The belief that generally valued knowledge is socially constructed and codified in institutions, such as public schools, compels me to examine the effectiveness of the system and its policies and personnel (and, primarily for this project, the professors who teach our future teachers) (Kozol, 2005; Lea & Griggs, 2005; White et al., 2000; Beall, 1993; Gergen, 1985). Feminist theory adds emphasis on moral issues related to teaching (Hytten, 1998); on listening to the stories and learning from the experiences of diverse individuals (Bloom, 1998); and, on opening even the processes and procedures within research to critique (Bloom, 1998). Scholars who work to merge Cultural Studies and Education help integrate and validate my position as a cultural studies-oriented, reform agent within the social foundations

of education (Lather, 2005;; Magolda, 2001; Hytten, 1998; Casella, 1999). All of these ideas from others' work inform my research which takes the form of a qualitative study. This study incorporates elements from a modified Delphi technique and grounded theory. After a discussion of the theoretical positions described above, the conception of the study and its implementation will close this chapter.

A Cultural Studies Perspective

This section will more fully describe my perspectives as an education scholar and teacher working within a cultural studies framework. I discuss cultural studies as a body of research and writing which contains certain elements and approaches in common, in spite of wide variance in subject matter. These common characteristics, such as investigations of power relationships, the hegemonic nature of societies, and the agency and resistance of oppressed groups to majority norms, support my recognition of cultural studies as possessing a distinctive world-view within academia and beyond. Based upon research into varied confused and contested explanations of cultural studies, I propose a definition which guides my thinking, writing, and actions. I believe that the academic field known as Cultural Studies also exists presently as an interdisciplinary and often multidisciplinary entity within higher education, either in conjunction with another discipline, as in a merger with Education, or as a

theoretical and practical link among disciplines sharing common topics and issues (Storey, 1996; Wright, n. d.). And, in applying critiques from cultural studies' understandings to the qualitative study, I particularly support the informed convergence of Cultural Studies and Education for their mutual benefit, as do many other writers (Lather, 2005; Giroux, 2004; Willis, 2004; Casella, 1999; Hytten, 1998).

A commonly understood ideological premise within cultural studies is the difficulty of assigning a precise definition (Gaztambide-Fernandez et al., 2004; Sardar & Loon, 1998; Grossberg, 1996; Wright, 1996). Part of the problem in constructing a definition can be discovered in the often-stated assertion that cultural studies mean different things to different people (Gray, 2003; Wright, 2001/2002; Hall, 1996). Gaztambide-Fernandez et al. (2004) use wording which constructs this field of inquiry as "an intellectual tradition," as "a scholarly movement," and as "an elusive and roguish field of inquiry" (pp. 1, 2, 4). Grossberg et al. (1996) stress that although cultural studies is "a diverse and often contentious enterprise," the manner in which it is conceptualized and defined does matter. This definition should contain "recurring elements within the field" (pp. 3-4).

The definition embedded in the Cultural Studies program announcement at George Mason University contains many important tenets characteristic of this field of inquiry, such as its emphasis on understanding how meaning arises and is distributed within a cultural group (Cultural Studies, 2007). However, a critical read still notes the omission of politically and socially motivated purposes for

research and distribution of the results. So, I would like to offer the following definition for use within this dissertation: Borrowing from varied sources of knowledge and integrating theory and practice, cultural studies is defined as ongoing, multiple, contextualized investigations into the political and social intersections of cultural practices and their effects on diverse individuals and groups during a particular time and place. It acknowledges internal and external influences and the existence of conflicts inherent within cultural expressions. Scholars in cultural studies accept responsibility for their own biases and positions within the research process. They agree to develop knowledge oriented towards political and social change to promote a more just and equitable society. The goal of cultural studies is to improve the lives of people living in one's own community, whether conceived locally or globally.

With other scholars and educators operating within cultural studies orientations, I regularly seek to understand perspectives different from my own. People volunteering to serve as study subjects differ from the researcher on the bases of many factors, such as cultural backgrounds, racial and ethnic allegiances, and other differences due to age, gender, sexual identities and performances, and experiences. I want to promote an inclusive and holistic attitude towards the pursuit of learning throughout my research process.

Thus, I now view every encounter through the multi-faceted orientations of cultural studies. These perspectives provide me with critical tools for evaluation in educational research. As often represented by a particular data set, the surface aspects of a situation do not represent all the important elements for

understanding events in multiple contexts. The underlying consequences for diverse people become a major focus of any cultural studies inquiry. In my study of social foundations educators, I seek to understand socio-economic, political, and cultural factors relating to not only their current circumstances, but also changes that have occurred during their careers. Using analyses of organizational power structures within colleges of education and education communities will help me to determine the relative influence (or lack thereof) of social foundations educators within their academic and social/political environments (Sardar & Loon, 1998; Johnson, 1996; Storey, 1996; Grossberg et al., 1992).

Cultural studies insist that its researchers investigate the subjects and objects of research to seek evidence of hidden manifestations of power. "Who has power in society [and] how is it created, negotiated, [and] maintained? How can we bring about positive change in this situation? (Wright, u.d., p. 2). Also, individuals in markedly similar circumstances may view the meaning of those situated events differently. Cultural studies was (and is) always looking at wins and losses in terms of the study of hegemony (Storey, 1996).

Hegemony, as originally conceived by Gramsci (Thayer-Bacon & Moyer, 2006; Maxwell, 2000; Storey, 1996), focused primarily on issues of class, but now has been expanded to include gender, race, and diverse areas of contested meanings (Maxwell, 2000; Johnson, 1996; Storey, 1996). In acknowledging the invisibility of social and political relationships that have become institutionalized over time, investigations of hegemony seek to uncover certain unchallenged acceptance of hierarchies of power. The relationships are so deeply ingrained that

people do not often recognize their embodiment in organizations and their intractability. In my study, I examine educational departments and colleges of education to determine if hegemonic structures adversely affect foundations professors and the perceived value of social foundations work in today's politicized environment which stresses adherence to externally-imposed standards within accountability schemes.

I also pinpoint instances of agency within my study, as foundations personnel resist the devaluing of the profession. Activating personal and collective agency is viewed as working in opposition to social and cultural structures to create resistance to the dominant culture (Grossberg et al., 1992). The purpose is to counteract the dismissal of multiple perspectives, needs, and wants of individuals and groups who operate at the edges of mainstream thought and behavior. Investigations into hegemonic circumstances promote revolutionary thought and action. This kind of activism suggests interventions for the betterment of human beings whose previously powerless states keep them in subservient positions (Maxwell, 2000). As Wright so powerfully states: "Cultural Studies originated with the idea of taking seriously the voices of those who had been left out of History, that it provides accounts from their perspectives and takes up their lives and perspectives as equally important to official acts" (Wright, 1996, p. 15). My study seeks to encapsulate examples of agency and resistance which create activism within the social foundations of education. These acts should support not only the well-being of faculty and content, but also promote real changes impacting the lives of teacher candidates and their future students.

A personal philosophical positioning is, of course, interwoven with applying cultural studies questions to educational inquiry. I propose that this field of inquiry has been and is important to know about and to understand for today's scholars and researchers working along diverse intellectual pathways, particularly in areas of public school reform tied to national educational policies. I believe that it is important for cultural studies scholars and practitioners to be able to articulate the critical nature of what we do and why we do it. We must position ourselves as credible members of the academic community, as partners in community enterprises, and as activists and policy-makers who participate in reform programs and efforts. And, to better explain my positionality, I now discuss some personal information which profoundly affects my current philosophical and professional orientations.

Personal Positioning

As an emerging scholar in cultural studies in educational foundations, with some complementary work and interest in feminist theory, I wish to discuss some aspects of my personal and professional experiences that affected my choice of topic. In this manner, my audience/s can better understand my situated arguments and perspectives. I am a Caucasian woman of middle age who is married to my first and only husband of 30 years. He has pursued teaching and educational administration throughout most of his professional career. We have three grown children, all of whom were educated in public schools (albeit an unusually

excellent, highly-accredited, small city system without many diverse elements or people, beyond some socio-economic differences).

Residing primarily in the southeastern United States for the majority of my life, my perspectives and opinions were formed by family, friends, and societal values. Fitting within a meritocratic belief system, school was a successful environment for my solo performances. During my undergraduate education in elementary education at a private teachers college, I especially enjoyed my classes in foundational areas. So, this subject matter has held my interest for several decades.

My dual major in special education focused strongly on behaviorism as an approach for modifying student behavior. At the time, I did not perceive contradictions between thinking about the meaning of teaching and learning and applying rigidly controlled management systems to individual student behaviors. However, recent professional experiences in supervising student teachers and in observing public school conditions have reinforced my current beliefs in the complexity of the tasks of teaching and learning.

Also, doctoral experiences in cultural studies and educational foundations have radically changed my views of others whose lives are different from my own. I am learning to seriously consider diverse ideas and actions within the context of our shared humanity. And, because of recent experiences in inner-city schools and rural schools, both with large populations of low-achieving minority students, I am now an educator who is interested in preparing future teachers for

an increasingly diverse group of public school students whose intellectual, emotional, physical, and spiritual well-being will affect the future of all of us.

To further ground my new philosophical conceptions, I claim a belief in the social construction of knowledge within specific, localized conditions that build on shared social and political norms. These often unrecognized standards for behavior greatly promote unearned advantages for some of us and oppress others. Our relative acceptance in society depends often upon individual and group identity variables outside our individual or collective control. These factors may determine our abilities to succeed in educational and employment settings. Study of the social construction of knowledge influences my thinking about whose knowledge and learning is valued and whose is not. It also forces me to consider the contextual nature of all educational research and outcomes, as well as acknowledgement of the role of language in shaping ideas (Lea & Griggs, 2005; White et al., 2000; Beall, 1993; Gergen, 1985).

I am also re-examining my views of teacher-student interactions to scrutinize the possible consequences of imposing certain classroom structures, standardized content, and assessment techniques. I am learning from many other scholars who also understand themselves as situated persons (Thayer-Bacon, 2000; White et al., 2000; Laird, 1996; Beall, 1993; Osborne & Segal, 1993; Butler, 1990; Rothenburg, 1990; Bordo, 1989). Accepting the social construction of knowledge fits well with both cultural studies emphases on examining social and political contexts for evidence of unequal power hierarchies and with

interdisciplinary investigations into educational theory and practice within social foundations.

The Merger of Cultural Studies And Education

So, how can we mesh theoretical and practical research findings in cultural studies with the need for significant educational reform? How can we recover the relevancy and urgency of social and political activism within cultural studies in education? Casella (1999) asks this same question when he wonders if the "intellectual and creative work done in cultural studies of education can matter …" (p. 107). Hytten (1998) states that cultural studies cannot remain in the realm of intellectual theorizing with little or no connections to changes that truly affect people's lives for the better. It must not simply claim to stand for justice, equity, democracy, and new opportunities for oppressed peoples. The work must transcend studies of popular culture and/or studies imposed on groups of marginalized people to be inclusive and to make a difference in the real lives of human beings. Inequalities based upon differential access affect the meaning of experiences of schooling. This often systematic and pervasive inequity leads to negative outcomes for many people. These outcomes have constrained and still restrict possibilities for the growth of individual, as well as collective, endeavors to raise standards of living and achieve meaningful employment (Casella, 1999; Hytten, 1998).

As only one example of thousands, please consider the situation of my young friend “Aurora.” An African-American child of elementary age, she lives in federally-subsidized housing with her single mother and four siblings. Located within a poorly-funded public school system with unequal opportunities for achievement (many of the middle and upper class students attend private schools), she was born into a family who did not connect to schooling during their formative years. Existing well below the national designation for poverty, “Aurora” eats her meals and snacks at school and during an after-school tutoring program. Her clothing is supplied by a local schoolteacher who has taken an interest in her. Any toys or games she receives and takes home are sold for a bit of extra cash (perhaps critical to the survival of the family).

Yet, “Aurora” exhibits a keen intelligence, an openness to learning, and the personal drive to succeed academically. Outgoing and generally cooperative during the after-school hours, she is shy and withdrawn in her public school classroom, however. She huddles in an over-sized coat, even on warm days. She struggles to focus on the teacher’s instructions and is not often acknowledged within the group. Without adequate exposure to new ideas, opportunities to explore various options, financial and emotional support, good nutrition and healthcare, how will she succeed in her dream to become a teacher? Without excellent teachers within a respected and well-funded school system (which it certainly isn’t at present), who will recognize her abilities and carefully guide her life to constructive outcomes? Will her emotional distress from living in such a

chaotic setting overwhelm her good intentions and ambitions? I don't know and I may never know, but I will always wonder.

A teacher and author who also questions the restricted futures of many children of poverty and of color in the United States, Kozol (2005) writes knowledgeably and persuasively of public school injustice in his book, *The Shame of the Nation*. Kozol exhorts educators, legislators, and community members to truly see the re-segregation of our country's schools and then to care enough to correct it. This writer exposes multiple factors which cause radically different educational experiences and outcomes for the wealthy and the poor within our K-12 systems. Kozol cites both pertinent and damning statistics and adds stories from his many interactions with students, teachers, and administrators to humanize his plea. For example, one high school in New York City has a student population that is nearly 100% Black or Hispanic. A short twenty-minute drive away, the suburban high school has only a tiny population of minority students (1%). The annual spending per student is double in the suburban district to that within the city. Lack of access to preschool education in inner-city neighborhoods; inadequate, crumbling facilities in which to study and learn; poorly prepared teachers who lack experience in teaching diverse students; a frequently-changing faculty due to retention problems; a curriculum that is not "race-specific" or responsive to student needs (p. 273); and, education for limited options within a capitalist marketplace are some of the reasons he discusses for the systemic failures of American schools to educate minority students.

In characterizing the separation of these students' lives as a different world from middle and upper class, White America, Kozol (2005) emphasizes the strict regulation of their school days and the reduced expectations for their academic performances. While actively searching for hopeful instances of productive educational experiences in inner-city settings, Kozol decries the terrible inequalities he found. He sadly but seriously considers Liebell's strategy for asking "for adequate provision," not truly equitable education, for these thousands of students (p. 248). Responding to the current politicized educational environment that imposes standardized testing and narrowly conceived, numeric measures of accountability, Kozol writes: "What these policies and procedures will do, is expand the vast divide between two separate worlds of future cognitive activity, political sagacity, social health and economic status, while they undermine the capacity of children of minorities to thrive with confidence and satisfaction in the mainstream of American society" (p. 284). He urges all of us, whether directly involved in public education or not, to begin work to revolutionize schooling to reclaim opportunities and access for minority students. Opportunities for activism should be found at all levels of schooling, including higher education. Connecting Kozol's evidence with a cultural studies orientation to improve people's lives through challenging existing power structures, I believe that cultural studies scholars striving to achieve educational reform can make some differences within teacher education programs to help diverse students.

Hytten (1998), Casella (1999), and Lather (2005) all write to encourage scholars and teachers in colleges of education and more particularly, within the

realm of foundations, to incorporate philosophical and practical applications from cultural studies to educational research and praxis. They view the two fields, which have been somewhat separated in many institutional arrangements, as forming a natural marriage of interests and activism working towards a more just and equitable society. Lather (2005) wants to emphasize their common bonds in the areas of fluidity or evolution in theory and practice, progressive thinking with innovative outcomes, the necessity of real-world applications, and dual foci on individuals and groups. In focusing on language choice and usage related to education and its influence on the marginalization of individuals and groups, Casella (1999) also promotes facilitating intersections between cultural studies and education. And, Hytten (1998) advocates the fusion of theory to problem-solving within contemporary contexts. She insists upon the centrality of examining ethical considerations through applying issues of "power, agenda, and voice" to educational situations and settings (p. 255).

Hytten (1998) uses Beyer's construct of teacher as moral agent to emphasize the centrality of ethics to inquiries in cultural studies, which is also of particular importance to me. She wants teacher education reorganized into interdisciplinary thematic studies that reject fragmentation of knowledge and emphasis on performance of specific teacher behaviors and skills. Looking at teaching as a series of choices, she stresses the importance of learning to critique present educational practices for pre-service teachers. And, Hytten insists that ideals of social justice, equity, and "civic courage" be integrated throughout the curriculum (p. 255). All of this conceptual work must be applied to practice that is

meaningful and relevant for all participants. All of the practical applications should direct themselves to the construction of pedagogical experiences that free people from situations that continue to privilege some and oppress others. Surely, a democratic education must open avenues into all sorts of opportunities for everyone to realize and maximize human potential. Hytten (1998) expresses many of the thoughts that I have been thinking in recent years, as does Lather in her article discussing the "foundations/cultural studies nexus" (2005).

Specifically targeting coursework in the social foundations of education in colleges of education, which is also the topic for my dissertation, Lather (2005) uses a case study approach in describing one possible merger between social foundations and cultural studies as an evolving, interdisciplinary field of inquiry. Examining the history of this process of transformation in teacher preparation at The Ohio State University, Lather exposes the political and social cultures within this institution that affect the College of Education's ability to define its work and to interact with students. She analyzes the theoretical and practical aspects of the merger during the current era.

From the early 1990s to 2003 (when a doctoral program with a cultural studies strand was integrated into Comparative Studies), the shifting and contested ground of what to do with educational foundations classes was hotly debated by faculty within and outside the College of Education. Finally, adopting a model already in practice at several other universities, including The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, a Cultural Studies of Education program was created. It is now housed within the College of Education at The Ohio State University.

Applying a broad definition of cultural studies that acknowledges critical inquiry, the teacher education program seeks to produce graduates who are capable of constructing meaning through diverse encounters with people, systems, and cultures. They are to analyze and critique their practice in conjunction with theoretical constructions arising from coursework and discussion in traditional areas of foundations, such as the history, philosophy, and sociology of education. Lather seems particularly concerned with recovering the need for and relevance of educational philosophy for teacher training.

In reaction to the new "professionalization" of teaching which has been narrowly defined as a set of technical skills, Lather (2005) connects her arguments to Tozer's work. He calls for "making the philosophical practical and the practical philosophical" (p. 7). She also cites Judith Butler's book, *Can the 'Other' of Philosophy Speak?* to insist that philosophy be re-instated and integrated into teacher preparation instruction, dialogues, and outcomes (Lather, 2005). With this goal of recovering the essential centrality of philosophy of education and other foundations courses to teacher education, this author urges significant connections with cultural studies.

Using recommendations from Wright (2000) and others, Lather promotes several ways that cultural studies could transform social foundations. These ideas are as follows: 1) de-centering educational psychology classes to infuse the curricula with contextualized content from cultural studies; 2) always looking at issues related to knowledge, power, and subjectivity; 3) reformatting research to challenge dualisms, certainty, and grand narratives; 4) reacting and providing

alternatives to the renewed emphasis on scientism; and, 5) learning from the subaltern. To design a viable future for thought and work in social foundations from a philosophical orientation within cultural studies would require significant thought and contributions from many scholars within this combined field of inquiry. This future is what Lather desires to witness. The core of Lather's challenge focuses on moving in positive ways towards a changed future, a task undertaken by Casella (1999) as well.

Other ways that cultural studies can and should influence educational research and practice are discussed by Casella (1999), as he focuses on discourses in education and the significant impact of language on ideas, standards, and interpersonal interactions. Defining discourses as "commonplace ways of thinking about the world that arise from people's everyday language and writing," he uses the work of Foucault as to how truth claims originate from within the language chosen to represent individual and communal beliefs (pp. 112-113). To pursue wisdom from many, intersecting sources of new knowledge, Casella always returns to look closely at underlying meanings embedded in language. Language choices contain elements of power and social control that permit or restrict how knowledge could be made and distributed within a society. Also, this author examines educational discourse within the academy, within communities, and within nations to link language usages and issues of differential amounts and applications of power. Casella scrutinizes the agendas of social manipulation to evaluate outcomes in schooling and effects on students, parents, teachers, and administrators.

In his role as professor, Casella (1999) asserts that it becomes necessary to challenge truths in the form of discourses within classroom dialogues. His conscious actions place students in a confused state of dis-ease with the known and the familiar. To achieve a new sense of balance requires a process of disequilibrium that encourages acceptance or rejection of new ideas from complex understandings of diverse perspectives. These perspectives often originate from people who are different from ourselves and our students. They invoke emotions of fear, distrust, and defensiveness. In my opinion, the cyclical process of causing disequilibrium and consequent periods of equilibrium in students forms the essence of a teacher's work in helping students to construct new learning. This refined knowledge can then be applied to changed behaviors and to a reformation of societal interactions. Thus, I concur with Casella's emphasis on language as an integral component of structures and relationships within a cultural group.

Hytten, (1998), Casella (1999), and Lather (2005) all write to encourage scholars and teachers in colleges of education and more particularly, within the social foundations of education, to incorporate philosophical and practical applications from cultural studies to educational research and praxis. They view the two fields, which have been somewhat separated, as forming a natural marriage of interests and activism working towards a more just and equitable society. In agreement with Hytten, Casella, and Lather, Magolda (2001) also advocates the connectedness of cultural studies and education. However, she presents important critique related to implementing the merger between the two that is valuable to consider.

Magolda (2001) determined an area of omission in the planning, execution, and outcomes of a school reform effort in Ohio. This collaborative effort included personnel from the local university college of education, three diverse public schools in K-12 education, and administrators of a grant. She determined that "border crossing" (Anzaldua, 1999) did not and perhaps could not occur in an effective manner because of lack of understanding of conflicting professional milieus. Also, some parties insisted that schooling and politics are inseparable and other participants wished to construe them as disparate elements. Therefore, philosophical differences emerged that prevented one group from understanding the perspectives of those in the other groups. In spite of efforts by the grant staff to foster collaboration, two groups remained dedicated to enacting their own distinct agendas. Magolda concurred that changing people who work in different educational environments whose central goals and duties are dissimilar is not an easy or quickly achieved task.

Additionally, Magolda (2001) proposes that educators who are "interested in school reform must not only encourage border crossings but they must also provide the border 'crossers' with technical, political, and cultural frameworks to support these efforts" (p. 346). This author's suggestions for improving a collaborative process focuses on several areas: first, she poses the intriguing question as to the value of collaboration; then, she wants all stakeholders involved more fully in the design and implementation of the renewal process; also, she insists that political considerations be recognized within the educational culture;

and, she wants participants to accept differences and areas of conflict while constructing methods to reach consensus.

Magolda (2001) noted some positive outcomes from this grant program. The most important part of this process was the "initiation of dialogues" (p. 354). Several participants resisted interaction unless structured and were not open to new perspectives, but it was a start. Also, she found evidence of risk-taking, some border crossing, and an attempt to establish a democratic learning community. Overall, however, "the inability of the stakeholders to recognize cultural norms that guided their everyday actions and the actions of others was one of the program's most notable, unfulfilled challenges" (p. 354).

As Magolda (2001) painfully discovered, to work towards school reform will take the dedicated efforts of many people, both within public educational environments and within their greater communities. Teacher education programs, and specifically foundations areas, have an important role to play in guiding pre-service and in-service teachers. This guidance should include understanding of cultural norms and how they affect educational access and opportunities that are either present or absent for different individuals and groups of students. It should include actions reflecting consciously-honed beliefs which create democratic learning communities to empower all learners. And, foundations educators must provide models for social and political activism which will encourage current and future teachers to fight for just and equitable schools for every single student. To raise awareness, to generate dialogue, and to help provide solutions for the dilemmas within the social foundations of education are all reasons for my study

of professors who are currently employed in foundations areas in colleges and universities within the United States.

The Evolution of a Methodology

Originally, I planned to use a mixed-design research methodology to countermand the dichotomy of qualitative versus quantitative research (Erickan & Roth, 2006). However, the quest for a suitable approach took a somewhat unusual path. My initial choice of a specific mixed-design research strategy, the Delphi study, was based on an analysis of several studies using this approach (Brill et al., 2006; Pollard & Pollard, 2004/2005; Tigelaar et al., 2004; Chou, 2002; Wilhelm, 2001; Westbrook, 1997; Pollard & Tomlin, 1995, Stahl & Stahl, 1991). Common components of Delphi studies, such as polling experts through several rounds of inquiry and the use of member checking to ensure accuracy of understanding, remained pertinent to my study of social foundations educators.

I faced a dilemma when starting the interpretation and analysis of results from the first round of questioning. I realized that the Delphi technique was not comprehensive enough to offer the kind of structure and guidance that I needed to depict the complexities of the multiple roles and responsibilities of my study group members. And, the use of Likert scales (a usual part of survey instruments constructed in Delphi studies) would not offer the rich descriptions of data that I was seeking. So, the methodology evolved into a qualitative study to organize,

summarize, interpret, and analyze my data. I chose to combine significant elements from both Delphi studies and grounded theory in pursuing my research.

Within Delphi studies, there are important considerations for research design and implementation. From evaluating several examples, I observed some common elements that distinguished them from other methodologies (Brill et al., 2006; Pollard & Pollard, 2004/2005; Tigelaar et al., 2004; Chou, 2002; Wilhelm, 2001; Westbrook, 1997; Pollard & Tomlin, 1995, Stahl & Stahl, 1991). First, the research question focuses on soliciting perspectives from people who are considered experts in their field of study. They may also be widely separated geographically and therefore, they cannot meet for on-going, face-to-face discussions. Sample size in Delphi studies is generally accepted as numbering between 10 and 20 persons. The size rarely exceeds 30 individuals (Delbecq et al., 1975, in Pollard & Pollard, 2004/2005).

My eleven participants are dispersed throughout the Midwest, Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, and Southern states. They are considered experts by virtue of the successful completion of their doctoral degrees and tenure processes within accredited institutions of higher learning. Tenured professors were chosen to ensure a similarity of achievement among the respondents. The tenure process assures their completion of substantial scholarly work, teaching, and service within their distinctive institutions. Also, they have self-identified as scholars and teachers working within social foundations areas. Therefore, they are deemed credible “experts” to poll**.**

I hoped to achieve some diversification in the representation of scholars/educators based on differences in gender, racial/ethnic backgrounds, age, career stages, and experiences. However, particularly within the confines of the qualitative parts of the study, the small sample size necessary for in-depth analyses of the written responses curtailed the amount of diversity achieved. Although differences exist in race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, experiences, and length of careers, these factors did not affect the results (please see “Implementation of the Study” for a more thorough explanation.).

Second, the research question (or questions) is broadly stated to test for common understanding of the word choices and related concepts within a professional setting. Also, the openness of the initial questioning ensures that the researcher is not directing or limiting the parameters of the written responses beyond introducing the general subject for commentary. I introduced three questions during the first round of questioning (please see Appendix A).

After the qualitative components of the Delphi study are initiated through the distribution of one or more generic questions, themes and/or issues generally emerge which provide data for further organization and critique. A five-point Likert scale is then usually applied to each of the major themes and subsidiary statements that emerge through text analysis. The application of numerical scales to extracted themes and issues usually adds the quantitative element to this type of mixed design study. I decided to substitute grounded theory to guide the analysis of data, a decision that was certainly applauded by one of my participants. This person commented that he would have immediately deleted my initial email and

not served as a participant, if I had relied on Likert scales as a simplistic method of reporting data.

Within most Delphi studies, several surveys are sent to participants after the receipt of the written responses to the initial question/s. The panel of experts is asked to consider the evolving group norms each time and to re-rank and justify personal priorities within the materials presented. A third questionnaire, or even fourth, could be sent, if the data is not fully saturated within the first two rounds of surveys. Generally, areas of consensus emerge which form the key elements of the results for the study. Then, a final report that contains analyses of results is sent to all respondents (; Chou, 2002; Wilhelm, 2001: Pollard & Tomlin, 1995; Stahl & Stahl, 1991). I followed this multiple-round format through the use of three rounds of inquiry and my respondents received feedback after each round. They were encouraged to comment on the opinions of others and/or to clarify and expand their own responses.

Conventional Delphi studies using paper-and-pencil instruments have largely been superseded by e-research constructions that combine email with interactive web pages (Chou, 2002; Wilhelm, 2001). Integrating the speed of online communications has greatly increased the efficiency of the Delphi technique. A study that formerly took six to twelve months of time to implement could possibly be completed within a month (Chou, 2002). My timeline of four to six months was very reasonable for the varied types of communications and analyses required for this study.

To ensure confidentiality**,** a critical element in Delphi studies, responses are coded and the principal researcher is the only person to have access to the identities of the participants. Confidentiality is viewed as essential to open the responses to serious critical thinking about the problem without the domination of certain powerful persons, as in traditional discussion groups (Wilhelm, 2001; Pollard & Tomlin, 1995). Stahl & Stahl (1991) cited the equality of participation as a strength within a Delphi study. Each person's responses are valued equally by the researcher, as she respects the contributions of the unique individuals involved. The content potentially remains more on topic and less likely to stray into periphery areas due to researcher oversight. A written consent form was obtained from each person. When specific quotes from any individual were used, written permission was secured from that individual.

Weaknesses of the Delphi technique include certain generally-acknowledged methodological concerns. First, the five-point Likert scale may not contain significantly distinguishable descriptions. Results are often clustered at either the top or bottom of the scale (Wilhelm, 2001; Stahl & Stahl, 1991). The literature review also supports my substitution of a qualitative methodology for the Likert scales and subsequent quantitative analyses.

Also, the quality of the results in Delphi studies is entirely dependent upon the quality of the experts. Thus, a study cannot necessarily be generalized across groups. Results are always tied to the interpretation of the researchers and their abilities to fairly represent both areas of convergence and areas of divergence within the data (Wilhelm, 2001). However, the Delphi technique was evaluated as

useful and valid for situations with unknown or poorly defined parameters to the research question which required the interaction of geographically-dispersed scholars. It was also considered particularly effective at counteracting the bandwagon effect. And, all writers agreed that this approach promoted serious reflection on issues of concern common to the participants (Brill et al., 2006; Pollard & Pollard, 2004/2005; Tigelaar et al., 2004; Chou, 2002; Wilhelm, 2001; Westbrook, 1997; Pollard & Tomlin, 1995, Stahl & Stahl, 1991).

In my reading about applied Delphi technique, little attention was paid to analyzing the words used to craft the initial responses. The studies seemed to center on the quantitative aspects (Likert scale rankings) and ignore the possible importance of specific language choices in the written comments. In my opinion, the qualitative components of the research could have been more credibly utilized to yield significant understanding of content and nuances within the content. Only one article mentioned analysis of content for details and subtle differentiation of meaning (Brill et al., 2006). Thus, I plan to scrutinize the commentary for insights into common and disparate understandings within the field, as evidenced through word choice and usage. To represent the opinions and experiences of my respondents as fairly and completely as possible, I introduced a significant modification of the Delphi technique through the implementation of grounded theory.

Conceived and developed by Glaser and Strauss during the late 1960s, grounded theory seeks to respond to the positivism of quantitative research. This methodology refutes the direct relationship of cause and effect as simplistic and

insists upon the necessary complexities of multiple contextual factors (Moghaddam, 2006; Clarke, 2005; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). It also provides a well-documented, comprehensive approach for engaging in qualitative research (Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Haig, 1995). As Haig (1995) states, grounded theory reacts against the "hypothetico-deductive practice of testing 'great man' sociological theories" (p. 1). Developed as a set of systematic, logical procedures to analyze data within a qualitative paradigm, it is applied to social science research as a way to include participants' perspectives, concerns, and opinions. The methodology has been used in varied disciplines, such as education, nursing, political science, and more rarely psychology (Haig, 1995).

Two recent studies provide examples of thorough and credible applications of grounded theory to educational topics. Harry, Klingner, and Sturges (2005) use concepts from this methodology to discover procedural and contextual reasons for the over-representation of minorities in special education programs and classrooms. And, a study of how authenticity is constructed in teaching exemplifies a successful application of grounded theory to inquiry within higher education which is, of course, the site of my study (Carusetta & Cranton, 2004).

I found that most of the theoretical and methodological approaches in grounded theory are pertinent to the data analysis and interpretation of my participants' responses. The philosophy focuses on the inductive nature of the inquiry and the openness of the researcher to extracting multiple and alternative meanings within the same data set (Moghaddam, 2006; Clarke, 2005; Harry,

Klingner, & Sturges, 2005; Carusetta & Cranton, 2004; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Haig, 1995; Kinach, 1995). Both the resources available to the participants and constraints imposed by societal and material limitations are acknowledged and incorporated as parts of the specific research situations (Clarke, 2005; Haig, 1995).

Usually operating as an "insider" to the field of inquiry, the researcher acts somewhat as a joint participant with the other respondents and acknowledges her assumptions and biases (at least to herself) throughout the research process and during the sharing of results (Clarke, 2005; Harry, Klingner, & Sturges, 2005; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Haig, 1995; Kinach, 1995). Although participants knew my name and my state of residence, I remained somewhat aloof during the study process. I acknowledged my "insider" status as a social foundations student and further divulged some areas of bias in the results discussion in Chapter Four.

Allowing the connections or relationships among respondents and their positions to emerge are keys to the conception and implementation of grounded theory methodology (Moghaddam, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Haig, 1995; Kinach, 1995). The links are discovered through a process of moving backward and forward within the data, a process defined as "constant comparison" by Glaser & Strauss (1967, as quoted by Haig, 1995, p. 57). Using either successive levels of coding or coding as a general technique, all interpretations are considered exploratory and tentative, until the properties and dimensions of the emerging categories become saturated (Clarke, 2005; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). This process is time-consuming and requires the researcher to suspend specific

judgments and closure until the study has been completed. Through conscientious review of the data, I revised my ideas and conclusions several times during the course of the months required for the study.

In addition, the researcher engages in recording “memos” concerning the research journey. These memos record options, omissions, and areas for further questioning through an important procedural element known as “theoretical sampling” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 66). Theoretical sampling allows the researcher to continue to ask respondents for information concerning subjects of interest. The sampling may focus on under-developed comments or opinions, or on omissions in the data, as defined by the researcher. This information is further integrated into the research, which I also conceive as an interpretation of participants’ “voices”, not merely fair representation of the “voices” themselves (Moghaddam, 2006).

The products of the research process always include a written report which can result in the formation of either substantive or formal theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). However, there may also be significant value in the full description of the data set without any claims on the part of the researchers to generate theory (Clarke, 2005). My aim was never the development of theory. My goal was to provide a comprehensive look at conditions in social foundations today to provide opportunities for critical discussion among members of the profession.

Grounded theory is especially considered an appropriate methodology to use within “an arena or social world” that has been traditionally unexplored. With

the exception of the dissertation by Hill (2006) who interviewed teacher education colleagues and administrators but not foundations professors, the social foundations of education have not been investigated from the perspectives of its practitioners since the mid-1980s (Shea, Sola, & Jones, 1986). Using grounded theory to investigate the current conditions within social foundations seems particularly critical considering an absence of such data during the past 20 years.

Changing conditions within a domain may also make it an interesting area to investigate (Clarke, 2005, quoting Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. xxviii). Scholars' writing documenting the devaluing of the social foundations of education as a profession validates my selection of this topic for study at this time (Butin, 2005b; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005). This methodology is often employed to raise awareness of issues within a discipline and to provide a forum for discussion of those issues. It is especially adept at proposing myriad solutions to problems which can improve practice within a theoretically-conceived position (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Please see results of the study in Chapter Four and recommendations in Chapters Four and Chapter Five for thorough discussions of concerns and proposed solutions.

Both Haig (1995) and Clarke (2005) focus on levels of inquiry beyond the individual and/or collective data set. Their work seriously considers abstractions, not only of the concrete and specific, but also of enlarging the vision of the interpretation to include phenomena within the more global situation of the research. And, whether focusing attention on the word, phrase, sentence, paragraph, essay, or whole set of responses, I move conscientiously and creatively

through the words and details to look for both points of convergence and divergence. In thinking through micro-, meso-, and/or macro- levels of involvement and their related historical and narrative discourses, I concentrate on answering Strauss & Corbin's central question: "What is happening here?" (1998, p. 114).

To answer their question, Strauss & Corbin (1998) speak of the "interplay" between one data set and the next. They also emphasize relationships between beliefs and actions and actions and interactions (p. 29). In summarizing all the sources I used to learn more about grounded theory, I propose a concentration on the concept of movement. The researcher moves among the participants and their responses as both a generator and receiver of the questions and commentary. Within a sensitive analytic mode, she fluidly shifts from data set to labeling abstractions and back to data set to more expansive and meaningful interpretations. Also, tentative hypotheses concerning outcomes move into positions of greater or lesser importance as the phenomena within a situation are diagrammed and conceptually linked. The ideas flow from seeking commonalities to acknowledging and placing discrepancies within the overall scheme, model, or theory. Contingencies continue to affect and shape issues which emerge from a specific research situation that is undertaken with cognition of the particular people, places, and time periods of the research. And, movement resides within the researcher, as her knowledge, awareness, and perhaps confusion grow as to the significance or lack thereof of the findings (Clarke, 2005; Bloom, 1998).

Opening the Research Process

Referring to criticisms of qualitative research which focus on its seeming vagueness, Clarke (2005) recommends opening the research process to disclose the perceived successes and failures of the study. Bloom (1998) clearly explains her need to examine methodological choices and their consequences in her book, *Under the Sign of Hope: Feminist Methodology and Narrative Interpretation.* Originally designed to investigate the teaching lives of feminist teachers and administrators in her community, her topic expanded to embrace how questions of methodology impacted her research and the subsequent interpretations of others' narratives. Although she embedded excerpts and analyses of her interviews and conversations with the women in her book, she focused on her increasing fascination with the process of research itself. She analyzed the consequences of her interactions and interpretations on her merged personal/professional identities and included evidence of changes within her participants.

A basic understanding in Bloom's feminist stance includes emphasis on the nature of multi-faceted relationships between the researcher and her participants (1998). Claiming that feminist theory rejects an objective distance found even in many examples of qualitative studies, Bloom insists that feminist researchers must acknowledge and learn from the complexities and difficulties of extracting personal narratives as research data and recognize the "nonunitary subjectivities" within themselves and their research participants (1998, p. 2). Shaped by language and discourse, as well as through personal histories and

social/cultural contexts, multiple identities emerge within the researcher and the participants, as part of their interchanges.

Very similar to the "constant comparison" procedure developed by Glaser & Strauss, Bloom uses repeated "forwards and backwards" interpretations of the material over a period of time. Applying Sartre's Progressive-Regressive Method, Bloom studies her own reactions and her participants' responses to deepen the richness of the findings (Sartre, 1960, 1963, as quoted in Bloom, 1998, p. 64). She also recognizes the different social positions within her participants and their conscious and/or unconscious representations of diverse identities. Through examining their renditions of certain key events in their lives with revised meanings created by later experiences, she theorizes about and documents the evolving development of teacher identity that includes both personal and professional aspects of self-in-relation-to-others. These women negotiate avenues of power and control within constrictions imposed in their respective educational settings.

Bloom also focuses on the power differentials between researcher and "subjects," a term she never used in reference to her own participants. She acknowledges the traditionally conceived structure of the dominance of the researcher in controlling aspects of the research process. The researcher initiates the contacts, determines the length and often the direction of the sessions, and then, either validates or subverts the respondent's expressions, opinions, and experiences. The researcher generally operates from societal positions of greater

economic security and educational advantages. While controlling the progress of the research, she could stop it at any time.

However, Bloom acknowledges the position of some feminist researchers who often move from strangers to co-investigators to friends. Within this interactive and shared setting, the power hierarchy may be somewhat equalized or minimized. For example, Bloom employs strategies used by other feminist researchers in asking for feedback about sessions during subsequent meetings. She incorporates revisions of the content through allowing participants to read and correct transcripts and interpretations of the interviews. She asks open-ended, generic questions to elicit responses that were directed by the people answering the questions. And, she explores gathering data through informal conversational exchanges that included her own disclosures, as opposed to remaining an unknown entity to the respondents. Thus, she attempts to collapse the separation between the knower and the known to add the distinctive voices and critiques of her community educators.

In one instance, Bloom (1998) realized that her own power was compromised and the research constricted through a relationship with a person whose professional status and experience outstripped her own. She lost control of the process and the conversations in her need to be validated by her respondent. In learning that power flows are not unidirectional, Bloom found the research process to be complicated by personality characteristics, interpersonal misunderstandings, normalized expectations of how people behave in research settings, and her expectations of alignment on the basis of gender alone.

The most valuable aspects of this study emerge from Bloom's revelations about herself during the research process. Through significant and repeated episodes of self-disclosure, she purposefully diminishes her position as academic expert and informed investigator and becomes a joint participant in the research process. She takes responsibility for the outcomes of her study and openly writes about her successes and her disappointments. Although her participants represented their interactions as positive learning experiences that generated either enhanced self-understanding or enlarged perspectives of others' feelings and experiences, this author admits being unsure of the lasting emotional consequences of the study, for herself or for the others involved. And, she admits her failures within some of the research relationships and states her desire to better conduct meaningful research in the future. Bloom encourages others to learn from her mistakes and to continue feminist inquiry into the conception and practice of teaching. Specifically, she admits the limits of her own understanding of the effects of intersecting factors, such as race, gender, and sexuality. She learned first-hand a premise of her mentor that "research needed to go wrong in order to be repaired" (Britzman, as quoted in Bloom, 1998, p. 83).

Bloom's work (1998) acts as a cautionary tale in at least one important respect. In communicating with study participants, it is possible to lose oneself as the researcher within a web of relationships that may have both positive and negative ramifications. Although the interchanges are enriching to the novice, she must take care not to forget the purpose of her study while perhaps forming

professional friendships. For the duration of my study, I intend to remain somewhat unknown within collegial online interactions.

In implementing my own research, I also hope to remain open to faithfully examining the material without imposing many of my own assumptions about the field of the social foundations of education. If I discover that my personal stances are impacting the direction and interpretation of the results, I plan to divulge my position with regard to specific issues. I will allow the participants to speak for themselves through the use of quotes. I will check the veracity of my accounts through cycles of feedback during the multi-stage process. I will look for indications of social, cultural, political, and economic forces that are affecting both the rewards and challenges of foundations work in the early twenty-first century. Although I will interpret responses using the perspectives of cultural studies and feminist theory, I also plan to allow the relative importance of these factors to emerge through the research process from respondents' concerns and comments.

Implementation of the Study

To begin the study, I designed three general[1] questions for consideration by the study participants. These questions focus on current roles and

[1] I stressed connections with varied stakeholders in question one. In directing participants to consider the quality of their diverse relationships as they explained their current roles and responsibilities, I guided respondents to include this analysis in their responses. I purposefully did not construct this question as broadly-stated as it could have been otherwise.

responsibilities as social foundations educators; changes in roles and responsibilities over the courses of their careers; and, recommendations for strengthening the positions of foundations educators within their academic settings and larger communities (please see Appendix A).

I believe that these questions encouraged social foundations professors serving as study participants to carefully and sensitively critique their work and its meaning for themselves and their students, colleagues, and community members. In fact, several respondents wrote to me about the thinking and analysis they undertook while engaging with the study. For example, one response stated: "… your study gave me the opportunity to critically think through where we are as a profession" (#10).[2] Also, contextualizing changes that they have experienced helped assess the impact of social, political, and economic forces on the profession. Using multiple perspectives arising from their educational and experiential backgrounds, these educators added their insights into its current dilemmas and predicted future courses of action.

After receiving responses to the first round of questioning, I compiled a Round One Report which was sent to all participants (please see Appendix B). Consisting of bullet points arranged in categories, study group members could comment on the opinions expressed to date through clarifying their own answers or agreeing with or challenging the responses of others. At this point, I did not divulge my initial coding process or relay my internal memos seeking connections

[2] I received permission from the eleven participants to use direct quotations from their commentary within the dissertation. The numbers 1-11 were randomly assigned to the members of the group and the associated number assigned to each individual will appear at the end of each quote.

among the data. Rather, I tried to avoid premature analyses and present preliminary findings in reasonable groupings for further critique.

Reactions to the Round One Report generated areas of consensus or disagreement. For example, one participant acknowledged the integration of student aspirations and experiences in teaching after reading others' comments concerning this aspect of the work. As a few people emphasized strongly that reduced funding is a critical problem for the continuation of the discipline, I decided to poll the entire group concerning this issue.

Next, respondents received instructions and questions for Round Two of the study (please see Appendix C). Applying theoretical sampling to the material received during Round One, I located several issues that needed further explication (including the funding issue mentioned above). These concerns are either ones that emerged as important areas of conflict for the majority of the participants, or as ones of significant interest to some members which were not discussed fully by the others.

In selecting these issues, my role as the researcher became more prominent. Using my knowledge of the discipline and its historical and contemporary issues, I tried to fairly and intelligently discern issues needing further discussion. However, I acknowledge my influence in making these choices. The questions for Round Two centered on the following areas: 1) a dichotomy in the conception of the teaching/learning process (teaching as an intellectually/theoretically constructed pursuit versus teaching as mastery of skills evaluated by performance criteria); 2) questioning the continued existence of

social foundations as a unique and recognizable discipline within departments and colleges of education; 3) multi-faceted aspects of funding problems, such as money for faculty positions, availability of funds for qualitative research, and funding for participation in national accountability organizations (i.e. NCATE); and, 4) predictions concerning the survival of the social foundations of education in higher education in the twenty-first century.

During Round Three of the inquiry, study members read and critiqued a summary of all findings to date. These results were organized either in bullet points or in narrative form and contained detailed information about agreement or disagreement arising in different answers to the study questions. The respondents were asked to evaluate the researcher's accuracy in transmitting their opinions into categories within a single document. They could also respond one final time to the commentary submitted by others.

The wealth of information gleaned through three rounds of inquiry from these eleven persons overwhelmed the scope of a study for a single dissertation. I selected pertinent parts for inclusion, as prominent themes began to emerge. Also, suggested pedagogical strategies for the social foundations are not included in the dissertation. They could form the basis for a journal article at a later date.

Demographic and Personal Information

I did not choose to gather personal and demographic data until Round Three of the study. I wished to examine the commentary without significant

knowledge of characteristics which could possibly influence my reading of the data. I had previously met one of the participants, but the others were unknown to me. I could guess gender according to names, but I was not aware of their preferred designations until personal data were collected. Also, I did not divulge any personal characteristics to my respondents, except my name and general geographic location. After Round Three results were completed, I did briefly meet three others in the group at the AESA 2007 annual conference in Cleveland, Ohio.

During spring semester 2007, sixteen people signed the consent forms to participate in this study. These volunteers responded to invitations which were posted on two professional listservs: that of the American Educational Studies Association (AESA) and that of Research on Women in Education (RWE), a Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). They identified themselves as tenured professors working in accredited colleges of education within institutions of higher education.

Eleven of the sixteen foundations educators responded to questions concerning their work. The other five people chose not to continue with the study for varied professional and personal reasons. The sample consists of four women and seven men. Ranging in age from 43 to 79, the mean age is 59. The oldest person described himself as a "senior." I estimated his likely age from his undergraduate graduation year. I did not discover many correlations between the ages of the participants and their attitudes or opinions. However, the number of years of professional experience within social foundations does affect the degree

of optimism or pessimism with which my study members seem to view the future of social foundations. I will discuss this finding in greater detail in Chapter Four.

The amount of professional experience in the sample group ranges from six years to more than thirty-seven years. The participants are currently located in universities in nine states – five from the Midwest, one from the Northeast, one from a mid-Atlantic state, and two from Southern states. All but one of the eleven universities are public institutions.

According to the 2004 Carnegie Classifications, the universities range in size from enrollments of approximately 10,000 to 45,000 students. Nine have "high" to "very high" to "majority" populations of undergraduate students who are enrolled full-time. Two universities serve higher percentages of graduate students, with one institution serving them full-time and one on a part-time basis. Nine of the eleven use "selective" or "more selective" admission standards. Nine of the eleven have high rates of transfer students and seven organizations are listed as residential in nature. Six universities are ranked as having "high" research activity levels. Three are ranked with the research designation "very high." Two institutions were not rated in terms of research levels. These two universities are also "medium" in size, as opposed to the rest which are labeled as "large." And, finally, with one "doctoral research" university, six "research" universities, and two "large master's programs," the remaining two of them are primarily viewed as undergraduate institutions (Carnegie Foundation, 2007).

Two respondents have changed professional positions since the beginning of the study – one has accepted a promotion and the other moved to a different

university. For the one person who changed geographic locations during the study, I used the current affiliation as of September 2007. For the one retired respondent, I used the university where he worked for many years.

Nine of the eleven people still working within the social foundations of education are employed in full-time positions. Their ranks include two emeritus professors (the retiree and the part-time teacher), two full professors, four associate professors and three assistant professors.[3]

Because of my academic background in cultural studies and feminist theory, I actively sought differences in opinions that could possibly be attributed to diverging personal characteristics, such as class, gender, race/ethnicity, age, sexual orientation and performance, religious beliefs, political affiliations, and other factors. However, very few responses include attention to any of these aspects of people within societies. It was difficult to assess the relevance of demographic descriptions to professional employment. Several categories of less significant personal characteristics are summarized in Appendix E.

However, two people discussed their sexual orientation in relationship to their work as social foundations educators. A person labeling himself as "queer" serves as an advisor for the student campus organization which serves students with non-heterosexual orientations. A "heterosexual" male represents aspects of diverse students on his campus. He stated: "I am straight and of course, this does affect my work and professional relationships. Most specifically, it gives me

[3] The term "professor" is used interchangeably with the terms "participant," "respondent," "study member," and "contributor." It does not denote academic rank.

freedom to [express myself with] more acceptance from students; it is safer" (#5). For the majority of my participants, the most significant aspects of diversity awareness and pluralism in American society were embedded in their discussions of their teaching, a finding which will be fully developed in Chapter Four.

Seven of eleven people had experience teaching in K-12 public schools prior to becoming foundations educators. Two also served as school administrators and in school district office positions. Three who did not teach in public schools worked internationally with projects linked to social justice agendas. For example, one person worked with adult education literacy projects and infrastructure development overseas. Four people served in other departments or capacities within higher education prior to connecting with positions in the social foundations of education. When comparing terminal degrees, ten participants hold the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Education. One person earned the Doctor of Education degree.

With the paucity of commentary dedicated in any significant way to personal and/or demographic data (other than answering the specific questions related to their personal differences that I asked during Round Three), I conclude that professional identities within my sample group seem rooted primarily in their self-identifications as social foundations educators. Multi-faceted work as professors within higher educational settings seems to be defined separately from most personal characteristics. I surmise that who these professors are as individuals does matter in their classroom and professional interactions. However, they did not choose to integrate many significant or even minor aspects of their

personal identities in answering questions concerning their professional roles and responsibilities.

Summary

Chapter Three explains my philosophical and theoretical perspectives stemming from cultural studies and feminist theory which affect how I view the research process and results. I discuss personal characteristics and experiences which inform who I am as a researcher. And, using contributions from feminist theory, I consider ideas promoting the appropriateness of merging cultural studies with educational research, as ways to capture the complexities of social, political, and cultural contexts related to educational dilemmas. I also explain my choices of methodologies, the Delphi study and grounded theory, and their suitability to my study. After explaining the steps I took to implement the study and the demographic and personal information concerning the sample, I am now ready to focus on study results in Chapter Four.

Chapter Four: Social Foundations Professors Speak

Introduction

This study of tenured professors working within the social foundations of education investigates their multi-faceted roles and responsibilities within colleges of education within the United States. I particularly wish to encapsulate some of the complexities of their professional lives, focusing on relationships with diverse groups of people, including students, colleagues, college administrators, and community members. Also, the study looks at changes in roles and responsibilities during the careers of the participants. Examining underlying socio-economic, political, and cultural factors arising from the responses, I contextualize the situations of their employment, noting both successes and challenges within these descriptions. I use their predictions for the survival of the discipline to conclude my analysis of current and changing conditions within the discipline of social foundations of education.

Through careful analytical work moving backwards and forwards within the data and from thinking about significant areas of emphasis within the responses, I discovered two over-arching themes that seem to illumine and organize my research findings. The first theme centers on matters relating to the compromised identity of foundations personnel and content within colleges of education, university settings, and within their greater communities. The second theme focuses on the issue of connectedness. I propose that a direct relationship

exists between the absence of a clearly articulated disciplinary identity, the inconsequential number and quality of influential relationships, and the subsequent devaluing of social foundations' value within teacher preparation programs and beyond. A most poignant plea that illustrates the theme of identity crisis is worded in this manner: "Is it too late to revive the label 'social foundations'" (#2)? Another person states: "Clearly there is a feeling of a lost or nonexistent identity that we cannot recover or realize" (#4). A third participant writes: "… a common language within social foundations is needed first; [I] suggest a 'lingua franca.' It's tough being a theorist in a field that prides itself on having no general theory. Such fragmentation tends to make us each other's worst enemies" (#4).

In responding to a dearth of collaborative projects reported within the colleges of education, the universities, and the local schools among the study group members, one professor writes: "I'm surprised that only 3 out of 11 of us have connections with public schools. I do extensively both as a community-embedded site for my students' learning and as part of my service work in stimulating urban teacher preparation …" (#3). A few participants urge that foundations faculty remain socially responsive, active community members, although this concern was not expressed by the majority of the group. Yet, I believe that missed opportunities for cooperation through networking have isolated foundations professors and led to the marginalization of the discipline within colleges of education today.

Prior to applying the themes of identity and connectedness to a rich description of current roles and responsibilities, I locate all of the results from the study within a greater philosophical issue concerning the construction of teaching and its related purposes for education in a democratic society. The political, social, and cultural divisions between the teaching/learning process as an intellectual pursuit and its definition in management terms to produce skilled workers for the state inform many aspects of decision-making within teacher education programs that ultimately affect social foundations.

Language/Discourses: The Theoretical versus the Practical

Tensions over reforms in curricula and programs within education today are predicated upon decades of historical disagreements about the purposes and outcomes of teacher education programs (McCarthy, 2006; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; Warren, 1998; Beadie, 1996; Jones, 1984). Do students need to understand the historical development of the field, with its multiple and diverging philosophies and practices? Or, do they need content knowledge in specific subject areas and skills in managing and evaluating students? Or, is a combination of both sets of priorities advisable? Acknowledging the longevity of this debate, one professor comments: “Educating someone to think as well as to teach and training someone to teach has been/is an interesting bone of contention. Historically, countries have always sought to control the education of teachers;

see Horace Mann's trip to Prussia's teacher training institutes in the 1840s. They became the models for our teacher training programs" (#8).

Another person views this tension between the theoretical and the practical as a good thing and promotes a balance between the two approaches. College of education faculty at this institution are currently engaged in inquiry with arts and sciences faculty and with area public schools to bridge gaps between intellectual conceptions of education and the realities of teacher licensing requirements. This college of education seeks to constantly improve curricula to address this seeming dichotomy, including the development of a new degree program.

However, in other locations, the ability of social foundations coursework to satisfy accountability requirements is questioned, as both current and former deans are reported to hold anti-intellectual stances. One report states that the current dean respects statistical policy research only and holds an accountability, pro-No Child Left Behind (NCLB) focus. Also, comments from two participants indicate that intellectual posturing and superior knowledge claims from some foundations faculty alienate colleagues in teacher education programs. Internal problems persist with the perception that the discipline is composed of an intellectually-based, caring, politically-correct elite. As one person sardonically writes: "We are the progressive ones who REALLY care about kids and have good politics" (#5). This person recommends that foundations personnel focus on collaborative efforts with persons and groups who will also value the perspectives of the social foundations of education.

The continual analysis of multiple conflicting factors within decision-making processes make foundations professors "a thorn in the side of administrators" (#2) and further alienate them from colleagues. "I feel that we do need to demonstrate that we can do more than critique, that we can contribute to change in schools and children's lives" (#2). However, a few of the educators seem to want the social foundations to be respected in academia without constantly addressing concerns over relevancy, practicality, and community connectedness. They seem to be relying upon its traditional placement and long-held value within education schools. For example, one professor "sees [social foundations'] strength in knowledge creation, not advocacy" (#7).

Three others definitely think that foundations scholars and organizations should directly address how this disciplinary content and perspectives help teachers in highly relevant and practical ways. They advocate recognizing that teaching-to-standards to meet accountability measures represents a popular and powerful intellectually-constructed theoretical position. To engage with the accountability movement is to resist co-optation of foundations content and to help retain its viability for students. A comment from one person states: "I never bought into the theory/practice split" (#11). Two professors recommend speaking in the "language of practice even when discussing theory," as a way to connect to teacher education personnel (#1, #5). Yet another respondent writes that the seeming dichotomy between theoretical and practical conceptions of teaching is symptomatic of systemic contradictions within our systems of schooling and

society. The reformation of modern American society, and education as a consequence, should change how people are educated and for what reasons.

So, within the context of this on-going debate about the purposes and meanings of the teaching/learning process, I describe current roles and responsibilities, as reported and [4]debated by my participants during the three rounds of inquiry within the study.

Roles and Responsibilities within the Colleges of Education

The two questions I seek to answer through examination of varied social, political, and cultural factors related to both historical and contemporary contexts are:

> **Question one:** How have the roles and responsibilities of the social foundations of education changed from the 1970s to the present?
>
> **Question two:** How have changes in areas, such as internal and external understanding of the discipline, work with students, relationships with colleagues, and professional opportunities, impacted social foundations scholars/teachers?

Later in this chapter, I focus on the answers that my study group provided to these two questions. I merge the responses citing specific changes and the related societal factors and effects into the same section of the discussion. However, before addressing my study questions, I summarize my participants' views of their current positions as scholars, teachers, service providers, and

[4] The debates were conducted anonymously through examinations of data, not in direct communications among respondents.

colleagues within their university settings. The definitions of their present roles and responsibilities, in conjunction with analyses focusing on the themes of identity and connectedness, serve as foundational understandings for examining reported changes during the courses of their careers (please see Appendix A).

As described by study participants, aspects of their current roles and responsibilities that are most pertinent to their conception of themselves and their work focus on the following areas: 1) teaching and relationships with students; 2) practicing as foundations specialists or generalists; 3) departmental locations (and the social foundations of education as a subsumed discipline within these placements); and, 4) miscellaneous duties associated with employment and service in higher education. Issues related to a perceived lack of funding and its impact on foundations professors bridges the sections between current situations and experiences of change.

Teaching and Relationships with Students

In answering the question concerning current professional roles and responsibilities (please see Appendix A), ten participants focus on the role of teacher first and in the greatest detail. They discuss the following issues in relation to their teaching: 1) the number of courses taught; 2) philosophical teaching and learning perspectives; 3) purposes for teaching; 4) personalizing

coursework to match student characteristics; 5) multiple roles they adopt with students; and, 6) challenges in working with students.

One person initially and very briefly mentioned the administrative role of department head. This person aligned the teaching choices and the extent of teaching per semester within that context. However, major emphasis was placed on teaching as central to the identities of social foundations educators. Especially considering the seven institutions that are currently ranked as having "high" or "very high" levels of research activity, this concentration on the teaching and learning process and interactions with students seems to be highly significant, as no other roles or responsibilities received this level of attention or consensus. In responding to results from Round One reported during Round Two, one person reacted similarly in these terms: "I think [the emphasis on teaching] reflects a strong belief in the importance of our teaching purposes, sometimes prior experiences as teachers, concerns for our students' future students, [and] maybe just a disposition among us" (#3).

Participants reported teaching seven undergraduate courses and ten graduate courses collectively. The retiree is not currently teaching and one person who serves as an administrator did not discuss a specific teaching load. The classes vary in size from small group seminars to a very large class with 100+ students per term. Only two of eleven professors reported teaching content online, with three others reporting the use of online communication sites for course management. There appears to be a distinct preference among study contributors for face-to-face communications with students.

Constructions of teaching are located within varied philosophical perspectives, such as critical theory, critical race theory, constructivism, feminist theory, and dialogic teaching based on a Freirian model. However, six of eleven respondents embed their purposes for teacher/student interactions within conceptions of democratic education within a pluralistic society. One person notes that "[he] is definitely one of the democratic educators on staff …" (#4). A colleague remarks: "The over-riding purpose that frames this course is 'what does it mean to educate for democracy?'" (#6). As another typical example, a participant comments: "I focus on the role of schooling and education in a democracy through the exploration of historical, philosophical, political, and socio-cultural contexts …" (#1). As I noted similar wording and concepts among these responses, I summarized some common purposes they give for their teaching which include: 1) encouraging students in their professional growth as they enter the teaching profession, or as they seek greater understanding through graduate study; 2) engaging in dialogue as a key element of a shared learning environment; and, 3) promoting critical inquiry of self and others in relation to diverse socio-economic, political, and cultural experiences of schooling. Another professor states: "My relationship with students inside and outside of class is dialogical … I draw their previous knowledge and experiences, as well as their future professional goals and aspirations, into class discussions and encourage them both to critique and build upon these through working with course materials" (#3).

Three of the six "democratic" educators refer directly to the Council of Learned Societies' Standards for Academic and Professional Instruction in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies (CLSE Standards) which promotes the use of "interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives" in social foundations coursework (1996, p. 4). Creating meaningful understandings of content (which could and should be applied to reflective teaching practice) are encouraged through explorations of multiple contexts. The collaborative nature of teaching and learning within a mutually respectful, collegial atmosphere is also emphasized. Understanding the organization of schools within varied contexts and working to improve educational equity through social justice activism are stressed here. "The challenge is to expand the vision of mostly white, mostly successful students, to understand the ways in which the world views of others differ from their own, and the consequent ways in which the school experience is different for different social groups" (#5).

As I understand the CLSE Standards, they were developed for use by foundations educators nationally as a way to unite professionals in the discipline and to promote communication of foundations' missions to others. I am puzzled as to why only three of the study participants mentioned this central guiding document. I surmise that unequal adoption and utilization of these standards provides another indication of the fractured nature of the discipline. Not discussing CLSE Standards, but a general opinion that supports my view is one from a study participant: "… we need to aim for syncretism rather than eclecticism. The latter approach, on which any idea from any relevant discipline

might prove useful … just makes us look like we have no idea what we are doing. Syncretism … requires of us that we identify the sorts of methods and concepts from relevant disciplines that are the ones we say are of most importance. Once we can do that, respect within academe will be achievable" (#4). And, I propose that the CLSE Standards could provide the "lingua franca" desired by one professor quoted earlier in the study.

Three contributors are actively involved in urban teacher education programs and another person noted the current connections between social foundations and multicultural education. Several of them spoke of the purpose of foundations content in linking theory with the improvement of teacher practice. Two mentioned explorations of the hidden curriculum in schooling as key content within social foundations classes. One person expressed that this discipline is "respected as a base upon which teachers construct their professional knowledge" (#1). And, another person acknowledged work with students as a significant element in his professional growth related to on-going research and writing.

Also, participants focus on personalizing coursework through incorporating the previous knowledge and experiences of the students. They often align assignments with students' individual professional goals and career aspirations. A teaching approach that pointedly challenged students' thinking and normative stances is expressed in this manner: "My purpose in teaching is to disorient and confuse students and make their boxes larger, even if they are not [yet] thinking outside the box." This professor presents alternative visions of education and seeks to expand students' ideas of the possibilities of schooling.

The goal is for students "to know less at the end than at the beginning" (#5). In vehemently reacting to this comment, another respondent wrote: "I find this a very dangerous approach to the field. Call it Socratic pride if you like. It is this obscurantist brinkmanship that contributes to the marginalization of the field among our colleagues, but more importantly by and among our students. "Teachers want practical advice and perpetuating the myth or pretending that social foundations cannot offer it is minimally off-putting and maximally a doomsday strategy for our discipline" (#4). As this response was written during Round Three of the study, participants #4 and #5 did not have opportunities to continue their discussion of the differences in their perspectives. These seemingly disparate notions of disciplinary mission were discussed in the section concerning "intellectual" versus "practical" tensions within the discipline.

One professor adds the use of theoretical perspectives from cultural studies to those from the history and philosophy of education to teach students through historical analysis, textual analysis, and cultural analysis (emphases very similar to my doctoral program). And, in examining the construction of identities formed through schooling experiences, four professors focus on socially-constructed aspects of people, such as race/ethnicity, class, gender, and sexual orientations.

Additional roles in relating to students are distinctive to the contributor and the setting and are labeled somewhat individually. Three people write of their sheer enjoyment of engaging with students during class and out-of-class. Several people serve as academic, professional, and personal advisors, counselors, and/or

mentors for current and former students. One person acts as a "fixer" and a "change agent" within the department to expedite students' pathways through academic hierarchies (#5). Also, several serve as guides and one considers being a role model to be important. One professor views acting as a spokesperson for pre-service and in-service teachers as intimately linked with advocating educational access and opportunities for diverse students in K-12 public school settings.

It is evident from responses related to teaching and student interactions that the core identities of social foundations professors are intact. These people have a sense of dedicated mission and approaches, content and resources that they value using with students. They define multiple roles for their interactions within the learning environment and find their greatest gratification overall within teacher-student interactions. As one participant comments:

> " … you have been able to bring together a diverse group of professionals who voice a wide array of thoughts about Social Foundations, Colleges of Education and Higher Education. I was/am impressed with their dedication and grasp of internal rewards – they are dedicated. Regardless of their specific views, it is noteworthy that they collectively have asked the right questions and are searching for the right answers. … What I re-learned from your group is they see themselves involved <u>within</u> Social Foundations - as if it is an exclusive reality set within/beside/beyond other exclusive realities. … I learned that issues are free of disciplinary ownership. They can be defined and presented by the academy – and, that disciplines (including Social Foundations) are free to join the conversation accordingly" (#7).

Perhaps the primary identification as a social foundations educator promotes a strong sense of commitment to the discipline and its multiple tenets. It is an identity that appears clearly understood by those involved in the field. But, it may

also isolate its practitioners from active communication and collaboration with colleagues.

Remarks indicate that most of the study group would agree that "the rewards are in human relations" (#7). However, professors also express concerns and challenges in interacting with students. Teacher education candidates are generally white, middle or upper-middle class people who have been fairly successful in school. This finding is identical to that found within the historical analysis in Chapter Two. Many still wish to "fit in" with their peers and are reluctant to consider new and different ideas. Socially, economically, and culturally, they do not match the characteristics of the students whom they will be teaching. They have problems connecting with foundations content related to diversity and social justice issues and are often content with current social, political, and cultural norms. Several respondents stated that many students may view segregation as normal and as desired by members of different groups. They have difficulties in recognizing and accepting hegemonic elements of laws, policies, and societal standards. Again, the perception of several participants is that students learn to speak correctly about diversity and social justice issues in a classroom environment without incorporating many lasting changes into their belief systems or behaviors. However, other participants commented that some students seem truly interested in investigations into educational and societal reform.

Also, it can be difficult for students to engage deeply in critical thought and analysis expected in foundations courses. Academic dishonesty is viewed as a

serious problem in at least three locales. One professor endeavors to use these instances as learning opportunities for students. Several professors report that students complain about grades, content, the amount of work, attendance policies, and methods of instruction. In balancing concerns about student attitudes and behaviors, one respondent openly acknowledges the complexity of students' lives: 1) balancing work, family and education; 2) financial concerns (including rising cost of tuition); 3) health problems and lack of access to insurance; and, 4) insufficient academic preparation for the demands of the programs. Another professor states that the complexity of the material utilizing both micro- and macro- views can be overwhelming for beginning students. "Finding that meso-level of the organization in which they will do their work and exercise most of their power seems to be the key" (#2).

After comprehensive and thorough discussions of teaching and student issues, professors briefly outlined administrative duties associated with teaching. These responsibilities generally include: 1) selecting readings; 2) compiling course readers; 3) developing syllabi; 4) coordinating and evaluating instruction by non-tenure track faculty and/or doctoral students; 5) participating in team-teaching situations; 6) revising curricula (either independently or as part of departmental committees); 7) serving as committee members for doctoral students (3 of 11 participants); and, 8) evaluating the academic work and performances of undergraduate and graduate students. For three respondents, supervising field experiences for students is also mentioned as a substantial part of their responsibilities.

Recommendations related to teaching focus on curriculum reform and program development within social foundations. These suggestions center upon examining the place of the core in teacher education programs and especially, the role of foundations within the core. Within a faculty, one person proposed that faculty use a "self-initiated and collaborative curriculum development process, inside accountability and quality control [measures], and develop guidelines for NTT [non-tenure track] faculty who teach courses" (#3). A note of hope focuses on a plan at one university to develop a set of concentrations for varied graduate programs, which will include the social foundations of education as one option. Faculty will be encouraged to develop courses in their areas of interest. And, yet another professor suggests a pragmatic approach to foundations work which centers on "developing exemplary solutions to problems of pedagogy" – use these "puzzle-solutions" tied to varied methods of inquiry" (#4).

Incorporating the significance of teaching, the description of philosophical orientations and approaches, and information concerning the joys and challenges of working with students, I found it very interesting to consider how foundations professors define themselves within the discipline, as specialists in traditional areas of social foundations or as foundations generalists.

Social Foundations' Generalists or Specialists?

Do specializations stemming from joint majors in arts and sciences areas, concentrations in graduate programs, or primary areas for research serve as

meaningful distinctions for foundations professors? Four of the participants are still conducting research and publishing articles associated with their original areas of specialization, but others are not. From the group of eleven participants, one uses the label “philosopher of education.” Two refer to themselves as “historians” and one as “an historian and sociologist.” The person who trained as an “anthropologist in education” writes directly of its inconsequential nature related to current work. Thus, the majority of the respondents function as foundations generalists, with little remaining connection to their graduate program specializations. Two of the employed participants hold joint academic appointments with arts and sciences disciplines. One also teaches in ethnic studies and the other person offers seminars in leadership development and ethics. In addition, the part-time teacher held a joint appointment within an arts and sciences department during his tenure as a full-time professor.

Within the sample group’s departments, many courses on both the undergraduate and graduate levels have merged specialty content into units within one course (rather than the stand-alone courses in history, philosophy, and sociology of education that previously existed). Also, one person reports courses in these areas that are still listed in the catalogue, but which haven’t been taught for years. Four of the eleven professors fear that their specialties will not be replaced in the backgrounds of new hires, either with their own retirements or those of colleagues.

A contributor indicated that specialty courses in foundations areas are still very popular with graduate students in varied educational programs, such as adult

education, higher education or leadership, or special education. Also, several reported that foundations' emphases are included in courses on diversity or multicultural education. One person's courses have all been altered to include educational policy orientations. Two other respondents indicated strong ties to educational policy work – due in part to departmental placements perhaps, but also to very strong beliefs that the social foundations of education need to connect to policy arenas. Policy debates and decisions are viewed by these two respondents as the most appropriate avenues for legitimacy, relevancy, and significance of foundations' contributions to educational research and reform.

With the loss of distinctive identities within social foundations related to history of education, philosophy of education, sociology of education, anthropology of education, etc., have these professors lost ties to arts and sciences areas that helped define their work and also provided some credibility within university settings? Have the interdisciplinary emphases become multidisciplinary with a result that teacher education colleagues and others are confused about what is taught in foundations classes? I am not suggesting that history of education requires a joint appointment with the history department. I am exploring the possible consequences of these changes and their relationships to issues of identity. Has it become more difficult to explain the purposes and content of social foundations within a contemporary context? The history of the discipline pinpoints several eras during successive decades in the twentieth century when the field experienced internal and external pressures. Contextualizations of the field from the literature support the idea that this time may well be another one

when social foundations needs to be defended (Butin, 2005: Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; Warren, 1998). Study results concerning the loss of specialty alignments indicate the same problem and current departmental locations further substantiate a loss of identity for the social foundations of education.

Departmental Locations

The departmental locations for the eleven participants vary widely, according to the organizational structures of their respective colleges of education. However, seven are located within departments of educational administration, leadership, and/or policy areas. Two additional participants were "housed" within teacher education departments at the beginning of the study. One has moved to administration and the other is now located within the educational leadership and policy area. Two people have been involved in departments that partially bear the name "foundations" – one currently employed person and one retired.

After the respondents labeled their departmental affiliations, I began to wonder about the significance of the placements. As identity issues for foundations personnel and content emerged through the processes of coding and theoretical sampling, I asked the study members to evaluate the efficacy of their specific locations and to imagine organizational structures that would more greatly benefit the discipline (please see Appendix C). Although two people housed in educational policy areas view this placement as ideal for integrating social foundations into current reform efforts, one person definitely does not. "I

think it is clear that we are eventually going to disappear under the current organizational structure and culture. … For us to have survived as Foundations, we should have kept our own name and perhaps allied with Curriculum & Instruction, the largest department. … I think we would be more nurtured, supported as teacher educators, and valued in graduate education" (#2).

Placements within educational leadership and administration areas are either deemed supportive due to the progressive nature of the faculty or detrimental. "The departmental and college placements are presently not conducive to preservation of the social foundations. The faculty perception of its value seems to be decreasing as social foundations are marginalized by other areas in Education and Arts and Sciences" (#7).

Two participants conceive the ideal placement for social foundations as a free-standing department that works cooperatively with other areas within teacher education and within the college of education as a whole. "… that department should exist as a federated set of disciplinary fields, such as anthropology of ed., cultural studies, philosophy of ed., history of ed., sociology of ed., etc." (#4). This respondent discussed several problems with this ideal placement becoming a reality: 1) a lack of sufficient full-time equivalents generated by foundations alone; 2) teacher education colleagues who do not understand the needs of their students with regards to foundations content; and, 3) an emphasis on technical skills within teaching. However, many practitioners within the field are seemingly not concerned about making schools better, a point of criticism from this professor. "… they see their work as primarily normative in character, a

discussion of values that should guide schools rather than formulation of policies that will make them better at being institutions of education" (#4). From his perspective, ethnography is common to all social foundations specialties. It could bind them together and increase value for the profession within academia.

Three scholars state that there is no one best location for social foundations within colleges of education, as programs, departments and institutions all vary. They proceed to comment that the quality and integrity of the work and the ability of foundations faculty to contribute significantly to teacher education and to the discipline are vital issues to consider.

Other Roles and Responsibilities within the Colleges of Education

Serving on and chairing committees within the department, the division, and the college of education is the second most-frequently-discussed professional duty for social foundations educators. The committee assignments relate to policy-making, governance, diversity programming, new course development, and revision of performance-based assessment standards. The newest faculty member taking part in the study also lists the most responsibilities within the department and division. This person co-directs a new student organization, manages a grant, and writes internal documents. Some participants mentioned a few collaborative efforts or projects with colleagues in other education departments. With calls for communication and collaboration (Hill, 2006), I am truly surprised at the absence of internal connections and resulting professional

isolationism that I detected within this group of professors. Could finding issues related to the emphasis on quantitative research impact the ability of social foundations personnel to participate in collaborative projects?

Funding Issues

In Round One, three participants emphasize rather emphatically that funding is the key issue for social foundations. As others did not comment on this issue during Round One, it became a concern needing further attention. The initial group of participants describe funding problems which include the following: 1) decreases in state funding for higher education; 2) increases in tuition and more pressures to increase enrollment which lead to the acceptance of less qualified students; 3) an increase in university marketing and "image creation" efforts to the detriment perhaps of true quality enhancement; 4) increased competition for teacher education candidates because of alternative certification programs and more teacher education programs within the state; and, 5) pressures for more efficient delivery of programs.

When specifically polled, four other professors do not think that funding is a significant issue for foundations personnel or programs. One person in this group considers it an historic part of academia and therefore, not a change that is worthy of notice. Another respondent does not experience any problems with funding within the college of education and reports that a new faculty member will be hired in the social foundations for fall 2008. A third person states also that

funding is not a problem for the discipline due to these factors: Grants for research are available and state department requirements for teacher education keep the programs funded adequately, as teacher education is a priority for the next decade within the city, the university, and the state. And, the fourth person discusses funding issues in this manner: Funding is not really an issue, although there are few new positions for foundations faculty. Those positions that are available are being given to graduates with significant research skills tied to scientific-based research and grant-getting abilities ("Money is everything in higher education" - #7). Or, as an alternative to receiving grants, the foundations faculty person must publish early and often to make a name in the career.

In reporting that funding cuts, either real or manufactured, prompted a change in class structure in teacher education, one professor commented that classes became large lecture-style classes instead of small group seminars in several instances. Also, faculty in educational psychology at this institution successfully argued that class size produces no differences in learning outcomes for students (contrary to the foundations professor's opinion and experiences).

Three people reported that hiring freezes are currently in effect at their institutions. New faculty members, when hired, will be those people who have received major grants (or who have the potential to get them). One person suggested that funding is being manipulated by division and college administrators to reallocate resources, even if funding crises are not real, but manufactured.

This recommendation emerged with regard to funding issues: We must prove our worth by getting grants, but not by changing our research methods or agendas. Look for opportunities to participate in interdisciplinary research within the education school or outside of it. As one person succinctly wrote: “I come back to the key element: social foundations faculty must be socially responsive, active community members” (#1).

Roles and Responsibilities within the University and/or Academia

Although I collected data on areas of service within the university, professional memberships in regional and national organizations, and research interests, these responses did not seem particularly important to the respondents in evaluating their roles and responsibilities (please see Appendix E for data summaries and Appendix F for a discussion of participants’ opinions concerning interactions with NCATE). For the group as a whole, service outside the college of education within the institution did not generate many cooperative teaching or research opportunities for foundations professors. Of significant concern for me was the lack of active participation in the most prominent national organization dedicated to preservation of the interdisciplinary nature of social foundations, American Educational Studies Association (AESA). Although five participants are members of American Educational Research Association, only three are members of AESA. One contributor states that he stopped going to AESA a decade ago, as there were too many conversations about the survival and

prosperity of the discipline. “I came to wonder whether our profession deserved to survive – and who exactly would care if we didn’t” (#10). Overall, only three cite important relationships within their respective organizations. This isolation from national networking and collaboration only reinforces my observation of the lack of connectedness in foundations work today.

Eight contributors discuss publishing their research and/or serving actively as journal article reviewers. Widely divergent interests are represented in the issues for research and writing (please see Appendix E). The majority of the professors pursue research and writing in multiple areas of interest for purposes of career advancement and to share their work. A criticism of this publishing focuses on the relative obscurity of the journals which publish work in the social foundations of education. One professor is very concerned that the work is not read widely or recognized sufficiently outside foundations circles. This person urges communication and collaboration with teacher education publications in increasing the visibility of significant scholarship in the discipline.

Communicating clearly outside social foundations circles to varied groups of stakeholders, such as students, teacher education colleagues, and community members would increase the understanding of this content and its visibility. Several participants urged their colleagues to connect foundations to important aims in teaching and learning in our society; to prepare students for democratic participation; and, to think more carefully about culture and cultural diversity in a pluralistic society.

Relationships with Colleagues

Many cordial relationships within the department, colleges of education, and the universities are reported by six professors. In opposition, there are several stories of conflicts (particularly with deans). One conflict divided a division along racial lines. This internal conflict lasted for seven years and resulted in very strained relationships. According to the respondent, substantive healing and improved relationships have occurred during the past two years, due at least in part to some key personnel changes. One person who writes of very congenial relationships also decries the lack of collaboration due to independent foci and work among colleagues.

The most positive account records mutually supportive and respectful relationships for a foundations faculty member within a teacher education program. This person's professional setting occupies a somewhat unique setting for the sample group. The level of collaboration mentioned for research and writing with teacher education professors is decidedly rare among the responses. The professor working in a "foundations" department relates well to arts and sciences faculty who prepare secondary teaching candidates. Two of the more experienced professors who have held positions in the same location for some period of years relate well to colleagues in academic disciplines outside education. In stating a preference for these connections, one person writes: "I think that is because of my seeking out individuals within strong disciplines" (#8). This quotation prompted angry reactions during Round Three of the study, when

two individuals critiqued its implied denigration of the discipline. One professor reacted: “Just think about how we talk about ourselves. Two of the subjects in this study identify education by contrast to ‘stronger disciplines’ as a relatively weak field of study” (#4).

This perspective finds echoes in past and present decades, however, as arts and sciences disciplines were often deemed more intellectually rigorous than teacher preparation programs. For example, in seeking credibility and prestige for the history of education, Cremin actively fought for the subject’s placement in a history department, not in the college of education (Warren, 1998). With over 75 years of established history as an academic discipline, it seems unfortunate that respect for the multiple avenues of inquiry within social foundations remains unsecured within academia.

Relationships with university-wide administrators seem to lack consequence to members of the sample group, except for those who participate on the faculty senate and work on issues of governance and faculty autonomy. As a point of consensus, however, the academic backgrounds of department heads and deans are viewed as directly related to the value placed on foundations content and research. Having strong educational experiences in the field lends itself rather naturally to more support for foundations faculty, in every aspect of their work. As one respondent expresses, “There is a need for a strong dean who would support required social foundations courses at the graduate and undergraduate levels” (#9). And, another participant, who functioned as a professor of social

foundations and has now moved into administration, hopes to facilitate the preservation of foundations' interests within the college of education.
A strong recommendation from several other professors agrees with cultivating support from department heads, division chairs, and deans as supporters of foundation coursework and research.

Professional Roles and Responsibilities: Partnerships with Schools and Community Groups

School and/or Community Service

From their reports, five of eleven participants have been or are actively involved with local schools and/or other educationally-related or community groups. Two people serve primarily as consultants to area principals, superintendents, and other school personnel. One of these professors is particularly involved in the community with work related to improving race relations. Several of the group members conduct professional development programs for teachers in local districts. One does regular volunteering and fieldwork in a local elementary school (particularly one 5th grade class and some school-wide projects). This professor and the classroom teacher engage often in discussions concerning the social and political climate of public schooling and on the effects of state and federal regulations. Another person reviews grant proposals for a local arts organization.

According to the responses received, perhaps the most "connected" professor to K-12 schooling regularly supervises service-learning projects with students and conducts multiple-day trips to an urban setting to incorporate more diverse field experiences for students. This person is somewhat frustrated by unsuccessful efforts to get colleagues in teacher education more involved in this type of community interaction. The stated purposes include preparing pre-service students for teaching in a diverse society and enhancing the value of disciplinary content within teacher education through meeting required diversity standards. Although one other respondent supervises field placements for large groups of students each semester, this person is not involved with the schools or community groups on an intimate basis.

Also, when discussing community service, one person reported no real "benefits" for career enhancement (finances, prestige, or promotion). Contrariwise, a recently tenured professor reported the perception that multiple community service connections provided a strong part of the successful tenure presentation. Finally, one person will use the public schools as a setting for research eventually to test an educational theory currently in development.

I am personally dismayed with the lack of connections to local public schools in communities surrounding the university placements for my sample group members. It seems to indicate an insular position within academia and perhaps disregard for important social justice issues relating to educational inequities in our society. I do not interpret "disregard" as lack of caring, but perhaps lack of definitive action outside university settings.

Summary of Current Roles and Responsibilities

The complexity of the academic lives of foundations professors is evident from the multi-layered responses concerning their current roles and responsibilities. They perform as teachers, scholars, researchers, writers, colleagues, committee members, advocates, consultants, and mentors. The challenges come in trying to meet the expectations of multiple groups of stakeholders: pre-service and in-service teachers, colleagues, public school and university administrators, publishers, and community members. Opportunities and willingness to engage in activism seem less important than university-dictated priorities, such as individual research interests, publishing, and teaching.

Thoughtful and dedicated approaches to teaching and interacting with students emerge as the single most important concern, even in environments which stress scholarship, research, and publishing. The importance of foundations content and understandings are expressed through discourses about democracy, tolerance, mutual respect, and justice within schooling and society. Opportunities for professors and students to learn about themselves in relation to diverse others form powerful rationales for interactions within classroom settings and outside them. Learning to resist racism, class-ism, sexism, ageism, and other forms of oppression within historical and contemporary contexts still informs the interdisciplinary nature of the discipline, as practiced in today's colleges of education. Although universally passionate about their teaching, the participants

seem divided about other kinds of relationships and commitments - which ones to pursue and which ones to avoid.

Though active in service to their departments, divisions, and colleges of education, these professors seem to connect very little with teacher education programs (except for acting as "service" faculty for a few courses required within the teacher preparation core). There are few reports of collaborative research projects with diverse education personnel or with community-based programs including local schools. Although very concerned about the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of future teachers, these foundations professors do not interact often with students or teachers in K-12 environments (except those involved in graduate education programs). The lack of intimate connections with public schools and their day-to-day pressures to educate such a needy and diverse population of children seems problematic to me. I believe that it is an important factor in the marginalization of the field in teacher preparation programs today. This assertion is validated in the literature where foundations scholars focus on the importance of this content grounded in knowledge of diverse student needs (Butin, 2005; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; Tozer, 1993). Audiences such as teachers, school administrators, parents, business leaders, and community members should clearly understand the importance of social foundations' contributions to American education and yet they do not.

The insularity of the discipline devoid of a clearly articulated and understood mission which is shared by college of education colleagues and others is leading to decreases in positions, courses offered, and student engagement. As

fewer and fewer foundations positions continue to exist, it becomes even harder for those individuals left in academia to communicate effectively on their own behalf. A supporting quote states: "… social foundations [has been] systemically eliminated from the teacher education curriculum, and other areas in schools/colleges of education. We were able to maintain our … roles, but that is coming to an end" (#10). It takes more effort to reconnect to positions which are integrated into teacher education programs when the departments are philosophically and geographically separated. Networking inside and outside the university in ways that expand the influence and worthiness of the field seems very difficult when the professors are confronted with issues related to survival within colleges of education. Perhaps the changes in roles and responsibilities during the courses of these eleven careers will further expose factors relating to the current conditions within the discipline.

Changes in Roles and Responsibilities

Four professors do not acknowledge many substantive changes in their roles and responsibilities as foundations educators to date. The changes they mention have come from teaching a different group of students (graduate to undergraduate), outside participation with a national accrediting body, and changes in topics or perspectives added to the curricula (race, class, gender, sexuality, sexual orientations, economics, English as a second language students in K-12 schools, and international issues). Additional changes described by the

fourth person focus on the current political environment within the United States: more emphasis on content knowledge for teachers; expedited, multiple paths to certification/licensure; and, changes in the types of conversations held related to accountability, standards, and testing movements. I really expected to see more discourse surrounding social and political contexts of education and it was not evident from the responses.

One person experienced many changes in early years of his career. Developing from an instructor to program coordinator, this person evolved later into an educational research specialist. Now, he participates also with the Internal Review Board (IRB) on campus. Another person has experienced continually expanded roles and responsibilities during the six years prior to obtaining tenure. This individual has been teaching until overloaded, working diligently on research and writing, implementing service-learning programs for students, and creating relationships with local schools.

Social foundations' numbers and influence are less than in the past, according to the professors' perceptions and experiences. The discipline lacks strength in numbers, when compared to C & I or teacher education programs. Also, the coursework is being systematically eliminated from teacher education curricula. For example, in one location, "the old foundations content will be folded together with [information on school organization] into one 3-hour course [by fall 2008]. The intro[ductory] class I now teach will be controlled and staffed by the teacher education program, probably with doctoral students in C & I" (#2). Many other educational areas within colleges of education are now teaching

foundations courses or their own versions of foundations courses. Doctoral students and non-tenure track faculty are currently teaching many foundations courses in several of the study locales. As another respondent comments: "… the social foundations area is being replaced by research classes in some cases. … [and] each area is fighting for its own curriculum. Thus, we have counseling, adult education, C & I courses in counseling history and philosophy of education, etc." (#9). Also, the coursework is often embedded in multicultural education classes, urban education content, or diversity classes. The majority of professors in the study group function as "service faculty" for varied programs in education, such as teacher education, educational leadership and administration, higher education, adult education and other areas. None of the eleven institutions represented in the study group offer graduate degrees in the social foundations of education.

Internal tensions and conflicts which have caused overall decline in foundations faculty and coursework center on the re-organization of departments and divisions within colleges of education. Recent departmental conflicts threaten the survival of the discipline. One professor writes: "I know that teacher education has gone from 100% of my teaching load to 25% of my teaching load over time, and may go even lower since we are relocating one class to C& I" (#2). According to participants, these internal struggles occurred in the early to mid-1990s and are happening again. In one location, departmental mergers took place in 1995. Here the two remaining foundations faculty members became educational policy people. All courses were then adapted to include policy foci.

Another departmental merger in a separate location with the educational administration and policy group led to an attitude that “everyone” can teach and conduct research in the social foundations. The content and teaching goals of the field have become particularly vulnerable to co-optation by other faculty members.

Three people have been actively involved in fighting for the continuation of foundations courses and faculty in their respective colleges of education. This focus consumes large amounts of time and has probably decreased their participation in other activities, such as community service. The time periods reported are either during the past decade or during the past twenty years. In focusing internally on retaining faculty positions, courses, and access to students, foundations faculty may have understandably lost opportunities to connect with varied stakeholders who could influence the continuation of the discipline within certain colleges of education.

Two other types of pressure, both within colleges of education and coming from outside agencies, include: Regulatory bodies and accrediting agencies are imposing content restrictions upon curricular design; and, new faculty members are being hired for their abilities to get grants which conform to National Science Foundation and federal Department of Education guidelines. State departments of education are increasing the number of state-mandated courses in teacher education programs as well, with particular additions required in specific areas, such as classroom management and quantitative research methodologies.

Several study participants report changes in the research environment. "Opportunities to do foundations research and teaching in the academy is diminishing" (#11). Several others see a decline in opportunities to do qualitative research with a corresponding increase in emphasis on "scientifically-based" research. One person thinks that too much research and publishing has been done recently on pluralism and gender issues in social foundations; other issues also need to be included in research agendas. Also, this person urges cooperative, interdisciplinary work within academia on this issue and others of similar importance. When expanding this opinion during Round Three, this individual writes: "Gender is an issue that is broad and dramatic. It is impossible to grasp the significance of the end of the last century and this if we do not recognize the extraordinary depth and breadth of gender expressed within the human condition" (#7). However, another person insists that "[t]here is a move politically in the United States to remove any discussion of humanity, cultural issues, philosophy, and race/class/gender/sexuality from the curriculum. It is a constant battle. The forces for standardization, accountability, and scientifically based research are too strong. Foundations of Education continue to suffer declines in courses, hires, and inclusion in the curriculum" (#11).

Finally, changing attitudes towards the work are reported, from positions of initial idealism and optimism to current ones of cynicism and hopelessness. Specifically, four participants fear that their positions/specialties will not be replaced upon their retirements, or those of close associates. They are also very discouraged about the viability of the discipline's future in colleges of education

and within academia. I did not find distinctive associations with chronological ages related to either pessimistic or optimistic attitudes towards the discipline. The years of service in the profession did appear to affect the general dispositions of the participants. Those professors with the greatest numbers of years of experience in the field are also the most pessimistic concerning their current positions and the future of the field (see also Predictions later in this chapter). However, six professors who are newer to the field focus primarily on their determined efforts to cultivate meaningful relationships with students, colleagues, and administrators. They concentrate on the value of their teaching, research, and service, even as they express concerns about the field.

Questions for Further Study

This study polled eleven foundations professors about their professional circumstances and factors related to their work in American universities. Although several of their opinions and concerns mirror those found in the analysis of current literature (please see Chapter Two), this study cannot speak for the discipline on a national basis. The results were, of course, affected not only by the unique people involved in the study, but also by the small sample size and the positionality of the researcher.

While participating in the study, participants proposed issues for consideration in future studies. These questions focused primarily on concerns related to historical representation, identity, teaching and curriculum

development, and connectedness. Also, questions arose about research agendas and methodologies. A study could pinpoint the differences between the intellectual history of the field and the history of labor in the field. In echoing one of my results concerning departmental alignments for social foundations within colleges of education, a call came for national discussion concerning the absorption of foundations into other areas, particularly administration, leadership, and policy groups. Other ideas centered on collecting information concerning curriculum content in foundations classes, emphases in teaching that have varied over time, and the effectiveness of online teaching of this disciplinary content. More research is needed concerning the effects of political movements tied to standardization and accountability on social foundations' viability within teacher education programs. This discussion could lead to an analysis of integration (or lack thereof) within teacher education programs nationally.

How many programs are granting graduate degrees in the social foundations of education? Are any foundations researchers conducting research tied to significant international issues, such as global health and/or educational monetary policy and their influences on future economic and social issues and the roles that schools must play? And, a fundamental question asked: "How do social foundations educators define research" (#6)? These questions and others indicated sincere interest and dedication to the well-being of the profession which were linked to their predictions for the future of the field.

Predictions Concerning the Future of the Social Foundations

One professor does not predict any future directions for the discipline. He comments: "I do not know anymore if any tack will work" (#8). Four contributors do not believe that it will survive within academia as a distinct area of inquiry, scholarship, and teaching. "I think it is clear that we are eventually going to disappear under the current organizational structure and culture … For us to have survived as Foundations, we should have kept our own name and perhaps allied with C & I, the largest department" (#2). This person feels "besieged" and very "defensive" of remaining territory. Believing that social foundations will not survive except for a few isolated courses, some participants believe that multicultural education courses will continue because they are either politically impossible to cut or due to their ability to fulfill diversity standards. In contrast, another person thinks that remaining coursework will perhaps include one traditional foundations course for undergraduates and a few graduate electives in the philosophy or history of education.

At one institution, the foundations discipline is invisible in the college of education at this point. All former foundations personnel (all two of them who remain after retirements and job cuts) are now designated as educational policy people and conduct research in this area. However, some graduate level foundations courses are still very popular and have full enrollment and/or waiting lists. The content is often folded into other courses, but the "introduction to education" course is now taught by C & I graduate students (who do not have

educational backgrounds in social foundations). Also, the current dean operates from a policy background and is consequentially concerned with the growth of that program. This respondent also cites pressures for further mergers within the college of education to streamline departmental alliances. Young faculty members with no public school teaching experiences wish to teach some of the theoretically-oriented courses (formerly the bastion of the social foundations). The educational policy people at this institution think they can teach foundations content with great effectiveness (viewed as a pervasive attitude but my participant certainly does not share this opinion). As pressures to publish to obtain tenure have increased, foundations professors' willingness to serve as faculty for service courses and to serve as extras on dissertation committees is diminishing. All of these factors continue to affect the viability of the discipline and its continued (although already subsumed) existence within this college of education.

As a possible solution to the progressive dissolution of social foundations, strong alliances with teacher education on the graduate level would provide an academic home and a viable location for content. Another possibility is a merger with curriculum theorists and critical theorists - "philosophers of education in the United States are [also] doing very good work, but it is not widely recognized" (#10).

According to several group members, more curriculum development in doctoral programs is urgently needed. Few universities currently serve as strong centers for doctoral education in foundations areas. Mentioned several times, examples of well-respected graduate programs for foundations work include the

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and the University of Georgia, Athens. These three universities are not represented by faculty members who joined this study.

On a hopeful note, a professor discusses the distinct possibility for a new political environment after the upcoming presidential elections. Perhaps new understanding and directions will emerge and change not only the philosophy of public education, but also its practices. Finally, another professor remains unsure about the survival of the field as a distinct entity, but urges foundations faculty to become active and committed to social activism within the community. “Teaching is an intellectually/theoretically constructed pursuit which is critically important for the well-being of the professor and for educators as professionals” (#1).

Six participants do believe that social foundations will possibly survive in some form within colleges of education in the United States. According to one respondent, the field has lost a lot of stature in the general field of education during the past century. However, some specialty areas, such as history and philosophy, are deeply entrenched into our educational systems and are unlikely to disappear forever. Several participants comment that survival really depends on the quality of the work and proving its worth to teacher education, leadership education, and other departments or programs. “Whether or not we (in social foundations) or they (departments, colleges of education, and universities) deserve to survive is a different – and more important – question. I just hope we are doing what we need to be doing to deserve to survive if we do. We might not agree what that is, but we should at least be talking with each other about it

honestly and openly as if ours and others' lives depended on it. Indeed, I think they do" (#3).

According to contributors, ways to accomplish renewal focus on locating and receiving funding, and on connecting with publishers and organizations that value the work. Other suggestions pinpoint engaging in critical national and international debates concerning significant issues, such as global healthcare and monetary reform. Several people express a need for clarity in communicating foundations' contributions to teacher education, to local schools, and to communities-at-large.

In one location, the social foundations of education were originally housed as part of C & I. Now, it is located within Educational Administration. Both were small departments that needed each other to maintain sufficient numbers of students for retaining coursework and faculty placements. This current merger is viewed positively as one where social foundations could develop its own graduate programs. The discipline is more firmly entrenched at another institution now, due to new concentrations within teacher education programs, one of which is social foundations. Yet another person sees a very bright future for the field "when its focuses its considerable abilities on issues that cross disciplines, offer potentialities for social growth and health and help schools …" (#7). Believing that social foundations will continue in better, tier three research universities, one individual thinks that research funds will be available to continue the theoretical research began 70 years ago and that it will continue to exist in other departments because of state certification requirements or school requirements. Others state

rather emphatically that funding for qualitative studies is declining and may not be easily or quickly replaced.

Several contributors express that professors within the discipline are responsible for the survival of the field. Strong spokespersons who are active as community members and as political and social activists are needed to promote a pluralistic agenda focusing on equity in schooling. If social foundations is lost, there will be "no theoretical resistance to pure instrumentalism in educational policy. We will have teachers [who] are unprepared to be spokespersons for the best interests of their students. Specifically, resistance to institutionalized racism, sexism, class-ism, and heterosexism will be virtually non-existent … non-social foundations people [are] not more racist, etc., but social foundations professors are more likely to see hidden and institutional operations of these forces" (#5). Another study member states that teacher education will lose its "ability to educate across cultures. Technicality and emphasis on standardized curricula, accountability, etc. will be all needed for success as a teacher. So, the stakes are very high not only for the social foundations of education, but for teacher candidates and their future students" (#4).

Predictions concerning the sustainability of the discipline within academia are quite mixed as to its future growth or eventual demise. However, many possible recommendations which have been integrated throughout the text of this chapter promote solutions concerning not only the continued existence of social foundations, but also its increasing relevance and importance for teacher education candidates. Adding to the recommendations made in Chapter Four by

study respondents, I compare historical insights and study results and their implications for the discipline in Chapter Five. Also, I conceptualize possibilities for future studies.

Chapter Five: Conclusions

In this chapter, I formulate some concluding statements which merge analyses from written sources with the results from my study of foundations professors. In adding some insights from the literature, from study members, and my own ideas, I also propose some additional recommendations for positive and corrective actions for practitioners within the discipline. As we all do, I seek to contribute to a revitalization of the profession. I close with proposals for additional research studies, some similar to and some different from the one I conducted.

Further Implications and Recommendations

Throughout this dissertation, I carefully examine the multi-faceted problems and issues that plague the social foundations from the past into the present era. My discussion centers on the contextualization and evaluation of various factors that contribute to the current marginalization of the discipline. I now merge the dual components of literature analysis and study to compare and contrast some of their similarities and differences. A participant supports my work in this manner: “In my opinion, the foundations disciplines are in trouble. Of course, this is a lament our profession has been making for several decades, so many think there is nothing new in all of this. I participated in your study because I think we need more data and inquiry into these issues” (#5). I hope this

dissertation provides interesting, informative, and substantive data into the myriad situations of the social foundations within higher education. But, what additional implications can be discovered through comparing analyses from the literature review with study results?

A summary of some of the inter-related, causal elements affecting the social foundations of education, as gleaned from the literature review are as follows: 1) a confused and contested history within academia which affects the successful integration of the social foundations into colleges of education and universities; 2) a lack of consensus concerning definitions and purposes of the discipline (which leaves us misunderstood by those outside the profession); 3) difficulties in communicating and collaborating with teacher preparation programs which have led to decreasing interaction with teacher candidates; 4) university students who question the relevancy and practicality of foundations content and who have problems in connecting with diversity issues; 5) a federal political environment which presently values strict interpretations of accountability in teaching and schools; 6) teacher education programs and courses which are responding to state and national mandates concerning preparing teachers – teachers are to follow pre-determined standards and align teaching with measurable objectives which are tested annually; 7) an insular intellectualism within social foundations combined with a dearth of community connections; and, 8) an increasingly diversified, public school student population that is still expected to conform to white, middle class norms (in spite of courses and conversations about the increasing pluralism of our society).

My study results corroborate many of these same problems, as experienced by the specific practitioners in the field. However, their concerns center first and foremost on the complexities of the teaching/learning environment within higher education, as I discuss in Chapter Four. They reinforce the idea that predominantly white, female teacher candidates are disconnected from public school students of color from lower socio-economic backgrounds. They often experience significant resistance from teacher candidates when exploring difficult subjects, such as differences due to class, race, sexual orientations, and gender. In overcoming initial barriers to encourage some university students to open their minds to new ideas and pluralistic values, social foundations professors confirm the rewards that come in teaching this content. I did not discover as much discussion of the impact of accountability and standards movements as I expected to find. I wonder if study members feel that this battle has been lost and is no longer worth the struggle to combat it.

In discussing problems with their teaching related to teacher education colleagues and other education professors, study participants pinpoint difficulties in collaboration and offer examples of co-optation of social foundations perspectives and goals through combined coursework taught by non-foundations personnel. Generally, in adopting self-contained positions within their departments, colleges of education, and communities, practitioners reinforce the written reports in journal articles that speak of the need for communicating a distinctive and clearly articulated identity through a network of influential connections which include missions and objectives for the discipline.

I also frame my analyses of the literature and the study through an examination of opposing ideologies. Political and social movements influence the prevailing thoughts of the populace in a society and affect the conceptions and purposes of schooling for its citizens. These movements often correspond with the political leadership within the United States during a particular time. Simplified for the purposes of this paper, I characterize the primary goals of education within American society as either promoting active, informed participation in a democratic governmental system, or as preparing people for different levels of employment within a capitalist economy. It could also be described as either promoting equity for diverse individuals and groups within social change leading to educational reform, or as maintaining the social and economic stratification of minorities and immigrants within American society (McCarthy, 2006; Altenbaugh, 2005; Kozol, 2005; Best, 1987, Wirsing, 1987). Of course, these two opposing goals for education operate in intertwining ways along a continuum of societal change – sometimes favoring the development of workers and other times focusing on citizenship needs and issues. Within different societal groups and operating according to dominant hegemonic interests, people may be educated during similar periods in history for radically different roles.

Evaluating the study, I contrast language and discourses that pinpoint the intellectual/theoretical conception of teaching with teaching as an applied science. This dichotomy constructs oppositional forces which affect my participants in their daily relationships and work. Discussions and decisions within education schools determine if and how certain knowledge is valued and implemented

within the curricula. In constructing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that future teachers need to succeed, it seems evident that performances of certain, easily discerned behaviors carry more weight and influence than capturing student growth in understanding the multiple contexts of schooling (admittedly a more difficult task that forms the essence of social foundations coursework).

Of course, there are shifting and conflicting philosophies and corresponding consequences within both of these simplistic dichotomies, the warring political ideologies and the contrasting discourses within colleges of education and schooling in general. At the present time, however, the "scientific" and technical orientations in American political circles which started during the late 1950s seem to still be prevailing. According to my analyses of the literature and the study, the current social and political milieu contributes to the on-going de-valuation of foundations within colleges of education in the United States. Decreasing job opportunities for social foundations graduates, fewer courses required in foundations areas for education students, declining influence for social foundations professors within their departments and colleges of education, and a loss of unique identity are a few of the many ramifications for professors and for the discipline as a whole.

Critical concerns within the social foundations of education mirror several internal and external pressures on teacher education programs. Teachers have alternately been constructed as professional experts or as laborers within a scientifically-implemented and evaluated system of schooling (Beadie, 1996). Teacher preparation programs have experienced public criticism, decreased

funding, reduced authority in the education of future teachers, and changes in curricular design due to legislative and funding regulations (McCarthy, 2006; Warren, 1998; Beadie, 1996; Best, 1987; Jones, 1987; Wirsing, 1987). Teacher education has been accused of producing inferior teachers who cannot respond to challenges to American scientific and mathematical supremacy within a global economy (McCarthy, 2006). Issues within the social foundations must be contextualized within problems for teacher education programs throughout the succeeding decades.

Problems within the social foundations of education and teacher preparation programs are not confined to issues directed only towards colleges of education. As the previous discussion has shown, the internal and external pressures on the discipline and its academic home have been affected by larger political and societal issues. Funding decreases which impact hiring, faculty research and service, and opportunities for students are also linked to the conceptualization of professional work within higher education as a whole. As one social foundations professor relates with dismay and disgust, university-wide rationale "is to intensify efforts to adopt language and techniques from corporate management for administration of our university and school. Hence, in the language of the budget system being currently instituted in our university, the school becomes a 'responsibility center' and our students are overtly identified as 'customers'' (#10).

Lustig (2005) also supports scrutiny of the corporatization of higher education through his study of its history in the United States. He traces the

development of the profession from the 1950s to the present with the recognition of the "$250 billion business it has become" (Business Week, December 22, 1997, in Lustig, 2005, p. 31). Acknowledging shifting epistemologies which have guided the mission and purposes of universities, Lustig documents alternating perspectives.

Universities are conceived as either institutions which promote liberal thinking tied to social justice reforms within a democracy, or they exist to serve the demands of a capitalist society to produce skilled workers who will increase national profit margins (Lustig, 2005).Within the current environment infested by instrumental monetary concerns, Lustig (2005) and Giroux (1998) speak of the changes in values, programs, curricula, structures, and organizations of colleges and universities which reflect this ideology. They write about altered student experiences and faculty work in settings which value consumer emphases. As Giroux comments, "Growing up corporate has become a way of life for youth in the United States … [and] the language of the market becomes a substitute for the language of democracy" (1998, p. 12).

In discussing the impact of a re-directed mission on students, Giroux (1998) writes, "One of the most important legacies of public education has been to provide students with the critical capacities, the knowledge, and the values to become active citizens striving to realize a vibrant democratic society" (p. 12). Lustig (2005) expresses the same problem in this manner: [Students have traditionally] "encountered not only separate disciplines and forms of truth … but a habit of mind that negotiated between and went beyond those disciplines, a

larger reasoning that drew together different areas of knowledge and enabled students to make sense of their world" (p. 18). Both of these authors and I believe that the politically-constructed functions of colleges and universities affect the academic journeys of students and their later relationships to local, national, and global societies. Their experiences in higher education determine their values and moral actions related to fair and equitable treatment for diverse individuals and groups within communities and world-wide.

Presently, the commercialization of higher education constricts university policies and practices to those aligned with business interests. The results are decreased funding for higher education, funding allotted primarily for "scientifically-based" research designs, and faculties and students who are expected to contribute economically to a consumer-oriented society.

To counteract the economic determination of priorities in higher education, we must recover faculty autonomy and strive to reinstate liberal perspectives within colleges and universities. Lustig (2005) recommends that faculty defend important principles through political action to recover autonomy in higher ed. and re-conceive faculty identity within it. He urges a return to "genuine institutions of higher learning" (p. 34) and suggests revitalization through building communities of scholars (teachers and students) with free exchanges of ideas based on trust and respect. He wants academic independence based upon ideals of freedom, civic mission, and democratic purposes for society.

Giroux (1998) concurs and adds that teachers need to function as public intellectuals who participate in educational reform and policy-making, so that they can influence the development of their own profession.

> "But more is needed than defending public education as central to nourishing the proper balance between democratic public spheres and commercial power. Given the current assault on educators at all levels of schooling, educators must also struggle against the ongoing trend to reduce teachers to the roles of technicians who simply implement prepackaged curriculums and standardized tests as part of the efficiency-based relations of market democracy and consumer pedagogy" (Giroux, 1998, p. 13).

These authors encourage all in higher education to rethink it purposes and become activists, as I am urging the revitalization of social foundations within teacher education programs. In addition to the re-mobilization of social foundations professors to protect the field, perhaps faculty of all disciplines need to rise up and resist the external redesign of universities as corporate entities.

I cannot offer any easy or definitive solutions for the multiple challenges facing social foundations, teacher education, or colleges and universities today. However, in the end, I choose to focus on the optimism of at least half of my social foundations study members and to emulate their dedication to the profession and to their students. One person espouses a positive attitude in this fashion: "I will say yes [to predicting the survival of the discipline] even if the answer is supported primarily by an absurd optimism. The optimism in my affirmative answer lies in the fact that every field of practice requires a theory to guide it. … If we can turn our attention and our efforts to this problematic, then we will be seen as useful on a broad range of educational issues" (#4).

Focusing on my original purpose of contextualizing the current situations of the social foundations of education in order to elicit problem-solving discussions within the discipline, I summarize recommendations from the literature and from my study members. Professors in social foundations areas should focus on connecting teacher beliefs and actions in powerful ways through helping students to critique schooling norms (Abowitz, 2005; Butin, 2005, Edmundson & Greiner, 2005; Magolda, 2001). New conceptualizations of teacher identities emerge from de-constructing and re-constructing notions of ourselves in relations with diverse others. Teacher educators in social foundations areas must reflect on interactions with students and the implications of their decision-making processes (Butin, 2005; Magolda, 2001; Greene, 1995). Many authors within the literature review and several study members promote engagement as social and political activists. One participant emphasizes collaborative efforts with colleagues in colleges of education and beyond who also value social foundations perspectives. My caveat would be to urge collaborative efforts with those who do not understand or value contributions from social foundations. I believe that significant effort needs to be made towards educating those who don't understand us and/or those who purposefully or ignorantly misunderstand us. We must seize this opportunity to re-form social foundations as a cohesive discipline and to work together to increase its presence and vitality within teacher education programs. Perhaps the current crises provide impetus for significant opportunities for a renaissance of the social foundations of education – I certainly hope so!

Beadie (2006) and Renner et al. (2004) also propose some useful ideas, as they endeavor to overcome the supposed splits between theory and practice in teacher education and between conceptual frameworks usually located within the social foundations of education and other teacher education coursework.

Beadie (2006) advises that foundations educators examine the inherent power structures and determine who really holds the power within the program, the department, and the institution. Also, she advocates for a model of shared decision-making which encourages communication and collaboration, as do many other authors (Butin, 2005; Hill, 2006; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005). Renner et al. (2004) recommend that social foundations strands be embedded within service-learning projects within multicultural and anti-racist environments. Connecting with diversity education and social justice issues within schooling provides a central purpose and mission for foundations within teacher education programs. These thoughts promote workable proposals for improving communication and collaboration with colleges of education.

In addressing student concerns about foundations content, Butin (2005b) posits an idea of student resistance as "Identity (Re)construction" (p. 118). He views student resistance as a way for them to save their stable identities. Students will naturally resist changing their perspectives of themselves as good people. Social foundations educators must persist and "destabilize identities, enhance students' tolerance for ambiguity, [open their hearts and minds] to alternative and opposing perspectives of selfhood, and assist as they re-make their identities" (p. 120). As everything in schooling and in life is socially constructed, it is all open

to adaptation, reform, and improvement. Thus, identity (re)construction serves social justice purposes and helps white, female teachers (and others) to consider themselves always in relation to diverse others (Butin, 2005b).

It would be unfair to consider all of the problems within the social foundations of education and not to comment on the very real resistance to foundations work found within teacher education programs and colleges of education (Thayer-Bacon, personal communication, April 1, 2008). I have documented some of the external pressures foundations professors face throughout the dissertation and I will re-state some of them here: 1) education colleagues do not like critique offered by social foundations professors as to the nature of teaching and schooling and refuse to listen or include their perspectives; 2) education colleagues often perceive foundations educators as outside the practical world of teacher preparation and do not include them in curricular reform and program changes; 3) departmental mergers have subsumed foundations within other areas and agendas; 4) antagonistic relationships stem from colleagues and/or administrators who do not understand or value social foundations knowledge and contributions; and, 5) coursework in methods, classroom management, and quantitative research are easier to justify in today's accountability schemes for evaluating schooling (Butin, 2005; deMarrais, 2005; Martusewicz, 2005; Tozer & Miretsky, 2000, 2005; Warren, 1998; Pietig et al., 1996; varied study members).

In spite of resistance from colleagues, administrators, and other stakeholders, we need to focus on constructive actions which recover a sense of

unique identity for the social foundations of education through its multiple expressions. We should foster connectedness through important and sustained relationships with varied stakeholders. We must work individually and together to creatively position our discipline, so that it may continue to positively impact the lives of teacher candidates and their future students.

A Call for Activism

I concur with Hill (2006) when she calls for social foundations professors to communicate directly and often with teacher educators, college of education administrators, and other stakeholders. I also agree with the need for collaboration to expand the influence and integration of social foundations into diverse educational departments and areas. In my recommendations for the discipline, however, I ask not only for communication and collaboration. I seek a return to the social and political activism that characterized the interdisciplinary origins of foundations from its earliest days at Teachers College, Columbia. From both historical and contemporary literature and as a result of my study, I find that foundations professors are keenly interested in promoting the examination of societal inequities in their interactions with university students. They are passionate about investigating racism, class-ism, sexism, and other avenues of oppression in their scholarship, choices of class resources, and during classroom discussions. Truly seeking to help future teachers understand the complexity of

social and political pressures on K-12 students, most of them conceive of themselves as change agents within their academic domains.

What I did not find is a dedication to service within local schools and/or local communities that integrated philosophical perspectives from foundations work with time and effort spend on concrete societal changes (with some notable exceptions). I propose that each foundations professor select one school or one program or one initiative to align herself with, in order to demonstrate a commitment to bettering conditions for one individual or group of human beings. I recognize the presumptive nature of this suggestion, but I believe it is essential in living the values we espouse. It would serve as an example to students who may be required to complete service-learning components within their teacher education programs.

Also, I did not discover meaningful and active connections to and service within AESA, the national organization that may be best able to represent diversified interests by promoting unity within the social foundations. Limited use of the CLSE Standards may be contributing to the feeling of fractured and subsumed identity within the profession. Even if these Standards are interpreted and applied differently, extensive applications could perhaps link professors in the discipline one to the other. Not revised since 1996, it seems time to examine them again.

Overall, there seem to be few efforts made to communicate social foundations concerns directly to the multiple publics within the university community and beyond. In my opinion, this insular position has allowed other,

more powerful, more numerous voices to misrepresent or under-represent social foundations issues in decision-making processes.

Acknowledging that I have not yet experienced the many stresses involved with full-time employment in academia, I nonetheless have some additional suggestions for foundations personnel. Join AESA (or rejoin) so that you may interact with colleagues nationally and assist in framing a cohesive way for professors to communicate effectively. At national conferences, meet several new people and share your ideas and develop a sense of belonging in the group. Make concerted efforts to establish and maintain relationships with college of education faculty, particularly those directly involved in teacher preparation programs, and focus on collaborative curricular design and research projects. Speak to diverse groups within the university and within the community to represent the field in easily understood and applicable language. Giving programs for civic groups, parent organizations, in-service events for public school teachers and administrators, and others could help us develop positive networks and provide opportunities for dialogue.

Echoing a suggestion from one of my contributors, I also promote writing for educational publications that appeal to widespread audiences of teachers. These articles could assist them in understanding very practical and relevant ties to the history, philosophy, sociology, and anthropology of education. Finally, seek ways to engage with public policy debates concerning educational reform. Our critiques of schooling inequities should be coupled with work on solutions that acknowledge and incorporate the needs of many people and organizations. Most

important of all, though, is the need to act on our beliefs and values and to share what we have learned about equitable and just schooling. As we pursue this lofty goal through our teaching and service, so may we also design research that contributes to the improvement of educational opportunities for all people.

Recommendations for Future Research

As my study polled just eleven foundations professors from the total employed nationwide, a subsequent study could replicate this methodology to either corroborate or refute parts or all of the results. Use of a different sample would assist the discipline in determining the amount of consensus from practitioners concerning their work and the placements of social foundations in colleges of education. In addition to collecting more data on issues related to the identity of foundations professors within their respective colleges of education and academia, studies could pinpoint program standards in curricular design and implementation. Rationale for selection of concepts, resources, student assignments, and projected learning outcomes would inform professors of areas of convergence and divergence in teaching disciplinary content nationally. Conclusions reached from successful, firmly entrenched, respected programs could provide guidance and support for foundations personnel and programs which are struggling with sustainability issues within teacher education and colleges of education.

With the emphasis on technology integration in teaching in hjgher education, particularly for teacher candidates, the use of online platforms and resources in social foundations would make an interesting study. As both the literature and my study indicate, many professors in the field are not fully utilizing new technological innovations. At present, this situation is predicated on the belief that the traditional classroom environment provides the best place for dialogic interchanges related to the political, social, and cultural contexts of schooling. What sorts of alternative teaching/learning settings and materials are being used in curricula and programs and how could their effectiveness be evaluated? Would such studies promote technology integration in social foundations classes? Would they help us discern which pedagogical approaches are most conducive to producing desirable outcomes in student learning?

A few of my participants give conflicting reports when asked about the types of research that are supported in their colleges of education and universities. Some professors emphasize the credibility of qualitative and/or mixed design studies and others center on requirements related to purely quantitative studies. One participant believes that he was hired because of his work as a philosopher of education. He believes that he adds credibility to educational leadership and policy work at this institution. As a contrasting example, another person definitively explains that all research in his division is statistically based; no qualitative researchers have been hired in some period of years. Yet another professor comments, “Particularly the qualitative/critical/discourse people among [recent graduates] will have a tougher time finding jobs in the current climate.

Two of my recent ones are unemployed" (#2). More inquiry into the types of research undertaken, funded, and published in the social foundations could help novice and experienced scholars in the development of their research agendas.

Regardless of the specific orientation and content of future studies, I agree with one of my respondents who writes: "[We must] engage in service and research that make a meaningful difference for children and families in schools and communities, especially in low-income and minority-rich districts and for those who remain on the margins" (#3). In spite of serious concerns that I have discovered through my literature review and my study of practitioners, I also have a vested interest in its success as a discipline. As a beginning scholar in the social foundations of education who is seeking a tenure-track position at an accredited university, I am vitally interested in the well-being of the profession.

Beyond my dreams for professional engagement, however, exists an abiding interest in reforming schooling experiences for thousands of American students. So, in challenging myself to continually seek a recognizable identity and fully integrated niche for the social foundations of education, I also challenge you - my colleagues, my study group members, and many others - who are dedicated to the significance of its concepts in the education of teachers. We must continue to work hard to define ourselves succinctly, to communicate this understanding clearly, and to connect to diverse stakeholders within our varied communities. We must promote the study of multiple contexts for education that will benefit future teachers, teacher education programs, public school students, and ultimately ourselves.

REFERENCES

Abowitz, K. K. (2005). Confronting the paradox of autonomy in a social foundations classroom. In D. W. Butin (Ed.), *Teaching social foundations of education: Context, theories, and issues* (pp. 127-150). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Altenbaugh, R. J. (2003). *The American people and their education: A social history*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

American Educational Studies Association (1978). Standards for academic and professional instruction in foundations of education, educational studies, and educational policy studies. *Educational Studies*, 8(4), 329-342.

Anzaldua, G. (1999). *Borderlands: La frontera* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Ballou, D., Sander, W., & Wright, P. (2004). Controlling for student background in value-added assessment of teachers. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 29(1), 37-65.

Beadie, N. (1996). From "teacher as decision maker" to teacher as participant in "shared decision making": Reframing the purpose of social foundations in teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 98, 77-103.

Beall, A. E. (1993). A social constructionist view of gender. In A E. Beall & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The psychology of gender* (pp.127-147). Guilford, NY: The Guilford Press.

Beaubouef-Lafontant, T. (2005). Womanist lessons in reinventing teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(5), 436-445.

Best, J. H. (1987). Five years for teacher preparation: Reasons rational and not-so-rational. *Educational Foundations*, 2, 63-66.

Bloom, L. R. (1998). *Under the sign of hope: Feminist methodology and narrative interpretation.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Books, S. (1994). Social foundations in an age of triage. *Educational Foundations*, 27-41.

Bordo, S. R. (1989). The body and the reproduction of femininity: A feminist appropriation of Foucault. In A. M. Jaggar & S. R. Bordo (Eds.), *Gender/body/knowledge: Feminist reconstructions of being and knowing* (pp.13-33). New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Bredo, E. (2005). Addressing the social foundations "accountability" dilemma. *Educational Studies*, 38(3), 230-241.

Brill, J. M., Bishop, M. J., & Walker, A. E. (2006). The competencies and characteristics of an effective project manager: A web-based Delphi study. *Educational Technology Research*, 54(2), 115-140.

Butin, D. W. (2005). Preface. In D. W. Butin (Ed.), *Teaching social foundations of education: Contexts, theories, and issues* (pp. xi-xxi). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Butin, D. W. (2005a). Is there a social foundations canon? An interview with Eric Bredo, Wendy Kohli, Joseph Newman, and Barbara Thayer-Bacon. In D. W. Butin (Ed.), *Teaching social foundations of education: Contexts, theories, and issues* (pp. 29-58). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Butin, D. W. (2005b). Identity (re)construction and student resistance. In D. W. Butin (Ed.), *Teaching social foundations of education: Contexts, theories, and issues* (pp. 109-126). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Butler, J. (1990). Gender trouble, feminist theory, and psychoanalytic discourse. In L. J. Nicholson (Ed.), *Feminism/poststructuralism* (pp. 324-339). New York: Routledge.

Butts, R. F. (1993). *In the first person singular: The foundations of education*. San Francisco: Caddo Gap Press.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2007). Retrieved September 27, 2007, from www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/

Carusetta, E., & Cranton, P. (2004). Perspectives on authenticity in teaching. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 55(1), 5-22.

Casella, R. (1999). What are we doing when we are "doing" cultural studies in education – and why? *Educational Theory*, 49(1), 107-123.

Chou, C. (2002). Developing the e-Delphi system: A web-based forecasting tool for educational research. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 33(2), 233-236.

Clarke, A. E. (2005). *Situational analysis: Grounded theory after the postmodern turn*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, xxi-xli, 83-144, 261-290.

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

Collins, P. H. (1986). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of black feminist thought. *Social Problems*, 33, 514-532.

Cook-Sather, A. (2006). The "constant changing of myself': Revising roles in undergraduate teacher preparation. *The Teacher Educator*, 41(3), 187-206.

Cozart, S. C., & et al. (2006). Using womanist caring as a framework to teach social foundations. *The High School Journal*, 90(1), 9-15.

Cultural Studies Ph.D. Program at George Mason University (2007). [Program description]. Retrieved August 30, 2007, from http://culturalstudies.gmu.edu

deMarrais, K. (2005). Reflections on a social foundations approach to teacher education. In D. W. Butin (Ed.), *Teaching social foundations of education: Contexts, theories, and issues* (pp. 167-188). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dottin, E. S. (1984). Enhancing multicultural perspectives in teacher education through the foundations of education. In A. H. Jones (Ed.), *Teacher Education Quarterly* (pp. 46-52*).* 11(2).

Dottin, E., et al. (2005). Representing the social foundations of education in NCATE: A chronicle of twenty-five years of effort. *Educational Studies*, 38(3), 241-254.

Edmundson, J., & Greiner, M. B. (2005). Social foundations within teacher education. In D. W. Butin (Ed.), *Teaching social foundations of education: Contexts, theories, and issues* (pp. 151-166). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Erickan, K., & Roth, W. (2006). What good is polarizing research into qualitative and quantitative? *Educational Researcher*, 35(5), 14-23.

Erickson, P., Hyndman, J., & Wirtz, P. (2006). Why is the study of dispositions a necessary component of an effective educator preparation program? *Essays in Education*. Retrieved March 31, 2006, from http://www.usca.edu/essays/

Finkelstein, B. (1984). Servants, critics, skeptics: The place of foundations faculties in professional education. In A. H. Jones (Ed.), *Teacher Education Quarterly* (pp. 14-21), 11(2).

Fiske, S. T. (1993). Controlling other people: The impact of power on stereotyping. *American Psychologist*, 48(6), 623-628.

Fonow, M. M., & Cook, J. A. (1991). Back to the future: A look at the Second Wave of feminist epistemology and methodology. In M. M. Funow & J. A. Cook (Eds.), *Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived research* (pp. 1-15). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gaztambide-Fernandez, R. A., Harding, H. A., & Sorde-Marti, T. (Eds.). (2004). *Cultural studies and education: Perspectives on theory, methodology, and practice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review, 1-13, 229-232.

Gergen, K. J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist*, 40(3), 266-275.

Ginsburg, M. R. (1987). Teacher education and class and gender relations: A critical analysis of historical studies of teacher education. *Educational Foundations*, 2, 4-36.

Giroux, H. A. (1998). Education incorporated? *Educational Leadership*, 56(2), 12-17.

Giroux, H. A. (2004). Doing cultural studies: Youth and the challenge of pedagogy. In F. R. Gaztambide-Fernandez, H. A. Harding, & T. Sorde-Marti (Eds.), *Cultural studies and education: Perspectives on theory, methodology, and practice* (pp. 233-260). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

Gourneau, B. (2006). Five attitudes of effective teachers: Implications for teacher training. *Essays in Education*. Retrieved March 31, 2006, from http://www.usca.edu/essays/

Gray, A. (2003). *Research practice for cultural studies: Ethnographic methods and lived cultures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 3-35.

Greene, M. (1993). The passions of pluralism: Multiculturalism and the expanding community. *Educational Researcher*, 22, 13-18.

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Greene, M. (1996). The Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies. In J. Storey (Ed.), *What is cultural studies? A Reader* (pp. 49-60). London: Arnold.

Greiner, M. B. (2005). "To live *for* art": Teaching and learning aesthetic education within foundations of education. In D. W. Butin (Ed.), *Teaching social foundations of education: Contexts, theories, and issues* (pp. 93-108). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Grossberg, L. (1996). The circulation of cultural studies. In J. Storey (Ed.), *What is cultural studies? A reader* (pp. 178-186). London: Arnold.

Haig, B. D. (1995). Grounded theory as scientific method. Retrieved July 12, 2007, from http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-yearbook/95_doc/haig.html

Hall, S. (1996) Cultural studies: Two paradigms. In J. Storey (Ed.), *What is cultural studies: A reader* (pp. 31-48). London: Arnold.

Harry, B., Klingner, J. K., & Sturges, K. M. (2005). Mapping the process: An exemplar of process and challenge in grounded theory. *Educational Researcher*, 34(2), 3-13.

Hill, D. D. (2006). Reimagining the place and curricular space for the field of social foundations of education in teacher education: A call for communication and collaboration (Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68, 68.

Hostetler, K. D. (2002). Responding to the technicist challenge to practical wisdom in teaching: The case of INTASC Standards. *Educational Foundations*, 16(3), 45-64.

Hytten, K. (1998). The ethics of cultural studies. *Educational Studies,* 29(3), 247-265.

Johnson, R. (1996). What is cultural studies anyway? In J. Storey (Ed.), *What is cultural studies? A reader* (pp. 75-114). London: Arnold.

Jones, A. H. (1975a). *Indicators from a survey of the social foundations of education in the United States, 1972-1975*. Paper presented at the meeting of American Educational Studies Association.

Jones, A. H. (1975b*). Comparative education in the social foundations*. Paper presented at the meeting of Comparative and International Education Society.

Jones, A. H. (1975c). *A continuing survey of social foundations of education.* Paper presented at the meeting of California Educational Research Association.

Jones, A. H. (1976). *A preliminary report: A future-oriented survey of social foundations of education in the United States.* Paper presented at the meeting of American Educational Studies Association.

Jones, A. H. (Ed.). (1984).What are the foundations of education? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 11(2), v-ix.

Jones, A. H., & Dottin, E. S. (Eds.). (1984). *The CASA Handbook: A chronicle of and guide to the work of the Committee on Academic Standards and Accreditation of the American Educational Studies Association.* Ann Arbor, MI: Prakken Publications, Inc.

Jones-Wilson, F. (1984). The nature and importance of the foundations of education in a teacher education program in a black university. In A. H. Jones (Ed.), *Teacher Education Quarterly* (pp. 41-45*)*, 11(2).

Kinach, B. M. (1995). Grounded theory as scientific method: Haig-inspired reflections on educational research methodology. Retrieved July 12, 2007, fromhttp://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-yearbook/95_docultural studies/kinach.html

Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of the nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America.* New York: Three Rivers Press.

Kupermintz, H. (2003). Teacher effects and teacher effectiveness: A validity investigation of the Tennessee Value Added Assessment System. *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis*, 25(3), 287-298.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1990). Like lightning in a bottle: Attempting to capture the pedagogical experience of successful teachers of black students. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 3(4), 335-344.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1996a). Silences as weapons: Challenges of a black professor teaching white students. *Theory into Practice*, 35, 79-85.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1996b). “Your blues ain’t like mine”: Keeping issues of race and racism on the multicultural agenda. *Theory into Practice*, 35, 248-255.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Fighting for our lives: Preparing teachers to teach African American students. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3), 206-214.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2004). Landing on the wrong note: The price we paid for Brown. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 3-13.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2005). Is the team all right? Diversity and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(3), 229-234.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006a). Once upon a time when patriotism was what you did. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(8), 585-588.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006b). It's not the culture of poverty, it's the poverty of culture: The problem with teacher education. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 37(2), 104-109.

Laird, S. (1996). "Working it out" with Jane Roland Martin. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 71(1), 103-113.

Lather, P. (2005). The foundations/cultural studies nexus: An emerging movement in the education field. *Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association meeting in Montreal, Canada,* 1-16.

Lea, V., & Griggs, T. (2005). Behind the mask and beneath the story: Enabling students-teachers to reflect critically on the socially-constructed nature of their "normal" practice. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(1), 93-114.

Lustig, J. (2005). The university revisioned: An alternative to corporate mis-education. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 27, 17-52.

Magolda, P. (2001). Border crossings: Collaboration struggles in education. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 94(6), 346-358.

Markley, T. (2006). Defining the effective teacher: Current arguments in education. *Essays in Education*. Retrieved March 31, 2006, from http://www.usca.edu/essays/

Martin, J. R. (1981). The ideal of the educated person. *Educational Theory*, 31(2), 97-109

Martin, J.R. (1982). Excluding women from the educational realm. *Harvard Educational Review*, 52(2), 133-150.

Martin, J. R. (1999). Women, schools, and cultural wealth. In Titone, C., & Maloney, K. (Eds.), *Women's Philosophies of Education: Thinking Through Our Mothers* (pp. 149-177). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Martin, J. R. (2006). Bound for the promised land: The gendered character of higher education. Retrieved November 28, 2006, from www.law.duke.edu/journals/djgp/articles/gen4p3.htm

Martusewicz, R. (Ed.). (2006). (Editor's corner). *Educational Studies*, 39(2), pp. 97-101.

Martusewicz, R. A., & Edmundson, J. (2005). Social foundations as pedagogies of responsibility and eco-ethical commitment. In D. W. Butin (Ed.), *Teaching social foundations of education: Contexts, theories, and issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 71-91.

Maxwell, R. (2000). Cultural studies. In G. Browning, A. Halcli, & F. Webster (Eds.), *Understanding contemporary society* (pp. 281-295). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

McCarthy, M. R. (2006). The rise and fall of ED200F. *Educational Studies*, 39(2), 139-145.

McIntosh, P. (1992). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. In M.L. Anderson & P.H. Collins (Eds.), *Race, class, and gender: An anthology* (71-81). New York: Routledge.

McIntosh, P. (1989). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Peace and Freedom*, 10-12.

Mirci, P. (2000). Teaching who we are: Reflecting on creativity, identity, and literacy. *Claremont Reading Conference Yearbook*, 97-109.

Moghaddam, A. (2006). Coding issues in grounded theory. *Issues in Educational Research*, 16, 1-16.

Naples, N. A. (2005). Confronting the future, learning from the past: Feminist praxis in the twenty-first century. In J. Reger (Ed.), *Different wavelengths: Studies of the contemporary women's movement* (pp. 215-235). New York: Routledge.

Nash, P. (1984). The humanistic foundations of education. In A. H. Jones (Ed.), *Teacher Education Quarterly* (pp. 53-59), 11(2).

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). An open letter to the American people: A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Retrieved April 2, 2007, from http://ed.gov/pubs.NatAtRisk/index.html

Noddings, N. (1990). Feminist critiques in the professions. *American Research Association Yearbook*, 393-424.

O'Brien, L. M. (2002). Social foundations of education and democracy: Teacher education for the development of democratically-oriented teachers. *Educational Foundations*, 19(3/4), 33-44.

Osborne, P., & Segal, L. (1993). Extracts from "Gender as performance: An interview with Judith Butler." Retrieved October 10, 2005, from www. theory.org.uk/but-int1.htm

Pietig, J., McCormack, M., & Grinberg, J. (1996). Conversations in the field: Social foundations and the student teaching experience. *Educational Foundations*, 10(2), 5-22.

Pollard, C., & Pollard, R. (2004/2005). Research priorities in educational technology: A Delphi Study. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 37(2), 145-160.

Pollard, R., & Tomlin, M. E. (1995). The use of expert teachers to improve education. *Education*, 116(1), 1-7.

Provenzo, E. F., Jr. (2005). Making educational research real: Students as researchers and creators of community-based oral histories. In D. W. Butin (Ed.), *Teaching social foundations of education: Contexts, theories, and issues* (pp. 59-70). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Renner, A., et al. (2004). Service learning, multicultural/antiracist education, and the social foundations of education: Weaving a cultural studies' pedagogy and praxis in an accelerated teacher education program. *Educational Studies*, 35(2), 137-57.

Reger, J. (Ed.). (2005). *Different wavelengths: Studies of the contemporary women's movement*. New York: Routledge, ix-xxx.

Riger, S. (1992). Epistemological debates, feminist voices. *American Psychologist*, 47, 730-740.

Rodriguez, E. (2002). Teacher education and the illusion of education reform: A comparative perspective. *Educational Foundations*, 16(1), 43-57.

Rothenburg, P. (1990). The construction, deconstruction, and reconstruction of difference. *Hypatia*, 5(1), 281-296.

Ryan, A. M. (2006). The role of social foundations in preparing teachers for culturally relevant practice. *Multicultural Education*, 13(3), 10-16.

Sardar, Z., & Loon, B.V. (1998). *Introducing cultural studies*. New York: Totem Books Network, 3-9.

Shea, C. M., Sola, P. A., & Jones, A. H. (1987). Examining the crisis in the social foundations of education. *Educational Foundations*, 2, 47-57.

Spring, J. (1984). Teacher power and the new role of foundations in teacher education. In A. H. Jones (Ed.), *Teacher Education Quarterly* (pp. 35-40*)*, 11(2).

Stahl, N. N., & Stahl, R. J. (1991). We can agree after all! Achieving consensus for a critical thinking component of a gifted program using the Delphi technique. *Roeper Review*, 14(2), 79-95.

Storey, J. (Ed.). (1996). *What is cultural studies? A reader.* London: Arnold, ix, 1-13.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998) *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for the development of grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Thayer-Bacon, B. J., with Bacon, C. S. (1998). *Philosophy applied to education: Nurturing a democratic community in the classroom*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Thayer-Bacon, B. J. (2000). *Transforming critical thinking: Thinking constructively.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Thayer-Bacon, B., & Moyer, D. (2006). Philosophical and historical research. In J. Kincheloe, & K. Tobin (Eds.), *Doing educational research – A handbook* (pp. 1-19). Sense Publishers.

Tigelaar, D. E. et al. (2004). The development and validation of a framework for teaching competencies in higher education. *Higher Education*, 48, 253-268.

Tozer, S. (1993). Toward a new consensus among social foundations educators. *Educational Foundations*, 8(1), 5-22.

Tozer, S. E., & Miretsky, D. (2000). Professional teaching standards and social foundations of education. *Educational Studies*, 31(2), 106-119.

Tozer, S., & Miretsky, D. (2005). Social foundations, teaching standards, and the future of teacher preparation. In D.W. Butin (Ed.), *Teaching Social Foundations of Education: Context, Theories, and Issues* (pp. 3-27). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

The University of Michigan (1972). Survey of social foundations of education in the United States, 1972. In *Notes and abstracts in American and International Education,* 37, 1-3, 9-16.

The University of Michigan (1975). An initial report: Survey on the social foundations of education in the United States. In *Notes and abstracts in American and International Education*, 50-52, 18-28.

Warren, D. (1998). From there to where: The social foundations in education in transit again. *Educational Studies*, 29(2), 117-130.

Warren, D. R. (1984). Second thinking in teacher education. In A. H. Jones (Ed.), *Teacher Education Quarterly* (pp. 1-13), 11(2).

Watras, J. (2006). Teacher tests, equal opportunity, and the foundations of education. *Educational Studies*, 39(2), 124-134.

Westbrook, L. (1997). Information access issues for interdisciplinary scholars: Results of a Delphi study of women's studies research. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 23, 211-216.

White, J. W., Bondurant, B., & Travis, C. B. (2000). Epistemology, theory, and methods. In C.B. Travis & J.W. White (Eds.), *Sexuality, society, and feminism* (pp. 11-34). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Wilhelm, W. (2001). The alchemy of the oracle: The Delphi technique. *Delta Phi Epsilon Journal*, 43(1), 6-26.

Willis, P. (2004). Foot soldiers of modernity: The dialectics of cultural consumption and the 21st century school. In F. R. Gaztambide-Fernandez, H. A. Harding, & T. Sorde-Marti (Eds.), *Cultural studies and education: Perspectives on theory, methodology, and practice* (pp. 261-282). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

Wirsing, M. (1984). The new civic religion. In A. H. Jones (Ed.), *Teacher Education Quarterly* (pp. 60-72), 11(2).

Wirsing, M. E. (1987). The centralization of academic authority. *Educational Foundations*, 2, 87-106.

Wright, H. K. (1996). How (not) to define cultural studies in five minutes under pressure. *UTK College of Education Newsletter*, 13-15.

Wright, H. K. (2001/2002). Editorial: Cultural studies and service learning for social justice. *Tennessee Education*, 31(2), 11-16.

Wright, H. K. (n.d.). *Notes on cultural studies*. Unpublished manuscript, 1-9.

Zagumny, L. L. (2007). *No foundations left to marginalize: The case of Tennessee Board of Regents schools*. Paper presented at the meeting of American Educational Studies Association, Cleveland, OH.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Study of Social Foundations Educators
Round One of the Inquiry

And, here are three questions for your consideration to start the study. Please write as fully as time allows.

1. Describe your current roles and responsibilities as a social foundations educator. Please comment on challenging and rewarding facets of your professional endeavors.

You may wish to consider the following areas (any or all, but feel free to comment on other subjects as well):

- Classroom environments and relationships with students, inside and outside the classroom;
- Relationships with colleagues in the undergraduate and/or graduate teacher education programs at your college or university;
- Relationships with other foundations educators nationally or internationally;
- Relationships with the local public or private schools and other educational organizations;
- Relationships with college/university administrators;
- Relationships with academic publishers/journal editors; and,
- Relationships with community service organizations.

2. What changes in your roles and responsibilities as a social foundations educator have you experienced during the course of your career? In your opinion, what factors (political, social, economic, cultural, etc.) have influenced these changes?

3. What recommendations do you have for strengthening the positions of social foundations educators within their departments and colleges, within local communities, and within national and international networks of educators?

Appendix B

Study of Social Foundations Educators
Round Two: Instructions and Questions

Reminder: Original methodology based on Delphi studies

- polling geographically dispersed "experts" within a discipline or across disciplines to discover solutions for problems and/or find areas of consensus and disagreement;
- multiple stages for the research process with feedback to participants following initial stages

Now, rather than develop a series of statements associated with Likert scales for your very quick ratings/rankings, a modification of the Delphi methodology has been approved for my study. I am applying grounded theory to analyze the text and to generate themes or issues which are either somewhat resolved or left unresolved from the responses to the three questions in Round One (current roles and responsibilities; changes in roles and responsibilities; recommendations for the discipline).

So, I will present areas of contention primarily and ask that you thoughtfully consider them and respond in written form. I know this process will be more time-consuming for you, but I really believe that the results will be of greater value to members of our profession.

(Note: During Round Three of the study, you will receive a transcript of all that I have learned from the group. You will be given one last opportunity at that time to agree or disagree with both areas of convergence and divergence.)

QUESTIONS FOR ROUND TWO (not in any particular order of importance):

1. **Identity of social foundations faculty, content, and disciplinary "uniqueness":**

Are your departmental and divisional placements conducive to the preservation of the social foundations of education as a distinct, valued alliance of disciplines, or is social foundations being consumed/subsumed through connections with other areas of education? What would be the ideal placement of social foundations within a college of education? How could this placement be achieved, or is it possible within the foreseeable future?

2. The continuing tensions between teaching as an intellectual/theoretically constructed pursuit and teaching as mastery of specified objectives/standards/behaviors (linked to value or lack thereof of intellectualism in our society):

- Social foundations as respected and valued areas for intellectual inquiry within academia
- Perceived relevance or lack of relevance of coursework to teaching practice for pre-service and in-service teachers
- Foundations faculty as socially responsive, active community members
- Gaps between program elements of teacher preparation programs and social realities of public school teaching
    1. "disconnect" with white, middle class, female teaching candidates and the diverse students they will teach
    2. incomplete understanding the complexities of the teaching situations new teachers will face
    3. retention problems
    4. lack of public support for the profession of teaching

Are any of these related concerns of vital concern to you, to the faculty at your university, and/or to the health and well-being of the profession? Why or why not? Do you have any further recommendations for linking theory to practice than those written in Round One?

3. Funding issues:

- Funding for faculty positions within foundations areas
- Funding tied to grants for “scientifically-based” research
- Funding for participation in national standardization/accountability organizations, such as NCATE
- Decrease in state funding for higher education

Are any of these areas or other areas associated with funding issues of significant concern to you personally, or to the profession? Any ideas on solving funding problems?

Appendix C

Study of Social Foundations Educators
Round Three Instructions

Dear Study Participant,

We are nearing the end of this study. Again, I truly appreciate your time and efforts on my behalf and for this research into the state of the discipline.

This round is constructed in two parts: a little more personal data is needed at this point a few questions within this email). And, you have 27 pages of transcript to read and make comments (attachment). It will probably take about an hour to 90 minutes of your time (a very crude estimate). Thank you. MD

Final level of permission:

Melinda Davis has my permission to use direct quotes from the responses that I have emailed to her during the study. My name and/or identifying characteristics will not accompany the quotes. Yes or No

Personal data:

- Age:
- Male or female (I have guessed thus far using names.):
- Married or single:
- Sexual orientation:
- Race/ethnicity:
- K-12 public school experience prior to becoming a social foundations educator (very briefly)?
- Other professional background prior to becoming social foundations educator (very briefly)?
- Evaluation of your health status at present: poor fair good excellent
- Any other personal stuff you would like to include (family members, political, social and/or religious affiliations, etc.):

Appendix D

Additional Demographic and Personal Characteristics

Table 1:

Racial/Ethnic Identifications	Number of Participants
Caucasian	9
African-American	1
Mixed Race	1

Table 2:

Sexual Orientations	Number of Participants
Heterosexual and Married	9
Queer with a Life Partner	1
Bisexual, currently Heterosexual and Married	1

Table 3:

Family Structures	Number of Participants
Have Children	4
Have Grandchildren	3

Table 4:

Religious Affiliations	Number of Participants
Protestant	2
Agnostic, background in Catholicism	1

Table 5:

Political Affiliations	Number of Participants
Democratic Party	2
Independent	1

Table 6:

Health	Number of Participants
Excellent	7
Good	4

Appendix E

Service Areas within the University:

- Faculty Senate (5 of 11)
- Governance and salaries
- Tenure and promotion
- Racial equity
- Gender issues
- Advisors for student organizations
- Ethics (academic honesty)
- Pedagogy in higher education
- Internal Review Board

Memberships in Professional Organizations:

- National Council for Assessment of Teacher Education 1
- American Educational Research Association 5
- American Educational Studies Association 3
- National Network for Educational Renewal (institutional affiliations) 2
- American Association of University Professors 1
- Social foundations' specialty organizations 5

Research Interests:

- The discipline of the social foundations of education
- Specialty areas (3)
- Educational policy debates (3)
- Diversity and social justice issues (5)
- Urban schools (3)
- Service-learning
- Religion and education
- Racism and affirmative action
- Schooling experiences of immigrant and minority students
- Funding reform

Appendix F

Relationships of Social Foundations to NCATE

As with many of the other areas of content found in study responses, the reactions to NCATE and state and federal regulatory acts are mixed, according to seven participants. Three people emphasize a strong need for participation in NCATE to influence the development and revision of educational standards. They also connect it to needed advocacy for the social foundations of education on a national basis. Their view is that funding to pay NCATE fees should be located and allocated to give foundations a presence within this powerful accrediting organization. The consensus is that foundations' work on urban education, multicultural education, and diversity issues satisfies an important NCATE standard and helps foundations survive within teacher education programs and colleges of education in general. Adding service-learning requirements to foundations' courses also satisfies some NCATE standards. To work proactively within NCATE while still seeking reform is to continue to apply creative resistance and remain active within this highly politicized environment.

Citing one benefit of a NCATE affiliation, a professor comments that the NCATE accreditation process within a teacher education program did force a collaborative faculty planning process. After designing commonly accepted objectives for some courses, faculty members retain the freedom to design and implement their syllabi and courses within the standardized structures. By

resisting and refusing NCATE directives, foundations' professors are perceived by some study respondents as marginalized from within.

In contrast, one participant responded that NCATE and its standards are "anathema to me" (#2). Another believes that NCATE is a political organization without a theory of education as foundational to it; it needs to acquire one or it will disappear over time. A third person cautioned that teacher education programs who receive good reports from NCATE may just want to celebrate and not continue to scrutinize their programs for social/political/cultural outcomes. Representing the comments of two people, another respondent wrote: " … we dropped out of NCATE in 2007 and there is a boycott of NCATE due to the dropping of social justice and sexual orientation from the standards" (#11). In addition, a person commented that her institution withdrew "due to cost, bureaucracy, dissolution of a state/NCATE partnership, and lack of identity with NCATE among non-teacher educators" (#2). Two institutions represented within the group have recently joined the Teacher Education Accreditation Council, as an alternative to NCATE.

A recommendation focuses on NCATE and state departments of education's "need to move beyond the tweaking of programs and enforcing accountability models based on standardized test data, work samples, portfolios, etc. [They] need to explore instead what would be necessary for a fundamental transformation of schools (which would include dismantling or radically altering of the very systems of which they are dependent for funding and authority" (#10).

Note: NCATE Standards which will take effect during fall 2008 include wording sympathetic to the SOCIAL FOUNDATIONSE and a reinstatement of the standard on diversity. Please see portions of the wording below (Retrieved March 13, 2008, from http://www.ncate.org/public/revisedStds07.asp?ch=4)

Standard 1: Candidate2 Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals need a sound professional knowledge base to understand learning and the context of schools, families, and communities. They understand and are able to apply knowledge related to the social, historical, and philosophical foundations of education, professional ethics, law, and policy. They know the ways children and adolescents learn and develop, including their cognitive and affective development and the relationship of these to learning. They understand language acquisition; cultural influences on learning; exceptionalities;8 diversity of student populations, families, and communities; and inclusion and equity in classrooms and schools.

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations,

including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools.

VITA

Reared in Kingsport, Tennessee, Melinda Moore Davis attended local public schools and graduated from Dobyns-Bennett High School in 1970. She completed her undergraduate degree in 1973 from George Peabody College for Teachers, with a double major in elementary education and special education. Her master's degree in Library and Information Science was earned in 1991 from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Melinda obtained her Doctor of Philosophy degree in Cultural Studies in Educational Foundations at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.