BECOMING A TEACHER:
DESIRE AND IDEOLGY THROUGH LIVED EXPERIENCE

By

Elizabeth A. Kenyon

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

2015

ABSTRACT

BECOMING A TEACHER:
DESIRE AND IDEOLGY THROUGH LIVED EXPERIENCE

By

Elizabeth A. Kenyon

This phenomenological study explores the lived experiences of four teacher candidates in relation to their understandings of teacher authority and citizenship. The medium through which these understandings take life is the participants' individual ideologies. These individual ideologies are studied by looking between the lines of the participants' lived experiences. The research is based in the idea that students learn about citizenship in schools not only through the formal curriculum but also through the implicit curriculum of how authority is enacted between teachers and students. The participants were all social studies teacher candidates.

The research begins with lived experiences from the participants' lives as students in K-12 schooling. These experiences revealed an expected script of the role of authority in the pedagogical relationship of teachers and students. These scripts were contradicted in the participants' experiences, allowing for new desires in regards to enacting authority as teachers. Then the participants desires in regards to citizenship education are explored through experiences of troubled belonging that reveal what the participants hoped to foster in their students. Lived experiences from the final two year of their teacher education program, show how the participants desires were often frustrated by the ways in which dominant Ideologies are taken up in the structure of schools, particularly in regards to meritocracy, bureaucratic authority and race.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Several years ago, my mother gave me a small wooden carving of a group of women cheering. For me this carving represents all of those who have so generously supported and cheered me on through many of my life's endeavors. We never act alone, or accomplish things on our own. I am indebted to many, both men and women, who have brought me to the place I am today. Knowing that it is impossible to name everyone whose love and support I have benefited from in this project, I will highlight a few folks here.

The project could not have happened without the research participants who willingly opened their minds and hearts to my various questions. They gave time, energy, and understanding to this project, not to mention some amazing stories. I will forever appreciate their openness, honesty, and courage. It was a great honor to work with each one of them.

Kyle Greenwalt has supported me through both this dissertation process and throughout my five years at MSU. From offering to look at housing for me, to many conversations over beers and cider, to parenting advice, to hundreds of emails and countless rounds of feedback, Kyle has been both friend and guide. He has played a role in who I have become both as a teacher educator and a scholar. The rest of my committee members, three intelligent and passionate women, have all been a part of my PhD journey in multiple ways. Corey Drake supported my adventures in teacher education through her role as program director but also in offering advice, listening to my many ideas, and helping me think through important aspects of enacting teacher education in a field based setting. Margaret Crocco has been both an inspiration and guide through her scholarship, her leadership in the department, and in co-teaching with me for a semester. Anne-lise Halvorsen has been a huge support both in regards to my teaching and

my scholarship. This group has engaged several times with me in thoughtful discussion not only about my work but also about the challenges and possibilities in teacher education. I truly appreciate their thoughtfulness and care.

My colleagues at MSU have served as a source of inspiration, friendship and support. From my first classes with the greatest cohort ever, I knew I was surrounded not only by brilliance, but also by passion and dedication. My colleagues, both from my cohort and from others, have challenged me, pushed me, and supported me. I hope to use their work in my teaching and scholarship, have them Skype into the courses I teach and to say, "I went to school with…" for many years to come.

Life does not suspend itself whilst one is working on a degree. I have had the beautiful experience during the past five years of falling in love and starting a family of my own. I am forever grateful to Matthew Steele for saying yes to this adventure. He has supported me in every endeavor through this PhD process, providing me with love, good nutritious food, sage advice, and the space to take on different adventures and activities. More recently, he has been a wonderful father to our son allowing me time to focus on writing.

My parents Diane and Bill Kenyon, and my brother and his family have all supported me as well. It was my brother Dave's idea that I pursue a PhD one day. He must know me pretty well. My dad has helped me in multiple ways and always lets me know how proud he is. My mother, who has been an ever loving and giving source of support in my life, has also worked hard to help me in writing this dissertation, serving as a sounding board for my ideas, a babysitter for Peter, and even a copy-editor. I am forever indebted to my family for their love and for cheering me on.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The Citizens We Become:

Lived Experience, the Implicit Curriculum and the Tapestry of Ideology

Several years ago, when my mom was visiting me in Washington, DC, we participated in a protest march against Arizona law SB 1070. As we were marching down the street with several hundred other protesters, my mom shared with me that it was her first protest march and that she was nervous. I looked around, saw the other people marching, saw the police watching us, looked down at the pavement, the part of the street intended for cars that we were walking on, and suddenly I felt some of her nervousness. However, until that moment it had not occurred to me to be nervous. For me, this was one of many protests marches I had participated in and would participate in.

I was surprised and not surprised that this was my mother's first protest. She was in her late fifties; I was in my late twenties. My mom came of age in the late 1960s and early 1970s, a time of frequent and fervent protest in the United States. However, she also grew up in Bellflower, a town of 400 people in central Illinois where everyone knew everyone else's business. Her dad was the town doctor, a member of the school board and occasionally the mayor. In college she met, and soon married my Dad, a moderate and active Republican who worked campaigns and considered running for office himself a few times. They stayed in Lenawee County where they made a life and a family.

So how was it that I, her daughter, had dragged her to her first protest? That is not the question I have set out to answer, but there are many components to this story and to this question. Why was I one to go to protest marches and not one to run for political office or work

for campaigns? How did my mom's experience in Bellflower shape her thoughts and actions on citizenship? How did our lived experiences impact who we were as citizens?

Citizenship

Who my mother and I are as citizens, how we enact that citizenship is largely a result of our lived experiences. These experiences, which include interactions with others, our experiences in schools and other government institutions, and our past attempts to enact citizenship all create an ideological backdrop to our current participation as citizens and to what we were doing on that sunny day in Washington, DC. These lived experiences were all a part of what got us to that march and also how we experienced that march. Just as important as that day at the march is the fact that neither my mother nor I have run for public office nor worked on a campaign. Put another way, the ways we do not enact our citizenship are just as important as the ways we do enact it. Also important is my mom's work on the church board and my work with the graduate employees union, both being examples of participating in civil society. We are also both university instructors who enact our citizenship through our teaching. She does it in her first year writing courses by bringing a critical lens to her teaching and fostering discussions about race, gender, and class. I enact my citizenship through teaching social studies methods to teacher candidates, focusing not only on methods of instruction but also the larger questions of citizenship. Who we are as citizens is not limited to whether or not we vote and whom we vote for. It includes the actions we take involving formal government structures but also the ways in which we participate in civil society (Parker, 2003) and the ways we teach. This dissertation has grown out of a persistent curiosity with how our lived experiences shape the citizens we become.

Every nation-state, whether a monarchy, a dictatorship, or a democracy is composed of a group of citizens, and in all of those settings, citizens act on and within the nation-state or

influence the nation-state by the absence of their actions. What makes us the citizens we become? Why is it that some people participate in protests, write letters to the editor, or run for political office? Why do some people exercise their right to vote and others do not? What determines why some people act and others do not? What determines the size and scope of our actions, the outcomes we expect or hope for, our sense of agency? These questions are too many and too broad to answer. There are many components that lead to who we become as citizens, neighbors, doctors, plumbers, and teachers. In this dissertation I will explore a few small components of this question. I will look at the role of authority in the pedagogical relationship, senses of belonging, and the attempts social studies teachers make to enact their citizenship. These topics may at first appear disjointed; however, they are all components of how schools, students, and teachers play a role in the development of citizens.

Between both the intended curriculum of social studies and the unintended curriculum of schools, many have argued that schools play a role in who we become as citizens. Some scholars examine how social studies teachers, for example, teach citizenship (e.g. Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1978; Evans, 2004; Kerr, 2002; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004b). Others research the ways in which schools reproduce the social order, a part of which is producing particular kinds of citizens (e.g., Anyon, 1981; Apple & King, 2004; Bowles & Gintis, 1976). Some study the ways in which students resist the schools norms and expectations of citizenship (e.g., Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985; Giroux, 2009; Willis, 1977). Finally, other researchers have investigated what impacts the political development of children with a focus specifically on schools (e.g., Hess & Torney-Purta, 1967).

The studies above look at the role schools play in creating citizens in a particular light. Some bring an economic lens; others focus on a snapshot of teaching and school practices; still

others look at it solely from the perspective of the children themselves, as they become citizens. To simply ask what role schools play in who individuals become as citizens is too broad a question and may not even be answerable. In this research project, I would like to focus on the role that lived experience plays in who teachers become both as teachers and as citizens. I focus specifically on teachers and the role teachers play because they are one link, among many, in both the change and continuity in school practices. It is teachers who interact most consistently with students in schools, spend the most hours with children, and are given the responsibility of maintaining some sort of classroom and school order. This classroom order and the interactions with students become a text for children on how they interact with others and particularly with government institutions and those in authority. These interactions become an implicit curriculum of citizenship for students.

Schools serve as sites of socialization, acculturation, and knowledge transfer/production. These processes happen both through the formal curriculum but also through the interactions amongst students, teachers, and school staff which form a part of the implicit curriculum (Eisner, 1979). These interactions can play a significant role in an individual citizen's understanding of herself and of her relationship with other individuals and with various institutions. At the heart of this understanding are relations of authority and foundations of citizenship.

A deeper understanding of the meaning of authority in schools is needed (Pace & Hemmings, 2007). Phenomenological research on the role of authority in schools is not prevalent. Furthermore, little research exists on how new teachers' former experiences with authority impact their ideas about authority in school. This impact of past experiences with authority in schools is crucial in understanding how much of the unintended curriculum gets

passed from generation to generation of teachers, and also how teacher education can engage teacher candidates in understanding school authority both in their past and in their future.

In this research project, I use the lived experiences of the participants to better understand the meaning and functioning of authority in schools as well as the development of ideologies. By ideology, I simply mean an individual's understanding of how the world works and her place or role in that world including her relationship to others and to various institutions. This research is based on the idea that student and teacher interactions function as curriculum for students in understanding their place in society, a cornerstone of an individual's ideology. My participants were all secondary social studies teaching candidates. Therefore, their ideology plays a role in both their desire to be a social studies teacher and also their enactment of teaching.

The Implicit Curriculum

Much of what we learn in school comes not from the formal curriculum but from the interactions we have in the hallways and classrooms, with peers, with teachers, and with administrators. These interactions serve as an informal curriculum of experience that teaches us about our place in the fabric of society and the institutions that are a part of that society. School is one of the first institutions that individuals in the United States enter into and learn to negotiate on their own. After our families, it is where we first begin to learn our place in the world in relation to society and in relation to each other (Jackson, 1992). Again, this learning comes not only from the explicit or formal curriculum but also from the implicit and hidden curricula (Anyon, 1981; Apple & King, 1979; Barrett, Solomon, Singer, Portelli, & Mujuwamariya, 2009; Eisner, 1979; Kerr, 2002). This learning comes in the form of experiences that later become stories we tell ourselves and each other to find meaning in and make sense of our lives (Bamberg, 2012; Bruner, 1991). The meaning that we derive from these experiences impacts our

developing ideologies. Many have long argued that school is a site of ideological reproduction (Althusser, 1972; Leonardo, 2003). An aspect of this reproduction, and the subjects that participate in it, is found in the lived experience and implicit curriculum of student and teacher interactions.

Our experiences not only shape our ideologies but also are shaped by them. We understand our experiences through the framework of our ideologies. Our response to experiences comes from our often-unquestioned beliefs and assumptions about the world. This means that the same experience may be interpreted or understood in many different ways. Also, the way we interpret or understand an experience will contribute to how that experience further influences our ideology. This creates a dialogic relationship between our experiences and our ideologies, a relationship we will see at work in the pages of this study. Ideology becomes the medium through which the continuum of experience (Dewey, 1938) becomes a part of who we are with past experiences influencing future experiences and future experiences influencing the way we understand and interpret past experiences.

These experiences of student and teacher interactions and the curriculum they create have not been researched as intensely as the interactions that form a part of the formal curriculum, and yet they are a very important component of the civic education that schools conduct. Schools have long been tasked with preparing citizens for a democracy (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Dewey, 1916; Hochschild & Scovronick, 2003; Parker, 2003). In the United States, we rely heavily on the intended curriculum found in the Social Studies to do this form of civic education (Kerr, 2002). However, there are many aspects of schooling in the United States that give us a basic understanding of the world, how institutions work, how capitalism and democracy work that create an ideology out of which we function as citizens (Illich, 1973). These aspects of schooling

create habitudes that impact the way we both understand the world and act in it, "and these habitudes which lie below the level of reflection are just those which have been formed in a constant give and take of relationship with others" (Dewey, 1916, p. 22).

These experiences that take place outside of the intended curriculum have been lost in the search for better discipline, specific strategies, and pedagogical tools to increase understanding as well as the incessant drive to raise test scores. The education and learning that often happens despite the mandated standards needs to be better understood so that we can know what learning takes place in schools and so that we can bring conversations about these interactions into the teacher education classroom. As Dewey (1938) noted, "Perhaps the greatest of all pedagogical fallacies is the notion that a person learns only the particular thing he or she is studying at the time" (p. 48).

Tapestry of Ideology

As a way of understanding who the participants are becoming as citizens and teachers, I use the concept of ideology. Ideology is similar to a worldview in regards to the way it describes how we understand and make sense of the world around us. Ideology is also something that underlies our thinking and actions. However, it differs from terms such as worldview because it is closely connected to relations of power that are sometimes absent in studies of worldview and culture. At the same time, I am not concerned with abstract political ideologies, but the daily, lived, practical ideologies (Eagleton, 1991). The definition of ideology I seek to employ would be more similar to Gramsci's idea of hegemony and Raymond Williams' idea of dominant culture in that ideology/hegemony/dominant culture saturate society, are lived, are in constant flux, and are supported through every day acts and interactions.

Ideology and ideologies are different (Leonardo, 2003). Ideology with a big "I" represents the systems of thought and belief that justify or legitimate the social hierarchy. Ideology is not static, but changes as time and culture change. Ideology is supported by institutions and shared aspects of culture. For example, the dominant narrative of United States History, one that focuses primarily on Western European men that take up the cause of democracy and civilization as something that the United States possesses and must spread, supports the dominant, big "I" Ideology.

Conversely, we all have our own personal ideologies (small "i") that are enacted every day. They come from our own personal histories, our own personal understanding of the world. But just as our personal history and story happen in relation to the dominant narrative of the country, so our own personal ideologies are connected to the dominant Ideology. In addition, the dominant Ideology must be supported through human institutions, through human stories. In this way, our individual ideologies connect back to, support, change, or challenge the dominant Ideology. This is what Althusser (1972) meant by the dependency of Ideology on its individual subjects. Ideology (big or small "I") does not exist without subjects and therefore is dependent on them while at the same time greatly influencing them.

Ideologies (small "i") are a part of the tapestry, the background that makes up our lives. They are developed through daily interactions with others, through what we witness in the media, through what we learn in school and various other institutions. Everyone's tapestry is different, depending on their identity, their geographic location, their life experiences, and their family. All of these in dialogue with the world around the individual, construct a tapestry full of complex ideas and expectations upon which we live our lives. This is not to say that ideology is everything, but it is in relation with everything. It provides the base out of which we act, live,

think, and relate to each other. In this way, it is something that becomes lived, because though it is not everything we say and do, it infuses everything we say and do.

The experiences of the participants in this study will give us greater insight into this tapestry that so often seems invisible because, as we will see, they contradict the expected script in some way; they go against the threads that are already woven, the cultural and individual expectations. Through looking closely at what surprises us, we come to understand what we expected in the first place. We can see our pre-reflective minds (Van Manen, 1990) at work in these spaces of contradiction and confusion. We can also see, in how the teller shares her story, the ways in which the fabric shifts and how a new thread or dye is added to accommodate this new and unexpected experience as it too becomes a part of the tapestry.

In the stories related here, these contradictions and confusions create desires. Desires come from times when we want to bring greater congruency to our individual ideologies, dominant Ideology, and the world as we see and understand it. These desires reflect times when an expectation, born out of one's ideology, is overturned. These desires highlight the ways in which individual ideology is more dynamic than dominant Ideology. They reflect added threads to the tapestry of the individual ideology. It is important to keep in mind though that not all experiences add to the tapestry of individual ideology. Some experiences go by unnoticed. Others may confirm, or be confirmed by the existing fabric, and some experiences that contradict our ideology we simply view as an anomaly or as the popular phrase states, "the exception that makes the rule."

Something that contributes to this tapestry is what Althusser (1972) called the Ideological State Apparatus (ISA). The ISA is composed of schools, religious institutions, families, cultural institutions, and the legal system as well as many other government and non-governmental

institutions and organizations. The ISA is a mechanism through which a particular ideology or understanding of the social order is maintained and promoted. Althusser contended that schools make up the most powerful aspect of the ISA. Again, through this research, I look at one of the ways that schools function as a part of the ISA in promoting a particular ideology, how the interactions between teachers and students, as well as lived experiences around citizenship contribute to the tapestry of the future teachers' ideologies.

An important part of this tapestry is the way one understands the relationships of the people around her. These social relations are both an institutionalized and a de jure hierarchy within society. They include hierarchies based on identity markers such as gender, race, class, ability, sexuality, etc. They also include an occupational hierarchy both in the sense that doctors and lawyers tend to be more highly valued than plumbers and electricians and also within occupations where a senior partner in a private law firm has more status than an assistant prosecutor. Schools have their own set of social relations both amongst the adult staff and frequently amongst the students as well. The social relations within schools frequently reflect the broader set of social relations as well as the dominant Ideology.

Other aspects of social relations taught in schools involve relationships with the government and the nation state both in regards to authority and culture. For example, children must listen to their parents, teachers, policepersons, coaches, and others who are given an institutionalized place of authority over them. These relations also involve divisions of labor as Althusser (1972) describes here:

> Children at school also learn the 'rules' of good behavior, i.e. the attitude that should be observed by every agent in the division of labour, according to the job he is 'destined' for: rules of morality, civic and professional conscience, which actually means rules of

> respect for the socio-technical division of labour and ultimately the rules of the order established by class domination. (p. 89)

Bringing everything together, our daily, lived experiences create our assumptions and beliefs about the world. We act in a pre-reflective, natural way based on these understandings and beliefs or our individual ideologies. Aspects of authority and how we respond to authority, play an important role in these assumptions and beliefs. School is a place where future teachers, as students, learn about authority. The things future teachers learn about authority in school will impact the way they behave as teachers in their own classrooms. These expectations around authority are a part of a dominant Ideology (which is not fixed) and become, in different ways, a part of each individual teacher's ideology. There is a dialogic relationship between ideologies and Ideology. Though it is constantly changing, Ideology is maintained through its subjects. Stories of the unexpected give us insight into the often-invisible ideologies that individuals hold because they uncover what is expected.

Layout of Dissertation

The first chapter will look at the major theories and approaches I bring to this work including authority, ideology and citizenship. These three ideas are so closely entwined in democratic life that they are difficult to tease out. However, each brings an important and valuable perspective to understanding how one lives out life with others. Understandings of authority are a component of individual ideology and can determine how one acts as a citizen. Assumptions around power, agency, and control are fostered in schools through the enactment of authority; this contributes to one's ideology out of which one acts as a citizen. I will not only define how I use these different terms, but also trace their development and the use of authority in schools through the work of Horace Mann, John Dewey, George Counts and others. I will then

look at various ethnographies to understand the ways enacted authority has worked in schools during the last few decades.

In Chapter Two, I include my methodological approach and methods of research in a description of this study. Phenomenology, the primary methodology of this dissertation, closely studies lived experience, seeking to find the essence of various experiences. Phenomenologists, unlike many other educational researchers, are not looking for answers to problems in education. Instead, they want to better understand the pre-reflective lifeworlds of their research participants (Van Manen, 1990). This methodological approach brings an important lens to the study of ideology, which is closely connected to the pre-reflective lifeworld. In addition to discussing phenomenology, I will describe how the study was conducted and introduce the reader to the four participants who took part in the study. I will close with my own experience living the questions at the heart of the study.

Chapters Three, Four and Five will center on stories the participants shared with me. These stories were first grouped by topic and then studied for various themes. These topics are experiences of authority, experiences of belonging, and experiences of teaching. These chapters will focus closely on the stories themselves with little analysis or extension beyond the words and experiences of the participants. Each of these chapters will conclude with a series of questions to further the reader's thinking on what the nature of these experiences could mean in regards to how one enacts citizenship.

Chapter Three considers experiences the participants had in schools with those in authority. It is an exploration of authority in the pedagogical relationship. These experiences, all quite memorable for the participants, reveal the underlying assumptions and beliefs that the participants had in regards to school authority; in other words, their ideology around authority.

Most of these stories reveal these assumptions because they are times when those assumptions were contradicted. These contradictions also broke open understandings of authority for the participants, creating new possibilities for enacting authority in the pedagogical relationship.

In Chapter Four, we step outside of school walls and explore experiences the participants had that reflect their sense of United States citizenship. Each story highlights a moment in which the participants were in some way disappointed with their fellow United States citizens or when their citizenship was challenged in some way. The participants all take on a certain sense of responsibility for those around them, which is reflected in their aspirations to be social studies educators and in the impact they desire to have on their future students. While most of this dissertation is focused on what happens in schools, this chapter provides crucial insight into the ways experiences in the participants every day lives revealed their assumptions about who they are as United States citizens and impact how they desired to enact their citizenship as teachers.

With these new understandings of citizenship, Chapter Five returns to the classrooms and hallways of school buildings; only this time, the participants are in the role of teacher candidate, not student. The stories in this chapter are about relationships that the participants created with their students during the internship year and the year prior to the internship. It reveals challenges they had in teaching the way they had aspired to. Most of the stories are derived from the internship year, which is a crucial time in teacher learning as the first time teacher candidates are really confronted with many of the realities of teaching in a particular time and place. In this chapter, we see the ways that the participants responded to different contexts and worked to negotiate them while enacting their citizenship as social studies teachers.

In Chapter Six, a deeper analysis is presented bringing together experiences from across the three previous chapters and drawing together themes connected with schools, citizenship,

authority and ideology in light of more contemporary literature. In this analysis chapter, I first look across each individual participant's experiences and draw connections from their individual narrative arcs, looking at the desires they developed in regards to their teaching. Then I look at what happens to these desires in the context of the dominant Ideology of meritocracy as it lives in schools.

The concluding chapter addresses what can be learned from this study in regards to teacher education and citizenship education. As this study shows, education for citizenship happens in a variety of ways that are not a part of the formal or intended curriculum. It is important for teacher candidates to both investigate their own understandings of citizenship and the ways their teaching will foster citizenship. I explore the ways in which aspects of my research process may be implemented in teacher education courses and the need to address the implicit citizenship curriculum with teacher candidates as well as in-service teachers. Furthermore, I return to the aims of citizenship education and consider what they need to be in the 21st century.

Work for citizenship education has a history as long as the existence of public schools in this country. Some have seen it as a site of reform, others as a tool for maintaining the status quo. This work was formalized through the founding of the National Council of Social Studies nearly a century ago. I am greatly indebted in this study to the work that those who conduct research in the social studies have done before, beginning with Barr, Barth and Shermis and extending through to the work of my colleagues and the faculty I have the honor to work with. In this piece, I rely heavily on the theoretical and empirical work of Walter Parker, Keith Barton and Linda Levstik, Nel Noddings, Joel Westheimer and Joseph Kahne, as well as others. They have done important work studying and thinking about what education for democracy can be, what it is

right now, and what it has been in the past amidst different historical and political influences (Evans, 2004).

This study seeks to add another strand to the understanding they have already generated, to look between the lines of formal curriculum and of formal instruction at what teachers, as the primary representatives of school, do to their students' understanding of government and authority, despite or because of what they intend to do. This study provides another lens for understanding the impact of teachers on students' burgeoning citizenship, thickening the line of work already accomplished by others in the social education field.

In our busy lives as citizens and teachers, it may seem overwhelming to think of the many experiences small and large, the daily interactions as potentially significant. It is hard to consciously fashion ourselves as teachers, parents, aunts and uncles, caretakers, and friends in our interactions with children and students. My hope is that delving into these questions will lead to greater tact, an action sensitive pedagogy (Van Manen, 1990), a greater understanding. This exploration takes more than intellectual energy; it takes heart and soul energy as well. Thank you for joining me on the journey.

CHAPTER ONE

Student and Teacher Interactions, Authority and Ideology

In this chapter, I present the major theoretical strands that bring this research together all through the lens of lived experience and the context of schooling. I argue that the lived experiences future teachers have, as students in schools, are important in developing their individual ideologies. Of particular importance are experiences of authority enacted by teachers that make up a part of the implicit curriculum. The individual ideologies that future teachers develop are a crucial part of the citizens and teachers they become. These ideas of authority and citizenship return to the school when the future teachers become teachers and enact their citizenship in the classroom through their pedagogical relationships and through enacting authority, thus beginning the cycle anew with a new group of students who are potential future teachers.

This chapter opens with an explanation of lived experience as used in this research project. I then define my use of the term ideology, an idea that has been used by many scholars in various fields and disciplines and with different meanings (Applebaum, 2009; Eagleton, 1991).Throughout the history of public education in the United States, educational philosophers have concerned themselves with the types of citizens schools, particularly teachers in schools, are creating. I review the thinking of some of these philosophers, particularly with regard to their understanding of the role of the teacher's authority in schools. I conclude by exploring several ethnographies that discuss the ways in which dominant Ideologies, patterns of authority, and student development come together in the school setting, particularly in regards to the student and teacher relationship.

The Lived Experience of Student and Teacher Interactions

The interactions between students and teachers become a curriculum for students about their role in society. Many think of these interactions as being limited to the transmission of knowledge through formal instruction, perhaps the teacher standing up front and lecturing, the student taking notes. While this is indeed an interaction, it is only one of many interactions that take place in schools. In Dewey's (1938) understanding, interactions between the internal conditions of the student and the external objective conditions of the school create situations in which educative experience happens. The teacher has the responsibility of creating these objective conditions, but for the most growth to happen, she must take the students' internal conditions into consideration in creating the interaction. That is, a teacher must know her students deeply and create a context for them to learn and grow through their experiences. What a child brings to school interacts with what is happening at school to foster learning and growth. These objective conditions can include things like the way a classroom is organized and managed, the way a teacher interacts with students, and the way students are encouraged to interact with each other.

These interactions have enormous importance. They form an implicit curriculum that inculcates students with a host of dispositions and virtues (Eisner, 1979). While some of these may be beneficial to the students through life, others may instead prepare students for a particular role in society (Illich, 1973). Apple and King (1979) expressed the concerns of many reproduction theorists in the following statement,

> [Schools] teach a hidden curriculum that seems uniquely suited to maintain the ideological hegemony of the most powerful classes in this society…ideological and social stability rests in part on the internalization, at the very bottom of our brains, of the

> principles and commonsense rules, which govern the existing social order. This ideological saturation will undoubtedly be more effective if it is done early in one's life. In schools this means the earlier the better, in essence from day one in kindergarten. The principles and rules that are taught will give meaning to students' situations (schools are, in fact, organized in such a way as to maintain these definitions) and at the same time will also serve economic interests. (p. 43)

The ways in which schools are organized, as will be noted in the discussion of two ethnographies below, often mediates student and teacher interactions. It does so as much in the structures surrounding the interactions as it does in the expectations that school sets up around teacher and student interactions. This study looks at those interactions in more detail within the broader context discussed here.

Interactions between teachers and students are not only impacted by the broader school structure and rules, they are also determined by the student. The pedagogical relationship involves action by a teacher, which is received by a student and responded to, or action by a student that is responded to by the teacher. Noddings (2005) highlighted the ways in which a caring relationship is not limited only to the carer caring for the other, but requires a response from the cared for. This response need not be verbal; it can include the scowl or a smile of a student, the leaning forward of an interested listener, the rolling eyes of an annoyed child, or the excited squirming of a five year old. This does not always mean that the student responds to the teacher in the moment, but the student may incorporate the interaction into their life as an experience. This experience will in some ways be determined by previous experiences as well as influence future experiences in the *continuum of experience* (Dewey, 1938).

Not all student and teacher interactions constitute *an experience*. While Dewey (1934) noted that we are all in a constant stream of experience as we interact with the world around us, we frequently do so in a haphazard way, paying attention at times but at other times not. We have *an experience*, on the other hand, when the interaction becomes a whole unit, "when the material experienced runs its course to fulfillment. Then and then only is it integrated within and demarcated in the general stream of experience from other experiences" (Dewey, 1934, pp. 36-7). Van Manen (1990) also defined an experience as something that makes up a whole unit, contains a beginning and an end, has structure to it, and stands out from the every day stream of life.

By focusing on the lived experience of student and teacher interactions apart from the intended curriculum, I hope to expand in many ways on Lortie's (2002) *apprenticeship of observation*. The apprenticeship of observation embraces the idea that we learn much of what it is to be a teacher during our years as a student through watching our teachers. While many argue this creates a false image of teaching as something performative, that only happens between the bells of the school day, they also acknowledge that new teachers, in particular, will revert to what they learned about teaching in high school when they first face their own classroom (Britzman, 2003; Feiman-Nemser, 2012).

Through this research, I want to expand on Lortie's idea in two ways. One is to broaden the definition of "teacher" and "student" and therefore broaden the idea of the pedagogical moment. Greenwalt (2014) contended that the apprenticeship of observation literature takes an overly narrow look at where and from whom teacher candidates learn about teaching. By looking at the interactions between parents and children and college instructors and students, in addition

to interactions between teachers and students both inside and outside the classroom, I hope to expand on this understanding.

The other way in which I want to broaden Lortie's idea is that we learn far more in our interactions with teachers than how to be a teacher, or than the subject matter at hand. I contend that we learn about how authority works and about our respective places in society. That is not to say that teacher and student interactions are the only places in which we learn these things or that once learned, they cannot be relearned in a different way. However, the power of ideology is that it composes a part of our lifeworld (Van Manen, 1990), the things we do not explicitly think about. These interactions build that lifeworld in ways we are not aware of, in large part because they are a part of an institution that is normalized for us through media and a long history of expectations, making them all the more important to take up as a subject of research.

Now that I have explained the use of lived experience in this study, I turn to the ways I employ the term ideology. These two concepts are closely linked. Not only does the study of lived experience provide an important lens for ideology, it also as I have just argued, is where our ideology is founded and enacted. Lived experience and ideology serve as mediums of teaching and citizenship in this study.

Ideolog(ies)

In developing an understanding of ideology, I draw heavily from Althusser's (1972) work. Basing his understanding in the political economy, Althusser developed his argument around the idea that capital not only needs resources and labor but also the reproduction of the labor in a particular light. Yes, labor must be prepared with a particular set of skills for the factory floor; but laborers must also be imbued with a particular disposition and understanding of

their place in society. They must experience, come to expect, and most importantly, accept, their role as laborer:

> I shall say that the reproduction of labour power requires not only a reproduction of its skills but also, at the same time, a reproduction of its submission to the ruling ideology for the workers, and a reproduction of the ability to manipulate the ruling ideology correctly for the agents of exploitation and repression, so that they, too, will provide for the domination of the ruling class “in words”. (Althusser, 1972, p. 89)

Those in power rely on dominant Ideologies to ensure this understanding. Althusser contended that because those in power also run the state, they use various state institutions to reproduce and control the ideologies that will develop the laborer with the right disposition. Althusser named these Ideological State Apparatuses and they include churches, schools, court systems, etc. He argued further that, in the contemporary age, the educational apparatus is the dominant Ideological State Apparatus.

Althusser (1972) did not stop his analysis with the Ideological State Apparatus; he continued to explain the relationship between ideology and individual subjects. He claimed that ideology hails or interpellates individual subjects. Ideology draws individual subjects in to an understanding of their own reality that supports the ideology. Ideology is dependent on its subjects; it does not exist without subjects, and yet it must control them to a certain extent: "the individual is interpellated as a (free) subject in order that he shall submit freely to the commandments of the Subject, i.e., in order that he shall (freely) accept his subjection" (Althusser, 1972, p. 123).

Important here is the idea of a dominant Ideology (big “I”) and ideologies (small “i”). Leonardo (2003) described the distinction using Mannheim’s (1936) work: “although

Mannheim's description still leads to a picture of ideology as something people need to overcome, he is helpful in pointing out the structuration between structures and agents. Ideology (capital 'I') is the structural backdrop of personal ideologies (lower case 'i')" (p. 206). Ideology is the dominant system of thinking, systems of social relations that hail individual subjects to them. The individual subjects each develop and enact their own ideologies (small "i") in the midst of various dominant Ideologies. This aspect of ideology, which involves power, is important. Leonardo contended that without this aspect of power, ideology becomes equated with culture, or simply becomes everything and therefore is nothing. As stated in the introduction, while ideology exists in relation to all we do, it is not all that we do. It infuses our daily actions, our daily actions will impact the ideologies of others, this is all a living out of an underlying base of assumptions, beliefs and frameworks we use to make sense of the world and act in the world. While Ideologies maintain systems of oppression, ideologies are of a more personal and enacted nature. They may also work to maintain systems of domination but are a necessary structure for understanding the world and communicating about it (Leonardo, 2003). This is to say, then, there is no absolute Truth. Only various (personal) ideologies that have differing relationships to the dominant Ideology.

There is also a dialectic relationship between Ideology and ideologies. The ideologies of subjects work to enforce and change the dominant Ideologies. Dominant Ideologies are frequently enshrined and reproduced in state institutions; however, these institutions are all composed of individual subjects, so even within these institutions, Ideology changes. This is precisely one of the roles the teacher plays. Teachers, enacting their own ideologies that have been developed within the Ideology of the state, work to reproduce (consciously or unconsciously) dominant Ideologies in the ideologies of their students. This is done through the

formal curriculum but also through the informal and implicit curriculum that is composed of interactions between teachers and students.

Still firmly rooted in a materialist understanding, Althusser (1972) described the way in which ideology is in many ways a working out of the individual's material needs in daily life through daily interactions. Althusser described the relationship between the subject and his material existence within ideology by saying, "*his ideas are his material actions inserted into material practices governed by material rituals which are themselves defined by the material ideological apparatus from which derive the ideas of that subject*" (italics in the original, 1972, p. 114). He went on to say: "There is no practice except by and in an ideology; there is no ideology except by the subject and for subjects" (p. 115). This makes clear that ideology is not merely a system of thoughts and beliefs that exist in the mind, in an abstract realm, but that it is based in a material reality that is practiced daily. That is, that "thinking" is a material practice played out in material ways.

The individual subject's actions are both directed and explained by her ideology; the way she makes sense of the world so that she can navigate her way through it. For example, I know that I need both shelter and food. My understanding is that these things must be purchased and paid for. Therefore, I make my decisions in life around the ability to get a job and earn wages so that I can purchase the food and shelter I need. Underlying this is a belief that food and shelter are commodities; they are not a right, they are not an inheritance, nor does some sort of overseer provide them for me. There is also an understanding of a type of freedom; that I am free to work where I want in the occupation that I choose provided I can find a job. Understanding freedom in this way and valuing this type of freedom is part of my ideology.

A final crucial aspect of Althusser's (1972) understanding of ideology is that these thoughts are grounded in a material reality but that does not make them a part of an absolute truth. Indeed, Althusser understood ideology to be a misrepresentation of individuals' relationships to the "real world."

> [Ideology] is not their [the subjects'] real conditions of existence, their real world, that 'men' 'represent to themselves' in ideology, but above all it is their relation to those conditions of existence which is represented to them there. It is this relation, which is at the center of every ideological, i.e. imaginary, representation of the real world. (p. 111)

In other words, Ideologies present to subjects a misrepresentation of reality, one that largely makes sense and is supported by material reality, but is still imaginary. This misrepresentation, again, creates the base of thoughts, the worldview out of which individuals act in society.

The hundreds of student and teacher interactions that take place on a daily basis in schools create an everyday part in forming the student's ideology. This is how ideology hails the individual student subject. These interactions are a part of the dialogical relationship of Ideology and ideologies. In describing Althusser's understanding of ideology, Leonardo (2003) states,

> Ideology *is* the relations that subjects live out, whatever forms these may take and whatever mode of production in which they appear, capitalist or communist. It is determining of people and is determined by people; ideology both structures and is structured by social practices. One acts because of prior ideological commitments, but as one acts one constitutes ideology as a lived relation to the social world. (p. 210)

This shows the dialectic relationship between ideology and its subjects. As Althusser describes, ideology hails subjects to it; it calls them. These interactions between student and teacher become a curriculum, a place of practicing and instilling the "relations that subjects live out."

This research project is an attempt to better understand the ideologies that are constituted through the lived experiences of student and teacher interactions. In the following section I explore understandings of authority, which make up a significant part of the student and teacher relationship. Authority is also a crucial aspect of the social relations that compose our ideologies and our actions as citizens.

Authority

Relations of authority in schools can be a large preoccupation of both students and teachers. Most of the stories in this dissertation involve relations of authority between teachers and students. In this section I first will review various types of authority as identified in research on ideology and authority in schools. Then I will trace the development of intended uses of teacher authority in schools starting with the founder of the common school movement, Horace Mann, and extending through to the third section which will include ethnographies that focus in some way on teacher authority in schools during the last few decades. This exploration of authority explores both extant and possible relations between teachers and students. It frames the question of what teacher authority does to our understanding of who we are as citizens and potentially future teachers.

Types of authority. Scholars define authority in many, often competing ways (Bingham, 2008; Pace & Hemmings, 2007). I will use authority as something that happens in relation (Bingham, 2008). It takes at least two persons and one person must in some way claim or exercise authority and the other must respond to, or give the former, authority. This means that authority is in no way fixed. While institutions may have structures that place people within a hierarchy, that is not a guarantee of authority, although it can contribute to authority. For example, a school principal, within the school hierarchy is in a position of authority. However, if

she is an unreasonable or abusive principal or one who is incompetent in some way; she may not garner much authority and in her interactions with other individuals, there is no guarantee that authority will be on her side. Structures and institutions can also constrain authority. For example, a scripted curriculum with frequent unannounced fidelity checks may create a situation in which the authority enacted between the administrator doing the fidelity checks and the teacher impacts the authority between the teacher and her students. Again, one can be in a position of authority and still not have authority. This structure and hierarchy can be enforced to varying degrees and in a variety of ways, which can strengthen the extent to which a position of authority can lend a person authority in relationship to another. There are also expectations, based in Ideology, that contribute to the ways in which authority is enacted between individuals. It is through these expectations that the social order is enforced through relations of authority.

In their review of literature on authority in schools, Pace and Hemmings (2007) identify several types of authority drawn from Weber and Durkheim that educational researchers have used. These include a traditional authority, which is founded on a set of already existing beliefs. Teachers using this type of authority can lose their legitimacy if they overstep the predetermined bounds. Charismatic authority is one in which the teacher maintains authority through passion, inspiration, and commitment. The teacher we worked with at Harper Middle School exemplifies this type of authority, and the participants all expressed a desire at some point to emulate this aspect of his teaching. Other types of authority identified by Pace and Hemmings include, legal-rational authority, which is supported through bureaucratic rules and policies, and professional authority, which is similar to legal-rational authority but is derived more from teachers' expertise and ability to fulfill stated goals and mandates. Additionally, Pace and Hemmings identified moral authority, summarizing Durkheim's (1956) description saying "Teachers interpret the

great moral ideas of their times and countries. They represent and uphold the moral order of the school and society" (p. 7).

These different descriptions of authority are useful in studying the way authority is actually enacted between teachers and students in the classroom. Often times, we think of authority as being an aspect of classroom management, or discipline. It has a functional purpose of helping groups of students who are in a compulsory school situation get through the day. Many teachers attempt to employ the many different types of authority described here to simply survive. I will return to this aspect of authority later in the chapter. However, it is also important to consider authority as enacted by teachers, in relation to democratic citizenship.

Teacher authority and democratic citizenship. The role of teacher authority in schools, as it relates to learning and democracy, has both changed and stayed remarkably the same in the first few centuries of public schooling in the United States. Here, I approach authority in schools both from a theoretical perspective and then from an empirical perspective. I look at three major moments in the development of compulsory schooling in the United States as a way to explore the ways in which understandings of authority in schools have changed, been displaced, and developed through time. I do this through the lens of three educational thinkers who had much to say about authority and ideology and conclude the section with several ethnographies that show some of the ways these frequently contradictory forces play out in contemporary schooling. The three thinkers, Horace Mann, John Dewey, and George S. Counts, all cared deeply about the country and about the role of schools in promoting strong democratic citizenship. However, they had varying definitions of good citizenship as well as different approaches at accomplishing the goal of good citizenship through teacher authority. They provide three contending perspectives

that are useful in framing the conversation about both actual and possible uses of teacher authority in schools.

Understanding both the thinking behind teacher authority and democracy in schools and the ways they are enacted is important because of the many ways schools teach students where they belong in the social order (Illich, 1973). As stated above, schools have demonstrated both continuity and change over the past few centuries. The purpose of schooling as a place of socialization and acculturation continues (Revilla & Asato, 2002). Many still believe one of the purposes of schools is to prepare citizens for a democracy, though they may have different understandings of what that looks like (Duncan, 2014; Noddings, 2013; W. Parker, 2003; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Goals of character development and work preparation are still very prevalent, particularly at schools for students who come from low-income communities (Ayers & Ayers, 2011). Many of our current practices in education exist as well because it is perceived that they have always existed or because they are entrenched in a grammar of schooling (Oakes, 1985; Tyack & Tobin, 1994). It is therefore helpful to return to the foundations of schooling in the United States to understand where various beliefs and practices originated.

Horace Mann and "Affectionate Authority." An abiding concern of Horace Mann (1957) was the ways in which schools prepared citizens for democracy. For Mann (1868/1845), the moral education that schools provided was as important, if not more so, than the education in reading, writing and arithmetic. As he stated here, he was deeply concerned that so much energy would be spent on developing the intellectual capacities of the child while neglecting the moral:

> But what do we do as soon as the child arrives at a proper age for understanding its [the earth's] true shape? Do we not spend time, use apparatus, and give explanations, again and again, until the natural error of the senses is corrected? And why should not as much

> time be spent correcting those moral errors into which all children naturally if not necessarily fall? No reason can be assigned, unless it be the infinitely false one, that moral culture is less important than intellectual. (p. 468)

With a rapidly changing society, Mann was concerned about the negative influence of industry and capital, and he saw free and public education for all as a way of curbing impulses of greed and tyranny (Hogan, 1990). He worked tirelessly, advocating for funding for these public schools and went to great lengths to prove that these schools would benefit all and thus be worthy of the tax dollars spent on them. As a part of this, he enlisted his own passion for using schools with morally upright Christian teachers to instill both a hunger for learning, but more importantly, a strong moral compass in the youth of the nation.

The ways in which authority and power were enacted in these schools was of great concern to him. He devoted many pages in multiple reports to detailed descriptions of how schools both in the United States and abroad achieved a social harmony and a willing student body without the use of harsh discipline. He worried that the rigid environment of the one room school house in which students spent most of their time memorizing lessons for the opportunity to recite them to the school master at some point stifled the student's learning and preparation for citizenship. For example, in his Ninth Report to the Massachusetts State Board of Education (1847), Mann spoke of the connection between how schools treat students and how the student will behave as a future citizen:

> As the fitting apprenticeship for despotism consists in being trained to despotism, so the fitting apprenticeship for self-government consist in being trained to self-government and liberty and self-imposed law are as appropriate a preparation for the subjects of an arbitrary power, as the law of force and authority is for developing and maturing those

> sentiments of self-respect, of honor and of dignity, which belong to a truly republican citizen. Were we hereafter to govern irresponsibly, then our being forced to yield implicit obedience to an irresponsible governor would prepare us to play the tyrant in our turn; but if we are to govern by virtue of law which embraces all, which overlies all, which includes the governor as well as the governed, then lessons of obedience should be inculcated upon childhood in reference to that sacred law. If there are no two things wider asunder than freedom and slavery, then must the course of training which fits children for these two opposite conditions of life be as diverse as the points to which they lead. (Mann, 1868/1847, p. 454)

Clearly, the overextension of authority by schools and schoolteachers would lead to future tyrants, according to Mann's logic, while an upbringing in Christian values, both taught and enacted, would prepare a citizen fit for democracy.

In Mann's (1868/1839) view, the purposes of management and government in schools were many but required a fine balance. It was necessary to have sufficient discipline and management to maintain a well running classroom and to not waste time on transitions or confusion. However, a child too often or too severely punished would be permanently damaged in moral character in that he would lose all sense of guilt; bad marks would mean nothing and he would cease to care for himself or for others (p. 64). In order to achieve this balance, Mann envisioned schools where teachers spent more time with students, developed bonds of affection, and engaged students actively in their own learning process. This vision was confirmed after one of Mann's many trips to Europe when he observed the following in the Prussian schools:

> The third circumstance I mentioned above was the beautiful relation of harmony and affection which subsisted between teacher and pupils. I cannot say that the

> extraordinary fact I have mentioned was not the result of chance or accident. Of the probability of that, others must judge. I can only say that, during all the time mentioned, I never saw a blow struck, I never heard a sharp rebuke given, I never saw a child in tears, nor arraigned at the teacher's bar for any alleged misconduct. On the contrary, the relation seemed to be one of duty first, and then affection, on the part of the teacher, of affection first, and then duty on the part of the scholar. The teacher's manner was better than parental, for it had a parent's tenderness and vigilance, without the foolish dotings or indulgences to which parental affection is prone. (1844, p. 152)

This quote comes from Mann's Seventh Report to the Massachusetts State Board of Education. It set off a heated debate between Mann and the Boston Grammar School Masters about the best way to enact authority in schools (Hogan, 1990; Rury, 2008). The Grammar School Masters advocated for corporal punishment while Mann contended that the development of affectionate bonds was superior.

In an analysis of this debate, Hogan (1990) argued that Mann's "affectionate authority" located the center of surveillance and discipline within each child (as opposed to external to the child). In this way, controlling a classroom would no longer require the constant watching of every student because the locus of control would be in the individual students (given their affection for the teacher and subsequent desire to please). At the same time, the Boston Grammar School Masters argued for continued use of corporal punishment as the only way to instill the proper morals for citizens of the Republic. According to Hogan, the need for authority was never questioned. They all saw authority as necessary in developing citizens who could withstand the

degrading impact of a growing capitalist and industrial society. The different groups merely contested the nature of the authority.

The move towards authority that was based more on trust and affection required not only a change in the individual teacher's disposition but also structural changes. One aspect of the move towards affectionate authority was the classification of students by age and ability, so that a teacher could more easily focus his or her time with the maximum number of students (Mann, 1844; Tyack & Tobin, 1994). Previously, when a teacher had many grades to work with at once, he was forced to leave the majority of the students working on their own while he listened to recitations or worked with the students at one particular level. With classification, teachers could work with an entire group for the entire day since it was presumed that they would all be at the same level.

Another aspect was the feminization of teaching. Mann (1868/1844) encouraged school committees to hire women as teachers, particularly for younger students, because they were assumed to be naturally gifted with patience, care, and maternal love that would help them enact the affectionate authority that Mann (1872/1838) championed.[1] He argued that soon, everyone would see the advantages of hiring women,

> I believe there will soon be an entire unanimity in public sentiment in regarding female as superior to male teaching for young children…she will not only find where a child's mind is, more quickly than a man would do, but she will follow its movements more readily; and, if it has gone astray, she will lead it back into the right path more gently and kindly. (p. 98)

[1] Mann also advocated hiring women because they were paid at about half the rate of male instructors and could thus be employed for twice as long at the same cost to the state, thus giving the state the ability to lengthen the school year.

With women leading age-grouped classrooms of young children, Mann was convinced that school would feel like family for students and that teachers could step in for parents who were either unwilling or unable to raise their children appropriately.

What did this push towards feminizing teaching and using affectionate authority really mean for students' interactions with teachers? While the more familial interaction between students and teachers, I believe, was preferable to the corporate punishment extolled by the Boston grammar school masters, I wonder about the impact this type of authority has had on students' understanding of their place in the world and what it means to do well or be good. If students are always seeking to please another, how does that impact their independent thinking, their ability to be critical citizens, and their individual ideologies in regards to their social relations with others? I now turn to John Dewey and George Counts, who, though writing nearly one hundred years later, take up Mann's concern with teacher authority in schools and democratic citizenship.

Dewey, Counts and the "Indoctrination Question." At the turn of the century, two progressive thinkers in education engaged in debates around the topics of authority and imposition in education. John Dewey, and George S. Counts were colleagues who both believed in the power of education to improve society. However, their beliefs in how this was to be done, particularly in relations to authority and imposition, varied greatly. For Dewey (1938), experience was at the heart of all educational growth. However, the experience, as noted above, must be of a particular nature to maximize its educative and growth potential. The ultimate goal of education was to increase community involvement and activity. While Dewey (1916), like Counts (1932), believed that education without imposition was both impossible and undesirable, Dewey (1938) also believed firmly in the importance of fostering independence and free thinking

through educational experiences. That is, for Dewey the end goal was not for students to emerge from school with a particular political orientation or way of viewing the world, it was that students would leave school involved and caring about their community, equipped with the knowledge and understanding of their world to act to change the world, and with a disposition that would lead them to do so (Stanley, 2005). The role of the teacher in all of this was to create the experience, or the objective conditions for a particular type of interaction that would foster growth, curiosity, and the potential for further education.

Like Mann (1957), Dewey believed that the child learned best when actively participating and engaging in her own learning. The way Dewey understood traditional schooling, not dissimilar from Mann, involved an exercise of authority that limited not only the physical freedom of pupils but also the freedom of thought (Dewey, 1938). By way of contrast, Dewey argued that the teacher must exercise their maturity in directing the student's growth and independence,

> The greater maturity of experience which should belong to the adult as educator puts him in a position to evaluate each experience of the young in a way in which the one having the less mature experience cannot do. It is then the business of the educator to see in what direction an experience is heading. There is no point in his being more mature if, instead of using his greater insight to help organize the conditions of the experience of the immature, he throws away his insight. (1938, p. 38)

For Dewey, it was important that the teacher know the student deeply in order to guide the student's experience toward growth. This was very different from the affectionate authority that Mann championed. Mann wanted the relationship between teacher and pupil to be close in order that pupils would become moral and upstanding citizens in an attempt to please their teacher.

Teachers therefore must be strong examples of moral and upstanding citizens. For Dewey, while the teacher needed to know the student deeply, it was in order to foster a strong connection between the student and her community, not between the student and her teacher. In other words, Mann hoped to instill character and morals in students through love while Dewey wanted to instill them through an active, independent, critical, and caring connection to the community.

In his 1932 booklet, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order,* George S. Counts opened his argument by listing many fallacies in popular thought around education. Central to many of these fallacies was the idea that schools should not impose any way of thinking, any ideological, cultural, or political persuasion on the child. Having stated that not imposing is impossible, Counts focused on what schools should impose and why. He also claimed that teachers should fully embrace their power and use it for the good of society:

> That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest is my firm conviction. To the extent that they are permitted to fashion the curriculum and the procedures of the school they will definitely and positively influence the social attitudes, ideal, and behavior of the coming generation….Representing as they do, not the interests of the moment or of any special class, but rather the common and abiding interests of the people, teachers are under heavy social obligation to protect and further those interests. (Counts, 1932, pp. 28-29)

Counts believed that the "common and abiding interests of the people" were for a new socialist economic system. He saw schools as a vehicle for creating that socialist order. For Counts, schools should be used as a place of transformation, indoctrination, and imposition to change society, to change the social order to one that he saw as being more just. He rejected a purely student centered approach for one that exposed students to the problems of society. If the

problems of society are presented in their true light, Counts contended that students would have to come to the conclusion that capitalism did not benefit the entire community. In order to do this, Counts argued that teachers would have to break from the dominant and powerful in society, those who embrace dominant Ideologies, and use their power as teachers to shape the curriculum.

Dewey and Counts were both critical of the way in which the progressive education movement had ultimately resolved itself towards issues of teacher authority, although they both saw more potential in it over the traditional model. Their critiques were different and reflected some of their fundamental differences. Dewey (1938) saw the progressive schools as bending too much to the will and the internal conditions of the child. There was too much physical freedom and too little development of self-discipline. The teachers in these schools did not use the advantage of their maturity to structure educative experiences that would lead to further growth. For Counts (1932), there was a concern that progressive education had not developed an adequate theory of social welfare. Without this theory, progressive education appeared, in its day-to-day enactment, to promote individualism and anarchy.

In regards to authority, Mann believed that teachers should engage a gentle authority; one that would foster the self-governance students would need as free citizens in a republic. He believed it would develop moral and upright citizens provided the teachers themselves set good examples. This authority, fostered by love, did not engage students in any form of critical thinking; indeed, it seems as though it would have the potential to mitigate against such independent thought. This would perhaps save the Republic from the vices of greed in the new capitalist era; however, it may not prepare students to question authority in a way that is crucial for a healthy democracy. For Dewey, the teacher must use the authority of their greater

experience, their maturity, and their knowledge of subject matter to create experiences for students. They must use authority to direct students in experiences of growth and away from mis-educative experience that would deaden growth. Through this process, schools would create engaged citizens capable of critical thought, eager to create a thriving democracy, and prepared for changes in the future. This type of authority required immense knowledge and creativity on the part of the teacher. Counts believed that teachers should use a different authority of knowledge. He thought that teachers should act on behalf of the common interest of all citizens and through their curriculum expose students to the dangers of capitalism. Through this authority, teachers would impose the idea of a transformed social order; one that Counts believed would be more democratic. However, the single vision of the new social order and the emphasis on indoctrination ran the risk of mitigating democracy, not enhancing it.

Authority, ideology and citizenship in the school context. I turn to two ethnographies that highlight, how schools, teachers, and students enact authority, foster particular ideologies and shape identity. The ethnographies included here embrace were conducted in the early 1980s and at the turn of the millennia. They both explore the ways capitalism has infiltrated schools and impacted teachers and students in regards to authority and ideology. I turn to these ethnographies because they connect the structures of schooling with dominant Ideologies and look at the role of ideologies in shaping students' experiences and success.

In the introduction to Linda McNeil's *Contradictions of Control: School Structure and School Knowledge* (1986), the author discusses the changes that were taking place at the time of Dewey and Counts and the ways in which those changes continued to impact the schools of the post-war era. With the boom of the comprehensive high schools, students were being educated in increasingly large numbers. For the first time, scientific strategies and business management

techniques became not just a discourse of adventurous school leaders, but an every day part of school life. The need for authority and control shifted from merely developing character and disciplining the mind to the more immediate need to get through a school day, managing students in the most efficient way possible. The onus for maintaining control was largely put on the teachers. These changes created a fundamental shift in student and teacher interactions. Teachers frequently found themselves negotiating or bargaining with students for their cooperation in order to maintain control. This impacted everything from the knowledge that teachers shared, to the pedagogies they enacted, to the expectations they held of their students (McNeil, 1986).

Linda McNeil (1986) wrote about these growing contradictions inherent in the dual purposes of school: control and education. One can see that these dual purposes were in many ways at the heart of the earlier debates. While Mann and Dewey were concerned about how students best learn, they were also concerned with developing habits and morals in the students. Mann, while believing that it was important for students to be interested in what they were learning and to be active learners, also recognized a need for direction in that learning. He focused on the teacher's charisma, love, and care to accomplish this. If a teacher were engaging enough and caring enough, he or she could capture any student's desire to learn. Dewey worked to find a balance between allowing students to learn through their own experience but also having teachers create the experience and guide them through it. Both advocated that control, particularly as an exercise of authority, be used only as a means for learning. For McNeil, control becomes more about processing students through a series of credits, maintaining a safe and clean building, and a smoothly running school day.

In this ethnographic piece, McNeil studied four different high schools with varying administrative and teaching structures to understand the impact of these structures on teachers'

classroom practice as well as the way knowledge was shared and generated in their classrooms. This research was important in looking at the ways context and structure impact schooling. In her study, McNeil followed several energetic, passionate, and creative social studies teachers, observing their classrooms, interviewing them, their students, their colleagues, and their administrators. To her surprise, she found that many of these teachers were not teaching the way they wanted to nor were they reaching the potential one would have expected given both their passion for teaching and content knowledge.

What she found in three of the four schools she studied, was that the administration's focus on student behavior, processing the students through their courses, and the absence of concern for academics all premised the need for control over all else in the classroom. This need for control not only changed the disciplinary authority teachers used in the classroom, but also the ways they engaged their authority in their subject area. That is to say, some teachers limited the amount they shared with students or taught students as a way to maintain control. For example, they would sterilize controversial issues from the past and reduce them to a series of lists. Others still taught a fair amount of content but reduced their expectations of student performance as a way to require the least effort possible. Many of these teachers saw conflict either over content or expectations as leading to less control.

McNeil summed up her findings in the following way:

> This study of four high schools reveals that today many teachers reverse [ends and means]. They maintain discipline by the ways they present course content. They choose to simplify content and reduce demands on students in return for classroom order and minimal student compliance on assignments. Feeling less authority than their Latin-grammar school counterpart, they teach "defensively,"

> choosing methods of presentation and evaluation that they hope will make their workload more efficient and create as little student resistance as possible. (McNeil, 1986, pp. 157-158)

McNeil's work allows us to see that the student and teacher interaction goes far beyond the two or three people involved: it is impacted by everything from the structure of the school building to the type of principal that can set the stage for particular interactions.

Particularly salient to McNeil's research was the implication that for some of the teachers she studied, concerns about students' sense of their place in the world were mitigated by concerns about the teacher's own career and working conditions. If social studies teachers are not thinking seriously about how their teaching prepares students for citizenship and life in the world, what does this say about how seriously schools in general are taking this task? If student credits, behavior, and truancies take priority in schools, this creates its own implicit curriculum that speaks louder than the semester long civics course. The school's priorities, intended priorities, and those that result from inherent contradictions in schools impact student and teacher interactions and the enactment of authority in those interactions.

In Peter Demerath's (2009) *Producing Success: The Culture of Personal Advancement at an American High School*, he studied the dominant, achievement oriented culture of a comprehensive high school in a suburb of Columbus, Ohio, and the ways the dominant culture fostered particular behaviors amongst mostly students but also some of the teachers. To conduct the study, he and several other researchers followed four students through their four years at Wilton Burnham High School interviewing them on a regular basis, attending their classes, and talking to their parents. In addition, they sent out a school wide survey asking several questions about how students felt about school, its role in their life, and how they handled the stresses of

school. Finally, they talked to many teachers and school staff and attended community functions. The study looked at the ways the dominant class culture maintained the status quo of social inequality by further advantaging already advantaged students and alienating disadvantaged students. It further explored the ways in which both students and parents commandeered the public resources provided for and through schools for the private benefit of the students doing well in the global market economy. In other words, it looked at the ways interactions between teachers, students, families, and administrators in the school maintained the social order.

It is clear throughout the book that the school is saturated with the ideology of capitalism, the very thing Mann and his contemporaries at the Boston Grammar School feared. Teachers colluded in this project through grade inflation, negotiating points and assignments with students, and in celebrating the achievements of some students in a way that alienated others. What my study does differently is the longitudinal aspect. It could be argued that the overwhelming culture of the school is more important than what individuals bring to the school community; however, even that culture is impacted by the individuals that are a part of it in the ways they do and do not fulfill their role in maintaining the social order.

In the achievement-oriented and competitive environment at Burnham High, many of the pedagogical relationships centered on grades. Giving points or good grades was a tool of coercion for the teachers. Authority was enacted by both teachers and students in negotiating grades and points. Students fostered personal relationships with their teachers in an attempt to get better grades according to many of the student interviews. This ability to negotiate grades, build relationships, and enact authority with the teachers was something the upper class students were more adept at, which helped further their position of privilege and their chances in the labor market once they left high school. This focus on grades also detracted from students attending to

learning the content. Students were instead focused on "doing school," or simply getting good grades instead of learning and understanding. In addition, there was a strong emphasis on "student centered" pedagogy in the school giving students more leverage in negotiating their assignments, workload, and grades. Demerath refers to the skills the students developed as "adult handling" skills in which the students would manipulate the adults. This adult handling, along with a good deal of cheating, was all done so that students could get good enough grades to get into a good college and be competitive in the global labor market.

Whereas in McNeil's study, the bargaining was for the purpose of mass processing of students through school, of getting through the school day, of teachers maintaining some sort of control, in Demerath's study it was about students gaining an advantage once they left school. These foci both reflect the influence of capitalism on schooling. In McNeil's study, the idea of school as industrial factory is strong. As McNeil outlined in the introduction, there was a belief in group processing and applying organizational structures and strategies used in the manufacturing world to schools. In Demerath's study, capitalism becomes a focus through the idea of the global marketplace and the belief that the students would not only be competing with each other for jobs but with people around the word. McNeil conducted her ethnography just as the industrial age in the United States passed its peak and Demerath's study comes during a post-industrial time. However, much of what was happening in schools in regards to the manufacturing model has remained unchanged. The bureaucratic management of schools has in many ways intensified as will be discussed in Chapter Six. There is now the added layer, particularly for those in the middle and upper middle class of an ever-changing labor market, one with changing possibilities and opportunities.

Conclusion

This chapter opened with a discussion of lived experience, defining them as moments in life that stand out from the every day, moments that have a particular structure and story line. I then discussed the way lived experience is intimately entwined with ideology. Ideology both shapes and is shaped by lived experience. Lived experience serves both as a window to ideology and a canvas for enacting ideology. From here we moved to the definition of ideology that I employ in this research project. Drawing heavily from Althusser (1972), this ideology is based in our material existence, is supported by the Ideological State Apparatus of which schools are the dominant component, and through a mis-representation of reality, provides a framework for understanding the world around us. There is both a dominant Ideology and our own individual ideologies, drawn from the dominant and yet distinct to each individual subject.

Through the lived experiences of the participants as students, as citizens and as teachers, we come to understand aspects of their individual ideologies that become a part of their teaching. The lived experiences studied here are largely based in relations of authority between the teacher and student. These relations of authority create an implicit curriculum for the student in regards to authority and citizenship. There are many different ways of enacting authority between teachers and students. Concerns about how teachers enact authority in schools and how that does or does not foster citizenship are foundational to much of the theorizing that has been done about public education in the United States.

Mann, Dewey, and Counts were all working with the philosophy of education, thinking through the practice to connect it with larger ideas of preparing citizens and workers. All three believed in the power of education in creating a strong and healthy democracy. However, not only did their visions of a strong democracy differ, so did their thinking on how education could

contribute to said democracy. At the heart of their arguments were ideas of authority and its appropriate use in schools. For Mann, authority should be enacted through love, care and charisma, instilling students with a strong moral character through their affection for the teacher. For Dewey, authority is found in continued learning and growth. Teachers use their greater maturity and authority to provide the appropriate learning context for their students, preparing students for continued learning, for working together, and for the inevitable change that comes with time. For Counts, teachers were to use their authority to impose a belief in a different social order, one he believed was superior to capitalism.

The ethnographies reviewed here give us insight into how these ideals are negotiated in the reality of the school both in the 1980s and at the turn of the century. They both explore the ways in which capitalism, industry, and the global market place can be important contexts of how teachers and students enact authority in schools. These contexts, which themselves are saturated with ideologies, deeply influence the student and teacher interaction. In studying the lived experience of the student and teacher interaction, the ideological meanings that are within those lived experiences; it is crucial to keep in mind these broader contexts and the ideologies they encompass.

Today, the combination of authority and imposition creates fears around political and religious bias. Teacher candidates are encouraged to leave their personal religion and politics at home when teaching so as not to unduly influence their students' ideologies. However, this proves to be almost impossible, and many contend that by maintaining a neutral stance, teachers are supporting an unjust status quo (Applebaum, 2009; Bigelow & Peterson, 1997). While many of these concerns are around the more overt imposition of ideology through authority in the school system, this research aims to understand the functioning of ideology and authority in less

overt, subtler ways. I do not contend that schools should be free of authority or ideology. They are both necessary to a certain extent. However, I think it is important to understand how the authority does and does not shape students' experience and ideology. In the following chapter I will share both the methodology and method I employ in this research project. They are both closely linked with the understanding of lived experience and the insight lived experience can give us into our own individual ideologies.

CHAPTER TWO

The Study

> *Accordingly, ideologies are neither false nor true, that is, more or less adequate representations of reality. Rather, ideologies provide the most fundamental frameworks through which people interpret experience and live the conditions available to them. Nor are these frameworks primarily mental, for they exist as lived practices of particular groups, classes, communities and so forth.* (McCarthy, 1994, p. 424)

> *From a phenomenological point of view, to do research is always to questions the way we experience the world, to want to know the world in which we live as human beings. (Van Manen, 1990, p. 5)*

The challenges of studying individual ideologies are not insignificant. While some may have the self-awareness to glimpse and recognize some aspects of their own ideology, it can be extremely challenging. To simply ask participants to describe their ideology directly would only scratch the surface. Ideologies are challenging because they are so embedded in dominant Ideologies. They often appear as common sense, or human nature, or "the way things are because they could be no other way." Also, some aspects of ideology, the "fundamental frameworks" are so a part of our every day life and action that they can seem invisible. Because our ideologies exist, as noted above as "lived practices of particular groups, classes, communities" they are derived from those groups; and as long as one is a part of her group, there is nothing to cause one to question what seems obvious and natural. Even when we leave a particular group or are exposed to another group with a vastly different ideology, it is all too easy to label the other group as strange, deviant, or abnormal instead of turning the gaze towards our own group.

Because of the seeming invisibility of ideology, I employ narratives of lived experience in an attempt to uncover my participant's ideologies. In phenomenological research, the essence of a phenomenon is under study. Lived experiences are collected from participants in what

researchers hope is the "natural attitude" or in a pre-reflective state. The natural attitude is an attempt to get at the most immediate response, how something was experienced in the moment, not how the person interprets their experience later. This can be challenging data to acquire. Here researchers are interested in what happened as it was experienced by the participant, not in the "facts" or "reality" of what happened. Phenomenologists are interested in the structures of these experiences, again, as they were experienced by the participant.

In this chapter, I will first discuss the research question and sub questions. I will then explore the methodology of phenomenology more closely, relating it to the aims of this research project. Following this, I will give a detailed description of my methods in conducting this study including the context, data, and analysis. Then I will give a brief overview of who the participants were and introduce each one as an individual. I will close the chapter with my own story of "living the question" in an attempt to both further explain my interest in the topic and to make explicit my own assumptions and biases as a researcher.

Research Questions

As sometimes happens with research projects of this length, the questions have morphed and evolved. I initially set out to see how personal practical knowledge (Clandinin, 1985; Clandinin & Connelly, 1988), would change and develop through a field-based methods course. However, after the first round of interviews in which I asked participants for a general overview of their life and then a memorable moment from their K-12 schooling experience, I realized that there were many directions in which I could narrow and expand my focus. In the following set of interviews, I asked for another memorable moment from K-12 schooling and one from secondary schooling. For some, the K-12 moment was from a field placement when they were in the teaching role. I discovered after these two rounds of interviews that there were many stories

about authority from the participants. I was also becoming increasingly curious about their goals regarding citizenship education. My orientation then shifted to "What is the experience of becoming a social studies teacher?"

Throughout the proposal process, the questions shifted yet again. At this point, my overarching question became, "Do beginning teachers' past experiences with authority shape their current ideologies as teachers and if so, in what ways?" With this question I developed three sub-questions, one dealing with past experiences of authority, another with teaching ideology, and a third with how their thinking about classroom community changed during the teacher education process. With these questions in mind, I returned to my data and conducted my final two rounds of interviews. In working with the data, my questions took on one last shift. For example, when looking at the stories that seemed connected to teaching ideology, a strong theme of belonging developed. When looking at how the participants' ideas of teaching had changed, a sense of frustration emerged. As these themes emerged, some data became more important and other data less so. Here are the final questions:

Overarching Question:

I. How doe the past experiences of social studies teacher candidates impact their ideology and who they become as social studies teachers?

Sub-Questions:

II. How do teacher candidates' lived experiences of authority in the pedagogical relationship both reveal and impact their ideologies and understandings of citizenship?

III. What past experiences impacted teacher candidate's thoughts on good citizenship?

IV. How have teachers' ideologies about classroom management and community changed through the process of becoming a teacher?

Phenomenology: The Study of Lived Experience

Student and teacher interactions are deeply human and deeply pedagogical phenomena. They involve individuals who vary in temperament, vulnerability, compassion, affect, and in countless other ways. Though there are scripted curricula and pre-packaged classroom management plans, there are no "best practices" in teacher and student interactions, no researched-based intervention, because there cannot be. The way a teacher greets students entering the classroom, responds to student concerns, says hello in the hallway or the local grocery store, smiles, frowns or ignores a student are all deeply personal and impossible to dictate, mandate, or quantify. Furthermore, how these actions make a student feel, how the student responds, and how they carry these moments forward in their lives are equally complex phenomena. Therefore, a natural science approach to this research or even the social science approaches that are modeled after the natural science approach is not applicable. There is no theory to prove, no generalizable knowledge to claim.

Instead, I turn to the human sciences, specifically phenomenology, as a way of understanding this pedagogical relationship. As Van Manen (1990) contended, "…pedagogy requires a phenomenological sensitivity to lived experience (children's realities and lifeworlds). Pedagogy requires a hermeneutic ability to make interpretive sense of the phenomena of the lifeworld in order to see the pedagogic significance of situations and relations of living with children" (p. 2). One of phenomenology's aims is to better understand this lifeworld of the child so we can act with more care and tact in our lives with children and students. While

phenomenology does not lay claim to generating generalizable knowledge, it does aim to get to the essence of particular experiences which leads to greater care and understanding.

In addition to phenomenology's focus on the pedagogical relationship and experience, it also seeks to access and describe the pre-reflective lifeworld. This is the "natural attitude" or the way that we function and interact with others on a daily basis without thinking. This lifeworld is also composed, in many ways, of our ideology. Eagleton (1991) described Althusser's understanding of ideology in this way:

> …ideology for Althusser alludes in the main to our affective, unconscious relations with the world to the ways in which we are pre-reflectively bound up in social reality. It is a matter of how that reality 'strikes us' in the form of apparently spontaneous experience, of the ways in which human subjects are ceaselessly *at stake* in it, investing in their relations to social life as a crucial part of what it is to be themselves. (pp. 18-19)

This "spontaneous experience" that is "pre-reflectively bound" is very much the phenomena that phenomenology looks for in its study of the lifeworld. Through understanding the essences of various phenomena, like authority for example, one can access pieces of the lifeworld and individual's ideologies.

My purpose in using phenomenological research is to better understand the curriculum of student and teacher interactions as well as the existing and developing ideologies of my participants. This requires a clear orientation to the experience of my participants as shared in lived accounts. This attention took the form of writing and rewriting their stories, always looking for new understanding. Van Manen (1990) described phenomenology this way: "the fundamental model of this approach is textual reflection on the lived experiences and practical actions of

everyday life with the intent to increase one's thoughtfulness and practical resourcefulness or tact" (p. 4).

While phenomenology may at first appear to be very similar to ethnography and other qualitative methods in that there are open qualitative interviews with participants, it is actually quite different. Instead of asking for thoughts, beliefs, or opinions, phenomenologists ask their participants primarily for lived accounts. Phenomenologists seek to find meanings that the participants themselves may be unaware of. To do this they get detailed descriptions of events as the participant experienced them. While phenomenologists often strive for lived accounts in the natural attitude, which is without reflection, they acknowledge that even in the telling of a story, a level of reflection is already taking place in what the teller chooses to share and not to share.

There is another important difference between phenomenology and ethnography. Ethnography seeks to describe a culture, a pattern of beliefs that belong to a particular place or group in a particular time, whereas phenomenology seeks to understand the meanings of particular experiences. Phenomenologists are interested in the being of human beings and access this through the study of human experience. As Polkinghorne (1989) contended, phenomenology "differs from [other qualitative forms of research] because its focus is on the subjects' experienced meaning instead of on descriptions of their overt actions or behavior" (p 44). Because phenomenologists study the experience, the burden of interpretation often lies with the researcher herself. Though some individuals are capable of some self understanding and reflection, another person's reading of an experience will often unearth meaning that is invisible to the person who had the experience. However, in interpreting the experiences of others, phenomenologists always dwell in a place of uncertainty in regards to their interpretation, acknowledging that theirs is one of many possible interpretations.

The experience, once told, no longer belongs to the teller but belongs to all. It is studied and shared for the understanding that we can all find in it, the depth and breadth we can add to the meaning in our own lives and experiences. Phenomenologists reject Descartes's division of the world into object and subject in which the researcher must reject all that is subjective. Instead, phenomenology is interested in the being of objects, which cannot be limited to a sterile description of the object. Furthermore, phenomenology is interested in the being of objects in their relationships to human beings and in their given use, again, not as an isolated entity that is there to be described (Heidegger, 1996).

The purpose of phenomenological study is to get to a different type of "knowledge," in a different way. It is not to design a curriculum that will raise test scores, nor is it to measure, nor is it to prescribe. However, as Van Manen (1990) attested, it supports,

> the progress of humanizing human life and humanizing human institutions to help human beings become increasingly thoughtful and thus better prepared to act tactfully in situations. In other words, sound human science research of the kind advocated in this text, helps those who partake in it to produce *action sensitive knowledge*. But, although this knowledge can be written and presented in textual form, ultimately it must animate and live in the human being who dialogues with the text. (p. 21)

There is a tension when working with individual lived experience between the part and the whole. At what point does the larger context of one's life or one's identity markers, the way in which one is individually situated, become important, in studying lived experience? In phenomenology, the larger life narrative is of secondary importance. The participant's experience of the object under study is the primary focus. The researcher must bracket, or set aside, her assumptions or pre-understandings about the experience, including how the

participant's identity categories may impact that experience. There are debates as to the ability of the researcher to do this completely. Van Manen (1990) advocated that one be explicit about pre-understandings and assumptions.

In this research project, this struggle was particularly strong because I worked with the participants over a span of time and knew them not only as participants but as students as well. I collected stories and experiences from throughout their lives and could not stop my mind from making certain connections. I therefore am taking Van Manen's approach by occasionally referencing other stories from the participants' lives, or important details from their life stories. I employ this the most in Chapter Six where I look at the participants' experiences in individual narrative arcs. I will also introduce each participant later in this chapter. All of this being said, I organized the data chapters by the object of experience; namely, authority, belonging, and citizenship through teaching. I did this in order to find aspects across each set of experiences that tell us something about the object of study.

The use of phenomenology in this study creates a deeply personal perspective on the experiences the participants had. It generates complex understandings of authority and citizenship. As stated previously, it is through these deeply personal stories and experiences that we make sense of our lives and our worlds. In dwelling in the experiences of others, we broaden and deepen our own reservoir of understanding and knowledge.

Now that I have explained both the methodology I employ in this study and the reasons for using this methodology, I turn to the study's context. While I focus closely on the lived experiences, there are important aspects of the context for this particular group of participants in understanding their experiences. In the following section, I provide the context of the teacher

education program along with information about a special methods course these students were a part of.

The Research Context

The participants in this research project all attended Michigan State University and were a part of the secondary social studies teacher education program. Traditional students enter the program their sophomore or junior year taking a series of foundation courses and then are divided into subject area groups for their senior year and the internship. This program is unusual in having a fifth year internship that teacher candidates participate in after receiving their bachelor's degree. The internships take place in school districts both close to the university and across the state. Prior to the internship, in the senior year, students take subject specific methods courses for the entire year.

The participants in this study were in the first year of an experimental sequence, in which one of these secondary social studies methods courses was relocated to an area middle school. In this special section, the teacher candidates would arrive every Monday and Wednesday at 11:30 a.m. at Harper Middle School where we had a dedicated classroom. After spending 45 minutes together as a class, half of the teacher candidates would go to Dan Torres' eighth grade United States History class while the other teacher candidates remained in the university classroom. The following hour the two groups of teacher candidates would switch and then during the fourth hour of class everyone would return to the university classroom.

This course was designed to close the gap between the field and the university and to respond to calls for more clinical teacher education (NCATE, 2010; Zeichner, 2010). The participants were in the pilot year of the program and I was the section instructor, a fact which created particular limitations and affordances discussed later.

This particular methods course resulted in a more embedded experience, one in which teaching could be studied in the context of a particular school in a particular place. The community that was created both amongst the teacher candidates and between the teacher candidates and the school faculty were both very important to the learning experiences. As the reader will note in some of the following stories, having this yearlong methods course in the middle school allowed for the participants to develop strong relationships with some of the students as well. Perhaps the greatest benefit during the pilot year of having the course relocated was the immediacy of being able to discuss what had happened in Mr. Torres' class. The teacher candidates would return to the university classroom anxious and eager to discuss what had just happened. There were 16 teacher candidates in the class so there were eight teacher candidates in Mr. Torres' class for each of the hours. This created eight different perspectives and interpretations of what had happened and why.

Also important is the broader context of Harper Middle School. It was located in a small, fairly affluent, majority white suburb of Lansing. The schools were very much at the center of the community both figuratively and geographically with just one middle school and high school. There was a lot of community support for the schools but also high demands from many of the parents. Though there were several English Language Learners (ELLs) in the school, there was not an ELL program so those students worked with one of the special education teachers. There was a fairly strong support network for students with special needs. In the two eighth grade classes that we worked with there was an overwhelming majority of white students with no more than three or four students from marginalized racial groups in each class.

Dan Torres, the teacher we worked with, was at Harper schools for over twenty years. He was a charismatic storyteller, teaching his students as much about life as about United States

History. A high-energy teacher who cared deeply about his students, Dan relied on his personality and on the care he showed his students to maintain classroom order. Mr. Torres was a graduate of Michigan State University's teacher education program and was deeply involved with many aspects of the college for many years. He loved mentoring the teacher candidates, and he enjoyed working with the new program where he was able to mentor a much larger number of future teachers.

The second year of the study, the context was drastically different. During this year the participants were all in a yearlong internship at school districts in mid-Michigan. In the internship year, teacher candidates were paired with one or two mentor teachers. For the fall semesters they taught a focus class and then occasionally took on other classes for the span of a week or two. In the spring semester, they did a ten week lead teach in which they taught all but one of their mentor teacher's classes. While this year has proven to be a vital learning opportunity for teacher candidates, it was also fraught with contradictions and constraints. The mentor teachers varied significantly in the support they provided the interns as well as the extent to which they allowed the interns to establish their own ways of teaching. The partial participation in the fall added to the constraints in that students saw the interns in their classrooms but not in charge for a significant period of time prior to the lead teach in the spring. Also, in the fall, many interns and mentors preferred for the mentor to follow both the mentor teacher's curriculum and their classroom management systems for the sake of consistency and ease. Frequently by the spring, interns had realized that for a variety of reasons, the mentor's style may not work for them. However, at this point it was challenging to make drastic changes. These constraints are important in understanding the participants' lived experiences during the internship year.

Another important aspect of the second year of the study is the schools in which the participants were placed. There will be a more detailed description of the schools in Chapter Five prior to each participant's stories. Briefly, Alicia and David were both placed in Lansing[2] 7-12 schools that serve a diverse group of students in regards to socio-economic status, race and ethnicity, ability, language, and nationality. There are several refugee communities within Lansing as well as other immigrant populations. Lansing schools are also under-resourced and have had several school closings and a restructuring of the entire district in the years leading up to this research project. In addition, in the round of contract negotiations prior to the second year of this study, the teachers in Lansing lost their planning period putting further strain on teachers, administrators, students, and their families since teachers had even less time to address student concerns, communicate with families, or work with administrators and each other. Jessica and Robert both interned in much smaller districts in rural communities close to Lansing. These schools were majority white with significantly less diversity. These districts had not seen the drastic changes that Lansing had undergone in recent years and were better resourced.

Methods

The data, described below, consists largely of stories of lived experience. I first identified the stories that deal specifically with student and teacher interactions, citizenship, and teaching. These stories encompass both what the participants experienced as students and what they experienced as teacher candidates. Orienting my reading towards teacher and student interactions and towards experiences of citizenship outside of schools and their various lived meanings, I first worked with the stories to group them by particular types of experience, and then I developed

[2] Throughout the dissertation I will use pseudonyms for individuals, locations and schools as much as possible. However, the distinction of the program at Michigan State University and the importance of local events in Lansing made it important to name them.

themes within each group. From this point, I returned to the stories again and through the process of rewriting and analyzing, attempted to draw out aspects of the phenomena. The stories and analysis will be presented by themes in chapters. The analysis not only highlights the various aspects of the phenomena under study but also connects them to the development of ideologies and an understanding of authority.

Selection of participants. As mentioned before, the participants all came from a class in which I was the instructor. Because of this I felt it was important that participation in the study be completely voluntary. Two weeks into the course I briefly described the study to the teacher candidates in the methods course, saying that I was interested in better understanding their process of learning to teach. I emphasized that choosing to participate or not participate would not impact anyone's grade and for those who did participate, the things they said would not impact their grade. I asked that those willing to participate email me to indicate their willingness. Prior to starting the project I had decided to limit participation to five or six participants. I soon had six teacher candidates contact me indicating their willingness. Of these six four were women, two were men; three were non-traditional teacher candidates and three were traditional. All six were of European descent and all but one came from solidly middle class families. The one exception came from a working class family. The participants all signed consent forms at the beginning of the process and I reminded them with each round of interviews that they had the option to withdraw themselves from the study at any time without repercussions to their grade or standing in the program. Of the six who volunteered, four were able to complete the study. The other two participated for the entirety of the first year and then were unable to complete the second year.

While I wanted a more diverse sample in regards to race and ethnicity there was only one person in the methods course who was from a marginalized race group. Again, because of my role as instructor in the course I wanted participation to be completely voluntary so I did not approach this one student to invite him into the study. This study would have benefited greatly from more diversity of all types. However, the participants who did complete the study are very representative of the students we generally have in teacher education courses at Michigan State University. In the case of the methods course that year there were an even number of men and women as well as an even number of traditional students and non-traditional students. One difference in this course was the larger group of non-traditional students. In most courses I have taught at Michigan State University, there are only one or two non-traditional students.

Data. The data for this study comes from participant texts, both spoken and written. In general, observation is not used in phenomenological research because the researcher is examining experiences, not events. That is to say, we are interested in the experiences of our participants as they lived them and as they share them. As stated above, it is important to get these experiences in the natural attitude or in a pre-reflective way. This is virtually impossible because even the act of telling or writing the story of experience involves a certain amount of reflection. The phenomenological researcher must ask for as detailed an account as possible of what an experience was like, and in some cases, ask the participants to revisit an experience repeatedly asking for clarifications and details, always with a focus on getting as close to the actual experience as possible. However, again, phenomenological researchers are not attempting to get a factual description of what happened but what the participant experienced, which at times can be very different than the events that took place.

Phenomenological researchers rely on at least two ways to access experiences from their participants: the interview and stories of experiences written by the participants. I will first describe the documents that were used in the study and then the series of interviews I conducted. While the documents provided artifacts for the interviews, the interviews were the primary focus of the analysis.

Written Documents. There were several course assignments that proved useful to the research from the methods course. I will go over each of the assignments that I drew from with a brief description of how they related to the research itself. In addition to assignments from the methods course, one participant shared one assignment with me from her internship year course.

One of the first assignments for the methods course was a blog post in which I asked the teacher candidates to share three stories of their own experience: one was a memorable moment from school; another was a memorable moment involving a teacher; and the third was a memorable moment from a social studies class. I like to begin the course with these moments for many reasons. One, it is important for teacher candidates to both remember and reflect on the ideas and images of teaching that they bring with them. Some of these reflections can revive good memories and ideas for themselves as teachers. Others may find memories of what not to do. Many scholars in teacher education argue that this type of reflection is important in helping teacher candidates unearth and critique past experiences (Feiman-Nemser, 2012; Lortie, 2002). In the research, these blog entries provided shorter versions of stories that I returned to in the first set of interviews which were all conducted after the participants had completed their assignments. Some of the texts quoted in the following chapters come from these descriptions.

The other part of this blog post were ten "I believe" statements about teaching inspired by William Gaudelli's (2010) lesson plan on using critical social reflection in developing a

pedagogic creed. These statements were to help the teacher candidates think about broader purposes of teaching and the principles that guide their own teaching. I used these, along with the teaching philosophy statements the participants wrote at the end of the methods course during data analysis to check the various goals participants had for their teaching.

The yearlong conversation journals, kept in composition books, with the teacher candidates created another source of data for this study. I provided the teacher candidates with a list of possible prompts for their entries and responded to each entry in writing. For the first entry, I asked everyone to both identify which of Barr, Barth and Shermis's (1978) social studies teaching traditions they best fit into, why they wanted to be a social studies teacher, and any experiences they could point to that led to this decision. These journals were useful both in better understanding my participants and in developing rapport with them. The entries that I use in the analysis are all used with the expressed permission of the participants.

For the third round of interviews, described below, I used two artifacts from the methods course. One artifact was the participants' favorite lesson plan. The other was a classroom management plan or syllabus that I asked the teacher candidates to create at the end of the methods course. This classroom management plan (CMP) included attendance and homework policies, classroom rules, grading schemes, and both expectations that the teachers would have of the students and the expectations the students could have of the teachers. These documents, and the thinking behind them, were important in understanding the participants' understanding and desires around learning and authority in the classroom. The lesson plans were used as a way to see how participants planned or hoped to enact social studies education in ways that had meaning for them and reflected what they thought was most important in social studies.

Interviews. Interviews are considered one of the best methods for phenomenological research because they allow the researcher to ask for further detail and push the participant closer to the natural attitude. As noted previously, interviews were the primary source of data for this project. For this research project I conducted a total of five rounds of interviews. While I had a few questions prepared for each round of interviews, they were mostly unstructured. At times, if something had happened with a participant at Harper Middle School, I would focus on that incident if the participant wanted to, instead of the questions I had prepared. In addition, as I came to know each participant, I would tailor questions to that participant. For example, Robert mentioned during nearly every interview that he was a patriotic person, so during one of my final interviews with him after getting a story about an interaction with a students, I asked him about a moment when he had felt particularly patriotic. As with many research projects of this duration, the focus and purpose slightly changed many times. This also impacted what questions I asked in the different rounds of interviews.

The interviews all lasted between forty-five minutes and an hour and a half. They took place in a variety of settings including conference rooms at the university, coffee shops, the break room at one of the participants' places of employment, and over Skype. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed by myself.

An initial set of interviews was completed with all four participants during the Fall 2012 semester. During this interview, I asked for a brief overview of the participant's life including any significant events. I also asked about the schools they attended prior to college, what the class and racial composition was and whether or not they enjoyed school and felt successful. I

then asked them to share a memorable moment from their K-12 schooling experience.[3] This interview established important context for the participants' many other experiences and created curiosities for future interviews. Furthermore, it helped in developing the participant and researcher relationship. In the second set of interviews, conducted in the spring of 2013, I asked for stories of times when their decision to become a social studies teacher was enforced through an experience. I also asked about a memorable moment from their time in college. Finally, I asked about a memorable moment they have had when they were in the teacher role; and for some, I was able to ask about a specific story that involved an interaction with a student.

In the third set of interviews, conducted at the end of their year in the methods course and prior to their internship, I brought with me classroom management plans that they had created in the methods course and their favorite lesson plan to use as conversation pieces. Through asking the participants to explain various choices to me, I was able to grasp what their ideal school and classroom environment would be. I was then able to refer back to these ideals in the interviews conducted during the first semester of their internship. While these interviews strayed from the details of student and teacher interactions, they provide a window into the participants' ideologies, particularly around teaching, and their thoughts on educational authority. These insights were important in understanding how the lived experience of the student and teacher interactions has impacted the ideology of the participants. Below is a chart specifying the questions I asked and their purpose.

[3] All of the participants had strong memories for this interview except for Alicia, the oldest participant, for whom these experiences were much further in the past than for the others. Because of this, she does not have a lived experience shared in Chapter Three.

Table 1

Interview	Prompt	Research Question	Purpose
Fall 2012	Give me a brief narrative of your life, where you were born, where you went to school, major life events… Tell me about a memory from K-12 education that has stayed with you.	I, II	Gain an understanding of where they are from, what school was like for them, and major life events. Gather an initial story from school.
Spring 2013	Tell me about a time when your decision to become a social studies teacher was confirmed. Tell me about a memorable moment from school after you finished high school.	I, II, III	Get a storied understanding of some of their motivation for teaching social studies, expand on understanding their school experience.
Summer 2013	What were you thinking about when you made your classroom management plan? How did you make each decision? Why is this your favorite lesson plan from the year? What do you want students to walk away with from this lesson plan? Tell me about a memorable moment from this past year in the methods course in another field placement/teaching experience.	I, IV	Develop a greater understanding of their teaching ideology, understand ways in which their experience in school is changing the teaching ideology
Fall 2013	Tell me about a memorable interaction with a student from your internship experience. What are some challenges you have faced in the internship in being the teacher you want to be.	I, IV	Understand how their teaching ideology is enacted in schools.
Spring 2014	Tell me about another memorable interaction with a student.	I, IV	Get more stories about student and teacher interactions.

Data Analysis. The first step in my data analysis was transcribing the interviews myself. This allowed me to revisit each interview, hearing the intonations of the participant's voice and

to return to the stories in a more relaxed and open way. After transcribing the interviews, I read through them and identified all of the lived experiences as defined in the previous chapter, and looked for ways of categorizing, or bounding the experiences. For example, as the reader will see in Chapter Three, there were several experiences that highlighted authority in the pedagogical relationship. At this point, I used a combination of Van Manen's wholistic or sententious approach and his selective or highlighting approach (1990, p. 94). For the first of these approaches, I read through the stories several times and lived with them and the questions I had about them. I would think about the stories while out on walks or runs, as I went to sleep at night, and while washing dishes. This allowed me to sift through the stories repeatedly in my mind to find both the structure of the experience and also the essence of the experience. To support this thinking, I also went through the stories and highlighted sentences or phrases that struck me as being particularly powerful, meaningful, or bewildering. Then came the process of writing and rewriting the stories, working from the interview transcripts and the written documents to get as close to the participant's experience as possible. Because I worked on the analysis while collecting the data, I was also able to revisit some of the themes I found in later interviews in both direct and indirect ways.

This reflection and highlighting was done in order to identify the essence of the experience in question and also its structure. As a part of this process, I reflected back on my own experiences, revisited some of the ethnographies, and thoughtfully consumed literature involving the themes I had already identified. While most of this reflection does not appear in the text, it was nonetheless helpful in processing my reflections. During this time, I wrote the following three chapters, sticking closely to the experiences at hand. Following this process, I returned to the scholarly literature on education, citizenship, authority, and dominant Ideologies.

In phenomenological research it is important to first deal with the experiences themselves, holding at bay any pre-conceived models or theories (Van Manen, 1990; Polkinghorne, 1989).

Limitations and Affordances. Every research project has its own set of limitations and affordances. Here, I will discuss both the limitations and affordances in an attempt to be as transparent as possible with the reader. We all take on various roles in our relationships with others and often we have multiple roles. In this research project, for the first year, I had the roles of both instructor and researcher and my participants were both students and participants. This combination of roles created both limitations and affordances in the research. I took several measures to mitigate the pressure the participants may have felt in regards to their grades by both making participation in the study completely voluntary and by iterating and reiterating both verbally and through the consent form that their participation would have no bearing on their grades. I also completed my grading for the course before conducting the last three rounds of interviews. While I took every measure possible to assure the participants that their participation in the project would not impact their grade in the course, this still did not change the reality of our multiple roles.

It is impossible to know all the ways that these multiple roles influenced the interview responses. There were a few aspects that I was able to identify during the course of the research but again, it is impossible to know all of the impacts. A few times participants shared a story, or talked about a teacher they had in the past in a very positive light, claiming that they had learned a lot either from the person or from the experience. They would then follow up this statement by making it clear that they now know that the teaching methods were not very good. They would then often return to how great the teacher or experience had been. To me, these contradictory messages were an attempt on the part of the participant to let me know, as their instructor, what

they knew about good teaching. Another challenge the dual roles presented was that the interviews would sometimes slip into conversations in which they were seeking my advice on an aspect of teaching or on an aspect of the teacher education program. This happened most often during their internship year. Even though I was no longer their instructor at this point, we had established this relationship during the previous year.

While our many roles created some challenges, they also provided a wealth of opportunities. As their instructor, I was able to build a rapport with them prior to the first interview making it much easier to get started. Also, I was able to get to know who they were as students, teachers, and colleagues by watching them participate in the course. The fact that the course took place at a middle school was invaluable in this regard. From the first day of class when they helped sort through Mr. Torres' classroom materials and decorate his room, the class had a tone of us all working together to provide Mr. Torres' students with the best education possible. The teacher candidates in the course often talked about how the class felt like a teacher's lounge at times. Much of this was due to the more constructivist teaching methodology I employed that year, but it was also due to the teacher candidates themselves. We had a unique group that year in that half of the sixteen teacher candidates were non-traditional students who were older and had already received their bachelor's as well as some life experience outside of school. This brought a more mature and collegial feel to the group.

Another opportunity I had as their teacher was to see them discuss ideas and beliefs with their colleagues and to participate in the conversation journals mentioned above. Finally, due to the nature of the program, I was able to be present when they first returned from Mr. Torres' classroom every day. This was important in an instance I share about David in Chapters Five and Six when he had a discussion about race with some of the students in Mr. Torres' class. I heard

about this experience first hand that day and then was able to ask him to write about it in his journal that night.

Just as it is impossible to know the full extent to which the many roles we played created certain limitations, it is also impossible to know the full extent of the opportunities. As a researcher, I found the multiple roles to be both challenging and fruitful. Ultimately, it was a very rich experience and one we all learned from. As Van Manen (1990) notes, research is a form of pedagogy, and I believe that learning happened not only in the creation of this document but for both the participants and myself as we participated in this project together in different roles. I know I am a better teacher educator for having heard the experiences of my participants, and some of the participants shared with me at the end of this project that the opportunity to share their experiences benefited them as well.

The ways in which I was situated in Michigan State University's teacher education program while I was writing this did create some important limitations. While, as noted above, I learned important things about my own teaching as a part of this research I did not include this learning as a part of the study. This also means that I did not theorize much about the successes or failures of our teacher education program. To do this would have made it a very different study. I think this work would be very valuable. However, due to my position in the program, I only make recommendations in regards to teacher education in general. I will use the research to improve, as noted above, my own pedagogical relations as I attempt to act with more tact and understanding as a teacher.

Another crucial limitation came from my participant group. As noted before, they were all of European descent. While this created an opportunity to explore the ways their whiteness played a role in their experiences of authority, it did not allow for insight into how those who are

not White may experience authority in schools either as student or teacher. This is important, as many studies have shown that the experiences of students who are not White are often very different than those who are (Decuir & Dixson, 2004; G. A. Duncan, 2002; Ferguson, 2000; Fordham, 1996; Tuitt & Carter, 2008). This research would be particularly interesting since most schools operate within an ideology of whiteness. The contexts in which the participants attended school and taught were almost all majority White with the exception of Alicia and David's placement schools. Further research in this area involving a more diverse participant group and involving more diverse school contexts is very much needed.

Participants

I focus on those individuals who were transitioning from being students to teachers. Studying teacher candidates during this time is ideal for two reasons. First, this is the time when the teachers' lives as student and teacher collide and sometimes overlap, a time when they are in a process of "becoming;" a tumultuous time, one filled with memories of life as a student and hopes for life as a teacher and hopes for the lives of their future students as well (Britzman, 2003; Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Second, this is a time when teacher education plays a role in who they become as teachers. By better understanding the impact that new teachers' lived experiences have on their understanding of teaching and classroom life, teacher educators can be better prepared to open up conversations with teacher candidates about these experiences. Also, teacher educators can discuss more deeply the impact of these interactions on their students' future selves. Below I describe each participant, with some information from his or her life as an introduction.

Robert. Robert was a traditional age college senior at the beginning of the research. He grew up in a small rural town a few hours from Detroit, Michigan. Both of his parents had been

teachers and his dad was a school administrator at the time of the interview. Robert was a white male, tall, thin with short dark brown hair. He appeared to be confident in his teaching ability, was very outspoken in the methods course, and regularly volunteered for spontaneous teaching opportunities in Mr. Torres' eighth grade United States History class. During his senior year, he worked at a sporting goods store where he regularly gave classes on gun safety.

In school, Robert had been successful academically, socially, and in sports. He was a three-season athlete throughout high school and also played club lacrosse in a Detroit suburb. In addition to sports, he was in the school musical every year and frequently had the lead. After completing high school, Robert spent several months in Ireland playing soccer for a university and practicing with a professional team. He related that this time had been difficult for him and he eventually returned home where he took a job as a para-professional working with an autistic student in the elementary school he had attended. Following this, he enrolled in the university initially pursuing a degree in psychology before switching to an interdisciplinary social science degree with teaching certification. Following the yearlong methods course, Robert was placed in a high school in a small rural town for his internship.

Jessica. Jessica was also a traditional aged college student. A white female, she grew up in a small town on Lake Michigan in the northern part of the state. Her parents divorced when she was very young and both remarried. She lived between the two families. Her father's new wife was a teacher at the high school and her dad was a principal at a charter school in the small town. They provided her with opportunities to travel and encouraged her to attend college. Jessica participated in marching band in high school, an experience she cherished. At first she considered being a music teacher but decided she needed to move away from music after it was such an intense part of her life.

Jessica interned at a middle school in a suburb of the state capital. It was similar to Harper in many ways and had a good reputation. Jessica was very hard working and thoughtful about her teaching. She developed a lot of confidence during the methods course and frequently brought up things she did with her younger siblings in conversations about education.

David. David, a white male, was a non-traditional student in his early thirties at the time of the research. He had grown up in a wealthy suburb of Detroit in a working class family. He attended a private Catholic school through the eighth grade and then moved to the better of the two public high schools in his district. David's parents divorced when he was in the eighth grade, which was particularly challenging for David while he attended the Catholic school. Following high school graduation, David attended a local community college and then transferred to the university where he completed a bachelor of arts in religion. During the following years he spent nearly two years teaching in South Korea and completed a bachelor of arts in history. He also worked at a local bookstore where he continued to work throughout the research project.

David interned in an eighth grade classroom at a 7-12 school in the state capital. It was housed in a large old building that suffered from years of neglect. His mentor teacher had moved to the building only a few years before when her middle school was closed in the midst of the district re-distributing grade levels and students as it attempted to consolidate and save money. David struggled throughout the year with the lack of support and resources at the school, particularly in light of the large refugee student population that required added language and social supports.

Alicia. Alicia was also a non-traditional student by age. She was in her late thirties at the time of the research with three teenage children. Alicia grew up in a small town in Michigan, the daughter of the editor of the local newspaper. She played sports and wanted to become a social

studies teacher and coach one day. She started off at the university but nearly failed out so switched to community college for a year to get her grades back up. She then returned to the university, but after her junior year her boyfriend, who had just graduated, gave her an ultimatum – either leave school and move to San Francisco with him or he was going to leave her. She chose to follow him and had their first of three children a few years later. His job took the family overseas to China and South Korea.

Alicia enjoyed her time overseas and spent a lot of time in her kids' schools coaching, running clubs and substitute teaching. After she and her husband divorced she moved back to the United States with her kids and decided to finish her degree and become a social studies teacher. Alicia interned in the same district as David though in another building that was also under resourced. She worked primarily with ninth graders.

Living the Question

As Van Manen (1990) points out, in phenomenological research it is important that the researcher live the question, that it come from the researcher's own experience. Here is my story of citizenship and teaching. It begins when I was eight and attended a talk at our church. The talk was given by a returned Peace Corps volunteer who had spent her two years helping to dig wells and irrigation ditches somewhere in Africa. I was drawn to the idea of making the world a better place. I was determined that one day; I too would dig holes in Africa. I spent the following years involved in the church, volunteering whenever I could. In college I was a part of a few different service organizations and spent my spring breaks in the Appalachian Mountains working on people's houses. After college, I spent a year in Argentina working at a home for street boys, my proverbial holes in Africa.

Prior to leaving for Argentina, I read a book called *Beyond the White Noise: Mission in a Multicultural World* written by Tom Montgomery-Fate (1997) who had done missionary work in the Philippines. It highlighted the ethical and moral dangers of such work, the many layered aspects to the relationship between the United States and the Philippines, the risks of soft imperialism, the arrogance of inviting one's self in as helper. After reading the book, I was confused, unsure of what my role and purpose going to Argentina really was. Upon arriving I soon was aware of my own arrogance thinking that I, a middle class white girl from the United States with beginner level Spanish had anything to offer street boys in Argentina. After several very challenging months in Argentina, a woman who was affiliated with the home said to me in a conversation that while it was nice what I was doing, it was never going to be enough for the boys in the home; they needed families, and that was something I could not provide them. A few years later I spent a year volunteering at a youth crisis shelter in Washington, DC. There I found myself again lost and confused. In what ways was I, through my "world saving," acting out white supremacy, United States exceptionalism, assimilation, and imperialism?

Even though I was troubled by these experiences, I still wanted to make the world a better place; so I pursued a master's degree in international development in hopes of becoming a program director at an international non-governmental organization. In my first semester of the master's program, I took a course called Social Justice in Intercultural Relations (SJIR). This course had a profound impact on my worldview. I do not think I would have been open to this drastic change in my worldview without the previous experiences. In this class, we learned about various structures of inequality and the damage wrought by United States and global capitalism around the world. It became clear to me that my work as a global citizen needed to be with education in the United States, not as a "helper" to other countries. While this was an exciting

learning experience, it was also painful. I frequently left class with a headache and feeling depressed.

The following year, I started a master's of education in a program with the same professor who had taught the SJIR course. I watched as some of my colleagues in the course went through a similar process to mine, painfully and slowly coming to see the world differently. Others in the course resisted the entire year and I believe left the course with their worldview untouched, or perhaps more entrenched than it had been at the beginning. I was curious as to why some people responded in one way and others in another way. If I was going to incorporate similar ideas in my own teaching, I needed to think about who my students were and how it would be received.

While I had these experiences after my years in K-12 school, I discovered with my teaching that many of my school experiences were deeply ingrained. As a student, I was a pleaser. Being socially awkward I craved the positive attention from my teachers since I struggled to get positive attention from my peers. I was driven by ideas of being "good" and an aspect of being good was getting good grades. I put immense amounts of pressure on myself, not to learn, but to get good grades. I still remember the sinking feeling when I forgot to put my name on a spelling test and had to sit on the tires for ten minutes at the beginning of recess in the third grade. One of my mother's favorite stories to tell about me is the time I came home in the fourth grade in tears. She asked me what was wrong and I shared that I had gotten a bad grade on my report card. She asked what the grade was and I sobbed out "An A minus!" For me, grades were very personal. I had all As until my senior year of high school. I didn't understand why anyone wouldn't try or behave – my peers exasperated me with their disruptive behavior. I assumed they did it because they didn't like the teacher.

I bring all of these life experiences with me to the classroom when I teach. They impact not only the explicit curriculum of my classes but also the implicit curriculum. They create the backdrop to the pedagogical relationships I form with students and the ways I enact authority. These experiences also led to me being at the protest march with my mother in Washington DC. They all contribute to my individual ideology, which saturates my understanding of and interactions with the world.

Conclusion

As described in the previous chapter, ideology is something that saturates our lives. Like breathing, it is something we are often unaware of, making it particularly challenging to study. Phenomenology, in its close attention to the experience of what is, in its focus on consciousness, provides an avenue for exploring ideology. Conducting this research project has been an incredibly fruitful learning experience. Because the data was collected over the course of two years, I had a lot of time to improve my interviewing skills as well as my analysis. My relationships with the participants changed and developed as did my understanding of their experiences.

In the following three chapters I will share the results of the work described in this chapter. Each of the next three chapters focuses on a particular theme I discovered in the data, exploring the experiences shared in depth. I purposefully withhold much analysis in these chapters as a part of the bracketing described earlier in this chapter. My focus is on describing the experiences and unfolding what can be learned from them. The writing of these chapters was indeed the final component of my data analysis as I worked the stories over and over, selecting the quotes, working to find the best way to tell each story, identifying what was important, and writing it to the best of my ability. Through this process, I have fallen in love with many of the

stories, they are rich in nuance and complexity. I have also been changed by these stories as I went through them over and over in my mind. I hope the reader also finds himself or herself thinking over some of these stories, asking more questions, finding new connections, and in the end, being changed as well.

CHAPTER THREE

Teacher Authority: The Creation and Disruption of an Illusion

In reading through the many lived experiences participants shared about their K-12 and post secondary schooling, a theme of authority emerged across several stories. These stories, memorable for the strong emotions they engendered, all contained a note of surprise as an expectation regarding authority in the pedagogical relationship was contradicted. As discussed in Chapter One, the role of teacher authority in schools has been central and strongly debated since the inception of public education in this country. It has also been at the heart of many illusions of who teachers are and what teaching is.

Nearly everyone arrives to their teacher education program with illusions, images, and dreams of what teaching is and can be. As we experience the apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 2002), the pedagogical experiences that take place in every relationship between adult and child, (Greenwalt, 2014) and are exposed to media's many portrayals of teachers and teaching, we develop certain myths (Britzman, 1986) and illusions around teaching and what it means. Many argue that these images or illusions become an important part of a teacher candidate's process of becoming (Britzman, 2003; Feiman-Nemser, 2012; Lortie, 2002). They are held as a part of our individual ideologies. These images and hopes of teaching are unquestioned assumptions.

What teacher candidates learn in their teacher education programs and their initial experiences in the classroom often contradict these illusions and assumptions. This creates conflict for the teacher candidates, forcing them to grapple with the unexpected and the unknown. While these images are challenged and put into question, they do not go away, they

remain a source of inspiration that the teacher candidate draws upon even as they are contradicted (Britzman, 2003).

The focus question in this chapter is: How do teacher candidates' past experiences as students shape their ideologies about authority and how do their ideologies shape their experiences? In other words, what does the retelling of these past experiences tell us about the participants' pre-understandings of authority in the pedagogical relationship? How do these pre-understandings inform their beliefs about "good teaching"? How do these relationships reflect their understanding of how authority is used in the relationship between the citizen and their government? As discussed in the previous chapters, because the school is the first government institution that most individuals in the United States navigate on their own, the understandings of authority in the pedagogical space of the school create the first understandings of interacting with a government. In later chapters, this connection will be drawn even further to understandings of good citizenship in connection with good teaching.

The Creation of the Illusion

Pre-service teachers bring illusions of good and bad teaching with them, filled with hopes and fears. For me, these illusions were comprised of Mr. Hamilton, my eighth grade social studies teacher, standing tall and large, voice booming down the hallway or reverberating in the classroom. There was Michelle Pfeifer's character in *Dangerous Minds* and even the nuns in *Sister Act*; with a little bit of sass and love you can change worlds. My images also included historical figures like Septima Clark (Levine, 2008), literary characters like Ms. Stacey in *Anne of Green Gables*, and cartoon characters like the distorted teacher voice from the televised Peanuts cartoons. Within these individuals and characters, I developed certain myths and illusions around teaching and authority.

Similar to my experiences, the participant stories in this chapter reveal assumptions and beliefs about teachers and teaching. In this chapter, I explore the lived experiences of Jessica, Robert, and David prior to their entering the teacher education program. They all take place within a pedagogical relationship, one between themselves and either a teacher or a university instructor. Furthermore, they in some way reveal expected or unexpected uses of authority. These experiences, and their understanding of them, paint a picture of how they thought about teaching and teachers before the process of teacher education. They reflect their broadened apprenticeship of observation (Greenwalt, 2014; Lortie, 2002) and the assumptions about teaching they may fall back on in times of distress (Britzman, 2003; Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Also important, they reveal the participants' pre-understandings (Manen, 1990) about the work of authority in the classroom. These pre-understandings compose a part of their ideologies (Althusser, 1972), the every day structures and beliefs out of which they act.

Many of the lived experiences recounted and discussed here expose a pre-understanding through the surprise and discomfort they invoked in the storyteller. The story finds its value in breaking from the expected "canonical script" (Bruner, 1991). The participants used words like "strange" and "unexpected" to describe these encounters with teachers. Many of them note that a particular incident was the first and often only one of its kind. Without these experiences that disrupt the expected script, neither the participants themselves nor the researcher would be able to uncover the underlying assumption, the taken for granted belief. As I argued in Chapter One, these beliefs and assumptions that we hold, without awareness most of the time, are absorbed through our every day lived experiences, through the dominant discourse (Bakhtin, 1981), Ideology (Althusser, 1972) and culture (Leonardo, 2003) that we live in. They come from the

above-mentioned media and literary images as well as the former teachers whom we make fit the dominant paradigm.

It is important to understand these illusions in seeking to understand teachers' development. As individuals move through a teacher education program, read theories of classroom management, confront their first classrooms, encounter their first discipline challenges, these illusions are challenged, and they may constrain a teachers' actions or understanding. They can create a false understanding, one that is more related to their own experience and who they were as students as opposed to the new student standing in front of them. Teacher candidates wrestle with these illusions and are forced to shift their ideals of what it means, for them, to be a good teacher (Britzman, 2007).

Many of the illusions of teaching are revealed in stories about past teachers. Most of our teachers or instructors from formal institutional settings become fixed in the past. With some, we may maintain a relationship beyond our school years, but with most, they become a memory. These teachers become a form of absent authority which, according to Bingham (2008), is of great importance. First, their memory becomes fixed in a way that makes it stagnant. When no longer confronted with the reality of this authority figure, we are no longer surprised by what they may bring to our life and challenge us with. Furthermore, as we take our memory of them and make it our own, it becomes modified to have a particular meaning for us. If we were to meet the teacher again, they may say or do something that would sharply contradict this meaning. This meaning may be simplified to conform to previously held illusions, or it may take up a place in our own narrative and understanding of ourselves.

In an example from my own young life, I had a much beloved teacher during the second half of my third grade year. As a deeply sensitive third grader, I felt as though she cared about

me and thought I was special. Two years later we went to visit a school where she had become the principal. I was so excited to see her and expected to get the same sense of warmth and being valued that I had experienced as her student. However, I was one of perhaps 100 fifth grade students sitting on the floor in the room she came in to. I don't remember if she even acknowledged my individual presence, but I do remember a deep sense of disappointment that she had not continued to recognize me in the way she had as my teacher. I had hoped for a welcoming hug, a look of delight to cross her face, for her to continue to recognize and validate me the way she had in the past; and when this didn't happen, my fixed idea of who she was in my life was challenged. In a similar way, most of the stories the participants shared involved teachers with whom they are no longer in touch. Bingham (2008) argued that these cease to be educative authoritative relationships because again, the individual is able to create a fixed meaning from the relationship that is no longer disrupted by the physical presence of the other with whom they were in relationship.

The Stories

The understanding of authority in pedagogical relationships in these stories reflects ideals of a professional distance, an absence of care, a certain form of being unimpeachable, of having an excellent character, and inhuman superpowers. The participants expected teachers to always be in control, not only of the students but also of themselves, and furthermore, to be somehow all knowing, not only about content but also about who students are and what their abilities are. These in some ways reflect Britzman's (1986) myths about teaching: 1) everything depends on the teacher, 2) teachers are the experts, and 3) teachers are self made. These myths and beliefs create the foundation of expectations for teacher candidates of who and what they will be in the classroom.

Teacher as expert, file as expert: Authority of teachers and authority of bureaucracy. The first story involves different aspects of school authority and how they worked to develop a participant's identity. There are formalized mechanisms teachers use such as grading, diagnosing, and noting. Through the use of grades and assessments, teachers put a quantitative value on student ability. With diagnosing, teachers, parents, and others can identify learning disabilities or other challenges students may face. While intended to be helpful, this is a way in which authority is exercised in the pedagogical relationship and another way through which students are identified. Finally, teachers' notes, comments, behavioral charts, and other documentations can be used when making important decisions about students such as which class they should be placed in the following year, what reading group they are a part of, and what can be expected in the future of the child.

Jessica, a white teacher candidate of traditional age who grew up in a small town on the shores of Lake Michigan, shared stories of two contrasting experiences. The first is about feeling identified or mis-identified as she was tracked into a low performing class at the end of the third grade. The second recounted a story with her eighth grade social studies teacher who saw promise in Jessica and eventually invited her to join an enrichment class that was only for the best students.

In one of her first interviews, I asked Jessica to share a general life outline, naming significant events both in and outside of school, and any characteristics of the community and school she grew up in. She started off briefly mentioning her parents' divorce and a time when she got sent to the principal's office in kindergarten, then talked about how the students were divided in her elementary school:

> It was kind of weird because my elementary, we, we talk about it still. My elementary school was really, um, segregated. Not, it was like segregated not between race but between like, I feel like, levels of, um, what's the word I'm looking for, like levels of, so like the smarter kids were in one class and then you could tell that you weren't as smart as those kids so you were put in this class. And that was really weird, um, just because, like, just because like, looking back on that, I feel like some of my insecurities, like with the education, has kind of stemmed from that just because I was always in, like, that other class, like I was always in the bad kid class I guess.

This separation happened at the end of third grade when Jessica was taken out of the beloved Ms. Hathaway's class. Most of her peers continued with Ms. Hathaway during fourth grade but Jessica was put in the other class, with a teacher no one liked as much. Jessica shared how this separation impacted not only her self esteem at the time but also the relationships she formed. She did not make friends with the students in the smarter class until they arrived at middle school where the tracking was no longer practiced as explicitly. Jessica says that the teachers and principal denied the tracking but that everyone knew. Though the school tried to maintain a façade of equality, the reality was quite different.

Jessica remembered this as a defining moment in her own self-image. She felt labeled, designated as one of the "bad kids," although she new it wasn't quite that. When telling the story she struggled to find the right word, she settled on "not as smart." Jessica believed that she continued to carry this experience with her to this day, making it more difficult for her to raise her hand and offer an idea in a class or have confidence in her work. In reflecting, Jessica never said that the grouping of herself with the less advanced students was explicitly wrong. While she questioned the practice of tracking, she did not, in this instance, question whether or not the

teachers were right in placing her with the less advanced group. She did not question their ability to know and understand her ability. In a later story, she talked of a fifth grade teacher who assigned her to a reading bin where the books were clearly too easy for her. In this case, Jessica resisted, refusing to read any of the books provided. This time she did question whether or not the teacher had appropriately identified her abilities. However, the impact of the first story remained.

While these two stories reflected moments when Jessica felt that teachers used their authority to decide who she was in a more negative way, her next story contrasted in the way that a teacher identified her more positively. Jessica's eighth grade history teacher, Mr. Schwartz, drew her aside after class one day and said that he could really tell that she was listening and understanding the material. Jessica, who was a quiet student and, as she later confessed, somewhat frightened of Mr. Schwartz, was surprised to have him notice her in this way. She assumed that because she rarely spoke, her interest in the class had gone unnoticed as it had with past teachers. Furthermore, this contradicted the assessment of her third and fifth grade teachers. However, Mr. Schwartz did notice her and appreciated her intelligence and interest. This was the first time, in Jessica's experience, that she felt a teacher had really seen her and recognized her ability. He didn't "look at the file," as Jessica put it.

Here we see Jessica's underlying assumptions about another source of authority in schools, one that was closely linked with teachers but was also a part of the bureaucracy of schooling. Jessica assumed that each student had some sort of file that followed her throughout her school career, and that teachers relied on these files to tell them who a student was and what she was expected to do or be capable of. These files, in Jessica's belief system, were created by the teachers, but then took on a life and authority of their own. In Jessica's interpretation of this

moment, Mr. Schwartz relied on his own expertise and authority over the expertise and authority of the file or the bureaucracy of the school. With the increase in testing that is currently taking place for data driven instruction, the bureaucracy and the authority of the bureaucracy in schools is growing.

Later, Mr. Schwartz invited Jessica to join a history enrichment class, surprising Jessica who, since her experience at the end of third grade, had assumed that she was not one of the smart kids, that she would not belong in an enrichment class.

> Cause you know teachers get a file about students and they get lunchroom talk, you know? Um, like, I feel like he didn't care about those. I feel like he's one of those teachers who was like, "Yeah, ok, we'll see what she actually has, we'll see what she's got." And I feel like for the first time, like, I don't know, he could see that I really liked what he was teaching and for the first time he recognized that.

For Jessica, the structures of the school, the tracking into advanced and less advanced groups, the authority of the sorting mechanisms, which from her position as a student were determined by both the authority of teachers and by the authority of a file on each student, provided discouragement and opportunity. While the authority of teachers and the file, or any documentation on student ability are in some ways shared, they are also different. Teachers frequently take part in generating data on individual students, assessing and quantifying their ability. However, in the institutional structures of schools, this documentation takes on a life and authority of its own as it gets passed from grade to grade and becomes detached from the one who initiated it and is only attached to the student. Because these documents or files are institutionally sanctioned, they hold their own place of authority within the school structure and

bureaucracy, one that teachers are increasingly forced to take into account and respond to as value added measures gain importance in teacher evaluations.

In Jessica's experience, when her eighth grade social studies teacher acknowledged her interest and ability, she interpreted the experience to mean that the teacher was somehow going against the system or the file. In her understanding, the teacher was paying closer attention to the students and not relying on the official, institutionally authorized documentation in the file, but instead relying on his own authority, his own knowledge and assessment of student ability. In this, she understood that with extra effort and attention, teachers had the power and authority to somehow go above the authority of the bureaucracy and give individual students opportunities they may otherwise not have had. This belief in teacher's power and authority within schools played a role in her decision to become a teacher. We will see this taken up in Chapter Five where I explore the ways in which the teacher candidates attempted to implement their ideologies as teachers.

Teacher as unimpeachable: The authority of a superhuman and moral character. Schooling has always carried with it some sort of moral imperative. For Horace Mann, this moral development of children was of equal importance to their intellectual development in regards to the school's mission; the development of a strong and upright character was as important as the development of a sharp mind (Mann, 1868a). While today many schools shy away from teaching morals or imposing values, they still embrace the idea of character with positive behavior systems and programs like Character Counts.

Within this setting teachers are held to incredibly high moral standards. In many ways, as those in society who are tasked with raising children and guiding them into healthy lives, they are under extra scrutiny. It is teachers who spread messages about working hard, perseverance,

healthy living through good nutrition, and avoiding unhealthy habits. It is teachers who insist that deadlines must be met, even if it requires staying up all night. Teachers are responsible for guiding us in the way of good choices which in turn means that the self they portray to the students must echo or reflect the good choices they urge their students to make.

For many teachers, these pressures keep them from sharing particular parts of their lives, the parts that involve perhaps bad choices or do not fit neatly into a framework of good choices always leading to good outcomes. A teacher may prefer to keep her divorce, her miscarriage, her struggles with alcohol hidden from the eyes of her students. Another teacher may keep to himself the challenges he is having raising a son with autism or controlling his weight. These challenges, which are all a part of life, and not necessarily a reflection of poor choices, do not fit neatly in the narrative of "try hard, do your best and things will go well."

Of course not all teachers either desire or are able to keep their personal challenges out of the classroom despite admonitions to "leave it at the door." These teachers tend to be the exception to the rule, the ones who break the expected script. They are accused of not maintaining healthy boundaries or of not being strong enough. The danger is that it is these life challenges that make us human, that reflect our humanness. When they are not a part of the dominant discourse, students may see teachers (and perhaps all adults) as being somehow more perfect and pure. As students become adults, they may be frustrated or feel added shame at their own humanness or they may develop a sense of being disillusioned once the illusion of the perfect teacher has fallen. Furthermore, it leaves teachers in a precarious position. What happens to teacher authority when humanness, which can also be seen as vulnerability, is revealed? This gives everyone incentive to maintain the façade of teachers having good lives, that they are

confident in who they are as good people and able to fulfill the illusion of perfection to the point of being inhuman.

In the following stories, a teacher's authority was brought into question by their human-ness in a way that, once again, surprised the participant. It may be that the teacher engaged in a habit that had been labeled "bad" by those in school. Or it could be something as simple as an instructor who, though he regularly expects his students to meet deadlines at all costs, confessed to being either unable or unwilling to complete his own work at a certain time. Again, these reflected ways in which teachers are held, and sometimes hold themselves, to a higher standard as an aspect of maintaining their authority.

This myth supports an ideological understanding that gives teachers authority over students. It becomes an assumption or a belief that supports students' response to their teachers. While students may be able to identify amongst themselves, or privately, the ways in which their teachers are not perfect, they will not question their teacher or bring up these complaints to parents because they assume that the teacher's authority as an adult, at not only knowing better but being better, will go unquestioned.[4] While these beliefs may not make up a component of every student's individual ideology, they are a part of the dominant Ideology. Both David and Robert had stories that disrupted the assumption that teachers hold unimpeachable moral standing, stories that involved their teachers or instructors being human and imperfect.

Robert approached a history instructor at the end of the semester about a final paper. He was first surprised when the instructor started smoking a cigarette, something he never expected to see an instructor or teacher do in front of a student. Robert asked for an extension on a final

[4] In the wealthy high school in which Demerath (2009) conducted his ethnography there was evidence of this changing for upper-class students who would challenge their teachers, not on their personal lives but on their teaching ability.

paper, sharing how he has several other papers due in the next week. He was surprised when the instructor admitted that he too was swamped and would be fine having one less paper to grade.

> It was my sophomore year. I was taking a history class … I think it's the first time I saw professors as like people. I don't know, you kind of hold them on this pedestal. And then he and I were talking and then we walked outside and I was just sayin' "this paper is not going well." And he lit up a cigarette, which was really strange in front of me because I'd never had a teacher do that before. And we were walking and we were talking and he was like, "You know what? Just turn it in in a couple weeks. I don't feel like gradin' it, you don't have time to do it. We'll just play it by ear. If you get it to me sometime over the summer, we'll go from there." And I was just like blown away ... And that still has never happened again like that. But still it was just really strange. It was like yeah, they have to grade this stuff too, he was on the same plane as I was. We're both swamped. He didn't want to do it and I just found that really funny.

The instructor granted Robert an extension and Robert felt like he had received a "get out of jail free" card. Robert also felt connected to the instructor in a way that was new for him, he and the instructor were both swamped, both overwhelmed, both human.

David's story was in some ways similar and some ways different. He shared it in a blog post about a moment during his senior year of high school:

> I remember it was a beautiful late spring day. I thought that I could skip out on study hall and grab a smoke behind the garage on school property.…After I lit up my Camel Red Light I turned the corner and that is when I came face to face with my study hall teacher, a cigarette dangling from his mouth. It came to me in a flash, he use to leave from the study hall session about 15 minutes in and would return just before the end...The teachers

> were just as outcast for smoking as the students were. We looked at each other and kind of just stared, not really finding the words…we exchanged a few uncomfortable words. Then something happened. We just started talking. Many of us that did smoke, or still do, would recognize it as the banter that you have with other smokers around a butt can. There was a level of comfort that I did not have with many teachers until college. For the next few weeks or so that were remaining in school the only class that I paid attention to was [the other class I had with the teacher]. I wanted to prove that I earned being treated like an adult.

In David's story we see what for David was a strange and new experience. This was the first time he witnessed a teacher do something even the students knew was wrong. Of course, David was also in the wrong. However, what this story really revealed is David's underlying assumption that teachers do not do "bad" things, that they somehow occupy a higher moral ground.

One aspect of Robert's story was that he was surprised when his instructor lit a cigarette as they walked through campus having their discussion. Robert attested that this was the first time he had seen a teacher or instructor smoke and that it was "really strange." What was strange for Robert was that this did not fit into the cultural script of teachers being in some way better than the rest of us. For someone like Robert, who grew up during the anti-smoking campaigns of the last few decades, smoking was "bad." No one should smoke, particularly those who were a part of the establishment that was sending the message about smoking being "bad."

In regards to grading, the instructor's admission that he too was swamped and didn't really want to grade another paper at the time was not "bad" but it did show human limitations, that this teacher was not superhuman, always willing and ready to do his job, to give a good or

bad grade. This both touches on the unseen part of teaching that happens outside of the classroom and is therefore not a part of the apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 2002), but also on the fact that teachers are human with their own wants, needs, desires, strengths, and weaknesses. This teacher was tired, he was not a robot, and furthermore he admitted it himself! While we have all witnessed teachers who are disorganized, poor planners, or in some manner not up to our expectations, teachers rarely admit these weaknesses to their students in so direct a manner. Teachers are put in the role of judging and measuring their students on everything from timeliness to organization to the ability to complete a set amount of work. For an instructor to admit that he struggles in any of these areas is to undermine his own authority in being the judge of such competencies. And yet, who is perfect in every way that we expect or want our students to excel?

This higher moral ground and super human ability is necessary to the teacher's position and authority. It is one of many things that allow him to enact the crucial role of maintaining control and wielding authority. While David indicates in his last sentence that he felt, through the interaction, that he had been treated like an adult, it could also be that the teacher was brought down to the level of delinquent student. Whatever it was that happened, a crucial hierarchy was, for a moment, leveled. Similarly, when Robert's instructor admitted that he too was overwhelmed by end of semester expectations, there was a sense that they were the same; that they were on the "same plane."

This hierarchy is again necessary to the schooling enterprise as it has existed for well over a century. Systems of control are put in place as early as kindergarten (Jackson, 1990) and through to high school (McNeil, 1986) as a result of the very structure of compulsory education. Later in the conversation, David noted how certain other human failings of his teachers, though

perhaps known, were not spoken of, perhaps in an attempt to maintain a façade of moral superiority. He spoke of one teacher whose last name changed after she was divorced and of another who, after spending a year on sabbatical in Eastern Europe, came back with a wife that was half his age. Again, while these things were known and questioned by the students, they were never mentioned in David's memory and did not make a part of the public discourse. These failings of teachers are noticed and known but we speak about them in hushed tones so that we can maintain our illusions about teachers and schooling.

Teacher as police: The authority of control. The import of teacher control has long been stressed in the education setting. As Linda McNeil (1986) pointed out, the need for control is in many ways the result of compulsory education and the increasing use of a business model for education. When communities first began hiring teachers, the ability to control a classroom was a primary concern (Sedlak, 1989) in many areas, given more import than a teacher's academic knowledge. Today, teacher candidates often express their concern over their ability to control the classroom (Britzman, 1986). This need for control saturates many aspects of education. It puts teachers and students in an often antagonistic relationship, leads to a lowering of expectations on the teacher's part (McNeil, 1986), and often a sort of bargaining between students and instructors (Cusick, 1983).

Control, the ability to keep a group of students quiet and contained within the four walls of a classroom, is important to authority and the dominant Ideology of authority in that it maintains social structure. It is frequently instilled with force or intimidation, or the threat of either, but is also a sign of a person's status or place in society. The one who is in control of others is the one who is above others. The police maintain control of a protest, firefighters control a fire; it is an aspect of domination and authority to control. When parents or teachers

appear to be unable to control children, they are seen as being unfit for their job as they are not appropriately maintaining the expected norms. When young children misbehave in public it is primarily attributed to bad parenting as misbehaving students are attributed to bad teaching. Teachers (Pace & Hemmings, 2007) and parents are expected to have the right, the obligation, and the authority to control the behavior of children.

The experience retold here is one in which an eighth grade United States history teacher intentionally appeared to give his students control of the classroom for four days for pedagogical purposes. Robert, the participant who shared the experience, still struggled with this apparent giving up of control. He still expressed shock and surprise; and though he attested to it being a great learning experience, he questioned whether or not it was a good idea. This experience came from a lesson on the Constitutional Convention that his eighth grade teacher, Mr. Perez, did:

> He explained the project the Friday… basically he wasn't going to have any involvement and that we were in complete control of running the class for the next five days and by the end of the week that we needed to produce a class constitution written collectively and that we would all receive a group grade. Now in hindsight, obviously with everything I've learned from the College of Education, I'm not sure that was really an appropriate way to teach it. But at the same time I learned a lot from it. So, um, we came in on Monday morning and … he didn't say anything. He literally didn't say anything. And the first day was just chaos, you know, eighth grade students just running amuck and being loud and obnoxious and throwing things and he didn't say anything. Nothing. So then we left, and then we came back Tuesday kind of the same thing, people just doing whatever they wanted. …Well, then, Wednesday came and people started to panic and Mr. Perez still has not said ANYTHING … by the end of class Thursday we weren't even close to

being done and this was due the following morning. So myself and two other people basically went home and, um, wrote the rest of it and printed it and turned it in. And then we discussed it on Friday and it was really quite eye opening to have Mr. Perez explain that in terms of the Constitutional Convention and, you know, the whole time he was taking notes, too, of the things that were going on that he could use in his analogy for how things happened and it was just it was really an excellent, excellent experience and it was a lot of fun for the students. Obviously for us it was a great time because we got to run the show for the entire week, so yeah, so that's basically the story.

Robert stressed here over and over that Mr. Perez did not say anything, that there was chaos and still, Mr. Perez did not say anything. Robert was clearly surprised by this apparent relinquishment of control. It was clear from other parts of our conversation that Mr. Perez did not lack the ability to control his classroom. Indeed, the very act of intentionally giving up control for a week indicated his confidence in his ability to regain control. Also, Mr. Perez didn't leave the room; his mere presence carried authority. Robert described him as being a large, older gentleman with a booming voice. However, Mr. Perez chose to sit there and let the week unfold. Here, the assumption that authority must always maintain control, that one in authority would never choose to not exercise control, is revealed. We see Robert's surprise about this when he kept repeating that Mr. Perez didn't say anything, Robert was surprised by this break from the cultural script as an eighth grader and was apparently still surprised by it as an adult.

I later asked Robert what he would do differently because of what he learned in the College of Education, which he mentioned in the above passage. He felt that having no classroom management was a bad idea and that Mr. Perez was only able to do it because of his size, authority, and reputation. In addition, Robert was concerned about the grading aspect; that it

was a group grade for the entire class, and that there was no rubric or clear set expectations so that if parents were to question the grade he gave that he would not have anything to fall back on. This again shows the importance of the bureaucracy and the authority of that bureaucracy. A part of Robert's understanding of teaching was that a teacher's authority was not enough; he needed to have official documentation to back up his decisions. Here we also see Robert troubled by and wanting to re-establish, the dominant expectations of control through the grading, the absence of which surprised him. He was made uncomfortable by this new experience and was not sure he would replicate it. At the same time, he stressed what a great learning experience it was, and that it was a great learning experience precisely because Mr. Perez relinquished the expected duty of controlling the classroom.

The concern of grading corresponds with the giving up of control. Grading is frequently used as a tool in education to control students' attention and behavior. If a teacher wants students to take a learning experience more seriously, they will put the material on a final exam or assign it points (Demerath, 2009). What Mr. Perez did here that was different was he relinquished control of the content. In *Contradictions of Control*, Linda McNeil (1986) shows the way in which many teachers, in an effort to control their classrooms, take greater control of the content, delivering it in lectures full of lists and dates. The control of knowledge becomes an aspect of controlling students. Here, by contrast, Mr. Perez allows the process to unfold without his active control (in not leaving the classroom he never fully relinquished control). He allowed students to develop and construct their own knowledge, through experience. For Robert, this went against his expected ideas of authority and control in the pedagogical relationship.

Assumptions of Teacher Authority: Identifying and Cracking Open the Script

These stories all revealed assumptions that the participants had of teacher authority in pedagogical relationships. They reflect some aspects of the dominant script expected between teachers and students. These assumptions composed aspects of the participants' ideologies.

The first of these assumptions is that teachers have the authority within the structures of schooling to decide who is smart and who is not. Furthermore, it was assumed by participants that these definitions of student ability are fixed and hold their own authority within school structures in the form of both teacher talk and documentation. Jessica clearly had an understanding that the school held a file on her, and while the "file" may not have correctly assessed her abilities (Jessica showed some ambivalence on this point), the teachers in the school have the authority to create and rely upon such a file.

The second of these assumptions relates to teachers holding a place of unquestioned moral authority and character. There is an important nuance here. David, in particular, was able to speak of things he knew about teachers, that everyone knew, that in his childhood community, were questionable. However, he made it clear that these things were never spoken of, they resided below the surface, absent from any dominant discourse. This maintained, on an official level, the dominant Ideological assumption of the moral superiority of teachers and mitigated the impact of the contradicting experience on individual subjects and their ideologies. This is important in sustaining a particular respect for teachers as adults, a quality that makes them unassailable.

Finally, Robert's story, of a teacher giving up control of a classroom for four straight days revealed his belief and assumption that teachers must always maintain control, that an essential aspect of authority is control of one person by another. Again, the assumption that a

teacher has the right and the duty to control his or her students is understood to be a requisite component of compulsory schooling on the scale that it is conducted in the United States. This sense of both a right and a duty is important to the dominant Ideology's support of the status quo. It compels students to obey their teachers but also enforces in teachers the expectation of being able to control their classroom, forcing teachers to go to various lengths to maintain that control.

These assumptions about authority in the pedagogical relationship are all a part of the dominant Ideology. While the participants' experiences did not fully support them, they did reveal them. This dominant Ideology presents a picture of schooling and of childhood that does not involve much democratic participation on the part of young people. They are assumed to have less authority than the adults on many fronts, including knowledge, morals, and control. The ways in which teachers enact authority and use other tools to control classrooms precludes the students' participation in the governing of schools, classrooms and, at times, themselves (Apple & King, 1979; McNeil, 1986). This creates a powerful implicit curriculum about citizenship and democracy, a point to which I shall return later in this dissertation.

For now, it is important to summarize some of the messages in the implicit curriculum. First, authority is something that both teachers and bureaucratic documents possess in their ability to define, for the purposes of schooling, individual students' abilities. Second, there is a façade that those with authority meet a higher moral and ethical standard than those over whom they have authority. Finally, there is an assumption that those who have authority have a right and a duty to control those without it.

These experiences all helped reveal the aspects of ideology listed in the previous paragraph, however, they all countered those assumptions as well. The experiences all demonstrated moments when the participants realized that authority does not have to function

according to the established script. For each of the participants, this breaking from the script provided the same structure of experience. They all experienced first the dread or trepidation that comes with the expected script, then a moment of confusion or bewilderment. In David's case with the study hall teacher, this moment rendered him speechless. Then there was a shift, a different feeling towards either the person in authority or towards oneself. As will be discussed in the following paragraph, this shift may be permanent or it may be temporary.

This breaking from the script is important in broadening the teacher candidate's understanding of their own ideology, but also ways in which the ideology could, though it does not necessarily have to, shift or accommodate the new experience. There are times when an experience may so strongly contradict one's ideology that it can cause a shift. This shift adds a new layer, color, or thread to the tapestry of individual ideology, though it does not necessarily subtract anything from that ideology. Experiences can make visible what had previously been invisible; they can make individuals aware of a previously unquestioned assumption or belief. This most often happens when an experience contradicts one's individual ideology.

As described in the previous chapter, ideologies are based in reality (Althusser, 1972). They are a framework for making sense of the reality and experience of individual subjects. However, this does not make them true. Often times ideologies have components to explain the contradictions. For example, in some forms of Christianity there is a belief in an all powerful, omniscient, and benevolent God. When bad things happen, say a young person dies of cancer, which would seem to contradict this benevolent God, many will fall back on the belief that God works in mysterious ways and that one cannot truly know the will of God. Times of trial and suffering will be justified in retrospect as a test or as an experience that strengthened an individual or an individual's faith. The fact that these components of the religious Ideology of

Christianity can be used to explain reality does not make them true; however, it allows the ideology to continue to fit individuals' experiences, or legitimately explain reality. Therefore, individuals can have experiences that contradict an ideology and at times that may shift the individual's ideology but it does not have to. The experience can be ignored or interpreted to fit within the pre-existing ideology.

The cracks in the expected script of authority described in this chapter could all be explained away as an abnormal act or something that comes from an abnormal individual. The stories that break the script can be the "exception that makes the rule." These incidents did not completely shift or change the ideologies of the participants. Interestingly, while this disruption happened for Jessica, it did not eliminate her insecurities about her own intelligence or ability to do good work as a student. It made clear to her the importance of seeing and understanding her students in a different way, of giving credit for class participation that is not verbal, of giving students individual attention, and being open to their abilities both seen and unseen. David responded differently to his study hall teacher alone for the rest of his time in high school, not to all of his teachers. Robert still questioned the wisdom of Mr. Perez's actions and found knowledge in the teacher education program that confirmed his suspicions.

However, though these experiences did not guarantee a shift of understanding, the disruption of the expected authority in the pedagogical relationship did open a door for different types of learning and a different understanding of hierarchy within institutions. Robert, Jessica, and David all experienced a breaking open of ideas of authority in the pedagogical relationship. Phenomenology asks what an experience is like. So what was it like for Robert, Jessica, and David? I contend that there was a feeling of relief or release, a feeling of elation, and the opening up of new possibilities. These new possibilities became desires for some of the participants in

regards to their hopes of enacting authority as future teachers. These desires are born out of these contradictions with dominant Ideology and shifts in individual ideologies. They are not the ideologies themselves but are based in the ways the participants experiences did or did not support their previously held beliefs and assumptions.

While Britzman (1986, 2003) conducted her research over 30 years ago, many of her conclusions still ring true. The myths of teaching remain powerful components of teacher candidate's teaching ideologies. As Robert's story showed, these include the belief that everything depends on the teacher and that the teacher must maintain control as well as the belief that the teacher is somehow all-knowing, an expert both in content knowledge and teaching. This latter myth was reflected in Jessica's story of being tracked in the third grade. While Britzman (1986) emphasized the belief that teachers are experts in content knowledge, Jessica's experiences revealed a belief in the teacher's right and ability to assess and label a student and contribute to the student's file or official documentation. As Britzman noted, "these views, or what I have come to call cultural myths, tended to rationalize and legitimize the existing school structure as well as to provide a semblance of order, control, and certainty in the face of the uncertainty of the teacher's world" (1986, p. 448). In other words, these cultural myths are an important part of the teaching ideology that teacher candidates bring with them to teacher education programs and they work to maintain and reproduce existing school structures. However, as discussed in this chapter, these myths can be disrupted.

Conclusion

The experiences discussed in this chapter left each participant with a desire to do something different when they entered the teacher education program. The "different" thing was not always clearly defined. Robert wanted to be approachable and to have loose deadlines with

his students; Jessica wanted to acknowledge and recognize her students for who they really were and to appreciate all forms of participation, not relying on a file or official documentation to inform her of a student's abilities; David wanted to be "real" with his students, more human, avoiding the facades he had witnessed around him. However, none of these three participants was clear on how to enact this difference. The most important thing here is that the participants all developed a desire for something different than what they had expected. The script of authority had been broken. As we follow the participants through their teacher education experience, we will see the ways this desire is enacted and frustrated by the dominant Ideologies of teaching and schooling.

In the following chapter, we will read stories from the participants' lives outside of school and see traces of their developing goals for citizenship education. These experiences add another layer of desire to the one revealed in this chapter. These desires reflect aspirations for the teacher candidates to foster good citizenship in their students. These aspirations are revealed reading between the lines of experiences involving the participants' own citizenship. Just as the experiences in this chapter were experiences of authority and not about authority, the experiences in the following chapter are also experiences of citizenship and not about citizenship.

As I argued in Chapter One and will continue to explore in Chapter Six, the way teachers enact authority becomes a part of the implicit curriculum of citizenship education. This chapter has uncovered the participants' ideologies in regards to authority; it has also highlighted moments when the expected script was broken open, allowing the participants to truly question these assumptions and beliefs about authority. I will explore in the fifth chapter how their experiences in classrooms during the teacher education program interrupted their desires in regards to their own teaching.

Questions for Further Thought

When we think of both the expected script of authority that was revealed in these stories and the breaking open of that script, we can ask a series of questions about how both the script and the contradiction of the script, impact citizenship and teaching. I pose these questions with no intention of answering them, but with every intention of fostering further thinking on the role that our lived experiences of authority in pedagogical relationships impacts who we are as citizens.

How do experiences of teacher authority in schools, as well as the myths that surround teacher authority impact who we become as teachers? What are the benefits and drawbacks of the belief in the teacher's authority to assess a student and document his or her ability? How does the authority of documentation impact students' and teachers' lives in school? How do expectations of moral perfection impact the student and teacher relationship?

How might ideological understandings of authority translate into an individual's interactions with the government as a citizen? How might they affect one's ability to live with others, to identify and communicate common interests, to deliberate and make decisions for the common good? How does the government, or various government institutions identify who we are as citizens? How do pieces of government bureaucracy define us? How do we expect our government officials to be morally superior? What happens when they fall off of a pedestal? How many of us are waiting for another Martin Luther King Jr. and how many people point to his alleged affairs as a way to discredit his legacy? What happens to our attempts to live together, associate with each other when we are all attempting to maintain a façade of perfectness – when we are all weighed down with hidden shame? Can any of us maintain the standards of a perfect

citizen? No. How do we learn to live together, to listen to each other, to deliberate in the midst of our imperfectness? In what ways do we anticipate the government or its institutions maintaining control?

CHAPTER FOUR

Troubled Belonging: Contradictions in Ideologies and Experience

In this chapter I ask, what past experiences impacted teacher candidates' thoughts on good citizenship? Individuals' expectations of both themselves and others reflect powerful concepts of ideal citizenship. In a similar way to the expected script of authority being broken in the previous chapter, we can gain insight into our expectations of citizenship when our fellow citizens disappoint us. It is in these moments that we realize that we hoped for something different, something better. I discussed citizenship briefly in the introduction and will do so again in Chapter Six. Here, in an effort to remain close to the text, I will simply look for what the participants expected or desired in regards to their fellow citizens. Using data from course artifacts and from interviews, I first look at how experiences from their past both reveal and shape their sense of citizenship, and then I explore how my participants hoped to use their social studies teaching to foster citizenship.

As teachers, our desires about who we want our students to be lay just below the surface of our everyday actions in the classroom. At times, these desires are interpreted as bias, particularly when they are of a religious or political nature. Teachers are encouraged to leave such biases at home, and yet they are present in the teacher's words and actions. Some desires, those that are congruent with mainstream aims of public schooling, or with the dominant Ideology, are not interpreted as biases. However these desires are understood by others, it is important to uncover them and understand them. These desires, through the teachers words and actions, become a part of the curriculum of how to not only be a citizen, but a human being (Greenwalt & Holohan, 2011). Because these desires are so embedded in an individual teacher's

thinking, we must look between the lines of their experiences to understand what lies beneath their discomfort, surprise, or disappointment. As noted in Chapter Two, with this phenomenological interpretation it is impossible to be certain and to know that the researcher has interpreted the experience correctly. However, even without certainty, we can explore possible meanings that enrich both our understanding of others and of ourselves.

In the previous chapter, I explored aspects of teacher authority that are present in dominant Ideology and the ways those were both revealed and disrupted for the participants in this study. This is crucial as the classroom and school are places saturated with authority; an authority we often assume should be there in a variety of forms. Here, I shift to ideas of citizenship, particularly national citizenship in the context of the United States, a country whose dominant Ideology is full of exceptionalism, goodness, and fairness. These aspects of dominant Ideology are reproduced in the Ideological State Apparatus that Althusser (1972) discussed, in schools, media, political parties, and our national narrative. While this dominant Ideology has suffered considerable damage throughout the past many decades, there are consistent attempts to restore it through such things as social studies classes in schools where some states are attempting to limit standards and curriculum to create a more positive and patriotic image of the United States (Heitin, 2015; Robelen, 2010).

Ideas of citizenship, and particularly "good" citizenship are a part of our individual ideologies and still connected to dominant Ideology (Leonardo, 2003). As Althusser (1972) argued, they are formed of every day experiences that instill in us an idea of our social relations to those around us. Indeed, citizenship is in many ways enacting social relationships between oneself, one's fellow citizens, and one's government. It involves dispositions that reflect a range of beliefs about government and human nature. These dispositions and beliefs, both conscious

and the ones that are seemingly invisible, play a role in who the participants hope to become as social studies teachers and in what they hope to foster in their future students. In the stories recounted in this chapter, the sense of belonging and pride can create a sense of disappointment and betrayal when it is contradicted. The participants then showed a desire to remedy the areas of disappointment they were confronted with through their social studies teaching. As Britzman (2007) highlights, they were taking responsibility for something they did not create by attempting to create better citizens through their teaching.

In the stories here, we find hopes about who people are and can be, revealed when the participants are disturbed as their desires are disappointed. In two of the stories that take place outside of the United States, this disappointment becomes about United States citizens as a group. This is not surprising since the participants felt a heightened sense of their United States citizenship in both contexts. The other two stories focus on smaller communities, but are still reflective of what the participants desire in others in regards to citizenship. All the stories reveal a sadness and disappointment about both the group or nation as a whole and the individuals that make it up. In addition to the stories, I start to discuss the desires the participants have in fostering citizenship in their social studies classrooms. These desires are reflections of the disappointments present in the stories. I continue to work with these desires through Chapters Five and Six as well, taking them first into the context of classroom and then into the context of dominant Ideologies in the United States.

I do not wish to draw a direct causal line between the experience and the approach to citizenship and teaching these teacher candidates embrace. Nor do I wish to present these desires as being fixed and permanent for the participants. I merely seek to understand better who these participants are and the ways in which who they are becomes reflected in their teaching. The

stories shared here illustrate moments in their lives when their expectations of groups they belong to are contradicted in troubling ways. These are not one-time experiences or one-time contradictions; instead they illustrate one of many. Here, I show ways in which these contradictions shape our sense of self and our sense of the citizenship group we belong to. When we are unsure if we want to belong to a particular group, we may seek to change the group, to make it better fit who we want to be. In the following chapter, I explore stories the candidates share from teaching in an effort to see how the ideas explored in this chapter do and do not become present in their classrooms.

Stories of Troubled Belonging

While our experiences in schools and the apprenticeship of observation leave a powerful and indelible mark on who we become as teachers, experiences outside of school that impact our relationship to the subject area also have an impact on not only what we teach but also how we teach it. The stories in this chapter happened outside of schools but not outside of ideas of citizenship and belonging. In this chapter, one participant was overwhelmed by the life of her college orientation roommate who came from a context very different from her own. In another story a mother navigated international politics and wondered what her children did and did not know about United States citizenship. Another participant attended a World Cup soccer game between the United States and Ghana, where after riding high on a sense of being American with others, he found the connections suddenly frayed after team USA lost. The final participant was troubled by the lack of nuance he saw both in his friends and colleagues, and in the customers who frequented the bookstore he worked at. They all included moments when the participants were confronted with an uncomfortable reality about the United States and about a group to which they felt they belonged. This confrontation unveiled aspects of their individual ideologies

and forced them to reconcile conflicting assumptions or to attempt to remedy the group they felt they belonged to. We see how these encounters did and did not shape the social studies teaching goals of the participants as they transitioned from being students to teachers.

Where I am from to breaking open new knowledge. Jessica grew up in a small town called Charlevoix[5] in northern Michigan, a popular tourist location because of its beautiful parks along Lake Michigan. Jessica identified strongly with Charlevoix. She returned there regularly on school breaks and spent her first year teaching there after she completed the program. However, as we will see in the stories, she developed a more critical view of Charlevoix through several different experiences. One aspect that troubled her at the time of our interviews was that Charlevoix is an overwhelmingly white community. While this aspect of her community went largely unnoticed for her as a child, several experiences, the first one recounted here, changed that. This story took place in her eighth grade social studies class, the same one in which Mr. Schwartz, in the previous chapter, identified Jessica as a promising student and invited her to the honors course:

> There's one lesson I remember. It's when we were talking about, um, discrimination and I am sure it was probably after the Civil War. Like, we were talking about Reconstruction or something like that, and he showed us this document of, um, a lease for a house. And he was like, "so." And it said like "No African Americans will be allowed to lease this property" or whatever. And he was like, "so tell me where this is from." And we were all like "The South, that's from the South!" And he was like "No, it's from Charlevoix." And we were like, "What!?" And then he was like, "What year do you think this was from?" and we were like, "Reconstruction, there's no way." And he's like, "No, 1965."

[5] Jessica is from a town similar to Charlevoix, but not Charlevoix itself.

> And we were just like, "What?" So he had the ability to have those like eye opening moments for us.

Clearly this lesson had a significant impact on Jessica. Not only did she share it both in her journal and this interview, she also referenced it when talking about the type of impression she would like to make with her future students. It was a time for her when previous assumptions that she and her classmates had about their hometown, about time, about the North and the South, and about racism were all challenged. Perhaps, because she lived in the North or because at that time she did not recognize any explicit racism in her hometown, she assumed that the document could not possibly be from Charlevoix. This experience disrupted for Jessica, in important ways, beliefs she had about where she was from, a place she belonged. It interrupted the idea that racism exists only in other places and at other times, that it is a thing of the distant past.

Jessica was reminded of this moment several years later when she attended the university's first-year student orientation program. She shared a dorm room with an African America woman from Detroit. After growing up in an almost exclusively White context, Jessica was overwhelmed by the experience. Following the weekend orientation, Jessica's roommate kept texting her, and Jessica became quite uncomfortable:

> [I was] mostly scared because like, when I met her at [orientation] it was like, I figured I probably wouldn't see her like really again. And I was like, scared just cause it was like the first experience where um, you know, her life had been really hard. Like it was, like, I feel like it would be like the typical story you would hear about inner city students. You know, of like parents just not being there, and like one dying and then just like living off of welfare and just like not having a good life. So I think that was probably what I was

most afraid to, it was like my first experience of being like, "oh life isn't the same in Detroit as it is in Charlevoix?" I had no idea.

In this story we see Jessica overwhelmed by the new and unfamiliar, realizing difference in this particular way for the first time. It was a realization that she and this roommate belonged to different groups and that these groups had vastly different life experiences. Jessica was a part of a small town group, one that was primarily White, while the roommate was a part of a group that, in this case, involved both poverty and being African American as well as living in an urban context. Jessica saw some aspects of her roommates life as being "typical" of an urban setting but also confessed that the only images she had to reference at that time were movies like "Save the Last Dance" which, she realized at the time of our interview, as being deeply inadequate in their representation of African Americans. There seemed to be a strong difference between seeing the life of another group in a movie and having a more personal encounter, and this difference was jarring for Jessica. The segregated environment that Jessica grew up in can lead to very limited understanding across group lines (Loewen, 2011).

According to Jessica, this experience or "exposure" as well as some classes disrupted the dominant belief in the United States that we all essentially have the opportunity to be successful, to become wealthy, if we work hard enough and are smart enough (Hochschild & Scovronick, 2003). When I asked Jessica what had helped her understand issues of racism better and want to pursue more knowledge in this area she responded by saying, "I think just exposure was the biggest thing to like, help me and then my classes a little bit…studying different socio-economic things has taught me to realize that the stereotypes that we do have of people, like, are things that they haven't built, others have built, you know?" Jessica went on to say that she thought having a pen pal program for middle school and high school students so they could understand what

"people in different racial groups go through," would be a good way to create the exposure she felt was absent from her own education. These quotes show some understanding of the structural challenges that marginalized groups face that directly contradict the belief that everyone has the opportunity for success in the United States.

This belief is foundational to the meritocracy that is a part of the dominant Ideology in the United States, as well as the idea that anyone can succeed if they just try hard enough. These beliefs compose aspects of the American Dream, something McNamee and Miller (2013) contend is an Ideology of inequality. The various aspects of the American Dream, a belief that anyone can be successful with enough talent and hard work, justify the inequality that exists. McNamee and Miller stress that this Ideology does not need to be true or factually based, indeed it is not. However, people must embrace this Ideology enough to allow the status quo of inequality to continue. I will discuss these ideas further in Chapter Six.

At first, Jessica tried to escape this uncomfortable encounter with her roommate and the contradiction of her underlying beliefs. As she put it,

> My roommate was from Detroit, middle of Detroit, totally different lifestyle than mine. I gave her my number and she was texting me…and kind of telling me about her life and that was the first exposure I had to just kind of realizing like, totally different. Like, she's only four hours away and yet she has to deal with tons of stuff and it actually scared me so I stopped texting.

She stopped texting the roommate back, assuming that on such a large campus they would not cross paths again. Then she discovered that she and her orientation roommate lived in the same dorm. They met for lunch a few times and then drifted apart. Jessica attributed this second drifting to differences in personality; the roommate was more into partying than Jessica. It is

impossible to take factors of race out of such choices, although they are not the only determining factors. Jessica saw this decision as one largely based on lifestyle preference; however, because we live in a racialized society, race matters in all of these decisions. Jessica showed some realization of this when she shared that at the end of her freshman year, she realized all of her friends were white and that this was something she wanted to change.

This sense of troubled belonging was one impetus for Jessica's college studies. She realized that there were many new questions she had after this experience with her orientation roommate. Curious about other cultures, Jessica found herself taking anthropology classes and hanging out with friends from a variety of contexts. She made a point of going outside of her comfort zone with her friendships and developed an appreciation for learning about cultures other than her own. The more Jessica learned, the more ways in which her assumptions were disrupted, the more questions she had. She was troubled both by her reaction to her orientation roommate and by her tendency during her first year to only spend time with people who looked like herself. In response to this, Jessica pushed herself to both connect more with people who were different from herself in some way and to take courses in which she learned about groups other than her own.

Later she mentioned taking a history class about Mexicans in the United States. The instructor asked the class if anyone was from Charlevoix and then went on to talk about a vigilante type person who lived in Charlevoix and had a website dedicated to keeping out all immigrants and was very worried about protecting the border with Canada. Jessica was shocked in ways similar to her response to the learning activity from her eighth grade history teacher. She did not know that the place she came from included people like this man. Again, it gave her a sense of troubled belonging. This community that she had grown up in, the place she returned to

over breaks, where her family still lived, not only had an exclusionary past but also an exclusionary present. In her continued learning at the university through courses, attending talks, and friendships, Jessica found herself increasingly troubled by patterns of exclusion in the United States and more committed to finding ways to change these patterns. We see aspects of this commitment to a more inclusive view in her desired approach to teaching.

The following is an excerpt from Jessica's journal at the beginning of the year-long methods course. I had asked the teacher candidates to describe their orientation towards teaching social studies. In Jessica's initial response, she mentioned that she wanted her students to be "transformative citizens" but she did not expand on her meaning, so I asked her to do so in the following entry, and this was her response:

> By wanting to make my students into transformative citizens I'm basically saying that I want my students to leave my classroom saying "I am a citizen of this nation that can change the future of the gov't. I am not a victim of the system. I am the change." I want to be honest with my students about their history and teach them how to move forward and to make sure that they know the government isn't only for a certain race or gender. I want to make sure they know the gov't is ours and not theirs which is the direction, many have noticed, that citizens tend to be leading away from. I want to make sure and make it a goal that I pass on more than just facts about the gov't and basic history of injustice.

In this statement Jessica wanted to increase her students' sense of agency no matter who they are or where they come from. She wanted to have her students feel a part of their government and to be active in it, to see it as a route for making change. It was important to her that the divisions of belonging she sensed between her orientation roommate and herself are not present in her students' sense of belonging as citizens. She also wanted her students to know about the history

of injustice to better understand why some do not have the same sense of belonging that she does. Furthermore, she wants her students' prior held beliefs and assumptions to be disrupted in a way that will cause them to ask more questions and think more critically and independently.

At the end of the senior year methods course, I asked Jessica to share with me her favorite lesson plan that she had written and/or enacted in Mr. Torres' class. She mentioned two. One was a jigsaw activity about the Middle East. When I asked her why this was a favorite, she highlighted the ways in which it brought a different narrative about the Middle East than the one she assumed her students would be used to hearing at home or on the news. It would hopefully disrupt their preconceived notions, garnered from the news and perhaps their parents, about what the Middle East was, what the people were like, and what the conflicts were about. As Jessica said, "I think that showing them that there are differing opinions than what they have grown up with in their house is kind of like a starting point you know, like I don't expect them to leave the classroom and be little social activists but at least get thinking, like oh hey, this is different." Again, this lesson, in disrupting previously held beliefs and assumptions would foster students' questioning about what they knew.

The other lesson was one that she and another senior taught about reform. In this lesson, they gave the eighth grade students a chance to list the things they wanted changed in the school. Jessica liked this lesson because it was clear that many of the students had never thought about officially expressing their opinion in any way or that anyone would want to hear their opinion on how school could be better. The students shared this sentiment out loud in the classroom as well as on exit slips that Jessica and the other teacher had them fill out. The students were also incredibly enthusiastic about the task once they began. Jessica thought the students generated some great ideas, and it was clear they were very excited. The students were given the

opportunity to question the way things were in school for them and to see that they could potentially play a role in changing those things.

Jessica's experiences with her eighth grade social studies teacher and with her orientation roommate caused her to reconsider her assumptions about Charlevoix and also the assumptions that she had about African Americans. She wished that in her own experience she had had greater exposure to the world outside of Charlevoix. In the lesson about the Middle East above, where she highlighted both current events and culture in the Middle East, she was hoping to broaden her students' perspectives about the world outside of the local community. She wanted to reduce their prejudice and increase their understanding.

The second lesson reflected one of her goals of transformative citizenship; that all students know that the government belongs to them regardless of their gender or race. This goal reflects a growing concern she had throughout college with issues of justice and fairness. This concern was sparked by her experience with the college orientation roommate and then fostered through her coursework and other friendships. Her belief in a democracy that was fair and good is highlighted in her hope for a government in which everyone feels like they can participate and have a voice.

Citizens who follow to raising critical citizens. Alicia was a non-traditional student in our program. With three teenage children, she had returned to the university in her late thirties to finish a degree she had started after high school. In the intervening years she lived abroad with her husband and kids because of her husband's job. While Alicia loved living abroad, it also presented certain challenges. She shared with me the story of a day when she was in Seoul, Korea doing some Christmas shopping with her kids; she thinks this happened in 2007, during the height of the U.S. invasion of Iraq:

> The kids and I were sitting in the Sheraton Hotel in Seoul and we're sitting there and behind us is this whole group of British tourists, and I think it was, I'm trying to remember …I can't remember exactly what the impetus was, but they started going off on, you know, US foreign policy essentially. And I'm finally, you know, I'm just sitting there listening to it and I finally stood up and I said, "You know what, I'm sitting here with my three children, we're American citizens. I realize we are in a public place, but sometimes I really think you should take a step back and think about the things that you are saying cause I could just as easily question British foreign policy and the things that you're doing. I mean, you are one of our allies and it's easy to throw stones." But I just remember sitting there thinking that this isn't, this doesn't work for me and that was really, that was really kind of it. What it did is it just further solidified that I wanted to teach social studies.

Here we see Alicia existing as a United States citizen in South Korea at a time when the United States is not very popular internationally. The United States was criticized in much of the world for participating in both the Iraq and Afghanistan war. Alicia was in the country where another such war had taken place decades before. For Alicia, this meant that she already felt a need to hide her national belonging. At this time she was already feeling threatened by her citizenship. Already uncomfortable in her belonging, a group of citizens from another country started questioning and criticizing the United States for their international policy. Alicia told me that throughout the time the United States was at war with Iraq, she was acutely aware of her identity as a United States citizen and frequently felt the need to mask it. There were regular travel warnings and messages from the state department about trying not to look "too American."

Alicia started to feel like she had to hide that aspect of her identity all the time and confessed that this became really difficult.

She later elucidated that in their conversation, the group of British people not only attacked United States' foreign policy but also United States citizens, claiming they were all like sheep who blindly followed President Bush. This was when Alicia really started to take offense and worried too about what her children were thinking as they listened. In this moment her belonging-ness became problematic. Her growing realization that her national belonging was becoming increasingly challenging came to a point. Alicia felt as though she was under prepared to navigate this rough terrain of belonging and that her children were also poorly prepared.

Crucial to not following like sheep is the ability to question and criticize those in authority. Imperative to the ability to question and criticize is the awareness and knowledge to know what to question and criticize. With everything that was going on at the time, Alicia had a hard time defending herself and her fellow citizens, "It probably was like 2007. Would that have been weapons of mass destruction and stuff? And, you know, they were going in and looking for everything and talking about that they never actually found any and all of that, um. So yeah, it was interesting because you just, you almost felt like you couldn't defend yourself or your country." This is where Alicia was caught. While she knew what she had seen on the news, she did not know enough of United States foreign policy to defend the actions of the United States, or to take an active role in changing them. She was also acutely aware of how the findings involving the absence of weapons of mass destruction made the United States look internationally.

Alicia's experience here was deeply disturbing to her. As our conversation unfolded, she confessed that while she knew in that moment that she did not necessarily agree with the foreign

policy the United States was pursuing, she was not ready to have a deeply involved conversation about it. In addition, she was concerned not only about her own lack of social studies knowledge but about what her children were lacking as well. This realization, that her own knowledge about the actions of the United States was not as strong as she hoped, contradicted one of the beliefs at the foundation of the United States; that it would be a country of educated citizenry, not run by a tyrannical government, but one in which thinking people would respond to the reasoning of other thinking people. This set of beliefs that Alicia had fit well in the dominant Ideology that exists that as a country born through the Enlightenment, we have been on a steady march of progress, always improving (Barton & Levstik, 2004) and developing citizens that are intelligent and independent, not ones to blindly follow their leader like sheep.

After this incident took place, Alicia and her family spent the rest of the day shopping for Christmas presents for her kids' teachers. That night she confirmed a long held desire to teach social studies. An important aspect in this narrative is that Alicia was likely thinking about teachers and teaching all day long as they did their shopping. She was also participating in holiday consumerism, a practice that is quite vibrant in the United States. Indeed, some would argue that consumerism is patriotic. It was definitely argued that consumerism was patriotic in the post 9-11 push to keep the economy strong by going out and shopping, first buying an American flag to show your support of those in New York City, but then shopping as a sign of your belief in the United States and its economy. The conflation of these many strands, consumerism, patriotism, war, United States foreign policy, and teaching, all came together that night into Alicia's decision that if she and her family ever returned to the United States, she would return to school and complete her degree to become a social studies teacher.

In her desires of becoming a social studies teacher, she insisted that she wanted to dive into "messy" conversations, ensure that her students knew about the world around them right now, and that they would have educated ideas and opinions on United States foreign policy. While she was indignant in her response to the British, there was a part of her that worried about some truth in it. In this story, Alicia felt like the British citizens in the coffee shop were attacking something that she was a part of, that they were critiquing not only the actions of the United States in the world but also the goodness and competency of the citizens who would allow such a thing to happen.

An important part of this story is the way Alicia connected it to raising her own kids outside of the United States. She mentioned how much she worried that they did not have a sense of what it means to be a United States citizen. As an example, she shared how her kids had to take a standardized test from the United States at their American school abroad and how they both failed the social studies part, not even knowing what a quarter (monetary coin) was. She realized that she was going to have to teach her kids the many details familiar to those who grow up in the United States, but was not sure she was entirely prepared. That being said, she did not want to shy away from it. As we will see in the following chapter, her approach to parenting appeared in her approach to teaching. With her kids, she preferred to have open and honest conversations even when they were complicated. She did the same with her students.

Alicia made it clear in the following statement that she wanted her future students to be aware of what was going on in the world and to be well enough informed and free enough to have their own opinion. That is to say, she wanted them to have the space and independence to have their own thoughts on a subject, not just mimicking their parents or teachers. This is her

response when I pushed her to define what she meant by a good citizen in the context of what she hoped her students would gain from her teaching:

> …involved, knowledgeable, caring, thoughtful, questioning.… I want kids who don't just say, "Ok, thanks Mrs. Glasser," you know. If we're talking about something I want, I want them to be able to, to think about it in deep and meaningful ways and if they have questions, to raise them and um, as opposed to just taking it in and kind of regurgitating it out, you know. I think if what we really want - its just become this machine, you know what I mean, in education.

In this statement, we hear echoes of Alicia's desire to prove the British people in Seoul wrong. She wanted her students to be citizens who were aware, intelligent, questioning, and independent, not like sheep who blindly follow their leader. In explaining the type of impact she wanted to have on her future students, Alicia talked about how students have become like cogs in a machine, going through the motions, regurgitating information to pass the class and eventually acquire either a bachelors or masters degree. She was critical of this system of education for creating citizens that do not ask questions, but as the British people accused, follow without thought a system and a government. To counter this, Alicia wanted her students to not only be aware of and question government policies, but also to question her and the information she gave them. She wanted her students to ask her hard questions that she did not have answers to, for conversations to get messy and for her students, as citizens, to be thoughtful in making their own decision.

Alicia and I were unable to do an interview during the third round of interviews because of her summer travel plans back to South Korea. However, in looking back over the lesson plans she submitted for the methods course, one of them engaged students in using primary documents

to discuss the suspension of the Writ of Habeas Corpus during the Civil War. In this lesson plan she asked students to think critically about the government's role in protecting both individual rights and public safety. Some of the questions she included in her lesson plan encouraged students to question the actions of President Lincoln and to also apply their understanding of our rights to the current context. This lesson plan reflected Alicia's desire to guide her students in being something more than just cogs in the machine of education. She was asking her students to not only be critical of the past but also to apply those questions to today so that they could be informed, aware, thoughtful, caring, and questioning citizens.

Futbol and loss to rights and duties. Robert frequently brought up his strong sense of patriotism in our interviews. Curious about this aspect of his citizenship and teaching, I asked him if he could share a story of when he felt particularly patriotic. After thinking for a moment, he arrived at this story but then dismissed it as not being related to teaching. A few minutes later, I asked him to return to it. Robert's story comes from one summer in high school when he extended a study abroad trip to spend time with friends and go to a World Cup game between the United States and Ghana. In this short version of the story, Robert begins with the moment he got on the train to travel to the game:

> We got on the train, it was all USA fans and we were, you know, singing "When the Yanks go Marching In" and "Yankee Doodle" and just the typical "USA! USA!" chant. Anyway, um yeah, that, and then we got there and it was very much, you know United States, very very patriotic pride. Um, which I had never really experienced before. So that was really cool, um. We ended up losing 2 to 1. Um, and then I went outside to buy some memorabilia, and I remember this American girl was really drunk and she and I got into an argument and she took my hat and threw it into a crowd of American people and

although they were all friends during the game then it was all kind of an "I versus you" kind of thing.

In further questions, I found out that the sense of patriotism climaxed at the point where the United States scored their one goal. Robert described this as a moment of total euphoria. The only other time he experienced anything close to it was when the university football team won an important game and he was there. However, as noted, the United States lost and afterwards the sense of "we are all Americans" that Robert felt on the train and in the stands suddenly and jarringly fell apart. Instead of continuing to feel a sense of unity and patriotism, Robert found himself fighting with a woman from the United States while others took sides creating a sense of division. Robert did not use the word, but his tone expressed a sense of betrayal. In some ways, this story was similar to Alicia's in the connection to patriotism and being abroad. However, the failure here was more a lack of patriotism, unity, and kindness, not knowledge and independent thinking. While Alicia felt like her country and her fellow citizens were under attack by others, Robert felt more a sense of disappointment and betrayal by his fellow citizens.

There is a strong connection in Robert's story between the idea of patriotism and of winning. While on the train, the group of United States citizens chanting and singing songs still held out the hope of winning the game. When the United States team scored a goal it was like a small victory. However, once the team was defeated, the unity and pride of United States citizenship turned into a squabble over who was first in line to buy merchandise. Robert later told me that the confrontation with the intoxicated woman started when she cut in front of him in line. Taking his spot in line violated a sense of fairness, of following the rules and respecting others, all staunch values in the United States. This vying for a spot in line made a stark contrast to the sense of unity and pride Robert felt on the train to the game and in the stands. At those

times there was a sense of togetherness. When the woman cut in line, it created a sense of conflict, a violation of that sense of group belonging. There was a contradiction with a sense of unity that is strong in dominant Ideology in the United States.

These ideas of unity and competitive sports were echoed in other aspects in which Robert claimed he was patriotic, particularly his nagging desire to join the Marines. The desire to win in war could be a reflection of the desire to win on the field. For Robert, competitive sports were a way of life. He was a three-season athlete throughout high school and participated in a hockey league over an hour away from his home in addition to his participation in school sports. Robert seemed to be drawn to what he considered to be the more noble professions, police, military, and teaching (he considered firefighters to be in the same category but never expressed an interest in being one). He saw these professions as ones in which you go above and beyond in helping others, you give of yourself to your community and nation. Sports hold similar phrases such as "giving it all on the field," "taking one for the team," etc. There is a sense of heroism both in these noble professions and in athletic activity. There is also a strong sense of belonging. In the following chapter, we will witness how this sense of belonging to a noble profession is disrupted in Robert's first semester as an intern.

This sense of both patriotism and belonging that he shared in his story about the World Cup game were important parts of Robert's impetus for teaching social studies. For Robert, his desire to teach appeared to come both from a desire to belong himself and to teach others how to belong to the group of American citizens. He wanted to instill in his students ideas of good citizenship including patriotism, how to follow the rule of United States citizenship, and how to be a productive and contributing member of society. The following is from an interview when I was pressing Robert on what he meant about teaching his students to be good citizens:

> I have very strong patriotic views, um, and I feel like part of a good education is learning to be a good citizen of a democratic society …I feel that, I don't know how to put this, but just understanding the boundaries in which students, once you graduate and you turn 18 and you're a productive member of society, you should know how to function within that society, you know, your rights and duties as a citizen. I feel like those are crucial all the way up from ditch diggers to the president of the United States needs to know their role and what their rights and duties are; what they can do for our society.

Here we see Robert's idea of good citizenship being grounded in rights and duties and in giving what one can to society, playing one's role as one would on a sports team or in the military. An important part of playing one's role is a devotion to country. Robert spoke repeatedly in interviews and wrote in course documents that he wanted to imbue his students with a sense of the importance of participating in the democracy and participating well, that the democracy of the United States would only function well with good citizens. A part of this citizenship was a commitment to the country, to making the democracy work. The incident after the World Cup match, represented for Robert a fracturing of that sense of commitment and togetherness as United States citizens. During the game, they had been all together, all cheering for the same team and afterwards, there was a strong sense of division.

Furthermore, Robert wanted his students to be aware of the law, how the government works, and what their role is in the government. In following with this, he highlighted again and again the rights and duties of citizenship, which are the rules of citizenship. After the World Cup game, the argument with the woman started when she broke an unspoken rule of common courtesy by cutting in line. This clear breaking of a rule went against Robert's vision of ideal citizenship in which everyone does their part and creates a well-run nation. For Robert, this

included many components of doing the work of citizenship. By violating the line rule, this woman had failed in her role as a citizen. The crowd, by dividing and taking sides, was not doing the work of staying together as a group of citizens

For Robert the duties of citizenship were not limited to following rules. It took both following rules and doing your part as a productive member. There was an active component of participation. This was reflected in what he wanted his students to walk away from his class with. He wanted his students to vote and to be educated in what they were voting for. He emphasized in one conversation the importance of students not just voting the way their parents vote but being well enough educated to make their own decisions. Also, incorporated in the idea of rights and duties, is that his students be productive and contributing members of society, that they are able to get jobs and take care of themselves. In addition to these duties of citizenship, Robert wanted his students to have an increased appreciation for their country. He saw the primary purposes of teaching history to be that of creating a stronger sense of national identity and pride (Barton & Levstik, 2004).

As mentioned in the previous chapter, school was a place that worked for Robert, a place of success in every area, academics, the arts, and athletics. The "goodness" of school was clearly important to him as is the idea of the goodness of the United States whether it be on the battlefield of war or the battlefield of a World Cup match. Robert's experiences that disrupt this sense of goodness are troubling to him; they created a type of difficult knowledge (Britzman, 2007) that was uncomfortable to him. The events that followed the soccer game gave him a sense of troubled belonging in his status not only as a US citizen, but as a patriot. Through his teaching, this sense of troubled-ness was reflected in his desire to make responsible citizens of

his students, to make them well aware of their rights and duties. He wanted his students to become compatriots whom he can be proud to be affiliated with.

In discussing Robert's documents from the methods course, we focused primarily on his classroom management plan. At the beginning of the plan, he made it clear that the students would have a role in developing the finalized set of classroom rules. He wanted to do this so that students would have a sense of ownership of their role in the classroom. He also wanted to use a behavior sheet when students were disruptive, one that asked what was happening, why it was a problem, and what they were going to do about it. Again, Robert stressed the importance of the students taking ownership, in this case, of their own behavior. Robert wanted his students to take responsibility for their rights and duties in the classroom in the same way he wanted them to do so as citizens.

Hardliners to multiple nuanced perspectives. David, who we first met sneaking behind a garage at school to smoke a cigarette, spent many years going to university and getting multiple degrees as he tried to find a career. During this time he worked in a local independent bookstore. David was disappointed with the lack of nuanced perspective of both the bookstore customers and his friends from the bookstore. He often found them too willing to attach themselves to one point of view to the exclusion of all others. Some friends in David's reading group refused to listen to opinions in conflict with their own. Many customers refused to look at books from a perspective different from their own. These interactions disappointed David; he believed, like both Alicia and Jessica, in the importance of being well informed and in being exposed to the experiences of others.

My conversations with David frequently wandered around in circles. In this one, he was attempting to explain to me why he thought it was important that his students have a nuanced

and complex understanding of history. He then shared his frustrations with people in the bookstore:

> I think some of it is also working in the bookstore for so long because you get such a contact with people who come in who are so wildly misinformed, who don't think that they are. And it's not maybe that they're completely misinformed all the way across the board, but they only get one side, or they only read like one author.…Like, [they] thought like what they were told in the history text book is gospel, and that's the way it is no matter what people find out, and research and letters prove and archeology or whatever, this is the way it is. And that's never been something that I have subscribed to…like I said, one of the guys that I keep arguing with, he is one of the smarter, more reasonable people that I talk with. But he will not read a conservative book or a blog, and I tell him "your arguments fall flat as soon as you're talking to someone and they say, 'well have you read this' and you say, 'no.' If you say 'yes,' they might listen to you and you might change your mind on something. So it's just, it's the ability, a lot of it is for people to be ok with changing their minds and being incorrect, it doesn't mean you're a bad person it means you have a lack of information.

Here we see David not only frustrated with the population in general, but the group that came into the bookstore and even a friend of his (who he told me later he was in a reading group with). He worried about how this one sided view informs the decisions that citizens in the United States make on both sides of the political spectrum.

In one of our conversations he referenced the book, *What's the Matter with Kansas: How Conservatives Won the Heart of America*. This book highlights the ways in which the political right in the United States has identified some cultural hot button issues and has persuaded large

groups of people to vote against their own economic and social interests. While David referenced this book, he again insisted that it is something both sides of the political system in the United States do, and that the real issue is misinformed citizens who get into one particular camp and refuse to look at the other side. From the energy in David's voice, it was clear how frustrated he was in these conversations, how desperately he wanted his own friends to be more open minded, willing to at least listen to another perspective and seek to understand it.

In the second part of the above quote, David brought up someone whom he identified as being a smart and reasonable person, his friend from the book group. By identifying him in this way, David was identifying with him (we rarely label people as being smart and reasonable whom we feel completely disconnected to or alienated from). And yet, even in this friend, he found this deeply troubling trend of being so strongly situated in one way of thinking that his friend refused to consider another way. Again, David recognized that his friend, customers in the bookstore, and the people of Kansas are all citizens of the United States and their lack of openness was both troubling and problematic.

We see reflected in David's desires as a teacher that he wanted to trouble and nuance these one-sided perspectives. He wanted his students to be well informed, to be willing to argue and to listen, to converse with those they disagree with, and to feel competent and capable in these discussions. In his teaching philosophy statement, David referenced Freire's (2007) belief that education is about attaining full humanity. David stated that he wanted his students to have a strong moral compass, not a rigid moral code. While he believed in issues of social justice, he did not want to impose, instead he wanted to ensure, both through his content and how he managed his classroom, that his students were empathetic and understanding. He acknowledged the many important decisions his students would have to make in their lives and wanted them to

have a strong framework from which to make decisions; he wanted to ensure that they knew what the important questions are.

Again, these desires for teaching in many ways reflected David's frustrations with the customers who came to the bookstore and his friend from the reading group. He clearly resisted imposing anything on his students, even insisted that social justice cannot be pushed on students because that is indoctrination. However, he did want his students to have a more nuanced understanding. This became very apparent during the methods course when he taught a review lesson on the views of the North and the South prior to the Civil War. Through this lesson, he really pushed students to develop a more complex and nuanced understanding beyond issues of slavery, economics, and states' rights. He asked one group of students to pretend they were from the North and trying to understand the position of the South so they could prevent the war. The other group took on the role of the South attempting to understand the North to also avoid war. Though the eighth grade students were not used to this level of complexity in their test reviews, they became very involved, including several students who generally remained silent. David cited this as his favorite lesson that he had written and taught that year because of the way it got students thinking of multiple perspectives at one time. As stated earlier, we will see in the next chapter how these aspirations, as well as the aspirations of the other participants, played out during their internship year.

Troubled Belonging

The different types of belonging described in these stories share both similarities and differences. For both Alicia and Robert, the sense of belonging was on a national level and related to their standing as citizens of the United States; this was true for David as well in many ways. For Jessica, it was more of a racial and community based belonging in her small

Charlevoix town. This was also connected to the national, for though understandings of race vary from region to region, place to place, and person to person, they are all embedded in a national history of slavery, racial strife, and oppression. For all of the participants, membership in the given group was in some way troubled. For Alicia, she was challenged by those outside of her group and put in a place where she felt she must defend her group. Robert and David were both troubled by those within their group. Robert realized that a sense of group unity and pride was only passing and could dissolve just as quickly as it had been created. David wanted his peers to be more open to other perspectives, so that they would not only understand the other perspective better but also better understand their own perspective. For Jessica, it was both through self-awareness and through learning more about her community that she was troubled. She realized that her membership in her group had left her unaware of the experience of those in another group. Her disappointment lay not only in her own limited understanding but also in the school and community who failed to broaden that understanding.

While it may seem easy to draw a line from the experience to the outcome of what type of social studies teachers these participants aspired to be, it does not work out so easily. One aspect of this is that the participants were still in the process of becoming not only teachers, but also citizens themselves. They were still working out their own sense of troubled belonging; troubled by things they had seen in themselves as a result of these experiences, troubled by events that had happened since, troubled by successes and failures in changing not only themselves but seeking to work with others.

We also see that they did not all respond in coherent ways to their various aspects of troubled belonging. Human beings, of course, do not work that way. We are not machines with a pre-determined output based on a given input. What is fascinating here are the ways in which we

come with our underlying ideologies, those preset yet malleable beliefs and assumptions and then how the experiences we have interrupt and reshape those ideologies. And because interactions are always a part of life, we are in turn impacting the ideologies of others.

A part of this continual change and inner conflict is that the dominant Ideology never ceases to draw us in as subjects; it does not hail us and then leave us. We are constantly interacting with it as it saturates the world around us. These experiences, though significant, are nestled in a continuity of many other experiences (Dewey, 1938), those that both confront and contradict the dominant Ideology and those that confirm it.

Out of this sense of troubled belonging comes a sense of social responsibility for making the belonging less troubled. Through the task of education, these participants took on the responsibility of making better (in their own understanding) a world that they did not create (Britzman, 2007). In discussing Hannah Arendt (1961/1993) and William James' (1899/1983) understanding of one of the quandaries of teaching, Britzman quotes and says the following:

> Arendt puts the paradox boldly: "the teacher's qualification consists in knowing the world and being able to instruct others about it, but his authority rests on his assumption of responsibility for that world" (p. 189). Like James, qualifications and authority are two different matters. Unlike James, there is a political problem. Teachers are responsible for the world they live in, even if they have not made this world. The teacher's authority will be linked to knowing the world and taking responsibility for it. …The teacher is responsible for a world they did not make and choosing responsibility means they are dependent on both the world and on the new relation with the child. (pp. 6-7)

If the subject can impact the ideology of those around her and change the people, perhaps through teaching, then she has tried to address what troubles her about her belonging.

For example, Alicia was troubled by the thought that United States citizens may not know enough to be confident in discussing issues related to foreign policy, or that they were unwilling to challenge their own government. She wanted to ensure that her social studies students were aware of what was happening in regards to the United States' involvement in the rest of the world. David, troubled by the pattern of thinking he saw in those around him, wanted to take responsibility for the members of his group and work to change them, help them be better informed and educated. Yet he struggled against his own desire that the education result in a particular perspective. That is, he wanted his students to be open to and knowledgeable about many perspectives, but David realized that he was strongly situated in one perspective himself. Robert found himself caught between a desire for a more cohesive and patriotic nation and a fear of imposing that patriotism at the risk of independent thinking. Jessica wanted to be better able to understand her college roommate; she wanted others to have a broader understanding of the world around them and of the experiences of others.

All of the participants took these desires with them into the classroom. As stated above, they lay just below the surface. Jessica is not likely to say to her future students that because she was uncomfortable with her orientation roommate, they must all work to understand the lives and experiences of others. However, because of her experience with her college roommate, and the meaning she derived from that experience, she may always feel an impetus to teach against prejudice and for greater understanding. This impetus may not be a part of her formal and explicit curriculum, however, it will live in her interactions with her students, the ways she guides discussions and responds to students' questions. Both teacher educators, and teacher candidates can benefit from unearthing these desires, making them explicit and understanding the ways they live in their teaching.

An important aspect of how the participants' sense of troubled belonging was manifest in how they spoke of their teaching desires highlighted the ways in which the participants hoped to encourage student questioning of the dominant social order. Robert did not want his students to question the way government functions. However, he did want his students to be well-informed voters who understood their roles within the government and society as it exists today. He also wanted his students to make independent decisions in regards to politics and explicitly stated that he did not want his students to merely follow their parents' politics. While he wanted students to have a positive view of the United States, he wanted them to have a well-informed view so felt it necessary to include some negative aspects of United States History. In short, Robert wanted the students primarily to ask the types of questions one would ask when deciding how to vote. His image of good citizenship did not involve questioning the government, the structure of the government, or the status of democracy in the United States.

Alicia wanted her students to ask difficult questions. She definitely displayed a desire for fostering independent and critical thought, but again, not with a particular change in mind. Both Jessica and David wanted their students to not only ask questions moving forward but also to question all they had learned in the past. They took different approaches. Jessica wanted to create for her students moments of confronting their assumptions, of breaking open new knowledge (Bingham, 2008). She wanted to confront her students' assumptions about fairness and belonging in hopes of creating a citizenry that is more aware of issues of social justice. David, however, wanted his students to question the textbooks and knowledge itself, to question the authority of the information they receive whether it be from a political party, a textbook, or a religious institution. This questioning did not have a particular focus as Jessica's did with issues of social justice. However, it is in some ways more radical because it disrupts lines of authority that are a

part of the dominant Ideology. Though different in the depth and type of questioning, they sought to promote, the participants all were seeking to address a sense of troubled belonging that came from a host of lived experiences.

Conclusion

This sense of troubled belonging had developed through contradictions between the dominant Ideology, participants' individual ideologies, and their lived experience. The stories highlighted in this chapter are illustrations of moments when these contradictions were made apparent, however they are no more than illustrations. As stated above, it is through daily interactions with the world that individual subjects are hailed into the dominant Ideology of a nation or society, interactions with both individuals and institutions (Althusser, 1972). These illustrations represent one of many moments when participants were uncomfortable with their group belonging whether it be the group of United States citizens, the group of a small town community, or a reading group. These developing contradictions, illustrated by the stories, are reflected in the above desires to impact their future social studies students and the ways in which they interact with the world around them.

Questions for Further Thought

As we strive to live together, or conjointly, and to make the world a better place, what is our responsibility as citizens and as teachers to improve the world for each other? To what extent can we impose our ideas of good citizenship on our students? How does a social studies classroom focused on unity and patriotism differ from one that is focused on multiple and nuanced perspectives? How does awareness about current events, United States foreign policy and the like make its way into classroom beyond an occasional current events assignment? How do we teach citizenship through these conversations?

How do ideas of unity and patriotism work with ideas of assimilation or difference? How does awareness support citizenship? How does questioning and critique develop citizenship? What is the role of connecting with individuals and groups in developing strong citizenship? In what way does our sense of belonging and patriotism impact who we are as citizens?

CHAPTER FIVE

Frustrated Citizenship

> *A democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience. The extension in space of the number of individuals who participate in an interest so that each has to refer his own action to that of others, and to consider the action of others to give point and direction to his own, is equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory which kept men from perceiving the full import of their activity.* (Dewey, 1916, p. 101)

This chapter brings us full circle. Chapter Three described the lived experiences of the participants as students and the ways in which their ideologies regarding teacher authority were both revealed and contradicted through these experiences. We established aspects of their individual ideologies as reflected in moments of the pedagogical relationships they had with their teachers. In these ideologies, we looked at pre-understandings of authority. In addition, we witnessed the breaking open of that authority through experiences that contradicted the participants' ideological expectations. From these experiences came a desire to enact authority in a particular way for each participant. In Chapter Four, we explored the participants' experiences outside of formal schooling, ones that gave us a sense of their individual ideologies involving good citizenship. We discovered that many times their expectations of their fellow citizens were disappointed, leading to a sense of troubled belonging as a member of the national group of citizens. This created another desire in relation to their work as social studies teachers, a desire to enact and foster particular aspects of citizenship through their own teaching. In this chapter, we study stories of the participants as teachers enacting their citizenship through the pedagogical relationships they have with their students. This brings the two desires together into the implicit realm of citizenship education. Through the ways the participants enact authority as teachers they will create an implicit curriculum of citizenship as they contribute to their students' ideological

tapestries upon which the students will then enact their citizenship. In teacher education, we often work to have students articulate their desires for social studies education through teaching philosophy statements, or pedagogic creeds. In this study, I have studied between the lines of experience to uncover the participants' desires. In this chapter, I will again study the spaces in between the lines of experience to understand how these desires were and were not enacted.

I open this chapter with a prelude to some of the aspects of citizenship that emerge from the participants' stories. I then look more specifically at the desires of the participants in regards to how they hoped to teach and foster citizenship. This will be important in understanding the stories of their teaching experiences during both the methods course and their internship year. In order to frame the stories included in this chapter, I briefly discuss the different phases of the learning to teach process and the ways in which teacher candidates develop and struggle during these phases. Then, I share many stories from each participant that highlight both the successes and challenges they had in enacting their desired citizenship as teachers. This is followed by a discussion of those experiences and what they share in common and how they differ. In the following chapter, I return to the larger research question of what it is like to become a social studies teacher, bringing together this chapter and the previous two chapters.

Citizenship

Current understandings and ways of teaching about and living citizenship vary broadly across many different spectrums (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Kerr, 2002; Parker, 2002, 2003; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). These spectra include levels of participation in governmental institutions, attitudes about and willingness to question the government, participation in other aspects of civil society, and emphasis on patriotism and nationalism. In the following chapter, I discuss varying aspects of democratic citizenship and citizenship education in greater depth.

However, in this chapter I will take the initial claims made about the participants' desires and understandings around citizenship in the previous chapter and measure them against the stories they shared with me from their internship year.

Just as others do, social studies teachers perform their citizenship in multilayered ways. However, in their position as social studies teachers tasked with citizenship education, these layers can take on added complexity and import for their students. Social studies teachers perform their citizenship through the content they teach, through the instructional methods they employ, through their pedagogical relationships, and through their classroom management. While it is easy to think of the content they teach as the most important aspect of teaching citizenship, it is still one of many. Also, in an era when content is increasingly controlled through high stakes tests and increased standardization, other aspects of teaching citizenship, those that are highlighted in pedagogical relationships, classroom management, and instructional method have added importance in regard to the agency individual teachers have in sharing their own understandings of citizenship.

For Dewey (1916), the democratic ideal consisted of two elements, one was developing many areas of shared interest between groups and the other was not only a freer interaction between social groups but a constant change of behavior as society changed as a result of the greater interactions. In addition, the group's identity must be maintained while they take part in the larger public life. Without this preservation of groups, an important diversity would be lost. Essentially, Dewey wanted people to be able to live well together, to look out for the common good and to constantly work together to improve society. A part of this is making decisions about society and its future direction together, through deliberation, thinking not only of one's personal interests but also of the interests of the entire community. Finally, it is crucial that we

understand and share in the experiences of others so that both their experience and ours are enriched. We must act with both ourselves and the rest of the community in mind.

Parenting is an aspect of citizenship. There is a strong link between parenting, teaching, and citizenship historically with the conception of republican motherhood. This was the idea that women needed to be educated in the United States, so that they could raise their children to be good citizens of the republic (Rury, 2008). Prior to both public schools and compulsory schooling in the United States, most education happened in the family home. When it was realized that citizens in a democracy would need to be educated in a particular way, some believed that women, as mothers, should step into that role. This belief was carried into the common school by Horace Mann. As discussed in Chapter One, Mann believed that because of their natural disposition and parenting skills, women would make ideal teachers, particularly in the primary grades. He further argued that through the use of affectionate authority, women could instill good moral character in their students, a trait that was seen as being essential to fostering good citizens (Hogan, 1990).

Furthermore, the act of parenting is something that is done for the common good. When parents are either unable to or neglect to raise their children in the United States, the onus of parenting is taken on by the state. Children at this time become wards of the state. Schools take on a portion of this work of raising citizens, when children reach a particular age. In working towards associative living, the work that parents do to guide their children in living and being with others is crucial. This looks different from one household to the next. For my mother, it was important that I have exposure to African Americans and their experiences. She bought me books like *Roll of Thunder Hear My Cry* and others by Mildred Taylor, she took me to a Sojourner Truth re-enactor, she hosted gatherings of Sisters of the Yam, a group of African

American women from Adrian College at our house, and she took me to Sweet Honey in the Rock concerts. We still talk frequently about race and racism and how it pertains to both our lives and our teaching. My mother's work in raising me has helped me to be a better citizen in regards to some important aspects that Dewey (1916) discussed in regards to working with people from a variety of race and class groups.

While the world of the family is often considered a private one, absent of public or political life, these boundaries have been permeable both historically and today. I contend that in an era of increasing global dependence, our actions both inside and outside of the home can have profound impacts both locally and globally, making them acts of citizenship. We now live conjointly not only with our next door neighbor, but also with the person who made our shirt in Bangladesh, the person who answers our phone call in India, and the business owner who supplied our coffee beans in Columbia. Our consumerism, our use of the environment, the way we relate to others both like us and different from us, are all both a part of conjoint living and also things we learn in the home from our parents. In addition, the ways in which we care for one another and supply each others' needs become an aspect of citizenship.

Another important aspect of citizenship is learning to speak to and with those in power to advocate on behalf of oneself and one's community. In the important task of identifying shared interests, citizens must be able to identify and communicate their needs. One of Dewey's (1916) two primary criterion of democratic citizenship is identifying shared interests across groups. These interests may include anything from a safe park in the neighborhood with a playground, or clean drinking water, or perhaps a way to have stronger community in an area. Identifying and communicating one's own needs is an important step in this process. This type of self-advocacy is something rarely taught explicitly in schools or encouraged implicitly.

Finally, there are some occupations that some consider to be more strongly linked to citizenship than others. These include occupations that are often connected with local, state, or federal government, are considered to be for the common good, and in which those who occupy the job may be called to go above and beyond the call of duty. These jobs include professions like firefighters, police officers, the military, and for some, teaching.

This has been a brief description of some aspects of citizenship that are highlighted in the stories here. As will be discussed more extensively in the following chapter, there are many different ways of defining good citizenship. In the interest of staying close to the text of the participants' lived experiences, I am going to describe their ways of thinking about good citizenship first and connect them to other frameworks of thinking about citizenship in the analysis chapter. This ordering is important in research of any type where it can be tempting to make the research data fit particular models and boxes as opposed to letting it first speak for itself.

Participants' Aspirations of Citizenship Education

Before going to the stories, let us first look at ways in which the participants' desired classrooms connected to their ideologies and ideas of fostering citizenship. For example, Jessica wanted her students to feel both comfortable but also surprised by the things they learned in her classroom. She wanted her students to have the confidence in themselves and the knowledge necessary to question their previously held beliefs and assumptions in order to see the world with less prejudice. Robert, on the other hand, explicitly stated that being a social studies teacher is a patriotic project for him. He saw his role of both teaching the rights and duties of citizens but also creating informed citizens as one of the ways in which he contributed to the United States. Robert even grouped the teaching profession with being a police officer, a firefighter, or a soldier

in regards to contributing to the common good and the good of the nation. Next, David saw teaching as very much about not only helping his students to become well informed but to become socially aware in a way that allowed for multiple perspectives and better understanding across groups. He saw his teaching as an attempt to create more critically informed citizens. However, David was also concerned about his own interactions with students and the potential harm he could do as well as the potential good. Finally, Alicia saw her role as a citizen largely through the eyes of parenting, having to raise her children to be United States citizens while she and her husband were living abroad. She also hinted at the idea that her social studies teachers in high school performed a service her parents failed to perform in making her more politically aware of the world around her.

The Stories

In *Practice Makes Practice: A Critical Study of Learning to Teach*, Deborah Britzman (2003) discussed the four chronologies of learning to teach: the chronology that takes place when teacher candidates are students; the chronology of the university and teacher education program itself; the chronology of student teaching; and, the chronology of teaching in one's own classroom for the first time. The third of these chronologies, the student teaching experience, is the first time teacher candidates are confronted with many aspects of teaching that are invisible from the student perspective. It is a time when teacher candidates have to negotiate their many selves. As Britzman contended, these four chronologies do not happen in isolation; they are layered on top of one another. She also advocated that we not look at this process as purely an experience of socialization, but one in which the teacher candidates act in response to what happens to them and around them, making teacher becoming a discursive process (p. 70). I contend that this is a time when the teacher candidates teaching ideologies and desires are

confronted and challenged and they must negotiate their teaching selves when their aspirations are put in conversation with the many realities of teaching. This--student teaching--is the time during which we will now see the participants in this chapter, during their first significant field experiences.

The participants in this study were students in a teacher education program that included field experience with every university education course once they were admitted to the College of Education. Most of these experiences were limited to two hours a week, during which they dropped into a classroom or service learning site and then left without embedding themselves in the school context. However, as described in Chapter Two, the participants in this study were part of a pilot program in which the year prior to their internship they took part in a methods course that took place in a middle school and was co-taught by a middle school teacher and myself. In this course, the teacher candidates spent eight hours a week within the walls of a public school and were able to witness much more of the "behind the scenes" work teachers do. In addition, through meetings with many teachers in the building and the building principal, they became much more familiar with the culture, structures, and expectations within this particular school. This course was intended through its design and location, to give the teacher candidates an opportunity to study and theorize teaching within the context of a K-12 setting as opposed to a university classroom. Through this experience, it was hoped, that the experiential aspects of the program would be more contiguous, both in regards to increasing work in the field but also in regards to different types of knowledge and the theory and practice divide. The stories in this chapter are drawn from the yearlong methods course as well as the internship that took place the following year.

Paternal relations. We first met Alicia in Chapter Four, in a Sheraton Hotel in Seoul with her three kids. There, she went and spoke to the British people who were discussing the failure of United States citizens to rein in President Bush and his war policies in Iraq and Afghanistan. For Alicia, her desire to raise her children as United States citizens was incredibly powerful. It was her experience as a parent that she relied on most in her teaching. In the following stories we see Alicia enacting this parenting instinct with individual students who struggle due to disability or due to their refugee status.

In all of these cases we see her parenting "the other." She recognized that these students needed extra support for various reasons and worked hard to provide that support. This reflected a virtue and component of idealized United States citizenship that can be both good and dangerous. It is good to help support those in need, to work with their abilities, to provide the best educational experience possible. However, it can also be dangerous when we approach others from a deficit perspective, when we make assumptions about what the other needs without truly understanding, potentially developing a relationship of dependence and domination. We watch Alicia walk this line in her work with three different students. In enacting this aspect of her teaching, she was repeatedly disappointed by her inability to do as much as she wanted to for these individual students. Furthermore, this parenting focus took away from her other focus of making students more politically aware. I will briefly relate her work with the first two students and then focus more closely on the third.

At Harper Middle School, Alicia found herself working closely with Victor, an eighth grade student with special needs. She described their relationship as one that "just happened." She sat next to him on a regular basis and when Mr. Torres, the teacher in charge of the classroom, changed the students' seats, everyone knew that Alicia would move her seat to stay

by Victor. In describing her work with Victor, Alicia highlighted two things. One, she frequently talked to Victor in ways similar to those she talked to her son. The second was that she learned a lot with Victor about making adjustments to instruction. Through many discussions with Mr. Torres and many days sitting at Victor's side, she learned to recognize the days when Victor was just not going to be able to work; on those days, she would relax and let him be. On other days she learned a variety of ways to both prod him and support him in his learning. While she provided a lot of important support for Victor, she worried about how he would fair once he left the middle school for the high school.

This experience carried over into her internship year where she had another special needs student, Steve, with whom she took a similar approach. One aspect with Steve is that she was able to talk to him directly about his challenges, both academic and behavioral, and develop a plan with him. This plan included him doing his work with a resource room teacher instead of in class, occasionally doing extended bell ringers where he would write about his weekend or a movie he had seen, and that at times he could take five minutes out in the hallway to calm down.

Here, Alicia described how she worked with Steve,

> There are times with him where I have to go over, and I have to kind of get down at his level and say, 'Hey, you know, Steve, we're kinda getting out of control so what can we do?' and he usually kind of come right back … some days I can tell that he's not going to do any work whether its an extended bell ringer or whether I give him map activities, … and so some days he's willing to do that and some days he isn't, and on the days where he's not, it's like 'Cut, here, I need more snowflakes, it's almost Christmas time.'

Paramount in her work with both of these students was flexibility and persistence as well as a willingness to wade into sometimes difficult relationships both with the students themselves and

with parents and support staff. These were the same skills she used in parenting her own children.

Both Victor and Steve had days in which Alicia decided to let them relax. For Victor, this meant letting him either sleep or play on his Kindle. For Steve, Alicia would have him do things like cut out snowflakes for her desk. These strategies were mostly used to keep Victor and Steve in school, in the classroom, and out of trouble. They were both capable of far more intellectually. However, in Alicia's understanding, they were not, on some days, in the right mental space for attending to schoolwork; and by allowing them to do something else, she was accommodating that particular need. This is a luxury that many parents may feel they can take but that many teachers, caught up in the rhetoric and expectations of "no child left behind," do not feel they can access. It also reflects the way that in attempting to meet their social and emotional needs; Alicia did not work to foster their political awareness. We see her more focused on their limits than on their possibilities.

The aspect of parenting in which Alicia attended to individual student's social and emotional needs was especially powerful in the spring of Alicia's internship year when Leylo, one of Alicia's students who was also a Somali refugee, came and told Alicia she was thinking of committing suicide. It was just before the last hour of the day when Alicia had a scheduled meeting with her mentor teacher and field instructor. Leylo came in and asked to speak with Alicia. Alicia took her to the back of the classroom and Leylo said that life was getting really difficult, she wasn't sure if she could handle it anymore, and that she had been thinking of killing herself. Alicia asked Leylo to stay in the classroom at a desk in the back while she had her meeting with her mentor and field instructor, called Leylo's sixth hour teacher and said that Leylo was doing an assignment with her, and then went ahead and had her meeting. After the

meeting was over, Alicia asked Leylo some more questions, getting more details and eventually called to see if the school social worker, Ms. Jackson, was still in the building. They then went to Ms. Jackson and had a talk with her. Alicia took Leylo home, something she had evidently done before, and then texted her a few times that evening to check in with her. Alicia shared that "I felt like, I just wanted to save her and I couldn't. And I think that's why Ms. Jackson was, you know, wanted me to be careful about my interactions with her as well, in terms of like phone conversations and that kind of stuff."

As our conversation unfolded, I found out exactly how much Alicia had done in an attempt to "save" Leylo. In the middle of winter, Leylo's family's home caught fire. Alicia organized a drive at the school to collect clothing and supplies for the family. At one point when Leylo's peers targeted an intense cyber bullying campaign at Leylo. Alicia went to administrators, teachers, and counselors in an effort to address the problem with little success. At one point, Alicia said that she told her own daughter that she wanted to be able to bring Leylo home with her and just have her live with them. Alicia recognized a limit here and did not bring Leylo home. However, it was clear when she told the story of Leylo's sharing with Alicia that she wanted to kill herself that many patterns were already in place. Alicia already had Leylo's phone number and she already had a habit of taking Leylo home. Alicia also told me that Leylo would frequently stay after school with her and help her grade papers or clean desks.

Here, we see Alicia's conflation of teaching and parenting working its way out in her citizenship in that she wanted to provide Leylo help through a way that made cultural and ideological sense to Alicia. This reflects the way in which the United States claims to help other nations through things like the Peace Corps, but also through "bringing democracy" to other parts of the world, an action Alicia found herself trying to defend in South Korea. Alicia decided

to help Leylo in the best ways she knew how. This becomes an aspect of citizenship in regards to caring for each other. As stated earlier, one of the many aspects of good citizenship that is valued in the United States is helping others who are in need. Alicia pours herself into this aspect of her teaching and citizenship. One aspect of the Ideology of American exceptionalism is the idea that United States citizens believe they are well positioned to help those from other countries. Again, this belief is epitomized in programs like the Peace Corps or like the one I participated in after college.

There is a sense that because we are "the best" we naturally have much to offer the rest of the world. As I alluded to in Chapter Two, I found this to be an arrogant claim in my own experience. While the reality may be that it is arrogant, it is seen as an aspect of the goodness of the United States that we do so much to benefit the rest of the world. We do this both across international borders but also across race and class boarders within the United States. Freire (2007) argued that this type of charity and generosity allows those with privilege to feel good about themselves without putting that privilege at risk. That is to say, actions like those Alicia took with Leylo and what I did working in Argentina, allowed us to feel as though we were making the world more fair and just, to feel good about our generosity and yet they do nothing to actually change the structures that put Leylo, or the boys I worked with in Argentina in the position they were in. These acts do not change the fact that we have wealth or time we can give to others; they merely perpetuate this reality and the inequality it reflects. Freire advocated that people instead work in solidarity, working to change structures of oppression.

Interesting too, is that while her work with these students reflected the flexibility and persistence she used in parenting, it did not include the citizenship education that she had worked to do with her own kids abroad. Through something Alicia said in one of her initial interviews, it

was clear that for Alicia, this process of becoming a citizen and becoming politically aware was both the responsibility of the parent and the teacher. She commented how two of her high school teachers had done a great job of compensating where her own parents had failed in this respect. In indicating her parents' failure, Alicia was putting the initial responsibility for this work on the parent. In indicating that these two high school teachers inspired her desire to become a social studies teacher, she was revealing a belief that teachers can and should step in to ensure this process takes place.

I later asked Alicia more directly about how her experiences with these two high school teachers and her experience in South Korea were manifest in her teaching. Her assumptions about the students, her deficit thinking, seemed to be the stumbling block for her in enacting the teaching these experiences had inspired:

> Yeah, that's hard, at Roosevelt. Um, because getting kids to engage in a kind of deep and meaningful way, at least with my ninth graders, is really hard because they do not have the tools in their toolbox and prior knowledge to get there quite yet. Now, it doesn't mean that we don't talk about that kind of stuff, but, they come from a very different place than the kids at Harper do, and they see the world in a very different way. And so something that I might have considered doing at Harper, I wouldn't necessarily do there because these kids, these kids - everything needs to be modeled, everything needs to be scaffolded, um. And there's nothing wrong with that but it makes having those kinds of conversations hard, because they can't quite process that information and get to where I might necessarily want them to get to.

Here, Alicia was primarily focused on what her students at Roosevelt Middle and High School were not able to do. She compared them to the students at Harper who she saw as being more

able. Important here is that Harper is a small suburb of the urban area that Roosevelt is in. The students at Harper are mostly white and of middle to upper class families. Roosevelt, on the other hand, draws students from an under resourced urban community where the poorly resourced schools struggle to meet the needs of a large refugee population as well as many students from poor and working class families. Teachers at Roosevelt gave up their planning hour the year prior to Alicia and David's arrival. Roosevelt has very little support either for English Language Learners or for special education students although both populations are high in the district. While Alicia was well aware of all of these limitations, she focused in this passage on the limitations of the students, not of the school district.

Regardless of the reasons why, Alicia felt as though she could not enact the second aspect of her citizenship in her teaching. She did not feel like she could raise the political awareness of her students. What is interesting is that I had to ask about this aspect of her teaching and bring it up myself. She did not mention it herself. This may have been due to the nature of the questions I asked or it could reflect that for Alicia, this aspect of her teaching was not as important as helping individual students survive within the harsh parameters of the status quo. As the author of this text, I see this as a place where Alicia was limited or frustrated in enacting her citizenship as a social studies teacher. I would contend that Alicia displaced this frustration on her students.

In regards to enacting her citizenship through a parenting and helping relationship, Alicia met with mixed success. She was able to help Victor, Steve, and Leylo in real and material ways. However, she was unable to save students as much as a parent would. She could not follow them from class to class and from grade to grade. Furthermore, she was unable to save Leylo from her difficult situation both at home and at school. In regards to her parenting role of creating politically aware citizens, Alicia's attempts were frustrated by the perceived inabilities of her

students, causing Alicia to refrain from having the in depth, complex political conversations she hoped to have.

Critical perspectives. David had a similar experience to Alicia in spending the year at Harper Middle School and then moving to an eighth grade class at Roosevelt. From my very first interview with him, when he shared a story from one of his first field experiences, David was concerned about issues of race, gender, nationality, and class. In this first interview, he shared his experience working with an African American second grader with a learning disability. The experience was very powerful for David. He was struck by how deep the challenges were that the student was facing and how behind he was in his learning. David would drive home overwhelmed with an awareness of his own privilege as a middle class white person. Being confronted with this injustice, David saw many things differently, like the posters on the wall that talked about how you could succeed if you only tried hard enough. David knew that this student would need a lot more than sheer effort and willpower in order to succeed in school.

One of David's many concerns stemming from this experience was the messages he may inadvertently send students. He was aware that simply telling students to try harder could be a very damaging message because it implied that those who struggled did so because they were lazy. David talked about how he was worried about promoting Disney stereotypes and expectations because of the potential damage they could do. As we shall see, David's concern with doing harm to his students inhibited his pushing them on broader, more nuanced perspectives. His confusion and uncertainty about being a white person inhibited his ability to address issues that were important to him.

David, whom we first encountered sneaking out of study hall to smoke a cigarette, and who later was frustrated by his friends' lack of perspective and nuance in their understanding of

the world, was confronted multiple times in his teaching with the limits of his own understanding. This first happened during the senior year methods course at Harper Middle School. The middle school students were developing skits about the Civil War when one of the girls in the group David was working with suggested that they "talk like black people" at a certain juncture in the skit. David stopped them there and engaged them in a conversation about what it means to "talk like black people." He asked the students what exactly they meant and they referenced students in another nearby district that had a large African American population. He asked them if all the students from that district were the same and other similar questions.

That evening David reflected on the experience in his journal:

> To be honest I could not really believe that I was having that conversation with my students....I kept reminding myself not to preach but to draw it out of them. I was proud when one of the students said after five minutes that we were having a "difficult conversation." First. I liked the idea that we were having a conversation. These were not things that I was offered when I was younger. Questions that might arise or topics that are difficult to talk about, race, sex, religions, class, etc., don't come easy. I have been in the position of these students. Many of them have no idea that they are sheltered or privileged. It can be hard to see because your whole world says otherwise. This would be the "difficult" part. It can be earth shattering to have told to you at a young age that your thoughts about other people, and thereby the mirrors in which yourself is reflected, are wrong. Not only wrong but hurtful…I will admit that I still make assumptions about people when I don't think about it. I was reminded about that and the fact of the irony of 17 white teachers talking about racial/class insensitivity. How do I trust the conversation? [The one African American student in class] should not have to speak as the sole

> authority. I don't think that these kids are willfully filled with racism/classism, but it is there. Do the kids in other areas talk different? Yes. Do the kids of Harper hear words like "ghetto" and "urban" and think that the underlying message is socially acceptable? Yes. There are differences between them and the other school districts. They think that their view of reality is normal and have judged others against that marker.

From this entry we see that David struggled with the limits of his own experience in knowing how to talk to the middle school girls. At the same time, he relied on his past experience to understand them and where they were coming from, how they had developed their thinking around others. Finally, we see that David wanted to push them to consider a different perspective; he wanted to challenge their thinking. and while he did do this, he felt limited in how much he could do and how well he could do it. He wanted to enact his citizenship in the conversation he had with these girls and yet was frustrated by his own lack of understanding.

As stated earlier, David's internship took place in the same school as Alicia's; his classes, like hers, also had several refugee students. Like Alicia, David developed a certain flexibility in working with the students, shifting rules, expectations, and guidelines. Like Alicia, he also tried to help the students. However, David did not go to the same measures as Alicia to "save" his students. He worked more to understand his students' perspective and their thinking. One of the challenging aspects for David in working in this school was the way students talked about race to each other. He sensed that the refugee students, who were primarily from East Africa, participated in a lot of racial banter as an attempt to fit in, but that some of the banter troubled them more than they let on. For example, the students would frequently joke about how dark skinned some of the students were, saying that you couldn't see them when the lights were turned off, and other such jokes.

One thing in particular that bothered David was the students' use of the N-word. As a white teacher he felt poorly positioned to address it, yet was still very much bothered by it. As he described it, students, particularly refugee students, used it in everyday language without intention:

> There's three [refugee students] in one class and they just "nigga this, nigga that." And I just literally cannot get them, cannot get them to stop, cannot. And it's just, it's literally, it's not intentional. It's not trying to hurt anybody. It's like water. It's like breathing, because I think they hear it everywhere. And because they hear it, they use it all the time. Because this is what people are referring to each other, they're doing it, they're mimicking it and they just keep, so. I can't keep punishing them for, you know what I mean? I can't keep kicking them out of class. They're not getting any sort of education.

Eventually, in a moment of sheer frustration, David suggested that they use the word "ninja" instead and not only did the three students referenced here pick it up, but the whole class did. While this technically solved his problem, David was very unhappy with himself for that moment because it didn't really address the situation at all. He didn't have a real conversation about it with his students.

David was overwhelmed with the diversity in his classroom, the complexity of having African, African American, Hmong, Mexican and European American students all in the same space. Because David did not fully understand these many perspectives, he was hesitant. As stated earlier, he did not want to do any harm. His understanding of the N-word seemed to be very different from that of his students. He was aware that for some of the refugee students, fitting in was crucial. One student in particular, David found out, had been threatened at the age of seven with having his arm cut off by a rebel group in his home country. He was evidently

targeted for some noticeable difference. For this student, the need to fit in was seared into his memory. David did not want to take away one of the student's means of fitting in, which was through the use of the N-word. David wanted to help and protect this student and allowing him to use the N-word without punishment was one way David felt like he could do this.

Here, we see David trying to move beyond his own understanding of the N-word to understand its use by his students. While his initial instinct was to intervene and get the students to stop using the word, he was able, in this instance at least, to step back and think of the potential meanings of the word in the life of his students. He was able to consider the idea that his understanding of the word was not the only one and that the students may have a variety of purposes and motives in using it (or no purpose or motive). This was a crucial step. David was still confused in how he wanted to respond to the students' use of the N-word and his ambivalence and frustration built to the point where he developed a solution that he was not happy with, replacing one word with another without ever having a more in depth conversation about issues of race, prejudice, language, and skin color.

This complexity, the "not knowing" David experienced, made it difficult for him to act out his citizenship in the way he most wanted to. He instead found other ways, tracking down students in the hall before the administration did, bending tardy and absence rules to keep his students from being ticketed for truancy. In general, David tried to make the process of schooling a little easier for his students; he would attempt to keep them from experiencing some of the harsher disciplinary measures. However, he was limited in his ability to do this. Just like Alicia, he could not follow them from class to class although he would frequently take some students into his class when their other teachers were having difficulties with them. He could not keep his

students from being suspended and he could not keep his students from being mean or prejudiced towards each other.

Second chances: Overwriting "the file." Jessica's goals in teaching social studies were twofold. One, she wanted to provide her students with "ah-ha" moments when she could expand their understanding on a particular topic and even disrupt a belief or assumption that they had previously held. Her second goal was to provide the space and confidence for her students to freely express themselves and move into a better future as a result. These goals reflected some of the experiences we have witnessed from Jessica's life. Jessica's eighth grade social studies teacher provided her with both the "ah-ha" moment about the history of racism in their own community and with the confidence Jessica needed by inviting her to be a part of an honors history class. Jessica's desire to create the "ah-ha" moments was further confirmed when she arrived on campus for university student orientation and was confronted with the life of her orientation roommate who hailed from the inner-city, was African American, and whose life was materially and culturally quite different from Jessica's. In the following stories, we see Jessica work to provide the comfortable space for her students and to inspire greater self-confidence in one student in particular. These attempts meet with varying success. Interestingly, Jessica did not share a story involving an "ah-ha" moment.

Jessica, who, in the first chapter is placed in the lower achieving third grade class and then surprised when her 8th grade teacher invites her to be a part of an honors class, attempted to help out an individual student herself during the second half of her internship year. Jessica interned in a middle school in a small suburban town similar to Harper. She described Leah, the student she worked with, as being a giggly seventh grader, not unlike how Jessica remembers herself being. Jessica thought that Leah's attempts to evade questions in class were indicative of

Leah's uncertainty about her own intelligence. She interpreted Leah's behaviors, her talkativeness, her lack of effort, to stem from low self-esteem, from a lack of confidence, similar to the way she had felt in middle school. One day Jessica told Leah that she had to stay after school and work with her or else Jessica would refer her to an after school program for students who were failing. Leah opted to stay afterschool with Jessica and finish her homework. Jessica worked hard to teach Leah how to answer the questions. As she put it, she forced Leah to do the work and frequently forced her to do more work than her classmates.

Again, initially, Jessica saw a lot of herself in Leah. However, as they continued to work together, that changed some:

> I could connect with her, that's a lot of it, but also she was a lot different from me. I learned that throughout the whole process, too. Like, yeah, I don't think she has the work ethic that I kind of had instilled in me, um. So it was kind of interesting because I think I did, I think I was able to make a lot of connections with her but at the same time we were very different…

Here we see Jessica wanting to rectify her own schooling experience through Leah. For Jessica, her experience of being labeled as less able than her peers, her sense that there was a "file" on her that marked her in some way, had been internalized. Jessica shared repeatedly the profound impact of being tracked in elementary school on her confidence as a student. She had taken on the identity in her "file." In Leah, she saw something similar, that Leah was working around her own perceived inability. Even though Jessica never referenced Leah's past or any documentation on her, she did identify strongly with Leah, interpreting her behavior as a reflection of her own lack of confidence as a student. In reaching out to her, Jessica was trying to get Leah to move past her own "file," imagined or real.

> I don't really know what I thought, like maybe if I could help her then maybe she could do better in school. Maybe if I had had someone, maybe I would have done better in high school. I mean, I did well in high school but I could have done better, so. Like knowing how, study skills, or like knowing note-taking skills and stuff like that. So I bet that was a part of it, not knowing, not knowing things.

In some ways Jessica wanted to save Leah, not only from others, but from herself. Jessica wanted to do this in the same way her eighth grade history teacher did for her.

However, this attempt to save Leah was, in the end, disappointed. As Jessica said, "I mean, it kind of got frustrating sometimes because I would spend so much time with her talking about how we could help her in class and then she wouldn't help herself in class. So it got really frustrating," I asked Jessica where she thought things might have gone wrong in regards to her interactions with Leah:

> I was a lot more lenient with her and I was trying to be more friendly and then maybe that is what caused that. And then, all the sudden, I did this kind of switch to like "no, this is not ok." And yeah, I think she definitely, I don't know, I don't know how it affected her or not. I tried to distance myself more, like I tried to get her to do more things on her own. That was my ultimate goal . . . I wanted her to seek resources on her own. I mean, I don't know how well that worked out, but I did get her to start asking me to stay after school without me being like, "do you need me to stay after school?"

An area of success that Jessica noted here is in getting Leah to advocate for herself. Not long after Jessica insisted that Leah stay after school, the tables turned, and Leah was regularly coming to Jessica asking her if she could stay after to help her with things.

This ability to advocate for oneself and ask for what one needs is an important part of both relations of authority and citizenship. For many students, it is what helps them get ahead and is something high socio-economic status (SES) students are more likely to do than low SES students (Demerath, 2009). Identifying one's own needs and asking for support can happen at both a personal and community level. Advocacy is an important part of active citizenship. Trusting that one's self and or one's cause is worthy of said advocacy and service is important. Another important thing that Jessica taught Leah is that it is the teacher's job to help the student (although Jessica noted that Leah expressed surprise at Jessica's willingness to stay after school and help her--that few teachers in the building did stay after school to help students). In a similar way with citizenship, ideas about what or who is worthy of advocacy or service as are beliefs about what one's government should do for one are important.

The second important aspect of teaching for Jessica was providing a comfortable space. Having been a quieter student who was easily intimidated and who rarely spoke in class, Jessica wanted to create a comfortable classroom where students felt free to express themselves. Jessica had many creative ideas for creating this level of comfort. However, during her internship year she confronted various limitations. Some of these were due to sharing a classroom with her mentor teacher. Other challenges came from Jessica working to find ways to both have a comfortable classroom and have enough order that learning could still take place. For example, she shared a story in which she took control of the classroom in ways that she was at first uncomfortable with but later felt more comfortable doing. As she progressed through her internship year, she found herself exercising more authority. Jessica understood it as a need to (wo)man up, even though she indicated that the classroom management procedures went against her teaching philosophy in the way they singled out individual students. Still, once Jessica

implemented these methods, she claimed "success." Here we see success and something working being defined as control of a class of students.

When Jessica talked about who she wanted to be as a teacher, she described someone who fosters a laid back and comfortable classroom. She saw herself being like Mr. Torres, the eighth grade teacher we worked with at Harper who primarily kept his students' attention by being engaging, telling exciting personal stories, and being highly energetic. Jessica even thought about having music playing every day when students walked in as one of her history professors did, music from whatever time period they were studying. Her hope was that this laid back approach to teaching would allow her students more freedom to express themselves and their growing knowledge.

However, once her internship started, Jessica found herself struggling with classroom management. Her mentor teacher had a warning system with students. First, a student would have his or her name written down on a clipboard, after a second infraction the student would be the last to leave the class, the third consequence was a yellow ticket, which was a behavioral reflection sheet the student would go into the hall to fill out. The final two consequences were contacting parents and in-school suspension. Jessica was concerned about singling students out in the way her mentor teacher did. However, she needed to do something. So she had a talk with her students, outlining the warning system and how she planned to implement it. She shared that she got so wrapped up in the content that day, she forgot to actually implement the system – the following day, according to a journal entry Jessica shared with me, she was too scared to give out any warnings, but that night, disappointed in herself, she vowed to follow through the following day. To assuage her discomfort about singling students out, she went and told them

quietly when they received the first warning, and she wrote their name on her clipboard. She felt like this worked pretty well.

The third day, she gave warnings to three kids and according to her, it worked for two of them. In this journal entry she labeled the day a success.

> Finally, on Wednesday, I had success! I gave warnings to three kids and it worked for two of them! I distributed the warnings quietly and personally, so that I didn't feel like I was singling the students out. It was also so easy once I got over my fear. The next step is consistency, so that the students know that I mean business. So, this week I (wo)manned up and got work done!

One of the interesting things here is how Jessica's goals for her classroom changed. At the beginning of the internship year she was more worried about comfort in her classroom, but then she shifted to maintaining control through (wo)manning up.

Jessica had wanted a comfortable classroom so that her students would feel empowered to speak up, would be free of fear so they could better learn, and would feel the space to grow fully into themselves. However, the pressure to have a classroom that was under control so that she could get through her instruction superseded the desired comfort. While Jessica attempted to compromise by speaking quietly to students instead of calling them out in front of everyone else, her focus still shifted. This was not a fault of Jessica or of her mentor teacher but of the needs of the school and schooling (Jackson, 1990; McNeil, 1986). This need for controlling large groups of students who are in a compulsory situation with limited choice, one in which their teachers find themselves as well (Ferguson, 2000), is a product of the structures of school. Jessica found herself wrapped up in these requirements in a way that ultimately constrained her ability to foster citizenship through a comfortable classroom because she had to focus on control over comfort.

Jessica's attempts to enact citizenship through her teaching met with mixed success. She was able to foster a sense of self-advocacy in Leah but was unable to transform her into a confident and serious student. In regards to her comfortable classroom, Jessica compromised by using her mentor teacher's classroom management method in a slightly different way. Jessica's compromise here indicates a confrontation with reality in which Jessica needed students to listen and pay attention in order to teach.

The noble profession. We first met Robert in a state of surprise when his history instructor gave him an extension on his paper. In another story, he was disappointed in his fellow US citizens after a World Cup loss to Ghana. For Robert, teaching social studies was very closely tied to his patriotism and his citizenship. He included teaching among a group of "noble professions" that included working as a police officer, a fire fighter, and being in the military. These noble professions all involve doing something for the common good, giving of yourself above and beyond for the sake of your community and your country. In the following story, Robert's belief in teaching as a noble profession was crushed when he was reprimanded for not meeting the needs of a special education student. He felt like he belonged to this noble profession where he would be trusted and appreciated, where it would be acknowledged that he was going above and beyond, and then he found that this was not always the case. A component of this involved authority as well. Robert believed up to this point, that as a teacher he had the authority and freedom to do what he wanted in his own classroom. In this story, he realized that he did not always have that authority.

Robert interned in a rural school district about 20 miles from Lansing. The high school Robert taught at had a small enrollment of economically disadvantaged students with an even smaller enrollment of students from ethnically marginalized groups. The rest of the school was

primarily white and middle class. In the fall semester of his internship year, Robert was struggling with a student named Adam who was in two of his classes. Adam had transferred in from another school and was on an individualized education plan (IEP). He also had a para-professional aid, Lisa, who was initially there as a mere presence to observe Adam. There were no set parameters on how Lisa was to support Adam. According to Robert, Adam showed some effort, at first, in understanding the material and doing the work. However, he progressively tried less and less, and eventually did almost nothing. At this point Lisa was taking notes for him in class and helping him substantially.

It was also around this time that the school had an IEP meeting for Adam. Robert was not a part of the IEP meeting and said that afterwards he made several attempts to get the new IEP, but did not succeed. As Adam continued to show almost no effort, Robert and Lisa decided that Lisa would not take notes for Adam until he started to show more effort. They sat down with Adam and told him about their decision and also informed him that he was at risk of failing the class.

The following day one of the school's special education teachers brought a note to Robert while he was teaching, indicating that they needed to meet. The following hour, a meeting was convened with Robert, the special education teacher, a guidance counselor, Lisa and Adam. In this meeting, Robert was told, in no uncertain terms, that in deciding to no longer provide Adam with notes, he was going against the new IEP and could get himself in big trouble. As Robert said,

> I got called into a meeting saying how this is bad and illegal and I can't do that anymore. And that was, that was the day where teaching was no longer the kind of euphoric, fun, up-in-front-of-the-students and you build great relationships and this and that. It's a very,

very serious and it's almost a fine line of things you can do.…it was more of a real world moment.

As Robert put it, he did not "take it lying down." He argued that he had been trying to get the new IEP from people in that room for a couple of weeks, and if he been able to get it he would have followed it. During this meeting they developed a plan in which Robert would provide Adam with a copy of the text every day that Adam would highlight.

While the situation with Adam was more or less resolved, the way Robert felt about teaching was changed. He suddenly felt like teaching was under appreciated, that if you were a good teacher no one noticed, and if you did something wrong everyone noticed. It is interesting that despite overwhelming evidence against such an image of teaching, Robert had maintained an understanding of teaching centered on the teacher's freedom and authority to do as he felt best in the classroom. Robert's dad was an administrator and his mother a teacher. He had grown up with parents involved in education and was very much aware of the changing policies and expectations in regards to teaching. During the year at Harper Middle School, we had several honest and open discussions with Dan Torres and with the principal at Harper about the contemporary rules and expectations regarding teaching. Furthermore, Robert had worked with the special education teacher at Harper for an inquiry project about meeting the needs of special education students in the general education classroom. Despite all of these experiences, it was clear that Robert still had an image of teaching in which the teacher had almost complete autonomy in the classroom.

For Robert, his ability to enact his citizenship is curtailed by this lack of freedom; he is not able to teach Adam in the way he believed best because of the requirements of the IEP and the oversight of his teaching. However, his citizenship is primarily frustrated because his vision

and understanding of the profession was changed. He no longer counted it among the noble professions because he did not feel the appreciation as a teacher that he believed was due those who engage in the noble professions.

> I don't want to say that it completely tainted it, but I definitely did feel like, I felt less like it had a support system, more so you were on your own, you need to watch out for yourself a lot of the time. And that was a very, like, kind of lonely realization that even though everybody is here trying to do the same thing, that you're very much on your own, too. Um, it is, you know, it's a thankless job. And when you do it right, you know, it's, you're not thanked, but if you do it wrong, you're definitely in big trouble… it wasn't quite the feel good narrative that teaching had been up until that point.

Included in his underlying beliefs and assumptions about noble professions is that they come with a certain recognition and appreciation that he came to feel was completely absent in this situation. And not only was the recognition and appreciation absent but he was being blamed for not doing his job. Robert also had an expectation of unity that was disrupted in this encounter. This did not fit in to his pre-established script of the noble professions. As we see in the following portion of the story, not only was Robert disappointed in the lack of regard for the teaching profession, he ended up feeling distant from the community of professionals as a result of this incident.

I asked Robert if his relationship with all of the people in the incident had changed. He said it had. With the other adults, the special education teacher, and guidance counselor in particular, he said he used to have really great conversations with them. After this incident, they treated him with more indifference and he no longer felt as much a part of the community. This disconnection with those he worked with echoed the sense of disappointment and betrayal he

experienced when he got in the fight with the girl after the World Cup match. His sense of belonging to a profession he was proud of was tainted as was his sense of belonging to a country, a group of citizens that he was proud of after the game. His belonging is again troubled and frustrated by his experience.

Robert's experience with the IEP and Adam led him to realize that the profession of teaching was not what he had expected. When working as a paraprofessional between high school and college, Robert had been disappointed with the teacher he worked with, one of his former teachers, for not being as organized and hopeful as Robert wanted. In this case, Robert was disillusioned about the teacher, but not the profession of teaching. He held intact his idea of teaching as a noble and giving profession, one in which you were looked up to.

This idea of being looked up to contributed to Robert's challenges with classroom management. He expected the position, the profession, to give him the authority over students, and in this case, the authority over how he taught all students in his classroom. He came to believe that the rules and regulations of schooling, the liability, the concern over being sued, have stripped teachers of much of their authority over how they teach in their own classrooms. In many ways this gets back to Jessica's "file," the idea that the paperwork and documentation surrounding a particular student can override an individual teacher's authority to teach that student in the way which he thinks is best. While in the case of Jessica, her eighth grade history teacher did not incur any risk by ignoring the "file," Robert did incur significant risk by not following Adam's IEP. The idea that this file would hold more authority than he would, that others would enforce the file in a way that felt belittling, challenged Robert's assumptions about teaching. These assumptions were that teaching involves being up in front of a classroom, building relationships, and doing good in the community.

Robert went into teaching seeing it as a noble and patriotic profession, especially teaching social studies. He was anxious to share the history of the United States with his students, to be looked up to and honored for being a teacher, to develop relationships with students and foster their development. While he did experience many of these things he also found that there is another side to teaching where one is not appreciated, where there are rules and regulations that must be followed, where relationships with colleagues and students do not come easily or do not come at all. This experience of the other side of teaching clearly frustrated Robert. His desire to be a good patriotic citizen through his teaching was disrupted by the unexpected lack of appreciation.

Citizenship in the Classroom

The participants had all set up different hopes around using their authority as teachers to act out their citizenship – to perhaps be the citizens they wanted their peers to be, and yet, they all found themselves disappointed in some way. Alicia could only go so far in helping Leylo, while Robert discovered that the profession as a whole was not what he had hoped, that he did not have the freedom to always act how he saw fit. Jessica discovered that not all students will respond to special attention in the same way that she did, while David was overwhelmed by the needs of his students, struggling with interpreting their interactions.

The limitations the participants met were all different, with some of them meeting multiple limitations. Alicia, David and Robert all ran into limitations created by the broader context of the schools in which they worked. For David and Alicia, there were limited resources, for Robert, there was the need to meet Adam's Individual Education Plan. Robert's colleagues, who betrayed his idea of what the teaching profession was supposed to be, also brought Robert's frustrations to the fore. There were also inner limitations, that is, limitations within themselves

that the participants confronted, whether it was a deficit perspective of the students or a sense that one's own perspective is too limiting. What is important here are the ways in which the participants responded to these various limitations. Primarily, they changed their practice, dropped particular aspirations, and in some cases embraced new aspirations. For example, for both David and Alicia, the extra effort required to teach in an under-resourced school with students of varying ability, left them with less energy for pursuing the citizenship education they were most passionate about.

Regardless of the source of conflict, whether external, internal, or both, all the participants were confronted with the unexpected, with something that went against their hopes in their teaching. In the midst of these disappointments and challenges, their initial desires to foster citizenship through their teaching can get lost. The participants all made attempts to enact their citizenship through their teaching, and while they had some success, they also met with considerable frustrations and limitations, not the least of which was their ability to maintain any idea of citizenship development in their teaching.

Conclusion

It would be foolish to expect teacher candidates to be able to carry out their hopes and dreams during their internship year or their first years teaching. As interns, teacher candidates are living in a shared classroom space, one that belongs more to their mentor teacher and their students than to themselves. This creates constraints on their practice. In addition, the internship year is a significant step up in the responsibility that these teacher candidates are taking in the classroom. The added responsibility can be overwhelming. Never before have teacher candidates had to plan four or five lessons a week. Never before were they responsible for classroom management. For many, this is a first step from the student world to the professional world.

These challenges are all significant and only increase with the first years of teaching. It is not at all surprising that the dispositions and aspirations carefully fostered in their teacher education courses would be challenged and even lost.

This loss is important to study because it may be permanent. Many people have studied the ways in which the induction period in becoming a teacher is a time when many teachers revert back to what they remember seeing as students in an attempt to survive the many new challenges they face (Britzman, 2003; Feiman-Nemser, 2012). In this chapter we saw that while many goals of enacting citizenship were challenged, remnants of the old goals remained and, through it all, new priorities combined with these remnants to shape the participants' practice. This emerging practice is important for the participants but also for their students. Whether teachers keep their citizenship goals in mind or not, they remain a text for their students on citizenship and being human (Greenwalt & Holohan, 2011). The participants were forming their own pedagogical relationships with their students that will contribute to both shaping and revealing the ideologies of these students. As mentioned in the beginning, it is here that we come full circle. In the following chapter, I will look across all of these data chapters, drawing out themes related to teacher authority and schooling in the United States as well as a return to ideas of citizenship and authority.

Questions for Further Thought

Once we get to the third data chapter one must ask, does the rest of this matter? Does the grammar of schooling render the rest of it meaningless? If schooling is increasingly scripted, will there be space for teachers' citizenship to be played out in the classroom? Does complying with the script indicate a form of citizenship? How does deficit thinking impact our actions as citizens

and teachers? How do the echoes of our own experiences as students interrupt the way as teachers, we see and understand our students?

How does the way we see ourselves in others contribute to our understanding of the common good? How does the way we think about groups other than our own impact our understanding of the role of government in all of our lives? How does it change the ways we understand group and community needs and wants? What are the ways in which government, political parties, civil society and other institutions have become scripted? How does this impact democracy?

CHAPTER SIX

Teaching Desires and Meritocratic Structures

In Chapters Three and Four, we studied experiences in which the participants developed desires around their use of authority in the classroom and their goals of citizenship education. In Chapter Five, the participants shared experiences of taking these desires into their internship experience, where they were all confronted with various challenges to enacting their desired teaching. In this chapter, I will briefly revisit those desires, placing them within some of the literature on citizenship education. I will then discuss the ways in which meritocracy, one of the dominant Ideologies in the United States, intercedes and disrupts those desires as it is taken up in schools.

In this chapter, I argue that while the desires both forged and revealed in lived experiences of authority and citizenship are important to the teachers individuals become, dominant Ideologies, particularly that of meritocracy, also play a significant role in shaping teaching practice. In the process of becoming a social studies teacher, teacher candidates must contend with the multiple ways that meritocracy works in schools. It is important that they consciously consider this and both its impact on their own teaching desires and on the implicit curriculum of citizenship their teaching is creating. Teacher educators can intervene in this process and assist in making the implicit explicit. They can also foster honest discussions about the ways in which school structures perpetuate dominant Ideologies and how, as a teacher one can respond to these structures.

Participants' Desires

When working with the lives of individuals there is always a tension between the parts and the whole. In this dissertation I have chosen to organize my chapters by theme as opposed to individual. However, the individual narrative arcs of each participant are also important. In this section, I will look across the participants' stories, adding some details from their life stories and then look at how their desires around authority and citizenship come together as they become teachers.

Before doing this, however, I will first review some of the literature on citizenship education to provide a framework for the participants' desires. I turn to it now both as a heuristic for developing a stronger understanding of the participants' desires and to show the ways in which this study thickens the work already done in citizenship education.

Types of Democratic Citizenship/Education. What exactly is education for democratic citizenship? While schools have touted democratic citizenship as a rationale for existence since their inception, there has not always been agreement on what good democratic citizenship looks like, let alone how to teach it (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004b). What does take place in the United States is found in civics courses which have had a rather narrow focus of how the government works from the three branches to how a bill becomes a law (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Kerr, 2002). However, citizenship is and can be much more than voting and understanding the branches of government. Citizenship includes participation in civil society (Putnam, 2000), working with others to create more just communities, running for office, interacting with those in groups other than your own, identifying shared interest, and critiquing the government, among other things (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004).

Several authors have identified various types of citizenship that serve as aims for social studies and history teachers (Barr et al., 1978; Barton & Levstik, 2004; Evans, 2004; Parker, 2003; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Here, I will review those of Barton and Levstik, and Westheimer and Kahne. I use these two studies because they are both based in empirical work and take very different approaches. Barton and Levstik's work studied stances in history teaching, touching on the implicit rationales for teaching contained in the explicit curriculum. Their framework was based on several empirical studies of history classes both in the United States and abroad. Westheimer and Kahne, on the other hand, researched ten programs intended to foster democratic citizenship in the United States. Some of these programs were a part of formal classes and others were extracurricular programs. Because this study focuses on the implicit curriculum, primarily in the student and teacher relationship, it is very different from both of these works. However, in putting these two seminal pieces in conversation with my own work, I hope to develop a deeper and thicker understanding of the many forms of citizenship education that take place in schools and between students and teachers.

In *Teaching History for the Common Good*, Barton and Levstik (2004) highlighted four democratic stances for teaching history: the identification stance, the analytic stance, the moral stance, and the exhibitionist stance. Though these stances do not all encompass aspects of citizenship, they reflect the possibilities for meaningful civic action that the authors located in the history classroom

Barton and Levstik's identity stance highlighted the purpose of teaching history to foster a national identity through one's personal identity development and through the developments of the nation's identity. The risks of this stance are the idea of a single national identity that can exclude others, implying citizenship is only for individuals with a particular history, ethnicity or

race. The analytic stance fosters a more nuanced understanding not only of history but also of the present times. Though scholars argue as to the ability to learn lessons from history, some who advocate the analytic stance do so with the hope that an understanding of history will increase, in important ways, the understanding of present day issues and dilemmas and contribute towards more informed action and citizenship. The moral stance focuses on the way that history can access and develop students' sense of justice and fairness in regards to events both past and present. The authors hoped that students could use this moral perspective in the deliberations necessary in a democratic society. They noted however, that there is a tendency in the United States to portray the nation's history as one of progress in which most of the injustices of the past have now been remedied and do not need to be considered in contemporary society. In the exhibitionist stance, the focus was on exhibiting historical knowledge for personal gain, purposes of accountability in schools or for the benefit of others. Exhibition tends to focus on details of history without much analysis or depth. This stance has a tendency to portray information and knowledge as fixed and static, not something that one can participate in as a citizen.

Westheimer and Kahne (2004) laid out three models of citizenship: personally responsible, participatory, and justice oriented. A personally responsible citizen votes, follows the laws, pays taxes, and volunteers on occasion in the community. A participatory citizen does these things but also may run for public office, serve on a community council, or write a letter to their representative. Both of these types of citizens are fairly well satisfied with the current structures of government and democracy. The social justice oriented citizen is concerned about issues of inequality, knows of and participates in social action groups, and, unlike the other two groups, questions the current establishment and its ability to improve society. As Westheimer and Kahne explained it, a personally responsible citizen would contribute canned goods to a food

drive, the participatory citizen would organize the food drive and the social justice oriented citizen would question what it is in the current establishment that allows people to go hungry and work to change the system. The authors contended that only one of these is complete, the social justice oriented citizenship that questions the status quo, the working of government and society as they exist.

While the participants' desires for citizenship education do not map perfectly onto any one set of these typologies, they do have stances that closely resemble some of those listed above. I included both sets to provide a broader range as well as multiple approaches to understanding the participants desires around citizenship education. In the narrative arcs of the participants that follow, I review their desires in regards to both authority and citizenship. I reference the different types of authority introduced in Chapter One, where I discussed ideas of affectionate authority from Horace Mann in which the teacher uses care and attention to build bonds of affection with students, prompting students to behave well out of a desire to please their teachers. I also reference Pace and Hemmings (2007) literature review on authority in which they identified several types of authority drawn from Weber and Durkheim that educational researchers have used. These included: traditional authority, charismatic authority, legal-rational authority, professional authority, and moral authority. As we will see in the narratives that follow, these types of authority can work to foster the different citizenship stances discussed above.

Robert. Robert grew up in a small rural community a few hours outside of Detroit. His parents both worked in the schools and provided him with a middle class upbringing. An important part of Robert's childhood was sports. He participated both in school sports and club sports outside of school. The schools Robert attended were almost exclusively White. Robert,

who is of European decent was very successful in school and enjoyed his K-12 experience. Prior to attending college, Robert spent several months in England playing soccer in hopes of one day being a professional athlete. He returned and took a position for a few months as a para-professional aide at his old elementary school.

Robert first had the rigid lines of authority in the pedagogical relationship broken by an eighth grade social studies teacher who turned control of the class over to the students for four days so that the students could attempt to create their own constitution. They were then further ruptured when a college history instructor gave him extra time on a paper, which surprised Robert both because the instructor was so flexible and also because he admitted that he too was overwhelmed with work. Robert, who was both a sports enthusiast and also a self described patriot, was disappointed in his fellow United States citizens following a World Cup soccer match loss when what had been a feeling of unity dissolved into a stark divide between himself and a woman who cut in line in front of him and threw his hat as those around took sides. Robert saw teaching social studies as an opportunity to participate in a noble profession and to help raise citizens who would be productive members of their society and fulfill the rights and duties of citizenship.

Robert desired to be more laid back in his teaching, like the college instructor who gave him an extension and like Dan Torres, the teacher at Harper. However, when enacting his teaching, Robert ran into the bureaucracy of schooling. He was reprimanded for not appropriately following a student's individual education plan and was struck with the realization that for him at least, teaching was not always treated as the noble profession he envisioned it to be, and by the fact that he did not have the authority or power to be the teacher he wanted to be in his classroom. Robert believed that both traditional and professional authority would suffice

(Pace & Hemmings, 2007). He trusted that students would respect traditional lines of authority so that he would not have to take extra strides in enacting authority himself. However, he discovered when he stepped out of the bounds of the traditional authority, both by being more laid back than his students expected and by not following the IEP, his authority lost legitimacy. He discussed his struggle to maintain a professional distance as a way to re-establish the traditional authority he felt he had a right to as a teacher.

Robert, who was disappointed with his fellow patriots after the World Cup match, was most aligned with the Barton and Levstik's (2004) identification stance and Westheimer and Kahne's (2004) personal responsibility citizenship. He desired students to have a sense of who they were, not only as United States citizens but also who and what the nation is. He repeatedly stated that he wanted his students to know the rights and duties of citizenship as well as how to be productive members of society. This coincided with Robert's desire for more traditional forms of authority, even though those forms were not always successful for him. Both his focus on citizenship and his vision of authority supported the status quo with an understanding of democracy as something that is already accomplished, a sense that the history of the United States, though flawed, is one of progress towards a better and better nation-state.

While he was concerned about his students' continued participation as citizens, the ways in which he defined participation were narrow, primarily focused on being informed voters. In many ways, Robert's more traditional notions of authority align well with his more traditional notions of citizenship. In his brief description of types of authority, Bingham (2008) describes the traditional approach to authority as one in which teachers assume and use authority under the belief that it is for the good of the students, that the teacher knows best what is good for the students and so uses his position of authority to act on their behalf. This also aligns with Robert's

belief in teaching as a "noble profession." Underlying all of this is an ideological belief in the good of the government, its institutions and its representatives. Robert clearly also believed in the good of what he hoped to do for his students. His struggle came when others had a different view than his. We see this in the conflict over the IEP, in the disagreement with the woman after the soccer match, and in the different expectations of authority he and his students had.

Jessica. Jessica grew up in another small town, this one in northern Michigan. A woman of European descent, Jessica had both struggles and successes in school. Jessica began with a disappointing experience with school authority; being tracked into a lower level class as she moved from the third grade to the fourth grade and feeling trapped in the bureaucracy, in her own "file," as the tracks remained for the fifth grade as well. However, her eighth grade social studies teacher then invited her to join the more advanced history class after noticing her attention and understanding in class. In her next story, Jessica struggled with her own lack of understanding and exposure when she had an African American roommate from Detroit for her college orientation. She was overwhelmed by the experience and felt like it was connected to her growing up experience in Charlevoix. During the following years in college she worked to expand her experience both through her coursework and through friendships.

These experiences were reflected in two of Jessica's desires as a social studies teacher: (1) Jessica's desire to teach in a way that allowed space for different types of participation in her classroom, a comfortable space to learn and grow, and (2) a curriculum that challenged her students to broaden their perspectives and understanding of the world around them. However, when Jessica attempted these during her internship year, she struggled with the need for control in her classroom and was frustrated when the special attention she gave a student did not result in

the same way that her eighth grade teacher's special attention had resulted with her. Jessica also felt a need to "(wo)man up" in the classroom in exercising her authority.

While Jessica had hoped to utilize a more charismatic authority (Pace & Hemmings, 2007) as she had witnessed in Dan Torres at Harper Middle School, along with an affectionate authority (Hogan, 1990; H. Mann, 1844), she found herself using more of a legal rational authority, relying on the rules and regulations of her mentor's classroom and of the school. Jessica expressed a tension between a desire for a comfortable classroom, with many avenues of both learning and expressing that learning, and a need for control. Too often, these ideas are seen as mutually exclusive. Bingham (2008) presented it as a supposed conflict between authority and freedom. Citing Freire (2007), he argued that many see the two as being mutually exclusive but that authority kept in balance, oscillating between teachers and students can be on the side of freedom. Authority is only a problem when it creates a consistent pattern of one party being dominant and the other party subservient.

Another one of Jessica's desires for her students were the "ah ha" moments that would most closely reflect the moral stance in Barton and Levstik's (2004) framework. These were moments like the one she had in the eighth grade when her teacher showed the students a real estate document prohibiting people of color from owning property. She and her classmates were shocked to discover it was not only from their town in northern Michigan, but that it was from the 1960s. This realization made Jessica see something that she took a moral stance on. She wanted to create similar moments for her students. In regards to Westheimer and Kahne (2004), it was important to Jessica that the students knew the government was theirs and that they could participate in it; which most closely aligns with the participatory type of citizenship education. She also wanted to foster greater equality and understanding amongst different groups. This puts

her somewhere between participatory and justice oriented citizenship. We see these expressed desires of Jessica's most clearly in her story about the history teacher who did the lesson on housing segregation in her home community and in her experience with her orientation roommate. Jessica desired to foster a participatory citizenship through her comfortable and free classroom. She struggled to envision a classroom with both caring and respectful expectations and the space for students to fully express themselves.

As discussed in Chapter Three, the participants had experiences that broke open the script of teacher authority in schools. However, these lived experiences stood out because they were an exception to the expected. None of the participants shared stories in which they saw the script changed in a sustained manner. In trying to enact their desires, the participants, Jessica in particular, struggled to envision something different perhaps because they had only had a brief glimpse of an alternative.

David. David, a White male who grew up in a wealthy suburb of Detroit, attended a Catholic school through the eighth grade. There, he internalized a strict hierarchy within the school with strong lines of authority. This hierarchy and the authority that went with it were disrupted in high school when he discovered his study hall teacher leaving to have a cigarette during class on school grounds. David came to understand the human-ness of teachers and those in positions of authority. Later, as a bookstore employee, he was frustrated by the lack of nuanced and informed perspectives in his friends and colleagues as well as the customers. He wanted to teach both in a way that inspired more nuance but also in a way that humanized those in positions of authority. In addition, he had a strong passion for working against racism and other forms of oppression, perhaps from growing up as a working class child in a wealthy community. During his internship year, he struggled both to infuse his class with more nuanced

perspectives and to work against racism. This struggle stemmed from his own limited understanding of working with a diverse group of students. While he had wanted to teach his students to have more diverse and nuanced perspectives of the world, he was instead overwhelmed himself with the many perspectives his students brought to the classroom and in working out how he could best respond in a way that was helpful to them and did not harm them.

In regards to his authority, he enacted it in very interesting ways. He, unlike Jessica, was not hesitant to exercise authority. He relied on the trust and relationships he built with his students to strengthen his authority (Erickson, 1992; McDermott, 1977). Frequently, he would use his authority to prevent his students getting caught up in larger consequences within the structure of school – he would track a student down in the hallway and get him into class before the administration found that student, in which case the student would have experienced more extensive punishment. He also wanted to use his authority in a moral sense when he attempted to get his students to stop using the N-word; however, by his own admission, he was only partially successful in that task. Mostly, David relied on developing a sense of trust with his students that was important to gaining their assent to his guidance (Erickson, 1992). Through building rapport with them, and trust, he developed an authority in his relationship with his students because they trusted him to guide them to good things that would not harm them.

David's desires regarding what his students would walk away from his class with most closely mirrored Barton and Levstik's (2004) analytic stance, particularly in alerting students to the ways in which history can be changed or manipulated for the benefit of those in power. David wanted his students to know that history was not always as it appeared to be or as it is presented in textbooks. As opposed to having a strong moral stance, David simply wanted to disrupt his students' belief in the given story, the given narrative. This was also reflected in his

experiences with his book club friends and bookstore customers and their limited political views. David's personal concern about social equality showed traces of Westheimer and Kahn's (2004) social justice orientation. However, it is not a close match because he did not want to impose this particular concern or perspective on his students. Instead, David was more concerned with living out his passion for justice through his own actions. David's use of authority through building trusting relationships with his students does not show an obvious connection to these goals of citizenship. At the same time, his enactment of authority did not mitigate the type of citizenship he wanted to foster. While he used trust with his students, it was built more through care as opposed to knowledge. That is, David did not try to foster the type of trust in which students would take what he said without question. Instead, he fostered a personal trust through sharing about his own life and showing an interest in the lives of his students.

Alicia. Alicia, who grew up in a small town in rural Michigan felt like her high school social studies teachers provided her with the political education that her parents neglected to provide her with. She later found herself in Seoul with her own three kids, defending United States citizens to a group of British citizens who were having a loud conversations about the incompetence of United States citizens. When Alicia returned to the United States and pursued teaching, she found herself repeatedly relying on her parenting skills and experience in her work with her students. She was flexible with rules and expectations and went to great lengths to help some of her students, particularly Leylo, a Somali refugee. While Alicia worked hard to meet the needs of some of her students, she was also constrained by the limits she perceived in her students. She had wanted to have open and complex discussions with her students that involved current issues of foreign policy as well as domestic politics. However, based on what she

believed her students were capable of, she felt like she could not have some of these more in depth conversations because her students lacked the basic skills necessary.

In regards to authority, Alicia is the most challenging to correlate to the types of authority already outlined. While Pace and Hemmings (2007) described the traditional authority to include the idea that teachers act *en loco parentis* and expected students to obey them just because they are teachers, as parents expect their children to obey them just because they are their parents; Alicia, with her experience as a parent, had no illusions about kids responding based solely on one's position of authority. However, Alicia did rely on using care and trust to build relationships with her students in which they were willing to grant her authority in her relations with them. We saw this most with Steve and Victor. Important in both of these relationships was that there was some give and take. There were days when Alicia would not push these students to get their work done, when she would let Victor spend time on his Kindle or sleep and she would pass Steve paper and scissors for making snowflakes for her, or let him go calm down in the hallway.

Again, Alicia is more challenging to identify neatly with any of citizenship education stances. While in many ways she fit within the personally responsible citizenship of Westheimer and Kahne she was probably somewhere in between Identification and Analytic stance with Barton and Levstik. But again, she is hard to identify. She wanted her students to have a sense of what was happening, what role the United States was playing in the world and the importance of history in understanding the United States today. Her use of affectionate authority most fostered an ethic of care through its example (Noddings, 2005, 2013) as did her attempts to get some students in the school to stop cyber bullying Leylo. This ethic of care applies not only to fostering care amongst the students for other human beings but also care for the subject matter

and for the world around them, which was one of Alicia's goals. She wanted her students to care about the wars the United States was involved in, so they would be able to question or defend those wars as needed. She wanted her students to care about ancient Chinese history, something she had fallen in love with while living overseas. Furthermore, she wanted her students to care about themselves, their moral and academic standing, as well as their futures. Alicia wanted her students to have a chance at success. In practice, it was Alicia's care and aptitude as a parent that allowed her to enact some of these desires. However, the resource challenges at her placement school, and her own deficit perceptions inhibited her from enacting others.

As noted in Chapter Five, the participants all approached their internship year with the above mentioned desires regarding use of authority and citizenship education. However, as they took on greater responsibilities and commitments as a part of their internship year and became more deeply enmeshed in the schools, they all faced challenges that impeded their ability to fulfill these desires. In the following section, I explore the ways in which meritocracy, a dominant Ideology that is at the heart of the American Dream, played a role in creating the participants' ideologies, and both shaping and disrupting their desires as social studies teachers.

Meritocracy: Legitimacy for the American Dream in Schools

Meritocracy is woven through the participant's experiences many times. It disrupts their desires at times and is reflected in their desires at other times. The teacher's role, as a component of the school assessing students to determine who is and is not meritorious, is found in Jessica's story of being tracked in the third grade, in Robert's concerns about the teacher grading the class constitution, in all of the participants' struggles to accommodate for difference, and also in many of the pressures the participants felt in regards to meeting the demands of standardized high stakes tests and preparing students for future schooling. Here, we continue to see the individual

ideologies of the participants in the dialogic relationship with the dominant Ideologies as the participants thoughts and actions are both drawn from the dominant Ideology and at times resist that same Ideology. The Ideology of meritocracy as enacted through school structures and policies inhibited the participants' abilities to author themselves as teachers. In this section, I use literature on the American Dream and the participants' lived experiences to understand the meaning of meritocracy as lived by these teacher candidates. I focus on two aspects of meritocracy, the role of bureaucratic authority and a colorblind racial Ideology. Both of these aspects of meritocracy impacted the participants' desires in regards to their enactment of authority and fostering of citizenship.

In the United States, the American Dream is both a powerful and controversial dominant Ideology. The American Dream incorporates many beliefs: that the United States is the "land of opportunity," that social mobility is attainable, and that anyone can succeed with hard work and perseverance. The American Dream can be defined in terms of material acquisition, career success, assimilation, or education. Meritocracy is, in many ways, at the heart of the American Dream. These beliefs have important consequences for how we understand society in the United States.

In their book, *The Meritocracy Myth* McNamee and Miller (2013) contend that the American Dream serves to justify inequality:

> Together, the tenets of the American Dream comprise an ideology of inequality. Ideologies provide socially acceptable explanations for a kind and extent of inequality within society. Ideologies are ultimately based on persuasion as a form of social power. Persuasion entails not just making claims but getting society's members to go along as well. It is not enough for some simply to have more than others. For a system of

> inequality to be stable over the long run, those who have more must convince those who have less that the distribution of who gets what is fair, just, proper, or the natural order of things. The greater the level of inequality, the more compelling and persuasive these explanations must appear to be. (McNamee & Miller 2013, p. 3)

These dominant Ideologies are incredibly important for understandings of good citizenship. If we look more closely at these tenets of the American Dream, they all have certain implications for citizenship. Essentially, they place the onus for individual success on the individual. Schools, similarly, place the onus for success either on the individual student or on the individual teacher. The broader contexts of student and teacher lives are ignored in the meritocratic systems of schooling. The implicit curriculum of citizenship is that as a citizen, it is most important to find your own individual success and be a productive, self-sustaining and contributing member of society. Those who are unable to accomplish this become a burden on society and are not doing their part as citizens.

The historian James Adams (1941) was the first to popularize the phrase "American Dream" and he described it as "not a dream of motor cars and high wages merely, but a dream of a social order in which each man and each woman shall be able to attain to the fullest stature of which they are innately capable, and be recognized by others for what they are, regardless of the fortuitous circumstances of their birth…" (as quoted in, Hanson & White, 2011, p. 3). This idea of meritocracy is still at the heart of schooling in the United States. Crucial to this idea is that everyone has a chance at success. If one does not succeed, it is the result of his or her lack of ability or willpower. Public education in the United States is a critical component of how the dream works. Schools legitimize the meritocracy that is at the heart of the dream. It is the place where everyone is supposed to get his or her equal opportunity at success. Public education also

appears to serve a purpose of social efficiency (Labaree, 1997), sorting out who is meritorious of being a CEO and who will flip burgers at McDonalds. Here I have briefly connected the dominant Ideologies of the American Dream and meritocracy, adding some insight into the role schools play in legitimizing both. In what follows, I look more closely at how meritocracy is enacted in schools and the ways in which this impacted the participants' ability to practice their desires.

Meritocracy and bureaucratic authority. In order for meritocracy to work, there must be objective measures in place to filter out those who merit success from those who do not. These objective measures are primarily found in standardized testing and the work of teachers assigning grades based on schoolwork, homework, and other assessments. Originally, meritocracy was viewed as progressive in that it allowed individuals to show their capabilities, whereas before, capabilities were assumed based on ethnic group. When the IQ test first entered schools, it was seen as a move towards greater equality because it gave those from marginalized classes and races the opportunity to prove their ability; whereas before it was assumed that children from these groups were innately less than their Western European counterparts (Oakes, 1985). Another aspect of meritocracy, though counterintuitive when combined with the first aspect, is providing extra supports for those with diagnosed disabilities. The diagnosis and identification of these disabilities is presented as an objective process.[6]

Both the development and use of objective measurements and the implementation of extra supports for students in schools are increasingly documented and enforced through the

[6] In my own experience of working in special education I have found many special education diagnoses to be rather subjective. Research on the over-representation of minorities in particular diagnostic categories also suggests a certain amount of subjectivity (Harry & Klingner, 2005; Rebora, 2011). Some diagnoses even have particularly arbitrary definitions (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.).

school's bureaucracy. As discussed in Chapter One, capitalist and industrial models in society have heavily influenced schools. Pace and Hemmings (2007) note the importance of bureaucratic authority,

> Callahan (1962) and Kliebard (1987) documented how the social efficiency movement took firm hold in the 1920s in the wake of principles of scientific management that essentially modeled schools after factories. Teachers then and now are expected to exercise impersonal forms of bureaucratic authority supported by rules, regulations, and assessments based on rational values. . . . Despite reform movements working against the standardization of curricula and assessment and other consequences of bureaucratization during the 1980s and 1990s, 20 years later, standards-based reform has been instituted on a national level. (pp. 12-13)

Bureaucracy adds "objective" measures of student achievement through testing at a variety of levels and frequencies; it is also used to guarantee services for special education students in an attempt to provide equal opportunity. The bureaucracy in itself, like technology, is not inherently good or bad. However, in the stories shared in the previous chapters, this bureaucracy had a large impact on the participants' experiences regarding school, authority, ideology and citizenship.

This bureaucratic authority works in relation to the personal authority already discussed. It is an aspect of how dominant Ideology is enacted in schools. As I will continue to discuss here, it is different from personal authority and yet has great impacts on personal authority. In the stories shared in the previous chapters, we see this bureaucratic authority come into play in many instances. The first was with Jessica, who felt, after being academically tracked into a lower level class in elementary school that there was a "file" on her. Robert experienced the bureaucratic authority of schooling on two occasions that he shared about. The first was when he expressed

concerns about the grading of the activity his eighth grade United States history teacher did with the Constitution. I was struck by Robert's focus on grading in the midst of this interesting learning experience. The second reference to bureaucratic authority came in Robert's experience with Adam's IEP. All of the participants struggled with grades, particularly Alicia and David when they wanted to accommodate students who were faced with overwhelming life challenges and who also attended a severely under-resourced school. Alicia and David struggled with how to apply a meritocratic system of grading onto a clearly unjust situation. Furthermore, for the participants, these concerns seemed to shift the aims of education from preparation for life and citizenship to preparation for completing high school. Though Robert was most explicit about teaching skills for success in school, they all stressed the need to prepare students for the next grade. This concern all centered around students acquiring a credential so they could have future success. This concern about the credential mitigated the participants' ability to enact their desires around fostering citizenship for their students.

This bureaucratic authority of standardization and high stakes testing also reflects a lack of trust in teachers. Changing aspects of teacher professionalization are shifting the authority and control from teachers to outside entities (Noddings, 2013). While the consequences of this shift are not always negative, as teachers and teacher educators we must be vigilant about potentially negative consequences. The increased use of scripted curricula, standards, and high stakes tests limit opportunities for teaching democratic citizenship (Zeichner, 2010). All of the participants spoke about the challenges of "covering" the material and preparing the students for standardized tests. As Deborah Meier (2000) contends, this shifting of authority has far reaching consequences:

> By shifting the locus of authority to outside bodies, it undermines the capacity of schools to instruct by example the qualities of mind that schools in a democracy should foster in kids – responsibility for one's own ideas, tolerance for the ideas of others, and a capacity to negotiate differences. Standardization instead turns teachers and parents into the local instruments of externally imposed expert judgment. (p. 5)

The qualities Meier lists here are just those that Dewey (1916) advocated for as well as ones that some of the participants, particularly Jessica and David, aspired to.

Perhaps more important than the ways in which the high stakes tests and standards restrict the explicit curriculum is the ways in which they impact the implicit curriculum of how knowledge is generated and shared. Because facts are far easier to test than dispositions, and because teachers can more efficiently share information that is static and already fixed, knowledge is presented in classrooms as a given. Crucial to social studies and to the idea of democratic citizenship is the possibility of generating one's own knowledge, of interpreting evidence in multiple ways, of disagreeing and deliberating. A curriculum that is full of facts and figures implies, as many textbooks do, that social studies knowledge is fixed and agreed upon by some group of experts. This expert knowledge gives those in authority added power, individuals are more likely to defer to those who have something that appears fixed and indisputable. David in particular was troubled by this aspect of the implicit curriculum of schools and worked to disrupt it through some of his lesson plans during the methods course at Harper. He did not bring up attempts to do the same during his internship year.

At the end of Chapter Three, I briefly posed several questions in regards to ways in which the government and its institutions identify us both in subjective and bureaucratic ways (which are not mutually exclusive). Indeed, teachers both create bureaucratic documentation as well as

have documentation created about them. They are often unwilling participants in the increasingly bureaucratic nature of schools, both resisting and enforcing bureaucratic authority. Teachers are also caught in a web of hierarchy (Britzman, 1986). As Noddings (2013) argued, the increased emphasis on teacher accountability based on student test scores reflects a hierarchy of who the teachers must answer to. Teacher *responsibility* to their students as opposed to an externally imposed *accountability* is a more powerful approach. When combined with Dewey's (1916) ideas of learning to live and be together, responsibility towards one another seems to be a much better lesson than accountability, which in its current form implies fear and an over emphasis on externally determined aims, standards, and goals. I will discuss this in greater depth in the conclusion.

Through the stories we witnessed the participants caught between responsibility to their students and accountability to the structures of school. Jessica, in her work with Leah; Alicia in her work with Victor, Steve and Leylo; and David in his work with the refugee students, all acted in a way that showed responsibility to their students. This work was also wrapped up in their different desires for enacting authority and citizenship in the classroom. Yet they all discussed the challenges of "covering" material, adhering to a particular curriculum, and preparing their students to complete school in sometimes hostile environments.

Now I turn to another important dominant ideology in the United States, that of racial Ideology. As seen in the stories from the previous three chapters, the participants repeatedly struggled with dominant racial Ideologies in their work as teacher candidates and these Ideologies inhibited their ability to enact their desires regarding authority and citizenship. Again, returning to Dewey's (1916) call for associated living, racial Ideology gets in the way of associated living and the work to find common interests. It creates a hierarchy that makes it

difficult for some to hear the voices of others. In legitimizing meritocracy, there is a dominant Ideology in the United States of colorblindness. The participants all had experiences that involved both their individual ideologies around race and the dominant Ideology around race in the United States.

Meritocracy and race. Race is an important part of the ideological landscape of the United States, particularly in regards to meritocracy. Race and multiculturalism are also an important part of democratic citizenship. Racial and ethnic groups are examples of the many groups Dewey argued need to be able to maintain their identity. These groups, and individuals from these groups must also be able to work together in a way in which every voice is heard and experiences and concerns are treated equitably (Dewey, 1916). For many students, school is the first place they have the opportunity to engage in conversations with people of a different race or ethnicity. School is their first opportunity to practice this aspect of citizenship. Therefore, in teaching citizenship, it is important that schools are anti-racist and foster multiculturalism (Parker, 2003).

It is important, in regards to maintaining the façade of meritocracy that schools appear to be fair and equitable places that are free of discrimination. McNamee and Miller (2013) described here how discrimination both contradicts the American Dream of meritocracy but also bolsters its power for those who are not discriminated against:

> According to the ideal of the American Dream, America is a land in which merit is the sole basis of vast and almost limitless opportunity. Discrimination, however, invalidates the American Dream. Discrimination not only interferes with merit, it is the antithesis of merit. Discrimination allows some, who are not necessarily meritorious, to get ahead of others. In this way, discrimination creates a terrible irony – the very discrimination that

> invalidates the American Dream for many Americans creates conditions that appear to validate it for others and enables them to embrace it so fervently. Excluding entire segments of the American population from equal access to opportunity, discrimination reduces competition and increases the chances of members of some groups getting ahead on what they often presume to be exclusively their own merit. (p 155)

To maintain the façade of meritocracy, many schools and teachers take a colorblind approach to issues of race and ethnicity (Bonilla-Silva, 2009). This not only denies the important experiences of marginalized groups but also leaves both teachers and students without an understanding or language with which to talk about race, ethnicity and discrimination (Wise, 2010). Furthermore, it ignores an important "education debt" that has built up over time (Ladson-Billings, 2006).

At the heart of meritocracy is the belief that everyone essentially ends out where they deserve to be based on their effort, or where they are able to be based on their intelligence, character and perseverance. In the quote above from James Adams (1941) states, "a social order in which each man and each woman shall be able to attain to the fullest stature of which they are innately capable" (as quoted in, Hanson & White, 2011, p. 3). The use of the word innately implies that those who do not succeed are somehow less on a biological level. Meritocracy does not account for history, for discrimination, or for a host of other challenges people from particular groups may face. In this way the Ideology of meritocracy supports and racist Ideology, blaming those from marginalized racial groups for not being as successful as those from dominant groups.

In order for schools to maintain the Ideology of meritocracy, they must take a colorblind approach both in the bureaucratic authority and also in the curriculum. Discussions of racism and discrimination, particularly contemporary racism, are often absent from the classroom,

particularly in schools where White students make up the majority. This aspect of race and meritocracy was perhaps most problematic for the participants in this study both in their experiences as students and in their experiences as teachers. In majority white contexts where the participants attended school, explicit conversations about race were rare and whiteness was normalized. School structures connected to meritocracy further normalized whiteness. This overwhelming whiteness was challenging for the participants to see or work past, and played a powerful role in shaping both their teaching and their individual ideologies as teachers.

Three of the four participants shared stories involving students or peers of a different race or ethnicity. Two of the participants highlighted this in their sense making of what was happening in these relationships. The absence of explicit talk about race and ethnicity, however, is also important in understanding sense making. Robert, for example, never explicitly mentioned race in his stories. Both his time at Harper Middle School and his internship in Clarkston were in majority White communities. Robert is White himself and grew up in a majority White rural town. Indeed, the one time Robert did mention race was in response to a question about diversity in his K-12 schooling experience when he stated that "there was one African American student and he went to our school for a total of two weeks during the four years of high school. Yeah, that's my school makeup basically." As many critical race theorists and critical whiteness scholars note, it is not unusual for White people to have difficulty seeing their own race, although that does not make it unproblematic (Haviland, 2008; Lewis, 2004). This silence is as important as the stories shared by the others.

I will briefly share and review the stories in which the participants did explicitly mention race or ethnicity and then discuss both these stories and the silences about race in light of dominant ideologies of race in the United States. David talked about race the most in our

conversations throughout the two years of the study. In our first conversation, he talked about an African American second grade boy with a learning disability he worked with in one of his first placements and how this gave David an overwhelming sense of his own privilege and also a realization of how easy it is to do harm in an education setting when operating on assumptions of meritocracy. David noted that for this student, no matter how hard he tried he would always be behind in the school context, so all the messages about effort leading to success could be very frustrating and harmful for this student.

David and Jessica also engaged some of the eighth grade students at Harper middle school in a conversation about race when they decided to "talk like black people" for a skit about the Civil War. That evening David wrote in his class journal about how he was confused about how to have conversations about race with students and realized that he still needed to have several conversations with himself on the subject.

Finally, as detailed in Chapter Five, David struggled with the many races and ethnicities represented in his field placement class at Roosevelt and how to not only not do harm himself but mitigate the harm the students were doing to each other. As a part of this struggle he explicitly mentioned his own race saying that it was challenging to walk in as a White person every day. This all reveals the ways in which David's individual ideology about race was both influenced by but also different from dominant racial Ideology in the United States.

In Chapter Four, Jessica shared a story about her eighth grade social studies teacher making her and her class aware of the housing segregation that took place in their own small northern town which started to shift her understanding of her own race and racism in general. This shift continued when she was confronted with the life of her college orientation roommate,

an African American woman from Detroit. Jessica learned more about race and ethnicity in the United States through both her coursework and friendship in college.

Both of Alicia's stories in which she specifically mentioned race and ethnicity took place during her internship year at Roosevelt. Alicia identified Steve, one of the students with special needs who she developed a plan with, as being African American. She also noted that Leylo was a refugee from East Africa. While she acknowledged these identities she did not use race or ethnicity beyond these identifiers. She did not use it as a way to make sense of her experience interacting with these students. Nor did she at any point talk about herself as being White. Furthermore, in her explanation of why she had not pursued more complex conversations regarding current events we must assume she was talking about a racially, ethnically and socio-economically diverse group of students because of the school she was placed in. This is important because even though it has been determined that race does not exist on a scientific level, it does exist on an ideological level (Leonardo, 2009). It is crucial in this context for Alicia to keep in consideration the historical and social context of her students and the impact of that historical context on their education (Ladson-Billings, 2006).

Both David and Jessica talked about the challenges of understanding the experiences of people of color and also of racism. They recognized that their own childhoods were saturated with whiteness (though neither of them used the word "whiteness"). They used this experience to understand how the White students at Harper understood race, but also both recognized the limitations this experience created for them personally.

One of the greatest challenges that David faced in having open conversations about race with students, Jessica faced in creating her "ah ha" moments and Alicia, to a certain extent, faced in having more complex conversations with her students is that there is no room in the

meritocratic formula for these conversations. There is not a standardized test for anti-racism. There is not a bureaucratic marker for how well a student is able to discuss issues with someone different from herself. The shift toward external bureaucratic authority, as noted in the Deborah Meier quote in the previous section, imposed aims that did not match the participants' desires in regards to this aspect of citizenship education.

Meritocracy, legitimized both through bureaucratic authority and through a colorblind Ideology, inhibited the ability of the participants to live out their desires in regards to both authority and citizenship education. The colorblind Ideology that the participants grew up with mitigated their understanding of various aspects of racism and understanding the experiences of students who are not White. This impacted their ability to act with care, to act justly, and to be responsive to their students' many needs. Furthermore, the fact that in regards to assessment school structures require a colorblind approach, meant that the participants could not accommodate for differences in their students' experiences whether that be as Jessica desired to assess learning and participation in many different ways or as Alicia and David wanted to take students lives into account when grading. Finally, the standardization of the curriculum limited the space for engaging in conversations with students that would create Jessica's "ah-ha" moments, that would bring David's more nuanced understandings of the world important to understanding multiculturalism, and that would look at Alicia's contemporary events involving those of various ethnicities, nationalities, and races.

Conclusion

Teacher education has perennially struggled with preparing teacher candidates for working in truly diverse classrooms (Haviland, 2008; Picower, 2009; Sleeter, 2001). One of the many challenges is that these issues are very complex. As Leonardo (2009) argued, proving that

race does not exist scientifically will not be enough because it does exist ideologically. Therefore we must address race through ideology. The challenge is extended in that, as David and Alicia experienced, the diversity is not merely a matter of race, which is complicated enough, but also differences of nationality, language, ability and ethnicity. In the concluding chapter, I discuss ways in which this can be an opportunity and asset, but fundamental shifts in most teacher candidates' ideologies are needed as well as in the ideology of schooling. These differences need to be understood not as a deficit, or a challenge, but as an opportunity.

While these issues are incredibly complex, this is not an excuse to not attempt to improve both teacher education and schools. In the stories shared in Chapters Three, Four, and Five, there is a note of hope. Both Jessica and David took action to confront their racist ideologies. Jessica made a point of changing her friendship group following her first year of college and also took classes to help broaden her own understanding and experience. David was taking strides to better understand his whiteness and also the experiences of his students from different race and ethnic backgrounds. Though he struggled to address issues of racism through his few attempts, primarily his attempt to get students to stop using the N-word, he was aware of them and desired to make a change.

In this chapter, I have attempted to both draw the themes of meritocracy, bureaucratic authority and race together and pull out a few strands from the tapestry of ideology in the United States, working within the space between the individual and the group, the particular and the essential. As noted previously, our ideologies can be challenging to see and identify. The stories reviewed here used the lens of authority to look at ways in which lived experiences in schools can shape, fashion and reflect ideologies about citizenship and government. Lived experiences outside of school then demonstrated the way other layers are added to our sense of citizenship

and our desires for the nation and for other citizens. Finally, we looked at the ways these desires are translated into teaching, especially through the pedagogical relationship that we began with. The cycle becomes complete when students return to classrooms as teachers, carrying echoes of the pedagogical relationships they had with their teachers as students, in the pedagogical relationships they form as teachers with their students. In this chapter, I not only explored the various desires the participants developed in regards to their teaching, I also looked at the way in which meritocracy both shaped and interrupted those desires.

This dissertation has focused closely on the role of the teacher in perpetuating and changing dominant Ideologies in schools through authority. Through the bureaucratic authority discussed in this chapter, outside entities are increasingly intervening in the aims of education and teaching. Currently, these entities are not particularly democratic in nature and many are deeply involved in the privatization and marketing of education. In the concluding chapter, I will pull back the lens and look more broadly at issues of citizenship education and teacher education in light of what has been learned here, and also imagine more democratic means of creating educational aims in regards to citizenship.

CONCLUSION

> *The end of human science research for educators is a critical pedagogical competence: knowing how to act tactfully in pedagogic situations on the basis of a carefully edified thoughtfulness. To that end hermeneutic phenomenological research reintegrates part and whole, the contingent and the essential, value and desire. It encourages a certain attentive awareness to the details and seemingly trivial dimensions of our everyday educational lives. It makes us thoughtfully aware of the consequential in the inconsequential, the significant in the taken-for-granted. (Van Manen, 1990, p. 8)*

Most concluding chapters in educational research focus on the practical applications of the research findings, the ways in which teacher education, or K-12 education can be improved based on what the author brought to light. However, phenomenological researchers resist this sort of "usefulness", the temptation to make recommendations, programmatic changes or new curricula. In response to the questions "what can you do with phenomenological knowledge?" Van Manen (1990) paraphrases Heidegger, "the more important question is not: Can we do something with phenomenology? Rather, we should wonder: Can phenomenology, if we concern ourselves deeply with it, do something with us?" (p. 45).

The goal of phenomenological research is to guide us in acting with more tact in our pedagogical relations, not because of a prescribed method of interaction, but because our understanding of lived experience is both broader and deeper. Maybe something in a story, or the analysis of the story, causes us to give a gentle nod as we recognize a feeling or idea that resonates with us and enlightens our own understanding of others and ourselves. Perhaps in a future interaction with a student we will more thoughtfully consider the ways our words and actions contribute to the pedagogical relationship. Maybe in our reading, writing and conversation with others we will seriously engage in the ideas of implicit curriculum for citizenship. Or maybe we will come to a greater understanding of who we are today in relation to a past experience. This is all-important learning that can have an important impact on how we act

and interact in the world. However, as said before, there are no concrete answers, instead, I hope, the reader has come to deeper understanding and empathy.

In this concluding chapter I provide a brief summary of the dissertation's findings. From here I suggest a few ideas for teacher education, not from the findings themselves but from the process of the research. I then move into a broader conversation of citizenship education in the 21st century. This discussion continues to be based in the writings of Dewey and other scholars who continue in Dewey's philosophy.

Summary

I opened this dissertation with the story of my mother and I at a protest march in Washington, DC, wondering about the different trajectories of our lives and the ways we enact our citizenship. As I write the conclusion, Mother's Day is fast approaching and for the first time both my mother and I will be celebrating it as mothers. I have a beautiful four-month-old son who is already so curious about the world. As I look at my mother's past, I wonder about his future, what life experiences he will have, what sort of a citizen he will grow to be.

In Chapter One, I drew connections between ideology, authority and citizenship, placing them all in the school context. I traced the ways in which authority in schools has been theorized in order to foster good citizenship. I outlined my understanding of ideology and how it became the conduit, for connecting our experiences to our ways of thinking about the world and how it connects back into our every day actions in classrooms. I also looked briefly at the dialogic relationship between individual ideologies and dominant Ideology.

From this framework, I opened Chapter Two with a discussion of phenomenology, highlighting the ways in which its close focus on lived experience and its potential use in studying the pedagogical relationship are powerful in working to understand the complex

ideologies that shape people's lives. I then told the story of this research project through the context, the documents I used, interviews I conducted, and the participants who are at the heart of the research. I ended this section with a brief description on how I have lived the questions of becoming a citizen in the world today.

In Chapter Three, I looked at the participants' experiences of authority in pedagogical relationships in order to gain insight on what their ideological understandings of authority were. For the participants, those in authority had particular characteristics, even if they were maintained in a façade. Those characteristics included: the right and the ability to assess, label and track, the expectations of moral superiority and the right and duty to control those over whom you have authority. These aspects of authority are all powerful in the ways in which they function in schools. Those who are in places of professional authority function as a part of the bureaucratic authority, a topic I explored in more depth in Chapter Six. Teachers are pressured to maintain a façade of moral superiority as well as superior ability in order to give them the legitimacy to tell students how to live their lives in a moral sense and to serve the role of being good examples. Finally, teachers are expected to maintain control of the classroom at all times, controlling both behavior and knowledge. The participants not only experienced these dominant ideas of authority, but also experienced moments when these aspects of authority were contradicted. This gave the participants desires in how they may enact authority differently in their own teaching.

In Chapter Four, I explored experiences that gave the participants a sense of troubled belonging and started to identify ways in which they desired to teach citizenship that reflected the things they were troubled about in regards to their peers. Each of their experiences reflected communities that they felt they were a part of, whether that community be the nation, or one's

hometown, or a reading group. They all shared stories in which their understanding of that community was thrown into question, where they were in some way disappointed with the community. This gave them a sense of being troubled by their belonging to that community and for some an explicit desire to "fix" that community. For others the desire was more implicit. For Alicia and David in particular, they saw aspects of their social studies teaching as a part of taking responsibility for the group and improving it.

In Chapter Five, I looked at the ways the participants enacted their citizenship through their teaching, which both did and did not echo their intended ideals of citizenship education. In this chapter, the ideologies of the participants, which were reflected in their teaching desires, are placed more fully in the context of K-12 schools. Their stories all include experiences in which those attempts were frustrated, changed, or successful although in limited ways. The stories in this chapter all included aspects of the pedagogical relationship. Only this time the participants were teachers instead of students. Here, the participants had varying levels of success in implementing their teaching desires.

In Chapter Six, I looked across the stories, identifying types of authority and citizenship education each participant aspired to and then looking over all at the experience of becoming a social studies teacher. I then placed this experience in the context of the dominant Ideology of meritocracy as enacted in schools. Within meritocracy I focus more specifically on bureaucratic authority and racial Ideology. The participants found their desires largely mitigated by meritocracy in schools and we were able to see the ways their individual ideologies existed in relationship to dominant Ideologies through their attempts to fulfill their teaching desires.

Ideas for Teacher Education

While the findings in this study are helpful in the ways described above, important lessons were also learned in the process of the research, particularly in regards to pedagogical moves that could be made both in a teacher education context and in work with practicing teachers. One is the process of asking teachers or teacher candidates to identify their primary purposes for teaching social studies and then asking them to show ways in which those purposes are present in their classrooms both through their explicit curricular content and in the implicit curriculum of how their classroom is organized. This would first involve clear discussions of democratic citizenship that go beyond the narrower rights and duties approach that focuses on the functioning of government and law and considers other possibilities including areas of civic engagement outside of government structures, aspects of care and justice in citizenship, and taking up a more critical perspective. These fundamental conversations are often lost, at least in my own experience, in the rush to teach unit and lesson planning, methods of instruction for the different subject areas, and classroom management. While these other topics are all of great importance, it is crucial that they be embedded in the broader and deeper understandings of citizenship education. Further research is needed in this area, particularly with practicing teachers in an era of increased accountability. During the teacher education process, teacher candidates are repeatedly asked to provide rationales for their lessons and actions in the classroom. However, practicing teachers are not always asked to do this beyond citing a state standard or district "I can" statement. To work through these purposes I propose a similar process to the one used in this research.

It is important to work on defining these desires with others. It is so challenging to know the self, to understand one's own experience and make sense of it. Through sharing stories with

each other and analyzing experiences, we can develop a clearer picture of who we are and what we are about. It was not until working on this research that I realized the contradictions and challenges in my own experience of wanting to provide an emancipatory education for my students but also having my own experience of education being one of pleasing others to the extent that it was hard to define my own thoughts, desires, or needs.

For the third round of interviews, I took all the data that I had for each participant and attempted to sketch out an idea for why it was they wanted to teach social studies. I then shared this idea with them at the beginning of the interview and asked them to clarify it. Perhaps having teacher candidates work in pairs or groups to complete a similar process through sharing stories and working to identify each other's purposes for teaching social studies would be useful. An extension of this activity, which I also did as a part of the interview process is to then look at some of the lesson plans or other teaching artifacts developed by the teacher or teacher candidate and ask them to identify their broader purposes for teaching social studies in those documents.

Education and Change

One of the many questions I have pondered throughout this research project is the way in which teachers, as subjects in an ideological state apparatus, reproduce the dominant Ideology and the status quo, and to what extent there is possibility for change. The participants in this project, as noted in the previous chapters, all supported and resisted dominant Ideologies, or at the very least aspired to do as such amidst the shifting learning and teaching contexts they negotiated. However, many people have researched and written about the socialization that takes place with new teachers during the induction phase (Britzman, 1986; Kardos, Johnson, Peske, Kauffman, & Liu, 2001; Lortie, 2002). In some cases, the socialization can be very strong. Britzman (2003) contends that it is not a process that happens in one direction, that is to say it is

not that the school and school culture are alone in having an impact on the novice teacher. The novice teacher can have an impact on the school as well.

In regards to changing the entire school structure, there are challenges and opportunities as well. Noddings (2013) contended that though

> Social reproduction theorists and critical theorists are right to point out that the prevailing culture controls the schools and has the power to use them for its own reproduction, this does not mean…that we can do nothing to effect changes in schooling that should lead to a more democratic, sustainable and socially just society" (p. ix).

I agree that there are many areas where changes can be made but that creativity and persistence are required. For example, many, including Dewey, have argued that a more integrated form of schooling, as opposed to learning divided into disciplines, would allow for better education for citizenship (Dewey, 1938; Noddings, 2005). However, there is the overwhelming power of the grammar of schooling (Tyack & Tobin, 1994). To work around this, Noddings (2013) suggested changes to the formal curriculum within the bounds of the disciplines. She suggested ways of teaching science that include care for the earth, ways of teaching history that would incorporate education about parenting through studying the idea of childhood, and infusing all subject areas with more deliberation. For the most part I agree with her recommendations; however, I propose that democratic education and citizenship be taught through the implicit curriculum, through how classrooms are structured and organized, through how schools are structured and organized and through pedagogical relationships as well. This provides more opportunities for students to practice citizenship instead of merely learning about citizenship (Kerr, 2002; Parker, 2003).

Aims in Citizenship Education

This dissertation has focused closely on the experience of the individual teacher candidate and they ways in which the candidate's teaching desires are mitigated by the ways in which dominant Ideologies are practiced in schools. As long as individual teachers are attempting to enact their desires in isolation, they will continue to meet with serious limitations. However, a process in which teachers and community members come together to determine aims that will be shared by an entire school would not only provide for more democratic aims, but also aims that are supported by the entire institution, not a lone teacher.

Dewey (1916) spent considerable time in *Democracy and Education* discussing aims and how they should be developed. He insisted that educational aims always be based in the context of those who are learning, in their temporal and social context but also in the progression of their learning. The means for achieving those aims should never become an end in themselves. Education must always lead to further growth and learning and when the means become the ends this creates a disjointed learning experience. This is one of the challenges presented by the high stakes testing of standards in the current context. For many, the standards have become confused with the aims of education. This makes the standards akin to externally imposed aims that Dewey (1916) discussed here:

> The vice of externally imposed ends has deep roots. Teachers receive them from superior authorities; these authorities accept them from what is current in the community. The teachers impose them upon children. As a first consequence, the intelligence of the teacher is not free; it is confined to receiving the aims laid down from above. Too rarely is the individual teacher so free from the dictation of authoritative supervisor, textbook on methods, prescribed course of study, etc., that he can let his mind come to close quarters

> with the pupil's mind and the subject matter. This distrust of the teacher's experience is then reflected in lack of confidence in the responses of pupils. The latter receive their aims through a double or treble external imposition, and are constantly confused by the conflict between the aims which are natural to their own experience at the time and those in which they are taught to acquiesce. Until the democratic criterion of the intrinsic significance of every growing experience is recognized, we shall be intellectually confused by the demand for adaptation to external aims. (p. 127)

There is much in the above quote related to the findings here. The alienation of bureaucracy, the lack of trust in teachers, and throughout it all are questions of authority, citizenship and democracy. Who has the authority to determine the aims of education? How could democracy be practiced in the development of these aims? What is the implicit curriculum of externally imposed aims? How do these aims foster or curtail citizenship?

In light of the fact that we live in a world of standards and high stakes testing, we need to work through teacher education and work with in-service teachers to do three things:

1. Separate standards from aims: Too often, standards, or "what is going to be on the test" become the aims of classroom education. In different districts these standards can take the form of objectives that must be noted on the board, "I Can" statements, the content on common assessments, or even a pacing guide that tells you how many chapters must be "covered" in a certain time period. Instead, standards should be seen as a guide or a springboard, not as an end point. The participants all struggled during their internship year to focus on their desires regarding citizenship education because their focus shifted to meeting the next standard and having their students prepared for the next test. Aims need to be developed in a democratic context as described in the next point.

2. Regular deliberation between teachers, parents, and community members needs to take place on the aims of education for a particular school or district. As times change so must aims to meet the different needs of the different times. Parker (2008) rightly argued that decisions around aims should be made through deliberation of all the stakeholders. I would add, that as Dewey advocated, the learners and their experiences need to be taken into account as well in order to form continuity of experience (1916, 1938). Aims must also be flexible and malleable, providing a general direction but not a destination. In this way teachers are not alone in either formulating aims or trying to teach towards those aims. Students are also provided with a lesson on democracy and the opportunity to practice democracy.
3. Within the current context of schools, consideration must be given to working towards aims through both extra-curricular activities and the implicit curriculum. In teacher preparation courses in addition to the methods of instruction, time should be spent, as I suggested earlier, discussing life with children, pedagogical relationships, the structure of classrooms and the implicit curriculum of how knowledge is addressed in the classroom. This must go beyond the traditional classroom management discussion and look closely at the lifeworld of children (Van Manen, 1990). These discussions should always be embedded in the broader aims of citizenship education.

Global Citizenship

One aim of citizenship education is that of global living. The call for associated living on a global scale is now more necessary than ever. While many schools are attending to global education for the purposes of creating more competitive employees for the global marketplace through increased cultural sensitivity and awareness, we also need to prepare global citizens who

can come together to work out issues that affect the entire globe such as climate change, international trade, resource distribution and population control among other issues. With continued conflict and animosity throughout the world we need Dewey's (1916) words more than ever, "It is not enough to teach the horrors of war and to avoid everything which would stimulate international jealousy and animosity. The emphasis must be put upon whatever binds people together in cooperative human pursuits and results, apart from geographical limitations" (p. 114). In an increasingly interconnected world we can no longer insist that the problems of another nation-state are theirs to deal with alone. However, we also cannot insist that all the world's problems be addressed in whatever way those with the most resources think is best. We must find ways to communicate with each other, deliberate, both maintaining group and cultural differences and finding common interests at the same time. These are heady aims, however, ones that we can begin to address in the classroom.

One place to start is in classrooms that are increasingly diverse. Unfortunately, David and Alicia primarily focused on the ways in which their truly diverse classrooms made teaching more difficult. I contend this was due both to their own ways of looking at and understanding the classroom but also due to the lack of resources and supports and the external imposition of aims through standardization and high stakes testing. These classrooms could instead be sites of practicing global citizenship, where students would learn about each other, and how to communicate and work with each other in a way that respects difference but also finds commonality. I agree with Banks (2004) that a certain amount of identity development is needed to foster such exchange. An important part of this is to return to Van Manen's (1990) call that we work on understanding the lifeworlds of our students to allow us to engage in an action sensitive pedagogy.

Future Research

An interesting area of future research would be to study the ways in which social studies teachers' purposes and rationales are enacted as they begin and continue their teaching career. Anecdotally, in a masters course I taught with practicing teachers it was clear that many of them had all but forgotten why they taught social studies. Revisiting their social studies teaching stances made them aware of this. As noted here, the participants were all faced with challenges during their internship years that limited their ability to carry out their desires for citizenship education. Some of these challenges were the result of being in someone else's classroom; others were typical of beginning teachers. However, as I argued, some were a result of the bureaucracy of schooling, the high stakes testing, and standardization of the curriculum. More research on how both new and veteran teachers are navigating these many demands and how these demands are impacting education for citizenship in their classrooms is important.

Another area of research is continued study into how the implicit curriculum of classrooms and schools prepare students for citizenship. While much research cited in this dissertation has explored how the implicit curriculum prepares students for the workplace or for taking up a particular place in society (Anyon, 1981; Apple & King, 1979; Eisner, 1979; Illich, 1973), more needs to be done on citizenship education. Furthermore, research that explores possibilities for improving the way the implicit curriculum can be used in fostering citizenship at all grade levels is needed.

The challenge of ideology is its power to justify the world as it is and keep us from dreaming about the world as it could be. However, the participants in this piece, as well as many of the theorists I have cited, have proven that we can see something beyond the status quo. While the mechanisms in place to maintain the dominant Ideologies are powerful, so are the efforts of

those who are working for a different way of understanding the world. Hopefully, we can foster education for citizenship that provides students with many ways of working with each other to navigate the challenges of their communities, their states, their nations and their world. Maybe for some it will be protesting a law that they believe is unjust, for others working to connect communities and the police to the benefit of both groups, for others tackling the challenges of global energy, and another group may work on more fairly distributing resources in hopes of ending many of the bitter conflicts that persist in the world. For education to take a stronger role, diverse classrooms must be seen as opportunities, not challenges, citizenship education must be valued as much as education for college and career readiness, and we must all think more intently about the way we live our lives together both in and out of schools.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Althusser, L. (1972). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses: Notes towards and investigation. In *Lenin and philosophy, and other essays* (pp. 85-126). New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.

Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 11(1), 3-42.

Apple, M., & King, N. (1979). Economics and control in every day school life. In *Ideology and curriculum*. (3rd ed,. pp. 43-60). New York, NY: Routledge.

Applebaum, B. (2009). Is teaching for social justice a "liberal bias"? Teacher's College Record, 111(2), 376-408.

Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. (1985). Reproduction and resistance in radical theories of schooling. In *Education under siege: The conservative, liberal, and radical debate over schooling* (pp. 69-114). Boston, MA: Bergen & Garvey.

Ayers, W., & Ayers, R. (2011). Living in the gutter: Conflict and contradiction in the neoliberal classroom. *Berkley Review of Education*, 2(1), 95-108.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *Dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bamberg, M. (2012). Why narrative? *Narrative Inquiry*, 22(1), 202-310.

Banks, J. (2004). Teaching for social justice, diversity and citizneship in a global world. *The Educational Forum*, 68(4), 296-305. doi:10.1080/00131720408984645

Barr, R., Barth, J., & Shermis, S. (1978). *The nature of the Social Studies*. Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications.

Barrett, S., Solomon, R., Singer, J., Portelli, J., & Mujuwamariya, D. (2009). The hidden curriculum of a teacher induction program: Ontario teacher educators' perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 32(4), 677-703.

Barton, K., & Levstik, L. (2004). *Teaching history for the common good*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bigelow, B., & Peterson, B. (Eds.). (1997). *Rethinking globalization: Teaching for justice in an unjust world*. Milwakee, WI: Rethinking Schools.

Bingham, C. (2008). *Authority is relational: Rethinking educational empowerment.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2009). The central frames of color-blind racism. In *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America* (3rd ed., pp. 25–52). Summit, PA: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). Education, inequality, and the meritocracy. In *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradicitons of economic life* (pp. 102-124). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Britzman, D. (1986). Cultural myths in the making of a teacher: Biorgaphy and social structure in teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(4), 442-457.

Brtizman, D. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.

Britzman, D. (2007). Teacher education as uneven development: Toward a psychology of uncertainty. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 10(1), 1-12. doi: 10.1080/13603120600934079

Bruner, J. (1991). The narrative construction of reality. *Critical Inquiry*, 18(1), 1-21.

Clandinin, D. (1985). Personal practical knowledge: A study of teachers' classroom images. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 15(4), 361-385.

Clandidnin, D. & Connelly, F. (1988). Narrative: Your personal curriculum as a metaphor for curriculum and teaching. In *Teachers as curriculum planners* (p. 248). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Counts, G. (1932). *Dare the school build a new social order*. New York, NY: John Day.

Cusick, P. (1983). *The egalitarian ideal and the American high school: Studies of three schools*. New York, NY: Longman.

Decuir, J. T., & Dixson, A. D. (2004). "So when it comes out, they aren't that surprised that it is there": Using Critical Race Theory as a tool for analysis of race and racism in education. *Educational Researcher*, *33*(5), 26–31.

Demerath, P. (2009). *Producing success: The culture of personal advancement in an American high school*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.

Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience.* New York, NY: Perigee.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.

Duncan, A. (2014). Seize the day: Change in the classroom and the core of schooling. U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/new/speeches/seize-day-change-classroom-and-core-schooling

Duncan, G. A. (2002). Beyond love: A critical race ethnography of the schooling of adolescent Black males. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, *35*(2), 131–143. doi:10.1080/10665680290175158

Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An introduction.* New York, NY: Verso.

Eisner, E. (1979). The three curricula that all schools teach. In *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs* (pp. 74-920). New York, NY: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Erickson, F. (1992). Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18(4), 335-356.

Evans, R. W. (2004). *The social studies wars: What should we teach the children?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1013-1055. doi: 10.1111/0161-4681.00141

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2012). *Teachers as learners*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Ferguson, A. A. (2000). *Bad boys: Public schools in the making of Black masculinity (law, meaning, and violence).* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Fordham, S. (1996). *Blacked out: Dilemmas of race, identity, and success at Capital High*. Chicago, IL: University Of Chicago Press.

Freire, P. (2007). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Gaudelli, W. (2010). Developing a pedagogic creed through critical social reflection. In E. Heilman, R.F. Amthor, & M. T. Missias (Eds.), *Social Studies and diversity education: What we do and why we do it* (pp. 15-18). New York, NY: Routledge.

Giroux, H. (2009). *Youth in a suspect society: Democracy or disposability?* New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Greenwalt, K. A. (2014). Frustrated returns: Biography, parental figures, and the apprenticeship of observation. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 44(3), 306-331. doi:10.1111/curi.12048

Greenwalt, K. A., & Holohan, K. J. (2011). Performing the nation: Pedagogical embodiment as civic text. *Phenomenology and Practice*, 5(1). 59-83.

Hanson, S., & White, J. (2011). The making and persistence of the American dream. In S. Hanson & J. White (Eds.), *The American dream in the 21st century* (pp. 1-16). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Harry, B., & Klingner, J. (2005). *Why are so many minority students in Special Education? Understanding race and disability in school*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Haviland, V. S. (2008). "Things get glossed over": Rearticulating the silencing power of whiteness in education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(1), 40-54. doi: 10.1177/0022487107310751

Heidegger, M. (1927/1962/2006). *Being and time* (pp. 91-107; J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing. Ltd

Heitin, L. (2015). Proposal to ban Advanced Placement U.S. History moves ahead in Oklahoma. *Education Week*. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/curriculum/2015/02/oklahoma_bill_to_ban_advanced_.html?qs=Colorado+APUSH

Hess, R. D., & Torney-Purta, J. V. (1967). *The development of political attitudes in children.* Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company

Hoschschild, J., & Scovronick, N. (2003). *The American dream and the public schools*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Hogan, D. (1990). Modes of discipline: Affective individualism and pedagogical reform in New England, 1820 - 1950. *American Jounral of Education*, 99(1), 1-56.

Illich, I. (1973). Deschooling society. Harrow Books. Retrieved from http://www.docstoc.com/docs/30207015/Deschooling-Society

Jackson, P. W. (1990). *Life in classrooms*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Jackson, P. W. (1992). Conceptions of curriculum and curriculum specialists. In *Handbook for research on curriculum* (pp. 3-40). New York, NY: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Kardos, S. M., Johnson, S. S., Pseke, H. G., Kauffman, D., & Liu, E. (2001). Counting on colleagues: New teachers encounter the professional cultures of their schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 37(2), 250 - 290. doi: 10.1177/00131610121969316

Kerr, D. (2002). Citizenship education: An international comparison across sixteen countries. *International Journal of Social Education*, 17(1), 1-16.

Labaree, D. F. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34(1), 39-81.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher*, 35(7), 3-12. doi: 10.3102/0013189X035007003

Leonardo, Z. (2003). Discourse and critique: Outlines of a post-structural theory of ideology. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2), 203-214. doi: 10.1080/0268093022000043038

Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, whiteness, and education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Levine, D. (2008). The birth of citizenship schools: Entwining the struggles for literacy and freedom. In *Teach freedom: Education for liberation in the African-American tradition* (pp. 25-41). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Lewis, A. E. (2004). "What group?" Studying Whites and whiteness in the era of "color-blindness." *Sociological Theory*, 22(4), 623-646.

Loewen, J. (2011). Dreaming in Black and White. In S. Hanson & J. White (Eds.), *The American Dream in the 21st century*. Pittsburgh, PA: Temple University Press.

Lortie, D. C. (2002). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Mann, H. (1844). Mr. Mann's seventh annual report: Education in Europe. *The Common School Journal*, 6, 200. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books/about/Mr_Mann_s_Seventh_Annual_Report.html?id=jWIKAAAAMAAJ&pgis=1

Mann, H. (1868a). *Annual reports on education*. (M. Mann, Ed.). Boston, MA: Horace B. Fuller.

Mann, H. (1868b). Life and works of Horace Mann. (M. Mann, Ed.). Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?id=X5gBAAAAQAAJ&pgis=1

Mann, H. (1872). Lectures and annual reports on education (Vol. 84). Lee and Shepard. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?id=vU84AAAAYAAJ&pgis=1

Mann, H. (1957). *Republic and the school: Horace Mann on the education of free man*. (L. A. Cremin, Ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Mannheim, K. (1936). *Ideology and utopia*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & World.

McCarthy, E. D. (1994). The uncertain future of ideology: Rereading Marx. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 35(3), 415-429.

McDermott, R. P. (1977). Social relation as contexts for learning. *Harvard Education Review*, 47(2), 198-213.

McNamee, S. J., & Miller, R. K. (2013). *The meritocracy myth* (3rd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

McNeil, L. M. (1986). *Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Montgomery-Fate, T. (1997). *Beyond the white noise: Mission in a multicultural world*. St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press.

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, Blue Ribbon Panel. (2010). Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice: A National Strategy to Prepare Effective Teachers. Retrieved from http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=zzeiB1OoqPk%3d&tabid=715

Noddings, N. (2005). The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (2013). *Education and democracy in the 21st century*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality.* Birmingham, NY: Vail-Ballou Press.

Pace, J. L., & Hemmings, A. (2007). Understanding authority in classrooms: A review of theory, ideology, and research. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 4-27. doi: 10.3102/003465430298489

Parker, W. (Ed.). (2002). *Education for democracy: Contexts, curricula, assessments.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishers.

Parker, W. (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Parker, W. (2008). Knowing and doing in democratic citizenship education. In L. S. Levstik & C. A. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 65-80). New York, NY: Routledge.

Picower, B. (2009). The unexamined Whiteness of teaching: How White teachers maintain and enact dominant racial ideologies. *Race Ethnicity and Education,* 12(2), 197-215.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1989). Phenomenological research methods. In R. S. Valle & S. Halling (Eds.), *Existential-phenomenological perspectives in psychology* (pp. 41–60). New York, Ny: Plenum.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Rebora, A. (2011). Keeping special ed in proportion. *Education Week Teacher PD Sourcebook*, *5*(1), 36. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/tsb/articles/2011/10/13/01disproportion.h05.html

Revilla, A. T., & Asato, J. (2002). The Implementation of Proposition 227 in California Schools: A critical analysis of the effect on teacher beliefs and classroom practices. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, *35*(2), 108–118. doi:10.1080/10665680290175130

Robelen, E. W. (2010). Standards debate puts Texas Board in hot seat. *Education Week*, *29*(33), 1–20. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2010/06/09/33texts_ep.h29.html

Rury, J. L. (2008). *Education and social change: Contours in the history of American schooling* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Sedlak, M. W. (1989). "Let us go and buy a schoolmaster:" Historical perspectives on the hiring of teachers in the United States, 1750-1980. In D. Warren (Ed.), *American teachers: Histories of a profession at work* (pp. 257–290). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *52*(2), 94–106. doi:10.1177/0022487101052002002

Stanley, W. B. (2005). Social studies and the social order: Transmission or transformation? *Social Education*, *69*(5), 282.

Tuitt, F., & Carter, D. J. (2008). Negotiating atmospheric threats and racial assaults in prediminantly White educational institutions. *Journal of Public Management and Social Policy*, *14*(2), 51–60.

Tyack, D., & Tobin, W. (1994). The "grammar" of schooling: Why has it been so hard to change? *American Educational Research Journal*, *31*(3), 453–479. doi:10.3102/00028312031003453

U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). IDEA - Building The Legacy of IDEA 2004. *Building the Legacy: IDEA 2004*. Retrieved from http://idea.ed.gov/explore/view/p/,root,regs,300,A,300%252E8,c,4,i,

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004a). Educating the "good" citizen : Political choices and pedagogical goals. *Political Science and Politics*, *37*(2), 241–247.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004b). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *41*(2), 237–269. doi:10.3102/00028312041002237

Willis, P. E. (1977). *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Wise, T. (2010). *Colorblind: The rise of post-racial politics and the retreat from racial equity*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Competition, economic rationalization, increased surveillance, and attacks on diversity: Neo-liberalism and the transformation of teacher education in the U.S. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(8), 1544–1552. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.06.004

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(1-2), 89–99. doi:10.1177/0022487109347671