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In this study, I addressed a gap in literature about purposes for social studies teacher education concerning how experiences contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. I undertook an instrumental case study of four pre-service social studies teachers and two social studies teacher educators in a social studies teacher education program at a mid-sized, Midwestern state university. The participants’ position in the program enabled them to speak to all three of the research questions.

I approached the data through a social constructivist lens, which viewed the construction of individualized meaning and beliefs as occurring through a process of experiences in a social context. I collected data from three face-to-face semi-structured interviews with each of the participants, participants’ reflective writing and journaling, written artifacts created by the participants, observations of the participants’ teacher education classes and student teaching, and detailed information about their teacher education programs. I analyzed the data using narrative analysis and compared across cases in an effort to identify how experiences contributed to the development of their purposes for teaching social studies. The findings of the study center on pre-service teachers’ experiences of teacher education, the unique incorporation of ideas from their
teacher education, the negotiation of tension in student teaching, and the confluence of these experiences as part of a “purpose formation process.” These findings have implications for improving teacher education programs, in terms of both program structure and curriculum, and improving classroom practice.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Defining the Problem

Purpose is an important area of scholarship for numerous reasons. Scholars have revealed the importance of purposes for education, teachers’ purposes for teaching, and the place of purpose within teacher education. Four themes became clear in a review of literature addressing why exploring purpose is important for education and teachers: (a) having a sense of purpose provides educational institutions with meaning and organization (Dewey, 1938; Pekarsky, 2007); (b) a sense of purpose guides teachers’ practices (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2005; Hammerness, 2010; Hochstrasser-Fickel, 2000; Johnston, 1990; McCall, 1995; Smith, 2000; van Hover & Yeager, 2007); (c) understanding one’s own purpose is central to teacher development (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Chant, 2002; Hammerness, 2003, 2008); and (d) focusing on purpose is important as a counter-movement to the drive for outcomes-based education (Biesta, 2009, 2010; Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2010; Gradwell, 2006; Hammerness, 2010; McNeil, 2001; Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013; Pekarsky, 2007).

A review of a specific segment of this literature—research concerned with purposes for social studies education, purpose as an area of focus in social studies teacher education, and social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching social studies—revealed a gap. There was a lack of research on how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contributed to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. This gap in the literature exposed a problem: by not exploring and
developing meaningful understandings of how these experiences contribute to the development of pre-service teachers’ purposes for teaching, we as social studies teacher educators are overlooking a key aspect of teacher development. This study explored three specific segments of that development. Such an examination of how a teacher’s purpose develops can reveal their larger objectives for teaching. If we can gain deeper understandings of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching, we as educators can create social studies teacher education programs that foster reflective teachers who teach for something rather than about something.

**Situating the Study in the Contextual Literature**

The following is a brief introduction to the contextual literature that surrounds and supports this study. Chapter II contains a thorough examination of the relevant literature.

**Teacher Education**

There is abundant research on efforts to create teacher education and social studies teacher education programs that focus on purpose and rationale development and engender reform-oriented teachers (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Biesta, 2009, 2010; Cochran-Smith, 2010; Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2010; Hammerness, 2003; McDonald, 2007; Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013). These scholars emphasize rethinking the structure of teacher education and social studies teacher education to include purpose and rationale development among students, critical reflection among students, and teaching aimed at deep democracy and social justice.
Beliefs

Much of the contextual literature for this study engages with and explores ideas of “beliefs” among teachers. It is essential to clarify here that I have interpreted “beliefs” as distinct from “purposes.” While the two concepts exist within a common realm, beliefs are typically discrete and specific where purposes are overarching. For example, a teacher may believe that differentiated instruction is an important part of sound practice, whereas his or her purpose for teaching may be more concerned with the broader goals of education. Thus, teacher beliefs, while not directly connected to teacher purposes, formed an important part of the scholarly context of this study.

Many researchers have explored beliefs of students beginning teacher education programs (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Kennedy, 2006; Owens, 1996; Slekar, 1998; van Hover & Yeager, 2007; Waring, 2010). Chiodo and Brown’s (2007) study of 52 secondary pre-service social studies teachers “attempts to assess the ideas and beliefs of pre-service students entering a social studies education program” (p. 12). Scholars investigated the influence of beliefs and purposes upon practice as well (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Gradwell, 2006; Hawley, 2012; Hochstrasser-Fickel, 2000; Johnston, 1990; McCall, 1995; Pryor, 2006; van Hover & Yeager, 2007). Researchers have also addressed the relationship between teacher education and pre-service social studies teachers’ beliefs about social studies education (Adler, 2008; Angell, 1998; Doppen, 2007; Johnston, 1990; Pryor, 2006). Doppen’s (2007) study of an intensive social studies teacher education program revealed that the program had a significant influence on pre-service teachers’ beliefs about social studies teaching. Pryor’s (2006) study of 27 pre-
service to in-service social studies teachers in a social studies methods course explored their retention of beliefs about democratic theory and practice.

Adler (2008) argued that social studies teachers’ thinking serves as the basis for their decision-making about practice and student learning. Other researchers have affirmed this contention, illustrating that prior beliefs influence teaching and that exploring these beliefs is a key component of teacher education and learning to teach (Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013; Richardson, 1996, 2003; Richardson & Placier, 2001). Angell’s (1998) comparative case study of two elementary pre-service teachers in a social studies methods class and a student teaching setting concluded that beliefs held prior to teacher education programs had a significant influence on learning to teach and that teacher education had an influence upon those beliefs. Goodman and Adler’s (1985) analysis of elementary teachers’ perspectives of social studies found that life experiences and beliefs that existed prior to teacher education programs were as powerful as the process of learning to teach, in terms of shaping views about teaching. Social studies education scholars have also suggested that there is a need for a deeper understanding of pre-service teachers’ beliefs about content and students and the dynamics that shape instructional decision-making (van Hover & Yeager, 2004).

Hochstrasser-Fickel (2000) revealed that teachers’ thinking and the beliefs that make up their framework for decision-making have a profound influence on educational equity and student achievement. In connection to this finding, scholars have found that teachers’ backgrounds are an important factor in the creation of their perspectives on social studies teaching and learning (Adler, 1984; Goodman and Adler, 1985; Smith,
2000). McCall’s (1995) study of pre-service teachers’ attitudes toward the ideas presented in a Social Reconstructionist multicultural education methods course concluded that an understanding of pre-service teachers’ backgrounds and experiences was essential to grasping how those experiences influenced their practice.

While these scholars’ explorations of pre-service social studies teachers’ beliefs—and the influence of social studies teacher education upon their beliefs—about social studies education informed and contextualized this study, an exploration of how teachers’ experiences in social studies teaching and learning contribute to the development of their purposes for teaching is largely absent. That is, none of the above studies have explored how social studies teacher education program experiences, including coursework and student teaching experiences, contribute to the development of pre-service teachers’ purposes for teaching.

Experiences

Other researchers have demonstrated that the experiences that influence teachers’ beliefs prior to teacher education are an important area for research (Book, Freeman, & Brousseau, 1985; Jantzen, 1981; Lortie, 1975; Robertson et al., 1983). These scholars found that previous educational experience, as well as moral and altruistic goals, affected students’ decisions to pursue teaching degrees and shaped the beliefs they brought with them to their teacher education programs. Research has also demonstrated that social and familial experiences bear upon teacher beliefs (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1996), and that teachers’ life experiences prior to teacher education play a role in the creation of their views of teaching and practice (Foster, 1995). Book and Freeman (1986) argued
that attention to teachers’ prior beliefs and experiences is important in the pursuit of helping teachers develop balanced views about the purpose of education, ones that include attention to broader social purposes. While the current study has not attempted to reorient the attention of the participants toward broader social purposes of education, Book and Freeman’s (1986) argument for deeper understanding of teachers’ experiences in connection to their purposes can be extended to an effort to create social studies teacher education programs with that goal.

Researchers have explored several potential sites of experiences that shape teachers’ beliefs about teaching. Marsh (2003) looked at the social construction of thought about teaching, focusing on personal backgrounds and social experiences as influences. Smith (2000) also emphasized personal backgrounds as important in shaping decisions and beliefs about teaching. Scholars that explored the influence of experiences teaching at schools on teachers’ beliefs about teaching suggested that schools are also influential sites (Owens, 1996; Slekar, 1998). Other scholars connected previous experiences with teacher education as well, particularly investigating how pre-service teachers bring their beliefs to their teacher education (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Kennedy, 2006; Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013; van Hover & Yeager, 2004), and how pre-service teacher education influences those beliefs (Angell, 1998; Doppen, 2007).

All of this research suggests that experiences have powerful influences on teacher beliefs. However, it is important to reiterate that none of the studies discussed here investigated the contribution of the experience of social studies teaching and learning to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. The
present study strives to provide an antecedent to this research on how beliefs and purposes influence practice.

**A Call for Further Research**

Scholars have suggested that there is an absence of discussion of purpose or vision in teacher education (Hammerness, 2010; Kennedy, 2006; Pekarsky, 2007). An excerpt from Osguthorpe and Sanger (2013) offers insight into why it is important to understand, as much as possible, the process through which teachers form their purposes for teaching:

> Ignoring significant elements of a learner’s background that are relevant to a given course of study is simply bad pedagogy, from a constructivist perspective. They [the learners] also base these motivations and beliefs on their personal life experiences in classrooms, possibly rendering these beliefs as psychologically central. Failing to address these beliefs and motivations suggests that what candidates do, learn, and experience in their teacher education programs will be disconnected from these basic elements themselves. (Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013, p. 193)

Van Hover and Yeager (2007) shared this interpretation, suggesting that “teachers are decision makers, and we need to better understand what influences their decisions…perhaps the strongest influence on practice is not pedagogical content knowledge but purpose” (p. 672). The present study strives to provide an avenue to deeper understandings of instructional decision-making.
Researchers also have suggested a need to investigate teachers’ theorizing and practice in order to encourage teachers to become critically reflective of their own teacher development (Chant, 2002). Scholars have emphasized the importance of the source of social studies teachers’ beliefs about becoming a teacher, and how reflecting on personal experiences related to social studies may assist teachers in improving their practice (Adler, 1991; Armento, 1986; Slekar, 1998; Thornton, 1992, 2005). Thornton (2005) echoed this emphasis on the value of exploring the source of teachers’ aims in classroom instruction, curriculum development, and teacher education. He argued that investigating these beliefs and aims leads teachers to reflect on their purposes for teaching. Dinkelman (2009) argued that research needs to increasingly focus on teachers’ purposes, stating that “the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of teaching comprise a much larger portion of their [social studies education students] thinking than the ‘why’ of teaching” (pp. 93-94). In his exploration of the challenges that pre-service social studies teachers face in articulating rationales, he concluded that reflection is one of the key contributors to students beginning to express their personal rationale for teaching.

Additionally, Brookhart and Freeman’s (1992) analysis of 44 studies published between 1960 and 1990, all of which addressed the characteristics of entering teacher candidates, explicitly points out the lack of a coherent theory at the roots of research on teachers’ purposes. From an analysis of the literature, they argued that a major conceptual weakness of the research was its tendency to be atheoretical. They revealed that the vast majority of the research in this area relied on behaviorist theory rather than Vgotskyan social constructivist theory. They called for further research that adopts a
social constructivist theoretical framework and explores entering teachers’ beliefs and purposes and how those beliefs influence learning to teach.

Further, scholars have argued extensively for the importance of deep democracy in social studies education. “Deep democracy” conceives of democratic life as more than just political democracy. Such an understanding promotes economic, social, and environmental democracy, among a host of others. Including these ideas in social studies education can lead to the enrichment of democratic society (Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Evans, 2007; Kahne & Westheimer, 2006; Parker, 2001, 2003, 2010; Stanley, 2005; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). If we know more about how teachers’ experiences contribute to the development of their purposes for teaching, we may be able to create teacher education experiences that foreground the importance of deep democratic purposes. Viewed in unison, the above research suggested a need to explore both how social studies teachers develop their purposes for teaching and these purposes’ contribution to teacher development and practice. By looking at how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching, I am attempting to fulfill the call for these discussions in teacher education.

**Clarifications**

Several clarifications are in order here. I did not in this research attempt to uncover or grasp the entirety of the development of participants’ purposes for teaching social studies. The parameters of the study made it clear that I was only concerned with experiences of social studies teaching and learning from three points in time, and only
with those experiences that participants chose to share with me. Further, a philosophical element of this study requires thorough explanation. I contend that exploring how someone develops a certain view of teaching is not the same as exploring why someone has a specific view of teaching. I perceived how someone develops a view of teaching as an experiential process. For example, through repeated experiences of teaching, I came to accept that students learn in diverse ways. Through this process, this view became part of my epistemological framework. That is, via repeatedly experiencing the phenomenon, I determined that the idea that students learn in different ways was reliable. Philosophers generally agree that this “process reliabilism” plays a powerful part in how people come to hold specific viewpoints (Goldman, 1979, 2008).

Why someone holds a specific view of teaching is about the justification of the view, not its development (Goldman, 2008). To return to our example, through experiences I came to accept that the knowledge that students learn in different ways was generally reliable. That process of experiences constituted how I came to hold that view. If asked why I accept that students learn in different ways, I would suggest the falseness of the opposite concept, i.e., all students learn the same way. Thus, how is developmental and experiential, whereas why is about justification of an existing viewpoint. Scholars have provided ample evidence of which beliefs pre-service students maintain in teacher education programs, and how those beliefs influence their practice (Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013; Richardson, 1996, 2003; Richardson & Placier, 2001). This study aimed to investigate how experiences contribute to the development of pre-service teachers’ purposes for teaching.
An exploration of how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contribute to the development of purposes for teaching can play an important part in creating teacher education experiences that push students to think about why and how they choose to teach. This vision of the purpose of teacher education emerges from a progressive, deeply democratic, social justice worldview, one shared by a host of social studies scholars and professionals. Such an orientation views teacher education as part of a process of improving society through education that emphasizes deep democratic principles, economic and social justice, and a communal rather than individualistic approach to citizenship. I maintain this worldview and thus hope to contribute to a rethinking of teacher education through the current research.

To summarize the rationale for this study: (a) There is a lack of research on the contribution of experiences of social studies teaching and learning to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching; (b) these experiences are an important part of how purposes for teaching develop; (c) understanding how a purpose develops is equally important to the purpose itself when gaining a deeper understanding of teachers; and (d) purposes for teaching are an important area of research because they often reveal what teachers teach for. Greater understandings of teachers’ purposes are an integral component of social studies teacher education programs that promote teaching for citizenship, social justice, and democracy.
Study Overview

Purpose Statement and Research Questions

From a review of research, I developed an overarching purpose and research questions for this study. The purpose of the study was to explore how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. It is important to note that the study did not focus on how pre-service teachers discuss their experiences, but primarily examined how these experiences contributed to the development of their purposes for teaching. I did not perceive the relationship between an experience and purposes for teaching to be cause and effect; rather experiences were a part of how pre-service teachers developed their purposes for teaching. Informed by this purpose, I explored the following specific research questions:

1. How do experiences of social studies teaching and learning that take place prior to teacher education contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching?

2. How do experiences of social studies teaching and learning that take place during teacher education, prior to student teaching contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching?

3. How do experiences of social studies teaching and learning that take place during student teaching contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching?
Overall, the study used a social constructivist theoretical framework as its orienting lens (Creswell, 2009; Guba & Lincoln, 1994), in keeping with the theoretical worldview of the researcher. The goal of constructivist research is to gather and analyze data that honors participants’ views of the phenomenon being studied (Creswell, 2009). In this study, the examined phenomenon was how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching.

Overview of Research Design and Methods

The research design for this study was an instrumental case study. Through the study of discrete cases, we can gain a deeper understanding of an issue or idea (Stake, 2000). In instrumental case studies, “the case is of secondary interest, it plays a supportive role, and it facilitates our understanding of something else” (Stake, 2000, p. 437). In this study, the cases (units of analysis) were the four student participants. The topic under investigation (the phenomenon, or “something else”) was how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contributed to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching.

Participants and Data

Four pre-service social studies teachers participated in this study. Additionally, two social studies teacher educators participated in the study. They provided important contextual data on the social studies teacher education program at the study site through interviews and analysis of the course syllabi. They also instructed the four student
participants within that program. The data sources from the student participants consisted of in-depth interviews, observations of teacher education classes and participants’ student teaching, and participant journaling. I analyzed the data using narrative analysis and categorical analysis. I discuss these methods, and the distinction between the two groups of participants, at length in Chapter III.

Explanation of Key Terms

I employ certain terms and concepts in this study that require elaboration. These explanations will assist readers in understanding the structure and scope of the research.

**Experience and experiences.** I frequently use the terms “experience” and “experiences.” I understand experience, in a very broad sense, to include almost any moment in a participant’s life that they felt connects to social studies teaching and learning. Experiences included conversations, thoughts, classroom experiences, social experiences, and reflections on literature. I allowed participants to determine what constituted an experience rather than define it for them so that they were not limited in what they felt was relevant to share.

**Social studies and social studies education.** The one delimitation I placed on the definition of experience is that the experience involved “social studies teaching and learning.” I interpreted this concept to include anything connected to the canon of social studies in K-12 and higher education. However, social studies education can take place anywhere and is not limited to learning within schools. For example, a conversation with a friend, family member, or colleague that included a discussion of a social topic or issue could be an experience of social studies teaching and learning. “Social studies education”
refers to the well-established core of social studies classes taught in public schools from K-12. These courses include history, geography, political science, economics, civics, government, and various other iterations that focus on social topics and issues.

**Purposes.** In this study, “purposes” for social studies teaching refers to participants’ understandings of their reasons for teaching. Several well-documented purposes for social studies teaching include fostering citizens who demonstrate democratic participation, acquiring a traditional body of knowledge that supports patriotism and civic pride, and engaging in a process of social critique with the aim of identifying inequalities and deepening democracy. In this study, I asked participants to share and explore their purposes for social studies teaching, and how they came to hold those purposes, but did not bound the notion of purposes to include only those that research has previously identified.

How I conceptualized purpose and other connected terms that arose in the literature (vision, goals, missions, ideals, objectives, rationales, and beliefs) is important to the framework of the study. I did not adhere to a bounded definition of purpose, as the research uses various terms to describe and discuss ideas of purpose. For example, we can understand broad educational goals and rationales for teaching as interpretations of purpose if we make clear how these ideas are about purposes for teaching. Thus, when I explored literature that discussed notions of purposes for teaching, but used different terminology, I identified how the work informed my discussion of purpose.

“Purposes for teaching” confers vast and complex meanings. It can denote broad ideas, such as social purposes of teaching, i.e., “we send children to school for academic,
social, economic, and individual reasons,” and “we send children to school to improve society.” It can refer to personal purposes for teaching, i.e., “I want to help children develop,” and “I am knowledgeable about a specific content area and I want to share my knowledge with students.” Further, it can suggest purposes for teaching teachers, i.e., “our purpose is to reform education through teaching teachers,” and “our purposes for teacher education focus on ‘training’ teachers to do the work of teaching.”

I interpreted “purposes for teaching” as a multidimensional concept. The first layer of the concept contains the broader purposes for education visible in public discourse. These ideas contribute to the foundation for teachers’ purposes for teaching. Scholars have found that teachers incorporate ideas from this collective conversation as they construct their own purposes for teaching, which is a second element of the concept. They bring these personal theories to their teacher education programs. Within these sites, they often develop and refine their notions of purpose through investigation and discussion of the ideas they hold, as well as scholarly interpretations of purpose. Any research reviewed in Chapter II connected with one, or several, of these elements of the concept of “purposes for teaching.”

**Teacher education.** “Teacher education” refers to a specific process of learning to become a teacher in a higher education program. I included a four-year program of social studies teacher education at a large Midwestern state university and a twelve-month MAT (Master of Arts in Teaching) social studies teacher education program at the same university. The three participants enrolled in the four-year program completed content area courses, introductory education courses, and a program of advanced study
during which they focused on methods for social studies teaching and completed a one-year student teaching field experience. The participant enrolled in the MAT social studies teacher education program completed introductory education courses, social studies methods courses, and a one-year student teaching field experience.

**Reform and reform-oriented approaches.** “Reform” and “reform-oriented approaches” refer to efforts to change teacher education programs to align with innovative understandings of the goals of social studies teacher education. “Reform-oriented approaches” refers specifically to fostering teacher development with an emphasis on teaching for democratic citizenship, critical social orientations, and adopting a critically reflective stance as a teacher.

**Critically reflective.** I interpreted “critically reflective” as a cognitive and social stance whereby teachers think deeply about their practice, explore the experiences and reasons that underpin their thinking, and do so with the intention of improving their practice.

**Practice.** In this study, “practice” refers to the generally accepted instructional and pedagogical behaviors of teachers within social studies classrooms.

**Summary**

A review of the research concerned with purposes for social studies education, purpose as an area of focus in social studies teacher education, and social studies teachers’ individual purposes for teaching social studies revealed a gap in the literature. There was a lack of research about how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for
teaching. The present study addressed this gap through an instrumental case study of four pre-service social studies teachers in a social studies teacher education program at a mid-sized, Midwestern state university. Three of the student participants were in the final year of their social studies teacher education program: a semester of observation and a 12-week student teaching experience. The fourth student participant was in a MAT program. She completed a 12-week student teaching experience as well. The student participants’ position in the program enabled them to speak to all three of the research questions.

I approached the data through a social constructivist lens, viewing the construction of individualized meaning and beliefs as occurring through a process of experiences in a social context. I collected data through face-to-face semi-structured interviews with the participants, participants’ reflective writing and journaling, written artifacts created by the participants, observations of the participants’ teacher education classes and student teaching, and detailed information about their teacher education programs. I analyzed the data using narrative analysis and compared across cases in an effort to identify how experiences contributed to the development of their purposes for teaching social studies. The findings of the study centered on pre-service teachers’ experiences of high school social studies classes, the unique incorporation of ideas from their teacher education, the negotiation of tension in student teaching, and the confluence of these experiences as part of a “purpose formation process.” The findings have implications for improving teacher education programs, in terms of both program
structure and curriculum, and improving classroom practice. I discuss the implications of the research findings at length in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

“The teacher who lacks clear goals and a sense of purpose is likely to have difficulty making sensible, consistent decisions about what to teach, when, and how.”

—Darling-Hammond, et al., 2005, pp. 171-172

“…unless they have a clear sense of purpose, teachers’ primary actions continue to be coverage of the curriculum and control of students no matter how much they know about history, teaching, or the intersection of the two.”

—Barton & Levstik, 2004, p. 258

Introduction

These excerpts offer a window into scholarly thought about the intersections of purpose, teaching, teachers, and education. There is a long history of scholarship on the social purposes of education and what role education should play in society, within both research on education in general (Counts, 1932, 1939; Dewey, 1916, 1938; Goodlad, 1984; Gutmann, 1987) and research on social studies education (Hunt & Metcalf, 1968; Hursh & Ross, 2000; Kincheloe, 2001; Newmann, 1975; Parker, 2003; Stanley & Nelson, 1986). As a corollary to this tradition, scholars now recognize the importance of exploring teachers’ purposes for teaching (Darling-Hammond, 2005; Duffy, 2002; Gradwell, 2006; Hammerness, 2003, 2006, 2008, 2010; Kennedy, 2006; Pekarsky, 2007; Pryor, 2006; Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013; van Hover & Yeager, 2007) and the value of developing purpose for pre-service teachers within teacher education programs (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Chiodo & Brown, 2007; Cochran-Smith, 2010; Hammerness, 2003, 2010;
Kennedy, 2006; Osguthorpe & Sanger; Thornton, 2005; Waring, 2010; van Hover & Yeager, 2004). In this literature review, I have investigated studies from three realms of research—social purposes for education, teachers’ purposes for teaching, and purpose as an area of focus within pre-service teacher education—with specific inquiry into purposes for social studies teaching. In an effort to present a clear picture of this literature, I also briefly discuss additional studies that provide foundational context. I discuss all research in connection to the following guiding questions: (a) What does the literature tell us about purposes? (b) How does the research fit in the larger education conversation? (c) Why is it necessary to explore purpose? (D) What is missing from the research? (e) What are dominant philosophical connections and patterns? and (f) What are the theoretical and philosophical groundings of the work in this area?

The Process

The research process for this literature review began with searching the Education Research Complete Database, through a university library, for articles that discuss purpose as a concept in education. I also conducted a wide-ranging search within the same database for discussions of purpose in social studies education. I used a set of inclusion and exclusion criteria to determine whether the scholarship was relevant to the research. The inclusion criteria limited the literature to studies regarding social purposes for education, teachers’ purposes for teaching, and purpose as an area of focus within pre-service teacher education, with specific emphasis on purposes for social studies teaching. Exclusion criteria eliminated studies that did not pertain to education and purpose. I also consulted journals that were not contained within that database, such as Teaching and
Teacher Education, for research about teachers’ purposes for teaching. I used the following search terms to identify relevant literature; purpose, vision, goals, aims, objectives, rationales, and beliefs. From these searches, I began a systematic inquiry of the collected literature. As I found literature that spoke to the guiding questions, I employed a process of backwards investigation. This process began with reading the selected articles, books, and book chapters. I then identified previous studies cited in the sources that addressed the area of focus. The most current articles (from 2010 to the present) were particularly valuable because their discussion of sources and reference lists provided a guide to previous research on issues of purpose.

Following the arc of scholarship and tracing prevalent themes in the literature allowed me to identify the studies and theoretical papers that scholars cited repeatedly within the literature. Exploring these seminal pieces confirmed that my investigation was on the right path. As themes in the literature began to appear—including discussions of teachers’ visions, citizenship education, democratic education, and purposes within general teacher education and social studies teacher education, to highlight a few—I repeated the backward search process to identify frequently cited scholarship within each of these themes. Of particular value as guiding sources were a series of handbooks: the Handbook of Research on Teaching, Handbook of Research in Social Studies Education, Handbook of Research on Teacher Education, and Second International Handbook of Educational Change. These provided literature reviews, commentaries from leading scholars within different areas of educational research, and reference lists that suggested
further reading. The organization of the literature reviews in these sources also provided a guide for how to structure this literature review.

The Structure

In this review, I explored various studies’ discussions of purposes for teaching, with particular attention on purposes for social studies teaching, noting how the authors connected ideas of purpose with the focus of their research. Even when the authors’ work centered primarily on educational reform, social justice, or teacher beliefs, their discussion and invocation of notions of purpose was relevant to addressing the guiding questions of this literature review. The importance of each work was revealed after reading the work in its entirety, not just their discussions of purpose, and I discuss the content of each work as I introduce them in the literature review.

I begin by exploring research that discusses why purpose matters in education. I then discuss research on social interpretations of the purposes of education. Both of these sections work to establish the context for research on purposes for teaching and social studies teaching. Following these sections, I narrow the focus to a discussion of research on teachers’ purposes for teaching, and further, to research on purpose as an area of focus in pre-service teacher education programs. These sections work to establish the context for subsequent sections on purposes for teaching social studies.

I then expand the scope of the review briefly to focus on research concerning social interpretations of the purposes of social studies education. Exploring scholars’ discussions of purpose in this body of literature was useful for establishing a context for examining social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching and purpose as an area of focus
in social studies teacher education programs. The final two sections of the literature review examine the theoretical foundations of the literature and identify a gap in the scholarship.

Why Purpose Matters

One of the guiding questions of this literature review was “why is it necessary to explore purpose?” Scholarly arguments from diverse areas of educational research reveal the importance of purpose within teacher education. This section looks at four themes in the literature: (a) having a sense of purpose provides educational institutions with meaning and organization; (b) a sense of purpose guides teachers’ practices; (c) understanding one’s own purpose is central to teacher development; and (d) focusing on purpose is important as a counter-movement to the drive for outcomes-based education.

From a theoretical perspective, Pekarsky’s (2007) work on vision-guided educational practice offers several reasons why purpose matters and provides a foundation for larger discussions of purposes for education, teachers’ purposes for teaching, and purpose in teacher education. Although he uses the term “vision” to describe his understanding of what should guide educational reform efforts and teaching, I understood his interpretation as an argument for the importance of purpose. In his “critique of the rhetoric and practice associated with American education” (p. 423), Pekarsky argues that having a vision of the type of person and community that we would like for education to create offers a non-arbitrary tool for organizing educational institutions. He contends that having a vision within an educational body imbues the work of its educators with meaning. Further, vision is powerful because it makes the
institution’s aims and activities coherent, personally fulfilling, and morally worthy.

Lastly, Pekarsky believes that not having a vision for education can be harmful for students by leading to shifting and disjointed structures of learning and development.

Pekarsky (2007) also argues that teachers’ “existential vision” should be the focal point of their complete conception of education, but stop short of dictating it. Just as institutions should have a guiding vision, so too should teachers have guiding visions of the type of person and community they seek to create through education, one that directs their educational practices but stops short of dictating them. Consequently, he contends that vision should be at the core of education. Pekarsky understands American education as failing to include an emphasis on vision. His argument is strengthened through his connection of Dewey’s (1938) ideas of educational purpose to his own concept of vision-guided education, specifically, the idea that organizing current educational efforts around future aims, or purposes, infuses those efforts with meaning.

Scholars have demonstrated that purpose is important because of the connection between teachers’ practices and their thoughts and beliefs about purposes (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2005; Hammerness, 2010; Hochstrasser-Fickel, 2000; Johnston, 1990; McCall, 1995; Smith, 2000; van Hover & Yeager, 2007). Van Hover and Yeager’s (2007) study of the instructional decision making of a history teacher with a clearly defined purpose showed purpose to be a powerful factor in pedagogical decision making. A case study of two elementary social studies pre-service teachers revealed that social studies methods courses influenced their practice of social studies, and that the backgrounds and beliefs of individuals interact with the content of their methods course
in differing ways (Johnston, 1990; see also Angell’s 1998 comparative case study of two elementary pre-service teachers in a social studies methods class and student teaching). Hammerness (2010) advances a similar conception, contending that teachers’ “visions of the possible,” i.e., what they hope to create through teaching, has a significant influence on their practice (p. 1033). Connecting the ideas of images and vision with the idea that having a purpose guides one’s practice, Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1984) state, “Images express the teachers’ purpose. Because they are open, images guide teachers intuitively, inspiring rather than determining their actions” (p. 33). These are powerful ideas of how the interrelated concepts of vision, image, and purpose all function as guides, rather than mandates, for teachers.

Closely connected to this theme is the notion that purpose is important in teacher development. Scholars have persuasively demonstrated that it is important for teachers and teacher educators to explore and understand teachers’ purposes as part of their development of authentic practice (Chant, 2002). Hammerness (2003) argues that it is important for teachers to explore their educational visions as part of development. She also examines the challenges of bringing vision into practice. In her study of beginning teachers and their visions of teaching, she argues that exploring the concept of vision can help teachers interrogate their beliefs about why they choose to teach, enabling them to develop practices that are more in line with those beliefs. Research also indicates that the ability to enact one’s vision can have a powerful influence on one’s decision to remain in teaching or in certain schools (Hammerness, 2008). Barton and Levstik (2004) suggest that a lack of a central purpose to guide practice and teacher development can be an
equally negative influence upon practice; “unless they have a clear sense of purpose, teachers’ primary actions continue to be coverage of the curriculum and control of students no matter how much they know about history, teaching, or the intersection of the two” (p. 258).

In this discussion of the relationship between purpose and practice, there is an important distinction. While the literature focuses on how purpose influences practice, my interpretation suggests that teachers’ purposes for teaching reveal what they are teaching for. While these ideas are interrelated, I contend that purpose serves as a foundation for rather than just a variable of practice. That is, in order to understand how and why a purpose influences practice, we need to understand the purpose itself and how it developed.

A final thought about why it is important to explore purpose concerns the current climate of education in America. There is a vein of educational research that contends the increased focus on high stakes testing (hereafter “HST”) and the predominance of outcomes-based education has driven out discussions of broad purposes of education, to the detriment of students and society (Biesta, 2009, 2010; Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2010; Gradwell, 2006; Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013). Biesta (2009, 2010) is particularly persuasive in arguing that a preference for evaluating the success of education based on data-derived factual outcomes overlooks the role education can, and should, play in perpetuating desirable social values. He argues that a reengagement with conversations about purpose in education is necessary to counter the single-minded approach of the HST movement (also known as the Accountability Movement). Further, there is a
coherent argument in the research that exploring and supporting a sense of purpose among teachers is important as a means to reorient teachers and educators to more powerful social purposes of education (Hammerness, 2010; McNeil, 2001; Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013). Pekarsky (2007) adds to this conversation through his argument that purpose is not a central focus in educational institutions, including schools and teacher education programs, due to the focus on HST.

**Social Purposes for Education**

“…thoughtful, systematic attention to larger questions of purpose is rarely at the heart of American social and educational discourse.”

(Pekarsky, 2007, p. 424)

Research on teachers’ purposes for teaching forms the heart of this literature review. However, the literature on broader social understandings of the purposes of education surrounds and interconnects with research on teachers’ purposes for teaching. Contextualizing the former literature within the latter scholarship necessitates a brief discussion of social interpretations of purposes for education. There is a proven relationship between beliefs about purposes for education held by society and purposes for teaching held by teachers. Pre-service teachers bring their own beliefs about education to their teacher education programs (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Kennedy, 2006), and scholars have shown that pre-service teachers begin their education with some inherent language of, and desires for, education drawn from their beliefs and social experiences (Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013; Richardson, 1996, 2003; Richardson & Placier, 2001). Additionally, society’s purposes for education often compete and conflict with
teachers’ purposes for teaching and particularly with the purposes for education espoused within teacher education programs (Kennedy, 2006). If this is the case, it suggests that the relationship between social understandings of purposes for education and teachers’ purposes for teaching is more complex than teachers reproducing dominant social understandings of purpose in their thinking and teaching. These themes in the research suggested a need for further research on the nature and function of the relationship between teacher and societal expectations in purposes.

Any discussion of social purposes for education necessarily includes an investigation of Dewey’s work on this subject (Dewey, 1916, 1937, 1938). His interpretations of the role of education in society, and the goals of education for society, form a foundation for the last 100 years of scholarship. The depth and breadth of his ideas on the social functions of education encompass teaching for democratic citizenship, education as an avenue to the common good, education as part of the social process of progress, and education as the primary developmental experience for children (see Breault & Breault, 2005, for a discussion of these concepts). The Deweyan concept that is most central to this review is his understanding of how education aims to foster democracy, specifically the belief that public education should nurture the development of an educated citizenry for the purpose of continually deepening and broadening our democratic society (Goodman, 2005). Dewey argued that public education should help create a society based on a social democracy, as well as a political one, and that a narrow economic focus in education poses a threat to these conceptions of educational purpose. He believed that every generation needed to enact democracy anew every year and day—
that school should be the constant nurse of democracy. These core ideas are visible in the following research on the social purposes of education and arise again in research on social purposes for social studies education specifically.

Pekarsky’s (2007) theoretical argument concerning the importance of purpose as a guide for education relies upon Dewey’s (1938) ideas concerning the importance of growth as an educational goal. Pekarsky held that it is possible to satisfy goals for student and social growth by establishing them as aims within vision-guided education. Similarly, Newton (1989) recounts Dewey’s three general aims of education in a democratic society (development according to nature, social efficiency, and culture) in an effort to reinvigorate efforts to reform education through a focus on purpose-guided education.

Additional scholars have discussed broad social purposes for education with Deweyan ideas as the foundation of their arguments. Goodlad’s (1984) seminal work on the place of school in society, which I explore further in the section on teachers’ purposes for teaching, suggests that there are four purposes of schools: academic, vocational, social and civic, and personal. This work builds upon Dewey’s ideas of the role of education in society and provides foundational constructs for further studies that look at specific social purposes of education. Labaree (1997) outlines three competing purposes for education: democratic equality, social efficiency, and social mobility. This theoretical exploration of the purposes of education suggests that the goal of social mobility has come to dominate American education and educational discourse and, as a result, “public education has increasingly come to be perceived as a private good that is harnessed to the
pursuit of personal advantage…” (p. 43). Labaree (2010) develops this understanding about the dominance of economic purposes for education, arguing that “the most prominent [contemporary] American rationale for schooling [is] to increase the productive skills of the workforce and promote economic growth” (p. 7). These discussions of social purposes for education form the context within which thinking and research on teachers’ purposes for teaching exist.

**Teachers’ Purposes for Teaching**

There is a body of scholarship exploring reasons for becoming a teacher. Why someone chooses to become a teacher can influence their purposes for teaching once they are a pre-service or in-service teacher. Consequently, such scholarship is contextual to research on and discussions of purposes for teaching. One of the foundational works regarding why people choose to pursue teaching is Daniel Lortie’s (1975) *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*. Lortie examined data from interviews and a National Education Association study of teachers and concluded that there were five reasons why teaching appealed to students: interpersonal appeal, service, continuation of school experiences, material benefits, and the appeal of traditional time demands of teaching. However, Lortie’s work emphasized that many teachers felt they were able to satisfy their desire to serve through teaching. Subsequent studies confirmed the idea of service as a purpose for teaching (Jantzen, 1981; Book & Freeman, 1986).

In connection with these studies is a body of literature that looks at teachers’ motivations for choosing a career in teaching (Book & Freeman, 1986; Brookhart & Freeman, 1992; Goodlad, 1984; Joseph & Green, 1986; Watt & Richardson, 2007). This
realm of research suggests that altruistic goals and positive educational experiences, both as a student and in previous teaching experiences, are a factor in many teachers’ decisions to undertake teaching as a career (Watt & Richardson, 2007). Brookhart and Freeman’s (1992) review of 44 studies published between 1960 and 1990, which addressed the characteristics of entering teacher candidates (motivations to teach and perceptions of the roles of teachers being two of the prevalent categories of characteristics), also suggests that teacher candidates choose to teach to satisfy altruistic goals. Goodlad’s (1984) study included a survey asking teachers to give their reasons for teaching. He concluded that, “The largest majority of our sample, on all levels, tended to be idealistic and altruistic in their views of why they chose to teach” (p. 173). This finding connects with the research on moral motivations for teaching discussed below.

One of the significant themes in the literature on teachers’ purposes for teaching is the notion of “moral” purposes for teaching. Moral purposes for education and teaching, not to be confused with “moral education,” which is understood as a specific aspect of educational practice (Hansen, 2001), center on the idea that reasons for teaching include inherently moral dimensions. Osguthorpe and Sanger’s (2013) study of teacher candidates’ reasons for choosing a career in teaching illustrates this interpretation. They found “moral” beliefs to be at the heart of why students chose to become teachers. In their study of pre-service teacher candidates, they asked students to respond to a survey item: “What is the purpose of schooling?” They found three pervasive themes. “Our teacher candidates expect schools to (a) prepare students for the real world, (b) strengthen academic capacities, and (c) encourage moral and/or prosocial development (as opposed
to antisocial)” (Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013, p. 186). They also concluded that “our candidates appear to have a general belief that the purpose of schooling is to prepare students to function in society” (p. 187). The authors suggest that teacher candidates view education and teaching as part of a means to an end, that objective being academic achievement that leads to social and economic success. Additional scholars illustrate that both in-service and pre-service teachers, whether intentionally or unintentionally, include moral and ethical purposes in their teaching (Campbell, 2003; Fenstermacher, 1990; Noddings, 2002; Tom, 1984).

Another significant theme in the literature on teachers’ purposes for teaching is the concept of “vision.” The literature on educational visions includes visions held by teachers, rather than limiting the discussion to organizational and institutional realms (Darling-Hammond et al., 2005; Duffy, 2002; Hammerness, 2003, 2008, 2010; Kennedy, 2006). Individuals’ educational visions often include a deep sense of purpose, and exploring these visions helps researchers uncover and understand teachers’ purposes for teaching (Hammerness, 2010). Hammerness explores current interpretations of vision in an effort to move toward a deeper understanding of the concept, answer questions about vision in education, and suggest some implications for the role of vision in educational change. A large portion of the scholarship on vision exists within the literature on educational reform (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Fullan, 2007; Hargreaves & Fink, 2005; Hodge, 2010; Pekarsky, 2007). Hammerness understands teachers’ educational visions as expressions of ideal classroom practice—what teachers imagine is possible for their classrooms, schools, communities, and society—as well as, in part, a cognitive
expression of a teacher’s mission or goals (Hammerness, 2003, 2006, 2010). Duffy (2002) argues that vision represents a “conscious sense of self, of one’s work and of one’s mission . . . a personal stance on teaching that arises from deep within” (p. 334).

Pekarsky’s (2007) notion of an “existential vision” held by teachers is another important interpretation that connects to a discussion of purpose. The author understands such visions as being deeply concerned with aims for the type of person and community one hopes to create through the educational process. The ideas of people and community intertwine, since the type of person desired will need to support the type of community desired and vice-a-versa. He states:

...a conception of the kind of person we hope will emerge from the educational process is intimately connected with a conception of the kind of community that he or she will share in; similarly, the attempt to foster a thriving community of a certain kind necessitates the cultivation of individuals whose qualities of heart and mind are congenial to its requirements. (Pekarsky, 2007, p. 426)

He continues, “Most generally, then, an existential vision is an answer to the questions, *What is this enterprise all about? What is its raison d’être?*” (Pekarsky, 2007, p.426).

While this research does not directly reveal what purposes teachers have for teaching, it does reveal where students, teachers, and researchers might look to find those purposes.

**Purpose as an Area of Focus within Pre-service Teacher Education**

One of the traditional sites for discussions of teachers’ purposes for teaching is literature on pre-service teacher education. Research on teacher education and social studies teacher education devotes significant space to questions of purposes for teaching,
purposes for teaching specific disciplines, and the role of purpose within teacher education programs. This section briefly explores research on purpose as an area of focus in pre-service teacher education.

Past research indicates that pre-service teacher education can provide powerful opportunities for students to explore and develop their visions (Hammerness, 2010; Kennedy, 2006). Focusing on vision in teacher education programs could help support and sustain teachers through examining their beliefs, their goals, and the relationship between their goals and practice (Hammerness, 2003). Joseph and Green (1986) call for teacher education programs to delve deeply into the motivating factors of students who wish to become teachers. They argue that this is essential as a part of professionalizing teaching. Osguthorpe and Sanger’s (2013) study emphasizes creating a place in teacher education to focus on the moral work of teaching. Doing so reorients teacher candidates to the purposes of schooling rather than focusing on meeting the demands of the HST paradigm, which elides the moral purposes of teaching (Biesta, 2009, 2010; Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2010). They offer a powerful reason for focusing on purpose in teacher education:

Teacher candidates seem to believe that they can attend to both moral/prosocial development and academic outcomes without any recognition that they will be teaching in an environment that has effectively squeezed out any notion of the broader moral and social purposes of schooling. (Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013, p. 192)
It is the responsibility of teacher educators to help future teachers realize and negotiate this tension.

Research on the role of social justice purposes in teacher education creates a bridge between two topics: purposes in teacher education and purpose in social studies teacher education. McDonald (2007) explored teacher educators’ understandings of social justice within two social justice–focused teacher education programs. He found that teacher education with a focus on social justice supports the moral and ethical purposes of teaching. McDonald’s research reveals a connection between purposes of teacher education and purposes for teaching, specifically, democracy and democratic citizenship. These are two of the prominent foci of social studies teacher education. Additionally, just as other scholars have emphasized the importance of focusing on teacher’s visions and purposes in research and practice as a counter to the standardization movement (Hammerness, 2003, 2008, 2010; McNeil, 2001; Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013), creating a theory of teacher education for social justice is similarly important in the current climate of policy-makers’ fixation on testing regimes (Cochran-Smith, 2010). Doing so reorients teacher educators and their students toward the larger social purposes of education.

**Social Purposes for Social Studies Education**

“The primary purpose of social studies is to help young people develop the ability to make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world”

This statement of the purpose of social studies education contains themes that are prominent in scholars’ current thinking about social studies education. Multicultural and democratic citizenship (both nationally and globally), the public good, and informed and reasoned decision-making are central goals of social studies instruction. A vast body of research exists on each of these ideas. While these realms of literature may not speak directly to teachers’ purposes for teaching social studies, they do suggest social purposes for social studies education. Just as research on social understandings of the purpose of education surrounds and interconnects with research on teachers’ purposes for teaching, so too does the research on the purpose of social studies education interconnect with research on social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. My examination of this literature developed the context surrounding the research on social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching.

In order to keep this section of the literature review manageable I explored two primary veins of research on social purposes for social studies education. Both provide context for a discussion of social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. I examined two proposed purposes of social studies education: to foster democratic citizenship and to engender multicultural citizenship. These two realms of research are vast in their own right. Thus, I focused on seminal pieces that contribute to our understanding of the purposes of social studies education and I present an interpretation of how this research connects to research about purposes for teaching social studies.
Democracy and Multiculturalism

A generally accepted purpose of social studies teaching is to equip students to become citizens who possess the knowledge and skills to participate actively in the democratic societies to which they belong (Dilworth, 2008; Foshay & Burton, 1976; Hawley, 2012; Ross, 2006; Saxe, 1991; Thornton, 2005; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Scholars have historically debated the nature and extent of education for democratic citizenship within social studies teaching (Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1977; Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Evans, 2004; Hursh & Ross, 2000; Kincheloe, 2001; Newmann, 1975; Parker, 2003; Thornton, 2005). Ross and Marker (2005) argue that social studies curriculum and pedagogy should prepare citizens for full participation in a democracy, rather than transmit the social status quo to students. From a multi-year study of school programs focused on teaching for democratic citizenship, centered on the question of what type of citizen social studies educators strive to foster, Westheimer and Kahne (2004) concluded that teaching for democratic citizenship is possible despite the current emphasis on teaching students to be individually-oriented citizens. They found that ideas within democracy-based teaching that contain politically infused, narrow understandings of citizenship work against the larger civic purposes of teaching social studies for deep democracy. Kahne and Westheimer (2006) built upon their findings from this multi-year study and made suggestions on how to structure educational programs that teach for democracy rather than merely about democracy.

Parker (2003) provides essential scholarship on teaching for democratic citizenship through his identification of three understandings of citizenship education:
traditional, progressive, and advanced. Parker held that traditional and progressive interpretations dominate public and scholarly thinking and that in order to realize a more robust democracy, social studies educators need to rethink their approach to teaching. Nelson’s (2001) discussion of the persistent controversies and conversations surrounding the definitions and purposes of social studies reveals that education for citizenship in a democracy necessitates more than transmitted traditional knowledge. Both of these foundational studies include, at the least, a suggestion that social studies education needs to consider and incorporate a purpose of teaching for democracy and citizenship.

In connection to these studies, scholarship that focuses specifically on citizenship education suggests that multicultural citizenship is an important area of focus for social studies educators. Gay (1997) makes this connection through her reflections on the interconnections between education for democratic citizenship and education for multicultural citizenship. She contends that a singular focus on democratic citizenship education, without the incorporation of multicultural ethics, values, and an emphasis on equality, creates tension between the two concepts of education. She proposes that social studies education move forward with a curriculum that incorporates elements of both understandings of citizenship education. Within Ritter and Lee’s (2009) study of a social studies teacher education program’s vision statement—and its reflection of cultural assumptions—the authors provide their explanation of social studies education for democratic citizenship and connect this idea to social studies education for multicultural citizenship. Banks (2008) looks at three types of citizenship education and argues for an expansion of citizenship education to include non-traditional groups, building upon his
previous arguments that doing so is requisite if students are to become active citizens who are aware of cultural and societal complexity and are able to identify contradictions in American society (Banks, 1990). Similarly, Patterson Dilworth (2004, 2008) explores multicultural citizenship education as an avenue to eschewing and expanding the traditional conception of a citizen. She proposes that in order for students to become citizens in an increasingly diverse national and global community, social studies education must equip them with the multicultural knowledge and skills to participate actively in such societies.

A Question of Overarching Purpose

The previous two areas of focus in the research exist within a larger conversation about the overarching purpose of social studies education in society. Stanley’s (2005) theoretical discussion of a key question concerning the purpose of social studies education—whether social studies educators should perpetuate the status quo in society or seek to transform society—presents several historical perspectives on this question. His aim is to encourage social studies educators to engage with the question and develop their own understandings of the purposes for teaching social studies. His discussion reveals the importance of considering broader purposes for teaching social studies. Hursh and Ross (2000) also explore this question from the perspective of the relationship between education, society, and citizenship. Vinson and Ross’s (2001) investigation of major ideas about the social studies curriculum and the purpose of social studies education is a key piece in this discussion as well. The authors consider the same question that Stanley (2005) and Hursh and Ross (2000) have: Is the purpose of social
studies education to promote citizenship that perpetuates the status quo in society or to create the type of citizen who will work to transform it? Each of these studies suggests that bounded conceptions of the purpose for social studies education lead to some version of transmitted citizenship understandings, which significantly influences how social studies teachers understand and develop purposes for teaching.

**Social Studies Teachers’ Purposes for Teaching**

There is ample research on in-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching social studies. However, Hawley (2010) affirms, “…little empirical research exists on how to encourage social studies teachers to develop their sense of purpose” (p. 132). Research on rationale-based teacher education, which investigates what student teachers are teaching for (Hawley, 2010; Dinkelman, 2009), is important to the discussion of social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. Dinkelman (2009) argues that research needs to increasingly focus on teachers’ purposes, stating “The ‘what’ and ‘how’ of teaching comprise a much larger portion of their [social studies education students] thinking than the ‘why’ of teaching” (pp. 93-94). In his exploration of the challenges that pre-service social studies teachers face in articulating rationales he concluded that reflection is one of the key components of getting students to begin to articulate their personal rationales for teaching. In his understanding, offering opportunities for students to engage in reflection is one of the key responsibilities of social studies teacher educators.

Van Hover and Yeager (2007) were responsible for a study that is integral to this review of research on social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. Their study
explored the instructional decision-making of a second-year social studies teacher who had graduated from an intensive social studies teacher education program, specifically asking what the notion of purpose meant to her and how her sense of purpose influenced her instructional decision-making. They found that their participant had a specific purpose for teaching history: “…to impart a particular set of moral values” (p. 671). This finding connects with the research on teachers’ moral purposes for teaching (Hansen, 2001, 2008; Noddings, 2002; Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013). The authors concluded that her purpose for teaching history, which was to impart her view of history to students, strongly influenced her decision-making and practice. This study reveals the power that purposes for teaching social studies can have in guiding practice, echoing Barton and Levstik’s (2004) argument that "teachers' goals appear to have more impact on practice than their pedagogical content knowledge" (p. 258), and that teachers with clear purposes and aims make decisions about their practice in keeping with their purpose.

**Purpose as an Area of Focus within Social Studies Teacher Education**

“…pre-service teacher education is well positioned to impact beliefs that underlie teachers' intentions toward becoming a democratic practitioner.”

(Pryor, 2006, p. 99)

While research on in-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching is relatively sparse, there is a significant body of scholarship on purpose as an area of focus in social studies teacher education. The quote that introduces this section characterizes thinking on the relationship between pre-service social studies teacher education and students’ possible purposes for teaching social studies. Pryor’s (2006) study of 27 pre-
service to in-service social studies teachers raises a number of relevant issues. Her research explores participants’ retention of the beliefs about democratic theory and practice they encountered in a social studies methods course. She argues that the HST movement minimizes critical knowledge of democratic citizenship among teacher candidates and that social studies teacher education programs are in a position to refocus students on the values and purposes of education and teaching, specifically democratic citizenship. In connection with this study, Hawley (2012) examines the importance of students developing a purpose during social studies teacher education programs in light of the HST climate. He suggests that those candidates who have a developed purpose have a better chance of enacting it and maintaining their commitment to it through their practice in spite of the pressures of outcomes-based education (see also Gradwell, 2006). Barton and Levstik (2004) also suggest there is a connection between focusing on purpose in social studies teacher education (creating social studies teacher education programs that counter the HST movement) and teachers who emphasize deep purposes for learning social studies in their classrooms.

As noted in the previous section, the literature on purpose in social studies teacher education often invokes a goal of encouraging teachers to adopt a purpose that includes developing participatory democratic and multicultural citizens (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Castro, 2013; Ladson-Billings, 2001). This body of literature emphasizes a similar goal to that of the literature on purposes for general teacher education, namely that teacher education should engender social justice–oriented teachers (Cochran-Smith, 2010; McDonald, 2007). With an overarching purpose for social studies education being
developing citizens who will live democratically, it is important to maintain a purpose in social studies teacher education of helping students develop into teachers who will foster these attitudes in their students.

Research on methods courses in social studies teacher education programs connects to this literature as well. Waring (2010) explores beliefs that students in a social studies methods course brought with them concerning pedagogical content knowledge and pedagogical approaches, and notes on what they hoped to learn from the methods course. His study also contributes to the growing call for social studies teacher educators to make their purposes explicit as a model for students (Hawley, 2012; Johnston, 1990; Loughran, 2006). This study and Pryor’s (2006) work on the importance of methods courses suggest they are sites where teacher educators can focus their attention in efforts to foster teachers oriented toward social justice and democracy.

Further research expands on the importance of purpose within social studies teacher education programs. Van Hover and Yeager (2004) argue that social studies teacher educators need to work with teacher candidates to uncover their purposes and goals for teaching history. They emphasize the importance of investigating the beliefs that students bring with them to their education programs, echoing research on teachers in general (Kennedy, 2006; Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013) that establishes the importance of beliefs in teacher development and practice. Similarly, Doppen’s (2007) study of the influence of an intensive social studies teacher education program on a group of pre-service social studies teachers explores how teacher education changes pre-existing student beliefs. Hawley (2010, 2012) focuses on purposes and social studies teacher
education as well. His work on developing a rationale-based pedagogy for social studies teacher education argues for “considering the development of purpose as both content and pedagogy of social studies teacher education” (Hawley, 2010, p.1). He contends that it is important for both social studies teacher educators and social studies teacher candidates to consider “why teacher candidates want to teach social studies” (p. 1), echoing literature that emphasizes the importance of exploring purposes for teaching within general teacher education programs (Hammerness, 2003, 2010; Kennedy, 2006; Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013). Research on teachers’ beliefs about the nature of social studies as they enter social studies teacher education suggests that students’ beliefs about social studies as a discipline have a significant influence on their desire to teach the subject (Owens, 1996; Slekar, 1998).

The above research proposes that both social studies educators and social studies education students need to develop and articulate their purposes for teaching social studies. Thornton (2005) provides an important addition to this conversation. He describes “aims talk” as examining the various purposes and rationales for teaching that we create and adopt. Furthermore, he argues for the importance of examining the origins of teachers’ aims—be they students, society, or scholarship—within classroom instruction, curriculum development, and teacher education. Such examinations lead to reflection on teachers’ purposes for teaching. While Thornton’s discussion primarily addresses in-service social studies teachers rather than teacher educators, we can easily extrapolate his premises; such an exercise in thinking about aims is equally important for teacher educators. When social studies teacher educators engage in examination of their
practices, and how their aims inform those practices, they open space to form a deeper understanding of their teaching about teaching. These understandings are indicative of current thinking about the importance of developing a purpose for social studies teaching.

Thornton (2005) goes on to argue that teachers who “do not understand the purposes of their actions” do not because they fail to examine their practices (pp. 45-46). The results of such a lack of understanding include student confusion about the reasons for learning subject matter, or worse, a sense that there is no reason for education at all. With this understanding, social studies teacher educators and pre-service social studies teachers are aware of the need to develop and perpetuate practices that make clear to students why our choices of subject matter are worthwhile.

Liston and Zeichner (1991) suggest that “Prospective teachers need to understand that they can examine their own and others’ educational views and in the process gain an enhanced understanding of both their own and others’ educational rationales” (p. 57). This interpretation is informative for social studies teacher education research on developing purpose, as well as research illustrating the connection between reflections and developing a rationale for teaching. Liston and Zeichner also provide a useful addition to Thornton’s (2005) call for social studies teacher educators to examine their aims. In their interpretation, no universal rationale exists that teachers can identify and adopt—a reality that others have suggested is partially responsible for the confusion and complexity of the notion of purpose in research (Adler, 2008; Pajares, 1992; Pekarsky, 2007). Rather, they suggest Gutman’s (1987) three basic principles of democratic education as a model rationale for education in a democratic society. Gutman held that a
democratic education “must develop a deliberative, democratic character in students, cannot repress rational deliberation, and cannot discriminate against any group of children” (Liston & Zeichner, p. 54). This rationale for democratic education offers a starting point for social studies teacher educators and social studies education students to consider their aims and ensuing practices. Further, this interpretation of a rationale for democratic education articulates principles that underpin social justice orientations for teaching and learning about teaching.

**Theoretical Foundations in the Literature**

This literature review has grouped the research into six main categories: social purposes for education, teachers’ purposes for teaching, purpose as an area of focus within pre-service teacher education, social purposes for social studies education, social studies teachers’ purposes for social studies teaching, and purpose as an area of focus within pre-service social studies teacher education programs. There are several significant themes visible across the literature, including an emphasis on the importance of larger purposes for education as a counter to the HST movement; ideas of moral– and value-oriented purposes for teaching; and, most consistently, ideas that beliefs and experiences shape teachers’ practices. However, these are more indicative of topical connections and similarities than they are shared theoretical foundations. Because the literature mostly consists of research studies, rather than explorations of theoretical concepts, the theoretical foundations in the literature remain difficult to identify.

This is not to say that the scholars did not base their studies on theoretical foundations, but rather that the scholarship on teachers’ purposes for teaching has rarely
been theorized as a contiguous body. Brookhart and Freeman’s (1992) analysis of 44 studies published between 1960 and 1990, which addressed the characteristics of entering teacher candidates, explicitly points out the lack of a coherent theory at the roots of this area of research. From an analysis of the literature, they argue that a major conceptual weakness of the research is that it has been atheoretical. They reveal that the vast majority of the research in this area relies on behaviorism rather than Vgotskyan social constructivist theory. They call for further research that adopts a social constructivist theoretical framework and explores entering teachers’ beliefs and how those beliefs influence learning to teach.

Scholars appear to have recognized Brookhart and Freeman’s (1992) characterization of the research on teachers’ purposes for teaching as atheoretical, and heeded their call for a social constructivist theoretical foundation for research in this realm. While the theoretical foundations of the literature on purposes for teaching are difficult to identify and categorize, due in part to the fact that the research explored in this review came from many different areas of scholarship with many different foundations, there is one identifiable, though arguable, theoretical thread that connects much of this research. Angell (1998) argues that research on how teachers think focuses on how teachers learn to teach (see Kennedy, 1991) rather than studying the structure of teacher education. She argues that this focus is indicative of a constructivist perspective, “which posits learning as an active creation of knowledge, an interpretive process in which the learner uses previous experience and existing beliefs to negotiate new meanings in social contexts” (p. 509). The idea that how one learns to teach is as important, or more
important, than the presentation of the practical aspects of teaching emerges across the different realms of research on purposes for teaching reviewed here (Chant, 2002; Hammerness, 2003; Richardson, 1996, 2003; Richardson & Placier, 2001; van Hover & Yeager, 2004). For example, Osguthorpe and Sanger (2013) state, “we assume, in the constructivist tradition, that effective teaching is informed by prior beliefs and that attending to these prior beliefs in teacher education is important when learning how to teach” (p. 181). Chiodo and Brown (2007) invoke the constructivist tradition as well: “Within the social studies profession, we have had a long history of viewing the teaching of our subject matter with an inquiry orientation (Evans, 2004). This method of instruction fits into the current constructivist view of teaching and learning” (p. 12).

While the literature consistently suggests that teachers’ experiences, beliefs, and previous understandings of social studies teaching and learning are important to their education and development, these understandings are not necessarily always representative of constructivist beliefs. A behaviorist interpretation of these ideas may suggest that the environment and learning that is immediately taking place most significantly influences students’ development into teachers. Where the authors do not explicitly state that their interpretations arise from a constructivist theoretical foundation, it is dangerous to assume they do. With these acknowledgements in mind, I would argue that constructivist understandings do support much of the research on purposes for teaching.
Gaps in the Literature

There is an apparent gap in the literature on pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. Literature exists on what beliefs teacher candidates bring with them to their teacher education programs (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Kennedy, 2006; Owens, 1996; Slekar, 1998; van Hover & Yeager, 2007; Waring, 2010), and how their thinking and beliefs about purpose, social studies, and teaching social studies influence their practice (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Gradwell, 2006; Hochstrasser-Fickel, 2000; Johnston, 1990; McCall, 1995; Pryor, 2006; van Hover & Yeager, 2007). There is also abundant research on how we can structure teacher education programs to challenge pre-existing beliefs and support educational reform efforts through engendering reform-oriented teachers (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Biesta, 2009, 2010; Cochran-Smith, 2010; Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2010; Hammerness, 2003; McDonald, 2007; Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013). Yet, there appeared to be an opening in the literature surrounding how social studies teachers develop their purposes for teaching social studies. For example, research discusses moral beliefs as a motivating factor in teachers’ decisions to teach (Campbell, 2003; Fenstermacher, 1990; Noddings, 2002; Tom, 1984). However, research as to how teachers develop those moral beliefs is minimal. If we are to have a deeper understanding of how teachers’ purposes contribute to their practice, we need to explore the experiences that contribute to the development of those purposes.

The literature reviewed here, as well as additional scholarship, confirmed the need for research on how teachers develop their purposes for teaching. Hochstrasser-Fickel (2000) argues that “teachers’ thinking and the underlying personal beliefs and theories
that form the framework for their classroom decision-making have wide ranging implications for educational equity and student achievement” (p. 360). In a study of three pre-service teachers’ attitudes toward the ideas in a social Reconstructionist multicultural education methods course, McCall (1995) concludes that it is important to understand pre-service teachers’ backgrounds and experiences in order to understand the influence of these experiences on their practice. Similarly, research indicates that personal backgrounds and views of social studies teaching factor heavily into the development of social studies teachers (Adler, 1984; Goodman & Adler, 1985; Smith, 2000).

Specifically, the experiences that teachers have before and during teacher education influence their teaching and decision-making (Foster, 1995; Noordhoff & Kleinfeld, 1993).

Additional calls to investigate social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching include van Hover and Yeager (2004), who ask, “how can social studies teacher educators better understand preservice teachers’ beliefs about the subject matter and their students?” (p. 24). They also state, “this study clearly points to the need for further research on beginning history teachers in order to more deeply examine factors that may influence their instructional and behavior management decisions” (p. 24). Chant (2002) calls for more research as well:

Further investigations regarding personal theorizing and practice may enhance our understanding of how teachers can use an awareness of their beliefs to help improve their teaching. Such examinations have the potential to help teacher
educators support the efforts of preservice, beginning, and experienced teachers through reflection and critical inquiry processes. (Chant, 2002, p. 538)

Together, these statements about the lack of research on how experiences contribute to the development of social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching, and the importance of understanding the formation of these purposes and their influence on teacher development and practice, reveal a significant gap in the literature that this study has attempted to address.
CHAPTER III  

METHODOLOGY  

Introduction

The following key points provide the rationale for this study: (a) there is a lack of research on how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching; (b) understanding this development is equally important to the purpose itself; and (c) such an exploration contributes to the effort to create teacher education programs that foster critically reflective teachers. I distilled these ideas from the literature reviewed in Chapter II. In this chapter, I discuss the research design and methodology for this case study of how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching.

Research Questions

The purpose of the study was to explore how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contributed to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. Informed by this purpose, I explored the following specific research questions:

1. How do experiences of social studies teaching and learning that take place prior to teacher education contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching?
2. How do experiences of social studies teaching and learning that take place during teacher education, prior to student teaching contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching?

3. How do experiences of social studies teaching and learning that take place during student teaching contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching?

It is important to note that each question explored experiences from a specific period. Rather than looking at a single experience, student teaching for example, I was interested in how a diverse number of experiences of social studies teaching and learning, which occurred at different times, contributed to the development of participants’ purposes for teaching.

Methodology

Theoretical Framework

The framework for this study emerged from my own lens of understanding and the frameworks and themes that appeared in the relevant literature. By investigating that background before getting into rationale, I have placed the study itself into a context of its own purpose and place within similar research.

The researcher’s lens. When undertaking a discussion of any methodology employed in educational research, it is essential to recognize the theoretical framework of the researcher, which guides decisions about the construction of research questions, choice of methodology, and research methods. Educational research methodologies emerge from various theoretical paradigms, which shape the manner in which researchers
understand and employ their chosen methodology (Hatch, 2002). A well-constructed and aligned study shows theoretical consistency, beginning with the theoretical lens of the researcher and continuing through the theoretical framework and foundations for the study, chosen methodology, research methods, and findings.

The design decisions of this research stemmed from the researcher’s worldview, which includes the constructivist belief that universal realities are impossible and that all people create unique understandings of reality through experiences (Creswell, 2007). Therefore, I did not expect the study participants to have the same reaction to similar experiences. I also adopted the critical stance that historical constructs regarding race, class, and gender have real consequences for individuals because of their perceived realness and social action based upon this perception (Merriam, 2002). Lastly, I uphold the critical belief that the objective of critique is to move society forward and to investigate critically how power functions in and between groups. These views shape my understanding of education and the purpose of educational research. I perceive the purpose of social studies teaching to be to develop critically reflective citizens who strive to lead deep democratic lives and analyze inequalities in society as part of an effort to improve that society. This study reflects such an understanding through its attempt to contribute to the re-envisioning of teacher education programs such that they foster teachers who maintain deep democratic purposes for teaching.

My epistemology emerges from multiple paradigms. I maintain the constructivist view that researchers cannot be objective due to the filtering of knowledge through the researcher’s lens, and an understanding that critical thought begins with deconstructing
our interpretations of the world (Derrida, 1976). My perspective includes a general understanding that positivist interpretations of the human experience tend to obfuscate the complex, relative, and contextual nature of both individual and shared life. I maintain that individuals have personal ontologies, unique to their temporal, spatial, and historical circumstances. Their interpretations of individual realities form their way of understanding knowledge and their world (see Bourdieu, 1993; Derrida, 1976; Foucault, 1979, 1980; Freire, 1970; Gramsci, 1971; Habermas, 1972; Said, 1978). My personal ontological and epistemological understandings influenced how I constructed the research questions in two ways. Due to my belief that individuals construct unique understandings of experiences, I chose to focus on how those constructed understandings contributed to participants’ purposes for teaching. Further, my understanding that the human experience is complex, relative, and contextual—and that individuals have personal ontologies unique to their temporal, spatial, and historical circumstances—led me to design research questions that included contextual elements of time and place. I discuss how my theoretical lens shaped the study, methods of data collection and analysis, and how I framed the findings of the research in the ensuing section.

**Social constructivism.** Qualitative research employs theory in various manners: as a point of departure for the work, as the orienting idea for the study, or as the objective of the research. This study used a social constructivist theoretical framework as the orienting lens for the work (Creswell, 2009), in keeping with the theoretical worldview of the researcher. The goal of constructivist research is to gather and analyze data that honors participants’ views of the phenomenon being studied (Creswell, 2009). The
phenomenon under examination in this study was how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contributed to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching.

How an experience contributes to the development of an idea is a unique and complex process. Before expanding on the definition and role of social constructivism, for the sake of clarity, I offer the following hypothetical example:

A student teacher writes a lesson plan for a 10th grade American history class with a purpose of getting students to think deeply about economic inequality in society. The cooperating teacher reviews the lesson plan and suggests that the purpose of the class is to prepare students to pass the end-of-unit test, and that neither the textbook nor the curriculum for that unit addresses economic inequality. Therefore, the teacher maintains, the student teacher should not waste time engaging students in a discussion of economic inequality.

How does this experience contribute to the student teachers’ purpose going forward? How does it mesh with the student teacher’s purpose of getting students to think about inequalities? Does the student teacher attempt to fuse the two purposes together? Does one take precedence over another? I designed the research questions and research process to uncover the contribution of such an experience. The data collection methods, specifically the interview questions, opened spaces for the participants to think and talk about how their experiences of social studies teaching and learning contributed to their purposes for teaching.
It is important to note that scholars use “social constructivism,” “constructivist theory,” and “social constructionism” to characterize different ideas. While the terminology is far from consistent, “social constructivism” and “constructivist theory” typically emphasize the idea that meaning, experiences, knowledge, and reality are unique constructions of individuals. The majority of the literature, both methodological and social studies research, that supported this study used the terms “constructivist,” “social constructivist,” and “social constructivism” (Angell, 1998; Brookhart & Freeman, 1992; Chiodo & Brown, 2007; Creswell, 2009; Hatch, 2002; Merriam, 2002, 2009; Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013). I have used the terms “social constructivist” and “social constructivism” in keeping with the frequent use of these terms in social studies education research.

However, two works on educational research methodologies cited here (Josselson, 2011; Schwandt, 2000) use the terms “constructionism” and “social constructionism.” Again, while there are degrees of difference in how, where, and when researchers use these terms, they typically emphasize the idea that social exchange is the genesis of meaning, based on contexts, experiences, and social interaction (Schwandt, 2000). Crotty (1998) provides a useful explanation of these ideas: “It would appear useful then, to, reserve the term constructivism for epistemological considerations focusing exclusively on ‘the meaning-making activity of the individual mind’ and to use constructionism where the focus includes ‘the collective generation [and transmission] of meaning’” (p. 58). While I recognized the importance of the social context within which my participants’ experiences occurred, my interest in their constructions of meaning from
experiences of social studies teaching and learning situated the study in a social constructivist realm.

The ontological roots of a social constructivist worldview assume that universal realities do not exist and that research should focus on individual constructions of reality (Hatch, 2002). Research with a constructivist framework emphasizes spending extensive time with participants in an effort to grasp the constructions that participants use to understand their world. Individuals’ realities are unique due to their experiences within distinctive contexts (Hatch, 2002), and there is an inevitable historical and sociocultural dimension to the construction of meaning from experience (Schwandt, 2000). Researchers can only understand the realities of individuals through those individuals’ “abstract mental constructions that are experientially based, local, and specific” (Hatch, 2002, p. 15). Further, research with a constructivist framework is often a process of co-construction or reconstruction to uncover the subjective reality that is the focus of investigation. These principles led to my decision to provide space for participants to write reflectively about the interview process and the data revealed in conversation in an attempt to assist them in reconstructing the meaning of the experience. This is an example of how the theoretical lens oriented the research.

Further implications of framing the study with a social constructivist theory center on the way I understood the purpose, structure, and findings of the study. Because I view the world through a social constructivist lens, I designed research questions that recognized multiple constructed realities of experiences and meaning making. The study design and chosen methodology for the research questions also adhered to social
constructivist beliefs, in that I did not look for a sameness of experience across all cases. Similarly, the data collection methods provided space for participants to share their constructions and meaning making. They place value on our conversations and co-constructions of understanding. As I analyzed the data, I was mindful of the social context and process of the experiences that participants shared. Importantly, social constructivism as a theoretical framework does not maintain a “goal,” as opposed to critical social theory, which attempts to recognize and undo oppression, or feminist research, which attempts to expose and challenge inequalities based on gender. Rather, this theoretical lens recognizes the influence of social and historical contexts on individuals’ constructions of how they understand the world and requires that researchers acknowledge this reality in their studies (Creswell, 2007). One could argue that social constructivism has an objective of undoing positivist interpretations of reality and complicating our understanding of how people experience and understand the world. However, this is more of an orientation one adopts than a goal one attempts to accomplish.

**Research Methodology and Rationale**

I chose a qualitative instrumental case study methodology for this research. The choice of a methodology that supported the research questions was crucial to the viability of the research. In this section, I discuss each component of this methodology to make clear how the methodology fits with the theoretical framework and research questions of the study, as well as my rationale for selecting this methodology.
Qualitative instrumental case study. The process of qualitative research is inductive, not deductive, which means the research moves from a specific case to a generalization rather than from a general observation to a specific conclusion (Crotty, 1998). Simply put, qualitative research does not attempt to “find” an answer to the research question in the data, but rather interprets the data to construct an understanding of the phenomenon (Merriam, 2009). In qualitative research, the researcher is the primary instrument of data collection, as I was in this study.

Case study research involves the intensive description and analysis of a unit of study (Merriam, 2002). While case studies can be quantitative or qualitative, qualitative case studies are “particularistic, descriptive, and heuristic,” making them useful as a means for researchers to investigate a specific phenomenon (Merriam, 2009, p. 54). Qualitative case studies allow participants to share their experiences of a phenomenon in rich and holistic accounts. Consequently, individuals’ experiences of a phenomenon are often the subject under exploration in a case study, but they are not the units of analysis. One understanding of case study methodology suggests that the dominant characteristic of a case study should be a focus on the unit of analysis, not the subject of investigation (Merriam, 2009; Stake, 2000).

In keeping with the descriptive aims of qualitative case studies, an instrumental case study tries to create an understanding of a phenomenon through the investigation of a case. Because I was interested in how my participants’ experiences of social studies teaching and learning contributed to their purposes for teaching, I chose an instrumental case study methodology. An instrumental case study intends “to provide insight into an
issue or to redraw a generalization….The case is of secondary interest, it plays a supportive role, and it facilitates our understanding of something else” (Stake, 2000, p. 437). Instrumental case studies require an in-depth look at each case and its contexts, and the activities that take place in those contexts, in pursuit of an understanding of the phenomenon under investigation (Stake, 2000). Importantly, researchers undertaking an instrumental case study choose cases that facilitate an understanding of the subject under investigation. Thus, I chose participants who could speak to my research questions. The student participants in the study represented the cases (units of analysis) and how their experiences of social studies teaching and learning contributed to the development of their purposes for teaching was the subject under investigation (the phenomenon).

While various interpretations of what a case study is or is not exist in methodological literature, there are certain foundational ideas about research and methodology at the core of case study approaches. One of these central ideas is that in order for something to be a case it needs to be bounded (Merriam, 2002). In this study, I organized the research into four cases and bounded the analysis to each of the cases. These four cases formed the units of analysis.

An examination of social studies research employing case studies was beneficial to the construction of this study (Angell, 1998; Fantozzi, 2012; Johnston, 1990; van Hover & Yeager, 2004, 2007). Scholars contend that the emphasis on creating a holistic account in a case study, one which incorporates multiple perspectives and works to uncover complex patterns, is useful in trying to understand teachers’ experiences and beliefs (Angell, 1998; Fantozzi, 2012). Johnston (1990) effectively connects social
constructivist theory with case study, asserting that he did not attempt to objectively
describe his case study participants. Studies from van Hover and Yeager (2004, 2007)
demonstrate how selecting individuals as “bounded” cases can be an effective way to
structure a case study. Each of these studies provided useful guidance in the construction
of this study.

**Narrative analysis.** Other types of methodologies often combine with case study
research. I chose to integrate narrative analysis and instrumental case study. In this
study, instrumental case study defined the subject. The process was narrative analysis.
Narrative analysis focuses on interpreting the storied knowledge participants use to
understand their world (Bruner, 1986; Hatch, 2002) and the meanings individuals’ stories
carry for them (Hatch, 2002; Merriam, 2002, 2009). Methods for gathering such storied
knowledge include interviews, autobiographical writing, and field notes, among others
(Clandinin & Connelly, 1994; Merriam, 2009). A review of the methodological literature
confirmed the complimentary nature of narrative work with the theoretical framework
that guides the study, suggesting that constructivist thinking and narrative analysis share
similar paradigmatic boundaries (Hatch, 2002). Narrative analysis attempts to understand
human experience as it appears in textual form, focusing on narrated texts that represent
individuals’ life stories or elements of them (Josselson, 2011). Narrative analysis also
assumes that the stories people tell about their lives embody their meaning-making and
that their narratives link life experiences together into a coherent whole. Based in
hermeneutics, narrative analysis focuses on understanding the lived experiences of people
in their own words. This method aligned with the social constructivist theoretical basis
of the study in its recognition that individuals construct narrative truth and that an account of an experience as the participant understood it is the focus of analysis rather than what “really” happened. Further, narrative analysis recognizes the contextual nature of experiences, as well as the fact that individuals intend narratives for a specific audience and may tailor their stories to meet the perceived demands of that audience. I discuss how this idea represents an issue of researcher influence in the trustworthiness section.

The typical structure for the data in narrative studies is a series of first-person accounts of experiences (and the meanings constructed from them) that have a beginning, middle, and end (Merriam, 2009). This methodological structure fit with the data collection methods for the study. Through interviews and journaling, I collected first-person accounts of experiences of social studies teaching and learning. Since each student participant had different experiences and made meaning of their experiences in different fashions, I was able to investigate how different experiences contributed to purposes for teaching social studies. The data analysis section contains a detailed explanation of the narrative analysis procedures.

**Research context.** The setting for this study was the social studies teacher education program at a large, Midwestern state university. I chose this site over other universities in the area for several reasons. The social studies teacher education program at this university maintained a vision for teacher education that included a focus on purposes for social studies teaching. The program averaged 25-30 students per yearly cohort, which provided a sufficient pool of potential participants, and the curricular
structure of the program facilitated an exploration of the research questions. Furthermore, the university allowed me to conduct research. These aspects of the program all contributed to creating an environment where I could pursue research that spoke to my research questions. Data collection took place beginning in November of 2013 and concluded in May of 2014.

**Participants.** Through purposeful selection, I recruited participants who could provide detailed and data-rich experiences (Hatch, 2002; Merriam, 2002). Diversity of race, social class, gender, and sexuality among the participants would be beneficial for an exploration of a wider range of experiences, data, and realities (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). However, these criteria did not determine who could participate. Participant selection began with visiting three teacher education courses. Class A and Class B were non-discipline-specific teacher education courses that preceded discipline-specific teacher education coursework. Class C was a social studies teacher education course in the final year of the social studies teacher education program. I shared the focus of the study with the classes and asked the students to fill out the Participant Selection Questionnaire (Appendix A). The four students selected to participate in the study provided thoughtful, reflective, and thorough responses to the survey. From an analysis of their responses, I concluded that it was likely that they could offer rich data. Selected participants then received the Recruitment Script, Study Outline and Responsibilities for Participants document (Appendix B) before deciding to take part in the study. It is important to note that all study participants came from Class C. I discuss how this reality shifted the focus of the study slightly in Chapter V.
Participants were all enrolled in a university-based teacher education program for certification to teach social studies in grades 7-12 at public or private schools. I chose to recruit social studies education students, as opposed to language arts education students, math education students, or science education students, all of whom could likely share ideas of social studies learning, because I wanted to cultivate a deeper understanding of how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contributed to the development of purposes for teaching social studies. There were four participants in the study, three of whom were in the final year of an undergraduate teacher education program. One was enrolled in a Master’s of Teaching program. There were two male and two female participants with a diversity of ages and experiences.

In addition to the four student participants, two social studies teacher educators participated in the study. These participants provided important contextual information about the social studies teacher education program at the site. Additionally, each of the four student participants had classes with both of the social studies teacher educators. I selected these two faculty participants based on their availability and ability to provide meaningful data for the study. Both faculty participants signed all consent forms and participated fully in the study. Unless otherwise specified, all uses of the words “participant” or “participants” refer to the four student participants, which make up the four cases of this study. I discuss the faculty participants at length only in the Context section of Chapter IV.

**Data collection.** In this study, I collected contextual, immediate, and reflective data. Each of these types of data generation assisted in answering the research questions.
Contextual data consisted of data from and about the two teacher education programs within which the participants’ experiences of social studies teaching and learning took place. I collected this data from both student and faculty participants. This data was crucial in establishing the social context within which the experiences occurred. Immediate data refers to data collected from observations of student participants, interviews with student participants, and any instance where the student participants and I engaged in conversation about something related to their experiences. This data added to an understanding of how the student participants’ purposes for teaching developed and functioned in practice. The final source of data came from participant interviews and journal entries. I asked the student participants to be reflective and articulate about their purposes for teaching and their understanding of how their experiences contributed to their purposes. These three types of data provided a diverse data set that increased the validity of the study through triangulation.

I was primarily interested in data concerning experiences that took place during the final year of the student participants’ teacher education because this was when participants did their student teaching and completed their coursework. However, I also provided space for participants to share experiences of social studies teaching and learning that took place previously in their teacher education and prior to their teacher education. I explored how those experiences contributed to the development of their purposes for teaching. This data was important as I constructed a rich picture of the participants’ purposes for teaching.
Data for this study came from: (a) face-to-face, semi-structured in-depth interviews, (b) participant journaling about their experiences, (c) observations of participants’ teacher education courses and student teaching, and (d) detailed data about their teacher education program. Table 1 illustrates which types of data generation addressed which research questions. I designed the data collection methods to uncover how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contributed to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. Implicit in this aim was the constructivist belief that there is an important connection between the context of an experience, the experience, and the meaning derived from the experience. The data collection methods aligned with this view, seeking qualitative data that facilitated an understanding of participants’ lived experiences and their meaning making of those experiences, both contextually and holistically. The data collection methods of this study were open-ended in an effort to recognize the complexity of experiences in the participants’ understandings. Further, due to the social constructivist lens of the researcher and the research, the data collection methods adhered to the idea that there is no single reality of experiencing social studies teaching and learning that would be visible across all cases. The context of each experience mattered and I did not attempt to separate meaning-making from the context.
Table 1

*Data Generation and Research Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Journaling</th>
<th>Observations of program coursework</th>
<th>Observations of student teaching</th>
<th>Document Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interv**iews**. I conducted two or three interviews with each of the participants throughout the final year of their social studies teacher education program. All interviews took place in classrooms, conference rooms, or my office in the College of Education building. I provided a pre-interview prompt to help them reflect on experiences that contributed to the development of their purposes for teaching. Following the interview, I gave a post-interview prompt to create space for them to reflect on what they said and what we talked about together. The interviews employed a broad protocol that provided many avenues and opportunities for participants to share their thoughts on topics relevant to the research questions. For example, in the first interview with participants, I asked them the following two questions: How are the social studies in teacher education different from social studies in high school? Have you had any experiences of social studies teacher education thus far that are particularly memorable or meaningful to you? (See Appendix C for the complete interview protocol for all three student interviews.) This allowed extended spaces for storytelling from the participants. This type of interview design enabled the accumulation of rich data through extensive
responses and space for participants to select how they would respond to open-ended questions (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). It is important to note that all interview questions served as scaffolding for more specific and probing questions that arose in the course of the interviews and throughout the duration of the study.

The design chosen for the interviews attempted to create a “casual conversation” between the interviewer and participant (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). Building rapport with the participants was an essential aspect of the interviews, as it facilitated a comfortable environment for the participants (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006). I also attempted to be vulnerable with the participants by sharing my experiences with the topics of conversation, thereby creating a climate that facilitated open dialogue (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006). This interview design assisted in combatting the power dialectic that can emerge in an interview, wherein a participant may feel at a disadvantage in terms of knowledge about the subject. Such a phenomenon can have a dire effect upon participants’ willingness to share information and converse freely with the interviewer.

One of the goals of this study was uncovering and interrogating participants’ visions of teaching. Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1984) state, “images express the teachers’ purpose” (p. 33). Hammerness (2003) interprets this idea of “images” as “visions” and argues, “vision may well be a concept that makes intuitive sense to teachers and thus could provide access to teachers’ ‘sense of purpose’” (p. 45). She also states, “in surveys of 80 teachers and teacher education students who were asked to share their visions, all participants were able to easily generate and discuss their visions” (p. 45).
These authors suggest that teachers’ visions may well be an avenue to get at their purposes.

Through the interview process, I created space where we could explore participants’ visions of teaching social studies. Taking a cue from the literature, I asked participants about their visions of social studies teaching as a way to get at their purposes. The following questions directed them to investigate their visions of teaching:

- What are your visions of yourself in the ideal social studies classroom?
- What do you think the ideal social studies classroom looks like?
- What is happening in the classroom?
- What is the teacher doing?
- What are the students doing?
- What are the students learning?

I asked these questions in the first interview as a way to begin the conversation about how the participants viewed social studies teaching. From that conversational point, we then began to talk about what their purposes for teaching social studies were, and from there, engaged in a conversation about the contribution of their experiences of social studies teaching and learning to the development of their purposes. These conversations took place throughout the two to three interviews with each participant.

**Participant journaling.** Participants had the option to write about their experiences of social studies teaching and learning and the contribution of those experiences to the development of their purposes for teaching. This reflective writing assisted in revealing *how* experiences shaped their purposes for teaching. Participant
journaling began following the first interview and concluded prior to the final interview. The following is an excerpt from the journal prompt (Appendix D) given to all student participants:

Throughout the duration of this study, I would like you to keep a journal of moments and experiences in your teacher education program that you feel connect to any ideas of your purpose for teaching social studies. As you complete course assignments, talk with fellow pre-service teachers, talk with your professors, cooperating teachers, your students during your student teaching, friends, family, etc., be thinking about how any of these experiences connect with why you want to be a social studies teacher, or what you are teaching for.

I received five journal entries total from two of the four participants. The other two participants elected not to journal. I collected and analyzed these journal entries in the same fashion as the interview transcripts. The pre- and post-interview writing prompts also served as a form of journaling. The pre-interview writing prompt oriented the participants to the ideas and topics of the ensuing interview and asked them to begin thinking about these ideas. The post-interview prompt created a bridge between the first interview and the ensuing pre-interview prompt for the second interview and so on.

There was a variety of ways for participants to share their journaling with the researcher, including writing, audiotaping themselves, and e-mail communications.

*Participant observation.* Observing study participants in their teacher education program classes and their student teaching provided both contextual and immediate data and led to opportunities to collect reflective data.
Observations in program classes. I observed my participants in two different program classes (three times total) to identify if there were experiences related to purpose within their teacher education program. Data regarding these observations came from researcher field notes. I paid particular attention to (a) the physical setting, including the environment and context; (b) the participants, including their organization and patterns of interaction; (c) conversation, in terms of content, speaking and listening roles, silences, and nonverbal behaviors; (d) subtle factors, such as informal or unplanned activities, symbolism/connotation of language, and what is not happening; and (e) my own behavior, in terms of researcher role, conversation, and how I am part of the setting (Merriam, 2009, pp. 120-121). I conducted conferences with participants after the classes to discuss how they experienced anything related to purpose and if they perceived connections between the class and their purposes for teaching. There was no formal interview protocol for these conferences, as the questions emerged during the observation. I collected data from these conversations through researcher field notes.

Observations of student teaching. Observing participants during their 12-week student teaching period provided immediate data on how experiences of student teaching contributed to their purposes for teaching social studies. Post-observation conferences provided opportunities to gather reflective data through questions generated during the observation. There was no formal interview protocol for these conferences, as my questions emerged during the observation. However, I did consistently question participants about their instructional decision-making, the structure of their lessons, and
their objectives and goals for the lessons, all in connection to their purposes for teaching. Sample questions included:

How did you plan your lesson to incorporate elements of your purpose?
Were there moments when you sensed your purpose emerging during the lesson?
Did you make decisions during the lesson to honor your purpose? How did you do so?

This facilitated a conversation about how experiences of teaching contributed to their purposes and subsequent decisions.

**Program information.** In keeping with the theoretical lens of the researcher, the theoretical framework of the research, the tenets of qualitative research, the theoretical basis of instrumental case study, and the purpose of the research, I collected extensive data on the social context within which participants’ experiences took place. A deep understanding of the social and educational context of the participants’ teacher education program, and its influence within their narrative constructions of meaning, assisted in revealing how their experiences contributed to the development of their purposes.

I collected data about the social studies teacher education program through interviews with the two social studies teacher educator participants regarding the role of purpose in their curriculum and teaching, following the interview protocol contained in Appendix E. In addition to interviewing these teacher educators, I observed classes and took field notes on experiences related to purposes for teaching, as noted in the previous section. I took particular note of; (a) the physical setting including the environment and context; (b) the participants, including their organization and patterns of interaction; (c)
conversation, in terms of content, speaking and listening roles, silences, and nonverbal behaviors; (d) subtle factors, such as informal or unplanned activities, symbolism/connotation of language, and what is not happening; and (e) my own behavior, in terms of researcher role, conversation, and how I am part of the setting (Merriam, 2009, pp. 120-121). I collected a third source of data on the program through analysis of the course syllabi for evidence of emphasis upon and experiences related to purpose. I analyzed the course syllabi for each of the three courses that the study participants attended during the final year of their social studies teacher education program.

**Data analysis.** The data analysis for this study began with creating an ongoing research journal. This journal served as a space for thoughts about data analysis, conceptual memoing, ideas about the organization of the information, and reflection upon the method in its entirety. Additions to the journal continued throughout the course of the research. I also shared the journal with colleagues and critical friends in an attempt to increase the trustworthiness of the study and to reflect on the ethics of the study. In addition to this step, other informal methods included continuous review of data and reflection on data analysis procedures with colleagues.

**Narrative analysis.** The majority of the data collected was narrative in nature. The participants’ journals, interview transcripts, and post-observation conference transcripts were in narrative form. The participants told stories about how their experiences of social studies teaching and learning contributed to the development of their purposes for teaching. Researchers use several different strategies to analyze
narrative data. The most frequently used approaches are “psychological, biographical, and discourse analysis” (Merriam, 2002, p. 9). The biographical approach extends its attentions to the person in the social context and how the context contributes to the experience and the meaning derived from the experience. I took a biographical approach during my analysis of these types of data, focusing on the social context of experiences of social studies teaching and learning, how that context contributed to the experience, and how the context made up part of the meaning that participants derived from the experience.

In an attempt to increase the validity of the research findings through transparency, the following is a detailed explanation of how I conducted narrative data analysis. In the data analysis process I attempted to organize the data in a manner that revealed the analytic scheme. The specific procedure of analyzing each narrative data source began with the creation of two categories for each text to separate the narration of the story from the content. Narrative analysis recognizes that there are often two parts to a story: the content (what the story is about) and the narration (how the story is told). The content reveals much about the story. However, the narration includes the voice of the storyteller, which can reveal much about the story and the teller as well. Looking at the language a teller chooses to use can reveal the voice of the storyteller. How the participants in this study talked about their purposes and experiences was important because their voices characterized and/or reflected their experiences.

Though I abstracted sections of the narratives to place them in content and narration categories (see Table 2), I engaged in this process not to distill specific
discursive elements for analysis, but to gain a better understanding of the whole, which illuminates the parts, which in turn creates the whole of the narration. For example, in one student participant’s journal entries, she described her goals as a social studies teacher (the content) in the following way:

I know that I want to teach about social justice but I want to teach more than that…. I also want my students to start to think critically about the way that history and the world works… I also think that by asking students to shift their ways of thinking it will help to open the door for more social justice ideas.

(Stephanie, Journal Entry, 1/2/2014)

Rather than looking solely at what was said, how she chose to tell the story, specifically the language used here (social justice, think critically, shift their ways of thinking), revealed the contribution of this participant’s social studies teacher education experiences.

Following this step, the narrative data was open-coded through a process of reading and rereading chunks of the text multiple times in a hermeneutic circle. This procedure considered the whole in relationship to the parts, how the parts comprise the whole, and so on (Josselson, 2011). Codes emerged from the text in this process, enabling the comparison of data to data. Following the placement of codes into categories, I engaged in categorical analysis of the data, identifying what themes were in the text, how they connected, and how they contributed to the narration and content. Finally, I read the codes in both categories for emergence of themes or a story. At the conclusion of the third data collection period, I had multiple texts from each participant,
comprising the entirety of their narration. At this point, I read the whole of their narration in another hermeneutic process, separated the narration from the content, and employed categorical analysis to uncover patterns both within and across cases. I recorded conceptual memos throughout the coding and analysis process. The following table provides an example of how the coding process was undertaken.

Table 2

*Example of Coding Process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>1 – Program Information</th>
<th>3 – Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 – Negotiation</td>
<td>2A – Active Resistance</td>
<td>4 – Experiences prior to social studies teacher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B – Passive Resistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stephanie, Journal Entry, 3/6/2014</th>
<th>Narration (How the story is told, language used)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As I have wrestled with my decision about changing my program and thereby my entire career trajectory, one thing has given me solace. That one thing is that I can still do what I feel that I was meant to do.</td>
<td>Wrestled, decision, solace (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I began my teacher education career I knew I wanted to touch the lives of people. Whether it be students or citizens at large.</td>
<td>Teacher education career, touch lives of people, students, citizens (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM – This idea remained constant throughout all my conversations with her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to make people and especially “students” question preconceived ideas about their world and about history.</td>
<td>People, students, question preconceived ideas, world and history (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM – Teaching for her was about questioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to teach students to think critically, for themselves.</td>
<td>Teach, students, think critically, themselves (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most important to me, I wanted to make students wonder. When I say wonder I</td>
<td>Most important, make students wonder (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
don't just mean ponder, although that is an important part of it. I do want to spark curiosity because I think that education is not just the filling of a vessel but the ignition of a flame (paraphrased from Socrates). However, I wanted to ask them to embark on a journey of wonderment. It is that feeling that we as adults lose as we age. That feeling that makes someone stop in their tracts and just amaze at what they are seeing or hearing. To me there is no more beautiful a thing than when a child has that look of pure wonderment on their face.

| **Categorical analysis.** Categorical analysis consists of “abstracting sections belonging to a category, using coding strategies, and comparing these to similar texts from other narratives” (Josselson, 2011, p. 226). This type of data analysis strives to identify the themes of the story in relationship to one another in a holistic manner. Categorical analysis of the narrative data helped to distill themes and patterns regarding experiences and purpose. I employed categorical analysis of participants’ journals and interviews, and observations of their student teaching. Because the data from the coursework, course syllabi, and the researcher’s field notes was in a less storied form, categorical analysis allowed me to identify themes and patterns that connected with the narrative data. Comparing and contrasting the codes, themes, and conceptual memos distilled from analysis of the narrative data with the data drawn from documents and researcher field notes assisted in determining the findings. |
| **Comparative data analysis.** I compared data from the cases in an effort to identify similarities and differences in how experiences of social studies teaching and | Spark curiosity, education is not just filling a vessel, ignition of flame, embark on a journey of wonderment, feeling, adults lose, beautiful, child, wonderment (3) |
learning contributed to the development of participants’ purposes for teaching. The comparison of cases revealed much about the phenomenon under investigation in this instrumental case study (Stake, 2000). Understandings of one case became deeper through the comparison of that case to another. Following analysis of the data (comprised of narrative data, documents, and researcher field notes) from each case, using both biographical analysis and categorical analysis, I was able to compare the emergent themes across and between cases. The analytic process of this step began with looking for differences and similarities in the emergent themes.

The following is a description of how the process of comparative analysis progressed in this study. After I analyzed the data from each participant and distilled findings from the data, I was able to construct an overarching theme or story from each participant about how their experiences of social studies teaching and learning contributed to the development of their purposes for teaching. I then compared these themes between participants to deepen an understanding of how purpose develops. It was at this point in the analysis that it became clear that a “purpose formation process” was at work for each of the participants. The comparison of the themes of each participant revealed that the purpose formation process was unique for each of them and that the manner in which the process progressed was distinct based on experiences of social studies teaching and learning within the three periods explored in the study. This comparative analysis was a crucial component of analyzing the data, as the distinctive nature of each participants’ process may not have been visible without comparative analysis.
In summary, I understood the data analysis process as uncovering ideas within the data and then “building” findings. The abstraction of chunks of narration, the emergence of codes and larger themes, and the eventual distillation of patterns, both within individual participants’ stories and across participants’ stories, comprised the process of building findings from the narratives. Narrative research “endeavors to explore the whole account rather than fragmenting it into discursive units or thematic categories…it is not the parts that are significant in human life, but how the parts are integrated to create a whole – which is meaning” (Josselson, 2011, p. 226).

**Methodological challenges.** One of the methodological challenges of conducting comparative analysis is trying to understand the complexities of each case (Stake, 2000). Because the units of analysis are cases, and the phenomenon under investigation is specific to each case, there is a question of how generalizable the findings from these complex cases may be. Therefore, case study researchers often focus on the idea of transferability rather than generalizability. This means that what a researcher learns from a specific case may inform a similar situation, making the case valuable. However, in qualitative research, it is the responsibility of the reader to apply findings to a new setting (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The researcher’s responsibility is to provide rich description so that the reader may have an opportunity to undertake this application. Thus, for this study, I was attentive to creating thick, rich descriptions of the cases that provided opportunities for readers to make connections with other cases.

It was also a challenge to decide how much comparison to do. Comparing across cases is valuable when categories of comparison are readily visible. Attempting to
identify similarities in categories that may contain too many differences can lead to false
correlations. As I read the narrative data and attempted to identify themes that were
visible across cases, I was mindful of whether the connections between cases were
authentic. For example, a theme of “negotiating active resistance in student teaching”
emerged across three of the participants. However, if the theme had contained too many
differences between the participants, it may not have been an authentic theme. Therefore,
I carefully evaluated all themes for similarity between and across the participants.
Further challenges were the researcher’s level of sensitivity and integrity, and the
reporting of bias by the researcher. I discuss the issues of researcher sensitivity and bias
in the role of the researcher section below.

**Trustworthiness**

This study attempted to maintain a strong sense of “trustworthiness” (Lincoln &
Guba, 1985). There are numerous approaches to constructing studies with a commitment
to trustworthiness. This study used three specific strategies to increase the level of
trustworthiness: member checking, triangulation, and peer debriefing. Member checking
is a process of reviewing initial analyses with participants to ascertain if the researcher’s
interpretations “ring true” (Merriam, 2009, p. 217). This enables the researcher to make
sure that they have understood their participants’ perspectives. I conducted member
checks with the participants by discussing elements of our conversations during the first
interview—and my initial interpretations of those conversations—at the beginning of the
second interview, and so on for the following interviews. I did this to ensure that I
understood participants’ ideas and viewpoints.
Triangulation refers to strategies used to increase the internal validity of research, including the collection of multiple sources of data, the use of multiple methods, and the reliance on multiple theories to confirm emerging findings (Merriam, 2009). I collected three types of data in this study: contextual, immediate, and reflective. Contextual data refers to data related to the temporal and spatial context of the participants’ social studies teacher education program. Immediate data refers to data regarding connections between the participants’ purposes for teaching and their practice. Reflective data refers to data that participants provided regarding their previous experiences related to social studies teaching and learning and their purposes for teaching. Research findings are more persuasive if they are visible across different types of data.

Peer debriefing entails reviewing various steps in the research process, including research design, methodologies, data collection, and analysis, and corresponding with other professionals as a means of reflection and obtaining objective input. I engaged in peer debriefing with another doctoral candidate at consistent intervals in the data collection, analysis, and writing portions of this research. This experience provided an additional perspective on the research, enabling me to develop trustworthy results from the research. In addition, I presented preliminary findings from the research as a paper at a national social studies conference. This experience provided me with feedback from faculty and doctoral students from other universities about the structure, methodology, analysis, and writing of the research. This presentation of a portion of the research functioned as a valuable part of peer debriefing. Finally, I also read and explored portions of the research with a colleague. Reflexivity is a part of both of these strategies.
and the ongoing research journal provided a space to document thoughts and ideas about the trustworthiness of the research.

This work also pursued trustworthiness by employing three concepts from Rubin and Rubin (2004). “Thoroughness and accuracy” called for care with data and thorough and rigorous analysis, collection, and reporting of data. “Believability” asked if my participants were comfortable enough to be candid and honest. “Transparency” focused on ensuring that the reader “is able to see the process by which the data were collected and analyzed” (p.76). Including each of these strategies provided a significant opportunity to increase the trustworthiness of this study.

One issue of trustworthiness may exist from the standpoint that I attended the university where I conducted the research, and my doctoral advisors were two of the primary teacher educators in the social studies teacher education program. A reader could perceive these as issues of researcher bias. As part of undertaking research in a trustworthy and honest fashion, I am disclosing these facts and recognizing that my familiarity with the university and the teacher educators may have influenced the study. However, my contextual knowledge of the university and program was beneficial in constructing a rich picture of the context within which my participants exist. More importantly, I had no prior knowledge of the student participants, or their experiences in the teacher education program. As their experiences and purposes were the focus of the research, and the teacher educators only provided contextual data on the program, I believe that having knowledge of the student participants would create far more of a trustworthiness issue than being familiar with the university and teacher educators.
Lastly, it is important to note that I did not study the program, but rather the participants’ experiences in the program.

Narrative analysis recognizes that participants may construct narration with the audience in mind. This could present an issue of researcher influence that may diminish the trustworthiness of the study if left unrecognized. In order to avoid this issue, I read participants’ narrations attentively, looking for any tailoring for the researcher. When these statements appeared, I discussed them with the participants to ascertain their reliability and accuracy.

Ethics

There were limited ethical issues in this study. One of the ethical responsibilities in the research process was making sure the research design adhered to the ethical commitments of the Institutional Review Board. Additionally, because I asked the student participants to discuss and reflect upon their coursework, classes, and teaching, I maintained a commitment to certain ethical sensitivities. I made it clear to participants that their reactions, comments, and discussions of coursework, classes, and their teacher educators were completely confidential. No one other than the researcher had access to anything participants wrote about or shared. Further, I refrained from making any value judgments about their coursework, comments, discussion, or teaching. The objective of the study was to learn about how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contributed to the development of purposes for teaching, not to suggest that participants should alter their purposes to more closely resemble the researcher’s or other teacher
educators’ purposes for teaching. All data gathered from participants, including teacher educators, was strictly confidential.

Assumptions

I have previously noted my belief that researchers cannot be unbiased and value-free. Rather, we bring our own lens to the research, as well as preconceived notions we may not have identified. Therefore, it is imperative that the researcher engage in a process of self-examination prior to beginning the research to reveal assumptions that may bear on the research. I have engaged in this process of self-examination and identified several assumptions that I brought to the research.

While I did not assume that the relationship between experiences of social studies teaching and learning and one’s purposes for teaching was cause and effect, I did assume that experiences played a part in how pre-service teachers developed their purposes for teaching. I assumed that the teacher educators interviewed in this study maintained a purpose for teaching and that purpose was an important part of their curriculum. I assumed this because I am familiar with the teacher educators that participated in the study. This meant that during the interviews, I had expectations about how the teacher educators would talk about the role of purpose in their classes and curriculums. However, I constructed the interview questions in a way that preserved space for the teacher educators to respond honestly and alternatively. For example, while I assumed that purpose was an important part of one of the faculty participant’s classes, I asked him “What type of experiences do you offer for your students that deal with purpose?” This provided space for him to respond openly.
I also assumed that participants in the study were capable of reflective thought about their purposes for teaching. This assumption may have been problematic if I maintained it as an expectation and constructed the study in a way that did not enable students unfamiliar with reflective thinking activities to understand what I was asking them to do. Instead, when I asked the participants a reflective question in the interviews, and asked them to write reflectively about their experiences and purposes, I made sure to talk with them about what I was asking them to do. Each of the four participants was more than capable of thinking reflectively.

Summary

This study was an instrumental case study of four pre-service social studies teachers in a social studies teacher education program at a mid-sized, Midwestern state university. Three of the student participants were in the final year of their social studies teacher education program, comprised of a semester of observation and a 12-week student teaching experience. The fourth student participant was in a MAT program. She completed a 12-week student teaching experience as well. The student participants’ position in the program enabled them to speak to all three of the research questions. Additionally, two social studies teacher educators participated in the study. They provided important contextual information about the student participants’ social studies teacher education programs.

I approached the data through a social constructivist lens, viewing the construction of individualized meaning and beliefs as occurring through a process of experiences in a social context. I collected data through face-to-face semi-structured
interviews with the participants, participants’ reflective writing and journaling, observations of the participants’ teacher education classes and student teaching, and detailed information about their teacher education program. I analyzed the data using narrative and categorical analysis and compared across cases through comparative analysis in an effort to identify how experiences contributed to the development of their purposes for teaching social studies.

One methodological challenge of the study was being attentive to creating thick, rich descriptions of the cases that provided opportunities for readers to make connections with other cases. Another challenge was being mindful of whether the connections between cases revealed via comparative analysis were authentic. The study pursued trustworthiness through member checking, triangulation, and peer debriefing. The study also employed three strategies for trustworthiness from Rubin and Rubin (2004): thoroughness and accuracy, believability, and transparency. There were limited ethical issues in the study. Specifically, I was attentive to maintaining the anonymity of the student participants, because I did ask them about experiences in their classes, and I refrained from making value judgments about their purposes for teaching. Important assumptions included the assumption that all participants were capable of reflective thought and an assumption that the two faculty participants maintained a purpose for their social studies teacher education classes. However, because I reflected on these assumptions prior to, during, and following the study, neither of them proved problematic for the study.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

Introduction

Review of Research Questions

From a review of the research, I developed an overarching purpose for the study and the following research questions:

1. How do experiences of social studies teaching and learning that take place prior to teacher education contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching?

2. How do experiences of social studies teaching and learning that take place during teacher education, prior to student teaching, contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching?

3. How do experiences of social studies teaching and learning that take place during student teaching contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching?

The purpose of the study was to explore how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contributed to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. It is important to note that the study did not focus directly on pre-service teachers’ discourse of their experiences, but on how their experiences contributed to the development of their purposes for teaching.

The participants and I explored experiences that took place during three general periods: experiences during high school social studies classes, experiences during social
studies teacher education prior to student teaching, and experiences during student teaching. Each research question focused on one of these general periods. The objective of the research was to explore and understand how these experiences contributed to the development of the participants’ purposes for teaching. To reiterate, I did not construct the research with the assumption that these experiences over time operated as a “process,” with concrete beginning and ending points. I did assume that experiences contributed in some manner to the development of their purposes, but I made no assumptions about how experiences contributed to the participants’ purposes. My process throughout the study is outlined visually in Figure 1.

Figure 1
Visual Illustration of Alignment of Research and Writing Process
Chapter Structure

The chapter begins with a section on context. This section shares background and foundational data that assisted in developing a rich picture of the social studies teacher education program. The section includes a brief introduction to the four student participants, an introduction to and discussion of faculty participants, and a discussion of the vision statement of the program. A discussion of the program’s emphasis on developing a “rationale” follows. This development of rationales for instructional decision-making made significant contributions to the participants’ thinking about social studies teaching. These contributions were visible in the student participants’ narrations. The section concludes by highlighting data from course syllabi and course observations, and offering a distillation of the contextual themes that emerged from the data.

The second section covers the cases. I present each case in a chronological fashion, beginning with (a) an introduction to the participant, (b) a discussion of the participants’ experiences in 9-12th grade social studies, (c) direct statements of their purposes for teaching at the midpoint of their final year of social studies teacher education, (d) the contribution of social studies teacher education coursework experiences, (e) a discussion of experiences of student teaching, and (f) a detailed discussion of how all these experiences came together to reveal a process through which the participants’ purposes for teaching developed and evolved. This discussion concludes the discussion of each case.

Throughout the presentation of each case, I explain how the data speaks to one or more of the research questions. It is important to note that not all aspects of each case,
nor the experiences, meaning making, or purpose formation process therein, spoke to each research question. By looking at the participants’ narratives chronologically, I was able to see how their purposes changed through experiences.

My process of selecting the evidence to present centered on the idea of “rich” data (Charmaz, 2006). Rich data powerfully expresses participants’ experiences and thoughts, speaks directly to the research questions, or presents an important idea. It can also have a combination of these aspects. Rather than include voluminous amounts of data that may not be consistently powerful, I chose to share data that contributed to a deep understanding of the research and visibly connected to the research questions. I edited the included excerpts minimally, redacting extraneous language (“um,” “like,” “you know,” etc.) and repetitive words so that readers could clearly see participants’ ideas. This is an established approach to writing about findings from qualitative work (Hatch, 2002, p. 233-235). The findings from the study are presented in the final section.

Context

Introduction

In keeping with the theoretical lens of the researcher, the theoretical framework of the research, the tenets of qualitative research, the theoretical basis of instrumental case studies, and the purpose of the research, I collected extensive data on the social contexts within which the study participants’ experiences took place. Interviews with program faculty, observations of program classes, and course syllabi were the primary sources of data collected on the program. Interviews and conversations with participants also provided important contextual data. An understanding of the social and educational
contexts of the participants’ social studies teacher education program and their student teaching placements, specifically the contribution of those contexts to their narrative constructions of meaning, assisted in understanding how those experiences contributed to the development of their purposes for teaching. I discuss how these experiences contributed to the development of their purposes for teaching throughout the Findings section.

**Student Participants**

The following is a brief introduction to the four student participants in this study to assist the reader in connecting contextual discussions of the social studies teacher education program and specific student participants. The four student participants in this study were Bette, Daniel, Drake, and Stephanie (pseudonyms). Daniel, Drake, and Stephanie were part of the undergraduate social studies teacher education program. Bette was part of the social studies cohort in a program that awarded a Master’s in Teaching degree. The participants ranged widely in age and experience, from twenty-one years old to their early forties, with a variety of familial and socio-economic circumstances. I introduce each participant more extensively in the Cases section of this chapter.

**Faculty**

As part of gathering information about the social studies teacher education program, the contextual site for the participants’ experiences, I interviewed two faculty members, Stanley and Stella, who taught three of the social studies teacher education program classes. Stanley taught Class C in the fall, and Stella taught Class D in the fall and Class E in the spring. I interviewed these two faculty members not only to develop
an understanding of the context but also to identify how ideas of purpose functioned in their approach to social studies teacher education.

**Stanley.** During our interview, Stanley shared his visions of social studies teaching and social studies teacher education. These views contributed to a richer picture of the context within which the student participants experienced social studies teacher education. He shared:

> The types of things students can learn in social studies classes really can influence the way they then go and act in the world. The way they think about and treat other people in a sense is kind of how they read the world and how they act in it. I really believe that social studies teachers can influence the things that their students do when they think about their work in the world. (Stanley, interview, December 19, 2013)

Here, Stanley illustrated that his view of social studies teaching and learning incorporated deep commitments to civic and social impact. He brought these ideas to his teacher education practice and worked with students to develop their understanding of the role and position of social studies teaching in education. Stanley went on to share his thoughts about the structure of the social studies teacher education program:

> I would say that one of the strengths of our program is that we really have developed assignments where we don’t just talk about these things, but we actually ask students to do some of these things. …the assignments just aren’t designed to make sure we pass NCATE accreditation…they are designed to have a payoff and outcomes, to use educational language now. We do have a vision for
our program, and we have thought what kind of assignments do we put in place for students to be able to do these things so that when they go off and become social studies teachers, they are then also doing them. (Stanley, interview, December 19, 2013)

In this statement, Stanley demonstrated that the social studies teacher education program’s vision for pre-service teachers included more than just learning what constitutes teaching for democracy and active citizenship. The goals of the faculty included helping students develop into teachers who could actually enact this type of teaching in their future classrooms. Through these two statements, it was clear that Stanley’s interpretation of social studies teaching and learning and the program vision were complimentary. From conversations with students, it was clear that they were able to see this consistency of vision and structure in the program.

Stanley also shared his thoughts about the importance of having a purpose as a teacher, an idea included in the social studies teacher education program’s vision:

Because the type of teacher we want you to be is a teacher who has a purpose, who can articulate what that purpose is, and who can say this is what it actually looks like in my practice…at least students that graduate from our program are teachers who have a sense of purpose that can guide their practice, that they can help them make sense of the world they work in. (Stanley, interview, December 19, 2013)

In this statement, Stanley revealed his thoughts about the role of purpose in the social studies teacher education program. Not only did he and other program faculty emphasize
the importance of purpose development in their students, but he also emphasized the importance of teaching students how to enact those purposes. Stanley’s thoughts about the role of purpose in social studies teacher education continued:

Your purposes matter, so I’ve been sort of playing around with these ideas of commitments, and so it’s not that my teacher education students or teacher candidates have to have the same commitments I have, but as part of their teacher education program they should be constantly thinking about what they are, how they developed, where they’ve come from, and what that then might look like in terms of their teaching. (Stanley, interview, December 19, 2013)

Stanley also emphasized the importance of planning in fulfilling purposes for teaching: “I don’t feel like they [students] can enact their purposes if they aren’t able to plan for it” (Stanley, interview, December 19, 2013).

The ideas that Stanley shared were clearly echoed among the participants’ responses. At least one of the following ideas emerged throughout each of the participants’ narrations in some form: (a) the importance of social studies teaching and learning, (b) learning how to enact teaching for democratic citizenship, (c) developing, articulating, and enacting one’s purpose, (d) reflecting on purposes, (e) how they develop a purpose as an autonomous teacher rather than adopting another’s, and (f) learning how to plan for one’s purpose. The following conversations with Stella affirmed a number of these ideas and revealed additional important concepts within the social studies teacher education program.
Stella. Throughout my conversation with Stella, she shared her idea that purpose evolves and develops over time. It was clear that the idea of purpose as an emerging and developing part of being a teacher trickled down to the participants from program faculty. Stella shared her ideas about how teachers develop their purposes for teaching in the following narration:

And what I talk with the students about is the fact that purpose is something that they’re not going to wake up one morning and suddenly have. That it grows and develops as they do, as teachers. And with any luck, it will deepen and strengthen with the multiplicity of experiences they have with students. With colleagues, hopefully with good professional development. Within their buildings. With additional coursework they choose to take, and with their own reading and study and their own being attuned to what is going on in their classroom. A teacher’s a tuning fork. (Stella, interview, March 4, 2014)

In this statement, Stella demonstrated a sophisticated understanding of how a teacher’s purpose develops. The ideas put forth here were visible within the participants’ narrations throughout the study. For example, Bette talked about how she recognized that her purpose would change over time. Both Bette and Drake shared how their purposes underwent shifts in focus, with new concepts emerging and previous ideas receding into the background. Daniel’s purpose underwent changes as well, albeit in a different direction than the other participants. These findings suggested that Stella’s ideas of how purposes develop, and the complexity of that development, clearly made their way into her social studies teacher education classrooms.
Stella also talked about how her purpose of teaching for social justice came through in her classes. When I asked her if she had to plan to enact her purpose of teaching for social justice, she shared, “I’m not sure I do. I think I live it. I don’t see it as something okay, I’ve got to plan for an issue of justice here. It is not something that is separate from my thought processes and my actions” (Stella, interview, March 4, 2014). Through this statement, Stella illustrated the centrality of social justice ideas in her teaching. Bette, Drake, and Stephanie were highly oriented towards social justice in their classrooms at the beginning of their student teaching. While they experienced challenges to this purpose in their student teaching, their narrations revealed that they retained their desire to provide opportunities for students to engage social justice issues.

In the following story, Stella shared the idea that she did not want her students to adopt her purposes for teaching, but rather she hoped to encourage them to develop their own purposes. I asked her how ideas of purpose came through in her classes. She explained that in the course of conversations with students about developing rationales for instructional decision-making, ideas of purpose emerged. She stated that she would ask students the following questions:

Did you see what I did? Okay, would you have done it that way? What do you think my purpose was? Do you agree with it? Would something like that work for you? It wouldn’t, okay. Then who are you becoming? I don’t want a clone. Here’s what I was trying to get. How might you, if that’s what, a response you want—then how might you go about it with the students in your school?

(Stella, interview, March 4, 2014)
Viewed in concert, these ideas from Stanley and Stella helped to develop an understanding of the social studies teacher education program in terms of the vision of the program and the role of purpose within the program. There was a continuity in how Stanley and Stella talked about their purposes as social studies teacher educators. Both faculty participants shared that they sought to challenge commonly held notions of what teaching social studies is and can be. Stanley revealed that the vision of the program, outlined fully in the following section, emphasized that students should enact what they have learned, develop and maintain a purpose for teaching, and be able to articulate, plan for, and use purpose in guiding their practice. There was also an emphasis on the importance of social studies teaching and thinking about purposes—where they emanate from, how they develop, and how they shape practice. Stella reiterated these ideas and added the idea of social justice as an imperative in the social studies teacher education program. Both faculty participants revealed that they encouraged students to examine their purposes for teaching, rather than mimic faculty purposes. This objective of getting students to think about their purposes and the development of their purposes met with considerable success among the participants in this study, as the findings illustrated. Together, these faculty members contributed to a deeper understanding of the social studies teacher education program as a contextual site for this research.

**Program Vision Statement**

The participants’ social studies teacher education program was committed to the following vision statement. Aspects of this statement came through in conversations with
program faculty, course observations, conversations with participants, and course syllabi.

(The statement was included in the course syllabi for Class C.)

**Integrated Social Studies (INSS) Vision Statement**
The Integrated Social Studies (INSS) program is designed to prepare prospective teachers to be purposeful, deliberative decision-makers, and reflective practitioners who prepare citizens who contribute to the deepening of democracy, and promote the common good.

To be a teacher who does this, we expect our pre-service teachers to:
1) Continuously reflect on their practice to learn from practice;
2) Engage in collaborative inquiry and partnerships to promote student learning and continued professional growth;
3) Create equitable classrooms that are responsive to the needs of all students;
4) Plan/organize meaningful lessons and assessments that promote active student engagement in worthwhile learning; and
5) View themselves as curriculum developers who recognize that social studies content and curriculum are more than information in textbooks and standardized curriculum guides.

**Rationale.** One of the prominent features of the social studies teacher education program was an emphasis on the idea of a rationale for teaching, planning, and decision-making. It is important to distinguish between a “rationale” and a “purpose” for teaching, as both terms arose in course syllabi, course activities, class discussions, and interviews with research participants and faculty. Rationales for planning and teaching decisions often function as specific components within an overarching purpose for teaching. To use Bette as an example, her rationale for the inclusion of democratic dialogue activities in a classroom was that doing so increases students’ experiences with “talking across difference,” which served her larger purpose of teaching for active citizenship. In this way, we can understand rationales as part of one’s talking and thinking about purposes for teaching, but not necessarily an aspect of the larger idea of what teachers teach for.
Understandings of rationale and purpose as distinct yet complimentary ideas arose in conversations with program faculty: “So you develop a rationale I think as a way to think through and to articulate your purposes or commitments. What it should do is help you articulate and continue to think about your developing sense of purpose” (Stanley, interview, December 19, 2013). A conversation with Stella, another of the faculty participants, about the distinction between rationale and purpose assisted in developing an understanding of the concepts. I asked her if her conversations with students about developing rationales centered on the idea of a rationale as a way of explaining why a teacher made a certain instructional decision. She affirmed that they do and shared, “when I say rationale, I’m talking about, if you will, mechanics” (Stella, interview, March 4, 2014).

Course Syllabi

An analysis of course syllabi contributed to an understanding of the social studies teacher education program as a contextual site. The syllabi illustrated the role that purpose played within the program. The syllabus for Class C, taught by Stanley, contained evidence of the role of purpose within the course. The interview with Stanley and researcher course observations further facilitated an understanding of the role of ideas about purpose in that course. The syllabus for Class D, taught by Stella, contained evidence of purpose as part of the curriculum in the Unit Plan Reflection Assignment. The relevant details of that assignment included:

**Task:** This assignment is designed to provide an opportunity to reflect on your unit plan that you enacted as part of the practicum experience. Respond to all the following prompts with a short (no more than 4 page, single-spaced) narrative: How did you
enact your rationale? Where did you enact it well? Where did you struggle to enact it? How will you strive to enact your rationale in the spring?

This is the only direct reference to the idea of purpose in the syllabus. While there are many concepts critical to powerful and meaningful social studies teaching in the syllabus, there is little to suggest that students engaged with the larger notion of purpose. The syllabus for Class E, also taught by Stella, contained more discussion and reference to ideas of purpose:

| Course Overview: | Throughout the semester teacher candidates’ will focus on developing an inquiry approach to teaching, continue to refine and enact their rationales for teaching social studies, and work collaboratively with peers as colleagues. |
| Course Goals: | 2) to think critically about and to reflect on your developing rationale for teaching and learning in social studies |
| Essential Questions for Consideration | 1. What is your purpose for teaching social studies?  
2. How might an inquiry approach to teaching influence our thinking and practice as social studies teachers?  
3. How might we work toward a teaching practice that is consistent with our developing rationales for teaching social studies?  
4. How are we leveraging student thinking as a resource in the classroom?  
5. How might we negotiate the pressures and challenges of teaching? |
| Specific Outcomes and Learning Objectives | Upon successful completion of this course, teacher candidates will:  
1. Be able to think critically about and discuss rationale-based social studies instruction; |

The ideas emphasized in these syllabi enriched my understanding of the social studies teacher education program as a contextual site. Both syllabi asked students to think about their rationales for planning and instruction. The syllabi also asked students to think critically about how their rationale and purpose for teaching had developed. These assignments supported and reinforced ideas that both Stanley and Stella shared regarding
their purposes for social studies teacher education. In conjunction with data collected from program faculty, this data contributed to a deeper understanding of the social studies teacher education program as a contextual site that emphasized specific ideas of purpose. Such an understanding of the context within which participants’ experiences took place facilitated a greater comprehension of how the participants’ purpose formation processes occurred. Data collected from observations of program classes further contributed to this understanding.

**Course Observations**

An observation of Class C, taught by Stanley, revealed his efforts to explore ideas of purpose through open, unstructured conversation with students. The conversation began with a discussion of the recent Thanksgiving holiday, but quickly enabled students to think critically about socioeconomic status and gender. While there were many powerful and meaningful ideas about social studies teaching brought up, there was not any overt connection to ideas of purpose in this conversation. During a subsequent conversation with study participants, I asked if they distilled any ideas about purpose or implications for their purpose from the conversation. While they did not perceive direct connections to the idea of purpose, they did suggest that the conversation centered on ideas (social justice, equality, and citizenship) that formed parts of their purposes for teaching. In this way, Stanley oriented students towards their purposes without overt direction (Researcher field notes, 11/26/2013).

Another observation revealed more about the role of purpose in the class. There was a critical consciousness visible in conversations during this class—Stanley facilitated
critical thinking with his questions. Three of the study participants, Bette, Stephanie, and Daniel, participated in conversations and displayed their ability to think critically about education. Stanley asked the students, “Can you actually do this [this conversation] with your middle and high school classes? Can the students have this conversation? Do you have time to do this?” (Researcher field notes, 12/3/13). He went on to challenge the students to think about the following questions:

Does education have to be this way if we don’t want it to be? We should always have an idea of where the conversations could go, but also we don’t have to have it go in a certain direction. What does society look like? What is our role as citizens? This is what social studies is about. What is it that you want students to know and do? (Researcher field notes, 12/3/13)

By giving them the opportunity to have these conversations and facilitating their thinking about their purposes, Stanley opened space for students to develop a purpose that addressed the problems their critical consciousness had exposed.

An observation of Class E, taught by Stella, revealed additional elements of the social studies teacher education program. Much of this class focused on the pragmatic aspects of teaching. During this class, Stella and the students discussed interviewing for jobs, building resumes, and the EdTPA requirement. Stella spent extensive class time working with the students to complete this requirement. While there seemed to be a great deal of focus on these subjects, the emphasis on purpose evident in the syllabus did emerge in the class. There was a sense of obligation among the students and faculty regarding these procedural aspects of the course, which visibly shifted when the class
moved turned to a discussion of lesson planning. The emphasis in this activity was on bringing elements of rationale and purpose into lesson plans. Conversations between Daniel, Drake, and Stella during this activity centered on bringing their purposes to the forefront of their lesson plans (Researcher field notes, 2/19/14).

These observations of the social studies teacher education program classes added to my understanding of how purpose functioned in the program. They also contributed to an understanding of the program as a contextual site. Through the observations, it was possible to see in practice the ideas shared by faculty and put forth in syllabi. The implementation of concepts such as purpose, rationale, social justice, critical thinking about teaching, and citizenship reinforced that these were central ideas in the program. While my observation of these classes was limited, they allowed me to get a sense of the participants’ class meetings as part of the social studies teacher education program as a contextual site.

Contextual Themes

I developed a deeper understanding of the social studies teacher education program (in terms of the vision of the program and the role of purpose) through conversations with program faculty, analysis of course syllabi, and observations of program classes. The following themes emerged.

1. Faculty sought to challenge commonly held notions of what teaching social studies is and can be.
2. The program vision emphasized that students should enact what they had learned, develop and maintain a purpose for teaching, and be able to articulate, plan for, and use their purpose to guide their practice.

3. There was an emphasis on thinking about purposes—where they emanate from, how they develop, and how they shape one’s practice.

4. The idea of social justice was imperative in the program.

5. Students were encouraged to examine their purposes for teaching rather than mimic faculty purposes.

6. Course syllabi required students to think about their rationales for planning and instruction.

7. Course syllabi required students to think critically about how their rationale and purpose for teaching had developed.

8. The ideas of purpose, rationale, social justice, critical thinking about teaching, and citizenship that emerged in conversations with program faculty and in course syllabi also emerged within class meetings.

These themes contributed to a thick, rich picture of the context within which the participants’ experiences of social studies teacher education took place. This rich picture facilitated a deeper understanding of how their experiences contributed to the development of purposes for teaching.

Cases

The participants in this study were unique, thoughtful individuals who maintained complex reasons for choosing to pursue a career in social studies teaching. Their
diversity of ages, experiences, and meaning-making in military service, parenthood, socio-economic status, and learning experiences and environments all contributed to their unique understandings of purposes for teaching social studies. Bette, Daniel, and Stephanie were non-traditional students in that they did not move directly from high school to undergraduate work. Daniel, Drake, and Stephanie were undergraduate students enrolled in the social studies teacher education program and Bette was a master’s student enrolled in a program for 7-12 grade social studies licensure. While all participants attended Class C, Class D, and Class E, Bette did not take Class D and Class E in the same way as the others. Her requirements for these classes were more rigorous as part of being in a master’s program. Further, she took additional courses that the other participants did not as part of her MAT program. I saw the participants’ purposes for teaching as existing on a spectrum, with information transmission on one end and transformative teaching on the other end (Stanley, 2005). A discussion of how their location on this spectrum did or did not change throughout their experiences during the final year of their social studies teacher education follows later in this chapter.

I chose to include their narrations in extended fashion to provide the reader with an opportunity to see the complexities of each of their thinking about their purposes. I follow each excerpt of narrated text with interpretive commentary that highlights how the text revealed the participant’s voice, experiences, and meaning making. I also explain how these aspects coalesced as part of a purpose formation process. Creswell (2007, 2008) establishes this type of organization and presentation of narrative data as an effective approach to illustrating how findings exist within larger meanings.
Bette

Introduction

Bette was a non-traditional student who returned to the university to complete a master’s degree in teaching and acquire a secondary social studies teaching license. It is important to note that she chose her own pseudonym, spelling, and pronunciation. She admired the actor Bette Davis and chose that pseudonym to honor her. She had completed a Bachelor’s degree at the same university approximately 15 years prior to enrolling in the master’s program. She was in her late 30s and was a single mother. She frequently brought up her middle-class standing and progressive political beliefs when we discussed her view of herself and her view of society.

Experiences Prior to Social Studies Teacher Education

In our first one-on-one interview, Bette discussed how her experiences in high school social studies contributed to her purposes for teaching. In an attempt to open space for participants to discuss high school experiences, I began this section of the interview by asking if their experiences in high school had any influence on their decision to become a social studies teacher. While I recognized that a participant’s decision to become a teacher is distinct from their purpose for teaching, I hoped that asking the question would initiate a conversation that revealed if and how those experiences contributed to their purposes for teaching. Fortunately, this approach frequently led to stories that revealed what type of teacher the participant wanted to become, which spoke directly to their purposes. When I asked Bette if any experiences she had in high school
social studies classes influenced her decision to become a social studies teacher, she responded:

No. And I ideally would like to teach government, that’s what I’m doing now in my student teaching. I just don’t want it to look anything like that [high school government class]. Not that, and where I’m teaching is good and she’s a fine teacher and it’s just, the program itself is very, it’s why I don’t remember my government class, right. And I was the rare student who was excited to take government. (Bette, interview, December 3, 2013)

There were two ideas within this statement that Bette continued to develop throughout the study. Like Stephanie and Daniel, Bette’s negative experiences in high school social studies classes led her to want to create classrooms that were markedly different from what she had experienced. In this statement, Bette also began an ongoing dialogue about how her student teaching placement and cooperating teacher mirrored what she experienced in high school. Her frustrations with her cooperating teacher and the administration in her student teaching placement continued to emerge throughout the study.

Stated Purposes for Teaching

During an interview following a course observation, Bette and Drake shared some of their thoughts about their purposes for teaching. In the context of the conversation, both of them discussed how they saw helping students develop as citizens as an essential part of social studies teaching. I asked them if they thought teaching students to be good
citizens and good people was part of their purposes for teaching social studies. Bette responded:

I absolutely think that my purpose for teaching social studies is a variety of some of those things. It’s definitely humanity—learn to be humane to each other. I think that that’s key to being a good citizen. I think teaching some of those skills for a democratic citizenship is extremely important for being a good human. And I also think that there is an element of—patriotism, but not blind patriotism—that questioning of your processes, procedures, practices, everything that your government does is important to becoming a truly patriotic person. Because for me that means questioning and trying to get better for some of the things you find that are not as good as they could be. (Bette, interview, November 26, 2013)

In this statement, Bette made two connections between ideas that comprise, in part, her purpose for teaching. She revealed that she thought being “humane” was a key part of being a good citizen and that taking a questioning stance towards government connects with working for social change. Similarly, during our first conversation prior to student teaching, Bette discussed the role of citizenship in her purpose for teaching social studies: “It’s that citizenship piece and just developing a sense of awareness and then as you build upon that it’s that critical thinking piece, that critical analysis piece” (Bette, interview, December 3, 2013).

Within that interview, Bette continued to develop the picture of her purpose for teaching:
I think a big part of teaching is at the very least getting students to come to an understanding that there is more to life than their particular situation, that there are huge lines drawn along social economic status—and in particular, when it comes to the economic status, everybody lives a little differently and, and I think that that shrinking or demise of the middle class is gonna play a particularly important role in their lives as adults and as citizens. I think it’s important to probably get that thought process rolling as young as possible…that awareness is obviously one part of it. And that’s scratching the surface…awareness but more importantly to start to be able to take it apart, think critically about it, what’s going on, what has to change for it to change, what’s it going to take for change to happen? (Bette, interview, December 3, 2013)

The central idea in this statement was student awareness of socio-economic status. Bette emphasized that her goal was to heighten student awareness of the differences between socio-economic groups and help students develop the ability to understand these differences with a critical orientation. Once again, she invoked the idea of change as a central part of this focus. Social justice and change, as part of Bette’s purpose for teaching, were ideas that persisted throughout her participation in the study. Bette continued to construct a picture of her purpose for teaching in response to a question I asked about what she would hope her future students could do when they left her classroom. She stated:

It would absolutely be to be able to consume the information that is out there and make sense out of it. That, I mean, it, it’s the critical piece. You need to be able
to consume. There’s a lot more out there, being able to sort it. And analyze what you’re consuming as well. So it’s not just piecing it together and making sense out of all the things that you’re getting, but to be able to analyze that source and say oh, you know what, I am watching this or I am just reading Yahoo news. I maybe need to look at some other things to build this up. I like the idea of, it’s essential that, that people are able to hear and consume their opposing information. Stuff that they’re not comfortable with. (Bette, interview, December 3, 2013)

The idea of critical consumption of information was a refrain throughout Bette’s discussion of her purpose for teaching social studies. Here, she added the idea that being able to understand society in a critical manner included consuming “opposing information.” She connected this idea, as part of her purpose, with her emphasis on social justice: “And an underlying part of all of that is, if there is an element and it’s a strong element for my purpose is this thinking about social justice and what that means to individuals across lines” (Bette, interview, 12/3/2013).

This comment about various elements of her purpose reinforced the centrality of social justice in Bette’s purpose at this moment in her teacher education. In these statements, Bette provided a rich picture of her purpose for teaching social studies. At this point in her development, immediately prior to her student teaching, she was focused on honoring the following ideas in her teaching: (a) democratic citizenship, (b) taking a questioning perspective as a patriotic citizen, (c) developing an awareness of socio-economic status, (d) critical consumption of information and diverse views, and (e) social
justice. These ideas were central within her social studies teacher education program, which suggests that the program experiences significantly contributed to the development of her purpose for teaching. With these ideas as a baseline, I was able to compare and contrast her subsequent statements about her experiences and purpose for teaching to reveal how her thinking about her purpose developed.

**Contributions of Social Studies Teacher Education Coursework Experiences**

In discussing her purpose for teaching social studies, Bette echoed ideas that Stanley, one of the faculty participants in this study, emphasized in our conversation about his purpose for being a social studies teacher educator. When I asked her where she saw ideas of purpose in the MAT program, she began to talk about the reflective activities that the faculty asked students to undertake:

So breaking down your previous perceptions of what good teaching is. And then just totally blowing that up, and then re-piecing together sort of a new idea of what teaching could be and how you could be a part of that, I think. And big on your feeling about what learning is, that’s another pretty dramatic shift. Because a lot of us think learning—I don’t know. I thought learning was memorizing, quite honestly. Like, I remember that, so I learned it. (Bette, interview, November 26, 2013)

In this statement, Bette revealed how her thinking about what learning “is” had changed because of her social studies teacher education. This shift in her thinking to a more complex idea of learning, in combination with her deconstruction and reconstruction of what teaching could be, suggested that her social studies teacher education experiences
made a significant contribution to her thoughts about social studies teaching.

Importantly, these reflective activities were foundational to her reflections on questions of purpose, and thus the development of her purpose throughout the MAT program.

In one of Bette’s most powerful statements, she invoked language that was common in her teacher education program to illustrate her perception of the tension between teacher education and the demands of public school:

But I think it’s the structure of where we’re going into that leads to the disconnect. I really don’t think there’s anything radical about what we’re doing in teacher ed here. It seems to all make perfect sense, and not be this crazy, radical theorist over here saying we should be shaking it all up. We should shake it up a little because what we’re seeing is some things that aren’t maybe working the way that they could be. (Bette, interview, November 26, 2013)

It was revealing that Bette chose to use the words “structure,” “radical,” and “disconnect.” The idea that there is dissonance between what pre-service teachers learn in their teacher education programs and the structure of the public education system is a concept that arose often in Bette’s teacher education program. The faculty worked with students to recognize and negotiate this tension. Bette’s acceptance and invocation of this tension reinforced the significance of coursework experiences to her thinking about social studies teaching.

In addition to adopting overarching ideas about education from her teacher education coursework, Bette also incorporated these ideas into her practice. In the
following statement, she noted her struggle with how much to incorporate discussion into her classroom:

But I have this theme in my mind that I will somehow need to figure out how to work it. I feel like a discussion in every unit is the only way. I just feel like it’s the best way to make the content have meaning, give it some backbone. Give it some legs, be able to carry that on with you. And, I’m not gonna want dates to stick with these guys or girls, so that they will have some memory of this coursework because it’s important. (Bette, interview, December 3, 2013)

This statement was significant for two reasons. Bette’s teacher education program heavily emphasized making content relevant and meaningful for students. Her connection of this idea to discussion formats for lessons illustrated how she brought elements of the program together and was attempting to incorporate them into her practice. From the following statement, it became clear that Bette also adopted program understandings about the importance of having a rationale and the role it plays in planning and instruction:

Your rationale for teaching can be your purpose, but you do also need to think through a rationale for each kind of day, week, semester, in those sort of ways as well. And that was a major thing with our unit plans. (Bette, interview, November 26, 2013)

These discussions illustrated how her social studies teacher education coursework experiences contributed to her thinking about social studies teaching, both through larger, overarching ideas of education and ideas related to practice within the classroom. These
changes in her thinking accompanied and facilitated reflection on her purposes for teaching. Throughout the study, it became clear that her experiences of social studies teacher education contributed to the development of her purposes for teaching.

**Contributions of Experiences of Student Teaching**

As part of her MAT program, Bette took a different student teaching seminar class than the other three participants during the spring semester. From an observation of that course, I found that the MAT students, including Bette, had begun to transition their focus to the “realities” of public education:

> The students in this class, at this point in their teacher ed program, appear to have already succumbed to the standardized management of public education. The students have lower energy and more “reality” talk already. They’ve been in their schools for about a week so we’re checking in on them and want to address the doubts that they’re surely having. Stanley wants to know if there are questions about practice, but all their questions are about school procedures and program assignments. Bette only asked questions about the workshop day and snow days.  

(Researcher field notes, February 4, 2014)

From this observation, it was clear that Bette was already struggling with negotiating the tensions between her purpose for teaching and the demands of her school and the public education system.

Bette student-taught two classes of American Government for seniors at Rodgers High School, a suburban school of approximately 485 students in a community of under
20,000 residents. The school had a long-standing relationship with the university’s teacher education program. She described the community:

My school is a suburban flight school. I mean by that is, it’s that place [for people] that didn’t wanna live in an urban community. They moved from the urban center into a “safer community.” Because it’s still quite small. There’s not much diversity. Very Christian. Very white, very, very Christian. It’s an aging population. And it’s a modest, working class. But for the most part, this is a 40K kind of town. (Bette, interview, February 24, 2014)

I observed Bette teach twice during her student teaching to investigate how her purpose was functioning in an educational environment that was somewhat philosophically opposed to her purpose for teaching. During my first observation of Bette’s student teaching, I noticed a number of objects in the classroom that sent clear messages to students about the type of environment Bette’s cooperating teacher sought to maintain. A poster on the wall stated: “Your life is a stage and the world is watching, so get your act together!” There was also a book prominently displayed on a shelf in plain view of the students titled Help! Mom! There are Liberals under My Bed! Following my observation, Bette and I debriefed about her teaching and discussed these items. She explained that her cooperating teacher was open with her conservative political views in the classroom and did not hesitate to dismiss views that she personally did not agree with. In our conversation, I asked Bette what, if any, effect this had on her ability to enact her purposes for teaching social studies. She characterized the situation as a challenge for her because her cooperating teacher did not agree with her desire to provide opportunities
for students to engage in critical thinking exercises and engage with the content in a critical fashion. However, Bette’s cooperating teacher was not overt in her resistance to Bette’s pedagogical approaches at first and allowed her to implement lesson plans and activities that reflected her purposes for teaching social studies.

As a result, during my first observation of Bette’s student teaching, I observed her using discussion as a formal assessment for a unit on current events. By having the students engage in a fishbowl discussion of public debates concerning abortion and the death penalty, she enacted her one element of her purpose, to engage students in civic discourse. The overall climate of the classroom and student interactions were more in line with her purpose than her cooperating teacher’s focus, which was control and classroom management. When I observed her teaching again approximately a week later, further elements of her purpose came through during student discussions. Bette’s emphasis on civic and critical discourse, which was an integral element of her purpose, provided the underlying framework for how the students discussed controversial issues and the way they interacted with each other. I observed one student comment during a class conversation, “I understand where you’re coming from…but…” This was an example of talking across difference, one of the central ideas that Bette wanted to bring to student discussions.

Where some participants struggled to find space to enact their purposes during their student teaching, Bette created room to bring her purpose into her classrooms. While she eventually experienced passive resistance to her stated purposes for teaching from her cooperating teacher, she also worked actively to overcome the challenges
presented by her cooperating teacher and the administration in her student teaching placement. She did this in an interesting fashion. Bette engaged in a process of what she termed “self-censorship” to reconcile the tension between her purpose and her cooperating teacher’s purpose for the class. She stated, “So I basically had the freedom. I did pretty much what I wanted to do, but I had already self-censored enough to add in some things that she had done before” (Bette, post-course observation interview, November 26, 2013). At the conclusion of her 110 hours of observation, Bette shared some of her thoughts about negotiating the tensions between her purposes for teaching and the system within which she was working: “And I gotta dial it back and that’s becoming my major focus right now is dialing it back and forth. That is a frustration” (Bette, post-course observation interview, November 26, 2013).

It is important to provide a definition of “passive resistance” and “active resistance” at this point. Bette was not the only participant to experience passive resistance from her cooperating teacher and school, as both Daniel and Drake experienced it as well. I understood passive resistance as subtle, though not always, resistance to ideas of purpose, lesson plans, classroom management strategies, and additional elements of teaching. It was expressed most frequently by participants’ cooperating teachers. This type of resistance often took the form of suggesting that participants’ ideas “may not work, but go ahead and try” or the frequent suggestion that what they had learned in their teacher education did not work or apply in the “real world” of teaching. Active resistance was more overt. In Stephanie’s case, for example, it took the form of denying her the opportunity to implement lessons or take instructional
approaches that did not align precisely with the cooperating teacher’s established practices and routines. This type of resistance was less common among the participants’ experiences.

Late in her student teaching, Bette negotiated a significant issue of classroom management that led her to shift her approach to instruction. As part of enacting her purpose of teaching for critical citizenship, she had frequently conducted lessons in an open classroom environment. In the following narration, Bette revealed how pressure from her cooperating teacher led her to shift her approach to instruction toward control and discipline in the classroom, consequently moving away from her purpose to teach for critical citizenship:

There was a cheating incident where a student from my second block class wrote down all the answers and gave them to students in the fourth block class. So then the administration was brought in, the students took zeros on the exams and it highlighted maybe the students aren’t respecting the student teacher or maybe she doesn’t have the classroom management skills. So, talking with my cooperating teacher, who is very traditional in classroom management style, she pushed me in another direction, and I tried to reign [the class] in, and in another regard I felt like, god, she’s so controlling, it’s a very authoritarian sort of environment.

(Bette, interview, May 6, 2014)

This experience was unsettling for Bette. She shared that she thought the administration over-reacted to the situation, and her cooperating teacher took advantage of the opportunity to discredit her approach to classroom management. While her cooperating
teacher initially gave her space to employ her preferred pedagogical methods, this incident marked the end of that freedom for Bette.

**Purpose Formation Process**

In our first interview, following my observation of a program class, Bette began to discuss how she thought her purpose for teaching would likely change and evolve:

I would like to sit there and confidently say my purpose won’t change, but I don’t know that I can say that. I think my purpose will always change, and I hope it continues to change, in what I consider to be a good way (Bette, post-course observation interview, November 26, 2013).

Much of the evidence of Bette’s purpose formation process came from her experiences during student teaching. After 6 weeks in her school, she had already undergone a significant shift in thinking about her purpose. While her commitment to a purpose of teaching for critical thinking and critical consumption of society remained strong, the realities of the system and her situation forced her to shift her focus for teaching. She shared the following story:

I’d say one thing that I didn’t, maybe, expect or think about a lot as a problem would be that all of the students in my school that I am teaching, it’s a government class, are seniors. I have probably ten students that are failing out of fifty, and I didn’t expect that. And I just keep packing more points into sections. That became a major focus, was to make things worth points, and that was not my focus [originally]. I didn’t really think about having a ton of formal assessments. I thought of assessing as being much more informal, and liking it that way. And
I’m making everything worth something. It’s not the same as worth something because it has educational value. It has value for your life and I’m just putting points on it so that they’ll [pass]. (Bette, interview, February 24, 2014)

Throughout the study, Bette had never mentioned imperatives on course pass rates or graduation rates as part of her purpose for teaching social studies. Her purpose was much more far-reaching, with a focus on getting students to think critically, develop citizenship skills, and be critically reflective about their world. Here, it was clear that, because of her experiences student teaching, Bette had become far more attentive to creating assignments worth enough points to enable her students to pass the course, rather than focusing on the value of education for students’ lives. Bette then began to reflect on how this change might influence her purpose for teaching going forward:

I hope it doesn’t shift my purpose too much. I still think that the things are valuable that we talked about before. And I still think that they’re the reason to teach social studies, and specifically government. My fear is that I’m gonna go too much into this how do you get kids to pass. And you lose sight of what’s valuable. And that’s where I’m at today. So I’m trying to redirect at this time, but I’m coming off of a major blow as far as expectations and thinking I don’t wanna teach for grades. I don’t want to teach for grades, but I find that I’m very quickly shifting over there, very quickly. In two units, I’m like grades, grades, grades, grades, grades are the only important thing. And I have to redirect, I know I do. I’m trying to with this unit. (Bette, interview, February 24, 2014)
In this statement, it was clear that she recognized how an emphasis on grades was pulling her away from her purposes of teaching for critical thinking and citizenship. Her explicit acknowledgment of a purpose shift made it clear that this was one of the most powerful examples of how her experiences of student teaching contributed to her purpose formation process.

During our second interview, Bette said she felt that her cooperating teacher wanted her to maintain a strong grip on the students’ behavior, at the expense of the social studies learning that necessitated more freedom in the classroom. I asked her if in addition to the focus on grades, she felt that her cooperating teacher’s emphasis on classroom management and discipline was contributing to a shift in her purposes. She responded:

No, I don’t feel like it’s making its way into my purpose necessarily, but in order to teach and have an equitable environment for all students, it isn’t something that I can dismiss. No my purpose to teach is not to teach authority and to teach control, that’s not going to make its way [in]. Control and maintaining control creates an inauthentic environment, and it just stifles any sort of spontaneity and I don’t want to go there, I just need to make sure that everyone is comfortable.

(Bette, interview, May 6, 2014)

Interestingly, Bette connected the idea of classroom management with equity here. In certain instances, she felt her classroom lacked equity for all students because there were too many disruptions. Thus, rather than choosing to emphasize only citizenship and critical consumption of society, Bette found a way to orient classroom management
towards her purposes of citizenship and equality. By combining the imperatives of her public school classroom with her overarching goals for teaching, Bette affirmed that her experiences in student teaching contributed to her purpose formation process.

There was another example of how experiences of student teaching contributed to the evolution of Bette’s purpose for teaching. When I asked Bette how her thinking about her purpose had changed after 12 weeks of student teaching, she told the following story about something she did not anticipate:

I had a little bit more of a grander [purpose], but I wouldn’t teach for consumption of knowledge and of information and I’ve found that once I got in there with the students I just really was trying to teach to those students but I didn’t think, and this is going to sound terrible, I didn’t think I’d care about the students as much as I did. I really didn’t. (Bette, interview, May 6, 2014)

Bette continued this narration to reveal how she developed an ethic of caring in her teaching. Her focus on caring for individual students worked in concert with her development of ideas about individualized teaching and curriculum. In the following statement, Bette illustrated how her experiences of student teaching contributed to the evolution of her purpose for teaching in ways that she could not have anticipated:

I was teaching because I felt like this was their last time in organized education and I needed to help them get some skills that’s going to help them in their later life, for other students, I need to work with this student to help them not hate females. You have that large (group) of students who have a real problem with female authority. So trying to meet them somewhere where they don’t feel that
way with everyone and maybe can use that later in their life. I was teaching different students for different reasons. (Bette, interview, May 6, 2014)

Here Bette revealed that rather than looking at the class as a group and teaching for critical citizenship skills irrespective of individual student needs, she started to individualize her teaching and connect with the students on an individual basis. In doing so, she had begun creating an approach to teaching that employed individualized curriculum at times. The concept of an individualized curriculum is largely contrary to the structure of public education in this country. I asked Bette if she thought the idea of individual curriculum might assist her in fulfilling her other purposes for teaching. She responded, “For sure. What the students need to develop or work on I don’t think in anyway could be contrary [to my purposes]. And the big picture can continually be the same. But those smaller elements can be more individualized” (Bette, interview, May 6, 2014). When I inquired further if Bette had ever thought about working with individual students on what they needed to learn as part of her purpose, she stated, “No, but like I said, I didn’t feel like I would individually care about the students. It’s not that I thought that I wouldn’t, I just never thought about it” (Bette, interview, May 6, 2014).

During our final interview, I asked Bette what she was teaching for. Her statement of her purpose at the conclusion of her student teaching and the study was particularly powerful:

Well, the thing that keeps coming to my head is, honestly, students. I’m teaching for that guy and that female, and it hasn’t replaced citizenship or equity or a sense of community that’s beyond your own or any of those other things, it hasn’t
replaced them, it’s just more individualized, it’s more about that particular student. Yes, for them, for the purpose, for the end result of helping them later in life. Which to me means citizenship. (Bette, interview, May 6, 2014)

In this narration, Bette revealed how her purpose formation process functioned. She recognized that her purpose would be fluid throughout her teaching, but feared that her experiences in the classroom would lead her to shift her purpose too much toward content coverage and a standardized management approach to teaching. At the outset of her program, she had a “grander purpose,” (Bette, interview, May 6, 2014) which was, in her understanding, to teach for the critical consumption of society. Through her student teaching, she developed an “ethic of caring” approach to her teaching, and simultaneously began to develop an individualized approach to thinking about coursework and curriculum. By the end of her teacher education program, she was attempting to marry her purpose of teaching for citizenship, democracy, and community with her purpose of teaching to meet individual students’ needs.

Daniel

Introduction

Like Bette and Stephanie, Daniel was a non-traditional student. He returned to university in his late 20s to earn his bachelor’s degree in education and a secondary social studies teaching license. He was also a single parent and had spent seven years in the military prior to attending the university. His military experience, which included significant amounts of teaching experience, played an important part in his understanding of education and teaching. Throughout the study, Daniel and I had frequent
conversations about his service in Iraq and Afghanistan, often related to his experiences as a teacher for a specific military unit. He did not name the unit. He told numerous stories about the enjoyment he experienced as a teacher during that time. There was a tacit implication during a number of our conversations throughout the study that his experiences in the military led him to pursue a teaching degree.

**Experiences Prior to Social Studies Teacher Education**

During our first one-on-one interview, Daniel and I discussed some positive and negative experiences he had had in his high school social studies classes. He told two stories, both negative, about how his teachers failed to engage him in the classroom despite his engagement with the subject of American history. As in the interview with Bette, I asked him if those experiences had any connection to or influence on his decision to become a social studies teacher. This was a way to discover if and how those experiences contributed to his purpose for teaching. He responded:

> Ultimately, I would say no. I think those experiences shaped me in who I am. A part of me so in, in some long distance and direct form you might be able to argue that but I would say there’s no direct relation because honestly, I didn’t decide I wanted to be a teacher until after I was already out of high school for, for I don’t know, five or six years. (Daniel, interview, December 11, 2013)

Daniel expressed a common theme among the participants that experiences of high school social studies classes did not directly influence their decisions to become social studies teachers. Like Bette and Stephanie, Daniel shared that it was after he had been away from formal public education for several years that he decided he wanted to teach.
In addition, Daniel’s stories about unengaging classes and rote memorization of material echoed Bette’s recollections of her experiences in high school social studies classes. Daniel was not able to recollect any experiences of high school social studies that contributed to his decision to become a social studies teacher.

**Stated Purposes for Teaching**

During our first one-on-one interview, immediately prior to his student teaching, Daniel began to develop a picture of his purpose for teaching social studies. When we discussed his purposes for teaching, he stated:

I want students and other people to see the world in a holistic view as I do so that they can make informed opinions, or decisions in their lives. Those lives should include relations with each other. There is a civic aspect to it, a citizenship aspect. And again back to that it doesn’t have to be voting, there needs to be some sort of relational aspect from them to other people. (Daniel, interview, December 11, 2013)

In this statement, Daniel revealed his focus on civics and citizenship. Interestingly, Daniel’s understanding of his purpose for teaching social studies included his own perspective as a significant component. That is to say, he aimed to bring *his* interpretation of the world into his teaching and his classrooms. This idea was visible in his stated desire for students to see the world in a “holistic view as I do.” It was also on display in the following statement:

I realized that I want to teach because I love the interaction. I love learning about it, I want to share that, but also in those interactions and in the content that I teach
I’ve learned that my favorite way to look at things, my favorite way to teach and the way I think everyone should learn is in a holistic pattern. So viewing it from all sides and then using what you have to make a judgment, but not a concrete judgment because teaching and learning and everything is still fluid as you go on through life. (Daniel, interview, December 11, 2013)

Here again, Daniel’s understanding of teaching included the notion that everyone should learn in a certain style. This did not suggest a shortsightedness or shallow understanding to me, but rather that Daniel was bringing understandings of education that he had gained prior to his teacher education into his purposes for teaching. Later discussions revealed more about his purpose and the contribution of his experiences to the development of his purpose.

**Contributions of Social Studies Teacher Education Coursework Experiences**

During the first one-on-one interview, Daniel summarized how the social studies teacher education program contributed to his purpose:

But as I’m going down through this outline in my head of where I am and what I want to be everything that the teacher program has done for me, it hasn’t specifically changed any one thing about me or what-what I’m looking at, goals, but what it’s done is it’s created new pieces and parts that are more in depth.

(Daniel, interview, December 11, 2013)

In this statement and in additional conversations, Daniel claimed that his experiences in the teacher education program did not contribute significantly to his purpose of teaching for citizenship and community orientations. Daniel elaborated on the role of citizenship
in his teaching. Interestingly, his ideas echoed the language of his social studies teacher education program, contrasting with his previous statements:

Well, the first thing that I would say is that a good citizen number one, takes part in some sort of community. Whether it be local, state, or even federal level. So that’s the first part that I think. The second part is more on a social level. I think that a good citizen is connected with other people. The idea of citizenship itself is fluid and should be fluid throughout your life. So your ideas are gonna change as your goals have changed and as your values change in life. (Daniel, interview, December 11, 2013)

There was ambiguity in his thinking about the role of his experiences prior to and during social studies teacher education. It appeared that he was at odds with himself, one moment focusing on ideas of community and citizenship, which were central in his social studies teacher education program, and the next falling back into transmission of content, a holdover from his previous experiences. After having been in his placement for 6 weeks, he shared the following:

When I do my planning I start from either, one, the standard and move forward or, two, I start with what my teacher tells me to in the book. So I may start with the chapter, find the standard, from the standard find my essential questions or my guiding questions. Find my objectives from there and then move forward in my planning process. How am I gonna transition myself from checking homework to going over the homework and then moving into a power point or some other way to get the information out to them. (Daniel, interview, February 28, 2014)
This narration provided an example of dissonance between Daniel and the program’s ideas. Course syllabi and observations of classes revealed that the way he discussed lesson planning was commonly taught in the program. However, the faculty and coursework typically follow such ideas with more in-depth thinking, which seems to be missing in Daniel’s discussion of his planning. I understood Daniel’s complexity of thought about his purpose as an example of how program experiences and experiences prior to social studies teacher education can intersect and lead to nuanced outcomes for pre-service teachers’ thinking about purposes for teaching. As such, Daniel’s case offered an example of how experiences were part of a purpose formation process that was unique to individuals.

**Contributions of Experiences of Student Teaching**

Daniel did his student teaching at Nelson Middle School, a rural school of approximately 500 students. The surrounding community was comprised of farms and small towns. The school was located approximately ten miles from the university he attended. Daniel taught several classes of eighth grade World History. In the following statements, Daniel revealed how he experienced active and passive resistance to his purpose in his student teaching. He also illustrated how he negotiated the tensions between the public education system and the ideas from his social studies teacher education program that had he incorporated into his purposes for teaching. The majority of the resistance he experienced related to aspects of content within his planning and instruction. Here, he specifically addressed how his cooperating teacher held a different view of content:
He [cooperating teacher] wants to focus on the war, the things he thinks are interesting. Where my focus will always be towards national identity coming together. Tolerance for each, for different types of people and the fact that people are different. (Daniel, interview, February 28, 2014)

I understood this statement as a difference of degree rather than substance. While Daniel chose to focus on different aspects of content, which may have done more to honor his purpose of teaching for citizenship, he was still highly content-driven. He went on to say:

I’m not gonna lie. I do have restrictions like I said. The content itself, I’m restricted to by number one, my cooperating teacher. Because number two he is very textbook based curriculum. And number three, when we do have area to deviate for the most part the school highly recommends that we follow a Youngstown curriculum map. (Daniel, interview, February 28, 2014)

In the following narration about the process of his planning and instruction, Daniel revealed the challenges he faced in constructing his own lessons and planning for instruction:

When I do get time to do my own lesson, it’s maybe once a couple weeks. Not even unit but just like, one day. The things in the unit I can change, the way that I present it but I can’t change the actual content. I’m basically doing what he wants for the lesson. However I can say what I want, I can explain it in the way I want. (Daniel, interview, February 28, 2014)
Through these statements, Daniel indicated that he experienced significant passive resistance to his purposes for teaching, including the elements of his purpose that he incorporated from his social studies teacher education. While he did not characterize these situations as tense, he approached his student teaching from a highly pragmatic standpoint. Rather than confront the tension between the imperatives of the classroom and his own orientations toward citizenship and teaching, Daniel chose to quietly negotiate any resistance from his cooperating teacher during his student teaching, as the following two examples reveal.

During two of my observations of Daniel’s student teaching, I observed examples of passive resistance to his purpose for teaching. His main purpose for teaching was to help students develop ideas of citizenship. However, the primary focus of his cooperating teacher was content coverage. For example, during a lesson on how the United States settles disputes peacefully, Daniel began with a guided discussion of the emergence of nationalism following the War of 1812. As he tried to balance his objective of getting students to consider the importance of citizenship with the imperative of content coverage, students struggled to see the relevance of the content pieces. This led him to forego conversations about citizenship in favor of lectures that covered the content. Consequently, the lesson did not reflect much of his purpose (Researcher field notes, March 3, 2014).

During another observation, I was able to sit with Daniel and his cooperating teacher while they lesson-planned for the class I was observing. They planned the lesson by going through the chapter in the course textbook and selecting the content for students
to learn. The focus of the lesson was content coverage exclusively. The students began
the lesson by spending ten minutes in groups, filling data into a graphic organizer, then
listened to a PowerPoint lecture with the remaining content. There was little in the lesson
that reflected Daniel’s purpose for teaching social studies. Throughout the study, it
became apparent that his cooperating teacher’s focus on content coverage and retention
had influenced his purpose. He actually reverted slightly from the ideas of his social
studies teacher education program when he told the students, “If you don’t have this
piece of content mastered by the end of the class, then your class time today was a
failure” (Researcher field notes, April 9, 2014).

**Purpose Formation Process**

There was limited evidence in Daniel’s narrations of how his purpose formation
process functioned. He experienced a purpose formation process throughout his teacher
education, but it may have been less dramatic than other participants’ processes. As
noted earlier, Daniel was focused on completing his teacher education program and
acquiring a teaching position rather than negotiating the tensions in his student teaching
placement and attempting to enact his purposes for teaching in that space.

From two interviews and two observations of Daniel’s student teaching, it became
clear that he did not think that the social studies teacher education program contributed
significantly to his purposes. However, he invoked ideas that were part of that program,
including citizenship, tolerance, and making content relevant for students. He also did
not like the content-driven focus of his cooperating teacher’s classroom. However, he
took a teacher-centered approach in his instruction, attempting to bring his worldview to
his students, and also adopting a content focus. These contrasts speak to the uniqueness of the purpose formation process among each participant. This is important as Daniel represented something of an outlier in the study—he remained almost singularly focused on completing the program and earning his credentials so he could acquire a paying teaching position. However, he was an important participant in the study because his case provided a contrast to the other participants.

**Drake**

**Introduction**

Drake was a more traditional college student, enrolling at the university immediately following his graduation from high school. He described his background as middle class. Drake was less forthcoming with personal information than several of the other participants were.

**Experiences Prior to Social Studies Teacher Education**

During our first conversation, following an observation of one of his teacher education classes, Drake shared that he came to the social studies teacher education program with a focus on historical content. He described how this content focus contributed to the development of his purpose for teaching:

When I came into the program, as a freshman, I think my ideas for teaching were mainly based on the idea of content. I would get upset that kids that have graduated high school, have a high school diploma, and you point to a map, point out England, and only half the class can do it. That kind of stuff drove me nuts. And I think my original purpose for getting into teaching was so that doesn’t
happen. I had this broad idea when I become a high school teacher, or middle school teacher, I’m gonna make sure I teach geography. I’m gonna make sure I teach religion and stuff like that. I think that was my original purpose; and like I think it’s still there. (Drake, interview, November 26, 2013)

In this statement, Drake revealed not only that he began his teacher education with a heavy emphasis on content knowledge, but also that he believed it was still a part of his purpose for teaching halfway through the final year of his social studies teacher education program. Through further conversations with Drake, he elaborated on how teaching for content knowledge fit within his purpose. Interestingly, Daniel also hinted that he had a focus on content knowledge in our conversations, and intimated that content knowledge was central in his purpose when he entered the program, though this focus was less directly stated.

In our first one-on-one interview, Drake reiterated his focus on content knowledge within his teaching. He stated, “I do love history, and that’s what brought me into this field. And I think I like history, and I like teaching history, because I know it” (Drake, interview, December 4, 2013). Drake also elaborated on his experiences of social studies learning in high school. In the following statement, Drake revealed how his experiences of high school social studies classes contributed to his purpose as he entered the teacher education program. He shared:

I think my purpose going into teaching was I wanted to be able to create the environment that I wished I learned in more. I think looking back on it now it’s more probably because of I wanted to create an environment like I had in my
Psychology class where it was more open, more free. (Drake, interview, December 4, 2013)

He also shared how a current events class that included space for students to engage in active learning heightened his engagement. I asked Drake if he thought that type of class structure would be something that he would want to bring to his future social studies classrooms. He stated:

I think ideally, I’d only want to teach those kind. I think my purpose going into teaching was I wanted to be able to create the environment that I wished I learned in more. (Drake, interview, December 4, 2013)

From these statements, it was clear that Drake’s positive experiences in high school social studies classes shaped how he saw his purpose for teaching social studies in the future. Drake’s recollection of a positive experience from high school, and his incorporation of that experience into his purpose for teaching, was unique among the participants. Bette, Daniel, and Stephanie all recalled only negative experiences from high school social studies classes.

Stated Purposes for Teaching

In the following statements, given immediately prior to his 12-week student teaching, Drake revealed his thoughts at that time about his purpose for teaching. He shared that critical thinking, having a rationale or a purpose for instructional decision-making, and creating space for “open learning” were aspects of his purpose. Drake described “open learning” as facilitating deep investigation of content rather than
focusing exclusively on the factual components of content. During our first one-on-one interview, he stated:

But, I think you have to kind of take that into account when you’re teaching and your purpose for teaching then should be, well is my purpose for teaching to get them to a level where they aren’t just focused on the consumerism, but that they can actually think of a broader social issues? I think that’s part of my purpose for teaching. (Drake, interview, December 4, 2013)

Through this statement, Drake suggested that his purpose had evolved to include active learning opportunities for students. It also began a conversation about the role of citizenship within his purpose. I asked him what he would want students in his classes to learn and be able to do when they left his classes. He responded:

That they recognize that beyond being a teacher I’m a human, and that they kind of recognize that my ultimate purpose was to make them good citizens if you will. Yeah I think that’s probably one of my biggest takeaways. You know there is a lot of things going on around the world, and I don’t want to say that [inaudible] or the power to change it, because they realistically probably don’t, but more like just for you, you have the power to not be those people who just trample everyone on Black Friday over sales. You have the power to be someone above that. And my idea is to hope that the kids realize that there are things that matter and things that don’t and that they can be the better citizen. (Drake, interview, December 4, 2013)
These ideas of citizenship became a central topic of conversation for us throughout the study. Drake continued to develop these ideas and it was clear that citizenship became more and more important to him throughout his student teaching. His previous focus on teaching for content knowledge began to recede vis-à-vis his focus on teaching for active and critical citizenship. Drake discussed these changes in a journal entry he made prior to the first week of his student teaching:

As for my purpose for teaching social studies, I have noticed it has changed a little bit. I no longer am doing this simply to be able to talk about history all day, but even more so than that I now realize that teaching isn’t about what I want, it’s about what the students need. I now firmly believe in the idea of cultivating a good citizen, or rather, a good human being. My old purpose of teaching to talk about history still exists, but it has become more of my drive to continue to do this. I want to be able to teach students about things that really matter; about things that can one day make a difference in their lives. (Drake, journal entry, January 2, 2014)

At this point in his development, Drake described his purpose as teaching for consideration of broader social issues and students’ development as humans and citizens. It was interesting to see how Drake’s view of his purpose for teaching had already undergone changes at this point in his teacher education. His experiences in his social studies teacher education coursework had led him to shift his focus away from teaching strictly for historical content and toward promoting ideas of citizenship and social development. In this way, the changes in his purpose mirrored some of the aspects of
Bette’s development. The following section provides additional examples of how his experiences contributed to his purpose.

**Contributions of Social Studies Teacher Education Coursework Experiences**

In an interview with Drake during his student teaching, he told a story that revealed how his approach to teaching social studies had changed and how he incorporated program ideas into his purpose for teaching. I asked Drake if he thought that bringing his purpose into the classroom had helped his students learn. He responded with a story about a lesson he taught concerning the emergence of socialism in Russia during the Industrial Revolution:

> Yeah, I think so. And I think it’s because it’s another way to reinforce it because they might not have gotten it in the book. They might not have understood, they might not be someone who can take notes and sit there. But by doing it this new way, by teaching them about the idea of the system and giving it some sort of relevance to them. And so I’m trying to teach them about the whole idea that the system sometimes is messed up. So the Industrial Revolution, that’s why socialism comes out is because the system was set against them. And so now they can use this in terms of you know, education. They can use this in terms of anything. (Drake, interview, March 4, 2014)

Here, Drake emphasized differentiating his instruction for students with different learning styles, which was a focus of his social studies teacher education program. He also brought up the importance of taking a critical orientation in this story, through his emphasis on systems and their impact on people. This suggested that part of his purpose
was to help students develop a critical mindset toward their world. Importantly, he also wanted to make content relevant to his students by exploring how systems function. The goal of this activity was to give students an opportunity to see how the social, economic, and educational systems they were a part of influenced their lives. This idea was another important point of emphasis in his social studies teacher education program. In further conversations, Drake continued to highlight how his purpose for teaching had changed over the course of his teacher education coursework. He emphasized the shift from using his passion for content as a means to teach for content mastery to teaching for students’ needs. In addition, he stressed the ideas of citizenship cultivation and social development as central points in his purpose for teaching.

**Contributions of Experiences of Student Teaching**

Drake did his student teaching at Cobb High School, a school of approximately 1,200 students ten miles from a major metropolitan center. Drake taught three sections of 10th grade American History. The surrounding community was solidly middle class and had suffered substantial economic decline in the past 25 years, but had maintained a strong emphasis on education. The school had recently undergone renovations. The student body was approximately 95% African-American.

During an interview following an observation of a program class, Drake told a lengthy story about the tensions he perceived between his purpose and the realities of public schools, and how he had to negotiate both active and passive resistance to his purpose. This was the beginning of an ongoing conversation about his negotiation of these tensions, which continued throughout the study. He began:
How do we get away from lecture? I’m in schools now and that’s still all they do. Even the teachers that agree that yeah we can’t be doing this, they’ve got administrators hounding on them. Like if an administrator walks by and doesn’t see them lecturing, then that’s a meeting in the office. You know, why aren’t you teaching them this? And they’re like oh no, no, no, no you’ve gotta do it this way. And so like how do you get past that? And I think that’s where the struggle is for me now. That’s how I feel when I go to my school and say hey I want to do all of this stuff, and like my cooperating teacher’s on board, and he’s like yeah I think it’s great. Then the administrations like well we need the kids to pass the OGT. And they’re so concerned with that, with the graduation rate, the OGT exam. Like I think, in the long run, I don’t think my purpose would change. But I think as like a first year teacher, I think my struggle is what do I do? Do I do everything just to please the administration because I want to keep this job?

(Drake, interview, November 26, 2013)

Drake shared this story after completing 100 hours of observation at his student teaching site during the fall semester of his final year of social studies teacher education. Through this story, Drake revealed that after having spent this small amount of time at his school, he had already identified a number of obstacles affecting his ability to enact his ideas of the purpose of social studies teaching due to the focus of his school. He noted several issues: (a) a heavy emphasis on lectures that transmit content, (b) the use of those lectures as a means to prepare students for content heavy high-stakes tests, and (c) his challenge
to reconcile those demands with his purposes of teaching for citizenship and social development. These ideas continued to emerge in Drake’s journal. He wrote:

I also began to realize that I want to be able to teach students about things like the issues brought up in RENT (AIDS, drug addiction, homelessness, homosexuality), but that the confines of my current student teaching classroom will never allow for that. In fact, the more I thought about it, I realized that no matter what school or classroom I end up in, it is unlikely my curriculum will have room to teach something like this. For example, right now I am in a school which has a heavy, HEAVY emphasis on OGT prep work and coursework. AIDS, HIV, drug addiction, and the likes have yet to be a main topic on an OGT test, and probably never will be, and therefore I don’t have the time to teach this kind of material. I’ve said before that part of teaching is crafting good human beings out of teenagers, and I can only hope that someday there will be curriculum dedicated to what actually matters in society. (Drake, journal entry, January 2, 2014)

In this narration, Drake revealed his perception of another tension between his purpose and the high-stakes testing focus of his school. The content of high-stakes tests did not reflect what Drake thought “actually matters in society.” That is, his purpose for teaching included having students engage with a curriculum that investigated relevant social issues. However, because of the tests, he felt he would not be able to include content that was relevant to students’ lives in his future classrooms. He reinforced this idea in another journal entry:
No offense to curriculum writers out there, but American Imperialism of the late 19th century is hardly going to affect the lives of students in today’s society. Sure it’s great to know it, sure it makes you a well-rounded individual, but is it going to help you help someone else? Probably not. (Drake, journal entry, February 10, 2014)

Through these conversations and journal entries, Drake continued to demonstrate that his focus on teaching for content mastery—which he brought into the program, and which was the focus of the social studies classes at his student teaching site—was moving further and further into the background of his purposes for teaching. After being in his placement for six weeks, Drake had experienced significant challenges to his focus on preparing citizens: “It’s tough. I find myself frustrated. There is no time for that great discussion on affirmative action. I have become way more cynical” (Drake, interview, March 4, 2014). Drake made it clear that while his purpose of teaching to prepare citizens remained a part of his philosophy of education, he struggled to enact this purpose because of the demands of high-stakes testing preparation and the focus of the administration and his cooperating teacher on content coverage. Drake discussed these priorities of his school in the following statement:

I think the biggest thing right now and this is more or less because of the environment that I’m in is the OGTs are next week so it’s a huge, huge push by the schools. Every Thursday after school we’re doing tutoring for the OGT which I’m helping on that. It makes it a little more difficult in finding lessons ‘cause it’s a lot more focused on [testing], and it sucks, it’s teaching to the test basically, but
that’s the push of the administration. There’s two big pushes: attendance and graduation. (Drake, interview, March 4, 2014)

In this story, Drake revealed that he recognized the tension between the high-stakes testing imperative of public education and his learning in his social studies teacher education. He viewed the idea of “teaching to the test” as an ineffective form of instruction, which was a persistent idea within his program coursework. Throughout our conversations, he continued to recognize and discuss how this tension formed part of his experiences of student teaching and what it meant for his purpose.

During an observation of one of Drake’s lessons during his student teaching, I observed consistent passive resistance to his purpose for teaching. Drake’s cooperating teacher focused almost exclusively on classroom management and discipline, frequently interrupting the lesson to control the students at the expense of the lesson. Drake’s objective for the day was strictly content focused, as opposed to an objective that reflected his stated purpose. His objective for the students was: “I can understand how America’s power tips the balance in favor of the Allies during WWI.” His cooperating teacher also consistently prompted him to “just tell them [students] the answer” and interrupted his teaching to infuse the lesson with content ideas that he felt were relevant (Researcher field notes, March 20, 2014). While Drake was able to engage students in a brief discussion of why the content mattered, this was the only time his purpose came through in the lesson. The curriculum, cooperating teacher, and structure of the class prohibited any other enactment of his purpose. These experiences during his student teaching contributed to the development of his purpose for teaching social studies going
forward. I discuss how all of these experiences contributed to Drake’s purpose formation process in the following section.

**Purpose Formation Process**

Throughout the study, Drake frequently discussed how his thinking about his purpose for teaching social studies had evolved, beginning with his experiences prior to social studies teacher education, followed by his experiences during coursework, and concluding with his experiences during student teaching. The following direct discussion of the development of his purpose provides a rich example of a moment in the evolution of his thinking:

I can absolutely agree with you on the fact that it [purpose] has changed quite a bit from the time that I started the program until now. And that’s why it will continue to morph throughout the rest of my life, I assume. But I came in with the “ugh how do the kids not know this kind of thing?” But I think it’s also evolved now, is that [content] really as important as I originally thought? So now what has become the new shift? My thinking, I think, is towards more the idea of the good citizen, good human. If a kid is having a problem, or having a struggle in their life, being able to mentor them or to guide them to know how to deal with that. And using ideas like racism and gender, and those kind of ideas to guide them towards thinking and more open minded sort of senses. I think that has become, is becoming my focus. (Drake, interview, November 26, 2013)

Drake shared these thoughts during our first conversation, at the midpoint of his final year of the social studies teacher education program, immediately prior to his student
teaching. In this narration, Drake revealed that his purpose for teaching had already shifted from a focus on teaching for content knowledge to teaching for citizenship and “open minded sort of senses.” These ideas were a central part of his social studies teacher education coursework, suggesting that his exposure to the coursework contributed significantly to the shift in his purpose.

In the following narration from our first one-on-one interview, Drake revealed more of the development of his purpose. He shared:

But, then coming here and learning about all these other things that we can be doing. Learning about things like having fishbowl discussions, which is something I’ve never heard of before. We never did that kind of stuff. Learning that there are other ways to do things, I don’t have to just sit up here and lecture about something. I can do the jigsaw [activity], stuff like that, and now I’m noticing, I think at this time last year I was like wow this is really great, this is the stuff I want to do. Then I get in the field this year. I’m in a school, and I’m watching classrooms in work, and now I’m stuck trying to find the balance between, because this high school is very similar to the one I went to in terms of methods and teaching, and I’m trying to find that balance between it worked for me and does it work for everyone else? Do I need to as a teacher shift gears, because even as I’m watching and so like oh yeah this works, and I don’t understand why the students aren’t doing well. I’m trying to find that balance.

(Drake, interview, December 4, 2013)
In this story, Drake described a strong content focus in his own high school social studies courses. In his social studies teacher education, he developed a greater focus on methods, pedagogy, and pedagogical content knowledge. However, when he entered his student teaching placement he found himself in an environment focused largely on content coverage and test performance. One of Drake’s goals was to find space to bring some of the methods from his social studies teacher education into a content-focused environment. Through this story, Drake provided a powerful example of his purpose formation process at work.

Prior to beginning his student teaching, I asked Drake if his thinking about being a social studies teacher had changed since he began the program. He responded:

I think it all has to have changed a little bit. Just based on what I’ve learned, and in the sense that I didn’t really know a lot of this stuff. Especially before last year, before I took my Principles class, which had every content area in it. That was my first, everyone’s first real like this is what teaching is supposed to be. And so I have to say it’s changed a lot, it’s not what I had in high school, there’s more to it. I think that’s where my thinking about it has changed is that I can still take what I learned and now I can add to it, and then when I get to a class like last year where we learned all those different pedagogical methods, like fishbowl, and jigsaw, and all that stuff. Now being able to come to this year and say well that stuff is great. I don’t have to rely solely on that sort of thing. I think that’s how I’ve changed because I’ve kind of gone from this is how it is, to there’s a lot more to it. That doesn’t mean it’s the only thing. (Drake, Interview, 12/4/2013)
This narration was particularly important for several reasons. Through this statement, Drake revealed an increased depth of thought about what teaching “is.” Rather than seeing social studies teaching as singularly content driven, or focusing exclusively on specific pedagogical methods, here Drake demonstrated pluralistic thought about his practice. This shift in his thinking about his practice was in correlation to the shift in thinking about his purpose and confirmed the contribution of his experiences of social studies teacher education.

Drake negotiated significant issues of classroom management in his student teaching, much like Bette. While Bette was strongly encouraged by administrators and her cooperating teacher to increase discipline across her class in response to an instance of cheating, Drake had the support of his cooperating teacher to employ different strategies to facilitate learning and reduce disruptions in the classroom. This experience contributed significantly to Drake’s thinking about his purpose and the balance he sought in his teaching. Through the following narration, Drake revealed his meaning making from the experience. He began by talking about a group of students in one of his classes that were particularly challenging and disruptive:

You really can’t focus on the two idiots in the back of the class that are there once a week and the only times they’re there they’re just sitting there screwing around the entire time. That’s not to say you lose focus on them completely, but if you focus on them too much, you lose everyone else in the class and you lose what you really need to be teaching them, I think. Because there were plenty of kids in that class and I could see the frustration in the kids’ faces that really wanted to
I pulled one kid aside, really bright kid, and I could just see that day on his face, he was turned around, he’s throwing his pencil down as fast as he could, and we couldn’t teach him, and I apologized after class, and he understood, he wasn’t mad at me, he was just frustrated. So we put him next to a couple kids that weren’t very good at learning and we put him there on purpose because we knew he was going to learn regardless of where he was sitting so if we put him next to maybe one of the kids that screws around, eventually, they’ll try to talk to him for ten minutes and then eventually they’ll say oh well maybe I should do my work. Right, and even a couple of times he, it used to make me laugh, he’d redirect the kid, like a girl would be like, wait can you explain this again, and he’d be like well maybe if you were paying attention you’d have heard him the first time. And I think I need to focus on, it’s not classroom management, it’s teaching well enough that the class can teach themselves if they need to. More or less. Like I can teach the good kids and through whatever projects I do, after whatever group work, whatever assignments I do, they can help. (Drake, interview, April 29, 2014)

The powerful implication for this study is that he chose to use both his purpose and his understanding of effective teaching from his social studies teacher education as solutions to classroom management issues. He wove these elements of his social studies teacher education and his purpose into the educational system and his particular school to create a unique understanding and approach to teaching. The evidence of democratic orientations toward teaching and a focus on citizenship were substantial in his telling of this story.
Drake’s final statement of the study was rich with ideas of citizenship and democratic living. In the following narration, Drake described his purpose as he graduated from the social studies teacher education program. I asked him to describe briefly his purposes for teaching social studies:

Alright, well I think it’s again what we kind of talked about all semester, I want to teach citizenship so I want to teach the idea that I don’t care if you know the four purposes of World War One, but I care that you realize that you’re a good citizen, you know what it takes to be a good human being. That’s part of being a teacher, I think that should be any teachers’ probably number one goal. Because if you can teach that then you’ll be a successful human being. I think kind of secondary to that is, I want to teach the kids that can learn, the kids that want to learn in the hopes that they will then grow themselves and teach those that refuse to learn. Because they’re going to be with them a lot longer than I will. So I think it’s kind of interesting, social studies is my content but I think my purposes aren’t necessarily only social studies. (Drake, interview, April 29, 2014)

Through this story, Drake suggested that he did indeed find a way to bring his purpose for teaching social studies into a school environment and classroom that maintained goals antithetical to his own. He could have conformed to the system, his cooperating teacher, or his administrators, or succumbed to the challenges of his classes and students. Rather, he chose to create space for his purpose in his classrooms.

All of Drake’s narration revealed how his purpose formation process developed throughout his social studies teacher education. Early in the program, Drake focused on
teaching for content knowledge and creating a learning environment that was similar to those he enjoyed as a high school student. During his final two years of teacher education, he began to shift his thinking to ideas of teaching for citizenship and open-mindedness. During his final semester, he taught in a high school classroom with a strict content focus. At that point, he began to search for a balance between the demands of the public education system and its high-stakes testing and his desire to plan and instruct with a student-centered focus. I considered this strong evidence of the success of Drake’s social studies teacher education program and further, and perhaps more importantly, his will to enact and fulfill his beliefs about his purpose.

**Stephanie**

**Introduction**

Stephanie was a non-traditional student who enrolled in her undergraduate social studies teacher education program in her late 20s. She was married with three children. She unswervingly described herself as a “blue collar” liberal. Throughout the study, Stephanie consistently invoked a critical mindset toward social, political, and economic issues. Her views were solidly progressive, yet she was not dogmatic in her approach to these issues. Her focus on social justice and equality for women were two of the hallmarks of our conversations.

**Experiences Prior to Social Studies Teacher Education**

In the same manner as Bette and Daniel, Stephanie felt that her experiences in high school social studies classes did not influence her decision to become a social studies teacher. When I asked Stephanie if she thought experiences in high school social
studies classes had any influence on her decision to become a social studies teacher, she responded, “Absolutely not. I mean, only in the fact that I don’t want to do that. I don’t want to be the teacher who force feeds students” (Stephanie, interview, December 3, 2013). However, this suggested that while her experiences may not have influenced her decision to become a teacher, they did have an influence on the type of teacher she hoped to become. Both Bette and Drake shared similar ideas. Additionally, her perception of her high school social studies classes was similar to the other participants’ perceptions—namely that the focus was on content knowledge and memorization. Prior to our first one-on-one interview, she discussed what she thought her high school social studies teachers’ purposes were in her journal:

What I think that my middle/high school social studies teachers’ purposes were, were just to force feed us facts and dates. However, I don't really fault them for doing that because that was the focus when I went to school, for rote learning.

(Stephanie, journal entry, December 2, 2013)

Stephanie also offered a powerful statement about her experiences in high school social studies when I asked her how experiences of social studies teaching and learning in her teacher education were different from what she experienced in high school. She stated that her experiences in the social studies teacher education program were “Absolutely different. The big thing, like I was just talking about, there’s meaning here” (Stephanie, interview, December 3, 2013). In the following statement, Stephanie continued to discuss how her purposes for teaching evolved through a comparison of her experiences
of social studies teaching and learning prior to social studies teacher education and her experiences within social studies teacher education. She shared:

Also, citizenship was not taught to me. I had a civics class, but it wasn’t what citizenship is. I never contemplated the idea of what a citizen was, or what citizenship meant until this program. I had these ideas of, what I thought I wanted to be like—the person I wanted to be—but I never connected it to being a citizen, or to being an engaged or active participant in my society. (Stephanie, interview, December 3, 2013)

In this statement, Stephanie made it clear that her understandings of citizenship, engaged and active citizenship, and being a citizen underwent significant changes because of her social studies teacher education. Her critiques of her high school social studies classes revealed that she recognized the lack of meaningful experiences in her high school classes because of what she learned about citizenship from her teacher education program. This strongly suggested that her experiences in social studies teacher education made instrumental contributions to her understandings of teaching social studies.

**Stated Purposes for Teaching**

Stephanie was able to articulate her purpose for teaching social studies frequently throughout the study. She shared ideas about her purpose through journal entries and interviews. In the following narration from her journal, Stephanie detailed how she understood her purpose for teaching:

My purpose for teaching social studies is to inform my students. Not just to push facts and dates. I also want to make my students think and always question
everything. I want to teach them that there are varying views of history and not just the dominant culture’s view of history. I also want students to be engaged citizens. By that I mean more than voting. I want students to know that there are other forms of engaging citizenship such as civil disobedience and giving to charity, whether it be time or money or looking out for others in their community. I also want students to be informed so that they can have intelligent discussions with other people. I want students to be able to argue their stance with pertinent facts and also to do it in a way that doesn’t have to be antagonistic. This is part of my purpose because I think that if we can gain this skill then we would be able to come together as humans to share ideas and information in the hope to make the world and our lives better as a society. Like my methods professor said “what does citizenship look like? What does our society look like and what might it need?” These are the things that I think about when I think about what my purpose is as a social studies teacher. (Stephanie, journal entry, December 2, 2013)

In this narration, Stephanie revealed how she had incorporated concepts she learned during her social studies teacher education into her purpose for teaching. She specifically mentioned the following concepts: (a) the inclusion of a questioning stance in her classroom, (b) a focus on the development of engaged citizenship and, (c) fostering the ability to speak across differences. These ideas formed a basis for additional discussions of her purpose for teaching.
During our first one-on-one interview, Stephanie continued to discuss her purpose for teaching:

Because my purpose for teaching social studies is not just about dates and facts. It’s not about the regurgitation of things that I’ve force-fed them about the War of 1812 or whatever. That to me, while important, is not the core of what I think is important about social studies. It’s about learning about other people. It’s about understanding other people. It’s about having empathy for other cultures, other ideas, other ways of thinking, so that eventually, my hope is, and I know this is grand and idealistic, but that we can someday come together and go, I agree but I disagree, but how about we try this and tell me what you think. (Stephanie, interview, December 3, 2013)

Here, Stephanie revealed that her purpose for teaching incorporated a critique of her high school social studies experiences. Specifically, she did not want to mirror the emphasis on content knowledge. She also included broader aims of cultural empathy and appreciation of diverse thought.

In addition to these broader goals, Stephanie revealed that she believed being a teacher served social justice goals. She discussed this view in the context of a conversation about her decision to become a social studies teacher:

And I don’t like the way that things are, and it’s not just me saying I’m more right, or I am some sort of saint, or anything like that. It’s just I don’t like the way the world works, I think that we would be better off if some of the things that
are in place in our culture were not in place. And I want to be able to make a
difference in changing those. (Stephanie, interview, December 3, 2013)

This statement raised a question in my mind. I asked her if part of her purpose for
teaching social studies was to be a change agent in society. She responded:

Oh, absolutely. I want to be the catalyst for social change in somebody’s mind. I
know that I can’t affect huge things on a broad scale, but I think that if we can
start getting people to empathize with each other. Start to understand each other a
little better, then we can definitely move forward from where we are right now—
which is not a good place, I think, in my opinion. (Stephanie, interview,
December 3, 2013)

Through this narration, Stephanie revealed two important facts about her purpose for
teaching social studies at this point in her teacher education. First, part of the reason she
chose to become a social studies teacher was to effect meaningful change in society.
Secondly, she hoped to bring that type of active citizenship and social justice orientation
into her classroom and provide opportunities for her students to engage in similar
activities.

Following our first one-on-one interview, Stephanie journaled extensively about
her purpose for teaching. In this narration, Stephanie began to bring together her ideas of
social justice, change, and teaching. Importantly, she returned to the importance of
critical thinking and questioning, an idea that she raised in her first journal entry, and
combined them with her social justice orientation.
I know that I want to teach about social justice but I want to teach more than that. I have been thinking that teaching students about social justice without other important fundamentals will probably end up like most other topics that are taught in history. I think that my lessons will come across preachy and/or without meaning to my students if the lessons are delivered to them without my students already having critical/historical thinking skills. I also want my students to start to think critically about the way that history and the world works. I think that if I can accomplish this then it will help students to start to question things that have been taken as a given. I want to challenge preconceived ideas that students might have already. I also think that by asking students to shift their ways of thinking it will help to open the door for more social justice ideas. (Stephanie, journal entry, January 2, 2014)

From this statement and our conversations, it became clear what Stephanie was “teaching for” at this point in her development. She wanted to build informed and questioning students, foster engaged citizens, and develop empathy among her students. She also aimed to engender change among her students and society, promote critical and historical thinking skills, and incorporate social justice ideas in her classrooms. From the way she brought these ideas together, it became clear that she saw all of these elements as part of her larger purpose of teaching for social justice and citizenship.

**Contributions of Social Studies Teacher Education Coursework Experiences**

When we have discussions, I definitely think about my purpose in social studies.

(Stephanie, interview, December 3, 2013)
Stephanie constructed a bridge between experiences she had had prior to the program and her experiences during the program as a way to talk about her purpose for teaching:

But I have to return to citizenship. Because that’s all-encompassing, I think. When I looked out my window, I didn’t like the way the world worked. And I knew that I had to, I didn’t know what I was gonna do, I didn’t know how I was gonna do it, but I knew I had to change something. I couldn’t sit still. I could not be passive and neutral. And so when I started thinking about citizenship, when the instructor said what does citizenship mean, that was probably my biggest aha moment. Because, like I said, being a good citizen is about the betterment of not only yourself, but your fellow human being, I think. (Stephanie, interview, December 3, 2013)

In this statement, Stephanie suggested that she was receptive to ideas of citizenship and social justice, which are critical to the teacher education program, based on her thinking prior to entering the program. Her experiences during social studies teacher education resonated with her experiences prior to beginning the program. In the following statement, she elaborated on her understanding of citizenship, which was an interpretation that was common in the social studies teacher education program:

It makes me think what does citizenship look like? And if you ask that question you can also ask what does social studies look like? Because what is citizenship? It’s more than just about voting. It’s being engaged as a citizen in your neighborhood, in your city, in your state, in your nation, in your world. It
absolutely reverberates out as far as I’m concerned. And it’s not just about voting, like I said, it’s about maybe civil disobedience if that’s what you think it calls for. It’s about helping your neighbor. It’s about just being involved in your community. And if we can do that, the problems that we have, I think, socioeconomically, will be diminished. (Stephanie, interview, December 3, 2013)

However, from the following narration, it became clear that Stephanie wanted to develop her own purposes for teaching, rather than singularly adopt the purposes of the program faculty. She brought her ideas about the purpose of social studies teaching and learning together with program ideas. Interestingly, she mentioned that she did not want to indoctrinate her students. This suggested that the program faculty’s commitment to encouraging students to develop their own purposes resonated with Stephanie.

I have my own ideas, and I have my own ideals and beliefs and that kind of stuff. I do want my teaching to be geared towards social justice, but I do not want to just have all my students lock step behind me. That is not what I want. And I think that when I talk about these things, people think that’s what I want. I want students, this is another big purpose, I want students to question everything. I don’t want them to take what I tell them and go well that’s the gospel, it can’t be any other thing. And I don’t want them to read something, no matter where it’s at, if they watch it on the news, or they read it on Facebook and they think it’s news, I want them to look elsewhere. Get different perspectives. (Stephanie, interview, December 3, 2013)
There were several important ideas about Stephanie’s purpose present in this narration. In her previous statements about her motivation to become a social studies teacher, she noted her desire to be a change agent in society. She continued this idea by stating that she wanted to bring that orientation to her students in her classrooms. Here, she tempered that statement by suggesting that she did not want to indoctrinate her students into such an orientation but rather to encourage them to adopt a questioning stance, including taking such a position toward her as the teacher. Through these statements, Stephanie revealed how she continued to develop her purpose through experiences in her program coursework, adding complexity and nuance to her understanding of what she wanted to teach for.

**Contributions of Experiences of Student Teaching**

Stephanie did her student teaching at Driver High School. Her school was in the center of a small city, surrounded by a rural community, roughly an hour and a half from the university. The school had an enrollment of approximately 1000 students. Stephanie taught three sections of 10th grade American History. From our conversations and Stephanie’s journal entries, there appeared to be two distinct periods in her student teaching: her experiences during her 100 hours of observation and her experiences during student teaching in the spring. The following two sections look at her experiences during both periods.

**Experiences during 100 hours of observation.** Within her placement, Stephanie experienced active resistance to her purpose for teaching from her cooperating teacher, more so than any of the other participants did. During the first interview, Stephanie
shared her experiences of the 100-hour observation requirement she fulfilled during the fall semester of the final year of her teacher education program. During that observation period, the social studies teacher education program required each student to teach a two-week unit. She discussed her experience of teaching that unit:

In the unit, I did not get to [teach] as much, only because my cooperating teaching is rote learning focused. And she comes out of that old idea, I think, and she’s not willing to change. So my unit plan was basically in lockstep with what she wanted me to do. Which is understandable and I will do that for the time being.

(Stephanie, interview, December 3, 2013)

Here, Stephanie demonstrated that prior to beginning her student teaching, she was willing to negotiate the differences between her cooperating teacher’s approach to instruction and her own purpose. However, when I asked Stephanie if she felt that her unit aligned with her purpose, she stated that her unit was “Absolutely not in line. But I have found a way during the lecture to bring some of what I wanted to do, some of what I wanted to say, and what I wanted to get across to students” (Stephanie, interview, December 3, 2013). This was another example of Stephanie’s commitment to negotiating the differences between her purpose for teaching and her cooperating teacher’s approach to instruction.

Through our conversations, it became clear that Stephanie’s cooperating teacher was a source of significant tension for her throughout her student teaching experience. I asked Stephanie what she thought her cooperating teacher’s purpose for teaching was. Her response was surprising: “This sounds awful, but I don’t think she has one, because
she seems not to even care that students—like ninety percent of her students are failing. And she seems not to care about that” (Stephanie, interview, December 3, 2013). The differences between Stephanie’s purpose for teaching and her perception of her cooperating teacher’s purposes continued to manifest and intensify during her student teaching in the spring.

**Experiences during student teaching.** Stephanie left her student teaching, and the social studies teacher education program, after six weeks of student teaching. Because she left her placement early, I did not have a chance to observe her student teaching. However, during our second interview, two weeks after she left her placement, I asked her if she thought she had been able to enact her purpose within her student teaching at any point. She responded:

I wasn’t able to plan my own lessons. I was going to do all the things I’d learned [in social studies teacher education], we know they work, and immediately it was “no, they can’t do this, you’re not going to be able to manage them. You’re gonna lose the class, they’re not gonna be able to understand, you’re putting too much information out there for them to grasp” and eventually I realized I had to lockstep behind her. (Stephanie, interview, March 6, 2014)

In this statement, Stephanie revealed that she viewed her cooperating teacher’s focus as primarily on classroom management. Lesson planning and the creation of engaging instruction for students were the hallmarks of Stephanie’s social studies teacher education program. Thus, her cooperating teacher’s active refusal to provide space to plan meaningful and engaging lessons was a source of significant frustration for Stephanie.
Stephanie journaled extensively following her decision to leave the program. Her journal entries provided powerful examples of her thinking about the active resistance she experienced during her student teaching. She gave me her journal when we met for our final interview. In the following entry, Stephanie revealed her thinking about her purposes for teaching, the imperatives of the public education system, and the tensions she perceived between the two:

However, the more I thought about the culture of public education, I began to worry about how I would be able to carry out my purposes. This is especially true of my purpose of having students think about what a good citizen is. My idea of what a good citizen is probably varies greatly from what is being taught in public schools. (Stephanie, journal entry, March 6, 2014)

In this statement, Stephanie demonstrated her recognition that her purposes, shaped by experiences from her social studies teacher education coursework, were contrary to what she perceived as the focus of public education in the United States.

In our final interview, Stephanie shared the experiences that ultimately led her to abandon her purpose for teaching social studies and leave the program. She stated that she was not able to plan and conduct any lessons of her own during her six weeks of student teaching. The lessons her cooperating teacher provided her with were strictly content-driven lectures with material taken verbatim from the course textbook. She added, “And the way she managed her classroom was military style. It was drill sergeant screaming at students” (Stephanie, interview, March 6, 2014).
During this conversation, I asked her why she decided to leave the program. She stated, “Initially, because I could not handle my cooperating teacher another second” (Stephanie, interview, March 6, 2014). I inquired further if Stephanie had any conversations with her cooperating teacher about her purpose for teaching. She stated, “I don’t think she saw a purpose. You gotta get through the material. That was her purpose. You gotta get through this, you’re taking too long, you’re throwing too much at them, you gotta get through the material” (Stephanie, interview, March 6, 2014). I asked Stephanie if she had realized through these experiences that she was not going to be able to enact her purpose for teaching in a public school. She said that was exactly her feeling and stated:

> Oh I just, I don’t think I can operate under the confines of public school district.

> You know, I can’t operate in the public school. I wanna teach. I don’t, I wanna teach, but I don’t think I can do it in those confines. (Stephanie, interview, March 6, 2014)

Throughout all of her narrations, both in interviews and journal entries, Stephanie discussed at length the frustration she experienced when trying to enact her purpose for teaching social studies in an environment that was antithetical to her purposes. The biggest challenge Stephanie faced was the unwillingness of her cooperating teacher to allow her to implement the pedagogical knowledge she had gained during her teacher education coursework. Stephanie characterized this resistance to her stated purposes for teaching social studies as the primary factor that contributed to her decision to leave her student teaching placement and opt for an Educational Studies degree rather than
completing her social studies teacher education program. The disconnect between Stephanie’s purpose for teaching social studies and her cooperating teacher’s beliefs about how a classroom should look and function effectively halted Stephanie’s development as a social studies teacher. There are a number of different avenues of interpretation of this series of events (perhaps the mismatch of mentor and student teacher was culpable, perhaps this suggests a lack of flexibility on Stephanie’s part, etc.). However, whatever the ultimate cause was, the reality was that Stephanie’s experiences led her to believe she could not enact her stated purposes for teaching social studies in this space. This affirmed similar findings among other participants that their experiences of student teaching challenged their purposes for teaching social studies.

**Purpose Formation Process**

Because Stephanie chose to leave the program prior to completing her student teaching, there was a stoppage in her purpose formation process. However, her case was still instructive for this study, particularly through cross-case analysis. Bette, Daniel, and Drake’s purposes for teaching evolved through their experiences, with notable shifts occurring during their student teaching. Bette increased her focus on classroom management and grades, shifting her focus away from teaching for social justice and citizenship, and directed her attention toward the idea of individualized learning. Drake also worked to reconcile the contrast between his purpose of teaching for citizenship and the imperatives of content coverage and high-stakes testing in public schools. Daniel was less oriented toward social justice and citizenship than Bette and Drake prior to his student teaching. As a result, he seemed to transition more easily into the structure and
In comparison, Stephanie came to her social studies teacher education program with a strong orientation toward social justice and equality. While the other participants brought similar ideas to the program, Stephanie saw teaching as an avenue to enact those ideas. She wanted to become a teacher to pursue social justice, equality, and social change, while the others wanted to become teachers who included social justice and citizenship in their teaching. This was an essential distinction to understand as part of grasping how each of their purposes for teaching developed. For Stephanie, this meant that when she realized that she could not achieve her purposes in her role as a teacher, she no longer had a desire to become a teacher. In fact, upon leaving the program, Stephanie began looking for work at several non-profit organizations in a nearby city where she could work for social justice. In contrast, when the other participants met with passive or active resistance to their purposes, they sought out ways to work their purposes into the system of education.

**Findings**

This section shares findings from the study related to how experiences contributed to the development of participants’ purposes for teaching. The four primary findings are explained below.

1. *Experiences of high school social studies classes contributed to purposes for teaching*. This finding facilitated an understanding of participants’
stated purposes and formed the first component of the purpose formation process.

2. *Experiences of social studies teacher education coursework contributed to purposes for teaching.* This finding represented another step in the purpose formation process.

3. *Participants negotiated passive and active resistance in their student teaching (including faculty recognition of tensions).* This finding represented a key moment in the purpose formation process.

4. *A Purpose Formation Process was at work among each of the participants.* This represented the culminating finding of the study. The process occurred through their experiences of high school social studies, social studies teacher education coursework, and student teaching.

A summary of findings concludes this chapter.

**Experiences of High School Social Studies Classes Contributed to Purposes for Teaching**

Narrative and comparative analysis of the data revealed that experiences in high school social studies classes contributed to participants’ development of purposes for teaching. This finding spoke to the research question: “How do experiences of social studies teaching and learning that take place *prior to teacher education* contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching?” Participants stated that their experiences in high school social studies classes did not directly influence their decisions to become social studies teachers. Rather, they revealed that
their experiences of high school social studies classes contributed to the type of teacher they did or did not want to become. Evidence emerged that participants actively worked to create classrooms that offered experiences for students that were highly dissimilar from what they had experienced, or to provide experiences that were not available to them. This finding represented an important initial step in the purpose formation process. Specifically, the ideas that participants brought with them to their social studies teacher education program functioned as a starting point for their thinking about their purposes. Rich data, specifically from the first set of interviews and the question, “Do you think your experiences in high school social studies classes influenced your decision to become a social studies teacher? If so, how? If not, why not?” supported this finding.

Bette’s negative experiences in high school social studies classes led her to want to create classrooms that were markedly different from what she had experienced. Daniel’s stories about unengaging classes and the rote memorization of material echoed Bette’s recollections of her high school experiences. Consequently, he began his student teaching with a desire to focus on citizenship development rather than content knowledge. In Drake’s case, both positive and negative experiences during his high school social studies classes contributed to his purpose. Drake revealed that he began his teacher education with a heavy emphasis on content knowledge, stemming from his experiences with high school social studies, and believed it was still a part of his purpose for teaching halfway through the final year of his social studies teacher education program. In comparing her experiences in high school social studies classes to experiences in the social studies teacher education program, Stephanie states that they
were “Absolutely different. The big thing, like I was just talking about, there’s meaning here” (Stephanie, interview, December 3, 2013). She elaborated on this idea in a subsequent conversation, making clear that part of her purpose was to infuse her teaching with meaning as not to reproduce the content focus of her high school social studies classes.

Experiences of Social Studies Teacher Education Coursework Contributed to Purposes for Teaching

Narrative and comparative analysis of the data revealed that participants thoroughly internalized ideas from their social studies teacher education program and incorporated them into their purposes for teaching, planning, and instruction. This finding spoke to the research question: “How do experiences of social studies teaching and learning that take place during teacher education, prior to student teaching, contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching?” Social justice, citizenship, the importance of having rationales for decisions, and the importance of having a purpose for teaching were the ideas that most frequently contributed to participants’ purposes. This finding represented another step in each participant’s purpose formation process. Data from Bette, Drake, and Stephanie supported this finding.

Bette revealed how her thinking about what learning “is” had changed because of her social studies teacher education. This shift in her thinking to a more complex idea of learning, in combination with her deconstruction and reconstruction of what teaching could be, suggested that her social studies teacher education experiences made a
significant contribution to her thoughts about social studies teaching. Additionally, Bette revealed that her social studies teacher education coursework experiences contributed to her thinking about social studies teaching through both larger, overarching ideas of education and more pragmatic ideas related to her practice within the classroom. Drake also highlighted how his purpose for teaching had changed over the course of his teacher education coursework. He emphasized a shift from using his passion for content as a means to teach for content mastery to teaching for students’ needs. In addition, he stressed the ideas of citizenship cultivation and social development as central points in his purpose for teaching.

Stephanie’s case was interesting in that she was receptive to program ideas such as citizenship and social justice because these ideas resonated with her previous experiences and thinking. Thus, these experiences provided somewhat of an affirmation of her purposes. However, Stephanie stated that she wanted to develop her own purposes for teaching, rather than singularly adopting the purposes of program faculty. Through her narrations, she revealed that she brought her ideas about the purpose of social studies teaching and learning together with program ideas. Interestingly, she also invoked the idea that she did not want to indoctrinate her students into her social justice orientation, but rather wanted to encourage them to adopt a questioning stance, including taking such a position towards her as the teacher. This suggested that the program faculty’s commitment to encouraging students to develop their own purposes resonated with Stephanie. Through these statements, Stephanie revealed how she continued to develop
her purpose through experiences in her program coursework, adding complexity and nuance to her understanding of what she wanted to teach for.

Participants Negotiated Passive and Active Resistance in their Student Teaching

Narrative and comparative analysis of data from observations of participants’ student teaching, journal entries, and interviews revealed that participants’ purposes for teaching social studies met with both passive and active resistance from their cooperating teachers and schools during their student teaching. In response to these experiences, participants’ began to rethink how their purposes could function in the classroom. This finding spoke to the following research question: “How do experiences of social studies teaching and learning that take place during student teaching contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching?” The participants’ purposes for teaching social studies largely centered on fostering active democratic citizenship, encouraging critical thinking, and taking a progressive approach to social studies and history. In contrast, their experiences led them to believe that their cooperating teachers held traditional purposes for teaching social studies that centered on mastery of content knowledge, standardized test success, and classroom control and discipline.

It is important to note that the tensions participants experienced were not limited to their 12-week student teaching in the spring. They spent the entire school year with their cooperating teachers, doing over 100 hours of observation in the fall before student teaching in the spring. Several of the stories and experiences shared within the cases occurred during the observation portion of their student teaching. The following
examples of the challenges participants faced in bringing their visions for teaching into practice revealed the contrast between their ideas of purpose and their cooperating teachers’ established classroom and instructional practices. These experiences had a significant effect on the development of participants’ purposes for teaching social studies.

Bette revealed how pressure from her cooperating teacher led her to shift her approach to instruction toward control and discipline in the classroom, consequently moving away from her purpose to teach for critical citizenship. Daniel indicated that he experienced significant passive resistance to his purposes for teaching, including the elements of his purpose that he incorporated from his social studies teacher education. While he did not characterize these situations as tense, he approached his student teaching from a highly pragmatic standpoint. Rather than confront the tension between the imperatives of the classroom and his own orientations toward citizenship and teaching, Daniel chose to negotiate quietly any resistance in his student teaching.

Drake revealed his perception of the tension between his purpose and the high-stakes testing focus of his school. The content of the high-stakes tests did not reflect what Drake thought “actually matters in society.” That is, his purpose for teaching included having students engage with a curriculum that investigated social issues that were relevant to students. However, because of the tests, he felt he would not be able to include content that was relevant to his students’ lives in his future classrooms. Similarly, Stephanie’s experiences led her to believe she could not enact her stated purposes for teaching social studies in the arena of public education at all.
Bette, Daniel, and Drake showed an evolution in their purposes for teaching through their experiences, with notable shifts occurring during their student teaching. Bette increased her focus on classroom management and grades, shifting her focus away from teaching for social justice and citizenship, and added the idea of individualized learning to her purpose. Drake also worked to reconcile the contrast between his purpose of teaching for citizenship and the imperatives of content coverage and high-stakes testing in public schools. Daniel was less oriented toward social justice and citizenship than Bette and Drake prior to his student teaching and thus seemed to transition more easily into the structure and style of public education than the others. However, his purposes for teaching still underwent a process of development.

**Faculty recognition of tension.** Interviews with program faculty revealed that they recognized the tension that existed between the vision put forth in the university’s education program and some of the realities of public education. The recognition of this tension trickled down to the participants through program coursework and conversations. Stella talked about how she discussed these tensions with students in the following statement:

What do you do when you find yourself in a situation where the values of your school and your community do not reflect yours? When their image of schooling and the role of education, the role of learning, the value of those don’t match yours, how do you protect yourself, and I don’t mean physically protect and I don’t mean legally protect. How do you take care of yourself in those situations? Especially if you’re in the very unenviable position of not being able to leave.
For whatever reason. What do you do to take care of you? (Stella, interview, March 4, 2014)

In this statement, Stella revealed that the students in the program were aware of the tensions, and that the faculty supported their negotiation of the system during their social studies teacher education coursework. Stanley echoed these ideas in the following statement:

Well let’s make it meaningful for the type of learning you actually want your students to have, so there’s nothing to say that an SLO can’t be about reading the world and seeing injustice, so if you’re going to have students do a close reading of something, why not have it be of something really powerful, and then think well how do you learn from this powerful reading how you might act differently in the world. I want you to then think how might I learn to act differently in the world having read this? (Stanley, interview, December 19, 2013)

This excerpt provided a powerful example of how Stanley recognized the tension between the public education system in the United States and the imperatives of the social studies teacher education program. He also revealed how he works to enact his ideas of purpose in the program.

The Purpose Formation Process

“Because purpose is not a goal. It’s a journey. You continually rework what you’re doing and why you’re doing it.”

(Stella, interview, March 4, 2014)
The research questions that guided this study explored how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contributed to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. Narrative and comparative analysis of the data revealed findings that coalesced to demonstrate a purpose formation process at work. The above figure is a visual representation of the main finding of the research. This figure illustrates...
how a purpose formation process functioned for the participants. This process consisted of an evolution of thought among the participants about their purposes for social studies teaching. Participants’ purposes for teaching social studies developed and changed over time and through experiences in this process. Participants entered their social studies teacher education program with rudimentary ideas about their purposes, developed these ideas during their social studies teacher education, and continued to refine their ideas during their student teaching. This evolutionary process progressed differently with each of the participants.

In this process, participants combined (a) their previous experiences and understandings, (b) program ideas, (c) realities of the educational system and their specific student teaching placement sites, and (d) aspects of content, accumulated through experiences, in unique ways. Each participant chose to emphasize certain elements or combine ideas in diverse ways. Participants’ narration and voices painted a complex picture of how their thinking evolved and coalesced into distinct ideas of what they hoped to teach social studies for.

The moments when participants revealed their thinking about their purposes varied. Daniel thought about his purpose more before his student teaching, while Stephanie shared a great deal about her purpose when she left the program in March of 2014. Drake and Bette talked about their development extensively following their student teaching. Their interviews were particularly powerful in terms of revealing how experiences of student teaching influenced their purposes for teaching social studies. Below is a summary of each of the participants’ purpose formation processes.
**Bette.** Bette recognized that her purpose would change throughout her teacher education, student teaching, and future teaching. At the outset of her program, she had a “grander purpose,” in her understanding, of teaching to promote the critical consumption of society. Through her student teaching, she developed an ethic of caring in her teaching, simultaneously beginning to develop an individualized approach to thinking about coursework and curriculum. Bette feared that her experiences in the classroom would lead her to shift her purpose too much toward content coverage and a standardized management approach to teaching. By the end of her teacher education program, she was attempting to marry her purpose of teaching for citizenship, democracy, and community with her purpose of teaching to meet individual students’ needs.

**Daniel.** Daniel came to the social studies teacher education program with a focus on content knowledge as his rudimentary purpose. He did invoke ideas that were part of that program, including citizenship, tolerance, and making content relevant for students. He also did not like the content-driven focus of his cooperating teacher’s classroom, though he participated in it with minimal negotiation for the sake of completing the experience. However, he shared and enacted many ideas that were contrary to program ideas, primarily taking a teacher-centered approach in his instruction and attempting to bring his worldview to his students. These contrasts speak to the uniqueness of the purpose formation process among each participant.

**Drake.** Drake described a strong content focus in his experiences during high school social studies. Early in his social studies teacher education program, Drake focused on teaching for content knowledge and creating a learning environment that was
similar to those he enjoyed as a high school student. Later in the program, he developed a greater focus on methods, pedagogy, and pedagogical content knowledge. During this time, he also began to shift his thinking to ideas of teaching for citizenship and open-mindedness. However, when he entered his student teaching placement he found himself in an environment that was content focused and content driven. At that point, he began to search for a balance between the demands of the public education system and high-stakes testing and his desire to plan and instruct with a student-centered focus. I considered this strong evidence of the success of Drake’s social studies teacher education program and further, and perhaps more importantly, his will to enact and fulfill his beliefs about his purpose.

**Stephanie.** Stephanie came to the social studies teacher education program with a strong orientation toward social justice and equality. While other participants brought similar ideas to the program, Stephanie saw teaching primarily as an avenue to enact those ideas. She wanted to become a teacher to pursue social justice, equality, and social change, where the others wanted to become teachers who included social justice and citizenship in their teaching. This was an essential distinction to understand as part of grasping how her (and their) purposes for teaching developed. For Stephanie, this meant that when she realized that she could not achieve her purposes as a teacher, she no longer had a desire to become a teacher. In contrast, when the other participants met with passive or active resistance to their purposes, they sought out ways to work their purposes into the educational system.
Summary of Research Findings

The findings below emerged from narrative and comparative analysis of interviews, observations of course work and student teaching, and participants’ journal entries.

1. Participants’ experiences in high school social studies classes contributed to the type of teacher they did or did not want to become. Participants actively worked to create classrooms that offered experiences that were highly dissimilar from what they had experienced, or to provide experiences that were not available to them.

2. Experiences in the program led participants to think about specific ideas related to their development as teachers (social justice, citizenship, the importance of having rationales for decisions, and the importance of having a purpose for teaching).

3. Participants thoroughly internalized these ideas and incorporated them into their thinking about their purpose for teaching, planning, and instruction.

4. Participants’ purposes for teaching social studies met with both passive and active resistance from their cooperating teachers.

5. Participants faced challenges in enacting their purposes for teaching. In response to these experiences, they began to rethink how their purposes could function in the classroom.

6. Participants’ purposes for teaching social studies largely centered on fostering active democratic citizenship, encouraging critical thinking, and
taking a progressive approach to social studies and history. In contrast, participants’ experiences led them to believe that their cooperating teachers held traditional purposes for teaching social studies that centered on mastery of content knowledge, standardized test success, and classroom control and discipline.

7. Participants combined elements of their purpose with previous experiences and understandings, program ideas, realities of the educational system, and aspects of content (accumulated through experiences) in unique ways, with each participant choosing to emphasize certain elements or combine their ideas in diverse ways. These activities comprised a purpose formation process.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter presents a discussion of the four findings of this study and a detailed explanation of how those findings connect with, inform, and forward the scholarly literature that I explored in Chapter II. I then discuss implications of the findings for pairing student teachers with mentor teachers, preparing students to enact their purposes in pre-service and in-service teaching during social studies teacher education programs, and structuring of social studies teacher education programs in general. Subsequent sections address changes in the study and limitations of the study. The final sections of the chapter offer a discussion of implications for future research and a concluding statement of the research.

Overview of the Study

From a review of research, I developed an overarching purpose for the study and three research questions. The purpose of the study was to explore how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contributed to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. It is important to note that the study did not focus exclusively on how pre-service teachers discuss their experiences, but examined how their experiences contributed to the development of their purposes for teaching. I did not perceive the relationship between an experience and purposes for teaching to be cause and effect; rather, experiences were a part of how pre-service teachers developed their purposes for teaching. Informed by this purpose, I explored the following specific research questions:
1. How do experiences of social studies teaching and learning that take place prior to teacher education contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching?

2. How do experiences of social studies teaching and learning that take place during teacher education, prior to student teaching contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching?

3. How do experiences of social studies teaching and learning that take place during student teaching contribute to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching?

A review of a specific segment of the literature—research concerned with purposes for social studies education, purpose as an area of focus in social studies teacher education, and social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching social studies—revealed a gap in the literature. There was a lack of research about how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contributed to the development of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. The present study addressed this gap through an instrumental case study of four pre-service social studies teachers and two social studies teacher educators in a social studies teacher education program at a mid-sized, Midwestern state university. Three of the participants were in the final year of their undergraduate social studies teacher education program, comprised of a semester of observation and a 12-week student teaching experience. The fourth participant was a student in a MAT program. She completed a 12-week student teaching experience as well. The participants’ position in the program enabled them to speak to all three of the research questions. Both of the
teacher educators taught classes in the student participants’ social studies teacher education programs.

I approached the data through a social constructivist lens, viewing the construction of individualized meaning and beliefs as occurring through a process of experiences in a social context. I collected data through face-to-face semi-structured interviews with each of the participants, participants’ reflective writing and journaling, written artifacts created by the participants, observations of the participants’ teacher education classes and student teaching, and detailed information about their teacher education program. I analyzed the data using narrative analysis and compared across cases in an effort to identify how experiences contributed to the development of their purposes for teaching social studies. The findings of the study centered on pre-service teachers’ experiences in their high school social studies classes, the unique incorporation of ideas from their social studies teacher education, the negotiation of tension in student teaching, and the confluence of these experiences as part of a “purpose formation process.” The findings have implications for pairing student teachers with mentor teachers, how social studies teacher education programs prepare students to enact their purposes in pre-service and in-service teaching, and the structure of social studies teacher education programs.

**Discussion of Findings**

In this section, I discuss each of the primary findings and their connection to established scholarship. The following findings emerged from a narrative and
comparative analysis of interviews, observations of course work and student teaching, and participants’ journal entries.

First, participants’ experiences of high school social studies classes contributed to what type of teacher they did or did not want to become. Participants actively worked to create classrooms that offered experiences that were highly dissimilar from what they had experienced, or they tried to provide experiences that were not available to them. Second, experiences in the program led participants to think about social justice, citizenship, the importance of having rationales for decisions, and the importance of having a purpose for teaching as they developed as teachers. Participants thoroughly internalized these ideas and incorporated them into their thinking about their purpose for teaching, planning, and instruction. Third, participants’ purposes for teaching social studies were met with both passive and active resistance from their cooperating teachers. Participants faced challenges in enacting their purposes for teaching and in response to these experiences began to rethink how their purposes could function in the classroom. Finally, participants combined elements of their purpose with previous experiences and understandings, program ideas, realities of the educational system, and aspects of content, accumulated through experiences, in unique ways, with each participant choosing to emphasize certain elements or combine ideas in diverse ways. These actions comprised a purpose formation process.

Additional findings emerged concerning the social studies teacher education program’s vision, structure, and contribution to participants’ thinking about social studies teaching and learning. While these findings add detail and depth to the four primary
findings of the research, they did not speak directly to the research questions. However, these specific findings open avenues for additional thinking and research. Therefore, I discuss them in the future research section below.

Experiences in High School Social Studies Classes Contributed to Purposes for Teaching

“I think that my middle/high school social studies teachers’ purposes were just to force feed us facts and dates.”

(Stephanie, journal entry, December 2, 2013)

Participants’ experiences in high school social studies classes contributed to what type of teacher they did or did not want to become. Participants actively worked to create classrooms that offered experiences that were highly dissimilar from what they had experienced, or worked to provide experiences that were not available to them. This finding was an important initial step in the participants’ purpose formation process. Specifically, the ideas that participants brought with them to their social studies teacher education programs functioned as a starting point for their thinking about their purposes.

Bette’s negative experiences in her high school social studies classes led her to want to create classrooms that were markedly different from what she had experienced. Daniel’s stories about unengaging classes and rote memorization of material echoed Bette’s recollections of her experiences in high school social studies classes. Consequently, he began his student teaching with a desire to focus on citizenship development rather than content knowledge. In Drake’s case, both positive and negative experiences during his high school social studies classes contributed elements to his
purpose. Drake revealed that he began his teacher education with a heavy emphasis on content knowledge, stemming from his experiences of high school social studies, and believed it was still a part of his purpose for teaching halfway through the final year of his social studies teacher education program. In contrast, he also wanted to create classrooms that offered students space to engage in open conversation about content relevant to their lives. In comparing her experiences in high school social studies classes to experiences in the social studies teacher education program, Stephanie stated that they were “Absolutely different. The big thing, like I was just talking about, there’s meaning here” (Stephanie, interview, December 3, 2013). She elaborated on this idea in a subsequent conversation, making clear that part of her purpose was to infuse her teaching with meaning, so as to avoid reproducing the content focus of her high school social studies classes.

During an interview with Stanley, he stated that “the majority of the students that come into our programs think social studies is about content knowledge; students learn it, the majority of it is about history” (Stanley, interview, December 19, 2013). The participants’ characterizations of their experiences of high school social studies classes affirmed this idea, connecting with scholarship on how K-12 social studies curriculums emphasize content knowledge, and specifically historical content knowledge, at the expense of a rich social studies curriculum that includes emphases on democracy, citizenship, equality, and social justice (Levstik & Barton, 2001; Whelan, 1997, 2006).

This finding also provided a nuanced appreciation of how their experiences in high school social studies classes contributed to the development of participants’
purposes for teaching. Due to their experiences, the participants actively worked to develop a purpose that differed from the content-focused and teacher-centered classrooms they experienced in high school. While scholars have demonstrated that pre-service teachers bring their own beliefs about education to their teacher education programs (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Kennedy, 2006), and thus begin their education with some inherent language of, and desires for, education drawn from their beliefs and social experiences (Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013; Owens, 1996; Richardson, 1996, 2003; Richardson & Placier, 2001; Slekar, 1998; van Hover & Yeager, 2004), this finding provides a deeper understanding of how those beliefs contribute to teacher development.

This finding also spoke to van Hover and Yeager’s (2004) call for social studies teacher educators to help teacher candidates uncover their purposes and goals for teaching history. They emphasize the importance of investigating the beliefs that students bring with them to education programs, echoing the research on teachers in general (Kennedy, 2006; Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013) that argues for the importance of early beliefs to teacher development and practice. The participants’ desires to create classrooms that offered experiences that were unavailable to them in their high school social studies classes illustrated how the purpose formation process contributed not only to their purposes but also to their future practice.
Experiences of Social Studies Teacher Education Coursework Contributed to Purposes for Teaching

“Like my methods professor said, ‘what does citizenship look like? What does our society look like and what might it need?’ These are the things that I think about when I think about what my purpose is as a social studies teacher.”

(Stephanie, journal entry, 12/2/2013)

Experiences in their social studies teacher education program led participants to think about social justice, citizenship, the importance of having rationales for decisions, and the importance of having a purpose for teaching. Participants thoroughly internalized these ideas and incorporated them into their thinking about their purpose for teaching, planning, and instruction. This finding represented a second step in the purpose formation process. Specifically, participants experienced shifts in their thinking about their purposes for teaching through their experiences of coursework.

Bette revealed how her thinking about what learning “is” had changed because of her social studies teacher education. This shift in her thinking to a more complex idea of learning, in combination with her deconstruction and reconstruction of what teaching could be, suggested that her social studies teacher education experiences made a significant contribution to her thoughts about social studies teaching. Additionally, Bette revealed that her social studies teacher education coursework experiences contributed to her thinking about social studies teaching, both through larger, overarching ideas of education and through ideas related to her practice within the classroom. Drake also highlighted how his purpose for teaching had changed over the course of his teacher
education coursework. He emphasized a shift from using his passion for content as a means to teach for content mastery to teaching for students’ needs. In addition, he stressed the ideas of citizenship cultivation and social development as central points in his purpose for teaching.

Stephanie’s case was interesting in that she was receptive to ideas of citizenship and social justice because they resonated with her previous experiences. Thus, these experiences within her education program provided somewhat of an affirmation of her purposes. However, Stephanie stated that she wanted to develop her own purposes for teaching, rather than singularly adopting the purposes of program faculty. Through her narrations, she revealed that she brought her ideas of the purpose of social studies teaching and learning together with program ideas. Interestingly, she also invoked the idea that she did not want to indoctrinate her students into her social justice orientation but rather wanted to encourage them to adopt a questioning stance, including taking such a position towards her as the teacher. This suggested that the program faculty’s commitment to encouraging students to develop their own purposes resonated with Stephanie. These statements revealed how Stephanie continued to develop her purpose through experiences in her program coursework, adding complexity and nuance to her understanding of what she wanted to teach for.

This finding contributes to current research on the role of purpose in social studies teacher education, specifically Doppen’s (2007) exploration of how a social studies teacher education program influenced beliefs students brought with them. The shifts in purpose that took place among Bette, Drake, Stephanie, and Daniel, because of their
experiences in social studies teacher education, mirror Doppen’s findings that social studies teacher education has a significant influence on how teachers teach in their future classrooms. Further, the participants’ incorporation of ideas of social justice, citizenship, and democracy into their purposes, due to the prominence of these ideas in their social studies teacher education program, addresses a call from the literature encouraging social studies teachers to adopt a purpose for teaching that includes developing multicultural citizens with a focus on participatory democracy (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Castro, 2013; Ladson-Billings, 2001). This body of literature emphasizes a similar goal as literature on purposes for general teacher education—namely that teacher education should engender social justice–oriented teachers (Cochran-Smith, 2010; McDonald, 2007). With social studies education having an overarching purpose of promoting teachers who will foster citizens who will live democratically, scholars suggest that it is important to maintain a purpose in social studies teacher education of developing teachers who will foster these attitudes in their students. From the evidence in this study, it is clear that such a goal is attainable.

A further connection between this finding and existing scholarship concerns the conflict between society’s traditionally espoused purposes for education and the professed purposes for education within teacher education programs (Kennedy, 2006). The relationship between social understandings of purposes for education and teachers’ purposes for teaching is more complex than a process of teachers reproducing dominant social understandings of purpose in their thinking and teaching. That the study participants actively rejected commonly held purposes for social studies teaching and
learning, specifically rote memorization of content knowledge, in favor of purposes that included citizenship, community, democratic and egalitarian orientations, which were generated in substantial part by their teacher education program, confirmed that teachers do not simply reproduce the teaching they experienced.

**Participants Negotiated Passive and Active Resistance in Student Teaching**

“He [cooperating teacher] wants to focus on the war, the things he thinks are interesting. Where my focus will always be towards national identity coming together. Tolerance for each, for different types of people and the fact that people are different.”

(Daniel, interview, February 28, 2014)

Participants’ purposes for teaching social studies were met with both passive and active resistance from their cooperating teachers during their student teaching. In response to these experiences, participants began to rethink how their purposes could function in the classroom. The participants’ purposes for teaching social studies largely centered on fostering active democratic citizenship, encouraging critical thinking, and taking a progressive approach to social studies and history. In contrast, their experiences led them to believe that their cooperating teachers held traditional purposes for teaching social studies, centered on mastery of content knowledge, standardized test success, and classroom control and discipline. The following examples of the challenges participants faced in bringing their visions for teaching into practice during their student teaching reveal the contrast between their ideas of purpose and their cooperating teachers’ established classroom and instructional practices. These experiences had a significant effect on the development of participants’ purposes for teaching social studies.
Bette revealed how pressure from her cooperating teacher led her to shift her approach to instruction toward control and discipline in the classroom, consequently moving away from her purpose to teach for critical citizenship. Daniel indicated that he experienced significant passive resistance to his purposes for teaching, including the elements of his purpose that he incorporated from his social studies teacher education. While he did not characterize these situations as tense, he approached his student teaching from a highly pragmatic standpoint. Rather than confront the tension between the imperatives of the classroom and his own orientations towards citizenship and teaching, Daniel chose to negotiate quietly any resistance toward his student teaching.

Drake felt the content of the emphasized high-stakes tests did not reflect what he thought “actually matters in society.” His purpose for teaching included a curriculum that investigated social issues that were relevant to students. However, because of the tests, he felt he would not be able to include content that was relevant to students’ lives in his future classrooms. Finally, Stephanie’s experiences led her to believe she could not enact her stated purposes for teaching social studies (for example, social change) as a public school teacher.

This finding connects directly with research on how the current structures and purposes of public education thwart the social purposes of education. The accounts of the tension that all four participants experienced concerning content imperatives, specifically Drake’s negotiation of the high-stakes testing culture of his school, connect with existing research on how teacher education can assist students in negotiating these tensions. Osguthorpe and Sanger’s (2013) study emphasizes creating a place in teacher
education to focus on the moral work of teaching. Doing so reorients teacher candidates to the purposes of schooling, rather than asking them to focus on meeting the demands of the HST paradigm, which elides the moral purposes of teaching (Biesta, 2009, 2010; Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2010). They offer a powerful reason for focusing on purpose in teacher education:

Teacher candidates seem to believe that they can attend to both moral/prosocial development and academic outcomes without any recognition that they will be teaching in an environment that has effectively squeezed out any notion of the broader moral and social purposes of schooling. (Osguthorpe & Sanger, 2013, p. 192)

This research suggests that it is the responsibility of teacher educators to help students realize and negotiate this tension. One example of what these scholars called for was visible in Stanley and Stella’s consistent focus on helping their students recognize and negotiate the contrasts between their purposes, the vision of the social studies teacher education program, and the focus on testing and content within schools. However, the program’s recognition and discussion of these tensions did not seem to prepare the pre-service teachers for the power of content-driven testing in their student teaching. Drake and Bette faced significant challenges when they tried to enact purposes that did not center on test preparation and content retention, and Stephanie perceived her attempts at enacting social justice and active citizenship as futile. These realities were no doubt frustrating for the participants and for Stanley and Stella, who worked diligently to prepare them for life in their schools.
This finding supports literature on the student teaching experience. The participants’ negotiation of both passive and active resistance to their purposes for teaching echoes existing research on the effects of the socialization process of the student teaching experience (Bieda, Sela, & Chazan, 2015; Lloyd, 2007; Smagorinsky, Cook, Moore, Jackson, & Fry, 2004). Bieda, Sela, and Chazan (2015) found that exploring intern teachers’ justifications for their practices in student teaching was one way to identify how their thinking about their practice had shifted because of the student teaching experience. Lloyd’s (2007) study looked at a preservice teacher’s development of instruction during her student teaching. The study revealed that the student teacher used “strategic compromise” to negotiate the contrasting pressures and goals of her placement. This strategic compromise consisted of a process of adjusting to the school climate, trying to retain her own instructional goals while being open to modifications of her practice and goals to meet school imperatives.

Both of these studies revealed how the process of student teaching can be a frustrating experience for student teachers, much as it was for Bette, Drake, Daniel, and Stephanie. Further, Bette’s process of “self-censorship” very closely mirrors the “strategic compromise” used by the participant in Lloyd’s (2007) study. However, the findings of this study further this research in that the focus of the existing literature was on the influence of student teaching on practice. While the participants of this study revealed that their student teaching experiences contributed to their practice, it also became clear that those experiences contributed to the development of their overarching
purposes for teaching. That is, the tensions they experienced in student teaching not only challenged how they were going to teach, but what they hoped to teach for as well.

**The Purpose Formation Process**

“I would like to sit there and confidently say my purpose won’t change, but I don’t know that I can say that. I think my purpose will always change, and I hope it continues to change, in what I consider to be a good way.”

(Bette, post-course observation interview, November 26, 2013)

Narrative and comparative analysis of the data revealed findings that coalesced to demonstrate a purpose formation process at work. This process consisted of an evolution of thought among the participants about their purposes for social studies teaching. Participants’ purposes for teaching social studies developed and changed over time and through experiences in this process. Participants entered their social studies teacher education program with rudimentary ideas about their purposes, developed these ideas during their social studies teacher education, and continued to refine their ideas during their student teaching. This evolutionary process was unique to each of the participants.

In this process, participants combined (a) their previous experiences and understandings, (b) ideas from their teacher education program, (c) realities of the educational system, (d) aspects of their student teaching placement sites, and (e) aspects of content, accumulated through experiences, in unique ways. Participants’ narrations and voices painted a complex picture of how their thinking evolved and coalesced into distinct ideas of what they hoped to teach social studies for. The moments when the participants revealed their thinking about their purposes varied. Daniel thought about his
purpose more before his student teaching, while Stephanie shared a great deal about her purpose after she left the program in March of 2014. Drake and Bette talked about their development extensively after their student teaching. Their interviews were particularly powerful in terms of revealing how experiences of student teaching influenced their purposes for teaching social studies.

The finding that participants’ purposes contributed to their practices confirmed scholars’ arguments that the connection between thoughts about purpose and teachers’ practices gives significance to purpose (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2005; Hammerness, 2010; Hochstrasser-Fickel, 2000; Johnston, 1990; McCall, 1995; Smith, 2000; van Hover & Yeager, 2007). However, there is an additional connection between the study and the existing research surrounding purpose. This study contributes to a larger conversation about the overarching purpose of social studies education in society. Scholars continue to consider whether social studies educators should foster teachers and students who will perpetuate the status quo in society or seek to transform society (Hursh & Ross, 2000; Stanley, 2005; Vinson & Ross, 2001). Each of these studies suggests that bounded conceptions of the purpose for social studies education leads to some version of transmitted citizenship understandings, which significantly restricts how social studies teachers understand and develop purposes for teaching. Through this study, it became clear that when the vision, structure, and faculty of a social studies education program align to promote social studies teachers who work for citizenship, democracy, equality, and social justice, pre-service teachers emerge from the program with commitments to transform, rather than transmit, the status quo. Throughout the purpose formation
process of each of the participants, particularly Bette and Drake, at least one iteration of each of their purposes included these ideas. Through this study of how pre-service social studies teachers experience social studies teacher education and student teaching, and more specifically, how their purposes for teaching develop, I found a successful response to the call for social studies education that works to transform society.

**Implications**

The findings that emerged from a narrative and comparative analysis of Bette, Daniel, Drake, and Stephanie’s narrations have implications for the student teaching experience and social studies teacher education programs. The implications for student teaching relate to the process of pairing student teachers with mentor teachers. There are three implications for social studies teacher education programs: (a) enacting purposes for social justice within student teaching requires extensive and thorough discussion in social studies teacher education programs; (b) social studies teacher education influences students’ beliefs and purposes for teaching; and (c) an understanding of how pre-service teachers develop their purposes for teaching social studies contributes to a deeper understanding of their inclination toward or resistance to notions of purpose that emphasize deep democracy, equality, and social justice. I discuss each of these implications below.

**Implications for Pairing Student Teachers with Mentor Teachers**

One implication from the finding that participants negotiated passive and active resistance in their student teaching became clear during a presentation of the research at a national social studies education conference. Social studies education faculty and
doctoral candidates suggested that this finding has implications for how social studies teacher education programs pair student teachers with mentor teachers for field experiences. The process of pairing student teachers with mentor teachers may need to expand to include matching cooperating teachers with students who share some of their ideas about social studies teaching. This peer review revealed another potential implication: the need to prepare students to negotiate the political landscape they are about to enter as teachers. There was extensive data to support this idea, particularly Drake’s ideas regarding his difficulty reconciling the curricular demands of his school with his purposes for teaching. Stephanie and Bette’s experiences with their cooperating teachers contribute to this implication as well.

**Implications for Social Studies Teacher Education Programs**

This study suggested that the ability to find space to enact purposes for democratic citizenship, the common good, and critical thinking is a skill that merits deep discussion and study in social studies teacher education programs. Such conversations may enable and empower student teachers who hope to teach for these purposes and consequently challenge traditional notions of the purpose of social studies teaching.

Furthermore, the overarching finding of the study—the identification of a purpose formation process at work—contributes to ongoing scholarly conversations about the importance of understanding how student experiences in social studies teacher education programs shape their beliefs about teaching (Adler, 2008; Angell, 1998; Doppen, 2007; Johnston, 1990; Pryor, 2006). Robust understandings of how social studies teacher education contributes to pre-service teachers’ purposes for teaching enable teacher
educators to grasp the influence of teacher education on student beliefs. Additionally, recognizing and understanding the developmental process of teachers’ purposes for teaching can reveal what they are teaching for. If we know more about the way students’ purposes for teacher are affected by students’ initial purposes when they enter social studies teacher education, their incorporation of program ideas, and their negotiation of public school imperatives, we can more effectively tailor our programs to fulfill program objectives.

This study’s findings could also contribute to the admissions process in social studies teacher education programs. If we know more about pre-service social studies teachers’ degrees of open-mindedness, or further, their orientations toward the purposes of social studies education espoused by the admitting social studies teacher education program, we might be able to better assess how they need to develop as teachers. If we can identify people who hold ideas of purpose that are in line with the notions of purpose put forth in teacher education, and explore how they came to these beliefs, we may be able to offer experiences in teacher education that help others follow a similar path.

**Changes in the Study**

There were a number of changes over the course of the study. Stephanie left the program and the study before she completed her student teaching. As a result, I only had the opportunity to interview her twice, and we did not have the opportunity to explore how the entirety of her experience of student teaching would have contributed to her purpose for teaching. Similarly, I was not able to interview Daniel at the end of his student teaching because he moved away from the area and was unavailable for the
interview. In terms of data collection, I asked each of my participants to journal reflectively about their experiences, but Stephanie and Drake were the only participants who did so.

**Limitations**

The study did not attempt to explore every experience that participants had prior to or during their teacher education. Among others, experiences in content courses, the influence of literature and reading, and conversations with peers were experiences that I did not explore. Therefore, frequent references to a “purpose formation process” or “evolution” of participants’ purposes was a finding, rather than a subject of study, of the research. All study participants were students recruited from Class C in the fall of 2013. This changed the focus of the study from looking at students in different years of the program to only studying students in their final year.

**Future Research**

I hope to continue this research at a different university with a different set of participants in the near future. Possible participants include students in diverse disciplines of teacher education (social studies, science, language arts, math, etc.) who are taking a general course on the history of American education, prior to their content-specific coursework. The continuation of the research with this group of students could focus on the development of their purposes for teaching at an earlier point in their teacher education. Through this additional study, I can further develop the idea of a “purpose formation process.” As a line of inquiry, there is significant space to continue this research. There are a host of points along the continuum of teacher development that are
open to exploration, including students in the first semester of their teacher education, in-service teachers in their first year, and teachers who have left the profession. Repeating the study at these different points could enhance our understanding of how teachers develop their purposes for teaching and how their experiences contribute to that development. The anticipated study this fall with participants at a different point in their teacher education is an appropriate next step in this line of inquiry.

Conclusions

This study explored how experiences of high school social studies classes, social studies teacher education coursework, and student teaching contributed to the development of four pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. The narrations from Bette, Daniel, Drake, and Stephanie, gathered from interviews, journal entries and observations, as well as detailed information about their social studies teacher education programs, revealed how their experiences contributed to their purposes for teaching. Analyses of these narrations distilled findings and implications for social studies teacher education programs.

The identification of a purpose formation process at work among the participants was the most powerful finding of this research. Participants entered the social studies teacher education program with ideas of purpose drawn from their previous experiences. As they continued to reflect on these rudimentary purposes during their teacher education, they integrated new ideas into their purposes for teaching and shifted the focus of what they were teaching for. Throughout their student teaching, these ideas continued to evolve and change because of their experiences in public schools. This identification
and initial exploration of the purpose formation process among pre-service teachers offers an example that social studies teacher education programs may follow. If we understand how pre-service teachers develop their purposes for teaching social studies, perhaps we can develop a deeper understanding of their resistance to notions of purpose that emphasize deep democracy, equality, and social justice. Such thoughtful considerations of pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching are important if social studies teacher education programs are to foster reflective teachers who teach for something rather than about something.
Appendix A

Participant Selection Questionnaire

I provided a brief explanation of the research to the classes and administered the following questionnaire to Class A, Class B, and Class C.

**Opportunity to Participate in Research**

I am conducting research here at (X) University on why students want to become social studies teachers. What purposes do they have for teaching? What do they hope their future students will learn? How has their teacher education program influenced their purposes for teaching? As part of the process of recruiting participants, I have created the following questionnaire. Please respond to the questions and if you are willing to participate in the research, please check the box at the conclusion and provide your e-mail address. I will contact all possible participants by e-mail to provide further information and begin the process of enrolling you in the study. Thanks for your time!

1. Did you enjoy social studies classes in middle and high school? If so, what specifically did you like? If not, why not?
2. Do you talk about social studies issues (and social issues) with friends and family? If so, what type of issues? (i.e. politics, history, culture, etc.)
3. Why did you choose to pursue a degree in social studies education?
4. Has your thinking about being a social studies teacher changed since you began the program? If so, how?
5. What are you most looking forward to about becoming a social studies teacher?

Are you willing to participate in the study: Yes________             No_________

If you are willing to participate, please provide your e-mail address below:

E-mail: _______________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to complete the questionnaire!!
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RECRUITMENT SCRIPT, STUDY OUTLINE, AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR PARTICIPANTS
Appendix B

Recruitment Script, Study Outline, and Responsibilities for Participants

You are being invited to participate in a dissertation research study. This project will investigate how experiences of social studies teaching and learning influence purposes for teaching. If you choose to participate in this project, I would like to interview you about (a) your experiences of social studies teaching and learning and (b) how those experiences shape your purposes for teaching social studies. There will be three sets of interviews over the period of the study. The first interview will take place in November, the second interview will take place in February or March, and the third interview will take place in late April or early May. If you choose to participate, each of the interviews will take less than two hours. I will ask you to complete short writing prompts before and after each of the interviews. The observations will be in your social studies education classes and student teaching and will not exceed 2 observations of your student teaching. We will meet after the observations to talk about the class. These conversations will not last more than 1 hour and are flexible, unstructured talks. I will also ask you to complete a short curriculum planning activity and maintain a journal throughout the duration of the study. The last thing I will ask you to provide are examples of assignments completed for classes. Your confidentiality will be protected using pseudonyms in all written products of the research. Taking part in this research study is entirely up to you. You may choose not to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time. Participating or not is completely up to you. Thank you for your time and consideration of participation. If you would like to participate, you will need to read and sign the consent forms. Please let me know if you have any questions.
APPENDIX C

STUDENT PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS
Appendix C

Student Participant Interview Protocols

Interview 1

The purpose of this interview was to begin the research process with all four participants. The specific purpose was to get to know the participants more and develop a thorough understanding of their background and how they perceived the program.

Pre-Interview Prompt: To assist us in having a productive and enjoyable conversation in the upcoming interview, I have provided you with the following writing prompt. The purpose of this exercise is to introduce what we might be talking about in the interview and to help you start thinking about your purpose for teaching social studies. We will use your writing as a jumping off point for the first interview. Take as much time as you would like to respond to the following questions. You can respond in any media format that you would like (writing, e-mail, audio tape, art, etc.).

Many social studies teachers maintain a purpose, or multiple purposes for teaching. Common purposes or goals are; preparing students to be successful citizens in our democratic society (voting, participating in the democratic process, etc.), teaching students the history of America, helping students become socially literate (understanding social and cultural norms), and preparing the next generation of citizens to improve society. What do you think are important purposes for teaching social studies? Are the social studies important? What were your experiences in middle and high school social studies classes like? Did you feel like your teachers had purposes?

Background

1. How would you describe a good citizen?
2. Tell me about yourself as a citizen. What is important to you about being a citizen?
3. Tell me something that sticks out in your mind (a memory, an experience) about high school or middle school social studies that was a good or positive experience of social studies for you.
4. Tell me something that sticks out in your mind (a memory, an experience) about high school or middle school social studies that was a bad or negative experience of social studies for you.
5. Is there a certain part of social studies that is of particular interest to you? (Political science, history, economics, citizenship, culture, geography, etc.). Why?
The next 3 questions were on the participant questionnaire, but I’d like to talk with you more about them to get to know you more.

6. Do you talk about social studies issues (and social issues) with friends and family? If so, what type of issues? (i.e. politics, history, culture, etc.)
7. Why did you choose to pursue a degree in social studies education?
8. What are you most looking forward to about becoming a social studies teacher?
9. Do you think your experiences in high school social studies classes influenced your decision to become a social studies teacher? If so, how? If not, why not?
10. How are the social studies in teacher education different from social studies in high school?

Experiences during Teacher Education
1. What do you think about the syllabus for the course you are currently in, in terms of purpose? Do you see aspects of purpose in the syllabus and assignments? What does that mean for you?
2. In my interview with your professor, he/she mentioned X regarding purpose in their class. Do you have a thought or comment about this?
3. Questions emerging from the pre-interview prompt
4. Has your thinking about being a social studies teacher changed since you began the program? If so, how? Has it changed as a result of any experiences you’ve had so far this semester?
5. Have you had any experiences social studies teacher education thus far that are particularly memorable or meaningful to you? Are any of these experiences related to purposes for teaching?

Purposes
1. What purposes do you think teachers may have for teaching social studies?
2. Do you have a purpose for teaching social studies? What do you think it is?
3. What experiences have you had that may have led you to having the purpose you do for teaching social studies?
4. How are the experiences you are having during teacher education shaping your purposes for teaching?
5. What are your visions of yourself in the ideal social studies classroom?
6. What do you think the ideal social studies classroom looks like?
7. What is happening in the classroom?
8. What is the teacher doing?
9. What are the students doing?
10. What are the students learning?

Post-Interview Prompt: Take some time and respond to the following questions in whatever format you would like (writing, e-mail, audio, art, etc.). What are some of your thoughts about the interview? What did you realize about your experiences of social studies teaching and learning that you had not noticed before? Did you realize things
about your purpose for teaching social studies that you had not noticed before? What did you think of the structure of the interview? Is there anything you would like to add to our conversation that you thought of after we stopped talking?

**Interview 2**

The purpose of this interview was to continue working with participants to uncover how experiences of social studies teaching and learning contributed to the development of their purposes for teaching. This interview focused on experiences more so than background. Here I started asking more questions about participants’ practice and how their experiences shaped the enactment of their purpose.

**Pre-Interview Prompt:** To assist us in having a productive and enjoyable conversation in the upcoming interview, I have provided you with the following writing prompt. The purpose of this exercise is to introduce what we might be talking about in the interview and to help you start thinking about your purpose for teaching social studies. We will use your writing as a jumping off point for this interview. Take as much time as you would like to respond to the following questions. You can respond in any media format that you would like (writing, e-mail, audio tape, art, etc.).

Do you think it is possible for teachers to display their purposes for teaching to their students? Are their purposes visible? How might students be able to see their teachers’ purposes? How might teachers teach in a way that honors their purposes? How might they not? (These are all similar questions. I wanted to give you a number of different ways to get at the big idea….that purpose may influence what we do in the classroom as teachers.)

The first part of this interview will be member checking anything from the previous interview that is unclear or bears revisiting.

**Experiences**

1. Have you had any experiences of social studies teaching and learning since we last spoke that you would like to share?
2. Have you had any experiences of social studies teaching and learning that relate to purposes for teaching or your purpose for teaching since we last spoke that you would like to share?
3. Questions emerging from the pre-interview prompt.
4. Do you think your experiences are influencing your purpose for teaching? How so?
Practices and Purpose

1. Do you have a purpose for teaching social studies? What do you think it is?
2. What experiences have you had that may have led you to having the purpose you do for teaching social studies?
3. How are the experiences you are having during teacher education shaping your purposes for teaching?
4. Have you had any experiences during your teaching where you planned lessons or units with a purpose in mind?
5. How much of a factor is your purpose in your planning for social studies teaching?
6. How much of a factor is your purpose for teaching social studies in your teaching?
7. Do you think having a purpose for lessons, and an overarching purpose (what you are teaching for), is important to what you are teaching for?

Post-Interview Prompt: Take some time and respond to the following questions in whatever format you would like (writing, e-mail, audio, art, etc.). What are some of your thoughts about the interview? Did you realize things about your experiences of social studies teaching and learning that you had not noticed before? Did you realize things about your purpose for teaching social studies that you had not noticed before? What did you think of the structure of the interview? Is there anything you would like to add to our conversation that you thought of after we stopped talking?

Interview 3

The purpose of this interview was to assist participants’ in reflecting on their experiences. At this point in the study, I was most interested in how the experiences of this semester of teacher education contributed to the development of the participants’ purposes for teaching.

Pre-Interview Prompt: To assist us in having a productive and enjoyable conversation in the upcoming interview, I have provided you with the following writing prompt. The purpose of this exercise is to introduce what we might be talking about in the interview and to help you start thinking about your purpose for teaching social studies. We will use your writing as a jumping off point for this interview. Take as much time as you would like to respond to the following questions. You can respond in any media format that you would like (writing, e-mail, audio tape, art, etc.).

Look at the attached excerpts of our conversations from earlier in the study regarding your purpose for teaching. What do notice about your thinking that has changed? Has your purpose evolved over the course of the semester? Do you think differently about purpose than you did before? What experiences have you had that may have contributed to any change?
The first part of this interview will be member checking anything from the previous interview that is unclear or bears revisiting.

**Experiences**
1. Have you had any experiences of social studies teaching and learning since we last spoke that you would like to share?
2. Have you had any experiences of social studies teaching and learning that relate to purposes for teaching or your purpose for teaching since we last spoke that you would like to share?
3. Questions emerging from the pre-interview prompt.

**Purposes**
1. Do you have a purpose for teaching social studies? What do you think it is?
2. What experiences have you had that may have led you to having the purpose you do for teaching social studies?
3. How are the experiences you are having during teacher education shaping your purposes for teaching?
4. What are your visions of yourself in the ideal social studies classroom?
5. What do you think the ideal social studies classroom looks like?
6. What is happening in the classroom?
7. What is the teacher doing?
8. What are the students doing?
9. What are the students learning?

Post-Interview Prompt: Take some time and respond to the following questions in whatever format you would like (writing, e-mail, audio, art, etc.). What are some of your thoughts about the interview? Did you realize things about your experiences of social studies teaching and learning that you had not noticed before? Did you realize things about your purpose for teaching social studies that you had not noticed before? What did you think of the structure of the interview? Is there anything you would like to add to our conversation that you thought of after we stopped talking?
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Journal Prompt for Student Participants

Throughout the duration of this study, I would like you to keep a journal of moments and experiences in your teacher education program that you feel connect to any ideas of your purpose for teaching social studies. As you complete course assignments, talk with fellow pre-service teachers, talk with your professors, cooperating teachers, your students during your student teaching, friends, family, etc., be thinking about how any of these experiences connect with why you want to be a social studies teacher, or what you are teaching for. We can talk more about the focus of this journal during the first interview, but it is all about you, your purpose for teaching, and how your experiences of social studies teaching and learning shape your purpose for teaching. You may log your journal entries in any format (blog, written, audio recorded, etc.). I would like you to journal once a week, but I realize that there may be weeks when not much is going on, just as there may be other weeks when you’re journaling 3 or 4 times. The important part about this journal is that it is a space for you to share your thoughts and reflect on your experiences in any manner you choose, without boundaries. I will collect the journals at the conclusion of the study.
APPENDIX E

TEACHER EDUCATOR INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
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Teacher Educator Interview Protocol

The purpose of this interview was to gather data about if, and how, the concept of purpose existed in the participants’ teacher education program. It seemed logical that the nature and frequency of experiences connected to purpose would influence if and how those experiences contribute to participants’ purposes for teaching. If teacher educators infrequently discuss purpose and do not value it as part of teacher development, it seemed unlikely that participants would do so. Therefore, having detailed and rich data about the program was essential to gaining a clearer picture of participants’ experiences and purposes for teaching. The data collected from these interviews provided contextual information about the participants’ experiences of social studies teaching and learning. The interviews were semi-structured, face-to-face, conversational style interviews and these questions served as scaffolding for more probing questions that emerged from participants’ responses. The interviews took place early in data collection period 1.

Background
1. Tell me about how you came to be a teacher educator.
2. What do you do specifically in the social studies teacher education program?
3. What do you see as your role in the social studies teacher education program?
4. How do you see your role in the “big picture” of teacher education?

Purpose
1. Tell me about your purpose for being a social studies teacher educator.
2. How does that purpose influence what you do in your teacher education classes?
3. How does that purpose influence your planning?
4. How do see your purpose come through in this class?
5. What role do you see for purpose in this teacher education program?
6. What type of experiences do you offer students that involve purposes for teaching?
7. What do you want your students to learn/know about developing a purpose for teaching?
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DATA COLLECTION SCHEDULE
Appendix F

Data Collection Schedule

Data Collection Period 1
-Nov. - Dec. 2013
- **Observation**
  - of program classes
  - Post-observation conferences with participants regarding class experiences
- **Interviews**
  - of program faculty to gather data on purpose in program
  - participants, Set 1, Round 1
- **Artifact/Document Collection**
  - of course syllabi
  - of participants' program work
  - of interview documents
- **Journaling**

Data Collection Period 2
- **Observation**
  - of program classes
  - Post-observation conferences with participants regarding class experiences
- **Interviews**
  - participants, Set 1, Round 2
- **Artifact/Document Collection**
  - of participants' program work
- **Journaling**

Data Collection Period 3
-Mar. - May 2014
- **Observation**
  - of program classes
  - Post-observation conferences with participants regarding class experiences
  - of student teaching
  - Post-observation conference with participants regarding student teaching
- **Interviews**
  - Set 1, Round 3
- **Journaling**

Data Collection Period 1
I observed all four participants in program classes taught by the two faculty participants to gather data on the program. During post-observation conferences, I also gathered data from participants about their experiences in class. I interviewed program faculty to gather data on the role of purpose in their teaching and collect program artifacts (course syllabi) for data on the role of purpose in the program. I analyzed course syllabi during this period as well. I conducted the first interview with each participant. The interview process began with a prompt administered two days before the interview to get the participant thinking, followed by the interview, followed by a post-interview prompt that asked the participant to reflect on our conversation. Participants made journal entries during this data collection period.

Data Collection Period 2
I observed all four participants in program classes taught by the two faculty participants to gather data on the contribution of experiences of social studies teaching
and learning to the development of participants’ purposes for teaching. I also discussed participants’ experiences with them during post-observation conferences. I conducted the second interview with each participant. The interview process began with a prompt administered two days before the interview to get the participant thinking, followed by the interview, followed by a post-interview prompt that asked the participant to reflect on our conversation. Participants also made journal entries during this data collection period.

Data Collection Period 3

I observed participants during their student teaching and collected data from researcher field notes and post-observation conferences. I conducted the third and final interview with two of the four participants. The interview process began with a prompt administered two days before the interview to get the participant thinking, followed by the interview, followed by a post-interview prompt that asked the participant to reflect on our conversation. Participants continued to make journal entries during this data collection period.
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Participant Data Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data type in parentheses</th>
<th>Journaling (Narrative)</th>
<th>Interviews (Narrative)</th>
<th>Course Syllabi (Artifact)</th>
<th>Observations of program classes and student teaching (Field Notes)</th>
<th>Post-Observation conferences (Narrative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 1 (Stella)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator 2 (Stanley)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1 (Bette)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2 (Daniel)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3 (Drake)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4 (Stephanie)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Informed Consent to Participate

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Study Title: The Influence of Pre-service Social Studies Teachers’ Experiences of Social Studies Teaching and Learning upon their Purposes for Teaching

Principal Investigator: Alicia Crowe; Co-Principal Investigator, Evan Mooney

You are being invited to participate in a research study. This consent form will provide you with information on the research project, what you will need to do, and the associated risks and benefits of the research. Your participation is voluntary. Please read this form carefully. It is important that you ask questions and fully understand the research in order to make an informed decision. You will receive a copy of this document to take with you.

Purpose:
The purpose of the proposed research is to explore how experiences of social studies teaching and learning, specifically experiences that deal with ideas of purposes for teaching, influence pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. For example, how does a person’s experience of a conversation with their cooperating teacher during student teaching about what the goals of the class should be, influence their purpose for teaching social studies going forward? The purpose of the proposed research is to explore the influence of such experiences in an effort to gain a deeper understanding of how pre-service social studies teachers develop purposes for teaching. If we have a greater understanding of how purposes for teaching emerge among pre-service teachers, we can use that information to develop teacher education programs that offer opportunities for those pre-service teachers to reflect on the development of their purposes and critically think about what they are teaching for.

Procedures
Participation in this study will require approximately 30 hours of activity on your part spread out over a 6-month period, from November 2013 to May 2014.
Data Collection Period 1
I will interview each of the 3 program faculty members who teach the class in which the three pairs of students are enrolled to gather data on purpose in their teaching and collect program artifacts (course syllabi and assignments) for data on purpose in the program. I will conduct analysis of these artifacts with participants. I will also collect participants’ course work as artifacts and conduct analysis of the artifacts with the participants. I will conduct the first interview with each participant. The interview process begins with a writing prompt administered two days before the interview to get the participant thinking, which creates a document for later analysis, followed by the interview, followed by a post-interview writing prompt which also creates a document. Participants will be journaling during this data collection period.

Data Collection Period 2
I will observe program classes for all three pairs of participants to gather data on the influence of experiences of social studies teaching and learning upon participants’ purposes for teaching. This will also allow me to gather data from participants about their experiences in post-observation conferences. I will collect participant artifacts in the form of their work for program classes and analyze the artifacts with participants. I will provide a curriculum planning activity for the participants, detailed in Appendix H, and collect data from this document through document analysis. I will conduct the second interview with each participant. The interview process begins with a writing prompt administered two days before the interview to get the participant thinking, which creates a document for later analysis, followed by the interview, followed by a post-interview writing prompt which also creates a document. Participants will also be journaling during this data collection period.

Data Collection Period 3
I will observe participants during their student teaching and collect data from post-observation conferences. I will conduct the third and final interview with each participant. The interview process begins with a writing prompt administered two days before the interview to get the participant thinking, which creates a document for later analysis, followed by the interview, followed by a post-interview writing prompt which also creates a document. Participants will also be journaling during this data collection period.

Audio Recording
The interviews and post-observation conversations will be audio recorded so that I may transcribe them for further analysis. You may have a copy of the recording and/or
transcript if you wish. Upon completion of this study, the audio recordings will be destroyed. Refer to the Consent to Audio Tape form for further information about audio recording.

**Benefits**
The potential benefits of participating in this study to you may include gaining a deeper understanding of what you are teaching for, how your purposes for teaching evolve, and what you consider to be important about teaching social studies. Investigating these ideas may contribute to your development as a powerful social studies teacher.

**Risks and Discomforts**
There are no anticipated risks beyond those encountered in everyday life.

**Privacy and Confidentiality**
Your study related information will be kept confidential within the limits of the law. Any identifying information will be kept in a secure location and only the researchers will have access to the data. Research participants will not be identified in any publication or presentation of research results; your confidentiality will be protected through the use of pseudonyms in all written products of the research. Written data will not be made available to anyone. Audio recordings will not be made available to anyone. Once they are transcribed, the recordings will remain secure, locked in Evan Mooney’s office at Kent State University in Kent, Ohio.

Your research information may, in certain circumstances, be disclosed to the Institutional Review Board (IRB), which oversees research at Kent State University, or to certain federal agencies. Confidentiality may not be maintained if you indicate that you may do harm to yourself or others.

**Compensation**
There is no compensation for participating in this study.

**Voluntary Participation**
Taking part in this research study is entirely up to you. You may choose not to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You will be informed of any new, relevant information that may affect your health, welfare, or willingness to continue your study participation.
Contact Information
If you have any questions or concerns about this research, you may contact Evan Mooney at 330-672-2580 or Alicia Crowe at 330-672-2580. This project has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may call the IRB at 330.672.2704.

Consent Statement and Signature
I have read this consent form and have had the opportunity to have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I understand that a copy of this consent will be provided to me for future reference.

__________________________________________
Participant Signature

Date
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Audiotape/Videotape Consent Form

AUDIOTAPE CONSENT FORM

The Influence of Pre-service Social Studies Teachers’ Experiences of Social Studies Teaching and Learning upon their Purposes for Teaching

Evan Mooney

I agree to participate in an audio-taped interview about my experiences of social studies teaching and learning as part of this project and for the purposes of data analysis. I agree that Evan Mooney may audio-tape this interview. The date, time and place of the interview will be mutually agreed upon.

________________________________________________________________________

Signature

Date

I have been told that I have the right to listen to the recording of the interview before it is used. I have decided that I:

____ want to listen to the recording

____ do not want to listen to the recording

Sign now below if you do not want to listen to the recording. If you want to listen to the recording, you will be asked to sign after listening to them.

Evan Mooney may / may not (circle one) use the audio-tapes made of me. The original tapes or copies may be used for:

____ this research project _____ publication _____ presentation at professional meetings

________________________________________________________________________

Signature

Date
APPENDIX J
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Faculty Consent Form

Informed Consent to Participate in a Research Study
Faculty Participant Consent Form

Study Title: The Influence of Pre-service Social Studies Teachers’ Experiences of Social Studies Teaching and Learning upon their Purposes for Teaching

Principal Investigator: Alicia Crowe; Co-Principal Investigator, Evan Mooney

You are being invited to participate in a research study. This consent form will provide you with information on the research project, what you will need to do, and the associated risks and benefits of the research. Your participation is voluntary. Please read this form carefully. It is important that you ask questions and fully understand the research in order to make an informed decision. You will receive a copy of this document to take with you.

Purpose: The purpose of the proposed research is to explore how experiences of social studies teaching and learning, specifically experiences that deal with ideas of purposes for teaching, influence pre-service social studies teachers’ purposes for teaching. For example, how does a person’s experience of a conversation with their cooperating teacher during student teaching about what the goals of the class should be, influence their purpose for teaching social studies going forward? The purpose of the proposed research is to explore the influence of such experiences in an effort to gain a deeper understanding of how pre-service social studies teachers develop purposes for teaching. If we have a greater understanding of how purposes for teaching emerge among pre-service teachers, we can use that information to develop teacher education programs that offer opportunities for those pre-service teachers to reflect on the development of their purposes and critically think about what they are teaching for.
Procedures
Participation in this study will require approximately 1 hour of activity on your part. I will interview each of the 3 program faculty members who teach the class in which the three pairs of students are enrolled to gather data on purpose in their teaching and collect program artifacts (course syllabi and assignments) for data on purpose in the program. I will observe program classes for all three pairs of participants to gather data on the influence of experiences of social studies teaching and learning upon participants’ purposes for teaching. This will also allow me to gather data from participants about their experiences in post-observation conferences. I will collect participant artifacts in the form of their work for program classes and analyze the artifacts with participants.

Audio Recording
The interviews will be audio recorded so that I may transcribe them for further analysis. You may have a copy of the recording and/or transcript if you wish. Upon completion of this study, the audio recordings will be destroyed. Refer to the Consent to Audio Tape form for further information about audio recording.

Benefits
The potential benefits of participating in this study to you may include gaining a deeper understanding of what you are teaching for, how your purposes for teaching evolve, and what you consider to be important about teaching social studies. Investigating these ideas may contribute to your development as a powerful social studies teacher.

Risks and Discomforts
There are no anticipated risks beyond those encountered in everyday life.

Privacy and Confidentiality
Your study related information will be kept confidential within the limits of the law. Any identifying information will be kept in a secure location and only the researchers will have access to the data. Research participants will not be identified in any publication or presentation of research results; your confidentiality will be protected through the use of pseudonyms in all written products of the research. Written data will not be made available to anyone. Audio recordings will not be made available to anyone. Once they are transcribed, the recordings will remain secure, locked in Evan Mooney’s office at Kent State University in Kent, Ohio.

Your research information may, in certain circumstances, be disclosed to the Institutional Review Board (IRB), which oversees research at Kent State University, or to certain
federal agencies. Confidentiality may not be maintained if you indicate that you may do harm to yourself or others.

**Compensation**
There is no compensation for participating in this study.

**Voluntary Participation**
Taking part in this research study is entirely up to you. You may choose not to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You will be informed of any new, relevant information that may affect your health, welfare, or willingness to continue your study participation.

**Contact Information**
If you have any questions or concerns about this research, you may contact Evan Mooney at 330-672-2580 or Alicia Crowe at 330-672-2580. This project has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may call the IRB at 330.672.2704.

**Consent Statement and Signature**
I have read this consent form and have had the opportunity to have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I understand that a copy of this consent will be provided to me for future reference.

________________________________  ___________________
Participant Signature                  Date
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