IDENTITY MATTERS: EXPLORATIONS OF THE IMPLICATION OF TEACHERS' SENSE OF SELF IN THE AMERICAN HISTORY CURRICULUM

By

Adam Joseph Schmitt

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Curriculum, Instruction, and Teacher Education–Doctor of Philosophy

2018

ABSTRACT

IDENTITY MATTERS: EXPLORATIONS OF THE IMPLICATION OF TEACHERS' SENSE OF SELF IN THE AMERICAN HISTORY CURRICULUM

By

Adam Joseph Schmitt

This study explored the relationship between a teacher's sense of self and the curriculum they plan and enact. The purpose of the study was to understand the degree to which teachers' identities, memories of learning history, and perceptions of their curriculum, academic discipline, and students allowed them to implicate themselves in or distance themselves from the process of curricular translation, wherein teachers make choices about what and how to teach. This study is interested in exploring the various discourses teachers use in that process and in the construction of their own identities, as well as complicating the understanding of the connection between self and curriculum.

This qualitative study is focused on the curricular work of three high school American history teachers. Semi-structured, active interviews and classroom observations were used to collect data over the span of two instructional units during the 2017-2018 academic year. A poststructural lens was used to analyze data and explore the discourses that participants used in planning, enacting, and reflecting on their teaching.

Whereas much of the research base is focused on teacher identity formation in preservice teachers or the impact of teachers' conceptions of what they teach on their practice, the findings of this study suggest that teachers implicate their sense of self in the curriculum in multiple, nuanced ways. Findings indicate that practicing teachers' identities both construct and are constructed by the curricular choices they make based on uncertainties they feel about elements of their own identities as well as the discourses they adopt to think about their curriculum and

discipline. Findings also indicate that teachers use their own memories as learners to justify their present-day classroom practices.

This study demonstrates that there is much to be gained in understanding how elements of a teacher's identity, related to socio-cultural aspects such as race, gender, and social class, as well as the memories and perceptions they have about history education, are related to and are constructed by their curricular decision-making.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study, and the last five years, would not have been possible without the support and advice of many people. I would first like to thank the members of my committee, Professors Avner Segall, Margaret Crocco, Anne-Lise Halvorsen, and Kyle Greenwalt. Each of you has played a significant role in my intellectual and professional development and I sincerely thank you for all that you have done to challenge my thinking over the course of this program. From inspiring me to pursue a Ph.D. to encouraging my development as an academic in courses and research projects, your guidance has been invaluable. I would like to especially thank my advisor, Avner Segall. Your ability to ask the hard questions combined with your generosity and compassion have made you an ideal advisor for me. I have learned so much from you and I truly can't imagine having gone on this journey under anyone else's guidance. I would also like to thank the College of Education for their generous financial support to aid in the completion of this dissertation.

This study would not have been possible without Rob, Julie, and Paul who took time from their often hectic days to invite me into their classrooms and share who they are. The time spent in your classrooms was a reminder of the possibilities of history education and what can happen in the hands of people who are passionate about what they do. I hope I conveyed the depth of who you are and what you bring to your students.

I have also been fortunate to be a part of an outstanding community of scholars and friends who have helped me talk through ideas, challenged and supported my thinking, given much needed encouragement, watched my kids, and perhaps most importantly, indulged my penchant for silly office conversations. I want to give special thanks to Mike and Kati Macaluso,

Cori McKenzie, Matt Deroo, Hannah Grisham, Peter Nelson, Erin Bronstein, Scott Durham, and Scott Jarvie.

This would have all been impossible were it not for the unwavering support of my family; the ways you supported me are too numerous to list. Mom, Dad, and Sarah, thank you for your countless trips to Michigan and for the ongoing guidance only one's parents (and sister) can provide. Bob and Whitney, thank you for your almost weekly trips to help watch our kids, the amount of housework and yard maintenance you've done, and for providing a place to stay during this study. You all have my deepest love and gratitude.

I would also like to thank Elliott, Reid and Simon for being a respite from the stresses that come with being a doctoral student. You probably won't remember much of this time period but dance parties, train hunting, walks around the marsh, bedtime stories, and going on any number of other adventures will always be etched in my memory. Whether you were a part of this journey from the beginning or joined along the way, you have made this experience richer.

Last but not least, thank you to Bethany. I couldn't ask for a better partner. You, like no other, know when to be patient with me and when to push me. Thank you for the countless papers you've read, especially when you wondered if I actually wanted the feedback I was supposedly asking for, and for being a sounding board with whom to work through ideas. Most of all, thank you for all that you've done for our family to make this degree possible. Words can't describe how deep my appreciation is for you, but thank you for your love and your ability to help me work through the challenges. I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Teaching is a complex process that involves multiple factors: the curriculum, state standards, district initiatives, the teacher, the students, and the context of the school, to name a few. While a curriculum may be settled upon before a teacher sets foot in the classroom, teachers do not solely serve as implementers, enacting a curriculum precisely as written. Rather, teachers act as translators, where the curriculum that is enacted is filtered through who the teacher is: their identity, history, experiences, memories, beliefs, desires, assumptions about students and learning, and what they consider the underlying purposes of education to be.

This dissertation study explores a small piece of this complex, multifaceted process by focusing on the teacher and the way her/his self, via her/his identities, personal history, experiences, memories, understandings, and perspectives about the content and field of history education impact what and how they teach. I seek to investigate the degree to which teachers insert and implicate themselves in the process of curricular "translation," and generation. Specifically, I explore how teachers understand the relationship between self and curriculum. The purpose of exploring that relationship is to consider the degree to which teachers see themselves impacting their curriculum, both in planning and implementation, and to explore the various discourses that teachers use in constructing their conception of history education and establishing their own implication in or distance from the curriculum.

This interest stems from, in part, a desire to complicate how teaching is often thought about. As is evidenced by the name often given to departments tasked with the job of teacher education, curriculum and instruction are often considered separate fields of inquiry. Indeed, the name of my own doctoral program, Curriculum, Instruction, and Teacher Education, indicates

some sort of distinction among those three concepts. Yet, curriculum and instruction, or pedagogy, are deeply intertwined. Shulman's (1986) conception of pedagogical content knowledge, or "the ways of representing and formulating [a] subject that make it comprehensible to others," recognizes that the boundaries between those two categories are blurred (p. 9). Shulman's work has become foundational for a wide swath of the field of teacher education research, informing studies on classroom practices that will result in the most powerful forms of teaching. Such work still assumes some sort of division between content and pedagogy as the idea that they overlap assumes that there are areas where they do not. As Segall (2004) argues, "knowledge is always by someone and for someone, always positioned and positioning and, consequently, is always already pedagogical" (p. 491). Rather than being distinct entities, then, pedagogy and curriculum are inherently intertwined and imbued with one another.

Through this study, I seek to bring another element into the relationship between curriculum and pedagogy: the self. Typically, when the self is taken into consideration in the literature on curriculum it is through the lens of who students are and what they bring to the classroom. Just as pedagogical content knowledge is a widely influential concept in thinking about the relationship between pedagogy and curriculum, culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995) is a widely used frame in thinking about the relationship between curriculum and those that interact with it. While it is certainly important to not view students as empty vessels waiting to be filled with information or as devoid of opinions, feelings and identities that may at turns embrace or resist the project of schooling, they are not the only people in the classroom who impact and are impacted by the curriculum. This study, then, seeks to explore the other main participant in that interaction: the teacher.

As previously mentioned, teachers are more than just passive enactors of the curriculum. Rather, through their planning and teaching, teachers imbue a sense of who they are in what they choose to teach, how they choose to teach it, and how they interact with their students. Woods (1984) explored the relationship between the self and curriculum by conducting a life history with a retired art teacher reflecting back on his career and found that elements of the teacher's identity were expressed in his teaching. In this study, I investigate the role of the teacher's self with practicing teachers in order to consider how any exploration of teaching is not just about the relationship between curriculum and pedagogy, but rather the relationship among curriculum, pedagogy and self. If knowledge, as Segall (2004) maintains, is "always by someone and for someone" (p. 491) then it is the goal of this study to explore who that someone, in the act of curricular planning and enactment, is and how elements of their self play a role in the process of teaching.

Overview of the Study

During the spring of 2018, I worked with three American history teachers in order to explore how each conceives of their own identities, the relationship between self and curriculum, the degree to which their conceptualizations transfer to practice and the factors that play a role in that process. Our interactions consisted of in-depth interviews about their identities, their memories of learning history, their conceptions of history education, and how they thought about and engaged in planning two different units during our time together. I also observed their classes in order to see how their curricular choices translated into action and took form through interactions with their students.

In order to think about these issues, I have drafted the following research questions:

Research Questions

1. How, if at all, do teachers think about the relationship between facets of their personal identity and the curriculum they develop and/or implement?
2. To what degree do these understandings impact their curricular decision-making?
3. What factors, such as memories, histories, experiences, and teaching practice, play a role in shaping how teachers think about self/curriculum?
4. What are the implications of the above for history teacher preparation?

My purpose in exploring these research questions is to access the connection between the beliefs and values that teachers bring into the classroom, especially as outgrowths of their own personal identities, histories, memories, and experiences. Instead of looking for a direct correlation between what teachers think and do, my research questions acknowledge there are factors – e.g., school policies, reflection on their own practice, personal memories, and experiences with the discipline of history outside of the classroom - that may impact how teachers think about and enact curriculum in their classrooms.

Theoretical Overview

Poststructural theories of research and teaching play an important role in thinking through questions related to what teachers do in practice. Poststructuralism begins with the assumption that we can only express ourselves through language, yet language is always problematic and partial. Therefore, although there may be straightforward connections between what a teacher thinks and what they do, these theoretical lenses require an acknowledgment that meaning is not straightforward and that there are factors – both internal and external – that shape how a teacher constructs who they are and what s/he imagines being able to do. These factors may also include the very context of an interview and the power relations underlying it or elements of the broader

culture that subtly impact decision-making, or one's perception of it. It may also include unconscious processes, which may result in a teacher avoiding topics they may find uncomfortable, that signal larger issues at play in how teachers make meaning of themselves and their practice.

My hope is that this study highlights some of the complexities that go into teachers' decision making and the way in which that process incorporates or eliminates the self as an agent of curriculum making and implementation. Teachers and teaching are constituted by a variety of discourses. These discourses are used to make sense of the world and one's place within it (Foucault, 1972). Operating under the assumption that the self and curriculum are intertwined with one another, this study identifies discourses that teachers draw upon when thinking about their own relationship to the content and method of history education. Furthermore, this study explores which elements of a teacher's self is/may be taken up in the classroom and which is/may be partially obscured or avoided. How, in other words, do teachers make decisions about how to construct a version of themselves in the context of the secondary social studies classroom and to what degree does that self reflect who they see themselves as being? Lessons derived from this study can inform teacher preparation in history education by identifying ways in which factors like memory, articulated purposes of history education, and personal identity contribute to curriculum development and implementation, as well as further recognition that the act of teaching is more than just the development of a discrete set of skill-based teaching strategies. This study also contributes to understanding the complexity of teacher practice, both in terms of the relationship between self and curriculum, as well as the way in which practice is discursively constructed, allowing certain types of pedagogical enactment of content and inhibiting others.

The goal of this dissertation is not to make claims about a correct way to envision the relationship between self and curriculum or support the notion that there is a direct link between how that relationship is navigated and what happens in the classroom. Rather, I have two goals for this dissertation. First, I am interested in the degree to which teachers implicate elements of their self, such as race, gender, class, and religion, in the curriculum in order to explore how that implication functions for those teachers. Second, I examine how conceptualizations of factors such as the explicit curriculum, the nature of history, perceptions of students, and teachers' own memories of learning both justify and construct certain understandings of who my participants are and the decisions they make as teachers.

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter One: In the first chapter of the dissertation, I provide an overview of the relevant literature related to the themes of this dissertation, specifically considering the field of teacher identity research and how themes from that field have been taken up in social studies education research. I also provide the theoretical framework for the dissertation focusing on the conceptualizations of discourse, self/identity, and curriculum I take up in this study.

Chapter Two: In the second chapter, I discuss the methodology and methods of the dissertation, paying attention to the methodological considerations related to doing poststructural research and explaining the methods used to conduct this study. The chapter ends with an introduction to the study's participants and an exploration of my own positionality as the researcher.

Chapter Three: Chapter Three explores the ways in which teachers implicate elements of their sense of self in the curriculum through their identities. Using Jenkins' (2014) concept of social identity, where identities are claimed and constructed through one's actions and

interactions with others, I investigate how and why teachers claim and navigate various intellectual and socio-cultural identities through the curriculum.

Chapter Four: In Chapter Four, I examine the connection between participants' remembrance of their own history education and their curricular work in the present. Using Simon, Rosenberg, and Eppert's (2000) conception of remembrance, I explore how participants elicit memories of their experience as learners in order to narrate and justify elements of their identity as history teachers in the present.

Chapter Five: Chapter Five explores how teachers construct particular images of their self related to the discourses of external factors that are connected to the work they do. These factors include the explicit curriculum that teachers are asked to work with, as well as their identification with the work of the academic field they are affiliated with, and the students they work with.

Chapter Six: In Chapter Six, I summarize the main goals of the dissertation place my findings in conversation with other history/social studies literature that speaks to the same general topic. I then explore implications for future social studies research and teacher education.

CHAPTER ONE

SITUATING THE STUDY

Introduction

In this chapter, I situate the current study both in terms of the broader field of teacher education research, as well as more specifically in the field of history/social studies education research. I then outline the conceptual framework I use to explore issues of self and curriculum, specifically focusing on how identity, curriculum, and discourse are defined and used. I argue that this study occupies a space in the field of history/social studies education that has not been deeply explored: the construction of identity by practicing teachers through their curriculum.

Teacher Education Research

Teacher education research has considered the relationship between the self and curriculum in multiple ways. Central to this work is Lortie's (1975) conception of the "apprenticeship of observation," wherein pre-service teachers often construct what it means to teach based on imitating practices they experienced as students, rather than recognizing and critiquing the underlying thought and knowledge that go into being a teacher. While Lortie was not specifically discussing issues of self and curriculum, his findings are foundational to the field of teacher identity. Lortie's goal was the development of a "shared technical culture," otherwise "the diverse histories of teachers will play a cardinal role in their day-to-day activity" (p. 67). He saw the propagation of the "apprenticeship of observation" as being an "ally to continuity rather than change," (p. 67), a charge that reflected his desire to strengthen teachers' ability to work as informed pedagogical agents as opposed to uncritical imitators.

Identity in Teacher Education

Since Lortie's study, there has been a large body of research dedicated to teacher identity development and its relationship to what teachers do in the classroom. Woods (1984) took a multi-faceted approach in thinking about the relationship between self and curriculum, specifically asking "to what extent does a teacher find self-expression within the curriculum? How far is a subject as practiced in the classroom a realization of an individual teacher's self?" (p. 239). To answer these questions, Woods interviewed Tom, a retired art teacher who had been a classroom teacher for thirty years. Employing a life history approach, Woods focused on issues such as family background, religion, educational experiences, literary preferences, social class as well as factors related to the realities of schooling, such as teaching assignment and the relationship between Tom and his principal. Woods approached his data by looking at Tom's actions and attitudes both professionally and personally and traced them back to element of his earlier life. Reflecting on his study, Woods noted that there was a connection between a teacher's self and the realization of their curriculum area. He goes on to claim that "a curriculum area is a vibrant, human process lived out in the rough and tumble, give and take, joys and despairs, plots and counter-plots of a teacher's life" (Woods, 1984, p. 260). The self is deeply embedded in the curriculum and is engaged in a dialectical interplay, resulting in teachers not just enacting a curriculum that is provided to them, but rather actively involved in the constitution of the curriculum itself (Woods, 1984).

While Woods (1984) examined the identity of a teacher at the end of his career, the majority of teacher identity research focuses on how a teacher's identity is constructed in the first place, specifically through the process of teacher education and early classroom experiences. Foundational to this field is the work of Deborah Britzman. Britzman (2003) draws out the way

in which learning to teach is already a reaction to our preconceived notions of what teaching entails as "we enter teacher education with our school biography. Teaching is one of the few professions where newcomers feel the force of their own history of learning as if it telegraphs relevancy to their work" (p. 1). Teaching is one of the only professions where those who are learning to teach have constructed a vision of what the work of teaching entails before their teacher education begins. Therefore, the process of learning to teach is always one of resistance, as pre-service teachers' conceptions of teaching are constantly butting up against the reality of their experiences and their preconceived notions of the teachers they want to be or avoid being.

Drawing on Britzman, and also focusing on the development of preservice teachers' sense of identity, Alsup (2006) calls for a holistic view of teacher identity as realized through a concept she calls "borderland discourse." Alsup views teacher identity as "inclusive of the intellectual, the corporeal, and the affective aspects of human selfhood" (p. 6). Teachers, Alsup argues, have to navigate a variety of conflicting positions as they craft a professional identity, an identity often perceived as needing to meet cultural expectations of what it means to be a teacher (Alsup uses the example of the "prim, feminine young teacher") (p. 6). In the same vein as Britzman, Alsup argues that teachers, while trying to enact the role they think they're supposed to play, might end up feeling tensions with who they really are and might leave the profession. The means to navigating these tensions is for pre-service teachers to engage in borderland discourse, where the tensions between competing identities of one's personal and professional self can be brought to light and navigated in order to form one's own vision of teacher identity.

Numerous other studies have also explored facets of teacher identity. These studies have further focused on teacher identity development at the pre-service teacher level (Danielewicz, 2001; Olsen, 2008), the connection between teachers' personal history and the contexts in which

they teach (Flores & Day, 2006), the place of emotion in teacher identity development (Zembylas, 2003), and how teacher identity is both impacted by and resistant to mandated education reform (Buchanan, 2015; Vulliamy, Kimonen, Nevalainen, & Webb, 1997). Common to these studies is a focus on the ways in which teacher identity is formed by knowledge of the profession and its dispositions. Beijaard, Verloop, and Vermunt (2000), for example, explored how experienced teachers view their teaching identity as seasoned professionals and at the beginning of their career. Defining teacher identity as "how they perceive themselves as teachers and what factors contribute to these perceptions" (p. 749), the authors primarily positioned identity as one's self-perception of expertise in subject matter, pedagogy, and didactics. In general, teacher identity research considers the way in which teachers feel like teachers via their understanding of teacher dispositions, pedagogical approaches, and the wider professional discourse around what it means to teach. While there are often competing definitions of identity, Beauchamp and Thomas (2009) note that the literature "reveals a common notion that identity is dynamic and that a teacher's identity shifts over time under the influence of a range of factors both internal to the individual… and external…" (p. 177).

Teacher Beliefs

Beyond solely looking at teacher identity development, the dialogic relationship between teacher beliefs and experiences is also an important means of understanding how the self enters into the curriculum. If, as Richardson (1996) contends, beliefs are the "psychologically-held understandings, premises, or propositions about the world that are felt to be true" (p. 104-105), and experiences uphold or challenge those beliefs, then it is important to understand how these concepts impact one another. Research stemming back to Lortie (1975) acknowledges that particularly influential educators, for example, may provide the model that a teacher wishes to

replicate through their own practice. Combined with identity markers such as race, gender, social class and religious background, these experiences are important for teasing out how beliefs take shape. Nespor (1987) argues that belief systems are persistent and that they are harder to shift than simply gaining new knowledge. Such arguments challenge the assumption that knowledge is the means of upending beliefs, particularly ones that are viewed to be problematic in some way. Garrett (2017), writing thirty years after Nespor, draws on political science research to demonstrate the way in which knowledge is taken up or rejected via its congruence to pre-existing beliefs. Beliefs are certainly capable of being changed, but the answer is not to simply learn the "correct" information. Rather, recent research has begun to focus on the role that interrogating memory can play on exposing and potentially challenging beliefs.

Memory

Memory, Rothenberg (1994) argues, goes hand in hand with experience, together constituting "a personal truth upon which belief systems are built" (p. 370). As a result, there has been increased interest in how memory structures teachers' conceptualization of teaching and the students they interact with. Much of this research adopts a psychoanalytic approach in order to focus on how teachers' views of childhood are reflections of their own memories of childhood and how such views impact how teachers interact with their current students. Chang-Kredl, Wilkie, and Ghaznov (2016) argue that teachers' imagined students contain traces of the children they once were and that "the motivation to teach was related to a desire to care for one's former child self" (p. 279). Surfacing memories of one's own childhood holds potential to create a space where teachers can acknowledge and interrogate how their memories impact their beliefs and actions in the present. Chang-Kredl (2015) sees film and other fictional representations of children as a space to engage in this work, while Chang-Kredl and Wilkie (2016) propose

teacher-created narratives, or memory texts, as a space where "the teacher can look back in nostalgic identification with his/her remembered child self and forward to an anticipated identification" related to the adult the child will one day become (p. 317). Regardless of how memory is invoked, there is a belief that engagement with one's memories will provide a space that can address "the need to disentangle our own subjective childhoods from the children we work with today" (Chang-Kredl & Wilkie, 2016, p. 317).

There is also a body of research that more broadly examines the relationship between memory, experience and one's development as a teacher. Ben-Peretz (1995, 2002), similar to Woods (1984), worked with retired teachers in order to explore how memory, as a means of thinking about how experiences are made sense of and transformed into professional knowledge. "From the point of view of teachers' memories," Ben-Peretz (2002) claims, "it is important to know which memories tend to survive, what forms they take, and how they shape professional actions" (p. 314). To Rothenberg (1994), summoning memories from the past to consider your own learning and schooling experiences is a fruitful way of combatting Lortie's (1975) "apprenticeship of observation," as it provides a means for questioning and more fully understanding what one personally experienced as a student and its continued impact on the act of teaching.

Memory is viewed as an important avenue for theorizing the link between self and curriculum because "teacher education programs have erroneously assumed that coursework can fully shape the beliefs and actions of pre-service teachers" (Miller & Shifflet, 2016, p. 21). Experiences that teachers have had as students, as well as their own experiences as burgeoning teachers, play a role in how teachers come to conceptualize and enact teaching. Therefore, these memories and experiences have to be engaged and made sense of, otherwise "new information

may not become hard wired into [teachers'] schema but instead only retained short term" (Miller & Shifflet, 2016, p. 28).

Explorations of Self and Curriculum in History/Social Studies Education

The fields of history/social studies education have also taken up the relationship between self and curriculum. Not surprisingly, this body of research has followed the same general trends that the broader teacher education research above has taken. The relationship between self and curriculum was originally explored via the link between teachers' conceptions about the field of history/social studies education and their practice, and has shifted towards conceptions of the self related to more critical engagements with the field.

The Link Between Perspective and Practice

Even though there have been recent studies about student implication in the curriculum, studies related to the relationship between teachers and curriculum is largely seen in a wave of research from the late 1980s focused on the relationship between teacher conceptions (abstract thinking about the nature of what they teach) and perspectives (concrete thinking related to what they do). This research has looked at student teachers (Adler, 1984; Goodman & Adler, 1985; Ross, 1987), and teachers from different disciplinary backgrounds (Wilson & Wineburg, 1988) and showed that there is not a direct connection between teacher's conceptions and their actions. Adler (1984) argued "social studies teaching was shaped then, not only by beliefs about social studies but by such things as concern for developing an appropriate teacher role, ideas about what school is about, and what ought to be learned there, as well as past experience in social studies and in community experiences" (p. 27). Ross (1987) also found that student teachers largely developed their teaching perspectives through the process of professional socialization

and suggested that there should be more attention paid towards the development of reflective practitioners who can reflect on and take up what they learn in a variety of education settings.

Evans (1989, 1990) explored teacher conceptions of the meaning of history, the factors that contributed to the development of those conceptions and their impact on the curriculum. He found that teachers could be divided into five different typologies of history approach and that these typologies were related to factors such as the teacher's political orientation and religious background and had some degree of impact on teachers' pedagogical choices.

More recent studies have attended to the connection between identity and practice. In the field of civics education, Vickery (2017) explored the intersection of race and gender in five female African American social studies teachers' conceptualizations of citizenship. She finds that her participants' understanding of citizenship is based on their historical and experiential knowledge of race and gender in the U.S. As a result, participants held a more community-based understanding of citizenship that eschewed traditional forms and citizenship, allowed for a sense of belonging and empowerment and focused on civic education that promoted student belonging. In a quantitative study, Knowles (2018) studied the connection between civics teachers' political ideology and preferred teaching practices. Knowles found that "teachers with particular views of social studies and citizenship education will likely implement instruction consistent with those beliefs" (p. 91). Working in a broader social studies context, Hung (2018) explored connections between Taiwanese social studies teachers' life stories and teaching controversial public issues. The teachers in Hung's study showed a "connection between the personal level and professional level" as teachers "attributed their views about controversial issues to their personal life experiences," which themselves are an intersection of a variety of factors (p. 75). Although they did not delve into the underlying reason of why teachers held their beliefs, Martell and Stevens

(2017) explored the connection between the beliefs and practices of race-conscious teachers, finding that those who identify as race-conscious were likely to discuss issues of race in class.

The Purpose of History Education

Another factor at play is the relationship between how teachers define the purpose of history education and the impact that has on how they implicate themselves in the curriculum. There have been multiple studies, over the past forty years, that outline different approaches to history/social studies education that get enacted in the classroom. Regardless of time period, history education pedagogy is usually split into three categories that roughly align with one another regardless of when the classification was written. Barr, Barth, and Shermis (1977) for example, posit three different pedagogical approaches to social studies education: citizenship transmission, disciplinary social sciences, and reflective inquiry. These three typologies respectively represent uncritical engagement with accepted values and knowledge (citizenship transmission), a focus on disciplinary understanding to build decision-making capacity (disciplinary social sciences), and critical, student-interest-based inquiry to meet social needs (reflective inquiry). Writing over twenty years later, and specifically addressing history education, Seixas (2000) suggests three orientations that closely mirror those posited by Barr, Barth, and Shermis: the collective memory approach, the disciplinary approach, and the postmodern approach. VanSledright (2011) also puts forth a typology, this time dropping the postmodern approach and focusing solely on the collective memory and disciplinary approaches.

Teacher reasoning related to the purposes of history education is an important mode for thinking about how teachers envision the relationship between self and curriculum. While Evans (1989, 1990) created typologies of teachers related to their personal conceptions and enactment of teaching, there is a need to explore what teachers' conceptions of the past make possible in the

classroom and the degree to which any conception of the meaning of history is fluid. How are teachers influenced by research, resources, and experiences that espouse the development of historical disciplinary skills (Levesque, 2008; National Council for Social Studies, 2013; Seixas, 2000; Stearns, Seixas, & Wineburg, 2000; VanSledright, 2011; Wineburg, 1991; 2001) or promote a more critical engagement with the power relations and structure of the discipline itself (Segall, 1999, 2006, 2013)? In other words, what is the relationship between practice and teachers' worldview about the meaning of the past and the study of history and how does their conception of that relationship function in connection to the kinds of learning experiences and questions posed and taken up in a classroom setting?

Critical Lenses About the Self and Curriculum

Unlike research on the connection between history teachers' perspectives and their actions, or research focused on the disciplinary approach to history education, critical lenses, especially those drawing from psychoanalytic theory and poststructural approaches, have considered the internal, affective components that come into play when a teacher is or is not implicating her/himself in the curriculum. As Farley notes (2007), "from a psychoanalytic perspective, the meanings we make… will be driven by unconscious forces that are other to chronological time and that education can neither predict nor control" (p. 428). Garrett (2017) also emphasizes that "learning about the world does not occur in absence of our intimate relationship with the knowledge that we bring with us and have been accumulating from our very first days" (p. 50). Garrett (2011) specifically looked at how pre-service teachers contended with difficult knowledge related to race and the Spike Lee documentary about Hurricane Katrina, *When the Levees Broke*, and how they sought to route and re-route knowledge away from themselves to avoid personal implication or contention with the complex issues of race presented

in the film. Zembylas (2016) also explored teacher implication related to trauma, specifically Cypriot teachers' resistance to historical representations that challenged their beliefs. Affect provides an avenue to understand the source of resistance as well as to imagine different ways of relating to otherness. Psychoanalytic frames related to history/social studies teachers, therefore, focus on the degree to which teachers implicate themselves in the complex and difficult contexts of teaching about the past, particularly those related to racism and other forms of social trauma.

Poststructural lenses in history/social studies research also draw attention to factors that blur the distinction between self and curriculum. Segall's (2003) examination of the discourses of the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP), for example, positions the MEAP as more than just a test that is distributed by teachers. Rather, Segall argues, the MEAP functions as a discursive practice that opens and forecloses particular views of teaching and is itself constituted by wider societal discourses that teachers may take up in their own attitudes toward the test and the resulting impact on their own practice.

Thinking about history curriculum itself, Parkes (2011) considers how history is engaged within the "end of history" discourse that dominated the 1990s and early 2000s. Specifically, Parkes is interested in identifying the specific forms of reasoning that are valued in a curriculum and examining those forms in relation to the styles of reasoning that are neglected" in order to explore how curriculum and pedagogy act as s form of governance that impacts self-formation (p. 40). In other words, curriculum, shaped both by what is included and what is ignored, influences the discourses one comes in contact with and how construction of the self is related to the discourses one interacts with. The impact of curricular discourses is also seen related to representations of women and feminism in the field of social studies education (Schmeichel,

2011) and the marginality and lack of agency of women as represented in the history curriculum of South Carolina (Schmidt, 2012).

Contributions to the Field

While there have been studies that have looked at the link between self and curriculum, there are several holes in the literature base that this study can help address. First, education research on identity development primarily focuses on the identity formation of pre-service or new teachers. Studies that do not focus on the context of teacher education instead look at how teachers at or near the end of their careers reflect back on their teacher identity. Instead of positioning teacher identity as the identity one has as a member of the profession, I consider the various identities that make up who one is as a teacher. I also shift the focus to teachers who are out of their pre-service phase and working as full-time classroom teachers. I assume, in this study, that my participants already have an identity as a teacher, and explore how various factors, such as race, gender, social class, religious identity, and memory enter into their practice through the curriculum.

I also bring a poststructural lens to this study. Such lenses are already at work in discussions about teacher identity in the broader teacher education literature (see Alsup, 2006; Britzman, 2003) but by and large have not been taken up within the field of history/social studies education. History education research on the link between perceptions and practice (e.g., Evans, 1989, 1990) posits a somewhat straightforward connection between what one says they do and what they do. The nature of this connection can of course be complicated in the act of teaching itself, but there is a belief that the route from internal to external is relatively direct. This study provides an opportunity to apply poststructural theory to uncover the complexity at work in the relationship between the self and the curriculum.

Within the field of history education, this study takes up factors like memory in ways that have not yet been explored. Memory has played an increasing role in thinking about the relationship between self and curriculum, yet history and social studies education research related to memory has yet to seriously take up the relationship between a teacher's personal and collective memories and curricular decision-making. Rather, this body of literature focuses on how group and/or national collective memories get taken up within school curriculum, particularly from a top-down approach. National and state governments might work to exert influence over history education curriculum to forward certain narratives about the past, especially traumatic and or contested pasts, in order to shore up present-day political interests (Papadakis, 2008; VanSledright, 2008; Wang, 2008) These include studies about how representations of the history of specific groups reflect dominant cultural memories (Brown & Brown, 2010, Suh, An, & Forest, 2014), and how traces of collective memory can be found in state standardized tests (Reich, 2011). There is also a small body of work that considers how students interact with collective memory, such as the narratives college students take up related to competing memories of Southern secession (Reich, Buffington, & Muth, 2016), and the role that racial and ethnic identity play in how students interpret and assign value to historical actors and events (Epstein, 1998, 2010; Peck, 2010). This study will attend to memory in a new way and consider not only how teacher memories play a role in shaping practice but also how teacher memories of the content they teach serves as a means of understanding the relationship between self and curriculum.

Theoretical Framework

In this section I explain the theoretical constructs I draw on in order to address the gaps that are present in the literature. I begin by outlining the poststructural lens used in this study,

focusing on Foucault's definition of discourse. I then discuss how I define two concepts important to this work: self/identity and curriculum.

Overall, I draw upon poststructural theory in order to analyze the processes through which teachers construct and reconstruct elements of their identity in relation to the curriculum. Using this lens, history education, including how teachers think about issues related to the field and engage in classroom practice, can be viewed as a text, meaning that it can be analyzed discursively. Discourses, according to Foucault (1972), are systems of thought that simultaneously construct and give structure to the world and are the means through which people make sense of that world. Foucault no longer considers discourses "as groups of signs (signifying elements referring to contents or representations), but as practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (p. 49). There are two important points to take from this argument. First, language is not just a reflection of the world around us. It is imbued with values and gives structure to how the world is understood and experienced as well as how people construct understandings about themselves. In fact, we cannot conceive of the the world outside of discourse, as there is no way to express ideas outside of language. Second, the practices that construct our reality can be analyzed to uncover the underlying values that are present and the impact they have on those that operate within a particular set of discourses.

Power, in poststructuralist theory, is not simply top-down, but is diffused, arranged like a network and able to act in multiple directions. Foucault (1980) claims that

> power must be analyzed as something which circulates, or rather as something which only functions in the form of a chain. It is never localized here or there, never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth. Power is employed through a net-like organization. And not only do individuals circulate between

its threads, they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. (p. 98)

As such, "the individual is an effect of power, and at the same time, or precisely to the extent to which it is that effect, it is the element of its articulation" (Foucault, 1980, p. 98). Individuals constitute themselves through the power relations they encounter and take part in. While power is not evenly distributed, a diffused conception of power recognizes the way that a multitude of discourses are constantly at work. For the purposes of this study, this means that as teachers constitute themselves, and consider their own relation to the curriculum, there are a number of factors that exert pressure. These may include discourses related to their memories and prior experiences, curriculum requirements, time, ideas about the contours and purposes of history education and who they construct their students to be. Power, in this conception, is not something that has a precise location and material nature, rather it is the process through which people make sense of the various discourses they encounter and inhabit, with the acknowledgement that these discourses do not all exert the same amount of power.

Therefore, work that considers issues of power needs to shift away from "questions such as 'Who has power?' or 'What intentions do power holders have?' to the processes by which subjects are constituted as effects of power" (Sarup, 1993, p. 74). The importance then is not who has power and for what ends do they put it to use, but rather how one's reality is produced through power and the resulting impact that has on who they are and what they do.

I also draw upon elements of psychoanalytic theory in order to understand how teachers conceptualize elements of their self in relation to their teaching. The concept of difficult knowledge is particularly helpful in understanding how one conceives of their personal relationship to their curriculum. Difficult knowledge is most commonly construed as "a concept

meant to signify both representations of social trauma in curriculum and the individual's encounter with them in pedagogy" (Pitt & Britzman, 2003, p. 755). Positioning difficult knowledge as related to social trauma conjures images of war, genocide, violence, and racism, but the process of difficult knowledge is always present, as people seek to make sense of and respond to the world around them. What needs to be brought to the fore, then, is how difficult knowledge is a way to engage that which is difficult to make sense of and the affective dimensions that contribute to that difficulty. As Garrett (2017) argues, "making a relation to difficult knowledge means being able to recognize that there is knowledge we simultaneously do and do not want to have" (p. 24). In considering the work of this study, psychoanalytic theory allows for the recognition of how that desire to know/not know is always present in meaning making about oneself and the broader world.

Whereas poststructuralism allows us to question taken-for-granted conceptions, expose the various discourses that teachers adopt and uncover the way they navigate power dynamics, psychoanalytic theory helps to illuminate the internal and unconscious processes at work as teachers encounter the curriculum. Due to the inherently interrelated nature of content and pedagogy (Segall, 2004), teacher's implication in the curriculum can both emerge in how teachers engage in pedagogical enactment as well as in the choices they make regarding which content to cover and which to exclude. Inclusion/exclusion, though, are not just confined to the content a teacher decides to cover, rather it also emerges in the moment-to-moment decision-making teachers engage in as they elicit student thinking through questioning. The content-related choices that teachers make may be an outgrowth of the process of difficult knowledge as an avoidance of contending with issues that makes a teacher uncomfortable or that they worry will be resisted or problematically taken up by students. Following Britzman (1998), an example

of this process is the teacher who focuses on the Diary of Anne Frank as a means of teaching about the Holocaust. The collapsing of the study of the Holocaust into a narrative that is largely about adolescence set against the backdrop of going into hiding allows a teacher to claim they are covering the Holocaust while avoiding the extreme violence of the concentration camps. Therefore, psychoanalytic theory helps to understand how resistance and ignorance are a part of learning and an active engagement with knowledge, as opposed to the absence of it (Garrett & Segall, 2013) Psychoanalytic processes are therefore important for understanding how the teacher brings the unconscious self to bear on the curriculum.

Self and Identity

There are a multitude of competing conceptualizations of how to define self and identity across a great variety of fields, with some arguing that the two concepts are different and others suggesting they are the same. Due to the sheer volume of work committed to these ideas, it is not possible to give a full examination of the different iterations of the concepts. Rather, I will focus in specifically on the frames that I am using to think about self and identity and the, somewhat artificial, distinction I make between the two for clarity in this study.

At its root, identity can be understood as "being recognized as a certain 'kind of person' in a given context" (Gee, 2000, p. 99). Gee argues that "all people have multiple identities connected not to their 'internal states' but to their performances in society" (p. 99). Identity, therefore is a social process, that "involves knowing who we are, knowing who others are, them knowing who we are, us knowing who they think we are and so on" (Jenkins, 2014, p. 6). These definitions draw out that identity is inherently social, as one's identity can only take meaning via the perception of others.

Identities, then, are discursively constituted. Jenkins (2014) sees identity as a process (which he terms "identification") and not as a thing that one can possess. Rather, "it is something one does" (p. 6). When people claim an identity, they are speaking to a specific discursive understanding of what constitutes that identity and they make claims about their own identification via their actions and interactions with others. Identities, then, are fluid as we move across various discourses and manifest ourselves in ways that are fitting to the particular context we inhabit at any given moment.

This formation of identity falls in line with Butler's (1993) of performativity, which she defines "not as a singular or deliberate "act," but, rather, as the reiterative and citational practice by which discourse produces the effects it names" (p. 2). Writing specifically about gender, Butler discusses the ways in which an interior, and often viewed as coherent, image of outwardly expressed gender, via fashion choices, mannerisms, and the like, is anything but internal or coherent. Rather, gender is a result of public and social discourse that gets internalized while it is simultaneously socially regulated (Butler, 1990). Butler's conception of performativity and identity reinforces the idea that our internal conception of self is shaped by social discourses, simultaneously constructs and is constructed by the relationship between the individual and these discourses and is apt to change based on discursive shifts related to the changing contexts one may find him/herself in.

In this study, I define self as the narrative through-line that marks a person's internal navigation of the world. In other words, how one views the totality of the multiple identities they inhabit across contexts. Identity, then, is the expression of and claims made about the self, meaning the various components that one may be recognized for. I, for example, have an understanding of who I am (self) that gets expressed through my various identities as researcher,

father, husband, white man, straight, and so on, identities that take on meaning via the social discourses we are embedded within.

Curriculum

Just as there are myriad ways of conceiving self, identity, and their interrelation, so too are there many different ways of conceiving the curriculum. Eisner (1985) defines the curriculum as "a series of planned events that are intended to have educational consequences for one or more students" (39). Further complicating his definition, Eisner contends that schools actually teach three different curricula to their students: the explicit, implicit, and null curriculum. Eisner defines explicit curriculum as the goals and objectives found in formal documents that the public is generally aware of. The implicit curriculum, or hidden curriculum, are the values and cultural norms, such as punctuality and deference to authority, that schools teach through school and classroom policies, interactions with students, and the like. Finally, the null curriculum is what does not get taught, a curriculum that Eisner sees as just as powerful as the explicit and implicit curricula as "ignorance is not simply a neutral void; it has important effects on the kinds of options one is able to consider, the alternatives that one can examine, and the perspectives from which one can view a situation or problem" (p. 83). The explicit and null curricula are especially germane to this study as teachers' curricular decision-making inherently makes claims about what will and will not be taught. Those claims stand in relation to a number of contexts, including the teacher's own positionality.

The gap in Eisner's (1985) understanding of curriculum is that while a curriculum may exist and convey values about what is explicitly and implicitly included as well as what is excluded, it is important to view how curriculum is taken up and enacted, in other words how it is translated from its stated goals to its implementation in the classroom. Therefore, I also draw

upon Marsh and Willis's (1995) conception of the intended, enacted, and experienced curriculum. Under this framework, there is a difference between that curriculum that is designed and meant to be taught (intended), what actually gets taught (enacted) and how it is received by its intended audience (experienced). By bringing in these dimensions, what actually happens in the classroom through the teacher's pedagogical approaches and in-the-moment decision making is also brought under the aegis of curriculum. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, I define curriculum as the intended goals, objectives, and learning activities of a course and the experiences that result in and through their enactment. There are instances, particularly in Chapter 5, where I specifically use the term "explicit curriculum" to denote the curriculum that exists prior to an individual teacher's encounter with it, such as the official Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate curricula.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have worked to situate this study both in the context of broader teacher education research as well as within the specific field of social studies/history education research. I argue that much of the research on teacher identity focuses either on pre-service teachers or teachers who have retired, thus overlooking how experienced teachers navigate issues related to their identity, both as teachers and via the multiple identities they see comprising their sense of self. In addition, beyond examining the relationship between teacher beliefs, social studies/history education has not widely taken up research that looks at the racial, gender, socioeconomic, or religious identity of teachers and the influence that has on understanding their relation to the curriculum.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

The following chapter is divided into two sections. The first deals with methodological considerations important to understanding how a poststructural theoretical framework plays a role in how the study was conducted. In this section, I will outline key ways in which poststructural considerations impacted the collection, interpretation, and reporting of data. In the second section, I will outline and justify the methods used in this study, as well as elaborate on the context of the research, including an introduction to each of the teachers involved.

Methodological Considerations

This qualitative study is informed by poststructural and psychoanalytic approaches to research. This means the theoretical framework not only speaks to the topic being explored in this dissertation but also to the methodology being employed. Therefore, the theoretical lenses and commitments that underlie the study are present throughout each stage of the research. Instead of collecting data and applying a theory at the analysis stage, poststructural and psychoanalytic approaches require the researcher to "think with theory" (Jackson and Mazzei, 2012) and understand that theory is playing a role as data is collected, analyzed, and represented in writing. Participants and researcher are constantly interacting with and informing one another (and the data) and it is important for those relationships, and the theoretical lenses each brings to the interaction and production of knowledge, to be understood as part of the research process. The theoretical lenses being applied to the research inform how data is read, with different insights and conclusions being made possible when different lenses are applied to the data, thus avoiding the claim that there is a single way to read data or that truth is inherent in the text.

As outlined in the previous chapter, using a poststructural lens allows for a discursive analysis of the data generated from this study. Because of this, data analysis is more than establishing direct links between what a teacher says and what they do. Rather, there is a need to attend to the systems of knowledge that produce both teachers' responses, as well as the teachers' identities. These discourses are detectable via traces found within language, though the meaning of that language, and language itself, is always unstable and subject to change (Belsey, 2006) and is not "inherent in the text, or given by the author (the teacher), but rather created by the meanings and assumptions brought to it by the reader" (the researcher) (Martusewicz, 2001, p. 12). As a result, there is no single, correct reading of a text, but multiple ways to engage in textual interpretation that will differ across readers and contexts.

In addition, while I do not directly employ psychoanalytic theory in this dissertation (I position it more as a form of poststructural thinking), this study is informed by psychoanalytic frames of thought. These frames illuminate the internal and unconscious processes at work as teachers interact with the curriculum. These frames also assume that these processes influence the degree to which one takes up or resists particular understandings of the past, of themselves, of their students, and/or of the social contexts an individual inhabits. Garrett (2017) states that, as teachers, "what we think of as our own individual selves are always in relation to investments of who we think we are based on our personal histories" (p. 51). This conception of how the self is constructed is especially important when thinking about how memories are taken up by teachers and used to form justify particular ways of understanding oneself in the present. Psychoanalytic frames allow me, as the researcher, to pose questions that move away from more rational engagements with the past and instead focus on the internal and affective elements at play when one engages with history.

Data Collection

Poststructural approaches to research assume that meaning is created in the interactions between and among discourses and individuals. Therefore, interviews were semi-structured in order to acknowledge these interactions and provide a degree of flexibility in each interview. While I developed a sequence of specific prompts to engage teachers' thinking (Appendix A), I did not bound myself to that particular sequence as that would have prohibited me from following the natural flow of conversation and the different directions the interview might have taken. As I progressed through the study, I also added questions specifically targeted towards each of my participants in order to further explore issues that had come up in prior interviews or observations. While each interview during the course of the study covered similar ground, there were also prompts that more pointedly engaged the experiences of each individual.

In addition to a semi-structured format, I also used active interviewing techniques. Active interviewing, as defined by Holstein and Gubrium (1995), seeks to engage both the interviewer and the respondent in the act of meaning-making as a means of bringing out the "subject behind the respondent" (p. 14). Therefore, it is necessary to pay attention to how the interaction of interviewer and respondent shapes what is said and how it is said, necessitating that the interviewer be fully present in order to take cues from the respondent for how to further conduct the interview (Holstein and Gubrium, 1995). Following the poststructural focus on how a person constructs meaning through discourse (and is simultaneously constructed through discourse), the respondent must be seen in light of how they are actively responding to the interviewer, so that they are viewed as more than just a keeper of knowledge that is waiting to be accessed correctly via the perfect question. Concurrently, the interviewer also needs to pay attention to the way in which they are implicated in the interview: how their body language, facial expressions, position

as a researcher, personal interests, and threads of conversation they take up play a role in the development of the interview's content and the nature of the respondent's answers.

Throughout the data collection phase, I paid close attention to how each participant positioned themselves in response to my questions. Active interviewing also entails the use of "positional shifts" where respondents, either by their own choice or by request of the interviewer, take on the perspective of another person or identity (Holstein and Gubrium, 1995). This technique was especially important in this study as identities are constituted both via the individual as well as outside contexts. All of my participants, for example, tied certain elements of how their sense of self entered into the classroom in terms of the specific context they taught in. In order to get a more nuanced view of how they were positioning and constructing themselves, I would, for example, ask them to explain what they would do if they taught at different schools with different demographics. In this specific example, the use of positional shifts allowed for more nuanced understandings of the connection between self, place, and conceptions of students.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was also driven by poststructural theory, which meant I always had to center the idea that truth is not found in the data, but rather through the work of interpreting and reading that data. As poststructuralism demands that we move beyond the words uttered in interviews as raw data waiting to be mined for the explicit meaning/truth of its speaker, my focus was not solely on what participants said or did, but also how and why they responded in the ways they did and what impact those choices had. I also paid attention to the pauses, silences, and omissions that could indicate a struggle to put ideas into language or an absence that could give further contour to understanding how a participant was thinking.

My analysis followed Miles and Huberman's (1994) approach to qualitative data analysis where I read through transcripts and observation notes searching for patterns and themes both within and across participants. These themes were not just focused on what participants said but also the motivating processes and discourses at play in the data. St. Pierre and Jackson (2014) argue that in order "to code data… one must assume that words actualized in interview transcripts and field notes are not only data but brute data that can be broken apart and decontextualized by coding…" and that these words "can be sorted into categories that somehow naturally and miraculously 'emerge' as if anyone could see them" (p. 716). Therefore, while I coded, I worked to avoid decontextualizing the words of my participants as well as the idea that truth was inherent in what participants said. As a result, I situate my participants' words in the context from which they came by providing detailed descriptions of their practice. I also recognize that the themes that I identified are reflective of the kinds of ideas that connect to my interests. For example, while I did not originally intend to write about memory (Chapter 4) in this study, it is unsurprising that those ideas would still emerge from my reading of the text due to my own background with that field. While I followed a more traditional form of qualitative analysis, I tried to at least partially address the concerns that St. Pierre and Jackson raise by working to keep data contextualized as well as by recognizing that the themes I identified are in no way natural or indicative of a universal truth.

I also worked to bring my own positionality to bear on my data analysis and interpretation. Throughout the study, I was implicated in constructing my own identities as researcher and former history teacher. Therefore, I tried to account for the ways I constructed meaning both about myself and my research participants, as well as ways in which I was complicit in the same processes that my participants were. I have worked to remain cognizant of

the threads that I took up as well as those that I ignored or did not explore. As I worked through data collection and analysis, I continually asked how I was implicated in the data, both in terms of how I positioned the teachers I worked with as well as how I interpreted what was said. For example, in Chapter 3 I discuss how teachers implicate their personal identities in the curriculum that they design and teach. One of the findings in that chapter relates to how the participants in this study did not fully implicate identities that they saw as having in common with their students. For example, two of my three participants did not consider ways in which their social class identity played a role in their curricular decision-making, perhaps in part because they saw their own social class reflected in their perceptions of and the lived experiences of their students. I was engaged in this same process in conducting this study. While I raised questions, for example, about social class, gender, and race, I never once asked my participants about their sexual orientation and the possible role that identity played in how they understood and navigated their curriculum. I believe the lack of attention to this identity stemmed from my own identity as a heterosexual, reflective of dominant societal discourse, and my knowledge of each participant's relationship with their spouse or partner, thus leading me to simultaneously ignore sexual orientation as an identity of interest in this study and the potential complexity of my participants' sexual orientation which could differ from my assumptions about what those identities were.

I also had to account for the complex power relations that existed between me and my research participants. Following Foucault's (1980) dispersed conception of power, both the context of the interviews and the hierarchical assumptions about the relationship between participant and researcher impacted how data was generated. On the one hand, as a researcher I exerted power through the very idea that the questions I asked and the topics I was exploring

were legitimate concerns that needed to be addressed. Combined with the hierarchical aspects of my relationship to my participants, especially to Rob and Julie who were both former students of mine, there were times that participants aimed to give me "good" answers that they hoped would please me or that would fit some conception of what a "right" answer to a research question should look like. At the same time, though, my research participants also exerted power in the research process. Interviews were conducted in their classrooms where they held more authority, they played a role in determining what lessons and units and I observed, and they chose what information to share and what to keep to themselves. Paying attention to the way in which their responses were produced and justified and the role that different forms of power relations played in the genesis of those responses was an important component of the process of data analysis.

While the methods outlined below could have resulted in a study that solely looked at what teachers say they think and how that relates to what they actually do, I am searching for a more complex engagement that considers the discourses that elicit particular responses and forms of engagement. As a result, I focused my attention on the complex ways the teachers I worked with narrated themselves and acknowledge that any narration or meaning-making is in a constant state of flux, dependent upon the contexts in which they are being enacted. I thus view the identities captured in this study as snapshots of my participants at a given time, place, and context. It is not my intention to present these identities as static in any way.

Methods

Research Phases

This study was conducted in three phases during the 2017-2018 school year, with data collection occurring between December 2017 and May 2018. The first phase consisted of a semi-structured (and audio-taped) interview with each of the teachers involved in the study. On

average, these interviews lasted between one and two hours and focused on building an understanding of how each participant constituted their self in relation to being a history teacher. Topics included background information about each teacher, specifically focused on important elements of their identity, how and why they entered into teaching, their own experiences as history students and how they conceptualize their vision for history education and their perceptions of the allowances and limitations that allow enactment of that vision. This interview was meant to prompt and engage the teachers' thinking about the multiple identities they inhabit and how those may or may not connect to their current practice.

All interviews, in this and subsequent phases, were conducted at each participant's school, with the majority of interviews taking place in each participant's classroom or, if unavailable, another space in the school, like the library. Interviews were held in participants' schools for convenience. Due to teachers' schedules and my need to often visit multiple school sites in a day, it was easier to conduct interviews immediately before or after school or during teachers' prep periods. The advantage in conducting interviews in participants' classrooms was that materials were on hand to discuss, teachers could make reference to where interactions with students had taken place and I was able to develop an understanding of who each participant was in the context of their classroom space when students were not present. Drawbacks to the use of classrooms as interview sites were interruptions from students, colleagues, or whole school announcements, as well as the potential that teachers would not divulge more sensitive information for fear of being overheard. Overall, the advantages outweighed the disadvantages as teachers typically seemed at ease and were forthcoming with information that was critical of themselves, their schools, and their students.

The second phase consisted of a series of audio-taped interviews and field observations that focused on the teachers' perceived connection between her/his self and the curriculum, specifically considering how each teacher plans, implements and enacts two units of study. Each unit included an interview conducted prior to teaching in order to make connections from the first phase of data collection and delve into teachers' curriculum planning and development as well as their own experiences with the content they were going to teach.

I then observed the teacher during the implementation of the unit, taking notes on their interactions with students as well as how they presented and justified the information and how the teacher inserted or distanced themselves from the information at hand. I looked for places where teachers made decisions about what to stress about a topic or the information they would include and exclude from their coverage as a means to generate follow-up questions regarding why they made the choices they did. As each unit was relatively short (most were between five and eight days long), I attended the majority of lessons.

Based on the events of a class, I, at times, conducted follow-up interviews with the teachers or, if they were unavailable to speak, I would email them any questions I had. At the end of each unit, I conducted another interview for the teacher to reflect on how the unit went, what they would change and why and how/where they saw themselves in each unit. This process was repeated for each unit I observed. The final interview not only recapped the second unit, but also included questions to help bring data collection to a close and reflect back on the larger themes of the dissertation. Data collection for the second phase also included field observation notes, researcher memos and the collection of documents related to teaching each unit, such as curricular materials. Including phase one, each teacher was interviewed at least five times. Interviews were transcribed shortly after being conducted in order to revisit any salient points

with participants in the next interview. This also allowed for data collection to be informed by ongoing data analysis.

The third and final phase of data collection was my own reflection on who I am and how elements of my self were present as I interacted with my participants, observed their teaching, and made decisions about what elements of the data to draw out and what to ignore. For this phase I drafted my own reflections on the process as a whole as a means to think about the development of my own identity and the identity that was in part co-constructed with the individuals I worked with.

Research Context

This research study is rooted in the work of three high school American history teachers. I decided to focus on American history because I assumed that the topics found in that course would be more likely to connect to my participants' own identities as Americans, or at least to their own experience growing up surrounded by cultural narratives about that subject. The participants of this study have been purposefully invited to participate due to previous interactions with them in classroom or research settings. Julie and Rob were both former students who were members of an advanced social studies methods course that was largely focused on theorizing from their experiences and practice as student-teaching interns. Though they both took the same course from me, I did not have them during the same year and, to my knowledge, they did not know one another. Paul was a participant in a large research study that I was involved in, and our time together resulted in several conversations focused on research and theoretical considerations of the field.

All three of these teachers enjoy engaging in critical and theoretical conversations and think about the field of history education in very thoughtful ways. Therefore, their inclusion is

not meant to create a representation of teachers at different points in their careers or who speak to a specific demographic. Rather they were invited to participate because of their thoughtfulness and willingness to engage in the issues this study seeks to explore. While I chose each of these participants because I knew they would be willing to talk about the issues I wanted to explore, I also assumed that our pre-existing relationships would create a degree of comfort and willingness to be open with me about their identities and experiences. I wanted to hit the ground running and wanted participants who would potentially be more willing to be open from the very first interview.

For the most part, this assumption was borne out. I had, in my opinion, a very easy rapport with all three teachers, who, in turn, spoke with candor about who they are, how they struggle with elements of their identity and what they think about various facets of history education. Communication was very open, resulting in ease with scheduling interviews and observations and I felt like a welcome guest throughout my time in each classroom.

There were ways, though, that our pre-existing relationships impacted the research. Although Paul was part of a previous study, he and I had limited interaction with one another and I had not had much one-on-one time with him. Paul was an eager participant and loved the idea of being a part of a research study. As we are the same age and have similar interests, our conversations were very open and friendly. When we discussed what happened in class, it was as though we were peers and I was just another member of his teaching team. There were times, though, when Paul assumed that I might have an answer to an education-related question due to my research background and that he wished I could send whatever I wrote about him to his principal to show how good a teacher he was, though he knew the purpose of the study was not evaluative. While my interactions with Rob and Julie were also very positive, they were

impacted by our previous teacher-student relationship. On the first day in each class, Rob and Julie both took time to introduce me to their classes as their former teacher and both seemed to take pride in showing off who they were in the classroom and what they had learned from their time with me (though, it is worth noting that both mentioned often wondering if I could guess where they were going with a lesson or realized that they had learned a specific way of thinking from me). Despite my best efforts, our interactions often seemed to revert to a teacher-student model. Rob, for example, was often concerned about giving the right answer or relaying a good story. Whereas Paul was pleased to be a part of a research study, Rob (who I think also was) wanted to make sure he was pleasing me, even though I always responded that there was no such thing as a wrong response or bad story. Rob and Julie also often wanted to know what I thought of how their lessons went and I worked to avoid being evaluative, though, for my part, I would sometimes recommend resources or help them think through an issue they were having.

The schools my participants taught at were all located in predominantly white, affluent communities. Just as my research participants do not represent a cross-section of teachers, my research sites do not represent the range of schooling contexts in Michigan. They do, however, allow for opportunities to think about this study's issues in various ways related to their form (public school vs. program within a public school) and curricular imperatives (AP vs. Interdisciplinary Study vs. IB).

I had recruited the participants in this study because I was familiar with their attitudes towards thinking about larger issues in history education and believed they would be interested and willing to take part in the study. Though I was not familiar with their teaching, I was fortunate to work with three compelling teachers doing interesting and vital work in their classrooms. I went into this study hoping that I would see some interesting lessons and came out

having seen teaching that challenged students to contend with issues of race and gender and challenged them to develop an appreciation for multiples perspectives and the connection between history and the present world we inhabit.

Research Sites and Participants

One of the challenges when writing about how one constitutes oneself is that all of my participants are the sum of their various parts and not at certain moments one element and at others another. To be certain, different aspects of oneself may be highlighted at different times, but it's not as though one is a woman at one point in time and young at another or white at one moment and straight at another. As a result, while I will at times be talking about my participants' sense of self in distinct, targeted ways, I recognize that often the picture is more complicated than I am painting but that my choices are meant to highlight specific ways of thinking about whatever issues are at hand. The introductions below are meant to provide a glimpse of each participant's personality and the context in which they work. I will not delve too deeply into aspects of their identities at this point, as those will be explored in greater depth throughout the findings chapters.

Julie Matthews.

Julie is a twenty-four-year-old white woman in her second year teaching AP U.S. history at Park Lake High School. Park Lake is a small, predominantly white, middle-class community located about thirty miles away from a mid-size Midwestern city with a large healthcare system and public university. When I asked Julie about her identity, she mentioned her roles as a mediator and as an organizer, identities she saw as being important to understanding her professionally and personally. As a mediator, Julie always wanted to ensure that everyone's voice was heard and would "let go of [her] own opinions" and play Devil's Advocate to support

students with minority opinions. She saw her organizational skills taking root in how she organized and presented information and in being able to always think multiple steps ahead. Julie reported that it was the organizational elements of planning curriculum that drew her to teaching, as opposed to working with students.

Julie's mother is a world history teacher at the high school in Julie's hometown. Because of this, Julie grew up in school, "riding her scooter around the halls" and she reported that school "felt like home." For one of her birthdays in elementary school, she received an overhead projector, which she added to the pretend classroom she would play in at home. As a high school student, she "always tried to be more, tried to do more." She was the class president and editor of the school yearbook. Julie planned on attending a prestigious public university, but when she received her acceptance letter she questioned whether or not that's what she really wanted. Much to the surprise and chagrin of many of her friends and family members, Julie decided to go to a different public university instead, a school that, in the eyes of her friends, had less prestige. After a semester as a Writing for Publication major (her father wanted her to be an editor), she changed to Interdisciplinary Social Studies and the teacher education pathway.

Upon graduation, Julie accepted the AP U.S. History position at Park Lake and is in her second year teaching there. Most of the teachers at Park Lake have been teaching for quite some time, and Julie sees herself as part of a younger cohort of teachers hired in recent years that are shaking up how classes are taught and taking initiative to develop new curricular approaches. Her principal recently told her that he views her as a leader in the school who is "interested in doing what's best for students." Even though she loves teaching, Julie doesn't see herself in the classroom for more than ten years. "I've always been progressing towards something," she told me. "I'm teaching an AP class; this is as good as it gets. I'm used to climbing a ladder and I

don't have a ladder to climb here." Julie imagines that she might do something with educational technology or curriculum design, perhaps starting her own consulting business.

In the classroom, Julie sees herself as having a different personality than she does in real life. With students, Julie can be silly and dramatic in order to drive home points that she is trying to make. In her personal life, though Julie noted that she's "usually the quieter one" who steers the conversation but only jumps in occasionally and that she's "not a funny person." Julie also works to cultivate a boring, domestic image of her home life. She assumes that students have ideas about who she is based on the social reputation of the university she attended and having been a sorority member. Therefore, she tries to curb students' imagination about what she does in her free time.

Julie's classroom is bright and the walls are adorned with colorful posters depicting the presidents, notable front pages from the *New York Times*, collages of each decade of the 20th century, and posters with tips for reading primary sources. The desks are arranged in groups of four (each desk facing forwards) in a semi-circle facing the front of the room. Julie's desk is at the front of the room, tucked in the corner near the door. She wishes that she could move her desk to the small room that acts as a breezeway between her classroom and the neighboring teachers' classroom, but can not because of the internet hookup. While not ideal, she is glad that "it's out of the way of where the learning happens."

Julie's room is decorated with pieces that reflect elements of her identity. On one cabinet there is a collection of Lego models representing major American landmarks, such as the White House and Lincoln Memorial, that her father built for her (her mother's classroom contains models of world landmarks). Behind her desk, on a bulletin board, are a graphic of her university mascot, the seal of the state fire marshal's office (she used to work for them), and various letters

and awards showing her accomplishments, which she puts up "because [she] likes the students to know [she's] proud when [she does] something and [she] likes to share that." Julie explained that she wants students to see her classroom "as a positive space but also dedicated to a specific purpose. I want them to feel they are immersed in U.S. history."

Julie would often talk about how she felt very normal and easy to understand. "I feel like I'm a Plain Jane. I don't know. Pretty straightforward," she told me as we wrapped up our initial conversation about her identity. Later, she added "I also lived in that middle class white family where everything was good… I just had a very good, happy, well-informed childhood." In these moments Julie recognized that her upbringing and background kept her from knowing certain information about the world, but still keeps from being fully implicated because she is a "Plain Jane" that has had a "traditional" life.

I observed two units in Julie's class. The first, which lasted seven days, was on the Progressive Movement. I was able to attend six out of the seven days, only missing a student work day. The second unit was a five-day look at World War II. I was able to attend four out of the five lessons, missing the lesson on Japanese Internment.

Rob Castillo.

Rob is a twenty-six-year-old Mexican American/Latino male in his third year of teaching at Northrup High School, a public school of choice that uses the International Baccalaureate (IB) program, located in Northrup, a predominantly white, upper middle class suburb of a large Midwestern city. While the population of Northrup is predominantly white, the student population of the high school is overwhelmingly Asian, with a majority of students being of Indian or Middle Eastern decent.

Rob started our first interview talking about navigating his own racial identity. Rob's father immigrated from Mexico as a young man and strongly identifies as Mexican, believing Latino to be a made-up identity and disliking Hispanic's connotation of Spanish heritage. Rob remembered being a child and having to navigate the often confusing way in which the U.S. government and other institutions classify ethnic identity. Because his mother is white, Rob also had to navigate how his peers viewed him. In fourth or fifth grade, one friend asked him "are you more white or more black?" Initially Rob thought he meant in terms of pop culture preferences, but later realized he "didn't fit into the box that [his friend] understood." Rob considers his racial/ethnic identity to be somewhat in flux as he continues to learn more about himself, but currently identifies as Mexican American as it's the "utilitarian, that is what I am" label that fits him, but also as Latino because of the "more connected, almost racial tie to it."

Beyond his racial/ethnic identity, Rob's identity as a globally-minded, rational thinker was also very important to him. He often spoke about his desire to be open to multiple perspectives, especially in the transformation of his own political identity from being a "bleeding heart liberal" who would often have knee-jerk reactions to events to being more thoughtful and methodical to his approach towards interpreting current events.

Both of Rob's parents valued education, which contributed to his becoming a teacher. His mother teaches Kindergarten and his father dropped out of school after seventh grade, returning to finish school three years later after realizing he did not want to work on a farm. Rob also had a number of positive teaching role models who had a profound impact on him as a student. Combined with his beliefs that "education [is] a way to right some of the wrongs that society has placed on us" and that "education really can be a great equalizer," Rob enrolled as a history major with a secondary education focus at a large public university.

In his role as a teacher, Rob sees himself as a mentor, especially to students who enroll at his school from outside the district. He sees himself as being able to empower students and provide opportunities they wouldn't otherwise have. He noted when he's looking at the students in his class who open-enroll, he thinks "you grew up in a rough part of town and if you would have gone to your neighborhood school, you may have been just fine. But you're here and you're going to do amazing. Even if this is just a stepping stone, let me hold it up for you. I love being your stepping stone." One way in which he does this is by being the co-sponsor of the school Diversity Club, which he sees as a way to make other students aware of identity issues they may not have previously been aware of.

In the classroom, Rob takes on a very calm demeanor. He rarely raises his voice and speaks in a very calm and soothing tone. He often dedicates the first part of class to informal discussions with students about their weekends or what they are interested in. During one lesson, Rob and his class had a long conversation about the movie *Black Panther*. In another, students discussed what they did on their spring breaks. During these times, Rob often elicits a lot of personal information from his students, but rarely shares information about himself. This is because he feels that as a young teacher, he needs to maintain boundaries. "For a lot of kids," he said, "I'm the same age as their siblings. Obviously I have a different relationship with them… I don't want to end up in any situation in which students view me as something other than a mentor." As a result, Rob does not share his age, relationship status, or other, more personal, details with them. He does bring his ethnic identity into the class, especially in more informal situations such as discussing naming conventions in different cultures, but again, does not share too much as he feels he's on "a pedestal or with a spotlight on me. If they don't like it, then that's going to feel like a personal attack on me."

Rob's classroom has student desks arranged in groups of four around the room. It is a messy classroom, with papers piled on the desk and along the windowsill. A row of soccer scarves hang above the windows and student work covers every bulletin board. On the white board at the front of the room there is a space to put sticky notes with thoughts and reactions to topics covered in class as well as a list of the class discussion norms. In the back corner of the room sitting on top of a file cabinet is a student art piece that depicts a bust of Nixon and the word OBEY in all caps below it. Rob likes talking about Nixon and finds it funny to have him constantly lurking in the background, though he doubts any of the students notice or get it. Rob's room is also used by one of the Spanish teachers, so he does not have much time in it by himself. He usually has a Mexican flag hanging in the room but he has not had the time to put it up yet.

I observed two units in Rob's classroom. Northrup High School uses block scheduling, so class periods were 90 minutes long and met every other day. I was able to attend four out of the five lessons, missing the bulk of a lesson on Japanese Internment. The second unit focused on the Civil Rights Movement and lasted eight class periods. I was able to attend five of those periods, missing two days that were primarily student work days, one in which Rob was absent, and the final wrap-up seminar on what students learned from the unit.

Paul Kacprzak.

Paul is a thirty-five-year-old white male in his fourth year teaching as part of the Interdisciplinary Studies Program (ISP), which combines history and language arts at Roosevelt High School in Scarborough, a predominantly white, affluent suburb of a large Midwestern city. When asked about important elements of his identity, Paul immediately mentioned that a key component was his relationship to his family, particularly the strong bond and respect that he has for his wife, who he considers to be an equal partner in every endeavor he undertakes. Paul also

noted that, citing a joke from *Saturday Night Live*, he has "rabies for learning" and is constantly reading and learning new information. He also spoke a lot about his identity as a Christian, a theme that will be taken up further in Chapter 3.

Paul's path to teaching was more circuitous than the other participants. Originally, Paul was going to be a theater major, having been active in his school's theater department as a student. After trying out that major, he ended up switching college and enrolled to become a minister, but moved away from that when he realized "there will be a day when I stand up in front of a congregation of people and I will be tired, maybe hungry and I'll just phone it in." Paul did not want to reduce someone's religious experience to him getting a paycheck, so he combined his love of theater and his passion for working with people and decided to be a teacher. He ended up enrolling as a history major, though he is dual certified in history and English. Traces of his past majors are present in Paul's teaching; he speaks in a booming voice and uses repetition in order to get his important points across.

At school, Paul is a part of the Interdisciplinary Studies Program and works with five other teachers to create and implement an interdisciplinary curriculum for a group of 160 students spread across all four grade levels. Outside of ISP, Paul teaches English classes, advises an after-school writing club and directs plays at a local theater. Due to the nature of ISP, the teachers have very easy-going relationships with the students. Paul is no exception. He often jokes around with students, loves to reference popular culture, and directs students to resources they might find interesting. He also engages in what he calls "Dad Mode" where he can be strict about something that he feels is in the best interest of a student, even though they may disagree. In general, Paul has a very easy rapport with students built on mutual respect.

Paul exudes a hip, nerdy vibe that is reflected in both his dress (bowties with patterned shirts) and his classroom. He sees his classroom as a direct reflection of himself. There is art on the walls created by his wife, son, daughter and himself. In the back corner is a cardboard cutout of Darth Vader that Paul got in high school. Instead of the customary presidential portraits found in most history classrooms, Paul has a set of drawings of the vice presidents called "Veeptopus," which depicts a typical bust portrait of each, with an octopus on top of their head. Paul's desk is in the front, left corner of the room, almost acting as a barricade from the rest of the class with him inside. Paul explained that his room is so infused with him because "when you walk in, you want to get the personality. You want it to be a nice, safe place, you want it to be happy and then you want shit to look at when you're bored." He sees the various elements of the room as opportunities to connect with kids when they ask who painted a piece of art or why he has certain objects on display in his room.

The Interdisciplinary Studies Program is a two-hour block where language arts and social studies curriculum is taught together in a four-year curricular cycle – American, Global, Western Civilization, and Anthropology. The 2017-18 school year was the American year. The core classes of ISP are based on a seminar model where students discuss key texts related to the time period and are mixed-age, meaning that any seminar includes a variety of students from all four grade levels. In addition to core classes, there are trimester electives and year-long grade-level requirement classes. These classes typically meet once a week, though they may be moved or canceled for a week if there is some other element of the program that takes precedence. Because of this varied schedule, I actually saw Paul teach a number of classes. I observed two core units. The first was focused on the 1920s and primarily centered on reading *The Great Gatsby*. The second was a unit on the 1950s and 1960s that first looked at the sanitized and idealized vision of

the 1950s that dominates popular culture and then moved towards the more complex realities, especially centered on racism and the Civil Rights Movement. I also had the opportunity to observe portions of Paul's economics class, the grade-level requirement for juniors, as well as his electives on Ralph Ellison's *Invisible Man* and American science fiction in short stories and short films.

Researcher Positionality

Key to qualitative research is the need to understand one's own positionality as the researcher. In many ways the experience of this project has been about the construction of my own identity as a researcher. As I observed my participants, I felt an urge to focus in on the curricular decisions they made and was often tempted to chime in during class discussions. These impulses were connected to my own identities as a former American history teacher and social studies teacher educator as well as my immersion in the day-to-day aspects of a history classroom for the first time in years. While I did largely remain external to the class proceedings, there were a handful of instances where I posed a questions or was invited to contribute by the participant. Throughout the study, though, I had to be sure that I was focusing on the questions I had set out to ask and not be distracted by other issues I became curious about during the course of the study.

Beyond my own personal identity formation, I also had to take into consideration how I positioned my participants. I have already discussed how our pre-existing relationships shaped the nature of our interactions, but I also needed to consider how my status as a straight, white, able-bodied male acting in the role of researcher played a role in positioning participants in specific ways. What did it mean to talk to Julie about issues of gender as a man who has not personally experienced the issues at stake? What did it mean for Rob and I to discuss the

uncertainty around his racial identity when I have always been certain of my own racial identity? How, if at all, did my Catholic upbringing and my own uncertainties and ambivalences around organized religion impact how Paul talked about his own Christian identity? In many ways, I don't know the answers to these questions, but I will take them up in the preludes for each findings chapter.

Beyond how my own identity was at work in carrying out the study, a brief biographical sketch of how I came to this project might help illuminate my motivations and ideas about the relationship between the self and curriculum. Prior to pursuing my doctorate, I taught middle school social studies for ten years in central Illinois. As a beginning teacher, I did not see the way in which I was implicated in the curricular choices I made; the curriculum was the curriculum and I was there to implement it. As a result, I thought that I was a neutral entity that did not influence what was possible for my students to learn. In my 6th year of teaching. I moved to a small, nonsectarian private school where I was hired, and given complete control, to write and implement the middle school social studies curriculum. It was through this process that I began to realize how my curricular choices did not reflect some sort of objective reading of the past, but rather were a reflection of my own values, experiences, and conceptions of the discipline of history.

Beyond developing course curriculum, the school's founder was very particular about how the physical space of the school should be arranged to convey our values. Therefore, she was very precise about how each classroom should be decorated and she preferred a very finished, almost museum-like aesthetic. I chose to adorn my walls with photos of historical sites I had visited that were connected to various units I would be teaching about. While I considered these photos, such as a shot of Roman architecture in Ephesus, Turkey, to simply be a reflection

of the kinds of history we would study, they marked the curriculum as an outgrowth of my own experiences and worked to construct the curriculum just as much as reflect it.

Having also taught during multiple presidential elections, I came to see how my own political values and worldview played a role in shaping my curriculum. Students are often curious about the political orientation of their teachers and it was a question I was constantly presented with. Though I often did not shy away from sharing my viewpoints, I never gave students a label that they could fix their misconceptions to or that would collapse the nuance of individual political thought, instead telling them that it was obvious if they paid attention to what we covered and discussed in my class. When discussing the Gilded Age, for example, I stressed the viewpoints and experiences of the labor movement and working class individuals instead of the prominent industrialists of the time. Similarly, my unit on Reconstruction focused on competing visions of freedom and rights in postbellum America and the ultimate failure of the government to secure a multiracial political structure in the face of white supremacy. The centrality of race, gender, and class and a critical view of the past (and present) were deeply embedded in my curriculum, not because they were the "correct" way to analyze history, but because I believed they were the best approaches to engage students' thinking about society, especially when considering the kinds of thinkers I wanted to help shape for the good of our society both in the present and future.

My understanding of history is always developing but at the core I have always been interested in why historical actors made the choices they did. This interest connects to my own interests as a researcher as I seek to uncover the underlying mechanisms that shape how and why teachers make decisions or how, more broadly, we construct and make meaning from narratives about the past. As a doctoral student, I have become deeply interested in issues related to the

relationship between collective memory and history and how our understandings of narratives of the past are always mediated through our selves via elements of our own identities, experiences, and beliefs. I believe there is much potential for how we teach and learn about the past if we understand the way people make sense of it and acknowledge that such sense-making is mediated via a host of processes, many inaccessible to us, and always partial and subject to change. In short, my self is deeply inscribed in this study and the issues raised here are issues that are reflective of my own intellectual trajectory and ones that I think may prove fruitful for the field moving forward.

CHAPTER THREE

INTELLECTUAL AND SOCIO-CULTURAL IDENTITIES

Introduction

In this chapter I explore the way that teachers' personal identities are implicated in the curriculum in order to complicate our understanding of how a teacher constructs and is constructed by their curricular decision-making. These processes are important because they have implications for how the curriculum is interpreted and enacted and the way in which the impact of an identity is felt through curricular decision-making. In addition, engagement with identity can either open or close dialogue about issues related to factors such as race, gender, class, and religion. Identities are multiple and fluid, intersecting and interacting in different ways in different contexts. For the sake of this chapter, I divide the identities that teachers addressed into two categories: intellectual and socio-cultural. I define intellectual identities as those that reflect how they navigate the world around them and/or the character traits they see as making them who they are (e.g., caring). I define socio-cultural identities as factors such as race, gender, class, and religion. Most socio-cultural identities are present at birth, but their meaning to an individual is mediated by societal discourse that favors some identities over others. Intellectual and socio-cultural identities are intertwined, but separating them for the sake of the chapter will hopefully make my points clearer. Drawing on Butler (1990) and Jenkins (2014), this chapter explores identity as something that someone does as opposed to something that someone has. In other words, an identity takes on meaning as it is enacted and discursively contended with, in this case, through the lens of the curriculum.

Using data from interviews and classroom observations, I argue that various elements of each participant's identity are present in the curricular choices they make, both in terms of how content is selected and interpreted as well as how that content is pedagogically implemented. I begin by looking at how and why each teacher makes claims about and implicates the intellectual aspects of their identity in the curriculum, observable through their underlying purposes of history education, structure of learning activities and interactions with students. I then explore how elements of each teacher's sociocultural identity (e.g., gender, social class, race, age, etc.) are asserted through the curriculum via the ways a teacher may interpret and enact content. By exploring these ideas, I argue that a teacher's self is connected to what happens in their classroom in multifaceted ways as they enact elements of their identity in curricular translation and that, at times, curriculum can be a space for teachers to work through uncertainties related to their own identity. I end by briefly touching on implications for thinking about these kinds of connections and what can be gained by teachers thinking more deeply about their own implication in the curriculum.

Intellectual Identities

I started the first interview of this study by asking participants to tell me about themselves and, in doing so, to identify two or three identities they considered important for understanding them. Two out of my three participants began this process by referencing intellectual or attitudinal elements of their identity, meaning that the facets they focused on had to do with how they mentally navigate the world around them and/or how they wish to be seen by others. Julie explained that two of the most important facets of her identity, both in her personal and professional lives, were that she was a mediator and that she was very organized. Julie saw herself as a mediator in her personal life because she was the point person for her

family, contacting others and serving as a go between when there was a need. In addition, when out with a group of friends, Julie would often sit back and let other people talk, jumping in to contribute to and guide the conversation as needed. Julie saw her identity as an organizer taking shape in the way she was always focused on what needed to get done and her knack for thinking multiple steps ahead. This was evident in her wedding planning as she mentioned only having one final day of prep work with the wedding still over two weeks away.

Paul immediately shared that a key component of his identity was being a part of the larger whole of his immediate family, as well as his love of learning and his caring disposition. Paul explained that, having been together for almost half of their lives, he and his wife had experienced several formative moments together, so, he claimed, "every decision I make is going to filter towards this other person… and their input is valued on an equal level to mine." Paul's love of learning is evidenced by his time spent reading. "I'm an avid reader," he explained, "I think a lot, very introspective. I just want to learn. I want to know everything about everything." Paul visits a variety of news sites to gain a wide perspective on the world, including NPR, CNN, the *New York Times*, *Washington Post* and Fox News.

Paul's most dominant identity was that he saw himself as caring, a trait that he positioned as the result of his Christianity, and that took shape in how he dealt with other people. Paul did not see his Christian identity as being directly reflected in his teaching because he wanted to be "encouraging and inclusive of all faiths," and did not want to "intimidate students and come across as proselytizing." Yet, his intellectual Christian identity was consistent throughout all of Paul's classes (except economics), specifically through his focus on the concept of invisibility and shining a light on the marginalized. Paul's elective on Ralph Ellison's *Invisible Man*, for example, ended with a final project that required students to identify a group of people who go

unnoticed in day-to-day life, interview members of that group and create a presentation about them so that "hopefully we can wake up a little and see them for who they are." During his class on science fiction, Paul dedicated a lesson to the Afro-Futurism movement and the importance of science fiction as a means to promote conceptions of the future where marginalized groups are equal. Paul connected this focus on the invisible to his religious identity, explaining "that's all my Christianity right there. That's where it comes from…[it's] about empathy for others, caring for others, especially the less fortunate. I can basically just read the Beatitudes." While official declarations of religious faith did not find their way into Paul's teaching, the underlying message of many of his lessons was an outgrowth of how he constructed and enacted his Christian identity as being a caring individual as opposed to being focused on dogma.

Rob was the only participant who did not start with intellectual aspects of his identity, but rather started with a discussion of his racial/ethnic identity through moments of childhood confusion concerning what that identity had meant. While I can't say for sure what led Rob to lead our discussion with race (was it our discussion before the interview about the Diversity Club he co-sponsored? Was it due to him using the template of an identity activity he recently used with that group? Was it because when a white person asks a racial minority about who they are, they are immediately positioned as other?), it was notable that he, the lone racial minority in this study, began with a discussion of the uncertainties he felt about his race and gender, while Julie and Paul focused on personal traits. Due to time constraints, we were not able to finish the first interview in one sitting. During our follow-up interview, though, Rob mentioned his thinker identity several times, referencing it in relation to almost every other aspect of his self that I was following up on from our first interview. When I asked him why the thinker identity had not come up in our initial interview, Rob suggested that it was because he "had framed out that [he]

was already talking about race and history and culture" due to our conversation before the start of the interview. Again, I am not certain why Rob led with elements of his socio-cultural identities, but believe it might be due to the idea that if one is a racial minority, there is an assumption that that identity structures all of your other identities. Paul and Julie, on the other hand, may not have felt a need to discuss race, as both teach in predominantly white schools, were talking to a white researcher, and live in a society that implicitly rewards whiteness. In our second sit-down together, however, Rob made sure to assert being a thinker as a means of claiming an intellectual identity that he perhaps had not felt the opportunity to previously discuss.

In the rest of this section, I use a poststructural lens to explore how the implication of teachers' intellectual identities is a complex interplay of how they construct their own identity in relation to the curriculum and assumptions they make about how they perceive and are perceived by others. This approach will help complicate the appearance of seemingly straightforward connections between how participants intellectually constructed themselves and what they do in practice.

The Mediator

The connection between participants' intellectual identities, their beliefs about the purpose(s) of history education, and their classroom teaching seem fairly straightforward, thus overlooking the complex ways in which teachers negotiate their identities in those spaces. Julie's mediator identity was connected to her desire for students to

> see beyond the Park Lake bubble. To see that there is a world out there. My goal is bringing to light that there are other issues out there that we can still be looking at so that when they leave home they aren't shocked by what they see or what they talk about.

Even though Julie described her mediator role as "always in the middle and playing Devil's Advocate if needed" by being willing to let go of her opinions to support a student with marginalized opinions, this element of her identity worked in the broader capacity of introducing students to concepts and ideas they had not encountered in their relatively homogenous white, middle class school district. One day during a lesson on the ideological differences between Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. DuBois, for example, students in Julie's class began asking about affirmative action, a policy that frustrated them because of the unfair advantage they interpreted it as providing racial minorities. Using her insider status as a white woman to try and mediate students' understandings. Julie explained "when I went to college and someone told me I got to where I am because I was privileged… I was really upset because I felt like I had worked really hard and I deserved to be there." She continued by explaining to students that kids at Park Lake have a lot of resources to help them be successful, unlike nearby towns that had large African American populations. By the end of the lesson, students still did not like affirmative action, but recognized the disparities that exist.

In the above example, Julie is constructing her identity as a mediator by, borrowing from Butler (1990), performing as one. By doing so, Julie hopes to be recognized as a mediator by her students. By leveraging her whiteness to make a claim that "[she] gets it, [she's] been in their shoes," Julie exposes them to information they have not considered, both in terms of their privilege to ignore the schooling conditions of cash-strapped schools primarily attended by students of color, but also in sharing the experience of someone who once thought like them but now thinks differently. Simultaneously, though, Julie is able to avoid her own potential implication in affirmative action, by focusing the conversation on race and avoiding the way in which that policy also seeks to promote gender equity.

The Rabid Learner

Much like Julie worked to claim and construct an identity as a mediator, Paul worked to bridge his personal identity as a rabid learner to his identity as a teacher. Paul's physical appearance aided in this identity construction and performance. He wore dark-rimmed glasses and had a beard, which lent an air of being slightly older than his 35 years, and most days he dressed in a patterned shirt, with a differently patterned bowtie and the occasional cardigan or sweater. The vibe he gave off was that of a hip, young professor. During seminars, Paul sat at his desk, outside the circle of students. One day, during a seminar on *The Great Gatsby*, students were discussing the extravagance of Gatsby in terms of his wealth. After students mentioned wealth several more times, Paul, who had been staring at his computer, seemingly not paying attention, raised the question "Does Fitzgerald ever talk about wealth?" As students had been discussing, Paul had grown curious about their word choice, looked up an online version of the book and searched for the number of times (4) and the contexts in which "wealth" showed up in the novel. Students asked Paul to look up the frequency of synonyms for wealth, which led to a discussion about the difference between wealth and money, being rich and being wealthy.

Another day, after a particularly contentious debate between a student and practically everyone else, the student approached Paul after class about how he felt about no one taking up his discussion ideas. Paul told the student "in order to steer conversations, you have to ask more questions and make less statements." "But I didn't like their answers," the student responded. "Understanding their answers is a different thing. You need to learn to listen."

In both of these scenarios, Paul was making identity claims about what constitutes a learner, who he is as a learner and how he wants students to perceive him as such. Paul used his curiosity to note an interesting distinction between how students discussed money in *The Great*

Gatsby and how F. Scott Fitzgerald did, then relied on his resources to find an answer. In that single interruption, Paul projected a claim about his curiosity and desire to learn, while simultaneously modeling for students how to ask questions that will prompt deeper discussion. In the interaction with the student after class, Paul again stresses the image that a learner is someone who can defer to others and listen to understand their viewpoints (like Paul does with his wife) and not someone who just airs their thoughts without consequence.

Both Julie and Paul constructed connections between their intellectual identities and their classroom practice in order to back up claims about those facets of their identities. Through her example of being a white person who came to terms with affirmative action, Julie constructed and performed an image of herself as a mediator, in the sense that she represented an unpopular and underrepresented viewpoint in order to challenge students to think differently, as well as in showing her own example as someone who changed their mind about the policy. Paul's largely seminar-based classes allowed him opportunities to construct and display ways in which he was a learner and the benefits that such an identity can have in discussion.

The Thinker

The most consistent intellectual identity, in terms of teaching practice, was Rob's thinker identity. "I really pride trying to be an open-minded and thoughtful person," Rob told me. "I think studying history taught me that a lot." During our second interview, Rob framed several of his other identities in reference to who he was as a thinker. His decision to no longer follow the Catholic faith was a result of his thinker identity allowing him to decide to not "keep practicing [his] faith because that's what [he] always did." It also mediated his political identity. Whereas just a year prior, Rob would have reacted to allegations about sexual misconduct in university athletics programs by wanting the coaches fired or reacted to President Trump's election by

immediately wanting to get him removed from office, his thinker identity came into help him question whether he was "being an ideologue or an opportunist" instead of rationally thinking through the available evidence and then making a conclusion. By citing the influence of his thinker identity in these ways, Rob worked to create and perform an image of himself that valued reason and rationality to make a claim that his ability to engage in rational thought was applied to multiple situations.

Rob's focus on thinking pervaded his classroom and took form both through Rob's own projection of himself as a thinker as well as his desire for his students to also adopt that identity. Therefore, Rob's class demonstrates the way in which a teacher's identity is constructed through the curriculum, while simultaneously being an example of how students undergo the same process. Rob used language to support the development of student thinkers. The desks in his classroom were arranged into groups of four that Rob called "think tanks" and class typically included writing prompts that students would record in their "thinking journals." He also started most lessons by reminding students of the roles they would take that day, be it historians, political scientists, or another type of social scientist. Through his language choice, Rob worked to have students perceive themselves as thinkers and historians and not just students sitting in their 3rd hour social studies class.

Like Paul, Rob used elements related to his appearance to project his thinker identity to his students. Most class discussions involved students sitting at their seats. Rob would often sit in a chair, near one of the front tables, positioning himself on the same level as students. As they talked, Rob would typically either sit upright in the chair, often stroking his beard thoughtfully. Other times, he would lean forward, elbows on his knees, hands clasped, looking thoughtfully at who was talking. In those moments, it was almost as if Rodin himself had installed him there.

Rob's overarching purpose of history education reinforced his identity. He "always tries to get kids to connect to the bigger picture," working to get them to put the historical information they learn into context and to make connections as to why it matters to them and why it matters to the broader world. This desire to be open-minded and to understand the context through which an historical event takes meaning across time is reflected in how Rob understands the purpose of teaching history.

> I want you to understand why things are the way they are, structurally, and where you fit in that. How can I get you to understand those structures and how they became the way they are, but also to understand that you play a role in it; you can change [those structures] or continue them if you want, but should recognize you're doing it.

Being a thinker meant that one would be more receptive to multiple perspectives and open to an understanding that there are structures that impact how those perspectives are formed and how the world is experienced by different people. Most importantly though, being a thinker conveyed the opportunity for agency. Being aware of these deeper structural meanings meant that one would have to make a decision whether or not to act. Being a thinker didn't assume you would, sometimes the rational decision is to not get involved; but by being aware, Rob saw himself and his students as having a choice in how to be in the world.

From a curricular standpoint, Rob created inquiry activities that allowed students to hone their intellectual identities, engaged them in the work of historians, and also projected an image of who Rob was intellectually. Students would often research a question, interpret their findings and then make an evidence-based claim to answer the question. This included, for example, having students research arguments related to whether the U.S.'s use of the atomic bomb was justified by having them place those arguments on a yes-no spectrum where the position they

chose to place each claim indicated how strong they thought the argument was. During another lesson, Rob had students research information about the rise of Japan and Germany in order to decide whether or not American foreign policy was effective in the lead-up to World War II. In his Civil Rights Movement units, students took part in a simulation where they had to serve on different committees responsible for planning various elements of the Montgomery Bus Boycott. These activities were the result of Rob's conviction that factual memorization was not going to help his students achieve or do better. He argued:

> The skills I try to help develop throughout their time with me, that's what's going to help. Can they be critical of a source? Can they view the different sides of something? Can you pull meaning from an image? I'm not going to achieve those higher level things by lecturing and making them memorize a timeline.

Rob acknowledged that his thinker identity was deeply reflected in his teaching. Although it resulted in rich inquiries, it also resulted in his students being discouraged from taking a firm stance on a historical issue because of Rob's concern with oversimplification. The result was that while Rob supported student understanding, he also kept students from being able to stake a firm claim and argue it. In the two Four Corners activities I observed, students shied away from the extreme positions. Even when Rob told students they needed to be able to take an evidence-based stance, he would follow it up with a comment about how he didn't want them to firmly commit to a side because he recognized there was grey area.

Despite Rob's acknowledgement of the implication of being a thinker, Rob used his intellectual identity to claim distance from the curriculum, as well. Rob took his thinker identity to mean that he was capable of objectively analyzing competing perspectives, claiming "if I ditched rationale and jumped to conclusions based off my beliefs, I wouldn't really be able to

teach thinking. I would be teaching a singular idea." Rob failed to recognize that his identity functioned as a perspective and was predicated on a set of beliefs about who he is as a teacher as well as what he imagines a thinker to be. The result was that Rob would sometimes rely on his open-mindedness as a sign of objectivity capable of removing these values.

Rob's choices simultaneously reflected and constructed who he was as a thinker. By creating a discussion- and inquiry-based classroom, Rob made claims about and reinforced his own intellectual identity. Participants initially stressed their intellectual identities when thinking about aspects of themselves that are important to understanding who they are. The instantiation of these identities in the curriculum resulted in opportunities to both claim and construct visions of what those identities entailed.

Socio-Cultural Identities

Despite their initial focus on their intellectual identities, participants' socio-cultural identities were also deeply implicated in their practice. Whereas teachers were often forthcoming with intellectual facets of how they understood themselves, I typically was responsible for asking questions about race, gender, class, and religion. Like the preceding section on intellectual identities, I use Jenkins' (2014) conception of identity to explore how the implication of teachers' socio-cultural identities is a complex interplay of how they negotiate and construct their own identity in relation to the curriculum and assumptions they make about how they perceive and are perceived by their students. I begin this section by connecting Rob's thinker identity to his socio-cultural one and then develop more detailed narratives of the process of socio-cultural implication for Julie and Paul.

The Thinker, Revisited

In the previous section, I traced how Rob's intellectual identity as a thinker was embedded in and expressed through his thoughts about history education and his classroom practice. Rob positioned his thinker identity as being one of the most important elements of understanding him as a person and as a teacher. This identity, though, was not the only identity being realized in Rob's teaching, nor was it an aspect of his identity that operated independently of other aspects. When Rob and I discussed his thinker identity, he mentioned that it came out of studying history and growing up in a biracial family, where he saw different lives co-existing. Rob's racial/ethnic identity, and his ongoing navigation of what he considered that identity to be, was connected to his thinker identity and vice-versa. In some ways, his racial/ethnic identity does not seem to be at play in his teaching, but it was an underlying factor in how he conceptualized his units on World War II and the Civil Rights Movement.

During his World War II unit, Rob's coverage of the course of the war was relegated to a single class period and was structured as a jigsaw activity. He even made light of his decision to spend so little time on the battles by asking his students how long World War II lasted. When they replied that it lasted six years, Rob responded "today it's going to last for about 56 minutes." He then had students rotate around the rooms in groups, taking notes on major events from each year of the war. Prior to starting the unit, Rob explained he would go through the course of the war quickly because he didn't "want to add to the fanaticism and the love of war and this weird passion that people have for death and destruction." From his thinker position, Rob felt that "history curriculum, in general, is wars… and then everything else is just happening between wars." This focus results in there being a lack of attention to how "this war destroyed that family… or a genocide happened." The course of the war is "important to learn about," he

said, “but I don’t want to learn about it in the sense that war’s super cool and now you understand why your *Call of Duty* game is the way it is. It’s a toxic part of our culture.”

Rob’s racial/ethnic identity was also at play, though. He made sure to discuss Japanese internment during the war, citing his desire to “highlight the experience of marginalized communities” because “I’ve had enough experiences in my life to see both sides of the coin… I have a unique ability to understand the perspectives of the oppressed and those who oppress.” Once again, Rob focuses on his thinker identity; he is able to see multiple perspectives and can therefore teach about Japanese Internment in a way that handles both sides of the experience. He has this vantage point, though, because of experiences related to his racial/ethnic identity, an argument further bolstered by his claim that he probably wouldn’t be as committed to teaching about Japanese internment if he didn’t feel solidarity as a fellow minority. Rob further implicated his racial/ethnic identity as he explained that he wouldn’t mind engaging a more celebratory look at the war, such as using the famous photo of the sailor kissing the girl at the parade, but that he doesn’t feel strongly about those images. The reason, according to Rob, for this lack of patriotism for World War II is because his father’s side of the family was living in Mexico and therefore were not involved in the war, and his maternal grandfather wasn’t able to serve due to a physical disability. He also downplayed patriotism because “post-war glory (the G.I. Bill, The Good War, Suburbia) is at the core of segregation that exists today.” Knowing that racial and ethnic minorities who served in the war came back to discrimination at home mad him wonder “what my fate would have been. Would I have been able to pass as white enough?... I think any instance in history in which my identity would be put into question makes me feel uncomfortable.” Throughout his World War II unit, Rob’s thinker identity and racial/ethnic

identity were implicated in one another, interacting in ways that allowed Rob's racial identity to enter the discourse of the classroom without making it plain to the students.

It's Obvious What Side I'm On

Although Julie's gender identity was not among the initial elements of her self she listed, she acknowledged her identity as a woman played a role in understanding her and who she was as a teacher. While Julie's gender identity entered into various facets of her life as a teacher, such as the types of discourse she needed to adopt in meetings, I focus this section on the way Julie used her curriculum to assert, construct, and make sense of her identity as a woman as well as uncertainties in understanding her gender identity in relation to the contemporary women's rights movement. I will provide some description about Julie's approach to teaching the Women's Rights Movement first, followed by more in-depth analysis.

Julie asserted that her gender identity played a role in how she made curricular decisions in two ways. First, she saw her identity as a woman being responsible for her own interest in addressing women's history, an attentiveness she doubted would be as deep for a male teacher. Secondly, she explained that "feeling discriminated against has led me to focus a lot more on Native Americans, African Americans, and things I don't identify with but I've felt the need to bring in their voices because they aren't always heard." Therefore, Julie's identity as a woman both impacted what was taught and constructed elements of how she understood that identity, in this case, linking being a woman to a history of discrimination and lack of voice.

Julie initially planned that the last two days of her Progressive Era unit would be dedicated to the different historical phases of the women's rights movement. Partway through the week, though, Julie started to make radical changes to how she was going to teach about women's rights due to the revelation that a Park Lake student had been sexually abused by Larry

Nassar. This revelation prompted Julie to think about "what is going on right now and what we are fighting for because it's not like there's a manifesto of everything we believe." As she read different articles that night, Julie realized "if I can't even wrap my head around this, students are not wrapping their heads around it because they're not paying attention to it." As a result, Julie decided to modify her lessons on the women's rights movement by spending a day on women's rights in the Progressive Era and then shifting to women's rights today.

The first day of the lesson was similar to how it had been previously taught. Julie, however, started class by referencing the protests and increase in female political candidates in the wake of Donald Trump's election, as well as the #metoo movement. She told students

> It's very weird for me to get up and talk about [the women's movement]. I try to be the mediator and not give you my opinions. In this case, though, it's obvious what side I'm on. Therefore, I wanted you to hear about the movement from people other than me.

Julie then proceeded to play recordings of two men: Mr. James, an English teacher at Park Lake who ended his statement by telling men they needed to "shut up and listen to what women have achieved," and Blake, Julie's husband, who argued that the movement is not about "women versus men." It's that not "everybody is born with the same rights you have. Up until know you've learned about great men, but that leaves out half the population." After playing the clips, Julie carried on with the rest of the lesson that she had originally planned, which included a lecture on the phases of the women's rights movement, an activity about the theme of continuity and change, and a video about women's suffrage.

The next day, Julie extended the lesson by introducing the new group activity she created in the wake of her own struggle to understand the women's movement. "I'm really excited about this," Julie remarked.

> For this project, the scenario is that its 2050. I want you create a textbook excerpt about what's happening with the women's rights movement right now. Look at textbooks and how they discuss women's movements in the past. There's no particular thing that I'm looking for, but I want you to interpret the information you see.

Julie split the class into groups, some all boys, some all girls, most mixed. The students had the rest of the day as well as the next day to work. As students worked, Julie circulated around the room, asking students about what they were thinking and giving advice on how to compose their sections.

Julie's curricular change demonstrates multiple ways in which her identity as a woman was being constructed and contended with through the curriculum and ways in which she both distanced and implicated that identity in her decision-making. First, Julie saw a direct link between being a woman and her interest in women's history. Therefore, Julie's conception of who she is as a woman is reflected and constructed through her desire to talk about the historical experience of women in the classroom setting, with students having a richer experience as she is not a man. Secondly, Julie linked the discrimination that she has felt to the discrimination that other marginalized groups in American history have felt, thus giving her a sense of affinity for and motivation to represent those groups, while also linking women's history to a similar history of marginalization. Julie also saw some degree of connection between herself and the women's rights movement, positioning herself as part of the movement, or at least as part of a community of women, by using the word "we" multiple times when discussing aims and who the movement was for.

During the enactment of the lesson Julie's identity as a woman was both distanced and implicated. Despite starting the lesson by saying "it's obvious what side I'm on" Julie never

explicitly explained her own position, instead relying on students' prior understanding of who she was via stories she had previously told in class about her relationship with her husband. Additionally, in a class about the historical experiences of women, male voices dominated. Julie's audio clips about the meaning of the contemporary women's rights movement were both told from the perspective of men. It turned out that Julie had asked two of her female colleagues to record their thoughts, but neither was able to get to it in time. Julie realized the irony prior to class but decided to move ahead because

> I realized I had something powerful with these two males speaking. I don't think they would have been discounted if I had another female voice in there, but I wanted people to know this is not just me in my classroom. It's not my ideas that I'm putting on you.

Julie, in many ways, seems to be directing this element of the lesson at her male students, who she saw as predominantly resistant to learning about women's history. During the course of the lesson, only two female students participated in the whole group setting and the video she showed as an overview of the suffrage movement was narrated by a man. Julie's distancing can be interpreted as an intersection between her gender identity and her mediator identity. She explained that she wanted to help build awareness of the issues but did not want to force her interpretation down students' throats.

Despite this distancing, Julie's gender identity was intimately tied to her decision to extend her Progressive Era unit by a day and a half to accommodate this new activity. As she explained, "This whole project came out of me as a female trying to make sense of what was happening and recognizing that if I can't make sense of it, most students are not making sense of it." In a later interview, Julie remarked that the genesis for the lesson was her "working through what a feminist is" and by extension, how she saw the degree to which her own identity as a

feminist connected to larger discourses about what it means to be a feminist. I argue, then, that the ways in which it seems Julie distances her identity from the assignment in her interactions with students is actually an expression of her own uncertainties about her relationship to the movement and points towards an engagement with difficult knowledge (Britzman, 1998).

In discussing the current atmosphere, Julie used collective pronouns like "we" to position herself as a part of the movement, yet felt uncertainty regarding its overarching purpose. When asked why, Julie explained that "it's one of those things, like, you don't know what you haven't experienced. I can hear the stories and I can see what's happening to people. I've been fortunate enough that's never been a problem [for me]." As a result, Julie did not attend the Women's March in 2017 or 2018 because of this lack of discrimination and explained:

> I did not go to and I'm not… I am sure why. It was always I would have to take work off and it was… If I was there in the moment at the time of the march, I would love to participate. But for me, I hadn't had enough discrimination in my life that it was worth taking a day off of work to go march for it.

Despite connecting her coverage of historically marginalized groups to her own understanding of being discriminated against as a woman, Julie repeatedly explained that while she might have to be careful in how she says something or how she's perceived, she's never felt as though she has not had a voice or an opportunity to speak. To her, she thinks the movement "should never be… a girl gets to stand up and tell them [boys] exactly how it is because everyone's had a different experience." She described being "conflicted between men thinking they know what's best and, you know, I listened to you, now let me fix it. They're trying to help, so don't tell them not to." This conflicted feeling about what role men should play was connected to her own experiences with her husband and father who she saw as well-meaning and would not "want blamed for

women being not equal because they've always made me equal in my life." Here, Julie shows engagement with the concept of difficult knowledge (Britzman, 1998). She recognizes that access to voice is a driving factor in the contemporary Women's Movement and that men need to stop speaking for women. Yet, she has not faced the kinds of discrimination that the Movement references and she has felt supported by the men in her life. Therefore, she feels a tension between the experiences that other people have had and the experiences she has had, which potentially leads to her confusion about the meaning of the Women's Rights Movement today.

Julie's own lack of being discriminated against and belief that the women's movement is not about access to voice connected to how she approached the subject in class. Class discussion, as noted above was dominated by male voices, both in the resources that Julie brought in and who she called on in class. When asked about this, Julie connected her own feelings of access to what her female students potentially felt in discussion, wondering

> if what's happening with the boys speaking up and the girls not - is it a product of the girls feeling like they can't or is it a product of feeling like they can [speak up] and therefore they don't have to or they don't feel like they have a right because they haven't experienced that stuff?

Julie questioning why her female students don't speak up in class is seemingly a reflection of Julie's own conflicted feelings. Instead of possibly being a case of not having their voices heard, Julie suggested her students could possess the same agency she felt and chose to remain silent. Alternately, they could inhabit the same confusion that Julie contends with and don't feel like they can speak to a set of experiences they have not lived.

Julie's gender identity played a prominent role in how she navigated the content of her curriculum as well as how she interacted with students. Her engagement with gender was not

consistent (e.g., gender was not directly addressed in her World War II unit) but it became prominent in moments where Julie questioned the meaning of her own identity in relation to her understanding of the broader cultural discourse about what it means to be a woman, as well as how she understood her students.

The Blue Collar Perspective

Earlier in this chapter, I discussed Paul's curricular focus on invisibility and marginalized groups. While he cited his Christian identity as the reason for this focus, Paul's working class background, an identity he did not initially discuss, was also connected. Our conversation about Paul's blue collar perspective originally emerged during our interview prior to the 1920s unit. When I asked Paul what strengths he brought to the ISP team when planning the unit, he responded that he doesn't like *The Great Gatsby*, the key text students would be working with for the unit. "It's just rich people ruining people's lives," he explained, citing the absence of working class and African American lives in the novel.

Paul's feelings about the book carried over into his teaching, first coming to light during a lesson he called "The Great Interdisciplinary Studies Art Project." For this project, students were asked to create an artistic representation of an assigned portion of the book. As students worked, Paul drew his own representation of a section from Chapter Two. His drawing depicted the scene where the narrator, Nick Carraway, joins his cousin's wealthy husband, Tom Buchanan, on a trip to Manhattan. On the way, the pair visit a mechanic's garage in Queens owned by George Wilson to talk with his wife Myrtle, Tom's mistress. The comic strip included three panels. The first frame showed small stick figures of Nick and Tom arriving at the garage, the second panel depicted the exterior of the garage and its neighboring buildings, and the third panel showed Tom and Nick leaving, with Myrtle following some ways behind.

After students completed their work and shared a couple examples, Paul provided context for his own illustration. Prior to explaining his work, Paul noted his own distaste for the novel:

> I don't like this novel. I've read it before. I've taught it before. Read it in high school… One of the things I don't like about this novel is that it focuses too much on the wealthy. I like the characters of Myrtle, George Wilson. I like these people and I want to know more about what's happening with them… Because there are some literal casualties in this novel and it seems the super wealthiest people walk away relatively unscathed.

Though Paul did not explicitly address his own working class roots, his decision to highlight the invisibility of working class characters is connected to how he constructs his own identity, particularly in relation to his predominantly middle and upper-middle class students. He then turned back to his own artistic interpretation and explained that he

> minimized the characters from the novel and decided to focus on the restaurant, the for rent building and the repair garage because one of the criticisms I have is not enough focus on these characters. So they walked in, they talked, and then you see Myrtle going to meet Tom, but the thing is they're small, they're insignificant.

He went on to explain how George's garage and the restaurant next to it are presented in the novel as being in the middle of nowhere, but that it's a nowhere based on the perception of the narrator. If there is a restaurant and a garage, Paul reasoned, there must be customers who visit those businesses and a book could probably be written about the lives of the working class people who are otherwise overlooked in the book. Several students chimed in that they also did not like the book and outlined similar reasons for feeling that way (e.g., the characters are shallow, they're stuck up and don't realize it, they're surprised that there are consequences to their actions).

Paul ended up class by issuing a challenge to the students who do not care for the book, as well as himself.

> I'm going to look at you to champion Myrtle, to champion George, to champion Wolfsheim. I'm going to challenge you to tell me where the working class are in the novel, where are the African Americans? Can you find them? Are they there?...
>
> Sometimes it's important to talk about and notice what isn't in the novel, right?

Paul also challenged students who liked the book to champion the main characters as well, to speak up for the lavish parties and the experiences they have in the book. After once again noting the importance of paying attention to what's not in the book, Paul dismissed students to hang their artwork on their lockers before the bell rang.

Originally, when I asked Paul why he cared about the underrepresentation of African Americans and working class whites in *The Great Gatsby*, he cited his historical background and the field of history's move away from great man history to focusing on regular people. When I reframed the question in terms of the perspective he brought to teaching the novel in a predominantly white, upper middle class context, Paul stressed his own working class background. "I would say my perspective is the blue collar perspective," Paul said. "We didn't own our own home. We lived with my grandma. I worked my way through college, things like that." As a result, Paul saw an ability to "draw [students'] attention to the other folks." Paul even ended our conversation about social class and *The Great* Gatsby by saying the perspective he brings to *The Great Gatsby* allows him to say "Hey – I didn't grow up like ya'll did, so in case you're not seeing it, let me go ahead and bring that up to you." In this case, Paul's sense of self connected to his own working class roots, takes a subtle shift from critiquing the absences of the

book to critiquing the absences he sees in his students' own understanding of the world. It's as if they became the residents of West Egg and he was an ambassador from the Valley of Ashes.

Paul's social class identity linked to his Christian identity as he taught about the Civil Rights Movement. In that unit, elements of his own religious identity became more slightly more pronounced at times due to his connection to the religious elements of the Civil Rights Movement. Paul explained

> I can't identify with MLK by being a black man but MLK and I know the same Bible stories. We have the same concept of nonviolent resistance. We have the same concept of pacifism… That's an area where I can stand proud and say 'when MLK is referencing Christian concepts and ideals, I know what he's talking about and can tell you what he's talking about because I know them intimately.'

When the class read King's "Letter from a Birmingham Jail." Paul was very excited to expound on King's reference to Shadrach, Mesach, and Abednego and explain why King would have used that biblical allusion. He was shocked, however, that his students had never heard those names, or the story of The Fiery Furnace before and bolted out of class at the bell to search out if any of the other ISP teachers or students in the hallway had heard the story. Paul was so excited about the story because it was an opportunity to share a piece of him that he otherwise considered hidden. "That's not an area I get to cross over into a lot, especially in a public school," he explained. "I'm very cautious, but in those moments where it's a direct literary reference, I have an excuse to [talk about it], without proselytizing." In this moment, Paul leveraged his Christian identity in order to help students better understand the point that Martin Luther King, Jr. was making when discussing the marginalization of African Americans and the need for white moderates to give their support to the movement.

Paul's students were resistant to the potential ramifications for their own lives if the promise of integration were to be followed through on. Paul liked to use the example of possibly integrating Roosevelt High School with a primarily African American high school in a nearby school district. One day, after a particularly intense lesson where students claimed that they wouldn't be friends with any students who came over from the other high school, Paul and I debriefed on what he was thinking about the class and his students' attitudes about race. "I'm a little troubled. I guess I always suspected how possibly elitist they were," he said. It was interesting to me that Paul cast his students' negative reactions to integration as the result of socioeconomics, when the comments in class, to me, seemed so racially motivated. It could be that Paul was experiencing difficulty in being able to rectify his vision of the students that he enjoyed teaching, and in some cases, had taught for years, while also contending with the problematic feelings that had about members of different racial groups. At the same time, Paul's interpretation was unsurprising, as he constructed his own identity as someone with a blue collar upbringing via the contrast to his students' more privileged childhoods. Part of me also suspected that his avoidance of race had to do with the severity of calling someone a racist or implying racist thought. Paul, though, felt that Roosevelt students tended to closely link issues of race and class and had a hard time disconnecting the two. He also seemingly framed his own reaction along class lines because of his own frustrations with those moments where students resist his desire for them to be more open-minded and egalitarian. Paul explained that it's been challenging to try and understand his students' motivations when they get away from history and are challenged to think about issues of discrimination in their own lives. At the end of his response, Paul sighed. "Rich people, man. Rich people be doing rich people things."

In this moment, Paul positioned his students' difficulties with racial issues as being tied to their class identity, a move that also allowed Paul to not implicate the role his own whiteness plays in thinking about these issues for himself. In this way, the focus on Paul's students' elitism seems to some degree to be an outgrowth of Paul's own experiences navigating social class at Roosevelt. He had been a part time teacher his first few years there and had to live off food stamps to support his family. He held some frustration at both the idea that there were not poor kids at Roosevelt (there are) and the invisibility that he experienced being someone who worked in a good school in a professional job and still had to take government assistance. These feelings of invisibility were both reflected in and constructed by Paul's curricular choices and his desire to highlight the marginalization of people along socio-economic lines in his teaching.

Each of the three participants in this study implicated socio-cultural elements of their identity in their curricular choices. Through these moments, teachers constructed and/or contended with what it meant to claim those aspects of their self, positioning their identities both in terms of broader societal discourse as well as how they perceived and were in turn perceived by others.

Discussion

Drawing on Jenkins (2014) and Butler (1990), my goal, as stated at the beginning of the chapter, was to explore the way that teachers' personal identities are implicated in and constructed through the curriculum. Dividing elements of the self into intellectual identities and socio-cultural identities, I make the case that both forms of identification are present in how teachers conceive of themselves and relate to their curriculum. Using a poststructural approach, my interest is not inherently related to the specific identities that teachers claim, but rather how those identities are enacted through and reified by the curriculum. Two questions, therefore,

grew out of the data in this chapter. First, why did Julie and Paul lead with intellectual identities (and why did Rob assert his later) and second, why did certain socio-cultural identities come more directly into play than others? In this section, I will explore possible answers for these two questions.

Why Intellectual Identities?

As I stated at the beginning of this chapter, Julie and Paul led with intellectual elements of their identities in the initial discussion we had about their identity. Rob, who discussed more socio-cultural elements, made sure to assert this intellectual thinker identity during our second sit-down with one another. Why did my participants lead with or later assert these identities as opposed to their race, gender, social class or other socio-cultural elements?

First, it seems that these intellectual traits are connected to discourses related to how these participants wish to be seen as teachers by their students, colleagues, and themselves. Julie, who sees herself as organized, hoped students would recognize that she "makes decisions for very specific purposes, that [she doesn't] intend to give them busy work, and that [she] always hopes there's a purpose." Furthermore, she wants students "to see the organization and thought that goes into [her] teaching." For Julie, being a teacher, in the eyes of her students, means that she's intentional and thoughtful about the work she does and that, through her organization, the curriculum builds towards being something that is meaningful for her students.

Paul similarly couched how he hoped students saw him in the traits that he originally listed as important to understanding him. He hoped that students would see him "as a teacher who cares about them, someone who's there to help them learn and has their best interest in mind." Paul's list reads as almost a backwards rendition of the original three elements of his

identity that he stressed: he's caring, he's a rabid learner, and he puts family first, which in this case translates to his desire for students to understand he considers their best interest a priority.

Rob is the only participant to deviate from this pattern with students. On the two different instances that I asked Rob how he thought he was viewed by students, he talked about how different students would inherently view him in different ways, but thought they would ultimately say he's "funny, caring, and a good teacher who makes things relevant." Rob's response deviated from the dominant thinker identity that he expressed in most situations, but connected to conceptions about teaching that Rob holds from his own experiences as a learner, which largely are about the importance of interpersonal relationships and recognizing the personhood of his students (an idea that is further developed in Chapter 4). Therefore, Rob thought primarily about how students viewed him along more relational lines.

Rob's thinker identity did come through with how he wanted his colleagues to view him, though. He mentioned that he often liked leaving his door open so that his co-workers could come in and see what he was doing with his students. He particularly viewed himself serving as a case study for how one "can do more provocative and forward-thinking lessons" that weave "connections between identity and history." Rob wants to be an example for teachers who might work in disciplines where it is harder to bridge the content with the learner, such as math. Julie and Paul, on the other hand were more concerned with how their colleagues saw them interpersonally, with both hoping colleagues saw them as being dedicated to their respective jobs. Additionally, Paul, reflecting the tight-knit interpersonal and family-like dynamics of the ISP team, wanted his colleagues to see him as someone "who's going to work with them, listen to them, care about them."

Second, these intellectual identities, in many ways, came across as being more certain in terms of how participants understood them and their connection to their practice, representing elements of themselves that that they perhaps have more control over dictating the meaning of. In other words, Julie can claim she is a mediator, Rob can claim he is a thinker, and Paul can claim he is a learner, and they can easily take actions that help construct those identities through the lessons they create or how they interact with students. Consequently, they can also reflect on those identities and make pedagogical changes that can bring them more in line with the type of teacher they want to be. Furthermore, intellectual identities connect to discourses about what it means to be a teacher or to have a teacher identity. While many people may imagine an older white woman when asked to describe what a teacher looks like, popular discourse around teaching often focuses on themes such as being caring, knowledgeable and organized. All three participants spoke to this kind of discourse. Therefore, it was through the labels that, Julie, Paul and Rob gave themselves that helped them construct conceptions of who they are as teachers and what it means to teach.

Socio-cultural identities are harder to navigate, though, because they often reflect more uncertainty in how they are understood and navigated, especially in the classroom. As previously discussed, Rob has a lot of uncertainty about racial/ethnic identity and his understanding of that identity shifts as he continues to get older, learn more about himself and navigates how other people are interpreting him at any given moment. In the specific context of his classroom, Rob wondered how many of his students actually saw him as Mexican American versus how many just assumed that he is white. Julie expressed similar uncertainty about what it means to be a woman, especially when thinking about her own experiences and how she is interpreted by her male students especially. Paul, at times, positions his working class background in opposition to

the majority of his students' socioeconomic status, while also seeming to feel that identity is, to some degree, invisible to his students. Therefore, while socio-cultural identities are deeply important to understanding who teachers are in the classroom, it seems unsurprising that they would first and foremost consider their intellectual identities as they simultaneously make claims and construct images about who they are as teachers. Saying that that one is a mediator or a thinker creates more of a mental image of how those identities take shape in the classroom than saying that one is a woman or Mexican-American does.

The curriculum itself also plays a role in favoring intellectual identity. Rob and Julie both worked in contexts with strictly structured curriculum (IB and AP, respectively). As they taught more formal curriculums, it is likely that they were required to cover topics that do not resonate with them. For example, Julie's gender identity was at the forefront of how she talked about the role of women in the Progressive Era, but that identity was not particularly present earlier in the week when she was talking about the multiple reforms that marked the era. Therefore, different elements of Julie and Rob's identity asserted themselves at different times and in different ways depending on how they saw themselves connected to the curriculum. Paul, on the other hand, worked with a much looser curriculum that he had significant control over. Due to the seminar-based structure of the ISP, Paul had far more opportunity to write himself into the curriculum. This was especially true in ISP electives, which were completely based on whatever each teacher was interested in teaching about. The structure of curriculum plays a mediating role. I argue that some element of one's identity is always at play, but the formal curriculums of Rob and Julie's classroom played a mediating role in where they asserted themselves and where they didn't, whereas Paul's classes more accurately reflected the lens through which he sees the world.

Identities Implicated and Distanced

If there is a single thought to sum up this chapter, it's that socio-cultural identities also matter to how teachers relate to the curriculum. As I said at the outset of this chapter, representing the complex, interconnected ways that my participants' socio-cultural selves are implicated in or distanced from the curriculum is challenging, so, for the sake of analysis, I targeted the specific identities that dominated their discourse in order to represent the processes at play in this phenomenon with more clarity. From a poststructural methodological approach, this move can be problematic in multiple ways, but there are two that I think are especially important here. The first is that I am complicit in how these teachers constructed their identity in our time together because I was asking questions about elements of their identity that they did not initially identify on their own. I think my questions and observations were justifiable and I hope I sufficiently presented the complexity at play in how my participants conceptualized themselves. The other problematic element is that one could read this chapter and come away with an essentialized understanding that I talked about gender with Julie because she's a woman, race with Rob because he's Mexican American and social class with Paul because of his working class background. I want to end this chapter by exploring how these categories are implicated across all three participants and the reasons why these particular identities were implicated or distanced by my participants based on larger cultural discourse about identity and power.

I have written about gender, race and social class only in terms of the specific participant who represented traditional notions of what these categories mean. However, gender does not mean "woman," race does not "non-white" and social class does not mean "poor." Despite the choices I made for data analysis in this chapter, identities of race, gender, and social class were implicated in each teacher's practice. During our initial interview, Rob explained that he was

proud to be male, which he saw connected to his ethnic identity as in Mexican culture "there's a lot proscribed to [being male], like machismo." Rob struggled with the meaning of his masculinity, though, at other times claiming he wasn't particularly proud to be a man due to the patriarchal culture of the United State. When thinking about his gender in the classroom, Rob admitted "I'm probably not aware when my [gender identity enters] because I don't have to think about being a male like I have to think about my last name or how people might perceive me." Rob recognizes that socially he doesn't have to think about being a man because, unlike his racial/ethnic identity, it isn't questioned by larger society. Instead of seeing his gender identity connected to the formal curriculum and his pedagogical choices, he largely saw it coming through in more informal interactions he had with male students about how to be a decent person.

Park Lake, where Julie taught, was the least racially diverse of the three schools. While Julie leveraged her whiteness, at times, to challenge students to think more deeply about affirmative action (as described earlier in this chapter), discussions about race also made her uncomfortable. "I tread lightly," she explained,

> because I almost feel like I don't have the authority to talk about it. I know I have a responsibility to talk about it… I can tell them what I've seen, but I've never experienced that. I get a little gun shy when we get to those conversations and it's finding the balance between I have to talk about this but I'm not sure how to do it.

Julie thought it was necessary to talk about race, though, so "that we don't have people like me who are uncomfortable talking about it," and to prepare her students for difficult conversations she envisioned them having in college.

Paul more directly implicated his gender and racial identities. Topics related to gender and race consistently came up in his classes, especially in the 1950s/60s unit where there were lessons dedicated to *The Feminine Mystique,* the life of *Peyton Place* author Grace Metalious, and the Civil Rights Movement, as well as in his science fiction elective which included discussions about the importance of expanding gender and racial representation in science fiction literature. Paul saw his role as being able to use his perceived authority as a white male to draw attention to underrepresented voices, but noted the limitations of his whiteness and masculinity because he knew that he "can't ever possibly scratch the surface" of knowing "what it's like to be a woman," or understanding what it's like to be Black. Paul's goal was to avoid mansplaining and/or whitesplaining perspectives that he could not speak to/for. While Paul addressed and thought about gender issues more than Rob seemingly did, it still was an identity that seemed to come and go. Paul recognized the way in which being a white male conferred distinct privileges, but never really delved into how his identity functioned in classroom interactions with students, beyond wanting to be sure to honor the voices of his students without turning a spotlight on them.

Paul was also the only teacher to substantively discuss his religious and social class identities. Julie never discussed her religion and Rob talked about his Catholic upbringing in terms of his current rejection of that identity. In regards to social class, Rob and Julie both discussed growing up in middle class households. Julie referred to her own upbringing as "that middle class white family that most people relate to in some way" and recognized that she has a hard time thinking outside of how wealthy people would view things. Rob similarly notes that his family was always comfortable growing up and that social class was not something he

thought about much, outside of his own distaste for the wealth discrepancies that existed between students at Northrup.

Key to understanding how and why participants implicated some identities and were able to distance themselves from others is the broader societal discourse that surrounds them. According to Foucault (1972) discourses are the means through which people make sense of the world and are "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (p. 49). Therefore, as participants construct their identities in and through the curriculum, they are simultaneously making claims about and working to understand those identities. Julie's gender was implicated in part because she saw that element of her self as constantly being challenged by her male students and she recognized the ways in which women's experiences are hardly represented in the history curriculum. Julie did not see herself possessing the same kind of authority her male colleagues had in relation to students. At the same time, she had her own uncertainties about what it means to be a woman and a feminist in the current context of the #metoo movement and calls for increased political action to confront the election of Donald Trump. Therefore, the conflict she felt in trying to construct and navigate her own identity as a woman found expression in the curriculum. Similarly, Rob's racial/ethnic identity saw reflection in his desire to highlight the experiences of those who have been oppressed and casting a critical eye at the policies of the United States. Even though he questioned the degree to which his students recognized his racial identity, he still imbued the curriculum with his sense of self. In terms of gender, though, Rob (and Paul) did not have to think about being men because they already had perceived authority and spoke to students' expectations about what kinds of teachers are highly knowledgeable.

Social class and religion rarely came up outside of Paul's experiences, though. This may be because the identities that Julie and Rob felt in these moments was more reflective of the dominant discourse surrounding them. Growing up in a predominantly Christian country either as Christians or as people with knowledge of Christianity but lack of attachment to another identity, allowed religion to be distanced from Rob and Julie because their comfort with the dominant discourse, which is also reflected in the structure of public schooling, allowed them not make a connection between whatever degree of faith they each have and their curricular decision-making. Paul, while making deep connections between the attitudinal elements of his Christianity in regards to caring, was still able to claim that he did not connect his Christian identity to his teaching because he didn't want to proselytize. In this case, the predominance of Christian discourse allowed Paul to implicate that identity while continuing to see it was distanced from his practice.

Social class was similar, with a slight difference. Rob and Julie both struggled to think about how their social class background came into play in their classroom. This seems to be due to their backgrounds matching their students' backgrounds. Both grew up in middle class homes and both taught in middle class schools, therefore there was no challenge to their class identity that would cause them to think about it. Paul, on the other hand, grew up in a working class neighborhood with parents who struggled financially. He taught, however, in a school where it was not uncommon for students to drive a better car than he had or to take vacations whenever there was a break. Therefore, Paul more willingly implicated his social class identity because of the tension between his own experience and the experiences of most of his students.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I sought to explore thee complex and interconnected ways that elements of a teacher's identity enter into a teacher's curriculum. While the teachers in this study initially focused on who they were intellectually and how that connected to their work, elements of their socio-cultural selves, such as gender, race, religion, and social class, were also embedded in their content choices, pedagogy, and interactions with students. There were clear ways in which some elements of a teacher's identity were more visibly at play, but it's not as though one aspect of an identity functions at a time. Rather, it's the ongoing intersection of multiples identities, intellectual and socio-cultural, that enter into the classroom. Power is at play through this process as one's relation to broader societal discourses and the ways in which students construct the meaning of a teacher's identity influence which identities are more directly implicated and which ones are distanced.

CHAPTER FOUR

REMEMBRANCES OF LEARNING HISTORY

Introduction

This chapter explores participants' engagement with memory, primarily in considering their own learning as students of history and the connection between those memories and their curricular decision-making in the present. In other words, the question posed is to what degree does one's remembrance of learning history relate to how one teaches history? In considering this question, I am not aiming to claim causal connections from one's past experiences to their present actions. Rather, using Simon, Rosenberg, and Eppert's (2000) conception of remembrance, I explore how the memories these teachers surface act as pedagogical moments meant to narrate who they are and/or want to be and justify their actions in the present. These acts of remembrance can also allow teachers to critically think about their own education in order to interrogate the influence their own learning has had on their teaching (Rothenberg, 1994) as well as to investigate the degree to which elements of their own past, as learners, are relived in the present-day (Chang-Kredl and Wilkie 2016).

I begin this chapter by looking at how my participants use their own pasts as learners in order to understand and give credence to how they teach, both through their own curricular decision-making as well as via their relationship to students. I then explore what gets forgotten in history education, in terms of their own experiences as students of history, from elementary school through college, as well as in relation to what they believe their own students will retain. Finally, I consider the implications that arise for history education related to memory's potential

as a source of pedagogical inquiry, the kinds of learning that resonated with my participants as students and what they hope to enact in their own classrooms.

Teachers' Remembrance of Their Own History Education

Memory, individual and/or collective is operationalized via remembrance, or how a memory is elicited, used, and understood in the present. To Simon, Rosenberg, & Eppert (2000), remembrance is inherently pedagogical and "all formations of memory carry implicit and/or explicit assumptions about what is remembered, how, by whom, for whom, and with what potential effects" (p. 2). Therefore, the memories we elicit are laden with values and can be used to justify decisions and actions we view as desirable, as well as deny those we wish to avoid. In other words, what and how people remember (and forget) is important.

In exploring participants' remembrances, it is important to note, from a poststructural perspective, that we craft stories about ourselves that help us feel at peace with who we are and what we do. In these particular instances, the accuracy of the memories being recalled and operationalized is not important. Rather, it's the process through which participants gives voice to their own experiences and provides through lines from those experiences to their own teaching that I wish to highlight. As Paul stated, unprompted, after discussing a memory related to why he became a history teacher: "whether that's how it happened or not… my modern memory shapes that as more of a transformative moment." In this section I am interested in those transformative moments. What is it about what and how these particular teachers remember that illuminates how they bring themselves into the curriculum? While it is possible that some of these memories may have a direct connection to the day-to-day activities of each teacher, there is just as much the likelihood that these memories serve as a representation of an element the participant may

have already held within themselves, perhaps unknowingly, and that they instead bolster an aspect of themselves that was already present.

History is the Most Human Thing

As a high school student, Rob was tracked in general education courses that included lecture-heavy history classes. Despite this, Rob enjoyed history and considered it his favorite subject, because, as he remarked, he did not have any other kind of history education to compare his against. It was not until his senior year, as a history major at a large, public university, that his conception of how history could be learned was challenged. It was during that year that Rob took a senior thesis course focused on slave resistance and rebellions of the antebellum period. This course differed from what he was used to because "it wasn't the government's policies, the war it was in, or the major era and what happened. It was human experience, the people whose stories you don't hear." Whereas his high school readings were just reiterated in the next day's lecture, Rob had to be an active reader and participant in this class.

> I have to use the information and now we're engaging in this discourse where my understanding is going to deepen. And that was a cool thing because you would leave class like, I thought I understood it, but then you engage and you're like "oh wow, I missed some things or I understood that differently" or "I really did get that and I brought that to the table."

Rob's remembrance of his senior thesis course draws out a theme of the importance of humanity when thinking about both history and the act of teaching, more broadly. When asked to discuss the memory of teachers who were formative to him, there was a consistent theme of his personhood being recognized. The first teacher he spoke about was his home economics teacher, Mrs. Jensen, who recognized his pain after his girlfriend broke up with him. Rob loves to cook

and while Mrs. Jensen helped inspire that in him, it was her caring nature and willingness to offer her classroom as a safe space for him that resonated the most. "She saw me as a person as well as her student," Rob noted, "and that meant a lot." Similarly, while remembering his senior methods instructor, Jaime, Rob acknowledged Jaime's importance to his development as a teacher, but led with Jaime's initial recognition of Rob's Latino identity as an affirmative moment where an element of his identity that is often overlooked was recognized. Even when discussing his mother and her importance to his identity, Rob shared how, whenever he did something stupid, his mom would sit with him to talk things out. As a result, Rob "started to think of my actions and… understand that everything that I do has impacts on other people."

These examples demonstrate how Rob's focus on humanity can be seen throughout his various remembrances. While I cannot make claims about where the importance of humanity for Rob comes from, it is clear that while such a focus may have been absent from his high school's history courses, it was certainly present in important and formative relationships during schooling and in his home life. This theme is also expressed in Rob's own teaching in myriad ways.

Whereas Rob had had an engaging experience as a high school student in a lecture-based class, it was the humanity-based approach to history that he cites as transformative to him. This focus on humanity carried through to his day-to-day practice. Rob often created opportunities for his students to think about complex issues related to the human experience of history because he saw the value in doing so. At the end of his unit on World War II, after a more typical class discussion about whether or not the United States met its war aims in dropping the atomic bombs, Rob used the picture book *Hiroshima No Pika* to stress the human side of the U.S.'s decision. The book, which is fiction, portrays the suddenness of the explosion and the traumatic

impact on those living in Hiroshima. After reading the book to the students, Rob had them get out their journals and record their thoughts and feelings about the book. After a brief discussion, Rob explained to the students that

> When we consider these monumental moments in history… we always have to come back to the central thing as being humanity and people. When we say that's war, that's what happens, that's to make an acceptance of something that doesn't have to be. It's always important to consider the humanity, as well.

Similarly, Rob also focused on the human elements of the Civil Rights Movement. During that unit, Rob used the example of the lynching of Emmett Till to drive home the destructive reality and legacy of racism in the United States. At the time of the unit, Rob's school had been experiencing several instances of students using racial slurs in the hall, either directed at one another, or via jokes and song lyrics. On the second day of the Civil Rights Movement unit, Rob showed a clip about Emmett Till from the documentary *Eyes on the Prize.* When Till's mutilated face was shown, Rob froze the image on the screen for two minutes. With the image on the board behind him, Rob told students "every time you use the n-word or make a racist joke, people think of this because this is the history it's attached to." Through this choice, Rob was trying to create a human connection to the consequences of racism and to impress on his students that the words they use have power. This was especially important for Rob who imagined his students becoming doctors in large cities having "not once considered what Black Americans go through." His hope was to burst his students' bubble and have them begin to understand the human impact of injustice.

During the next lesson, Rob provided the class with a piece of art that depicted Emmett Till and Trayvon Martin together. As his students discussed the piece, Rob discussed how

Trayvon Martin was dehumanized by the media just as Emmett Till had been by his killers. "News organizations," Rob explained, "were going through his Facebook and found a picture of him giving the middle finger. That was the picture they used. He was 17 and pretty big and maybe he was scary. They didn't talk to his family members." By bringing up the way the media shaped the narrative around Martin, Rob was seeking to restore his humanity. Instead of Martin being presented as a stereotypical scary black man, Rob repositioned him as an innocent child who was just another in a long line of lynched black children.

On that day, Rob not only worked to humanize black youths who were the historical victims of racism, but also showed his own focus on being the caring and affirming teacher that he valued in his own education. After the bell rang, the lone African American student in the class, Evelyn, was still in her seat, sobbing. Rob immediately went to her side. Though, out of respect for their interaction, I did not listen in on their conversation, Rob later explained that he allowed her to feel what she was feeling and listened to what she was thinking about, then encouraged her that the purpose of the lesson was not to bring up these issues to her, but to help her personal knowledge of these kinds of experiences become shared knowledge to those who might not know they exist.

The remembrance of these humanizing moments from Rob's past, both in the content of history and through interactions with those who educated him, supports Rob's own desire to recognize those that are often left out of history as well as the students he interacts with on a daily basis, both in terms of their identity and through their own engagement with the curriculum. While Rob seems to have a pre-existing disposition that lends itself to this kind of approach, his remembrance of his own schooling allows him to justify his belief that "history is the most human thing" by connecting it to his own experiences as a learner.

I'm Not Going to Teach It the Same Way She Did

While remembrance can be a means of supporting the positive choices one makes, it can also be used as a justification for what one does not want to do or be. Unlike Rob, whose remembrance can be viewed as a means of positively justifying his approach to history, Julie's remembrance serves as a reminder of the kind of teacher she does not want to be because she "never had good U.S. history teachers" and part of the reason she decided to become a teacher was because of questioning her teachers' methods and asking herself "wouldn't it have been better if [they'd] done it a different way?" Julie did mention having good teachers for other social studies subjects. Her mother was her World history teacher and Julie remembers it being an impactful experience due to the projects, discussions, and her mom's propensity for telling historical stories full of interesting facts. For the purpose of this study, though, I will focus on Julie's experience learning American history due to her own role as an American history teacher and the way she navigates that identity vis-à-vis her own remembrance.

As an 8th grader, Julie had a teacher who primarily taught by having students take Cornell notes. Much like Rob, she did not have an issue with this approach as a student. Later in life, though, she felt angry that that's how she learned U.S. history because "there were all of these interesting things that I didn't understand or didn't know how cool they were." Julie cited the memory of a class field trip to Gettysburg where the only thing she remembers is the guide "telling us that that there were two people there and the rule was if someone was going to the bathroom, you didn't shoot them." Julie reported this memory was frustrating because "I didn't know what [Gettysburg] was… and that's a result of that style of teaching. It wasn't made interesting for me and I didn't know enough to make it interesting for myself."

Ironically, Julie frequently mentioned wanting to be able to share fun facts with students, the tidbits of historical knowledge that are not commonly known and that her preferred teachers had an ability to weave in. While her memory from Gettysburg could certainly be considered a fun fact, it resonated for a different reason because it represents the limits of her learning; she had no context to connect the fact to. As a teacher, Julie is concerned about becoming like her 8th grade teacher. When assigning independent seat work, Julie explained "I always feel like I'm that teacher, like I'm sitting at my desk making them do this work. I have to tell myself it's okay that once a week they sit down and do their work."

Julie's remembrance of being an A.P. U.S. History student provides a more complex relationship with her past, primarily because her own A.P. U.S. History teacher, like her, was a young woman who was also in her second year of teaching. Julie mentioned that part of the problem with her A.P. U.S. History teacher was that

> it was always very clear that [the lessons she taught] were someone else's and I don't know that it was that she wasn't prepared for it, but it was all surface-level and lecture and not much of us thinking historically, of us becoming better students… but I put greater pressure on myself because I don't want my students to just have a lecture every day.

According to Julie, when her teacher did try to move beyond lecture and include discussion in class, the results were still dismal. These discussions were "awkward" because "we hadn't built up any norms and I don't know if she knew her place in discussion, either," she explained. Julie's remembrance of her experience in that class was so bad that she said her first thought when her principal called to let her know that she was hired at Park Lake was "I'm not going to teach AP U.S. History the same way she did." In general, Julie was very critical of her own

experience as a student in that class. Upon further reflection, though, she was able to empathize with elements of her teacher's experience. "Now that I'm teaching," she explained, "I recognize that there are definitely days where I go in and I'm very uncomfortable with the lesson I'm teaching because I just don't feel I have the background knowledge to answer questions; I'm praying they don't ask me questions…." Overall, Julie saw her own experience in American history classes as being sub-par, lacking in the kind of content and pedagogical processes that she best learned from. As a result, she saw herself as wanting to avoid similar approaches in her own teaching.

Through her remembrance of her own AP U.S. History teacher and her identification with her teacher from having a similar demographic profile, Julie is able to imagine an alternate self that is ineffective at her job. She does mention that part of the reason why everything may have been more surface-level back then was because the test was different, however Julie also uses her remembrance as a means to give justification to her own lack of a senior AP teacher to mentor her. Julie is the only AP U.S. history teacher at Park Lake and although she may utilize online AP support groups as well as her mother and other former teachers, she does not have someone to go to and learn from in her own building. This particular narrative, though, allows Julie to see the benefit in that absence. Her former teacher who, in some ways is like Julie, was never comfortable in her lessons and was not as effective of a teacher. Julie, on the other hand, does not have anyone to be subservient to and therefore has to rely on herself to not fall into the same traps that her own teacher did. At the same time, Julie is able to critically look back and explain why classroom discussions did not go well – there were no norms. As a result, Julie spends time creating classroom discussion norms in order to avoid that same problem. Through the creation of those norms, Julie seeks to become invisible in her class discussions, allowing

them to be fully student-led (a goal not yet met), as opposed to the hyper-visible teacher who inexpertly controlled the class.

The Slow Accumulated Progress of Learning

As discussed in the prelude to this chapter, not all memories stem from our own experiences, nor do all memories of learning about the past or what it means to teach have to be from formal K-12 learning experiences. Paul serves as an example of both of these phenomena. When initially asked how he would characterize his K-12 history education, Paul responded "Yeah. I don't remember it. I mean, it's almost like a blip on the map. If you had asked me pre-college… what was cool about history, I don't know that I'd be able to tell you…" Paul's university experiences were very different, though, and he credits the demystification of academic history and the resulting belief that he could be a historian to a professor's remembrance. As Paul relates the story, he took a university history course where the professor told a story about a morning where he was reading a history text and making corrections as he read. When the professor's wife entered the room, she asked what he was doing. The professor responded that he was correcting errors and that he was more than qualified to as he also had a PhD in history and had studied the subject matter. The result of hearing this story, according to Paul, "was like if a bolt of lightning struck me. Just the idea of being equal with people that had always been demigods. It was that moment that I was like 'I, too, can be a historian.'"

Through the preceding story, Paul recounts a moment of clarity, which had previously been lacking, that started him down the road of becoming a teacher. While he had been a good student in high school because he "didn't have to try," he struggled finding success at the university level. After first majoring in theater and then in ministry, Paul would often skip class and his grades faltered. Once he decided to be a teacher, though, all uncertainty was gone. As he

recounts: “Theater major? Struggle with grades. Minister? Struggle with grades. Teacher? I walked into my university and just A’s the whole way. Never missed a class. Everything was on time… There was no looking back.” The use of this remembrance allows Paul to create a narrative where he had an epiphany about the subject he was studying, followed by an epiphany about himself which then directly led to his success in college and feeling that teaching was a natural fit for him.

Unlike Rob and Julie, Paul had a tendency to link his memories of learning about history back to popular culture. This is not surprising, as Paul is known to both his students and co-workers as a reservoir for pop culture references, obscure and mainstream. When asked to share a memory, experience, or story about an impactful teacher, Paul cited George Feeney, the main teacher from the 1990s sitcom *Boy Meets World.* Paul saw a parallel between himself and Corey Matthews, the show’s protagonist, as they were roughly the same age when the show aired, and he admired how Mr. Feeny was not only a teacher, but a mentor to his students. As a pre-service teacher, Paul used a picture of Mr. Feeny on the binder for his educational philosophy class because Mr. Feeny “has this quote where he says education is not little tests and quizzes, it’s like the slow accumulated progress of learning.” The character’s quote was important to Paul because it’s the realization that he “may never see the fruit of what [he] did in the classroom because it might just be that moment I wasn’t even paying attention to.” His commitment to the idea of the slow accumulation of learning also speaks to Paul’s own journey into teaching. Through the fits and starts of his postsecondary education, Paul gradually came to the point where the factors that needed to combine did (teaching, after all does contain a fair amount of theater and ministry) and he is now in a place where is happy and feels professionally fulfilled.

Paul's use of popular culture does not only relate to how he became a teacher. Most of the time when I asked Paul about what he learned in high school history, his answer was nothing or that he couldn't remember any specifics outside of a couple memories that he shared. This was true not only regarding how he thought about teaching, but also how Paul learned about the past. Paul mentioned that he had no recollection of learning about the 1950s and 60s in school. Rather, Paul learned about it in bits and pieces over time, combining and making sense of the various sources he encountered:

> I grew up on *Back to the Future* and I've watched *Happy Days* and my parents were born in the 50's. So I've been able to piece it together, I don't really remember someone sitting me down and being like… "here's the 1950s…" I love *Better Homes and Gardens* and stuff like that from the '50s and '60s and like, I think I just kind of studied a lot of that on my own.

Paul was largely in charge of a 1950s Experience that his team ran for their students to learn about how the 1950s viewed itself, how the 1950s viewed the future, how the 1950s is viewed by the future, and what the realities of the 1950s are. Just as Paul gradually assembled an understanding of the 1950s, he asked his students to do the same. The only guidance they had in the activity was the four prompts outlined above. Through interacting with various popular culture, including issues of *Better Homes and Gardens*, students were to construct answers to those guiding questions. Paul, then, is bringing his self to bear on the curriculum. He did not have someone tell him what the 1950s meant and he's not going to provide that for his own students. They instead were required to learn by interacting with non-traditional sources and by thinking about the time period from different angles, including a supercut that Paul created from clips of movies about the 1950s that were made later. This video included what Paul remembered

learning on his own as some of the major themes of the 1950s that have been taken up culturally: fast cars, cool music/dancing, and putting up a façade of perfection.

Paul's remembrances of learning history demonstrate the importance of collective memory or the way in which we create our own memories from others' memories, to an individual's remembrance. It is not Paul's experience of questioning history that led him to teaching; it was the memory that his professor shared that led to his epiphany. Similarly, it is not one of Paul's teachers who he remembers as an example of a good teacher in his life; it is a fictional character from a mid-90s sitcom that resonated with Paul. Our remembrance of the past, both our own and the cultural narratives that we take up or critique (such as Paul in the 1950s/60s unit) is closely connected to the memories and experiences of those we interact with as well as the way that collective memory is instantiated in culture. Therefore, as Paul remembers, he remembers through a variety of sources. Rob and Julie take part in the same process, but it is through Paul that we see the clearest example of this process in action.

Complicating the Narratives

The narratives above illustrate the way that teachers may use a remembrance of their past experiences in order to justify their actions in the present and/or a vision of who they want to be as a teacher. The examples I provide might give the impression that there is a direct connection between how a person narrates their memories and how those are expressed in the present. Analyzing data using poststructural theory, though, exposes issues that complicate the relationship between a present-day remembrance of the past, which seeks to justify one's actions in the present, and what happens in the classroom. The narratives that we create often focus on the positives to give a forward-moving momentum from Point A to Point B. When negatives are cited, they are often framed as a challenge overcome, a dark spot that can be used as a reference

point to make change. We see this phenomenon in American history classes with the widespread adherence to a narrative of the United States as a country of ever-expanding rights and continual progress. We know, though, that this narrative overlooks contradictory evidence that would complicate the story and create a more nuanced understanding of the topic, our history, and present character. Individuals can engage in the same process with how they narrate their own lives. This is neither a negative nor a positive; it is just a facet of the process of remembrance and how memory is taken up to present a particular version of ourselves. While I by no means aim to cast doubt on how my participants framed elements of their self in relation to teaching and the curriculum, I do want to complicate our understanding of how the process of remembrance occurs and in turn create a more nuanced understanding of how each teacher sees her/himself in relation to the curriculum.

While Rob did not personally point out the theme of humanization/humanity in his remembrances, that element is found throughout his memories of being a student as well as the pedagogical choices he makes. This does not mean that he never deviates from that kind of understanding, though. As mentioned above, Rob chose to follow up a class discussion about the use of the atomic bomb in WWII with a reading of the story *Hiroshima No Pika*. After a brief discussion about student reactions, Rob re-directed the conversation to being about the book as a historical source, asking the class why it is "important and necessary as historians to take in both human and more objective perspectives." The students mentioned that one could eliminate bias and learn a more comprehensive view. When asked what kind of bias people could develop by just reading *Hiroshima No Pika,* students responded that one could think "Americans are monsters" and would be ignorant of the reasons the United States dropped the bomb in the first place.

Similarly, Rob criticized the prompt they used for the American portion of the lesson's discussion ("Was the use of the atomic bomb justified?) because it was too subjective. Rob specifically discussed this issue using the IB framework, claiming that it would make a bad internal assessment (a mastery assessment completed at the school level) because there is no source that would allow a student to quantitatively prove that argument. Much of Rob's criticism of the question as an assessment stemmed from his uncertainty that a student could be capable of making a nuanced enough argument to argue the morality of the act one way or another. Therefore, while the question was a good prompt for verbal class discussion because there were so many avenues one could take, it was inappropriate for a written response, in his view, because the burden of evidence in an internal assessment is higher.

As discussed in the previous chapter, Rob prides himself on being a thinker and highly values reason, rationality and being open to a multitude of perspectives, all dispositions that he views as being important for engaging with history, but are absent from the memories that he speaks about. A tension emerges in Rob's understanding of and approach to history because on the one hand, he wants students to delve into the humanity of those that lived in the past, a process that can often make it difficult to maintain distance, while on the other hand he wants them to be able to stand back and objectively consider the viewpoints in question.

It is not an issue that Rob holds these potentially conflicting viewpoints, people often simultaneously hold many different perspectives. understanding the past is certainly a balancing act between being able to look at the big picture from a distance and to better understand historical actors on a human level. While he does not always do this, Rob specifically positions the discipline of history as something that needs to be objectively engaged and quantitatively measured, at least at times when fidelity to the discipline is merited. This is not to say that there

is not merit in that approach or that Rob is right or wrong in his thinking, just that his own actions and beliefs complicate the humanity narrative he has built for himself through his remembrances. My point is that these tensions need to be brought to the fore and made sense of in order to see how they interact and what impact, if any, the potential mixed signals have on students. This is especially true in the case of World War II as Rob's preferred objective prompt, which would have had students answer whether or not the use of the atomic bomb was effective at reaching U.S. war aims, could allow for the erasure of the Japanese perspective, which is unnecessary for answering that question.

While Julie is able to use the remembrance of her own AP U.S. history experience as a template for what not to do, she overlooks the way that she is implicated in doing several of the same things her teacher did. For example, one of the reasons why Julie did not think her AP teacher was effective was because "she didn't know the content, she didn't know how to teach this style class" and "was making [connections] right along with us." When discussing her own struggles and development as an AP teacher, though, Julie explained how the previous year "was interesting because [she] learned right along with [students]." "I was pretty open with them about it," she explained, "that it had been a long time since I took it and we were going to learn about it together." Furthermore, Julie also explained that "it's very difficult to figure out what I need to teach and what the students need to learn on their own."

As a further example, Julie often does not feel confident in her content knowledge. She attributes part of this to her own experience as a learner, where she would get frustrated by teachers who felt "they were right no matter what" and viewed issues as being black or white. On the other hand, she also had teachers "didn't know what they were doing," which was also frustrating because "[they're] supposed to be the one that knows this." Consequently, Julie tries

to reach a middle ground where she can admit that she does not know something, if there is time to find an answer and have resolution. Otherwise, she might "steer the conversation away from the things [she doesn't] know." Julie admits that not knowing information is scary but that "it's a better classroom because of it" as "it gives [students] a little more flexibility in how they interpret things."

Julie uses the remembrance of her own experience as an AP U.S. history student to think critically about her own education and use those experiences as a means to shape her own teaching in the present. In setting out the ways that she is different from her AP teacher, Julie overlooks that their similarities may extend past the parallel that they are both young women in their second year of teaching. Julie marks herself as uncertain, yet ultimately competent; she is able to search out resources, rely on others, and take advantage of the ways the AP curriculum has been updated in the past few years to create a more compelling and, hopefully, student-centered class. Because she has outlined these differences, she does not seemingly dig deeper and work to understand how their parallel experiences may have otherwise compared and think about what lessons may lie in those similarities.

In a similar vein, Paul's own forgetting and reluctance to engage in remembering overlooks his own slow accumulation of knowledge. Just as Julie may be unwilling or unable to see multiple parallels between her and her teacher, Paul's inability to remember what he learned as a K-12 history student overlooks the process that he implicates himself in as a teacher, namely that education is not about pinpointing a specific moment when you learned a discrete fact as evidenced by success on an assignment or a test, but that knowledge builds, layer after layer over time, often in ways that are not immediately recognized.

Each of the teachers in this study draw upon their own memories in ways that help legitimize their actions in their present-day classrooms. While none of the participants seemingly teaches in ways he or she was taught, there are ways in which they avoid the kind of critical engagement with their memories of learning that Rothenberg (1994) views as an important component of challenging Lortie's (1975) "apprenticeship of observation." Rob, Julie and Paul may not teach like they were taught but there is potential to further develop their understanding of the connection between their own experiences as students and their actions as teachers.

Things Forgotten, Things Remembered

Rob, Julie and Paul all used memories in ways that reinforced their conceptions of what it means to be a teacher with many of their memories relating to interpersonal connections they had with teachers or experiences that happened in college or after. One of the most surprising findings in this study was the fact that, as high school history teachers, neither Rob, Julie, nor Paul had vivid memories of their own high school history education. Each participant struggled to identify what exactly they remembered from their own history education and lacked more than one or two vivid memories of their high school classes. Rather, their content knowledge either came from university-level experiences or during the course of their professional career. It was experiences outside of school or exposure to new ways of thinking that made them reconsider what history meant to them and could mean to others. In this section, I will explore the role that forgetting plays in thinking about the kinds of experiences that were impactful for my participants. Of course, it is impossible for me to know what my participants actually forgot because I was not present for their initial experiences, nor can I be fully sure that the experiences they told me about were the only experiences they remembered. However, it is possible to fill in the holes of what was forgotten by thinking about what was remembered and to explore what

impact, if any, that has on how each teacher thinks about their own curricular and pedagogical choices.

The Meaning of Forgetting

After Julie was hired at Park Lake, she was required to attend an AP training seminar in order to be qualified to serve as the school's AP U.S. History teacher. While sitting at the seminar, teachers started discussing the Gilded Age and Progressive Era. "I was like 'I don't even know what that is. How am I going to teach this?" Julie reported. As a result, she had to learn about the time period on her own, an experience that led it to become one of her favorite units to teach. When I asked Julie why she thinks she forgot that time period, she explained:

> I'm wondering if part of the reason I don't remember that information is that I was so focused on [figuring out the AP format] that I had that information at the time of the test but it disappeared after that.

While Julie does not remember specifically learning about the Gilded Age and Progressive Era, she imagines that her teacher had lectured on the topic, as that was the primary pedagogical strategy she used.

Julie's remembrance of forgetting about the Gilded Age and Progressive Era illustrate several ways in which remembering and forgetting are intertwined and how the teachers in this study made use of their inability to remember their own experiences as high school students. First, forgetting about the existence of the time period forced Julie to learn about it on her own. This experience led the time period to resonate more with her because she explored her own interests and had an epiphany about the cause/effect relationship of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era, a moment she views as having positively impacted how she teaches the topics. Ultimately, Julie's forgetting was beneficial to her and her students. Second, Julie's inability to

recall how she learned about the Gilded Age and Progressive Era caused her to conjecture how she must have learned about it, through lecture. Even though Julie does not have memories of lessons about that time period, she creates a sort of stand-in memory that fits her overall narrative about her own experience as an AP student (that her teacher was inept and primarily lectured). Finally, Julie's remembrance points us in the direction of the nature of what participants did and did not remember about their own history education, which can be used to think about their own teaching as well as broader lessons for the field.

Rob and Paul engaged in similar kinds of thinking about the experiences and topics they forgot. Much like Julie, Rob ultimately saw a benefit in not having developed strong content knowledge as a result of his own education:

> I really didn't have that knowledge base, so I probably would have come across as a little uneducated about things that are supposed to be important… Once I'd gone through all these teacher prep programs and I'd learned about history in a nuanced way, I then could approach and learn this new material. At the end of the day, not knowing much about the content actually helped because then I learned about it and found what I want to get across to the kids.

Again, it's not a negative to Rob that there's not much that he can remember from his own K-12 history education because knowledge that he gained from his teacher prep courses challenged him to think about history in more complex ways, which allowed him to think about content in a way that would be more targeted towards his students.

Rob also made assumptions about how he learned about World War II. Although he did not specifically remember his experiences, the preponderance of lecture and his being tracked in a lower class led him to think that unit was "this battle, this battle, this battle. Here's how we

won. Let's watch Pearl Harbor." Again, in the absence of a memory, Rob created a narrative that fit his existing conception of what his own education had been like. In the case of the Civil Rights Movement, though, Rob claimed that he did not have any traditional academic learning experience about it. Instead, he suggested that it's one of those topics "that almost feels like common knowledge. It's almost one of those things that just feel like 'when didn't I know about it?" Rob claims that despite not having formally learned about the Civil Rights Movement, by the time he got to college he could explain the difference between Martin Luther King, Jr.'s and Malcolm X's ideology and that he felt as though he had always known King's "I Have a Dream" speech. While it's entirely possible that Rob could have picked up understandings of those concepts from the cultural milieu, it might be that he forgets learning about those topics due to his own affinity for the material. Perhaps he sees his understanding as stemming from within as opposed to being explained to him by someone else.

Participants had a wide range of answers when asked why they think they forgot about their history education. Julie wondered if she didn't remember history because her classes "made sense, because they were easy." Unlike her history courses, Julie remembered AP chemistry and AP English because they took her out of her comfort zone and challenged her to confront her own limits and recognize her growth as a student. These challenges were absent from her history classes and she sees the lack of discomfort contributing to her forgetting. For Rob, it was because he was in lower tracked classes with students who were not fully engaged with the material, including himself. The classes he remembered were ones where learning was accomplished through doing, such as home economics, or where he saw information that was applicable to how he could understand the world, like statistics.

The reasons why Paul forgot influences him as a teacher because:

> The day-to-day isn't important. It's a slow gradual build-up of information over time, it's precept upon precept, layer upon layer, you add to yourself. And so much of school as a student is literally a blur.

He added by making a connection to his own teaching:

> I know for a fact that most of those students who walked out of Econ today aren't going to remember that lecture. They're going to forget it like five seconds after they get out of there. But it's, "Did Mr. K. [Paul] listen to us and change the format? He cared. He stood up there and explained things," you know, little stuff.

To Paul, the ability to pinpoint a moment when something was learned is irrelevant because learning is cumulative and ongoing. As discussed earlier in this chapter, he views it as quite possible that he will never quite know what his students will learn because it may be a moment that he wasn't paying attention to.

Julie and Rob also contended with how their own students will forget, just like they did. Julie believes that the students will end up having a similar experience to her, where:

> they'll remember a lot of the early stuff. We spent a lot of time on that. They'll remember a lot of the end because it's relevant to their daily lives. I'm guessing they'll have a similar experience that I did, that {The Gilded Age/Progressive Era] was just somewhere in the middle and I think people forget 1800-1920.

Rob, though, did not as easily see why students would forget, only that they would. He ended one of his interviews with what he saw as a humorous anecdote about some of his former students:

> We were looking at the impact on two civilian populations during World War II and this group of seniors had a quiz about it and they all did poorly and the excuse was that I

> didn't teach about WWII in sophomore year. I thought that was such a funny, interesting justification of why you didn't do well on a quiz in your senior year is because two years [before] I mysteriously didn't teach about World War II. Like for six weeks you were asleep or I was doing such a poor job that you think we didn't learn about it.

Unlike Paul and Julie, Rob does not quite see the process that he went through applying to his own students. Even though I believe he told the story because we had been discussing what he imagined his teachers hoped he had taken from their class, he did not make the connection that his students would only remember bits and pieces of their time together, just as he had. Rob's inability to see that his own students could be capable of forgetting is Britzman's (1998) concept of difficult knowledge at work. As Garrett (2017) notes, engagement with difficult knowledge "means being able to recognize that there is knowledge we simultaneously do and do not want to have" (p. 24). On the one hand, Rob recognizes that his students forgot what they learned in his class. He is able to recall the story and his need to share it before ending that day's interview signals that that experience holds significance to him. On the other hand, Rob's telling of the story is marked with disbelief. The reason why this anecdote seems difficult for Rob to contend with is not necessarily that his students forgot information, it's that their inability to recall what they learned potentially marks Rob as having done "a poor job." As Rob does not want to view himself as a bad teacher, he seemingly recalls the story as a funny example of how students will make excuses that don't, to him, make any sense.

What Gets Remembered?

So if most of their K-12 history education was forgotten, what did the participants in this study actually remember? Both Rob and Julie recalled projects, though as Julie noted she doesn't really know how much she learned from the construction of a large, 3-dimensional map of

ancient Rome but it made her interested in the topic. All three participants also remembered teachers who were engaging, caring, or who did funny things, like Paul's government teacher who looked like and did impressions of Robin Williams.

It is not surprising that projects and personalities would be remembered. Many of us still have material evidence of projects we completed as children tucked away in our (or our parents') basement or attic, and swapping stories about teachers good, bad, and weird is a time-honored tradition seemingly shared by everyone, as school is a fairly universal experience. The experiences that really resonated with my participants, though, were the ones that Rob described as being based on "humanity and community." Rob particularly remembered watching films and reading narratives, what he described as "non-traditional ways of understanding history." Movies stuck with him because he was a visual learner, but the experience of watching *Schindler's List*, *The Pianist,* and reading the work of Elie Wiesel allowed him to see the "narrative, human story side of things." In the case of learning about the Holocaust, these experiences allow him to no longer see the impact in terms of "this number, six million Jews," but to instead see it as "six million of those stories."

Similarly, the primary memory Paul had of his American history education was the day his teacher invited in a Vietnam veteran to talk about his experience in the war. In remembering a class where Paul claimed he could not remember anything, he said that he could tell the vet's story verbatim. Paul went on to describe the vet's story about being deployed and being told that his group would be able to go home if X number of casualties have occurred. The moment that stuck with Paul was when the vet asked the class how they thought he felt when he found out about a soldier dying. "I was happy," Paul remembered the vet saying, "because we were one more closer to being done. That's a terrible way to feel about life." Much like Rob, Paul's

example stresses the humanity and complex emotional experience of having lived through a war, an experience that was so powerful for Paul that it is more or less the sole thing he remembers about learning history in high school, almost twenty years after the fact.

Discussion

Throughout this chapter, I've used Simon, Rosenberg, and Eppert's (2000) conception of remembrance to look at how participants narrated their own learning as history students and the connection such narratives have to justifying their own vision of who they are as teachers in the present. Julie, Rob and Paul all demonstrated that connections do exist and that memories are operationalized through the act of remembrance to make claims about who each is or wants to be. However, this process is not necessarily straightforward, and I can not claim that a teacher engages in a specific action because they elicited a particular memory that reinforces it. I also cannot claim that the memories that participants elicited are representative of the scope of what they actually remember. From a psychoanalytic standpoint, there may be memories that teachers repress or choose not to discuss because they do not want to contend with their implication. I also explored what participants forgot about their history education and the insight that can be gleaned from their omissions and what they remember in light of their forgetting.

Most research about the relationship between teacher identity and memory uses a psychoanalytic framework. Chang-Kredl and Wilkie (2016), for example, have teachers create narratives of a childhood memory to create a space where "the teacher can look back in nostalgic identification with his/her remembered child self and forward to an anticipated identification" related to the adult the child will one day become (p. 317). That is, that, from a psychoanalytic perspective, teachers are psychically working out elements of their own pasts in the present-day context of their classroom. Rothenberg (1994), on the other hand, sees engagement with one's

memories of learning as a space to combat Lortie's (1975) "apprenticeship of observation" and to engage more deeply in interrogating and understanding how one's personal experience as a student impacts an individual's teaching. In both studies, there is a belief that the memories one holds have a connection to present-day actions. The elicitation of memories can help surface that influence and help a teacher more critically understand how they conceptualize their field or make pedagogical decisions.

The work in this study deviates from this existing research. Largely, this is due to methodological differences. Memory work, as currently conceptualized, often focuses on having teachers create written narratives that they revise and then, in working with others, make sense of by looking at themes that may connect to today. As this study was not entirely focused on memory work and because I was interested in how teachers remembered in real time, I chose to instead elicit memories through questions that the participants had not been previously provided. I thought, and still think, that there is much to be gained from understanding what immediately comes to a person's mind in their telling of the past, just as there is something to be gained from engaging in a more focused, written remembrance.

What is evident, though, is that the participants in my study did not engage their own memories in ways that spurred them to critically reflect on their own experience, either as a way to understand how they engage in a repetition of their own experiences or as a means to critically analyze the "apprenticeship of observation," nor would they have necessarily engaged in memory work without the prompting of my questions. Out of my three participants, Julie perhaps was closest to doing this type of work. Her remembrance of her own AP U.S. History experience led her to critique the problematic, in her view, features of her own education, such as over-reliance on lecture and a lack of clarity in class discussion protocol, and to consciously work to

avoid those same pitfalls. However, she was not able to recognize the parallels given an opportunity in the conversations we had. It would be interesting to see how participants' understanding of why they elicited the memories they did and how those remembrances justify their actions in the present would change if they took part in more focused memory work.

One of the most fascinating findings to emerge from this study was that none of my participants, all history teachers with degrees related to their field, could remember much of their own K-12 history education. This was especially remarkable given that Rob and Julie graduated from high school less than ten years ago. On the one hand, this finding, especially as it relates to what participants did remember, points to the need to further explore the kinds of pedagogical approaches that resonated with participants and why those approaches had such an impact. On the other hand, there is also a need to understand the relationship between teachers' own experiences and what they project their students will and won't remember.

In considering the kinds of pedagogical experiences that participants remembered, three trends emerged. First, participants tended to report activities where they learned through doing. In their history classes, projects and simulations resonated with them, though both Julie and Rob raised the importance of interrogating whether a project or simulation is remembered because it was fun or because it had deeper educational merit. Second, engagement with texts that added an emotional and human understanding of history were powerful. This was evident in Rob's discussion of the various Holocaust-related movies he saw and their impact on helping him simultaneously recognize the large scale of the Holocaust while illustrating the specific impact that event had on the individual victims. Similarly, Paul's remembrance of the Vietnam veteran's troubling story of being happy to hear when his fellow soldiers died demonstrates a kind of historical understanding not typically found in sources used in history classes. Finally,

the experiences they remembered, often not within the realm of a history class, were those that challenged them and took them outside their comfort zones. Often, this theme was talked about in terms of their learning. Julie, for example, had to confront the challenge of learning how to write in her AP English class and she struggled in AP chemistry. There is also the struggle, though, where one's understanding of the surrounding world is challenged. Too often, history classes provide answers that can be located in a textbook passage, overlooking the way in which historical claims are constructed and, in the case of K-12 education, often stripped of their more controversial elements. The findings from this chapter point to the potential of restoring those challenges and that uncertainty in order to facilitate learning that goes beyond the end of the unit.

However, it is also important to think about the tension/difficulty that potentially exists when teachers who don't remember their own learning have to confront the nature of what their own students will or won't remember after being in their class. The participants in this study recognized this possibility in various ways. For Julie, it was logical that her students would not remember learning about the Gilded Age and Progressive Era, just as she hadn't, because it fell in a time period that is often culturally forgotten. Paul's belief in the slow, accumulated progress of learning signaled awareness that he might not see the fruits of his labor. Rob, on the other hand, expressed disbelief that students who had only had him two years prior could completely forget that he had taught them about World War II. All three of these responses signal different ways that teachers cope with the potential limitations of their own impact and the disconnect between feeling as though they can't remember what they learned, yet having faith that their approach to teaching will result in lifelong memories. Further exploration into this idea could result in more nuanced engagement with how teachers understand their own learning and what that means for their approach to teaching.

Conclusion

In closing, interrogating participants' memories of their own learning allows for insight into how teachers may narrate their memories in order to justify elements of who they are in the classroom today. In addition, these remembrances provide insight into how teachers learned as history students and how their own experiences as learners connect to the pedagogical choices they make in their own classrooms. Further engagement with the ideas raised in this study can more directly involve teachers in interrogating the impact their memories have on their identity as teachers and the long-term influence they see themselves having on students. In addition, it can also lead to a more complex view of the kind of learning experiences that teachers were impacted by and what, if any links, those memories have on teacher practice.

CHAPTER FIVE

EXTERNAL FACTORS

Introduction

In this chapter, I explore external factors related to how elements of the self connect to the curriculum. Specifically, I look at how teachers construct elements of their identity via the way in which they think about the explicit curriculum of their school and/or program, their conception of what it means to be a historian, and their perceptions about who their students are. By engaging in this analysis, I follow Segall's (2003) poststructural examination of the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) and the discourses and discursive practices that surround it. Segall argues that "the meaning of the MEAP is not considered… as simply 'out there' waiting for teachers to decipher it, but constructed by teachers as they interact with it and with the discursive practices that go along with it" (p. 292). In this chapter, I seek to understand how teachers constitute themselves in relation to the various external factors they encounter in the day-to-day realities of teaching. Like Segall, I argue that these external factors do not hold meaning in and of themselves, but rather it is how teachers perceive and navigate the discourses that surround these external factors that have an impact. Such understanding can provide a clearer picture of when and where teachers see themselves having agency in their work, as well as the way that the discourses of these external factors are navigated and the resulting impact they have on how a teacher imagines what is and isn't possible in their teaching. I begin the chapter by exploring how participants constructed themselves in light of the explicit curriculum they were each tasked with implementing. I then consider the role that conceptions of the nature of the discipline one teaches has on teaching. Threaded through both of these themes are the

perceptions about the character and needs of students that position teachers to enact their identities in particular ways.

The Curriculum Giveth and the Curriculum Taketh Away

Chief among the pedagogical constraints that teachers might feel is the explicit curriculum they are required to teach. The explicit curriculum of a school, or the official goals and objectives intended to be taught (Eisner, 1985), is usually adapted from standards and guidelines that have been adopted by the state. The participants in this study, though, used three different curriculum formats that deviated from the more typical process: The Advanced Placement curriculum (Julie), the International Baccalaureate Program (Rob) and a curricular adaptation process unique to the Interdisciplinary Studies Program (Paul). Explicit curriculum can certainly impact what gets taught and how, but how it is enacted is further mediated by the context of the school in which it is being taught, including the degree of academic freedom one has and the amount of pressure from parents and students one feels. Conceptions of the impact of the explicit curriculum varied both within and among participants' experiences. At times, it helped facilitate meaningful learning experiences that were an expression of an element of the teacher's own identity, while at others it was an obstacle that created a time crunch and a need to keep moving forward through required content. In this section, I focus on how Julie and Rob conceptualized their relationship to their respective curriculum programs and the way in which their perceptions of the discourses around their curriculum simultaneously allowed them to accomplish and kept them from achieving.

The Top of the Ladder

Julie saw her status as an AP teacher as a positive indicator of who she was as an educator because, according to her, people who teach AP are "always the good teachers; they're

the ones the kids love." However, Julie also felt "restricted by the curriculum framework for AP" because "there's still so much to cover that I feel like sometimes it's… a topic a day." Instead of focusing on breadth, Julie wanted to be able to "dive into topics," so students could develop a more nuanced understanding of the past.

From the outset, these two statements illustrate a discursive tension that Julie experienced through her perception of the AP curriculum. On the one hand, the status Julie saw conveyed to her as an AP teacher allowed her to construct an image of being a good teacher who was skilled and had a close relationship with her students. Simultaneously, though, the AP curriculum inhibited Julie from being the kind of teacher she desired because the quick pace and assessment-based focus of the class led to an inability to explore topics more in-depth. In this section, I focus on how Julie's perceptions of the AP curriculum both positioned it as an obstacle to her curricular goals and allowed her to focus on interests that were important to her.

Julie's interactions with the AP curriculum reflect Foucault's (1980) conception of power, with Julie at times being constituted by the power she perceived the AP curriculum having over her curricular decision-making and at other times exerting her own power either against, or in tandem with, the discourse of the AP curriculum. Julie's AP curriculum was an 80-page document that included 55 pages of standards intended to be covered prior to students taking the AP exam in early May. The high number of standards and short timeline for covering them reflects the discourse of Advanced Placement classes; these are considered college-level courses and in the conception of AP, that means that coverage is fast, largely factual, and independent learning is a key to success. Even though the AP curriculum was demanding, Julie felt she did "get a little bit of say" in her classroom, especially in relation to how she wanted to organize the curriculum. The year prior to the study, Julie had been frustrated by the official

order of the units because, as someone who positioned herself as an organizer, the units did not flow well into one another, especially, in her opinion, when it came to student knowledge retention. As a result, Julie shifted the order of the units. This change allowed her to further insert herself in the curriculum as she positioned the Gilded Age and Progressive Era in a cause/effect relationship and "picked things that would demonstrate that relationship," thus reflecting "the way [she] think[s] about this time period." In this case, Julie's view that the AP curriculum did not precisely lay out how to teach worked to her advantage as she was able to impart her own understanding on the interrelationship of elements in the curriculum.

While Julie felt restricted by the curriculum, she still created space for her own interests and strengths to come through. When asked, in the context of her Progressive Era unit, how she decided which content to include in a unit and which to leave out, Julie replied

> I don't know if this is a good teaching method or not, but I pick the [content] that I like. I pick the things that I know, mainly because I enjoy teaching them, but also I feel like my kids will get more out of it if I enjoy it or if I understand it.

Here, Julie recognizes her own agency in making selections about what to teach. It is somewhat surprising that the requirements of the AP curriculum are not even mentioned. Rather, Julie focuses on the content that interests her. Even though it is her own interests that she is selecting, Julie argues that students will get more out of the class because she will be more motivated to teach what she likes, as opposed to focusing on information she does not fully understand or enjoy.

When it came to her World War II unit, though, Julie explained her choices in terms of the AP curriculum and her students. Julie explained that she asked herself "what do I think is going to be important on the test? What do I think they can understand without my guidance?"

Even though she placed importance of her curricular choices in terms of the AP test and her students' abilities, Julie still chose material that connected with her own interests. Julie discussed her almost complete exclusion of the course of the war, explaining "I don't enjoy teaching [battles] at all… and it's something the curriculum doesn't' spend a lot of time on. It basically says they need to know what island hopping is and about D-Day." Julie also couched her inclusion of the Arsenal of Democracy as a result of her own experience taking a college-level Michigan history course. In these examples, Julie initially situates her curricular decision-making in relation to the AP curriculum; the curriculum says, after all, that only two elements related the course of the war that have to covered. Even though Julie starts by positioning her decision-making in relation to the AP curriculum, she shifts her rationale to include that her choices reflect her own interests. Therefore, Julie uses AP curriculum to dictate her decision-making at times when it is advantageous to use the AP as rationale for certain decisions. In the case of World War II, a stricter reading of the AP curriculum supported Julie's decision to not teach about specific battles, which reflected her own interests. She couldn't teach about specific battles, after all, because they weren't specified in the explicit curriculum. At other times, Julie exerted her own power to circumvent the curriculum, as was the case when a loose interpretation of the AP curriculum allowed Julie the flexibility to focus on the topics that she wanted to and that made sense to her during the Progressive Era, as well as assert her own organizational tendencies. The curriculum served a dual purpose as facilitator and inhibitor, both roles that, in these cases, helped Julie make the curriculum choices she wanted to implement.

While Julie saw the freedom to insert herself and select topics that she wanted to focus on, she also saw the AP curriculum inhibiting her pedagogical choices. In the first lesson of her Progressive Era unit, Julie displayed an excerpt from Upton Sinclair's *The Jungle* and read a

short passage depicting the graphic nature of the Chicago meatpacking industry. In our discussion at the end of the unit, Julie explained that she wished she could have students read *The Jungle.* When I asked her why she couldn't, she explained that it wouldn't be worth taking so much time to read the book because "it's a question on the test." "In the end game of the AP test," she argued, "I don't know that it's beneficial to take that much time to read *The Jungle*, even though I feel like most kids would probably enjoy it." In this example, Julie sees worth in having the students take a deeper dive into a motivating cause of Progressive Era reforms; in fact, she has a class set of books, which indicates one of her predecessors did just that. However, Julie adopts the discourse of the AP curriculum that the focus should be on test preparation, where historical events or texts are reduced to a multiple-choice item or essay question. Instead of asserting what students stand to gain from reading the book, Julie positions it as what they have to lose; the instructional time dedicated to the book wouldn't be worth the "pay-off" of how the book is potentially represented on the AP exam. The implication is that time spent developing a deeper understanding of reform movements in the food industry would result in time missed learning about other topics, which would then be detrimental to students' ability to perform well on the test.

Even though she claimed that she did not have time to read *The Jungle* during the Progressive Era unit, Julie expanded the unit by one and a half days in order to accommodate her lesson on the contemporary women's rights movement (as detailed in Chapter 3). This decision was an outgrowth of her own struggle to understand the movement, related to issues of identity, and also because she believed her students to be experiencing a similar struggle in understanding the meaning of the contemporary movement. Whereas *The Jungle* couldn't be used because of its weak relation to the test, Julie had students spend an extra day and a half of instructional time

creating their textbook excerpts. Recognizing this disconnect is not meant to criticize her pedagogical choice, as it does, after all, take much longer to read a novel as a class than it does to work on a small project. Rather, what's interesting about the choice is that when Julie avoided the possibility of teaching *The Jungle*, an issue that might have its roots in potential uncertainty over how to teach a book, it was because the AP curriculum inhibited her from doing so. However, when Julie wanted to extend instructional time to deal with a topic of that she saw reflective of her own uncertainties, she was able to expand the amount of curricular time given to the project, even though there was no way that material could possibly be on the test.

Julie also frequently discussed her desire to cede more control of the class to her students, wanting to have more student-led discussions and projects. Once again, the discourse of the AP curriculum was positioned as inhibiting her from doing so. When asked why she could not cede control, Julie responded "it's hard for me to say, with the AP test in mind, they may not understand every single thing that they need to understand." Julie used the AP curriculum to explain why she could have a more student-centered class. It was the specter of the AP exam that haunted her pedagogical decisions and kept her from changing her approach and not her own uncertainty about her students' ability to take responsibility for their own learning, a hesitation she also expressed. This uncertainty cycled back around and connected to the AP test again as Julie felt pressure from her students to deliver a certain kind of course as "they took this class to get college credit, not change their understanding of U.S. history." Therefore, the AP curriculum not only structured her understanding of what could and could not happen within the realm of an AP class, but it also positioned her students in certain ways. Students in Julie's class were both immature enough to be trusted with more control over their learning in the class, yet mature enough to take a class that relied heavily on students taking responsibility for learning material

on their own. This dual conception was reinforced by the AP curriculum. In order to ensure that students got the experience they wanted, one that would lead to college credit, Julie had to maintain control to deliver the test preparation she believed they required to pass the test.

Julie simultaneously constructed herself, via discourses surrounding the AP curriculum, as a good teacher who had made it by her identity/status as an AP teacher, as well as a teacher who fell short of her goals of a discussion-based, student-centered class focused on in-depth engagement with the curriculum due to AP's onslaught of information. Julie used the curriculum to reflect her interests but ultimately taught in ways that reinforced a vision of AP education as dependent upon a succession of quick, surface-based understandings of a litany of topics as well as a need for students to succeed on the test.

The Dog and Pony Show

Rob was my other research participant who taught within a very rigid explicit curriculum Whereas Julie centered her criticisms of AP in the AP curriculum itself, Rob perceived that the issues in his experience weren't due to the IB curriculum, but due to the challenges of having a common curriculum across three campuses as well as what the IB curriculum was perceived to represent to parents and school officials. Like Julie, Rob navigated his curriculum in ways that allowed him to express elements of his identity, but unlike Julie, Rob did not necessarily take issue with how the IB curriculum discursively shaped him, but rather how the discourses that surrounded how his administrators and his students' parents perceived the IB did.

At its core, Rob felt there was congruence between his personal vision for education, (focused on developing students' understanding of themselves, the structure of the world they live in and an ability to recognize their own role and ability in making the world more just), and

the vision set forth by the IB curriculum. “In its truest sense,” Rob told me, “the IB curriculum is beautiful.” He continued:

> The goal of the learner profile and creating these well-rounded students who… [are] thinkers, communicators, principled, like, yeah, 100%... [and] not just being a bookworm, but also the portions like creativity, action, and service…. The model itself fits my view of teaching really well.

The problem, Rob suggested, “[is] my school really prides scores and our ranking. Our prestige is based on that.” The school had taken steps to tone down the score-based rhetoric, but “at the end of the day, [students] still have to sit and take the exam.” Therefore, Rob had to teach in ways that would ensure his students would do well if they happened to get a strict examiner who required “a perfect thesis and an absurd amount of specific facts” so that the school’s scores would not be on the line.

It wasn’t just the school that was the problem, however. Rob stated that parents exerted a great deal of pressure on the school and their children, which in turn caused students to frame their learning in relation to the discourse of what the IB meant as a means to future success. In the case of parents, the IB meant that students would be educated for the purpose of “really successful testing, really successful grades, and the stepping stone to a great university.”

In Rob’s telling, the IB curriculum had a transcendent quality to it that made it “beautiful.” Since he saw a great deal of overlap between his own commitments and that of the IB, he believed that his students would do just fine on the exam if he could “teach the way [he] want[ed] to teach, in a really beautiful way.” However, even though it was the IB curriculum that dictated what the exam looked like and positioned its program of study as a stepping stone towards access to and success in higher education, Rob saw school policy and parental attitudes

as being at fault for compromising what the IB meant and, therefore, compromising elements of his own approach to teaching. Rob explained his issue with the IB wasn't the skill-based work that it required students to learn, most of those skills he saw himself teaching anyway, but that it was the formulaic expression of those skills he viewed as a burden. Those formats, it seems, were primarily an outgrowth of and problem because of the way they were assigned meaning by IB test scorers, parents, and the administrators at Northrup High. As a result of all of these discourses, Rob felt that he needed to put on a "dog and pony show" in order to appease the various actors whose perceptions were so important.

Like Julie, Rob still found ways to operate within and assert his own identity through the curriculum, but he was also simultaneously critical of and complicit in the ways it limited his teaching. One of Rob's frustrations was that technically Northrup was one of four campuses that comprised a single high school despite being geographically far flung from one another. That led to a curricular challenge because Rob had to give common assessments on the same day as his colleagues at the other campuses, despite not really working together in a collaborative way. In addition, any changes a teacher wanted to make to the curriculum had to be approved. Yet, Rob still found spaces in his curriculum to make himself present. For example, when schools had to pick a non-European authoritarian state to study, Rob lobbied for Cuba, even though the other campuses had chosen to do China. Rob was granted an exception. Rob explained that he was excited to teach about Cuba because "it connects to my identity. Being able to have sources in Spanish… that was a big thing I was excited about." Therefore, even though commonality was a factor, he was able to work around it to promote a unit he situated as important to himself. While the commonality of the Northrup's four campuses at times positioned Rob in unfavorable ways,

he was still able to overcome that commonality in ways he thought were pedagogically beneficial.

Due to the commonality across campuses, Rob often felt crunched for time and his penchant for having students engage in inquiry activities, such as his two period (out of five periods dedicated to the unit) activity about the rise of Germany and Japan in the lead-up to World War II or his decision to watch the documentary *13th* in class, contributed to that feeling. Rob remarked that the main obstacle to his teaching was "always time" because he would be capable of teaching a year-long class about any of the topics he in the curriculum. However, Rob situated his inability to fully explore topics in the context of IB and of his students, noting that he had "a responsibility to students to go through more thematic things and set them up for the content they going to need in the next program." In addition, even though he disliked the commonality aspect of his job, Rob felt "a responsibility to [his] colleagues" and need to maintain some commonality in order to "make sure that the experience in [his] class is not [so] radically different from another class that it causes tension between students." This feeling of responsibility made Rob at peace with having a prescribed curriculum because he saw himself as being able to stay on a single topic for a long period of time. Therefore, having a set of guidelines ensured that he would meet the responsibility he felt towards his students and fellow history teachers to cover the material needed for success in higher grades.

Overall, Rob saw the IB curriculum as an entity that spoke to creating well-rounded students through curriculum that would help achieve many of his own curricular goals. He was, however, frustrated by the way in which he saw the overarching goals of the IB curriculum, and his own ability to speak to them, compromised by the desires of other stakeholders in the school. Even though Rob was frustrated by the "dog and pony show" he had to occasionally put on, he

was complicit in how the IB curriculum functioned via his own issues related to timing, adoption of discourses related to students needing to be prepared for the next level of curriculum and his desire to be respectful of the commonality he was supposed to share with his colleagues.

While the AP and IB curriculums existed above and beyond Julie and Rob, their perceptions of the discourses that surrounded their respective curriculum played a major role in the power each felt in their ability to make curricular decisions. For Julie, the AP curriculum could be navigated in ways that allowed her to assert elements of her own vision of history education, but ultimately resulted in her teaching in ways that followed the more rapid-fire, surface-level discourse of AP courses. Meanwhile, Rob perceived the discourse of the IB curriculum itself to be highly reflective of his own values, yet it was his perceptions of the discourses that other curricular stakeholders brought to bear on the IB program that compromised what the curriculum was meant to promote. At the same time, though, Rob still bought into these other discourses as he felt pressured to make sure that his students were on-target and on-topic in the eyes of parents and administration.

The Nature of the Discipline

Another factor that influenced how participants constructed elements of their identity was their perception about the larger field of the academic discipline they taught and how they perceived their relationship to it. In this section, I focus on the experiences of Paul and Rob in order to understand how they crafted images of who they are as teachers in relation to their perceptions of the expectations of what it means to be a member of that field. Just like the exploration of curriculum, though, the teacher's perception of the discipline and the discourses that surround it is not only shaped by their own conceptions, but also their perceptions about how their students view the field and what they think students expect to get out of it. Similar to Julie

and Rob's relation to the curriculum, Paul and Rob both shape and are shaped by their assumptions about what it meant to be someone who identified as part of their discipline in relation to the specific context of their students.

The Sage on the Stage

As part of the Interdisciplinary Studies Program (ISP), each teacher facilitates a once-weekly grade-level requirement course that students have to take to fulfill pre-requisites for graduation. The 2017-2018 school year was Paul's first year teaching the junior-level economics course. I decided that I should see Paul teaching economics as a means of observing any differences that might exist between how he approached that class and the more typical ISP core class. I went into my initial observation with two pieces of information: the week before Paul had his class play the board game *Settlers of Catan* and the focus of the lesson I would observe was discussing that experience.

Instead of holding class in his room, Paul taught economics in the "little theater" on the other side of the school. Students sat in auditorium-style seats and Paul stood behind a lectern on the stage. A large pull-down screen took up a large chunk of the stage and a PowerPoint titled "'Everything' You Need to Know About Economics You Can Learn From *Settlers of Catan*" was displayed on it. Over the course of an hour, Paul explained the connection between the board game and economic principles such as scarcity, opportunity cost, comparative advantage, and the laws of supply and demand. Occasionally Paul asked students to illustrate a concept with an example from their experience playing *Settlers*, but overall it was a very teacher-centered lesson.

I was slightly surprised to see Paul teach such a lecture-heavy class, especially because it did not connect to how he, or any other ISP teacher, typically taught. Lecture was not unheard of in ISP and many units began with a whole group lecture to give context for the material to be

learned, but it was not typical in the otherwise seminar-centric classes. I assumed it might be a fluke, but other observations were very similar. Most classes were focused on an economic concept, such as the costs of production, and might include a small activity or two, but otherwise were primarily lecture-based.

Paul's approach to teaching economics stemmed from his perceptions of how his students perceived learning that subject as well as his own discomfort with the material. When I first asked him about his choice to teach in the auditorium, Paul responded, "that's talking to [student] expectations of what an econ teacher looks like and that's legitimately me saying 'you want a sage on the stage? Here's the stage. Here's your sage.'" Paul had initially designed the class to work like an online course. Due to the once-a-week format of the class and the increasing likelihood students would experience an online course in their college career, Paul envisioned students watching *Crash Course Economics* videos, reading from the textbook, and completing quizzes on their own. Class time would be spent as a place to work and Paul would be available to answer questions for students. Students did not like that approach, complaining that they could not learn on their own, hence Paul's decision to lecture. "Since I've been doing it," he explained, "I haven't had any complaints."

Paul explained most of his choices in light of what he perceived his students' understanding of what an economics class and teacher should look like. In the rare, for his economics class, moments where Paul attempted to teach in a way that more directly connected to his vision of education and bucked his perception of what an economics class was supposed to look like, he would end up reframing what he had done in a more traditional, lecture-based way. The decision, for example, to use a popular board game, like *Settlers of Catan,* to teach economic principles was inspired. Yet, instead of following that activity with a discussion about what

students had experienced, Paul created a lecture that told them what they had experienced. Paul explained his decision as a "riff on we did thing I thought you should have done but now I'm going to do a thing you want me to do so that you can feel it was legitimized." Paul worried that his students would not see the connection between playing the game and learning economics, so he lectured as a means to confront his fear that they would not buy the lesson as being an acceptable way to learn economic principles.

Even though Paul framed the decisions he made about economics as being an outgrowth of what he thought students wanted (based on his perceptions and the reality that they did complain), there were other elements at play. Paul's pedagogical decisions about economics arose from his own conceptualization of the field and its shortcomings, as well as his own discomfort with the curriculum. "I think my struggle with the students in econ is also my struggle with econ," Paul remarked. "It's so quantitative at times and I have no interest in being a math teacher." For Paul, it was the very nature of economics he had issues with because it wasn't social studies; it was math. Paul wished that instead of economics, students would take a personal finance class that more directly applied to their lives and would be more appropriate for high school students because he did not see the purpose of micro- and macroeconomic ideas, at least in terms of the formal economics curriculum used in Michigan: "I have a hard time finding the 'so what?'" he said, "in econ the answer is 'because I said so.'" As a result, Paul did not view himself as having much control over the curriculum, drawing most of his materials from pre-prepared curriculum. He characterized his approach as "monkey flips a switch teaching."

Paul's feelings about his students and his perception about the discourse surrounding the field of economics education (which he initially filtered through his students) combined with his students' perceptions of what an economics class should look like to construct a particular image

of teaching and learning economics that simultaneously resulted in the reification of that image through Paul's actual practice. Interestingly, Paul was able to recognize that there were alternative ways of teaching economics. Besides taking a more personal finance approach, I asked Paul how he would feel if he taught an elective called Board Game Economics, where each week students played a different board game that illustrated an economic concept. Paul loved the idea and could see how students could defensibly learn through those experiences. When I asked him why he thought it would make a great class, he responded "because I wouldn't feel the pressure to do the content expectations." The combination of Paul's perception of economics as mathematics masquerading as social studies, his own discomfort with the curriculum, and his students' perceptions (and Paul's interpretation of those perceptions) of what an economics class should look like resulted in a more lecture-based approach and foreclosed the possibility of a more creative, student-centered way of learning the material. Paul was able to imagine a different approach for teaching economics free of the discourse surrounding a required course. Within the bounds of a traditional economics course, though, Paul felt he could not deviate from the expectations that such a requirement entailed.

I'm Not *That* Historian

Much of Paul's approach to economics was the result of his own misgivings about the field and his perceptions about who he thought his students wanted him to be in that context, but both Rob and Paul also constructed specific images of themselves in relation to the discipline of history. Julie, on the other hand, seldom spoke about herself as an historian, and when she did it was typically in response to a specific question I asked that positioned her as such. I will present possible reasons why this was the case in the discussion at the end of this chapter. In this section, though, I will explore how Rob and Paul claimed identities as historians not only through their

own conception of the field, but also through imagined threats to their conception via the spectral figure of "*that* historian."

In Chapter 4, I relayed the story of the Vietnam veteran who visited Paul's high school history class. As he told me that story, Paul tripped on what he thought the right word would be to describe a group of soldiers stationed in the war. "I don't know the proper terminology," he said, deviating from the story for a moment, "I'm not *that* historian." After finishing his story and our discussion about that experience, I asked Paul to elaborate on who *that* historian was. "Just the Battle Historian, right?" he replied, "The History Channel Historian. You know, 'here's the number of casualties…' you just walk through [and] they're doing a football play-by-play." Even though his tone seemed to indicate differently in his delivery of *that*, Paul said that he was always amazed at that ability. "If you're not that, you're not quite there, yet," Paul said, indicating that to some degree he equated mastery of minutiae as an indicator of being able to identify as a historian. Rob had a similar conception of *that* historian, the history buff, an older gentleman who would, in Rob's imagination, approach his students and inquire into their historical knowledge by asking questions like "how do you feel about the Battle of the Bulge?"

As Rob and Paul both had constructions of *that* historian, how did this imagined other's expertise compare to their own identities as historians and what they were trying to achieve with their students? Furthermore, what role did this imagined other play in either fortifying or challenging the conceptions that Rob and Paul held? First, Rob and Paul both positioned themselves as historians who focus more on the larger themes of history. Rob connected this disposition to his own shortcomings in being able to tell someone exactly what happened. "I know that sounds bad, but I've never been the person who tell you every name, every date, of the name of every bill… For me it was always how I understood… and applied that to the bigger

picture." For Paul, such a conception of history, of looking for the larger connections between ideas, linked to his appreciation of the slow accumulation of knowledge. If, after all, the devil is in the details, then there is no inherent reason to be focused on the universalizing factors that tie ideas together. Both Rob and Paul attributed much of their identity as historians to the professors that they each had in college. "Most of who I am as a historian and as a teacher is a result of my university professors," Paul explained. "I was kind of a blank slate and allowed the university to say 'we're the experts,' here's how to do these things." As discussed in Chapter 4, it was Rob's experience in a senior thesis class that he credited with allowing him to see how history can take on larger themes and introduce more human elements.

Paul and Rob's conception of the field of history being more concerned with larger themes that thread through or transcend units was evident in their teaching. For his unit on the Civil Rights Movement, Rob wanted students to understand that there were bottom-up (grassroots) and top-down (law-based) approaches to the Civil Rights Movement. He specifically focused on grassroots movements as a way to spur student agency for making change in the world and saw a correlation between what students learned as historical knowledge in that unit and connections he hopes they'd make to their own ability to address incidents of racism in the school, as well as participate in events like the National School Walkout held in the aftermath of the school shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School. For Paul, the entire ISP curriculum was built upon the idea that large scale themes take precedence in understanding the humanities. The entire American Year curriculum was centered on a set of essential questions such as "What are the American myths? How do they shape us?" and "Can we still dream the American dream?"

So why the focus on *that* historian if Paul and Rob had clear visions of who they were as historians as constituted by their own training as undergraduate students and realized through their teaching? The specter of *that* historian served as a bogeyman, of sorts, who challenged Rob and Paul's own understanding of history through the larger social discourse of what it means to know history. History, in the popular imagination, often consists of the ability to rattle off names, dates, and discrete facts with ease, and results in people who are primed to be contestants on shows like *Jeopardy!* This discourse is reflected in and created by educational programs like those on seen on The History Channel, which are often comprised of historical images juxtaposed with talking heads who supply meticulous detail about the event being covered. Paul spoke to this dominant discourse when he imagined a dialogue between a "pissed off History Channel fan" student and their dad:

Dad: Have they talked about the Battle of Antietam, yet?

Student: No.

Dad: What are they teaching you?

Through this dialogue, Paul speaks to the dominant social discourse of history that focuses on minutiae and rote memorization because, in the words of Paul's imagined student's father, "that's how I learned it."

That historian, then, represents the fear that their students will be perceived not to know anything about history, and by extension that they themselves do not know anything about history, if confronted by someone who has strong historical knowledge. Rob spoke about this fear of students not learning anything in the strongest terms, saying that "it comes from [his] insecurity that something [he] dedicated [his] life to doesn't bear any fruit." He also worried that his class "will become someone's example of how we fail as educators." Paul's fear seemed to

be related to being personally discredited with the imagined student from above believing that the History Channel would be a better teacher.

Neither Rob nor Paul subscribed to minutiae-based history instruction, but they spoke about the success/failure of units that I observed in terms of this more popular understanding of history. Rob, when discussing the end of his Civil Rights Movement unit, claimed that his students' lack of specific details (a problem in his eyes) in their end-of-unit seminar was the result of "doing thematic teaching rather than timeline history or the very factual bullet-point-style." He wasn't worried that students didn't learn who Ralph Abernathy, someone he had mentioned wanting students to know, was – they could google him. What they couldn't google, was a nuanced understanding of the role the media played in the Civil Rights Movement or the nature of the grassroots movement. A moment later, however, Rob mentioned that the fear of history teachers is "that your kids' gonna go out there and get schooled by someone because you didn't teach them who Ralph Abernathy was." While Rob was focused on thematic understandings of history and assigned more importance to overarching ideas that were hard to summarize in a single sentence, he was still somewhat influenced by competing understandings of history that he saw as placing discrete facts first. Paul was similarly concerned when students didn't use specific details but conceded that the use of specific details was not a requirement on their assessment protocol. Rob and Paul both engage in an internalization of the popular discourse around history education. While they are committed to developing students' understanding of the big ideas of history, they both criticize rote memorization of facts while to some degree evaluating their students based on a conception of history that favors the small details.

Unlike Paul's teaching of economics, Rob and Paul both held positive conceptions of who they were as historians and taught in ways that backed up their claims to that identity. Despite having undergraduate history degrees and developing who they were as historians in part due to the models portrayed by their history professors, both Paul and Rob at times questioned their effectiveness because of subscribing to their big picture/thematic-based approaches and feared they or their students' historical knowledge would be discredited if they encountered someone with a more traditional view of what history entailed.

Discussion

External factors played a key role in how participants both positioned their identities and were positioned by elements such as the curriculum, the disciplines they identified themselves as part of and their perceptions of their students, both in terms of who they saw their students as, as well as how they perceived students viewed them. While I position the curriculum, the fields of economics and history, and their students as external to the three participants, they in many ways gain meaning based on internal processes taken up by the participants. As Segall (2003) notes, the meaning of these external factors is not "out there waiting for teachers to decipher it" (p. 292). While a curriculum, such as AP or IB is certainly something that exists outside of an individual, how it comes to take meaning for someone is an internal process. This is also true of how disciplines and students are viewed. At any given time, the teachers in this study were engaged in an internal dialogue about how they perceived their students, for example, and how their students were perceiving them. This is evident in Paul's teaching of economics, where he often defends his pedagogical choices not because they stem in part from his own discomfort about teaching economics, but because he's teaching in the way his students want him to and expect him to given the topic. This is not to say that the reason for Paul's decision-making has to

be one or the other, it's both, but how Paul creates a justification for what he does says a lot about how Paul is implicating himself in or distancing himself from the curriculum and the degree to which Paul sees himself as having agency to exert power and teach economics in a way that's more in sync with who he sees himself as being.

Power and the Curriculum

I started this chapter by focusing on Rob and Julie's relationship to the curriculum, arguing that they used their respective curriculum to make claims about who they were as teachers, both via the affordances they provided (in the case of Rob, philosophical affinity) or the obstacles they erected (in the case of Julie, only going as deep with material as the test required). But what about Paul? Where do his experiences fit in and can they tell us about the relationship between curriculum and self?

I decided to focus on Rob and Julie at the outset of this chapter because they both worked in contexts that used curriculum that were created wholly external to them. The way they navigated their curriculum, as entities that were not only created outside of them and their school and state contexts, but also that had built-in accountability that resulted in pressure from administrators, students and parents, is potentially much different than how a teacher in a typical public school setting engages in this work. Paul does not give us much insight into how teachers operate in a typical public-school setting, due to the idiosyncratic nature of ISP, but, following Foucault (1980) he does allow us to see the power in feeling that one has control over the content and form of their curriculum, feeling at peace when he feels his voice is represented and discontent when he feels it is not.

Unlike Rob and Julie, as an ISP teacher, Paul worked with five other teachers "who tend to philosophically, pedagogically agree with each other." The ISP teachers functioned as a team

and had common planning time every day where they discussed and worked on creating the curriculum they taught. While they were held to the same standards as the rest of the school, the curriculum generated by the ISP team was unique to them. I could analyze Paul the same way that I analyzed Rob and Julie, as the ISP program has been around for over sixty years and definitely constructs very specific images of what constitutes the curriculum and how a good teacher teaches. Instead, I want to look at him as an example of the power of curricular control. Out of the three participants, Paul felt the strongest about his ability to enact his vision of education because he's "enabled to enact my philosophies on education, my philosophies on teaching history and English… it has to be with being able to write the curriculum." This feeling of curricular control was due to his work on district curriculum planning committees and the amount of control ISP had over their day-to-day and long-term curriculum. With the exception of economics, Paul always felt he had a voice in how the curriculum was created and therefore felt present because his perspectives were represented. This is not to say that Paul wasn't constructed by his curriculum, he certainly was, just that it was a construction that he was at peace with because it was, to some degree, of his own doing.

Who is a Historian?

Just as a I did not talk about Paul in the first section of this chapter on curriculum, I specifically did not talk about Julie in relation to her perceptions of how she felt as a part of the field of history. Unlike Rob (who would at times start responses with "As a historian…") and Paul, Julie did not really refer to herself as a historian, only doing so if I specifically positioned her to think about herself as one. The first time I asked her about her potential identity as one, her immediate response was "Uh-oh." When I asked Julie the degree to which she felt like a

historian, she positioned herself as a mediator who interprets and presents the work that historians do. For example, Julie explained,

> I have an easy time with taking the historian's side and putting it into an organization that I think other people will understand…. On the other side, I have a very difficult time giving definitive answers to things if I'm not 100% sure.

Like Rob and Paul, Julie conceptualizes historians as knowing a lot of facts and dates, but her fear stems more from her students finding out that she does not know something. Julie described that process as "scary, but at the same time, it's a better classroom because of it." Instead of having fear about a different kind of historian finding out that she's a fraud, Julie sees the benefit of the limits of her own knowledge because "it gives [students] a little more flexibility in how they interpret things."

There are two different, but potentially interconnected, explanations I have for why Julie did not identify as a historian with the same ease that Rob and Paul did. First, she was an Interdisciplinary Studies Major and therefore had a major comprised of a range of disciplines instead of just one. It may be that she doesn't have (or feel she has) the degree of content knowledge or disciplinary expertise she might position a historian as having. Second, gender may play a role. History is a male dominated field, and it may be that Julie did not see herself as having access to that identity because of how she constructed her own image of a historian. On the flip side, it may be that, even though Rob and Paul were history undergraduates, their male identities enabled them to feel as though they can adopt that identity, even thought they are not engaged in the interpretive work that historians do on a day-to-day basis. As a result, their claims about who they are as historians help solidify and practice a particular vision of what it means to be a historian, removed from the more technical work of someone who researches, interprets and

writes representations of the past, while Julie's lack of identification reflects her own view that teaching is translating what historians have done in ways students will understand.

Perceptions of Students

The most fascinating finding to me is the prominent role played by teacher's perceptions of their students and the perceptions of how their students perceived their actions as teachers. Participants always seemingly had their students in mind as they navigated various issues related to the curriculum and their own identities. While this should be unsurprising as a teacher's main job is the education of students, students were always present in how teachers thought about their own understanding of the curriculum and the discipline. On one hand, this was because they were engaged in the education of students, and therefore needed to take into account students' experiences, preferences, and pre-existing knowledge. On the other hand, students were often used discursively to back up a position that had a different logic than was originally presented. This could be, in the case of Rob, stressing that his unit on Cuba was not just for him, it was for his students as well (who he saw as needing to get acquainted with a part of the world overlooked by IB), or it could be like Paul and the actions that he justified in his economics class as being what the students wanted. Again, it may very well be the case that students mattered in those instances, but how they were positioned in relation to other forms of discourse is deserving of a study in and of itself.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I followed Segall's (2003) example of exploring how teachers perceived and were positioned by the discourses surrounding the MEAP by examining the relationship between teachers and the various discourses they enter into as they consider the relationship between their sense of self and external factors such as their curriculum, the discipline they

teach, and their students. Findings indicate that these factors are not really external, but rather are internally processed via the discourses that surround external factors and how those discourses are taken up by teachers. Teachers' perceptions of these discourses help to construct particular images of who they are as teachers and how they relate to their curriculum and the disciplines they teach. Using Foucault's conception of power, teachers are able to exert control over these factors related to the degree to which they feel they have an ability to do so.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

Introduction

The goal of this study, as the name implies, is to show that identity matters to the work that history teachers do. Over the course of this dissertation, I have explored ways that the various identities that constitute a teacher's sense of self are implicated in the curriculum and the ways in which the teachers in my study acknowledged or distanced themselves from that implication. I specifically focused on three mechanisms through which teachers' identities were constructed in relation to their teaching. First, via the intellectual and socio-cultural identities they see constructed through and by their pedagogical choices. In other words, how they saw their identities reflected in their curricular choices as well as how they made and enacted claims about their identities. Second, I explored teachers' own memories of learning and how through the pedagogical act of remembrance (Simon, Rosenberg, & Eppert, 2000), teachers constructed narratives that made claims about who they were in the present, via their understanding of their own pasts. Finally, I explored teachers' identity construction through the interplay between teachers' internal perceptions of external factors related to their work, such as curriculum, the discipline they taught, and their students. In the rest of this chapter, I explore the ways in which this study, both through its content and methodology, contributes to the field of history/social studies education as well as the implications of this study for future research related to my findings.

Contributions to the Field of History/Social Studies Education

Examining elements of who a teacher is or what they believe is not a new endeavor in the field of history/social studies education, although it is an underexplored area of research. As discussed in Chapter 1, there is a body of research stemming from the 1980s about the impact of teacher beliefs and conceptions about the nature and purpose of social studies/history education on teachers' curricular decision-making. In recent years, attention is again being paid to the impact that elements of a teacher's identity have on what and how they teach. In this section, I will revisit that literature and place my study in conversation with it in order to explore connections and differences across these works as well as what this study specifically contributes to the field.

Teacher Perspectives

Building on research started by Adler (1984), Goodman and Adler (1985) explore how pre-service elementary social studies teachers' perspectives about social studies education are taken up in the classroom. Goodman and Adler pointed to the ways in which teacher perspectives about social studies ranged from its status as a non-subject to its importance as a means of social change and that teachers often draw from a variety of perspectives across the span of a school year or even a day. Goodman and Adler suggested that official conceptions about the purposes of social studies, like that suggested by Barr, Barth, and Shermis (1977), have little relation to what pre-service teachers actually believe and do in the classroom and that pre-service teachers are generally lacking the skills necessary to implement a vision.

Goodman and Adler (1985) provide an important glimpse into the way in which teacher perspectives about the nature and purpose of social studies don't inherently align with scholarly views about the field as well as the way in which practice is often incoherent, with teachers

drawing from a range of perspectives instead of holding to a specific vision at all times. Evans (1989, 1990) also connects to this finding in that teachers often had a dominant way of teaching, but that they also drew from a variety of the typologies he established (e.g., storyteller, scientific historian, cosmic philosopher), even though how teachers taught did not necessarily sync up with how they represented their teaching to the research. These finding are backed up in this study in the way Rob stresses the potential for history to teach students about humanity in order to gain empathy, while simultaneously believing that it is important to step back and rationally consider what happened in the past. It is also seen in the way Julie stresses the importance of challenging her students' conceptions of the world (bursting the Park Lake bubble) while primarily focusing on content coverage for the AP exam and seldom bringing in current events.

Yet, I argue that across the lessons I observed, participants in this study demonstrated a fairly consistent vision of what they each see the purpose of social studies education to be and that those conceptions do connect, to some degree, to larger ideas about the purpose of learning history/social studies related to becoming critical thinkers who have the skills needed to challenge their own misconceptions and positively impact society. Paul and Rob had especially consistent visions due, in part, to their feeling that they had the power to more fully enact what they believed, whereas Laura saw her vision being hampered, in part, by the AP curriculum and her own lack of experience.

What becomes important when using poststructural and psychoanalytic frames, though, is not only determining what perspectives teachers adopt but how and why teachers take up the perspectives that they do. For example, Rob wants his students to be able to recognize and challenge the underlying structures that impact society. This perspective does not only tie in to his understanding of history, but also to his experiences as a minority and his deeper desire to

have students develop the skills and knowledge base needed for challenging the status quo and being open to others who might look different than them. As mentioned above, this is not always consistently addressed, but it was certainly a vision that found expression through Rob's teaching. Goodman and Adler (1985) recognize this incoherence and that there are underlying reasons why their participants take up or reject the perspectives that they do, but they do not delve deeply into what those reasons are or how and why they may play a role in mediating how teachers express those perspectives. Evans (1989, 1990) does recognize that teacher background plays a role, especially in regards to teachers' political and religious beliefs, but his focus is centered more directly on how teachers represent their teaching and what they do in the classroom.

Older research about elements related to teacher identity in history/social studies education largely focus on factors that are positioned as external to the teacher. Wilson and Wineburg (1988) were interested in how well teachers were prepared to teach social studies courses that fell outside of their area of expertise, such as an anthropology major teaching American history. They found that a teacher's disciplinary background mattered greatly to their classroom practice, with teachers whose disciplinary background matched their teaching load facilitating more nuanced engagements with their discipline that more closely followed the established norms for their respective fields.

The findings of this study also recognize the important role that discipline played. This was most directly seen in the disconnection Paul felt between his roles as an interdisciplinary teacher, which drew upon his history and English backgrounds, and as an economics teacher. Paul's vision of economics was shaded by his own lack of comfort with the discipline and his inability to see why economics education, at least as mandated by the state curriculum, was

important for high school juniors to learn. The importance of disciplinary background was also inherent in how teachers viewed themselves as members of the fields they taught. Paul and Rob both referred to themselves as historians and both held undergraduate degrees in history. Julie, on the other hand, held a degree in Interdisciplinary Social Studies, and did not typically talk about herself in connection to any of the specific disciplines that comprise social studies.

Wilson and Wineburg's (1988) study stresses the important need for teachers to be able to access and use different ways of knowing when encountering social studies classes that fall outside of their disciplinary expertise, as different disciplines focus on different elements of understanding the social world. Yet, the authors place disciplinary understandings as being somewhat external to their participants; their specific disciplinary lenses are a result of their disciplinary training and the lack of training in other social studies fields. There are also internal factors at play, though, in how disciplines are understood and engaged. Paul's feelings about economics and his decision to teach that class with a more traditional "sage on the stage" approach certainly reflects his own lack of economic understanding. At the same time, though, Paul's decisions are filtered through, or at least rationalized by, his perceptions of how his students understand what economics education should look like. In his regular ISP classes, Paul felt that he had the power to teach in ways that he saw reflecting the interdisciplinary relationship between history and English as well as research-based conceptions of what sound pedagogy entailed. In his economics class, though, Paul's discomfort with the discipline and his perception of what he thought students wanted out of an economics class resulted in a more traditional way of teaching that didn't ultimately serve his students or him.

Disciplinary affiliation, though, was not entirely positive. As I mentioned above, both Paul and Rob referred to themselves as historians, yet, as outlined in Chapter 5, both were also

consistently worried that their personal conception of history would be challenged by outsiders who held a more traditional, fact-based interpretation of what history looks like. Wilson and Wineburg's (1988) conception of history seems to mirror that of Rob and Paul's, yet Wilson and Wineburg do not implicate themselves and the way that their conception of history is itself a conception and not a hard truth of what the discipline should look like. Therefore, it is not only important to consider the internal elements at play in how and why teachers take up specific views of a discipline but to also acknowledge the way that a researcher's own disciplinary understandings mediate how they interpret the teaching they observe and discuss with their participants.

Poststructural and psychoanalytic lenses require researchers to complicate our understandings of often taken-for-granted concepts. The pre-existing research on teacher identity primarily focuses on teacher beliefs and perspectives about the field of history/social studies education. However, these beliefs and perspectives, and the desire to adopt or reject certain beliefs and perspectives, are connected to other factors such as one's personal identity and the internal perceptions they have about external factors, such as the curriculum or their students. While the findings of Goodman and Adler (1985), Evans (1989, 1990), and Wilson and Wineburg (1988) continue to be important for understanding how teachers engage in teaching history/social studies, this study contributes to understanding how elements like conceptions of the field and personal identities such as race, gender, social class, and religion play a role in shaping how teachers engage in practice. Recent research has started to address issues of race (Vickery, 2017) and political ideology (Knowles, 2018) in relation to teachers' conceptions of citizenship, but research related to teachers' religious beliefs and understanding is rare (White, 2009) and work related to social class is seemingly non-existent.

Experience and Memory

The work of Lortie (1975) is foundational to research on teacher identity and how teachers develop their beliefs and perspectives about teaching. "The apprenticeship of observation" points to the way in which teachers' practices often uncritically reflect how they were once taught. One of the key interpretations of Lortie's work is that teacher education has a limited impact on those learning to teach because their experiences as a learner are already deeply ingrained in how they imagine teaching. The participants in this study challenge that idea, however. All three teachers had limited recollections about their own learning as K-12 history/social studies students and their teaching practices differed greatly from the memories of learning that they shared. In fact, Julie, Rob and Paul all indicated that the most powerful learning experiences they had were a result of their university-based teacher education courses and their professional experiences as practicing teachers. While not necessarily indicative of all teachers, this finding shows that the "apprenticeship of observation" matters not only in the positive takeaways teachers adopt from their own learning, but also in the negative examples that provide guidance in how not to teach. Julie specifically went as far as to say she did not want to teach like the A.P. U.S. history teacher that she had. Rob primarily remembered being lectured to, a pedagogical approach that he seldom uses, while Paul could not recall much from his K-12 education. While it may be that teachers did not completely share their thinking with me, the stress on university experiences they each expressed demonstrates that university teacher preparation may play a larger role in the development of some teachers than Lortie recognized.

The work of Kissling (2014) and Hung (2018) explore the importance of teachers' prior experiences. Kissling specifically considers how teachers' life experiences create a "living curriculum" that comprises "a course of learning across the times and places of… life" (p. 81).

Hung examines the ways in which Taiwanese teachers' childhood experiences impacted how they engaged their students in controversial public issues as well as how they represented historical events to their classes. Both of these studies mark the importance of personal experience in how teachers think about their work and translate those thoughts to practice. In this study, I also examined teachers experiences (which I position as memories) and specifically use Simon, Rosenberg, and Eppert's (2000) conception of remembrance in order to consider how the memories that teachers elicit serve to justify their actions in the present-day. Like Kissling, this is largely interpretive work that I engaged in, drawing out teachers' remembrances from the various interviews they took part in and implicating my own interpretations in how I chose to represent the what I had learned about my participants.

The memory research that has been done in the field of social studies education largely focuses on issues of collective memory, especially as situated externally to the teacher (e.g., Reich, 2011; Reich, Buffington, & Muth, 2016; Suh, An, & Forest, 2014). This study, in conjunction with more targeted research on memory work along the lines of Chang-Kredl & Wilkie's (2016) use of teacher-created memory texts, can help position teacher memories and remembrances in a new light: one that recognizes memory not as an external entity that is tapped into or taken up in different ways, but that which stems from the teacher's own experiences and identities. This study is limited by the fact that I did not directly engage participants in direct forms of memory work, which usually relies on written narrativization of one's memories, so the degree to which teachers ever interrogated their own practice from a critical standpoint without being prompted by me is unknown. However, such an approach can contribute to the field by taking up poststructural and psychoanalytic frames that seek to understand how power operates

through one's remembrances as well the internal processes at play as one crafts stories and assign meaning to the past in terms of the present.

Poststructural and psychoanalytic lenses can aid researchers in understanding the deeper processes at play in how teachers' selves enter into how they plan and implement curriculum. While many elements of the content of my study have been taken up by prior research, especially in terms of teacher identity and teachers' perspectives about the fields of history and social studies, there has not been much research on how the identities of practicing teachers are shaped by their intellectual and socio-cultural identities and remembrances of their past experiences. As I will discuss in the next section, these issues are important to consider for future research.

More important though is attending to the questions and understandings a poststructural study that includes elements of psychoanalytic theory can do for the field of social studies education. A common criticism of poststructuralism is that the absence of absolute truth will lead to the development of runaway relativism where anything goes. This is not my intent, nor do I think it is representative of the aims of scholars who engage in poststructural work. Rather, poststructuralism requires that we question taken-for-granted concepts and relationships, to expose the ways in which they are constructed and to complicate surface-level understandings of the connections people draw between their thoughts and actions.

In the case of this study, that means an acknowledgement that identity is not something that people possess, but rather something that people claim in negotiation of their actions with broader societal discourses (Jenkins, 2014). As Foucault (1980) argues, power is diffuse and while it acts unevenly, all people are simultaneously constituted by power relations and are able to exert power in the various networks they inhabit. This study raises questions about the power teachers have to either exert or ignore elements of their identity. How can a male teacher, for

example, claim to distance their masculinity from their curricular choices in ways that a female teacher is seen as incapable of doing? How does whiteness, especially in a primarily white context, both function as an invisible given as well as an opportunity to use the power conferred to whiteness through discourse to draw attention to marginalized communities? The identities that teachers are able to (or required) to claim and those that they can downplay are tangled in a complex of discourses that recognize and ignore authority and value based on those identity claims. By working to recognize these claims, one can analyze a teacher's conception of their sense of self in relation to the curriculum and work to better understand how and why teachers make the decisions they do and move beyond simply considering the content of those decisions.

It is also imperative that researchers who engage in this kind of work implicate themselves in the research process as a whole, as well as their findings. I view the content of this study as a snapshot of a particular time, place, and context that was taken with my particular camera. If another researcher attempted to replicate this study with the same teachers, units, and questions, the results would be different. While qualitative studies almost always include statements of teacher positionality, often to situate why the particular questions of the study are being raised and how the researcher's self is implicated in the genesis of the study, poststructural and psychoanalytic theory requires researchers to recognize that they are implicated in the same processes their participants are and that data analysis stems from the researcher's own positionality and interpretive frames. Truth is not inherent in the data, rather claims about the meaning of that data stem from the theories and experiences the researcher brings to the analysis of the data.

This study contributes to the field of history/social studies education by working to understand how elements of a teacher's self, especially related to their identities, remembrances,

and perceptions of the curriculum, their students, and their disciplinary field. The relationship between a teacher's self and the curriculum is complex and involves teachers implicating and distancing various elements of their sense of self based on the various discourses they encounter and power networks they are a part of.

Implications for Future Research Teacher Education

This study points to several potential implications for future research and teacher education. In their survey of the demographics of social studies teacher educators, Busey and Waters (2015) note that, according to the National Center for Education Statistics, "about 63% of secondary social studies teachers are male and an overwhelming 87% of social studies teachers are White" (p. 72). This statistic, coupled with the ongoing drive to make social studies curriculum more inclusive, indicates a significant need to make sense of how practicing social studies teachers understand how various identities they claim relate to their teaching.

As discussed in the Chapter 3, teachers' intellectual and socio-cultural identities play an important role in how the curriculum is engaged. Identity construction and navigation was especially at play when elements of a teacher's self were seen as being at odds with the dominant discourse about the meaning of an identity (e.g., Julie's identity as a woman). Conversely, identities that did not deviate from the dominant discourse were not interrogated (e.g., Rob's gender identity). Therefore, there is a need to further investigate how teachers enter into or distance themselves from their curriculum. Such engagement will help teachers interrogate the impact their identity has on developing and teaching curriculum meant to convey a variety of historical voices.

Research shouldn't just be on those who identify as white and/or male, however. There are a huge variety of identities that teachers draw upon when conceptualizing their sense of self.

In this study, race, gender, social class, and religious identity were all surfaced, but there are many others, such as sexual orientation, that were overlooked and/or not a part of this study. Much more attention need to be paid to the role that these less physically visible identities play in the classroom, especially following up on my finding that these identities may be perceived to be invisible in school settings where a teacher's identity reflects the dominant identity. Many of these frames, such as race, have been taken up in terms of student but not teachers. Social class, for example, as a lens for considering social studies teacher education, has seemingly not been considered. This study helps provide a lens for thinking about how to continue to expand the field beyond gender and race as its primary modes of analysis.

Another implication is the need to better understand how students enter into the construction and acknowledgement of teacher identity. Participants in this study had very clear perceptions of who they believed their students were and what they needed. These perceptions shaped instruction both in terms of how teachers taught (such as Paul's economics class) as well as how teachers made decisions about what lessons to impart on their students (e.g., Rob's decision to use Emmett Till's image to address racism in his school). While there is certainly more to gain by taking an in-depth look at teachers' perceptions of how their students perceive them, and the resulting impact on identity construction, there is also a need to look at the students themselves. How do students perceive their teachers' identities? A significant portion of Julie's male students seemed to question her intellect due to her gender via the comments they made and their overall behavior in class. Their attitude definitely had an impact on how Julie positioned herself and made curricular decisions, but to what degree did those students recognize what they were doing? Did Paul's students really believe that economics had to be taught by a "sage on the stage?" Did students recognize Rob's ethnic/racial identity when learning about the

Civil Rights Movement or his identity as the son of an immigrant when discussing Japanese internment? These questions point to a need to further understand the dialogic relationship between how a teacher constructs their identity via the curriculum and the degree to which that identity is recognized or ignored by students as well as the impact that reception has on their understanding of the content.

Research that uses critical approaches is important to understand how teachers engage in identity construction and what that process makes possible for their understanding of their self, their curriculum, their pedagogy, and their students. Critical lenses can help one see how power relations are navigated by history teachers and the way they make sense of their self and the curriculum. Where do teachers insert themselves in the curriculum? Where do they back off and present the curriculum as an objective statement about the past? How do the discourses teachers take up when implicating themselves (or avoiding implication) in the curriculum have an impact on what happens in the classroom? Engaging in this process can open up the discursive field and present new possibilities for how history education can be imagined.

Research on Memory

As I discussed in Chapter 4, the kinds of memory work that are currently being done in the field of teacher education have not yet been taken up in history/social studies education. Doing more targeted memory work, along the lines of Chang-Kredl & Wilkie's (2016) use of teacher-created memory texts, can help teachers understand the ways in which their own learning is reflected in their practice. Such an approach can also be a means to interrogate one's own education from a critical standpoint (Rothenberg, 1994).

In general, participants did not remember their own K-12 history education. As suggested at the end of Chapter 4, more work could be done to explore the kinds of learning experiences

that resonated with currently practicing history/social studies teachers. The participants in this study discussed the importance of projects, engagement with texts that indulged a more human understanding of the past, and the role of discomfort in their remembrances of their own education. While these findings should not be taken as representative of others' experiences, there is much that can be gained from understanding what teachers remember about their own history learning, what they perceive their own teachers' goals to have been and to what degree there is a connection between how a teacher learned and what they do in their own classroom.

Beyond engagement with what they did remember, there is also a need to engage what was forgotten. If, as my participants reported, teachers do not remember much of their own learning, what kinds of learning activities do they engage in today? If, for example, there is a teacher like Julie who forgot that a period of time she was responsible for teaching existed, then how does she go about learning that material? What resources does she use? What, if any, connection is there between the kinds of learning approaches and resources she seeks out and elements of her personal identity? Addressing these kinds of questions can help the field better understand the kinds of ideas, viewpoints, and disciplinary approaches that are opened up and closed off to teachers as they engage in learning about the content they teach. By extension, questions can also be asked about what the relationship is between the kinds of thinking teachers expose themselves to and what they do in the classroom.

If our understanding of the world, and the past, is filtered through our own identities, what kinds of collective memory narratives resonate with teachers and how does that impact the kinds of historical events and perspectives they engage in class? How, for example, did Rob's desire to avoid what he saw as fanatical engagement of World War II that seemingly took pleasure from the violence and loss of life challenge dominant cultural narratives about the war?

Concurrently, how did his view reflect a different kind of cultural narrative about the meaning of war. Alternately, how does the selection of topics to teach in a history class reflect a canonical understanding of what is and is not important to teach and learn about in a school and whose collective memories are left out of that process? Further engagement with the concept of memory, individual and collective, holds a lot of promise for further understanding the field and the connection between self and curriculum.

Teacher Education

While there are a multitude of ways that the findings from this study can be taken up for future research, there is also a need to consider the implications for teacher education. In other words, if we accept that teachers' identities are simultaneously reflected in and constructed by their curricular choices, what does that mean for teacher education? Similarly, if teachers do not widely engage in critical reflections of their past experiences and their remembrances of their own learning, how can teacher education create more targeted, and hopefully impactful, experiences in engaging memory work?

As Busey and Waters (2015) note, the social studies education field is overwhelmingly comprised of white males. As I argue in this paper, identities, both claimed and perceived, play a role in how teachers plan and implement curriculum. Therefore, regardless of demographics, pre-service teachers need to be given opportunities to examine the influences that their own identities have on their work as well as how their identities are further constructed by the choices they make. This may take the form of activities like Epstein's (1998) that asked students to identify and explain important historical figures and events in order to understand different racial sense-making of the past. It can also take place by creating unit plans that are then critically analyzed

in groups for how they reflect elements of one's identity both via choices related to content and pedagogy.

In terms of memory work, pre-service teachers could create narratives about an episode of their own history education. They could then analyze these remembrance narratives with a peer to search for traces of their own experiences in how they conceptualize who they are as a teacher in the present and who they hope to be in the future. Furthermore, they could analyze these narratives to explore which themes they take up and which they ignore in order to better grasp the kinds of understandings they take up and what that allows and limits in their practice.

Following the work of Chang-Kredl, Wilkie, and Ghaznov (2016), pre-service teachers could also engage in crafting narratives about who they were as students as a means to understand their own perceptions of who their students are and the degree to which that impacts how they think about their discipline and practice. For teachers who are in the midst of their student-teaching, there is a need to constantly reflect on how they perceive of the power among a variety of external factors, such as school policies, the curriculum, and their students, as well as their own sense of self. By doing so, pre-service teachers could begin to see how they exert their selfhood when navigating the various discourses that contribute to how they view themselves as teachers. Engaging in these forms of reflection can help teachers understand as they enter the field that they are not neutral actors presenting objective information. Rather, through working in group settings to analyze who they are, how they are reflected in and constructed by their own experiences and their curricular decision-making, teachers can better understand how elements of their self connect to their curriculum.

Conclusion

While the above implications are framed in terms of practicing teachers, they also apply to thinking about teacher education. The results of this study can possibly be used to think about what discourses pre-service teachers draw upon when imagining themselves as future history/social studies educators. There is potential for thinking about the kinds of identity and memory work that need to be done to surface how pre-service teachers enter into conceptualizing the possibilities of the field and implicating themselves in the curricular decisions they make. Such a conception will help challenge the belief that teachers are objective enactors of pre-determined knowledge and will highlight the complex ways a teacher's self mediates what is made possible for students.

Teaching is a complex process that is mediated through several different discourses. At the root of teaching, though, is the teacher. By engaging the teacher in terms of their personal relationship to and implication in the curriculum, the multifaceted ways in which teachers enter into the curriculum can be uncovered and explored in order to better understand how and why teachers make the curricular decisions they do. Whether thinking about this study's implications for in-service or pre-service teachers, I am interested in raising ways in which the construction of a teacher's self can be uncovered, examined, questioned, and implicated in the role it plays in what it makes possible and impossible in the classroom. Such work can advance our understanding of the relationship among teacher, content, and pedagogy and the way in which a teacher's identity matters to their practice.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Interview Protocols

The Self and the Curriculum: Interview 1 Protocol

Thank you for taking the time to be interviewed. As with any part of this study, you can withdraw your consent to participate at any time and you do not have to answer questions that you do not want to answer. Anything you say will not be connected with your name, the name of your school, or the name of your school district in any publications or presentations.

STATE PARTICIPANT ID NUMBER, DATE, INTERVIEWER NAME, AND "START INTERVIEW" FOR RECORDING DEVICE

Our first interview will focus on elements related to your personal background, how you theoretically engage the field of history education and what you perceive as the allowances and limitations that impact your ability to enact your vision of history education.

Section 1: Background Information

1. Tell me about yourself. What are three or four elements of your identity that you consider important? Why?
2. Why did you choose to become a teacher?
3. How did you enter into the field of teaching? Is this the first school where you've worked? Is teaching your first profession?
4. Think of a teacher who made a major impact on your life (this can be from any level of education). Can you tell me a story about this teacher that exemplifies why they were so impactful?
5. How did you feel about the way that you learned history? Can you share a memory or experience that you remember having about learning history in school?

Section 2: The Field of History Education

6. Why should we (teachers, students, as a society) study the past?
7. What do you think the purpose of history education is? How did you form this purpose?
8. What do you want your students to gain from this course? How will you know that students have met that goal?
9. What is your favorite unit/subject to teach in history? Why? Can you share a memory you have of learning about this subject?
10. What is your least favorite unite/subject to teach in history? Why? Can you share a memory you have of learning about this subject?

Section 3: Allowances and Obstacles

11. To what degree do you feel that you are able to enact the vision of history education that you have?
12. What do you think are the major obstacles keeping you from fully enacting your vision (if applicable)?
13. What are the reasons why you believe you are able to enact your vision of history education to the extent that you are able to?

14. Are there any other thoughts, questions, or comments you would like to share that you thought about during this interview?

STATE PARTICIPANT ID NUMBER, DATE, NAME OF INTERVIEWER, AND "END INTERVIEW" FOR RECORDING DEVICE

The Self and the Curriculum: Interview 2 Protocol

Thank you for taking the time to be interviewed. As with any part of this study, you can withdraw your consent to participate at any time and you do not have to answer questions that you do not want to answer. Anything you say will not be connected with your name, the name of your school, or the name of your school district in any publications or presentations.

STATE PARTICIPANT ID NUMBER, DATE, INTERVIEWER NAME, AND "START INTERVIEW" FOR RECORDING DEVICE

Our second interview will focus on how you engage in planning the first unit I will observe. We will discuss how your thoughts about planning connect to the issues that we talked about in the first interview, as well as how you personally understand the material you are teaching.

1. Tell me about the unit that you are going to teach. Are you taking a specific focus? What material are you covering?
2. How do you see your approach to this unit connecting back to your purpose for teaching history?
3. How did you decide what to include and what not to include in this unit?
4. How did you learn about the content of this unit? Do you have any memories of learning about this content in school or as an adult?
5. Why are you taking the teaching approach that you are with this unit?
6. What are you most excited about teaching in this unit? Why?
7. What are you least excited about teaching in this unit? Why?

STATE PARTICIPANT ID NUMBER, DATE, INTERVIEWER NAME, and "END INTERVIEW" FOR RECORDING DEVICE

The Self and the Curriculum: Interview 3 Protocol

Thank you for taking the time to be interviewed. As with any part of this study, you can withdraw your consent to participate at any time and you do not have to answer questions that you do not want to answer. Anything you say will not be connected with your name, the name of your school, or the name of your school district in any publications or presentations.

STATE PARTICIPANT ID NUMBER, DATE, INTERVIEWER NAME, AND "START INTERVIEW" FOR RECORDING DEVICE

Our third interview will reflect on how you implemented the first unit I observed. We will discuss how your thoughts about planning connected to your practice, the issues that we talked about in previous interviews, and how you personally understand the material you taught/are teaching.

1. Overall, how did you feel your first unit went?
2. Describe an instance that positively stood out to you about this unit. How does this exemplify what went well?
3. Describe an instance that negatively stood out to you about this unit. How does this exemplify what did not go well?
4. If you could change one thing about the unit, what it would it be and why?
5. What factors allowed you to do the kinds of things you wanted to achieve in this unit?
6. What factors kept you from fully realizing your curricular vision?

STATE PARTICIPANT ID NUMBER, DATE, INTERVIEWER NAME, AND "END INTERVIEW" FOR RECORDING DEVICE

The Self and the Curriculum: Interview 4 Protocol

Thank you for taking the time to be interviewed. As with any part of this study, you can withdraw your consent to participate at any time and you do not have to answer questions that you do not want to answer. Anything you say will not be connected with your name, the name of your school, or the name of your school district in any publications or presentations.

STATE PARTICIPANT ID NUMBER, DATE, INTERVIEWER NAME, AND "START INTERVIEW" FOR RECORDING DEVICE

Our fourth interview will focus on how you engage in planning the first unit I will observe. We will discuss how your thoughts about planning connect to the issues that we talked about in previous interviews, as well as how you personally understand the material you are teaching.

1. Tell me about the unit that you are going to teach. Are you taking a specific focus? What material are you covering?
2. Where are you in this unit? What are you not? Why are or aren't you in those spaces?
3. How do you see your approach to this unit connecting back to your purpose for teaching history?
4. How did you decide what to include and what not to include in this unit?
5. You mentioned some changes, such as reading guides being switched to essential questions. Why did you make those decisions?
6. How did you learn about the content of this unit? Do you have any memories of learning about this content in school or as an adult?
7. Why are you taking the teaching approach that you are with this unit?
8. What are you most excited about teaching in this unit? Why?
9. What are you least excited about teaching in this unit? Why?
10. Are there any other thoughts, questions, or comments you would like to share?

STATE PARTICIPANT ID NUMBER, DATE, INTERVIEWER NAME, AND "END INTERVIEW" FOR RECORDING DEVICE

The Self and the Curriculum: Interview 5 Protocol

Thank you for taking the time to be interviewed. As with any part of this study, you can withdraw your consent to participate at any time and you do not have to answer questions that you do not want to answer. Anything you say will not be connected with your name, the name of your school, or the name of your school district in any publications or presentations.

STATE PARTICIPANT ID NUMBER, DATE, INTERVIEWER NAME, AND "START INTERVIEW" FOR RECORDING DEVICE

Our fifth interview will reflect on the second unit I observed

7. Overall, how did you feel this unit went?
8. Describe an instance that positively stood out to you about this unit. How does this exemplify what went well?
9. Describe an instance that negatively stood out to you about this unit. How does this exemplify what did not go well?
10. If you could change one thing about the unit, what it would it be and why?
11. What factors allowed you to do the kinds of things you wanted to achieve in this unit?
12. What factors kept you from fully realizing your curricular vision?
13. How, if at all, did my presence impact how you engaged this unit?
14. How does your classroom reflect who you are? Why do you have it set up the way you do, why is it decorated the way it is?
15. You discussed that you don't really remember your history/social studies education that clearly. Is there a subject you do remember? Why do you think you forgot?
16. There's often a claim that's made that the curriculum should be relevant to and reflect students' identities and lives. How do you model this or to what degree do you see the curriculum you develop and teach as an opportunity to work through your own identity?
17. What parts of your identity are easy to talk about? What's not?
18. What do you think your students see when they look at your and interact with you? Your colleagues? What do you want them to see/think?
19. Are there any other thoughts, questions, or comments you would like to share?

STATE PARTICIPANT ID NUMBER, DATE, INTERVIEWER NAME, AND "END INTERVIEW" FOR RECORDING DEVICE

APPENDIX B

Unit and Lesson Topics

Julie Matthews

Unit 1 – The Progressive Era
- Progressive Era overview
- Key reforms
- Dubois and Washington/The New South
- Phases of the women's movement
- Women's Movement Textbook

Unit 2 – World War II
- How the United States got involved in World War II
- Analysis of Dr. Seuss political cartoons about domestic issues
- Japanese Internment
- Homefront/Michigan World War II Memorial
- Atomic bomb

Rob Castillo

Unit 1 – World War II
- New Deal Wrap-up, Discussion of State of the Union Address
- Challenges to U.S. Neutrality
- Rise of Germany and Japan
- Course of World War II
- Japanese Internment
- Atomic Bomb

Unit2 – The Civil Rights Movement
- Civil Rights Meaning Seminar
- Emmett Till
- Montgomery Bus Boycott
- Voting Rights Act
- SNCC/Freedom Rides/Selma
- Civil Rights Wrap-Up Seminar
- *13th* Documentary

Paul Kacprzak

Unit 1 – 1920s/Great Gatsby
- Jazz
- Women's Suffrage
- Prohibition
- *The Great Gatsby*

Unit 2 – 1950s/1960s
- Grace Metalious
- 1950s Experience

- 1950s Experience Seminar
- "Crisis in Levittown"
- John F. Kennedy
- Integration vs. Desegregation
- Letter from a Birmingham Jail
- Grace Lee Boggs

Elective 1 – *The Invisible Man*
- Invisible People Project

Elective 2 – Science Fiction Short Stories and Films
- Asimov's Three Laws of Robotics
- "Evidence"
- "Way Up in the Middle of the Air"
- Afro-Futurism

Economics
- *Settlers of Catan*
- Intelligence Squared debates about current American economic policies
- Costs of production

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Adler, S. (1984). A field study of selected student teacher perspectives toward social studies. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *12*(1), 13-30.

Alsup, J. (2006). *Teacher identity discourses: Negotiating personal and professional spaces*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Barr, R. D., Barth, J. L., & Shermis, S. S. (1977). *The nature of the social studies*. Palm Springs, CA: Etc Publications.

Beauchamp, C., & Thomas, L. (2009). Understanding teacher identity: An overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 39*(2), 175-189.

Beijaard, D., Verloop, N., & Vermunt, J. D. (2000). Teachers' perceptions of professional identity: An exploratory study from a personal knowledge perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *16*(7), 749-764.

Belsey, C. (2006). Poststructuralism. In S. Malpas & P. Wake (Eds.), *The routledge companion to critical theory* (43-54). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ben-Peretz, M. (1995). *Learning from experience: Memory and the teacher's account of teaching*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Ben-Peretz, M. (2002). Retired teachers reflect on learning from experience. *Teachers and Teaching*, *8*(3), 313-323.

Britzman, D. P. (1998). *Lost subjects, contested objects: Toward a psychoanalytic inquiry of learning*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Britzman, D. P. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Brown, A. L., & Brown, K. D. (2010). Strange fruit indeed: Interrogating contemporary textbook representations of racial violence toward African Americans. *Teachers College Record*, *112*(1), 31-67.

Buchanan, R. (2015). Teacher identity and agency in an era of accountability. *Teachers and Teaching*, *21*(6), 700-719.

Busey, C. L., & Waters, S. (2016). Who are we? The demographic and professional identity of social studies teacher educators. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, *40*(1), 71-83.

Chang-Kredl, S. (2015). Teachers conceptualizing childhood: conversations around fictional childhood texts. *Teachers and Teaching*, *21*(2), 203-220.

Chang-Kredl, S., & Wilkie, G. (2016). What is it like to be a child? Childhood subjectivity and teacher memories as heterotopia. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *46*(3), 308-320.

Chang-Kredl, S., Wilkie, G., & Ghaznavi, S. (2016). Circling a memory: a layered reflective method for generating subjective knowledge about childhood and teacher identity. *Reflective Practice*, *17*(3), 270-283.

Danielewicz, J. (2001). *Teaching selves: Identity, pedagogy, and teacher education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Eisner, E. W. (1985). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs.* New York, NY: Macmillan.

Epstein, T. (1998). Deconstructing differences in African-American and European-American adolescents' perspectives on U.S. history. *Curriculum Inquiry, 28*(4), 397-423.

Epstein, T. (2009). *Interpreting national history: Race, identity, and pedagogy in classrooms and communities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Evans, R. W. (1989). Teacher conceptions of history. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *17*(3), 210-240.

Evans, R. W. (1990). Teacher conceptions of history revisited: Ideology, curriculum, and student belief. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *18*(2), 101-138.

Farley, L. (2007). The "shadowy underside" of learning history. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, *29*(5), 423-440.

Flores, M. A. & Day, C. (2006). Contexts which shape and reshape new teachers' identities: A multi-perspective study. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*(2), 219-232.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge & the discourse on language*. (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). New York, NY: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. (C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham & K. Soper, Trans.). New York, NY: Pantheon.

Garrett, H. J. (2011). The routing and re-routing of difficult knowledge: Social studies teachers encounter *When the Levees Broke*. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 39*(3), 320-347.

Garrett, H. J. (2017). *Learning to be in the world with others: Difficult knowledge & social studies education.* New York, NY: Peter Lang

Garrett, H. J., & Segall, A. (2013). (Re) considerations of ignorance and resistance in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *64*(4), 294-304.

Gee, J. P. (2000). Chapter 3: Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education*, *25*(1), 99-125.

Goodman, J., & Adler, S. (1985). Becoming an elementary social studies teacher: A study of perspectives. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *13*(2), 1-20.

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (1995). *The active interview*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hung, Y. H. (2018). Exploration of teacher life stories: Taiwanese history teachers' curricular gatekeeping of controversial public issues. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *70*, 67-77.

Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. A. (2012). *Thinking with theory in qualitative research: Viewing data across multiple perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Jenkins, R. (2014). *Social identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kissling, M. T. (2014). Now and then, in and out of the classroom: Teachers learning to teach through the experiences of their living curricula. *Teaching and teacher education*, *44*, 81-91.

Knowles, R. T. (2018). Teaching who you are: Connecting teachers' civic education ideology to instructional strategies. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *46*(1), 68-109.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *32*(3), 465-491.

Lévesque, S. (2008). *Thinking historically: Educating students for the twenty-first century*. University of Toronto Press.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *School teacher: A sociological study.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Marsh, C. J., & Willis, G. (1995). *Curriculum: Alternative approaches, ongoing issues*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.

Martell, C. C., & Stevens, K. M. (2017). Equity- and tolerance-oriented teachers: Approaches to teaching race in the social studies classroom. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *45*(4), 489-516.

Martusewicz, R. A. (2001). *Seeking passage: Post-structuralism, pedagogy, ethics*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miller, K., & Shifflet, R. (2016). How memories of school inform preservice teachers' feared and desired selves as teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *53*, 20-29.

National Council for the Social Studies (2013). *Social studies for the next generation: Purposes, practices, and implications for the College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework for Social Studies Standards.* Silver Spring, MD.

Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *19*(4), 317-328.

Olsen, B. (2008). *Teaching what they learn, learning what they live*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Papadakis, Y. (2008). Narrative, memory and history education in divided Cyprus: A comparison of schoolbooks on the "history of Cyprus". *History & Memory*, *20*(2), 128-148.

Parkes, R. J. (2011). *Interrupting history: Rethinking history curriculum after 'the end of history.'* New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Peck, C. L. (2010). "It's not like [I'm] Chinese and Canadian. I am in between": Ethnicity and students' conceptions of historical significance. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 38*(4), 574-617.

Pitt, A. & Britzman, D. (2003). Speculation on qualities of difficult knowledge in teaching and learning. An experiment in psychoanalytic research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *16*(6): 755-766.

Reich, G. A. (2011). Testing collective memory: Representing the Soviet Union on multiple-choice questions. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *43*(4), 507-532.

Reich, G. A., Buffington, M., & Muth, W. R. (2015). (Dis) union at 150: Collective memories of secession. *Theory & Research in Social Education*,*43*(4), 499-527.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. *Handbook of research on teacher education*, *2*, 102-119.

Ross, E. W. (1987). Teacher perspective development: A study of preservice social studies teachers. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *15*(4), 225-243.

Rothenberg, J. J. (1994). Memories of schooling. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *10*(4), 369-379.

St. Pierre, E. & Jackson, A. Y. (2014). Qualitative data analysis after coding. *Qualitative Inquiry, 20*(6), 715-719.

Sarup, M. (1993). *An introductory guide to post-structuralism and postmodernism*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press.

Schmidt, S. J. (2012). Am I a woman? The normalisation of woman in US History. *Gender and Education*, *24*(7), 707-724.

Schmeichel, M. (2011). Feminism, neoliberalism, and social studies. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *39*(1), 6-31.

Segall, A. (1999). Critical history: Implications for history/social studies education. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 27*(3), 358-374.

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

Segall, A. (2004). Revisiting pedagogical content knowledge: the pedagogy of content/the content of pedagogy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *20*(5), 489-504.

Segall, A. (2006). What's the purpose of teaching the disciplines, anyway? The case of history. In A. Segall, E. E. Heilman, & C. H. Cherryholmes (Eds.), *Social studies—the next generation: Researching in the postmodern* (125-139). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Segall, A. (2013). Revitalizing critical discourses in social education: Opportunities for a more complexified (un) knowing. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *41*(4), 476-493.

Seixas, P. (2000). Schweigen! die Kinder! Or, does postmodern history have a place in the schools? In P. N. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history* (19-37). New York: NYU Press.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, *15*(2), 4-14.

Simon, R. I., Rosenberg, S., & Eppert, C. (Eds.). (2000). *Between hope and despair: Pedagogy and the remembrance of historical trauma*. Lantham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield.

Stearns, P. N., Seixas, P. C., & Wineburg, S. (Eds.). (2000). *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: National and international perspectives*. New York: NYU Press.

Suh, Y., An, S., & Forest, D. (2015). Immigration, imagined communities, and collective memories of Asian American experiences: A content analysis of Asian American experiences in Virginia US history textbooks. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, *39*(1), 39-51.

VanSledright, B. (2008). Narratives of nation-state, historical knowledge, and school history education. *Review of Research in Education*, *32*(1), 109-146.

VanSledright, B. A. (2011). *The challenge of rethinking history education: On practices,*

theories, and policy. New York, NY: Routledge.

Vickery, A. E. (2017). "You excluded us for so long and now you want us to be patriotic?": African American women teachers navigating the quandary of citizenship. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *45*(3), 318-348.

Vulliamy, G., Kimonen, E., Nevalainen, R., & Webb, R. (1997). Teacher identity and curriculum change: A comparative case-study analysis of small schools in England and Finland. *Comparative education*, *33*(1), 97-116.

Wang, Z. (2008). National humiliation, history education, and the politics of historical memory: Patriotic education campaign in China. *International Studies Quarterly*, *52*(4), 783-806.

White, K. R. (2009). Connecting religion and teacher identity: The unexplored relationship between teachers and religion in public schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *25*(6), 857-866.

Wilson, S. M., & Wineburg, S. S. (1988). Peering at history through different lenses: The role of disciplinary perspectives in teaching history. *Teachers College Record*, *89*(4), 525-39.

Wineburg, S. S. (1991). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and academy. *American Educational Research Journal, 28*(3), 495-519.

Wineburg, S. (2001*). Historical thinking and other unnatural acts: Charting the future of teaching the past.* Temple University Press.

Woods, P. (1984). Teacher, self and curriculum. In I. F. Goodson & S. J. Ball (Eds.), *Defining the curriculum: Histories and ethnographies* (239-261). London, England: The Falmer Press.

Zembylas, M. (2003). Caring for teacher emotion: Reflections on teacher self development. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 22,* 103-125.

Zembylas, M. (2016). Teacher resistance to engage with 'alternative perspectives of difficult histories: the limits and prospects of affective disruption. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 1-17.