

**Examining Influences on the Beliefs and Practices of Secondary Social Studies Teachers in  
their Early Careers: A Multiple-Case Study**

by

Robert Colby Jones

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of  
Auburn University  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama  
May 8, 2016

Keywords: problem-based historical inquiry, professional induction, pre-service teacher  
education, rationale development, mentorship, social studies

Copyright 2016 by Robert Colby Jones

Approved by

John Saye, Chair, Professor of Social Science Education, Dept. of Curriculum & Teaching  
Jada Kohlmeier, Professor of Social Science Education, Dept. of Curriculum & Teaching  
Christopher Ferguson, Professor of History, Dept. of History

## Abstract

This study examined the enduring effects of a pre-service teacher preparation program rooted in problem-based historical inquiry on the beliefs and practices of five program graduates in their early careers. Interviews with participants and observations in their classrooms allowed me to explore the enduring effects of the pre-service program as well as the interplay of other factors that influenced the beliefs and practices of the teachers in the field. Findings suggest that the pre-service program continued to have some impact on the beliefs and practices of all participants, though this impact varied a great deal due to other factors. Other mitigating factors included content coverage pressures, testing pressures, perceived time constraints, and beliefs about students. The early career experiences of the two participants who were the most successful at translating their pre-service teaching rationales into current beliefs and practice suggest the importance of perceived autonomy, continued connections between teachers and their pre-service teacher education programs, and the support of like-minded veteran teachers and communities of practice.

## Acknowledgements

First, I must offer a sincere thanks to the teachers who participated in this study. Without you, none of this would be possible. You sacrificed your precious time for interviews and invited me into your classrooms on a regular basis. You did so enthusiastically and out of a desire to reflect upon your beliefs and practices as a means to continually improve your craft.

I also want to thank the members of my committee: Dr. Christopher Ferguson, Dr. Jada Kohlmeier, and Dr. John Saye. Thanks to Dr. Ferguson for being an innovative and knowledgeable history professor, and for inspiring me to write the best history paper of my academic career on the “Tiger of Mysore.” Thanks to Dr. Kohlmeier and Dr. Saye for all of your support and mentorship throughout my undergraduate and graduate experiences at Auburn University. My fifteen-year relationship with your department has forever changed me professionally and personally. I feel fortunate to have been given the opportunity to study under and work with such dedicated professionals devoted to excellence in teaching and research.

Finally, I want to thank my family for all of their support on this journey. Thanks to my parents, sister, brother-in-law, and niece for your support, hours of babysitting, and for not thinking I was crazy when I announced my intent to give up a full-time job to become a student again. Thanks to the wonderful people at Panera Bread in Auburn, who came to know me by name as I often spent more time working there than at home. Most importantly, I want to thank my wife, Anna, for taking this journey with me as you pursued your own doctorate. I’m so glad we did this together. Thanks for your love, patience, and encouragement on this long journey.

Finally, I want to thank my son, Jackson. Being your dad is my greatest achievement, and I hope you surpass all of your parents' accomplishments while living life to the fullest.

## Table of Contents

<b>Abstract.....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>List of Tables.....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>Chapter One: Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Significance of the Problem.....	3
Research Questions.....	4
Definitions.....	4
Limitations.....	7
<b>Chapter Two: Literature Review.....</b>	<b>9</b>
The Purposes of Social Studies.....	9
Teacher Practice and Professional Communities.....	12
Pre-Service Preparation.....	19
Rationale Development.....	25
Student-Teaching.....	30
Professional Induction.....	35
Relevant Studies.....	43
Importance of the Study.....	49
<b>Chapter Three: Methodology.....</b>	<b>51</b>
Design of Study.....	51
Participants and Setting.....	53
Data Sources.....	59
Threats to Data & Efforts to Mitigate.....	64
Data Collection Procedures.....	68
Data Analysis.....	70
<b>Chapter Four: Findings Regarding Teacher Beliefs.....</b>	<b>74</b>
Introduction.....	74
Individual Cases.....	75
<i>Fiona</i> .....	75
<i>Matt</i> .....	78
<i>Frank</i> .....	81

<i>Bram</i> .....	84
<i>Waylon</i> .....	86
Cross-Case Examination.....	90
<i>Factor One: Reflections on Pre-Service Education</i> .....	91
<i>Factor Two: Induction Experiences</i> .....	93
<i>Factor Three: Departmental and School Cultures</i> .....	95
<i>Factor Four: Personal Conceptions of Teaching/Teacher Biography</i> .....	97
Conclusion.....	99
<b>Chapter Five: Findings Regarding Teacher Practice.....</b>	<b>101</b>
Introduction.....	101
Individual Cases.....	102
<i>Fiona</i> .....	102
<i>Matt</i> .....	107
<i>Frank</i> .....	110
<i>Bram</i> .....	114
<i>Waylon</i> .....	117
Cross-Case Examination.....	121
Conclusion.....	126
<b>Chapter Six: Summary, Limitations, and Recommendations.....</b>	<b>128</b>
Introduction.....	128
Summary and Discussion.....	128
Alternative Explanations.....	135
Limitations.....	137
Implications.....	139
Recommendations.....	141
Conclusion.....	144
<b>References.....</b>	<b>146</b>
<b>Appendices.....</b>	<b>163</b>
Appendix A: Professional Philosophy Statement Assignment.....	164
Appendix B: Initial Interview Protocol.....	166
Appendix C: Observation-Based Interview Protocol.....	167
Appendix D: Final Interview Protocol.....	168
Appendix E: AIW Rubrics for Classroom Instruction and Task.....	169

## List of Tables

Table 1: <i>Relevant Studies</i> .....	44
Table 2: <i>Variables guiding participant selection and subsequent inquiry</i> .....	53
Table 3: <i>Brief overview of study participants</i> .....	58
Table 4: <i>Data sources and collection</i> .....	60
Table 5: <i>Interrater reliability for AIW scores</i> .....	66
Table 6: <i>Timeline of data collection procedures</i> .....	69
Table 7: <i>Overview of observed lessons in Fiona’s classroom</i> .....	103
Table 8: <i>Overview of observed lessons in Matt’s classroom</i> .....	108
Table 9: <i>Overview of observed lessons in Frank’s classroom</i> .....	111
Table 10: <i>Overview of observed lessons in Bram’s classroom</i> .....	115
Table 11: <i>Overview of observed lessons in Waylon’s classroom</i> .....	118

## **Chapter One: Introduction**

### **Statement of the Problem**

Upon beginning my career as a high school social studies teacher in 2003, I found myself struggling to figure out how to meet the demands of full-time teaching while also transforming my vision for powerful social studies teaching into practice in a new environment. I had recently completed South Plains University's pre-service social studies education program, a philosophically coherent program that focused on developing a personal philosophy for social studies teaching along with ambitious teaching practices to realize that philosophy. Though I entered the classroom with numerous teaching strategies and the vision I had crafted during my pre-service experience in mind, transforming theory into practice while apart from my peers and professors for the first time was no easy task. As I began to master the demands of the profession, I gradually became more and more successful at implementing the ambitious strategies needed to realize my purpose for social studies, a purpose rooted in the ideals of civic education, problem-based inquiry, and critical thinking.

After a few years in the classroom, I began to serve as a cooperating teacher for South Plains University undergraduates during their student-teaching experiences. As I mentored these interns and watched them begin their careers at nearby schools, it became apparent that their early career experiences differed greatly. Some seemed to immediately excel at putting their individual purposes for social studies into practice as they regularly implemented powerful learning strategies with great success. Others seemed to disregard both the visions and practices they had developed during pre-service preparation in favor of the goals and practices of their



schools or traditional teaching. More than once, I heard a program graduate state that they did not believe what they had experienced in pre-service preparation to be feasible in the “real world.” Others believed in their individual purposes and in ambitious teaching practices, but faced a number of school-based challenges in realizing their visions.

Finally, some program graduates had an experience similar to my own, in that they worked to gradually implement their vision of social studies, sometimes in a piecemeal fashion, as they struggled through their induction into the profession. When I returned to South Plains University for full-time graduate work in 2010, I was again a part of the social studies education program and I began to serve as a university supervisor for student-teachers. Again, I witnessed new teachers as they sought to transform their visions for social studies into practice with varying degrees of success, and again I wondered why some teachers were more successful in doing this than others.

This research study represents my attempt to examine the variety of factors that influence teachers’ early career beliefs and practices. In doing so, my goal was also to discern the enduring effects of a pre-service teacher preparation program on the beliefs and practices of teachers. This social studies education program is a philosophically coherent program framed by the philosophical tenets of civic education and problem-based historical inquiry (PBHI). While the focus is on graduates of a single program at South Plains University, the findings of this study should prove insightful for anyone seeking to prepare teachers for success while promoting principled, professional teaching practice. Moreover, understanding the effects of professional induction and the “real world” of teaching on the beliefs and practices of this study’s participants can provide a starting point for teacher educators to think about how they can continue to support their graduates in the field.

## **Significance of the Problem**

Despite the emergence of new pathways into the teaching profession, the majority of teachers continue to be prepared in traditional pre-service programs such as the program that produced this study's participants (Feistritzer, 2009; Zumwalt & Craig, 2008). These programs typically consist of coursework and a student-teaching apprenticeship (Feistritzer, 2009; Zumwalt & Craig, 2008). While the relative influence of these traditional teacher education programs on the classroom practices of teachers is contested in the literature, studies have demonstrated that pre-service preparation is influential on teachers' stated beliefs and dispositions (Fehn & Koeppen, 1998; Saye, Kohlmeier, Brush, Howell, & Maddox, 2013). Even so, the majority of research on the effects of teacher education programs has been conducted at the conclusion of the programs or during the first few years of in-service teaching. As such, we know little about the long-term effects of teacher preparation beyond the professional induction period, a chaotic period in which many factors work to facilitate changes in teacher beliefs and dispositions (Kagan, 1993; Patterson & Luft, 2004). For teacher educators seeking to promote powerful teaching practices, understanding the influences of these other factors is as essential as discerning the effects of teacher education programs. Further research on the beliefs and practices of early career teachers beyond their professional induction period is needed if we are to examine the enduring effects of pre-service preparation in relation to the host of other factors that influence teacher belief and practice. Such research can also provide a starting point for teacher educators to think about how they can continue to support their graduates beyond the "awarding of initial certification" (Saye et al., 2013).

## **Research Questions**

Throughout the literature, this continued support of teachers beyond pre-service preparation has been deemed essential if teachers are to continue to reflect on their rationales and implement thoughtful instruction to match these beliefs. Teachers in their early careers explicitly acknowledge that they need career-long, continued professional development if they are to utilize the models of instruction learned in pre-service education (Scott & Baker, 2003). This study examined the beliefs and practices of program graduates after they completed the transition to in-service teaching. In doing so, this study sought to answer a number of calls to determine the extent to which pre-service preparation continues to impact teachers in relation to other factors. Finally, it allowed participants to critically reflect on their transition to in-service teaching, and provided a starting point for this prospective teacher educator to think about how he can continue to support program graduates after the completion of pre-service teacher education. Specifically, this study addresses the following questions:

1. How does pre-service preparation in problem-based historical inquiry professional teaching knowledge influence teacher rationales and practice?
2. What factors other than pre-service preparation influence teacher rationales and practice?
3. What are the implications of this study's findings for promoting principled, professional teaching practice?

## **Definitions**

**Authentic Intellectual Work (AIW):** Authentic intellectual work (AIW) refers to meaningful intellectual work that mirrors the tasks undertaken by “successful adults who continue to work with knowledge” (Newmann, King, & Carmichael, 2007). Authentic intellectual work as described by Newmann, King, and Carmichael (2007) exists in opposition to

the traditional work done by students which is often “contrived and superficial.” In advocating for AIW across disciplines, Newmann and his associates provide examples of such work and criteria for recognizing it in action. The criteria for AIW include advanced construction of knowledge, in-depth disciplined inquiry, and a task value that extends beyond school. Rubrics derived from the recommendations of the Center for AIW were utilized to assess the quality of classroom instruction and student tasks during classroom observations in this study. These rubrics are suitable for this task due to the fact that the type of problem-based historical inquiry that framed the pre-service preparation of study participants mirrors the standards of AIW discussed above (Saye & Brush, 2007). Lessons that scored higher on the AIW rubrics were characterized by the higher-order thinking, high-quality discussion, and real-world relevance also present in the PBHI framework (Newmann et al., 2007).

**Plowing Freedom’s Ground (PFG):** The PFG project referenced in later chapters of this study was a multi-year collaborative project between teacher educators from South Plains University and social studies teachers from local school districts. The program consisted of a two-week long summer institute focused on the promotion of increased content knowledge and the initiation of a lesson study cycle. Each lesson study cycle involved the collaborative development of, implementation of, and reflection on a lesson designed by teacher participants with the support of teacher educators and content area experts from South Plains University. Two of the five participants in this study participated in the project, which served as formal professional development and extended contact with their pre-service teacher educators. Two other participants participated in similar, short-term lesson study cycles with teacher educators from South Plains University.

**Problem-Based Historical Inquiry (PBHI):** As discussed by Saye and Brush (2007), problem-based historical inquiry (PBHI) is a framework for teaching historical topics that involves framing units of instruction around persistent historical problems in order to promote student inquiry. Students build knowledge, engage in disciplined inquiry, and make ethical judgments with the goal of using evidence and values to answer the persistent historical question at the end of the unit (Brush & Saye, 2014; Saye & Brush, 2007). Study participants were exposed to the PBHI framework and the strategies employed as part of this framework over multiple semesters as part of their pre-service preparation at South Plains University. Problem-based learning and inquiry strategies in the social studies are not unique to history courses, however, and teachers of non-history social studies classes can also utilize a problem-based framework as a way to organize their units and teaching practices.

**Professional Induction:** The induction period is typically defined as the first three years of a teacher's career (Kagan, 1993; Patterson & Luft, 2004). This period often marks the first time that novice teachers must master the demands of full-time teaching without the direct support of their preparation programs, and it has been described as a lonely time in a teacher's career (Lortie, 2002). In order to mitigate this loneliness and support teachers during this phase, schools often set up formal and informal induction programs. Regardless of the types of support for induction, the first three years of a teacher's career marks a period of great change (Patterson & Luft, 2004). In order to allow participants to look back on changes that might have occurred during this chaotic period, participants in this study must have completed at least two years of full-time teaching prior to the beginning of data collection.

**Professional Teaching Knowledge (PTK):** Professional teaching knowledge (PTK) refers to a type of knowledge that combines the culture and practices of teachers with that of academic

researchers as a means to bridge the gap so often noted between theory and practice in education (Saye, Kohlmeier, Brush, Mitchell, & Farmer, 2009; Hiebert, Gallimore, & Stigler, 2002).

Development of this type of PTK requires collaboration between researchers and teachers in a variety of forms beginning with, but continuing beyond, pre-service preparation (Saye et al., 2013). A key variable in my study is the problem-based professional teaching knowledge that characterized the pre-service preparation of participating teachers.

**Teaching Rationale:** Formal teaching rationales are often developed as part of pre-service teacher preparation programs in an attempt to answer researchers' calls regarding the needs for such formal statements that merge beliefs and teaching practices with a formal purpose in mind (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2008; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Shaver & Strong, 1982). The rationale of social studies educators may move beyond general educational outcomes to include goals related to civic education and democratic citizenship (Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1987; Barton & Levstik, 2004). All of this study's participants designed such formal rationales in the form of professional philosophy statement papers as a part of the final social studies methods course prior to their student-teaching experiences. Participants' reflection on these documents served as starting point of discussion in the study's initial interviews.

### **Limitations**

To facilitate in-depth investigation of the problem, this research project was designed as a multiple-case study (Stake, 2006; Creswell, 2007). Participating teachers are all graduates of South Plains University's pre-service social studies teacher education program and are currently in years three, four, five, or six of their teaching careers. Data sources included interviews, classroom observations, student tasks, and the professional philosophy statements of each participant. All data was utilized in the construction of five cases that were analyzed

individually and collectively in order to investigate the research questions. It was my design that the results of this study be useful to anyone seeking to support teachers in the field and promote principled, professional practice.

As is the case with all research projects, there were a number of limitations to this study. In order to facilitate the type of data collection necessary to construct cases with thick, rich descriptions and supporting evidence, I was limited by proximity. The need to work with participants within an hour's drive of South Plains University reduced the size of the population I studied and dictated that my sample be drawn from those teachers who were still employed near the university where they received their pre-service training. As a result, geographic proximity also took precedence over the degree of variability in the experiences of the teachers in the study. While each teacher's experiences invariably differed somewhat, the range of experiences was not as great as it might have been were proximity not a factor. Further, in-depth investigation of a relatively small sample may not lead to findings that are easily generalizable. Generalizability is not the central goal of qualitative research, however, and a multiple-case study of five teachers can provide valuable "lessons learned" while providing thick, rich descriptions of the investigation (Creswell, 2007). Further possible limitations due to social desirability and the presence of an outside observer in the classroom environment are discussed at length in chapter three of this document along with a disclosure of my own potential biases in the study. Because the researcher is the central tool of inquiry in qualitative research, ongoing reflection on any personal biases as well as the effects of my presence on participants was a necessity in this study (Patton, 2002).

## **Chapter Two: Literature Review**

The purpose of my study was to determine how participation in a philosophically coherent, problem-based pre-service social studies education program influenced the rationales and classroom practices of program graduates. Additionally, this study examined the other factors that may support or inhibit teachers as they attempt to transform their beliefs about social studies teaching into meaningful practice. My aim was to determine the range and degree of the factors that influenced the practice of early career teachers, with a particular emphasis on the relative influence of pre-service preparation. In order to place this study in an appropriate framework, this review of literature examined research in the following areas:

- The Purposes of Social Studies
- Teacher Practice and Professional Communities
- Pre-Service Preparation
- Rationale Development
- Student-Teaching
- Professional Induction
- Relevant Studies
- Importance of the Proposed Study

### **The Purposes of Social Studies**

A commonly advanced statement of purpose holds that the “development of good citizens in a democracy” should be the central goal of social studies education (Engle & Ochoa, 1988). This notion had been shared by many researchers and reformers prior to 1988, and it has been built



upon by others since (Barber, 1984; Barton & Levstik, 2004; Dewey, 1998; Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Evans, 2004; Ochoa-Becker, 1996; Saye & Brush, 2004; Sizer, 1992). Indeed, the idea of educating American students to prepare them for the activities of the participatory democracy in which they live can be traced to the early-twentieth century writings of educational reformer John Dewey, who argued for an education that was both authentic to the broader democratic society and centered around the task of helping students evaluate and choose the proper paths to reach desirable ends (Dewey, 1998). Later researchers and reformers have refined a variety of approaches that place the goal of authentic citizenship education as the over-arching framework of the social studies.

Living in a participatory democracy is akin to participating in a perpetual dialogue over what should be done. As such, the goal of social studies education is to prepare students with the skills and knowledge to consider issues and “keep the dialogue open” by acting with “enlightened political engagement” (Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Parker, 2003; Parker, 2008). It has also been argued that while citizenship education in the United States may carry with it a focus on democratic values and virtues, it must also include a focus on the importance of dissent and criticism for the perpetuation and betterment of society (Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Vinson & Ross, 2001). Modern researchers often tailor their conceptions of civic competence and democratic education to account for this by noting a distinction between old models of civic education which valued “fitting in” and current conceptions of democratic education that value the controversial, ever-changing nature of democracy (Hess, 2009). Even so, teaching for civic competence and enlightened political engagement is by no means a process devoid of competing conceptions and controversies.

Acceptance of this conceptualization of social studies education for enlightened political engagement is by no means universal. Leaders in individual social science disciplines have also emphasized the importance of knowledge acquisition and basic skills mastery as the preeminent goals of social studies education (Thornton, 2008). This belief that basic knowledge acquisition should be the preeminent goal of education is shared with traditionalists who adhere to older notions of factory-style efficiency and fairness. These efficiency-minded individuals typically advocate for a common body of basic knowledge, as well as standardized assessments focused on rote recall that can be graded quickly (Bransford, 2000). Recent work by James (2010) recounting her experiences with pre-service teachers holding fundamentalist religious beliefs reminds us that even the perpetuation of democracy itself is not a universally agreed upon end result of education. Still others have noted the persistence of the notion that the inculcation of Western myths and avoidance of criticism of one's own nation are worthwhile goals of education (Nelson, 1996). The belief that the social studies curriculum should avoid criticism of the United States has been manifested in a variety of ways throughout the last century, perhaps most notably in the case of Harold Rugg. Rugg, a progressive educator, saw the banning of his social studies textbooks by a number of school districts during World War II amid charges that the works were "un-American" (Dorn, 2008). Charges that social studies education, particularly models which encourage dissent and criticism, has the potential to be subversive hardly ended with the Rugg controversy (Dorn, 2008).

Despite criticisms from a variety of sources and competing conceptions, the conceptualization that social studies education should promote civic competence is featured prominently in the position statements of the National Council for Social Studies (The National Council for Social Studies [NCSS], 2008). According to the NCSS (2008), social studies is best defined as "the

integrated study of the social sciences and humanities to promote civic competence,” a definition that emphasizes citizenship education over the importance of individual disciplinary knowledge. Further analysis of the position statements of the NCSS reveals a focus on critical thinking, decision-making with information from multiple perspectives, and the weighing of values (NCSS, 2008). The current rationale provided by the NCSS is built upon the work of all of the aforementioned researchers who sought to build a rationale that includes civic competence and enlightened political engagement as the goals of social studies education (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Dewey, 1998; Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Evans, 2004; Ochoa-Becker, 1996; Sizer, 1992). In a survey of twenty-five teacher educators, Shermis and Washburn (1986) identified four main conceptions of the purpose of social studies education. Chief amongst these was this notion that social studies education should prepare students for democratic participation (Shermis & Washburn, 1986). While such a rationale is central to the PBHI framework experienced by prospective social studies teachers at South Plains University and is not uncommon in other teacher education programs, teachers guided by this overarching purpose face multiple challenges in translating these beliefs into meaningful classroom practice.

### **Teacher Practice and Professional Communities**

If a teacher’s rationale for social studies includes such conceptions of democratic education for civic competence and enlightened political engagement, he or she must implement teaching practices that further these ends. Despite the promotion of various inquiry- and issues-based classroom practices in methods courses and research journals, teacher-centered, traditional classroom practices continue to dominate classroom practice (Cuban, 1993; Kagan, 1993; Lortie, 2002; McNeil, 1986; Saye & Social Studies Inquiry Research Collaborative, 2013). Investigation into the prevalence of authentic classroom discussion in social studies classrooms

demonstrates this trend towards teacher-centered practice. Though many teachers report utilizing discussion, observational studies from outside researchers tend to find little evidence of discussion in classrooms (Hess, 2009). Nystrand, Gamoran, and Carbonaro (1998) observed over 100 English and social studies teachers in a large-scale study of discourse and writing. Their results found similarities in both subjects, with class time tending to involve a mixture of lecture, recitation, and “seat-work.” More striking was their report that time spent on discussion in the social studies classrooms they observed averaged thirty seconds per day (Nystrand, Gamoran, & Carbonaro, 1998).

These findings on the lack of discussion in social studies classrooms exemplify the general pattern that finds instructional practices framed by inquiry and the exploration of social issues are rare (Hahn, 1996). Overall, social studies classrooms tend to be dominated by textbooks and teachers, and rarely include a focus on social issues or the input of students (Goodlad, 1984; Hahn, 1996; McNeil, 1986). This trend occurs in spite of studies that indicate that students hold more favorable opinions on social studies when taught by “inquiry teachers” (Hahn, 1996). It has been suggested that the gap between research and classroom practice is attributable to differences in the beliefs of teachers and academics (Kagan, 1993). However, it is also clear that even teachers who espouse beliefs similar to those of academics often fail to translate their beliefs into high-quality issues-based instruction or inquiry (Adler & Goodman, 1985; Hawley, 2010; Patterson & Luft, 2004; VanSledright, 2010). Reformers seeking to bridge this divide between belief and practice have advocated for a form of professional teaching knowledge that merges the craft culture of teachers with the academic culture of researchers (Saye, Kohlmeier, Brush, Mitchell, & Farmer, 2009; Hiebert, Gallimore, & Stigler, 2002).

Assessing the classroom instructional practices of social studies teachers in order to evaluate the extent to which thoughtful teaching occurs has proven to be a difficult task. As defined by Newmann (1991b), the thoughtful classroom is one in which the teacher presents students with “higher-order challenges” and helps them to apply the “knowledge, skills, and dispositions to solve them.” Newmann’s approach to evaluating the thoughtfulness and quality of instruction in classrooms was designed to assess the broad spectrum of social studies courses in a variety of contexts (Newmann, 1991b). His work led to the development of Authentic Intellectual Work (AIW) rubrics that allow observers to utilize a common language as they assess the thoughtfulness and authenticity of various higher-order instruction models in social studies classrooms (Newmann, King, & Carmichael, 2007).

Observers must consider a number of factors that may account for the lack of higher-order processes and thoughtful instruction in social studies classrooms. It has been advanced that social and institutional barriers often limit such instruction by encouraging passive education and traditional models of instruction that promote order and social efficiency (Evans, 2004; Rossi, 1995). In his comprehensive look at social studies education, Onosko (1991) further categorized six major barriers to the promotion of higher-order thinking and challenging instruction in social studies classrooms. Among these barriers, he cited teachers’ low expectations of students, class over-crowding, and a lack of planning time as barriers to the implementation of thoughtful and challenging instruction in social studies courses (Onosko, 1991). Standardized testing pressures and the coverage imperative have also greatly impacted the extent to which social studies courses are taught and the methods used to teach social studies content (Rossi, 1995; Van Hover & Pierce, 2006).

As noted above, traditional beliefs that social studies should involve basic knowledge transmission have combined with a “curriculum of coverage” to produce a major barrier to complex teaching styles. This may be especially true in Advanced Placement (AP) courses that present teachers up to twice the amount of content to cover along with the additional goal of successful performance on AP exams (Parker et al., 2011; Brooks, 2013). While much of the research discussed here is devoted to the curriculum and other factors beyond individual control that affect teachers’ ability to implement ambitious and complex teaching practices, it should be noted that all teachers are also guided by their personal beliefs in their instructional decision-making (Nespor, 1987).

If teachers hold beliefs that are incompatible with advanced teaching practices suggested by researchers, they may not implement such practices in spite of teaching in a context that allows for such practices. Conversely, teachers who believe strongly in ambitious, authentic teaching practices find ways to implement these even in restrictive, coverage-focused environments (Brooks, 2013; Maddox & Saye, 2014). Brooks’ (2013) case study of one AP teacher found that the teacher was able to implement ambitious teaching and achieve a variety of higher-order goals in addition to AP exam preparation. Similarly, a study by Maddox and Saye (2014) found that the smaller sub-group of AP students in their sample were much more likely to receive exposure to ambitious, authentic pedagogy than their non-AP peers. Taken together, these studies demonstrate that personal decisions made by the teacher can over-ride even the barriers associated with the extreme “curriculum of coverage” model presented by AP courses. As revealed by Nespor’s in-depth interviews with eight practicing teachers, personal beliefs and dispositions are very powerful guiding forces in teacher decision-making in any curriculum or teaching environment (Nespor, 1987). Such personal beliefs and dispositions regarding

educational practices may even be formed prior to pre-service preparation (Lortie, 2002; Tatto, 1998).

Onosko's final obstacle to higher-order thinking in social studies is that of teacher isolation. In this assertion, Onosko (1991) is in agreement with Lortie (2002) that teaching is often a lonely endeavor. While pre-service preparation programs provide collaborative opportunities in which teachers may learn and hone their craft, practicing teachers often feel unsupported as they continue to attempt to implement thoughtful teaching practices. In her studies of teachers who regularly and successfully implemented discussion and other thoughtful practices, Hess (2002, 2008) reported that these teachers often participated in collaborative professional development opportunities to develop their skills in this practice. A more recent study by Rice (2013) also found this connection between professional learning and effective teaching, as those teachers deemed to be highly effective explicitly cited professional development and learning opportunities as a major factor that helped them stay and thrive in the profession.

For secondary social studies teachers, departmental culture and communication may be the most important factor in overcoming isolation and creating communities that emphasize higher-order, thoughtful practice (Newmann, 1991a; Onosko, 1991). Indeed, Ladwig (1991) found that departmental culture was a more powerful influence on classroom thoughtfulness than factors such as class size, planning time, and teaching preps. Departments with a common vision that supported higher-order thinking led to more thoughtful individual classrooms (Ladwig, 1991). Similarly, King's (1991) study of sixteen schools found that when leadership from department chairs and principals promoted higher-order thinking, individual social studies classrooms saw gains in thoughtfulness. Like Ladwig, King concludes that a common vision shared by supportive colleagues is necessary to support higher-order classroom practice (King, 1991;

Ladwig, 1991). Powerful examples of teacher communities can thus be studied to determine ways in which collaboration between teachers and teacher educators can promote more thoughtful instruction. In a study by Flores and Day (2006), the researchers found that an ideal teacher community proved to be one in which teachers worked in natural, organic collaborative settings while also receiving more formal, collaborative professional development opportunities as these teachers held more positive views of teaching that were also evidenced by their practice.

Such models of development support continued teacher development through the promotion of teacher communities. Teacher communities offer the benefit of “distributed cognition,” a type of cognition and knowledge-building that occurs between individuals in collaborative work settings (Grossman, Wineburg, & Woolworth, 2000; Rogers & Ellis, 1994). In ideal communities, distributed cognition can lead to “collective wisdom” (Grossman, Wineburg, & Woolworth, 2000). Teacher communities take time to establish, and can be the source of tension as the traditional beliefs of the “craft culture” of teaching come into conflict with other ideas (Grossman et al., 2000; Thomas et al., 1998). The development of such tensions is in fact essential if teachers are to continue to participate in and sustain democratic societies (Grossman et al., 2000). In a study of a professional development initiative that sought to build a community of English and history teachers at one high school, the struggles and successes of the teachers involved varied depending on a number of factors, but experience seemed to be a major determinant in how teachers reacted to the program (Thomas et al., 1998). Novices and student-teachers in particular responded well to the program and saw it as a means to break their feelings of isolation, while some veteran teachers resisted some of the more difficult components of the initiative and became more isolated. Despite this, this collaborative attempt to change instruction led to new curriculum in a surprisingly short amount of time, though the authors



questioned the extent to which the in-class practices of the teachers involved would change (Thomas et al., 1998).

While formalized teacher communities such as those above are often formed as part of professional development initiatives, it is clear that teachers are perpetually a part of many different communities. While all of these configurations are not the teacher communities advocated by Grossman and her associates (2000), these bodies are nevertheless sources of change for teachers as they continue their careers. Teachers' continued experimentation with their identities and methods occurs in the context of a variety of personal and professional groupings (Schultz & Ravitch, 2013). For secondary social studies teachers, departmental groupings can be significant in how teachers continue to develop. If organized in departments, the department learning culture in which a teacher operates is a significant predictor of continued professional learning and development (Burn, 2012). Indeed, the study of social studies departments that successfully promote higher-order thinking has been undertaken in order to demonstrate how collaboration can lead to more thoughtful teaching practices (Newmann, 1991a). In accordance with findings by King (1991) and Ladwig (1991), Newmann and associates found that a common vision and a commitment to intellectual quality were necessities for restructured schools and departments that sought to promote higher-order thinking through professional collaboration (Newmann, Marks, & Gamoran, 1996).

In addition to collaborative cultures within a teacher's school, increased collaboration between teacher educators and teachers beyond pre-service training has long been advocated by researchers (Kagan, 1993). Earlier in this review, I acknowledged the gap between theory and practices. For Kagan (1993), this gap is best reduced through increased collaboration between professors and classroom teachers in more authentic communities. Such communities can take

on a variety of unique forms such as collaborations between practicing teachers and teacher educators that produce lesson plans and learning materials. For example, a nearly decade-long collaboration between a teacher preparation program and practicing teachers led to the development of the online “Decision Point” learning environment (Saye et al., 2009). More common are models of collaboration influenced by Japanese Lesson Study, in which groups of teachers collaboratively design and test lessons with one another (Hiebert, Gallmore, & Stigler, 2002).

Even teachers who do not have experience in formal, research-based communities of practices such as those described above may still be members in a variety of professional communities beyond that of the general school faculty. Regardless of profession, everyone belongs to multiple communities of practice or groups working together towards a common goal (Nishino, 2012; Wenger, 1998). This “multi-membership” frames both identity and behavior, and individuals may behave differently dependent in each community (Wenger, 1998). Teachers may belong to many communities beyond the aforementioned university-based programs, subject-specific departments, and lesson study groups. They may also be a part of professional development programs, educational reform initiatives, and study groups (Nishino, 2012). In the modern era, online professional communities also exist for continued learning and collaboration between teachers (Nishino, 2012; Kale, Brush, & Saye, 2009). Any of these formal and informal communities of practice may influence participants’ identities (Wenger, 1998) and thus alter their beliefs and practices.

### **Pre-service Preparation**

While teachers will be participants in a variety of communities in their careers, the pre-service preparation program typically constitutes their first teacher community. Formal programs to

prepare and certify teachers to enter the field of education are relatively new. While many colleges and universities introduced formal training for teachers in the nineteenth century, it would not be until the early twentieth century that most practicing teachers received formal preparation to enter the classroom (Lortie, 2002). Since then, traditional undergraduate models of teacher preparation have been joined by professional development schools and nontraditional routes to teacher certification that may occur while individuals are actively employed as teachers (Boyd, Grossman, Lankford, Loeb, Michelli, & Wycoff, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 2008; Grossman & Loeb, 2010; Lortie, 2002).

That entrance into the teaching profession can occur via a number of pathways is somewhat surprising given the more limited paths available to individuals seeking to enter other professions. Teaching, however, is perhaps unique among professions in that those who enter it have had the opportunity to see teachers practicing their craft in close proximity throughout their own schooling (Lortie, 2002). This widespread familiarity with the teaching profession is one catalyst for the acceptance of a variety of non-traditional preparation models, as the practices of teachers are more well-known to the general public than those of other professionals. Recently, research endeavors have been designed to evaluate the efficacy of various traditional and alternative models of teacher preparation (Boyd et al, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 2008; Grossman & Loeb, 2010). Notable among the findings of these studies is Grossman and Loeb's (2010) contention that comparisons and contrasts between traditionally and alternatively prepared teachers must be viewed with the understanding that the in-group variation in effectiveness and retention of both of these two populations is greater than any differences between them.

Whatever the pathway into teaching, factors such as a coherent program vision, high level of intellectual rigor, and extended field experiences are better indicators of highly effective teacher preparation programs than the aforementioned dichotomy that pits traditional programs against alternative models (Goodlad, 1990; Howey & Zimpher, 1989; Zeichner & Conklin, 2008). Proponents of traditional teacher preparation models such as the program at South Plains University agree with many of these tenets of effective teacher preparation programs suggested above. Among these advocates, Linda Darling-Hammond (2008) also discusses the need for a great deal of supervised clinical work and proactive relationships with local schools. The increase in rigor by teacher preparation programs called for by Darling-Hammond and others is necessary to prepare teachers to enter into a complex and demanding profession (Darling-Hammond, 2008; Feiman-Nemser, 2008; Zeichner & Conklin, 2008). Learning to teach is a complex process that involves learning to think, know, feel, and act like a teacher (Feiman-Nemser, 2008). Beyond this, new teachers must be able to integrate this multi-faceted identity into a meaningful and responsive process that can be maintained over the course of a meaningful school day in which they may engage in a thousand interpersonal exchanges (Feiman-Nemser, 2008; Jackson, 1990). Preparation to engage in such complex activities takes time and involves observation of teachers who have mastered the profession's demands (Darling-Hammond, 2008; Jackson, 1990).

Despite a variety of pathways into teaching, baccalaureate programs at four-year public institutions continue to be the norm, producing the majority of the nation's prospective teachers (Feistritzer, 1999; Zumwalt & Craig, 2008). Such programs tend to prepare prospective teachers through coursework, field work, and an apprenticeship in the form of a student-teaching experience. Teacher education programs must also be designed to take into account the three

major intersecting components of knowledge about teaching, learning, and the content being taught (Darling-Hammond, 2006). In other words, teachers must be able to do more than implement teaching practices. They must also understand learners and have a deep command of their content that allows them to organize subject matter in ways that make it meaningful and usable by students (Shulman, 1987; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 2008).

This interaction between specific content knowledge that underlies successful teaching across disciplines and pedagogical knowledge of practices specific to teaching has been dubbed “pedagogical content knowledge” (Shulman, 1987). In order to successfully prepare teachers to enter the field, teacher education programs must be designed to increase not only the content knowledge of prospective teachers, but also their pedagogical content knowledge, as the latter allows them to make content accessible to students (Darling-Hammond, 2008; Shulman, 1987). Shulman’s research on pedagogical content knowledge was conducted with teachers of multiple subject areas, and he found that similar processes guided teachers as they transformed content into meaningful, accessible forms for students. He recommended that teacher education programs move beyond the then-common approach of teaching pedagogy and supervision without connections to the content itself (Shulman, 1987). Recent research into the effects of teacher education programs on the content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge on prospective mathematics teachers in Germany reveals that quality teacher education programs produce growth in both types of knowledge during the pre-service phase (Kleickmann, Richter, Kunter, Elsner, Besser, Krauss, & Baumert, 2013).

Teacher educators seeking to produce prospective teachers with high levels of pedagogical content knowledge and other skills necessary to succeed in the profession must remember another lesson from John Dewey (1998) that was echoed by Shulman (1987). Just as Dewey

(1998) posited that the children who entered the nation's classrooms were not blank slates, prospective teachers who enter the nation's university-based teacher education programs also hold their own preconceived notions regarding subject matter and the teaching profession. Thus, methods courses have "partial and differential" effects on students as previously held beliefs and knowledge interact with new ideas (Johnston, 1990). Because of this, determining the relative influence of teacher education programs on the instructional decision-making and classroom practices of prospective teachers is perhaps a more difficult task than determining growth in knowledge.

While some studies such as that of Scott and Baker (2003), have demonstrated that the majority of graduates of pre-service preparation programs are likely to utilize the "complex teaching models" they learn in their courses, these studies often rely on self-report only. Similarly, the transferability of models of instruction common to social studies education has also been examined. Caron (2004) sought to determine the extent to which participants in a graduate-level methods course utilized issues-based instruction in their classrooms as well as obstacles that impeded their ability to do so. These obstacles included a lack of teaching experience, limited exposure to issues-based instruction when the teachers were students themselves, and the rigor inherent to designing powerful, issues-based units. In addition to determining these and other obstacles, he concluded that a longer period of instruction in issues-based education was likely needed if teachers were to successfully implement such a model in the classroom (Caron, 2004).

Even so, assessments of the effects of pre-service preparation conducted near the end of formal teacher education programs show some promise with regards to the effects of programs on teachers' instructional decision-making processes and practices. By using a scenario-based

survey at the beginning and end of their social studies teacher education program, researchers at one university found that their students demonstrated movement towards the instructional design principles of their program. Further, these students offered more thoughtful, nuanced rationales for their instructional decision-making at the end of their teacher education program than they had at the beginning (Saye, Kohlmeier, Brush, Howell, & Maddox, 2013). The results of this study further illustrate a contention by Fehn & Koeppen (1998) that social studies teacher educators should be “cautiously optimistic” about the impact of methods classes on teacher practice, as these courses provide students with options for how to react when confronted with specific teaching scenarios.

Determining the efficacy of teacher education programs may be a difficult endeavor if pre-program beliefs of students are not taken into account. Teacher educators seeking to evaluate the effects of their programs must be reminded of Lortie’s contention that prospective teachers enter their programs having already observed the work of teachers for many years during their own schooling (Lortie, 2002). Further, it is difficult to separate the development of one’s identity as a teacher from basic self-development and maturation (Rodgers & Scott, 2008). It is also difficult to determine the efficacy of teacher preparation programs as there is no finite endpoint to be reached for program graduates. While all teacher educators seek to produce functional teachers, many programs also seek to prepare their students to become “change agents” who continue to demonstrate innovation in their practices (Ronfeldt & Grossman, 2008). Doing so also requires pre-service programs to teach critical reflection and critically reflective teaching (Dinkelman, 1999). While teachers may report that methods courses and pre-service preparation programs were influential, the extent to which they will continue to reflect and adhere to the principles encountered in their programs is unclear (Fehn & Koeppen, 1998). Continued support for in-

service teachers is likely to be necessary as they seek to implement their pre-service beliefs about teaching in their daily classroom practice (Saye, et al., 2013).

### **Rationale Development**

An important part of teacher education programs often includes the development of teaching rationales, but the extent to which teacher education programs actually influence pre-service social studies teachers' teaching rationales and beliefs about teaching is contested. In a cross-case study of two pre-service elementary social studies teachers, Angell (1998) found that beliefs held by each of the teachers prior to entering their teacher education program influenced their receptiveness to new ideas espoused by the program's methods courses. The teacher who Angell (1998) classified as being a realist/traditionalist in Adler's (1984) paradigm was as influenced by pre-program beliefs as by the realities of classroom life. The other teacher in the study was more aware of her own beliefs and regularly accessed these conceptions as she reflected on her practices. By doing this, she found the teacher education program more valuable and influential, leading Angell (1998) to advocate that teacher educators actively work to bring preexisting beliefs to the forefront early in their programs. By contrast, it has been suggested that pre-service social studies teachers enter teacher education programs without many powerful beliefs regarding teaching and learning social studies other than a desire to move beyond traditional methods (Doppen, 2007). It should be noted, however, that Doppen's 2007 study relied largely on self-report, and the extent to which social desirability affected students' assessments of the helpfulness of their methods courses must be taken into account.

Further, while small-scale studies such as those by Angell (1998) and Doppen (2007) are useful in understanding the experiences of individual and small groups of teachers in particular contexts, studies with larger samples are needed if we are to discern the biographical factors



most influential to teacher beliefs and practices. Indeed, teacher researchers should attend to Goodson's 1992 call to take into account the lives of teachers. Teachers' descriptions of teaching and life in schools are invariably linked to personal factors from teachers' own biographies (Goodson, 1992). That finding is not surprising when one considers that identity development and teachers' professional development are intertwined (Hsieh, 2015; Rodgers & Scott, 2008). Indeed, it has also been advanced that the end result of teachers' identity negotiation occurs by the combination of teachers' personal experiences and classroom contextual identities, as well as the ever-evolving dialogue between the two (Hsieh, 2014). At any given point, teachers may rely more strongly on their personal experiences, their current classroom context, or some interplay between the two when making decisions that affect themselves and their students (Hsieh, 2014).

Taken together, the findings of the sample studies discussed above from Angell (1998) and Doppert (2007) and the more complex dialogic framework advanced by Hsieh (2015) further illuminate two traditional models of understanding the effects of teacher education on individuals (Knowles, 1992). One model holds that formal teacher education, student-teaching, and the early years of in-service teaching are the most powerful socializing influences on teachers' beliefs as they enter the profession (Knowles, 1992). A second framework is based on the notion that prospective teachers have already been socialized into the profession well before formal training, due to the fact that they have already been a part of classrooms for many years (Knowles, 1992; Lortie, 1975; Grant & Zeichner, 1981).

Compelling cases have certainly been posited for the latter model, which suggests that teachers will often teach as they were taught and thus uphold a relatively stable set of pedagogical practices over time (Cuban, 1993; Lortie, 2002). Still, in-depth study on teachers'

backgrounds and beliefs also suggests that teacher education programs do exert at least a partial influence, though this influence will differ widely by individual as the tenets of the teacher education program interact with student's preexisting beliefs and backgrounds (Johnston, 1990). Acceptance of either model for understanding the effects of teacher education does not remove the onus placed on teacher educators to understand that their students' lives apart from formal preparation programs will invariably play some part in their teaching selves. Further, it should be noted that these two models advanced by Knowles (1992) are not mutually exclusive. Indeed, Angell's (1998) study demonstrates that while pre-program socialization is important, teacher education programs that acknowledge and respond to preexisting beliefs can exert a greater influence on prospective teachers than non-responsive programs. Thus, the ideal model of preparation may not easily fit within either of Knowles' frameworks, as it would seek to merge future teachers' pre-program beliefs and life experience with the curricula of the program.

One way in which teacher education programs can help prospective teachers to account for their own beliefs while understanding the effects of the teacher education process is by having them articulate formal rationales or statements of purpose. Calls for formal rationales and statements of purpose have come from within social studies education and from the educational field in general (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2008; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Hawley, 2010; Shaver & Strong, 1982). For social studies educators, a sound rationale moves beyond the establishment of goals for teaching practices to include a coherent vision for democratic education (Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1987; Barton & Levstik, 2004). Yet, rationale development cannot occur in isolation from "real-world" teaching, as the challenges of classroom life may lead new teachers to set aside their established rationales for teaching social studies in favor of practices that aid in classroom management and order (Hawley, 2010).

This call to develop rationales in conjunction with the demands of full-time teaching underscores a persistent theme of advocates seeking to improve teacher education programs, namely that such programs must incorporate significant fieldwork and take into account the realities of classroom life (Darling-Hammond, 2008; Hawley, 2010; Zeichner & Conklin, 2008). Rationale development can only be meaningful when teacher preparation programs help pre-service teachers to consider ways that their rationales can be manifested in their practices (Goodman & Adler, 1985). Only then can the gap between rationale and practice be addressed. Just as a gap between belief and practice has long been discussed in the literature, pre-service social studies teachers also rarely implement strategies that match their rationales for teaching (Goodman & Adler, 1985; Hawley, 2010).

Teacher educators who prepare social studies teachers are charged with the task of developing civic-minded educators who seek to keep the dialogue of democracy open and prepare students to be thoughtful participants in the democracy. Still, the task of helping pre-service teachers to develop their rationales and philosophies is not uniform in nature. Teachers' rationales must be personalized in order to take into account the beliefs they hold away from their programs (Rodgers & Scott, 2008). Reflecting on his career as a social studies teacher educator, Evans (2008) believes that greater choice and personalization is needed when pre-service educators help prospective teachers to develop their rationales.

Whereas the development of a powerful rationale for teaching social studies has been discussed here as being of great importance, it is also important to note that individual teachers may not operationalize the teaching of content as the major component of their rationales for teaching in general. For example, some teachers may view their role as predominantly pastoral in nature. In other words, their primary task involves oversight of their students' overall well-

being and “moral welfare” (Lang, 1983; Child Health Promotion Research Unit, 2006). As defined, this understanding of the role of the teacher seems to counteract the commonly-held notion that secondary teachers are first and foremost purveyors of knowledge in a specific discipline (Child Health Promotion Research Unit, 2006). If teachers cannot reconcile their rationales for social studies education with their larger rationales for the teaching profession in general, it seems plausible that one might take a backseat to the other.

Given the major focus currently placed on the academic success and test performance of students, it would seem that the pastoral role of the teacher might be neglected in response to other concerns (Child Health Promotion Research Unit, 2006). The pastoral role, however, might also be seen as “values education” (Beck & Earl, 2001; Schoeman, 2012). Conceptualized in this fashion, it seems plausible that the pastoral role could function well in a complementary fashion alongside the many conceptions of social studies education that are also focused on values education or are organized around American creedal values and civic life (Engle & Ochoa, 1988; NCSS, 2008). While the pastoral role represents just one potential component of an overall rationale for teaching, it is clear that pre-service teachers need a good deal of support in order to comfortably develop a teaching role that merges both personal and professional values (Flores & Day, 2006; Mead, 2003).

Still, greater personalization and choice in rationale development may invariably lead to dissonance between teachers’ personal beliefs and the rationales of their pre-service programs. Van Hover and Yeager’s study (2003) of recent program graduate Angela found that her own beliefs about moral education often superseded takeaways from her methods courses. Their later study of Charlotte also found a teacher who had developed a vision that differed from that of her pre-service preparation (Van Hover & Yeager, 2007). Similarly, James (2010) found that

religious views, especially fundamentalist beliefs, sometimes led the students in her teacher-education program to be resistant to practices such as controversial issues discussions. Some of her students' beliefs rendered their opinions immutable, and they sometimes disagreed with the process of deliberation and holistic goals of the program (James, 2010). Whatever the influences on teachers' rationales, pre-service teachers still require the aforementioned assistance in translating purpose into practice as studies continually find that teachers' practices often do not match their stated beliefs (Flores & Day, 2006; Thomas, L., & Beauchamp, C., 2011; Van Hover & Yeager, 2003; 2007).

### **Student-Teaching**

Pre-service teachers' rationales for teaching often intersect with the "real world" of classroom life for the first extended period during student-teaching (Angell, 1998). Student-teaching is a widely accepted practice in teacher preparation programs, and it is one that often serves as the culminating experience in pre-service preparation (Cuenca, 2011; Koerner, Rust, & Baumgartner, 2002; Thomas, Wineburg, Grossman, Myhre, & Woolworth, 1998). The prolonged field experience of student-teaching allows students to transition into the profession by encountering "practical dilemmas" in the field (Cuenca, 2010; Cuenca, 2011). Because of this, the extended field experience of student-teaching is often regarded as one of the more formative periods in a teacher's career (Adler, 1984).

This extended period of field-work is marked by the interaction between the prospective teacher, teacher education program, and a practicing cooperating teacher, who "sanctions" the entry of the student-teacher into the broader teaching community by demonstrating the lived experience of teaching (Cuenca, 2011). By working closely with a practitioner, pre-service teachers learn how to think, know, feel, and act as a teacher does (Feiman-Nemser, 2008). The

third participant in the student teaching arrangement is typically the university supervisor or another representative from the teaching candidate's pre-service preparation program. This individual serves a "field-based teacher educator" throughout the internship experience (Cuenca, 2010). This unique configuration between academia and classroom life ensures that all relationships between all stakeholders are important, and it leaves student-teachers in a unique position in which they balance multiple power relationships (Koerner, Rust, & Baumgartner, 2002). This balancing of power coincides with their attempts to translate their rationales into classroom practice (Angell, 1998; Wilson, Konopak, & Readance, 1994).

Before discussing the findings of studies that have examined how pre-service teachers change during their student-teaching experiences, it is necessary to again acknowledge the importance of beliefs held by pre-service teachers even before they enter their teacher preparation programs. The extent to which student-teaching helps students to redefine their preexisting notions differs by the individual. Angell's 1998 study of two elementary social studies student-teachers found substantial differences in the effects of student-teaching on the two participants. One student-teacher's preexisting beliefs on the nature of social studies created an obstacle to her ability to take on new perspectives on teaching, while the other participant's beliefs on teaching allowed her to continually reassess and reflect on her experiences (Angell, 1998). While the small sample size used in this study prevents generalization, it is clear that preexisting beliefs affect the student-teaching experience as well as the experience of methods courses. In addition to preexisting beliefs, Adler (1984) found that the extent to which the rationales of student-teachers were constructivist or traditionalist shaped their experiences and evolving conceptions of social studies.

While student-teachers may articulate a variety of beliefs about social studies, teaching, and students, it should be noted that, as is the case with in-service teachers, their conceptions may not predict their actual classroom practice (Adler, 1984; Goodman & Adler, 1985; Wilson, Konopak, & Readance, 1994). One possible explanation for this gap between beliefs and practice may be that students often receive inadequate assistance by methods course instructors in helping them think about how their beliefs can be manifested in their classroom practice (Goodman & Adler, 1985). Student-teachers are also frequently dismayed when their pre-service experiences in academia clash with the realities and pace of classroom life (Thomas, Wineburg, Grossman, Myhre, & Woolworth, 1998). A dissonance between belief and practice may occur as a result of this clash.

Most commonly, the gap between the rationales and practices of student-teachers has been explained by the desire of student-teachers to develop an “appropriate teacher role” as they begin their careers (Adler, 1984). Part of taking on this appropriate role involves classroom management concerns, and it is clear that management concerns often lead to what McNeil (1986) refers to as “defensive teaching” practices that prioritize control of the classroom environment. Teachers who adopt defensive teaching practices seek to promote classroom order by simplifying content and reducing the demands that they place on students. In seeking their teacher role, defensive teachers often control students by “mystifying” content and making themselves sole purveyors of knowledge (McNeil, 1986). Wilson, Konopak, and Readance (1994) expanded on a survey-based study by engaging in a deep case study of one student teacher who typified many of McNeil’s findings. This student-teacher often relied on lecture, taught defensively, and exhibited a gap between beliefs and practice out of a need to manage the class (McNeil, 1986; Wilson, Konopak, & Readance, 1994). Interestingly, this subject of their

case study exemplified a common pattern by initially demonstrating practices more consistent with his university-based pre-service preparation program, before gradually falling into practices that mirrored those of his cooperating teacher (Wilson, Konopak, & Readance, 1994).

In summation, the need to manage student behavior strongly influences what practices are implemented, particularly by novice student-teachers (McNeil, 1986; Wilson, Konopak, & Readance, 1994). Student-teaching is often less a time of reflection, and more a period in which pre-service teachers are focused on “survival” (Kagan & Tippins, 1992). While the effects of this on student-teachers’ classroom practice is documented, the overall impact of the experience of student-teaching varies. Chong & Low’s (2009) study of student-teachers in Singapore found that experiencing the reality and struggles of daily school life for an extended period during student-teaching may decrease pre-service teachers’ perceptions of their profession and efficacy. However, a study of agricultural education students undertaken by Swan, Wolf, and Cano (2011), found that self-efficacy was surprisingly high amongst student-teachers, likely due to the close support and assistance of a cooperating teacher. Of the agricultural education students who entered the teaching profession after student-teaching, most exhibited their lowest levels of self-efficacy after their first year of teaching on their own (Swan, Wolf, & Cano, 2011).

As student-teachers struggle to develop professional identities, manage classroom behavior, and simply survive, they are also tasked with developing their own pedagogical content knowledge for the first time (Seixas, 1998; Seixas, 1999; Shulman, 1987). Discipline-specific secondary teachers and elementary teachers who exclusively teach social studies must develop discipline-specific skills and understandings of their content even as they establish their professional identities. Struggles to do this may further explain the gap between belief and practice exhibited by social studies student-teachers in numerous studies (Adler, 1984; Angell,



1998; Goodman & Adler, 1985; Wilson, Konopak, & Readance, 1994). Seixas (1999) agrees with Shulman (1987) that pedagogy and content are inseparable, and that student-teachers in history courses are often doing the work of both historians and teachers. Student-teachers of social studies courses often struggle to make their content and questions pedagogically appropriate for students (Seixas, 1999). This struggle joins a host of other processes that occur during student-teaching.

Student-teaching often serves as the last pre-service experience before what Lortie (2002) has described as a “lonely” leap into in-service teaching. During this time, student-teachers are busy negotiating a host of relationships and professional identities as they develop their own pedagogical content knowledge and classroom practices. While some studies indicate that pre-program beliefs and the need to teach defensively drive much of what student-teachers do, still others have found that the effects of professional development and continued learning may be more evident in student-teachers and in-service novices who are still seeking out their professional identities (Thomas, Wineburg, Grossman, Myhre, & Woolworth, 1998). While it may be tempting to view pre-service student-teachers as constrained by a host of forces beyond their control, it is likely that they have greater agency than is typically prescribed to them at this point in their careers. While student-teachers do not possess absolute free-will, Sexton (2008), reminds us that “agency exists in how people mediate their position and resources.” While their position and resources are defined for them, student-teachers can continue to reflect on and develop their practices as they transition to in-service teaching (Angell, 1998, Sexton, 2008).

The agency student teachers possess can lead to benefits for their cooperating teachers as well. In the best cases, student-teachers can even serve to update their cooperating teachers on current practices and create a dynamic relationship that is mutually beneficial to both parties

(Arnold, 2002). By supervising student-teachers, cooperating teachers have continued access to pre-service teacher preparation programs and an opportunity to break the isolation described by Lortie (2002). Student-teacher supervision can thus serve as opportunities for professional growth and development beyond the cooperating teacher's own induction into the profession if the mentoring teacher is willing to seize upon the opportunity presented (Arnold, 2002).

### **Professional Induction**

The first three years of a teacher's career are often referred to as the "induction period" (Kagan, 1993; Patterson & Luft, 2004). During this time, beginning teachers are navigating their own classrooms for the first time without the support of a cooperating teacher and university supervisor. They are also constructing, deconstructing, and reconstructing their identities as teacher and their conceptions of teaching (Flores & Day, 2006; Hsieh, 2015). It should be noted that this three-year induction period is not necessarily a one-time experience, as teachers who move to new schools may again experience many of the struggles experienced by first-year teachers (Pietsch & Williamson, 2010). Regardless of context, the first years in the classroom after pre-service preparation have been characterized as a period of "transition shock" (Chong, 2011). Unfortunately, this induction period is often a lonely time in which teachers feel unsupported (Lortie, 2002).

Support for teachers during the induction period is crucial as they continue to learn how to take on all the dispositions of a teacher and develop their own meaningful, responsive practices (Feiman-Nemser, 2008). One study of metaphors utilized to describe early career experiences of new teachers found that while graduating pre-service teachers considered themselves ready for the profession, follow-ups with the same teachers during their first year of teaching found them exhibiting low confidence and a sense of powerlessness (Thomas & Beauchamp, 2011).

Because of these factors and the need to help novice teachers ameliorate a host of other struggles, formal mentorship relationships and induction programs are not uncommon in schools. Such formal arrangements are often needed to reduce the sense of isolation described by Lortie (2002), and these arrangements typically occur when administrators assign a veteran teacher as a mentor to a novice (Davis, 2001). While the focus and quality of such mentoring relationships varies by school, it is not uncommon for the primary focus of these programs to be on the “nuts and bolts” of teaching (Melnick & Meister, 2008). Van Hover and Pierce’s 2006 study of two first-year history teachers found that their induction programs followed this “nuts and bolts” approach by focusing largely on paperwork, maintenance of an orderly classroom, and other issues related to survival (Van Hover & Pierce, 2006).

It is not surprising that mentoring and induction programs focus on the areas described by Van Hover and Pierce (2006) when one considers the stated needs of novice teachers. Teachers in their early careers are often focused more on themselves than on formal professional development with regards to instruction and student learning (Chong, 2011). Indeed, teachers in this period experience both psychological as well as instructional issues (Van Hover & Yeager, 2004). These struggles are to be expected as new teachers develop their professional and personal identities (Bullough, 1990; Feiman-Nemser, 2008; Rodgers & Scott, 2008). Bullough’s (1990) in-depth study of Heidi, a first-year teacher, found that the major narrative of her first-year was one of experimentation with various roles. Throughout her first year, Heidi’s supervisor noticed her shift from content-area expert to friend to “caring adult” as she struggled to develop her identity in relation to her subject matter and her students (Bullough, 1990).

Mentoring and induction programs that respond to the psychological needs of teachers developing their professional identities are certainly necessary, but it is clear that such programs

must do more. In addition to the expressed struggles of teachers seeking to handle the nuts and bolts of teaching as they develop their professional identities, teachers in the induction period often articulate a host of other concerns. Not surprisingly, beginning teachers often stress classroom management and communications with parents as their major concerns (Melnick & Meister, 2008). Doppen (2007) also calls for induction programs to include on-site technology induction to help novices meaningfully utilize technology in their practice.

Helping novice teachers develop and address all of the aforementioned concerns is both a worthy endeavor and a tall order. Yet, the practical, survival-based focus of many programs is inadequate in supporting teachers in their instructional practices (Grossman & Davis, 2012; Van Hover & Pierce, 2006). Teachers need direct support to improve their instructional practices and assess student learning (Grossman & Davis, 2012). Advanced forms of support for instruction and pedagogy are often absent from mentoring and induction programs. As Bullough (1990) noted, his first-year subject was often left alone by mentors and supervisors as she seemed to be doing well. Thus, teachers who appear to be mastering the day to day activities of the profession may not receive advanced forms of support that they need.

To successfully implement thoughtful instructional methods, novice teachers need help in understanding how practical issues like classroom management and learning interrelate (Melnick & Meister, 2008). Without direct support in these areas, it is likely that teachers will fall into patterns of defensive teaching (McNeil, 1986). When coupled with the pressures of standardized testing, this lack of instructional mentoring can lead to practices that move beyond even McNeil's conception of defensive teaching. In a study of social studies teachers in Virginia, Van Hover & Pierce (2006) articulated their fear that the lack of instructional support offered to their first-year subjects would combine with standardized testing changes and lead these novices to

“drill and kill,” coverage-oriented practices even though they had been prepared to teach in a more thoughtful fashion.

However, formal mentorship arrangements at school sites cannot address all of these concerns. Novice teachers regularly cite informal and unplanned learning from their peers as being more valuable and influential to their practice than their formal programs of induction (McCormack, Gore, & Thomas, 2006). Davis (2001) concurs with this in his assertion that true mentorship is a voluntary experience, and that the development of true teacher communities in schools is more important than refocused efforts on traditional induction programs.

Novice teachers are not blank slates, however, and any formal or informal mentorship arrangements occur in the context of the teacher’s pre-service preparation programs and personal conceptions. In an earlier section of this review, I addressed research on the relative influences of teachers’ pre-program beliefs and the effects of pre-service preparation programs. While the formal and informal induction experience of novices will continue to shape their beliefs, it is important to examine the continued effects of pre-service preparation on teachers, and in particular social studies teachers, in their early careers.

Assessing the continued impact of pre-service preparation on novice teachers once they have left their teacher education programs is not an easy task. Scott & Baker (2003) attempted to determine the extent to which sixty-six recent graduates of an alternative teacher education program utilized “complex teaching models” in their classrooms. While their findings indicated a majority of the teachers surveyed used at least one of the models they had experienced during pre-service preparation, this data was generated only by self-report of the teachers themselves (Scott & Baker, 2003). Such findings may be helpful, but also demonstrate the difficulty of determining what large groups of teachers are actually doing in the field. More intensive studies

of smaller samples of teachers provide more insight on the effects of pre-service preparation on novice teachers.

Chant's (2002) more in-depth study of three first-year social studies teachers examined the extent to which these teachers displayed fidelity to the Personal Practical Theories (PPTs) of teaching they developed in their pre-service preparation program. In all three cases, the teachers attempted to base their practices on their pre-existing rationales, though their experiences as first-year teachers necessitated the refinement of their pre-service PPT (Chant, 2002). Further, context proved to be significant, as one of the subjects began her career in a vastly different school environment than the one that had informed her original rationale. Her struggles to base her practices on her conceptions were more evident than those of the other teachers, who taught in a context very similar to the one that initially formed their beliefs (Chant, 2002). Similarly, Hawley (2010) studied the rationales and practices of first-year social studies teachers, and found gaps between the two. Hawley identified three recurring themes in the struggles of these novice teachers as they sought to address the dissonance between their beliefs and actions: "teacher versus the system," "rationale meets reality," and "built-in guilt." These themes represented the teachers' perceptions that the "system" prevented the practical implementation of their rationales, and that the clash between pre-service rationale and reality proved problematic. Further, these first-year teachers often exhibited some guilt over the gap between their rationales and classroom practices (Hawley, 2010).

The distance between pre-service rationales and classroom practices is not unique to social studies teachers or to teachers in the induction period. Researchers have long acknowledged gaps between broad educational theory and classroom practice (Kagan, 1993; Lortie, 2002; McNeil, 1986). In social studies education, it has also been demonstrated that the inquiry-based

instruction often advocated for at the university level is not prevalent in the practices of classroom teachers (Patterson & Luft, 2004). While such gaps are not unique to novice social studies teachers, support for these new teachers that focuses directly on discipline-specific instructional techniques can prove invaluable in bringing together pre-service preparation and in-service practice (Van Hover & Yeager, 2004). While researchers continue to discuss the distance between general theory and practice, we still don't know enough about the extent to which the methods encountered in pre-service preparation are utilized by in-service social studies teachers (Van Hover & Yeager, 2004). Further research is needed to determine the effects of pre-service preparation on the practices of teachers during the induction phase and beyond.

As noted above, schools rarely provide formal continued education on teaching methods during the induction phase, focusing instead on survival and procedural concerns (Melnick & Meister, 2008; Van Hover & Pierce, 2006). This trend is further understood in light of trends in teacher attrition that reveal that beginning teachers leave schools at a much higher rate than teachers who are further along in their careers. Studies demonstrate that over forty percent of teachers entering the field leave the profession in five years or less (Brill & McCartney, 2008; Ingersoll, 2003, Rinke, 2008). The majority of these teachers leave during their initial three-year induction period, and cite a host of factors such as large workloads, classroom management issues, dissatisfaction with school leadership, and their own preexisting conceptions that teaching was not a lifelong profession (Brill & McCartney, 2008).

Teacher attrition carries with it more than the financial costs associated with finding and training replacements for teachers who leave. It also negatively impacts the ability of teachers to collaborate effectively and form collegial relationships (Brill & McCartney, 2008). Smethem's (2007) study of retention amongst teachers in the United Kingdom demonstrates that the problem

of new teacher attrition is not unique to the United States. Like Brill and McCartney (2008), Smethem advocates for more powerful induction programs as a means to stem the tide of teacher attrition (Smethem, 2007). Ultimately, however, these induction programs must do more than simply focus on helping teachers survive and stay in the profession. Such programs must be tailored to be more comprehensive and include a greater emphasis on instruction and lesson planning (Johnson & Kardos, 2008). A well-structured and all-encompassing program is no easy task, however. In addition to these practical components, teacher induction programs must also include a focus on the affective components of the profession and seek to provide positive experiences to counteract negative experiences that new teachers will invariably encounter (Morgan, Ludlow, Kitching, O’Leary, & Clarke, 2010). Simply retaining teachers beyond their induction period requires the creation of positive experiences in addition to, and perhaps more than, the avoidance of negative experiences often described as risk factors for attrition (Morgan, et al., 2010). Indeed, the power of negative episodes can easily drive teachers out of the profession if these are not counterbalanced by positive episodes or “stories to live by” rather than “stories to leave by” that drive new teachers out of the profession (Craig, 2014).

Any approach to retaining and supporting new teachers must be multi-faceted and move beyond a basic dichotomy of attrition and retention that focuses on whether or not new teachers will stay or go. Such dichotomies assume that success is measured in the retention of new teachers, without appropriately considering the quality of the teaching practices employed by teachers who stay. Recently, more nuanced views beyond “stayers” and “leavers” have been advanced in the literature (Cochran-Smith, McQuillan, Mitchell, Terrell, Barnatt, D’Souza, Jong, Shakman, Lam, & Gleeson, 2012). Cochran-Smith and her associates (2012) examined a cohort of fifteen new teachers over their initial five-year span in the classroom and considered



instructional quality as well as the likelihood that the teachers would remain in the profession, and found that the traditional dichotomy of stayers and leavers was inadequate to describe the early career moves of their sample. A deeper look at the early careers of these teachers revealed that some who were left the profession or transferred schools were teachers with strong instructional practices, while others who stayed exhibited weak or problematic practices. These authors suggest new configurations for assessing the paths of novice teachers that take into account the quality of instructional practice so often ignored by traditional thinking on induction and teacher retention. The five configurations represent instructional practice as strong, adequate, or weak/problematic, and take into account that career moves may include staying on, moving schools, or getting out of the profession altogether (Cochran-Smith, et al., 2012).

More nuanced research on teachers in the first three to five years of their careers is certainly laudable as we continue to examine the struggles, successes, and career moves of novice educators. While the bulk of research on the first years of a teacher's professional life has focused on the struggles faced by teachers and induction programs to encourage retention, it has also been suggested that new teachers in the modern era possess many advantages and opportunities for continued growth and development. At the present time, many beginning teachers demonstrate greater confidence in implementing multiple methods of assessment, and are often more prepared than veterans to address students with special needs (Melnick & Meister, 2008). Further, beginning teachers who enter their careers shortly after completing teacher education programs may also retain ties with these programs, and can thus receive continued support. It has been suggested that change can occur more readily in the induction phase (Patterson & Luft, 2004). Such changes may be for the worse, as pressures stemming from novice teaching and standardized testing and may lead to changes away from the types of

instruction advocated in methods courses in favor of traditional, coverage-based practices (Van Hover & Pierce, 2006). However, change in the induction period can also be for the better, if novice teachers receive the right kind of support and mentorship. Teacher education programs that wish to ensure the continued development of professional knowledge and the use of complex instructional strategies by their graduates must continue to provide such support when teachers leave their programs and enter their careers (Saye et al., 2013).

### **Relevant Studies**

Throughout this review of literature, many of the studies referenced have examined the rationales and practices of teachers as they transitioned from pre-service programs to in-service teaching (Scott & Baker, 2003; Van Hover & Yeager, 2003; 2007). In these cases, findings centered on changes to teachers' rationales, the common challenges that made rationale implementation difficult, and teachers' awareness of the dissonance between their pre-service beliefs and in-service practices. Small-scale studies, such as those by Van Hover and Yeager (2003; 2007), have examined the experiences of one or two teachers in depth, but the transferability of their findings is unclear. Larger-scale studies such as that of Scott and Baker (2003), suffer from reliance on teacher self-report only. In order to more fully understand the effects that the transition into the teaching profession has on the beliefs and practices of teachers, further study is needed. Even when teacher self-reports acknowledge the helpfulness of their pre-service preparation, the actual influence of teacher education programs on teachers' daily instructional practices is unclear (Fehn & Koeppen, 1998; Van Hover & Yeager, 2004). We need to know more about how pre-service preparation and rationale-building continues to affect teachers beyond the induction period, as well as how pre-service preparation interacts with other factors that influence teacher rationale and practice.

The following table (Table 1) displays the three studies discussed in this review of literature that are the most relevant to my study. Both Hartzler-Miller (2001) and Hawley (2010) moved beyond the basic self-reporting common to larger-scale studies to examine smaller samples of teachers in a more in-depth fashion. Like my study, both of these authors were primarily concerned with the extent which teachers in their early careers were able to translate their pre-service rationales and preparation into meaningful practice. While the third study presented in the table below does not mirror my study in scope and method, it nonetheless relates to my study in that the participants were a part of the same South Plains University social studies teacher education program that produced my participants (Saye, et al., 2013). While participant data in this study was anonymous, the authors' findings are still valuable in showing a general trend among program graduates.

*Table 1: Relevant studies*

Study	Type/Method of Study	Data Collection	Purpose	Sample	Findings Relevant to this Study
Hartzler-Miller (2001)	Single qualitative case study	Interviews (autobiographical & observation-based)  Observations (2 class periods per day every day for 2 units)  Lesson- and unit-level planning materials	To investigate the classroom practices of a third-year history teacher who articulated beliefs and knowledge that aligned with inquiry-based teaching	1 third-year history teacher (initially 2 teachers)	Despite knowledge and some beliefs that aligned with the principles of inquiry-based teaching, the teacher in this study was reluctant to implement inquiry-based strategies in the classroom due to some divergent beliefs and a potential lack of exposure to these strategies.

Study	Type/Method of Study	Data Collection	Purpose	Sample	Findings Relevant to this Study
Hawley (2010)	Year-long, multiple-case study	Interviews (4)  Observations & observation-based interviews (14-15)  Written Rationale Statements of teacher participants  Administrator interviews	To examine the extent to which the practices of first-year teachers reflected their pre-service rationales for teaching	3 first-year social studies teachers	All three participants faced gaps between their pre-service rationales and practices as first-year teachers. The author identified three themes that were articulated by the teachers: teacher v. system, rationale meets reality, built-in guilt
Saye, et al. (2013)	Scenario-based survey instrument	Scenario-based survey instrument (participants responded to scenarios surrounding the planning of a U.S. History unit at the beginning and end of the teacher preparation program)	To examine the effects of a four-course social studies teacher preparation program on the professional teaching knowledge (PTK) of pre-service graduates	34 pre-service secondary social studies teachers	Though not a study of practicing teachers, this study examined the effects of the same South Plains University teacher preparation program on pre-service teachers at the end of their student-teaching experience. Findings indicate that graduates of this program tended to move closer to the PTK of their program. Further, they were able to offer more nuanced descriptions of their decision-making.

Hartzler-Miller's 2001 case study of a third-year history teacher most closely matches my study in its scope. Hartzler-Miller found that the teacher held a rationale that matched his pre-service preparation and supported historical inquiry teaching methods, but still did not take this approach regularly in his classroom practices (Hartzler-Miller, 2001). This teacher was not explicitly constrained by the school culture or coverage expectations which typically make

inquiry-based practices difficult to implement (Fehn & Koeppen, 1998; Hartzler-Miller, 2001, Seixas, 1998). Instead, even though many of his beliefs were congruent with the underlying framework of inquiry-based teaching, this teacher did not translate this into his own definition of “best practices,” and thus his classroom practices did not support the inquiry-based instruction supported by his rationale.

Hartzler-Miller attributes this disconnect to the teacher’s own definition of best practice and a possible lack of sufficient exposure to inquiry teaching practices in his methods course (Hartzler-Miller, 2001). While the case study raises interesting questions, the focus on a single teacher working within a single school context limits its utility. This study attempted to control for this by exploring the beliefs and practices of more than one teacher in various school contexts. Further, Hartzler-Miller’s belief that this teacher may have experienced inadequate and short-term instruction in inquiry-based teaching practices is significant. Making sure that teachers have been sufficiently exposed to inquiry-based practices is an essential first step in evaluating how these teachers conceptualize and use such practices.

To account for this, the participants in my study are all graduates of South Plains University’s social studies education program that emphasizes inquiry-based practices in social studies across multiple semesters, rather than within a single sixteen-week methods course. Indeed, the pre-service program that produced these teachers is characterized by inquiry-based practices in general and problem-based historical inquiry (PBHI) in particular. As discussed by Saye and Brush (2004), PBHI combines traditional conceptions of inquiry-based practices with a focus on recurring social issues. As conceived these authors, PBHI provides an approach to teaching social studies that aligns with the conceptions of democratic citizenship discussed in the first section of this review of literature (Saye & Brush, 2004). Still, even though we know that

graduates of this program have been exposed to PBHI for an extended period of time, their individual understandings and takeaways from their methods courses is likely to vary. It is important to discern the individual understandings of graduates before considering their successes with implementing the ambitious teaching practices that they encountered. One way to do this is by examining, and having participants reflect on, the professional philosophy statements they designed at the culmination of the final methods course before their student teaching experiences. This document, along with their current articulations regarding the purpose of social studies education, can be of use in discerning the understandings participants derived from their pre-service instruction.

Hawley's study is also similar to mine in scope and purpose in that he sought to examine how practicing teachers translated their pre-service preparation and rationales into classroom practice. Hawley's methodology and data collection techniques were comprehensive, as he conducted four formal interviews with participants and observed each teacher multiple times. He also made use of participants' written rationale statements that they completed near the end of their pre-service preparation program (Hawley, 2010). Similar to Hawley's written rationale statements, participants in South Plains University's pre-service preparation program complete written professional philosophy statements near the end of their undergraduate experiences. Along with interviews and classroom observations, my study also relies on participants' pre-service philosophy statements as a data source (see Appendix A for this assignment).

While Hawley's study is commendable with regards to its comprehensive data collection procedures, it offers less than expected in terms of findings that are relevant to my study. As mentioned earlier, Hawley discerned three common themes in the experiences of participants as they sought to transform rationales into practice: "teacher versus the system," "rationale meets

reality,” and “built in guilt” (Hawley, 2010). Ultimately, however, these themes do not seem to be distinctly different, as all refer to the struggles of first-year teachers as they experienced the reality of classroom life and the chaos common to novice teaching. I was left wondering if Hawley’s takeaways were all that could be gleaned from his comprehensive data collection and analysis. It is important to remember, however, that Hawley’s research questions were tailored to specifically examine the experience of first-year teachers as they sought to transform beliefs into practice. Because he studied first-year teachers during the chaos of their first year, it is not surprising that his findings seem relatively broad. Novice teachers are not unlike student-teachers in that they are often focused on survival more than critical reflection of their beliefs and practices (Kagan & Tippins, 1992). While Hawley’s findings answer his research questions regarding the experience of first-year teachers, we need to know more about how pre-service preparation and rationale building continues to affect teachers beyond the induction period. In order to allow for this and allow for critical reflection on their induction period, my participants must have completed at least two years in the profession prior to data collection.

As mentioned earlier, the third study displayed in Table 1 does not relate to my study in terms of its purpose or scope in the way that Hartzler-Miller and Hawley’s articles do. However, the participants in this study were members of the same social studies teacher preparation program that produced my participants (Saye, et al., 2013). In this examination of 34 pre-service teachers over multiple semesters, a pre- and post-program scenario survey revealed that many respondents did in fact move towards the types of professional teaching knowledge advocated by the program when responding to items on learning objectives, unit introductions, resources, and unit assessments. Twenty-one percent of respondents demonstrated integration of the program’s professional teaching knowledge across all four of the survey’s subsections (Saye, et al., 2013).

As they exited the program, most teachers were able to provide more nuanced descriptions of their instructional decision-making process than when they entered (Saye et al., 2013). These findings are important here, as the authors demonstrated that the general trend of pre-service teachers in the program was a move towards the philosophy and professional teaching knowledge of the program. As with many other studies, however, the extent to which graduates of this program continue to adhere to the principles and practices as they begin their careers is unknown. My study follows a select group of graduates from this program into their careers in order to determine the continued effects of the pre-service preparation model.

### **Importance of the Study**

As detailed in the literature, a host of challenges await first-year social studies teachers (Van Hover & Yeager, 2004). As noted by other researchers, the first years of teaching mark a chaotic period, and one in which changes in the rationales and practices of teachers can occur (Caron, 2004; Patterson & Luft, 2004; Van Hover & Yeager, 2004). In order to allow teachers to reflect on changes, participants must have completed their first two years of teaching prior to the beginning of data collection in order to allow meaningful reflection of this time of transition into teaching. As many of the issues common to first-year teaching continue throughout the initial three-year induction period, almost all of the participants had completed their first three years in the profession. Studying teachers who had already completed the induction period allowed me to more effectively assess the changes to rationales and practices that may have occurred in the interim, and allowed me to account for some of the host of challenges common to novice teachers in this period.

This study is also significant in that it sought to evaluate the endurance of an integrated approach to professional teaching knowledge that merges researcher and craft knowledge (Saye



et al., 2009). Indeed, the pre-service social studies education program at South Plains University supports and is framed by the concept of professional teaching knowledge as the merger of the craft knowledge of classroom teachers with the academic knowledge of researchers in the form of professional communities. This conception of professional teaching knowledge represents a promising approach for improving student learning, and my study examines teachers prepared in the context of a professional community that emphasized problem-based inquiry techniques generated by researchers and practicing teachers (Saye et al., 2009). This study examined the extent to which practicing graduates of the program continue to adhere to this type of professional teaching knowledge.

## **Chapter Three: Methodology**

### **Design of Study**

This research project was designed as a multiple-case study. As defined by Stake (2006) and Creswell (2007), a multiple-case or collective case study allows the researcher to select and study multiple cases in order to illustrate the key issue under examination, in this case the various factors that influence teachers' beliefs and practices. In such studies, the researcher is able to "purposefully select multiple cases to show different perspectives on the issue" (Creswell, 2007). The purposeful selection of five cases allowed me to account for the widest possible range of factors that may influence the beliefs and practices of teachers. As a general rule, multiple-case studies generally consist of no more than four or five cases as the inclusion of more cases significantly reduces the depth of any single case with regards to data collection and presentation. Researchers are often tempted to include a greater number of cases as a means to establish greater generalizability, but generalizability is not the goal of qualitative research (Creswell, 2007). This is particularly true if the search for generalizability reduces the depth and richness of the individual cases. Instead, the goal of this and similar studies is to seek "lessons learned" that may be extrapolated to other situations (Creswell, 2007; Patton, 2002). As is often the case with collective case studies, the result of this study was the construction of individual cases that can be analyzed, as well as a comparative analysis across the five cases (Creswell, 2007). This multilayered analysis is designed to address the following research questions:

1. How does pre-service preparation in problem-based historical inquiry professional teaching knowledge influence teacher rationales and practice?
2. What factors other than pre-service preparation influence teacher rationales and practice?
3. What are the implications of this study's findings for promoting principled, professional teaching practice?

Case studies are primarily designed to provide a framework for the collection of rich qualitative data, and qualitative data collection occurred through teacher interviews, classroom observations, and the analysis of student tasks. While the details of this qualitative data collection are discussed later in this chapter, it should be noted that in accordance with the recommendations of Yin (2003) and Creswell (2007), replication of the same procedures was used for each case with regards to the number and general format of interviews and observations with each participant. The “logic of replication” discussed by Yin (2003) does not mean strict allegiance to procedures that limit design flexibility. As naturalistic, qualitative fieldwork unfolds, flexibility in design is a necessary component of the inquiry process (Patton, 2002). In this study, replication of procedures does not prevent me from moving beyond pre-constructed protocols as necessary during interviews or incorporating new types of data that might emerge, but a standard format and number of data collection opportunities ensure that drastically different quantities of data are not collected from participants.

While case studies are primarily designed as approaches for qualitative data collection, the use of pre-existing, numerically-scored rubrics for the examination of classroom observations and student tasks allowed for some basic numeric comparisons between cases. In addition to detailed field notes and the development of classroom observation reports that provide thick, rich descriptions of the events of each observation, classroom observations were scored using

Authentic Intellectual Work (AIW) rubrics. Additionally, the student tasks assigned by each teacher was scored using a related AIW rubric. These rubrics were selected as data collection instruments due to their research-based development and similar criteria to the PBHI framework with regards to higher-order, relevant teaching practices (Saye & Brush, 2007). The numerical scoring of these rubrics allowed for basic comparisons between the observations within each case and between the five cases.

**Participants and Setting**

A purposeful sampling strategy was used to select the participants for this study. Due to the focus of the study and questions posed, all participants were graduates of South Plains University’s pre-service social studies teacher preparation program. Additionally, all participants were employed within an hour’s travel time from South Plains University and had completed at least the first two years of their teaching careers. The latter requirement was developed so that participants were able reflect on their professional induction period and to mitigate against the unique challenges of this period.

I sought a sample that was as heterogeneous as possible, as well as one that accounted for the wide range of variables discussed in the literature. The following table presents major constructs suggested by the literature reviewed in the preceding chapter as influential on teachers’ beliefs and practice along with specific questions that guided participant selection and inquiry.

*Table 2: Variables guiding participant selection and subsequent inquiry*

Major Construct	Questions
School & Departmental Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent is collaboration with other teachers required or supported?</li> <li>• Is the school organized by departmental or grade-level?</li> <li>• Does the school climate focus on lower-order and standardized testing rather than higher-order learning and transfer?</li> <li>• What is the administrative structure of the school? Who supervises and supports teachers?</li> </ul>

Major Construct	Questions
Professional Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the participant a member in any professional communities at the school (beyond the faculty as a whole)?</li> <li>• Has the participant continued his/her education by pursuing advanced degrees? In what field(s)? Where?</li> <li>• Is the participant a member in any informal and formal professional communities beyond the school?</li> </ul>
Professional Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What types of professional development initiatives has the participant experienced on a school or system basis?</li> <li>• Has the participant participated in formal professional development on his/her own initiative?</li> <li>• Does the participant make efforts to stay current in the research and practices of the field?</li> </ul>
Course Load & Additional Responsibilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many courses does the participant teach on a daily basis? Are all courses in field?</li> <li>• Does the participant have additional responsibilities beyond classroom teaching? If so, what? What is the time commitment?</li> </ul>
Mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the teacher taught in schools other than his/her current school? If so, what were the contexts of these schools and the reasons for movement?</li> </ul>

I initially recruited six teachers as participants in the study. In order to find these individuals, I asked for recommendations from departmental professors and graduate school colleagues who had taught pre-service social studies teachers in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching. I avoided any participants whose internships I had supervised. None of the teachers I approached refused to participate in the study, though two of the initial group of six participants dropped out of the study. The first decided to leave a few weeks after agreeing to participate due to an overwhelming workload and personal matters. Because no data was collected, she is not referenced elsewhere in this study. The other participant that dropped out of the study completed consent forms and an initial interview, but dropped out of the study before any other data could be collected. Due to the departure of these two individuals, I recruited another candidate (Waylon) midway through the academic year. Waylon joined Fiona, Matt, Frank, and Bram to form the sample of five teachers in this study.

**Fiona.** At the onset of this study, Fiona was beginning her fourth year as a social studies teacher at South Plains High School, located within walking distance of South Plains University. Unlike other participants in this study, she had elected to complete her MEd immediately after her undergraduate work in social science education at South Plains University. After this “fifth-year” program, she began teaching full-time at South Plains High School in fall 2010. She continued to have a relationship with her South Plains University program through her service as a cooperating teacher for interns. During this study, Fiona taught four sections of 11<sup>th</sup> Grade United States History along with two sections of an Advanced Placement Government course. In addition to her teaching responsibilities, she was involved in a number of extracurricular activities at the school, with the most prominent being her supervision of the band’s flag line. She indicated a genuine enthusiasm about being involved in these extracurricular activities, and spoke at length about her roles as a counselor and mentor as well as her traditional classroom responsibilities.

**Matt.** Matt graduated from South Plains University and began teaching social studies in 2009. With regards to location, he was the closest of the participants as he worked just outside of the South Plains University campus at South Plains Junior High School. A fifth-year teacher during the study, Matt was taking a break from his MEd work in social science education at South Plains University. He began this Master’s degree program after teaching at SPJHS for one year. Despite having not finished his graduate work, Matt continued to be involved with South Plains University through professional development activities and a graduate assistantship with the Model United Nations camp during his summer break in 2010. Like Fiona, he also worked with pre-service teachers from his program and served as a cooperating teacher. The lone ninth-grade teacher in this study, Matt taught Modern World History all day long. Like all of his peers

in the study, Matt was involved in a number of extracurricular activities. Among these activities were positions as an 8<sup>th</sup> grade football coach and the sponsor of the South Plains Competitive Anglers fishing team. Like Fiona, Matt spoke enthusiastically about these topics and the pastoral role and mentorship responsibilities that drew him to the teaching profession.

**Frank.** Frank was the only seventh-grade teacher in this study and the lone representative from the neighboring Swamp City School System. A teacher at a middle school comprised of grades 6-8, Frank was accustomed to working with younger students. He also differed from his peers in the study in other key ways. With only two years of experience at the beginning of the 2013-2014 academic year, Frank was the least experienced of his peers. He also entered the profession at an older age than his peers. Unlike the other participants, who each entered into full-time teaching in their early twenties, Frank did not complete his undergraduate work and begin his career until his early thirties. During the initial interview, he spoke at length about his long journey to becoming a teacher, a journey that included taking a significant amount of time off from college and trying other professions before determining that teaching was a good professional and personal fit for him. Like Fiona, Frank spoke at length about his passion for coaching and other extracurricular responsibilities and the opportunities these presented for mentorship and counseling.

**Bram.** Bram completed his undergraduate work at South Plains University in December 2007, and began teaching social studies full-time at the school that hosted his internship the next month. Due to his status as a mid-year hire, he actually had five and a half years of classroom experience when the study began. Unlike Frank, Matt, and Fiona, Bram taught at a school located nearly 45 minutes away in Georgia. Despite this distance, he maintained contact with the teacher education program at South Plains University. While he had continued to participate in

the PFG project and other professional development activities with his alma mater, he elected not to return to South Plains University for MEd work. Instead, he was in the process of completing a Master's degree in "Accomplished Teaching" at a nearby university. Unlike his peers in the study, Bram's course load consisted almost exclusively of Advanced Placement courses such as AP US History and AP Government. He also taught an elective Debate course that catered to Advanced Placement students. In addition to his responsibilities as a soccer coach, his AP courses required a great deal of his time outside of school as he spoke of regularly coming early and staying late for AP exam preparation and review sessions. Bram described the 2012-2013 year as having been particularly challenging due to a major conflict with the parents of one of his AP students stemming from grades and classroom behavior. Though he was considered a successful AP teacher and enjoyed teaching Advanced Placement students, it was clear that these courses brought a unique set of challenges.

**Waylon.** Waylon was a colleague of Bram at Farmerville High School in Georgia, and like Bram, Waylon completed his pre-service teacher education program in 2007, though he finished in August of that year. He spent the fall semester of 2007 as a substitute teacher before spending the following spring as a long-term substitute for the marketing teacher at Farmerville High School. He spent the 2008-2009 academic year teaching social studies in another school district before returning to Farmerville High in his current position in fall 2009. At the study's onset, Waylon had not completed any graduate work, though he had participated in the PFG project with Bram. Waylon was the only teacher in the study who had full-time teaching experience at more than one school, and the only participant who spent significant time as a substitute teacher. He was also unique among the study participants in that he taught non-social studies courses as well as United States History. During the year of data collection, he taught courses on the



profession of teaching and current events in education. While these courses were technically not social studies courses, he had a great deal of flexibility in designing the courses and saw these as opportunities to utilize problem-based teaching methods learned during his pre-service preparation program to a greater extent than he did in other courses.

**Group.** As evidenced by the brief profiles above, the group had a few similarities beyond a common pre-service teacher education program. All five participants were deeply invested in their schools and participated in a number of time-consuming extracurricular activities. Despite long hours and multiple responsibilities, all spoke favorably of their professions and none indicated moving on to other professions. By design in the drawing of the study sample, however, a number of variables set the participants apart from each other. The participants varied in their years in the profession, experiences with continued education, and a number of other areas. The table below (table 3) provides an overview of some of the key similarities and differences between the participants that existed during the 2013-2014 academic year.

*Table 3: Brief overview of study participants*

Participant	Yrs . of Exp .	Completed Master's Degree (Y/N)	Master's Before Teaching (Y/N)	Currently in Grad. Program	Continued PD with SPU (Y/N)	Coop. Teacher for Interns (Y/N)	Grades Taught	Course Preps
Fiona	3	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	10-12	2
Matt	4	N	N	N	Y	Y	9	1
Frank	2	N	N	N	N	N	7	1
Bram	5 ½	N	N	Y	Y	N	10-12	3
Waylon	5	N	N	N	Y	Y	10-12	3

In order to account for these variables and examine the relative influence of each on the beliefs and practices of participants, every effort was made to ensure that the sample of five teachers was not completely homogeneous and was as representative as possible of these variables. Classroom observations took place in the classrooms of each participant and interviews were also conducted on-site in the teacher's classroom or a neighboring room. All data collection occurred in the classroom that served as the setting for the day-to-day activities of each teacher. The goal of this collective case study was not to alter teacher behavior or to implement an intervention, but rather to utilize interviews, observations, and student task analysis to gain an understanding of what the teacher believed and was likely to do in his or her normal, everyday setting. While the presence of an outside individual may have some effect on the behaviors of the teacher and students, the goal of the qualitative researcher is to minimize this effect to the greatest extent possible (Brown, 1992). Ways to mitigate this are discussed later in this chapter, though it must also be noted that classrooms are not laboratory settings that can be completely controlled. Even if the effects of the researcher's presence can be mitigated, classrooms are multiply-confounded environments that cannot be completely controlled or replicated (Brown, 1992). As a result of this pragmatic concern, design flexibility and detailed descriptions of all events are a must in the construction of these cases.

### **Data Sources**

Table 4 displays the sources of data that were collected in order to address this study's guiding research questions as well as when this data was collected. All of the data sources were significant to the construction of the cases for individual and collective analysis and thus all data sources were utilized to address each of the three research questions. Following this table, I describe the data sources and the collection of each in-depth.

*Table 4: Data sources and collection*

Data Source	Time of Collection
<b>Teacher Interviews (5)</b>	
Initial Interview	Beginning of study (August 2013)
Observation-Based Interviews (3)	Following each formal classroom observation (see below)
Final Interview	End of study (May 2014)
<b>Classroom Observations (3)</b>	
Observation 1	September – November 2013
Observation 2	December 2013 – February 2014
Observation 3	March – April 2014
<b>Other Data Sources</b>	
AIW Classroom Observation & Student Task Rubric Scores	Created during and after each formal observation
Student Tasks	Collected at each formal observation
Unit- & Lesson-level Planning Materials	Collected at each formal observation
Professional Philosophy Statements	Collected at time of initial interview

**Qualitative data.** Qualitative data was collected in a variety of ways during the construction of the five cases in this multiple-case study. First, qualitative data was collected in the form of five semi-structured interviews with each participating teacher that were audio-recorded and transcribed. Prior to the initial interview, participants were asked to review their Professional Philosophy Statements that they designed in the final methods course before their undergraduate student-teaching experiences. This reflection was designed to help to meet one of the goals of this initial interview by having teachers reflect on their pre-service beliefs and ideas on the purpose of social studies education. During the initial interview, participants were also asked to consider their current vision regarding the purpose of social studies education. This initial interview also included items that asked teachers to reflect on their professional induction as they transitioned from pre-service to in-service teaching. Finally, the initial interview included items that asked participants to explain their conceptions of the PBHI framework. Because there is often a gap between what teachers say they do in their classrooms and what is actually observed,

these items were included to help me to determine if teacher practices and beliefs did not align as a result of misunderstandings regarding PBHI or due to other factors. (See Appendix B for initial interview protocol)

In addition to the initial interview, each teacher participated in three interviews based on each formal classroom observation. These interviews were designed to allow teachers to provide their rationales for their lesson- and unit-level goals, as well as to describe their decision-making process prior to and during the lesson. Additionally, these observation-based interviews were crafted to allow participants to critically reflect on the successes and shortcomings of their lessons and to suggest potential changes to ensure greater success on subsequent implementations. Finally, observation-based interviews provided teachers the opportunity to revisit their beliefs regarding the purposes of social studies education and to consider the ways in which the observed lessons connected to their overarching beliefs regarding social studies and schooling in general. While the general observation interview protocol guided each post-observation interview, I also asked additional clarifying questions and inquiries specific to each observation as necessary. (See Appendix C for observation-based interview protocol)

A final interview was conducted with each teacher in order to allow teachers to reflect on the year holistically and to consider the success they had in transforming their beliefs into practice. Teachers were also asked to consider the obstacles they faced during the period of data collection that may have affected their planning and classroom practices. Participants were further asked for recommendations to improve their program pre-service training experiences as well as their induction into the profession and continued in-service support. While the standard final interview protocol can be found along with other data collection tools in the appendix (see

Appendix D), this protocol did evolve somewhat on an individual basis as data collection occurs and emergent areas of inquiry became apparent.

In addition to the five semi-structured interviews, each participant was formally observed three times during the school year. In order to reduce the effects of outside observers in the classroom, the same class section was used for each formal observation and any informal visits. Participants were to select the class that most typifies their experience in the profession thus far with regards to a range of student performance, classroom management, and general class dynamics. In line with similar studies, participants were provided with two to three week windows in which each formal observation might occur, and selected a day for the observation within that window (Thompson, Windschitl, & Braaten, 2013). Teachers were encouraged to select a lesson for observation that was representative of the type of lesson and activities that they typically implemented in their classes.

For each formal classroom observation, I recorded detailed field notes and attempted to capture as much classroom dialogue as possible. These field notes were used to develop observation case summaries consisting of thick, rich descriptions of each observed class period. In addition to these narrative case summaries, AIW classroom instruction rubrics consisting of a briefer case report, numerical scores, and justifications for each score were generated. The AIW rubrics (see full versions in Appendix E) assess classroom instruction quality through the use of four standards: higher-order thinking, deep knowledge, substantive conversation, and connectedness to the real world (Newmann, King, & Carmichael, 2007). These AIW standards mirror the components necessary for effective implementation of PBHI in the classroom, as PBHI necessitates higher-order thinking, deep knowledge of the subject studied, active learning that is not controlled by one party, and connection to real-world problems and situations. In

addition to the case reports, the descriptive justifications for the scores in the four AIW classroom instruction standards included qualitative data collected from the observations.

Qualitative data was also collected in the form of all relevant lesson- and unit-level planning materials that accompany each classroom observation. These materials helped to provide context for the classroom observations and situate each observed lesson in the broader unit in which it was taught. These pieces varied based on the unit and individual planning practices of each teacher, but collecting, describing, and connecting all available materials to each classroom observation and associated interview was essential in the construction of each case. In addition to using the AIW rubric for classroom instruction, the AIW rubric for social science tasks was utilized in the analysis of the major task assigned to students as part of each formal classroom observation.

The AIW rubric for social science tasks evaluates the task assigned to students with three standards: construction of knowledge, elaborated communication, and connection to students' lives (Newmann, King, & Carmichael, 2007). Like the classroom instruction rubric, the standards and criteria that make up the rubric for social science tasks also mirrors the components of effective PBHI. As is the case with the classroom instruction rubric, the justifications for the numerical scores assigned for each student task standard helped to provide a method for the organization of qualitative data relevant to the tasks assigned to students as part of each formally observed lesson implementation.

**Numeric representations of data.** While the collective case study design of this investigation is primarily qualitative in nature, the numerical scoring of the AIW rubrics for classroom observation and social science task does allow for some basic descriptive comparison and contrasts between observations within each case, as well as between or across cases.

Because the central goal of this multiple-case study is to produce rich descriptions of cases for individual and collective analysis, the goal is not to oversimplify by assigning numerical scores to complex events. While secondary in importance to the qualitative data and justifications for the scores, the two AIW rubrics allowed for the conversion of qualitative data into basic numerical scores for a common language and framework to compare observations within and across cases.

While not the central feature of this study, some comparisons and contrasts were made by comparing the individual standard scores within each rubric as well as the total score of the AIW classroom instruction or social science task rubrics. Additionally, observations were scored holistically for comparison by adding the scores of the two rubrics to produce an overall authentic pedagogy score. This score provides the simplest method for comparisons between observations and was used for basic numeric descriptions where appropriate. While the rigorous standards of the AIW rubrics ensure that high authentic pedagogy scores are rare, the difference in quality of instruction and student gains between lower, moderate, and higher-scoring observations is very significant (Newmann, et al., 2007).

### **Threats to Data and Efforts to Mitigate**

**Researcher bias/human as researcher.** My interest in this project was partially borne out of my own educational and professional experience. I am a graduate of the pre-service teacher education program that produced my participants and am currently a graduate student in said program. During my seven years as a social studies teacher at a nearby high school, I worked with South Plains University as a cooperating teacher and mentored multiple student-teachers from the program. At the time of data collection, I continued to supervise student-teachers in this program in my capacity as a university internship supervisor. Because of my continuing

educational endeavors and consistent relationship with the teacher educators and students in this teacher education program, it is clear that I have a great deal of “buy-in” with regards to the philosophy and strategies advocated by this program. Data collection and analysis was conducted with this source of potential bias in mind. With regards to data collection, the protocols developed for teacher interviews were reviewed by my committee members and peers. This review process helped ensure quality in item construction and allowed individuals other than myself to examine questions for bias and design elements that are leading in nature.

Further, a previously-trained second rater participated in 25 % of classroom observations and independently scored each of these four observations and tasks using the AIW rubrics. Following each observation where a second rater was used, we met to norm on scores and ensure inter-rater reliability in a fashion similar to that utilized during our AIW rubric training processes. The second rater’s scores were utilized as a means to assure validity and proper application of the AIW scoring instruments. After the observations were scored individually, the second rater and I met to discuss our scores and attempt to achieve a consensus score on each AIW category. Previous AIW research by Newmann and others set an ideal exact agreement rate between scorers at 65% or higher, with 90% of each rater’s scores being within one point of each other (Newmann & Associates, 1996). Achieving such levels of agreement provides greater confidence in the scoring process used to allow for basic quantitative comparisons. The table below (Table 5) presents a brief summary of the agreement between my primary rater scores and the scores of the second rater.



*Table Five: Interrater reliability for AIW scores*

AIW Rubric: Instruction		
Standard	Exact Agreement	Exact Agreement or Agreement Within 1 Point
Higher-Order Thinking	25%	100%
Deep Knowledge	50%	100%
Substantive Conversation	75%	100%
Connectedness to the Real World	50%	75%
AIW Instruction Totals	50%	93.75%
AIW Rubric: Task		
Construction of Knowledge	100%	100%
Elaborated Communication	75%	100%
Connection to Students' Lives	25%	100%
AIW Task Totals	66.66%	100%

As seen above (Table 5), inter-rater agreement met or exceeded the standards previously established by Newmann and associates (1996) for exact agreement in 3 of the 7 criterion. Inter-rater agreement within one point exceeded these standards in all but one of the seven rubric categories. Only once did our initial individual scores not fall within one point of each other. While our initial scores did not meet the 65% agreement standard suggested by Newmann and associates (1996), it should be noted that further discussion yielded a common consensus score in all cases. Further, the small sample of observations (n=4) scored by two raters likely made the exact agreement standard difficult to achieve, as initial disagreement on even two scores made the exact agreement percentage fall below the suggested standard.

**Social desirability effects.** Participants in this study were all graduates of South Plains University's pre-service social studies education teacher preparation program. As a result, they were well-versed in the general language of PBHI professional teaching knowledge, and it is possible that they responded to interview items with what they perceived to be the desired answer whether or not such a response was generally in line with their actual beliefs and practices. As I am the primary researcher and instrument of data collection, the social desirability imperative may have been exacerbated by any pre-existing relationships I had with the respondents and the program. An initial step to mitigate this threat was the exclusion from the sample of any potential participants whose internship I supervised. As noted in the literature review, the student-teaching experience is a significant bridge between pre-service preparation and in-service teaching. My relationship with participants during this time and status as an evaluator of their performance was a potential threat to the data, and was likely to exacerbate social desirability effects.

Multiple steps were taken to mitigate the threat posed by the effect of socially desirable interview responses and classroom behaviors. First and foremost, I worked hard to make the purpose and audience of my study clear to participants. I wanted participating teachers to see their involvement in this research study as a means to improve teacher education and as a way to help teacher educators to consider new ways to continue to support teachers in the field. This clear establishment of purpose was necessary in order to help participants feel comfortable and lessen the possibility that they would not alter their practices to please the researcher. Beyond the establishment of purpose, I worked to build rapport with all participating teachers. By maintaining regular contact with teachers, I developed this rapport and tried to ensure that they considered me as a collegial peer rather than an outside evaluator.

**Observer effects.** The presence of one or more outside observers in the classroom can invariably affect the behavior of teachers and students and alter their typical day-to-day interactions. Because I wanted to gain a perspective of teacher practice and the natural classroom environment, it was important that my presence was as little of a distraction as possible. While I discussed the importance of building rapport with participating teachers above, it was also important that students did not alter their behavior due to my presence in the classroom. One method to reduce the effects of an observer's presence is to ensure that the observer spends an extended amount of time at the site that is the study's setting (Patton, 2002). This notion of the benefits of extended observation time has long been advocated by anthropologists and qualitative researchers (Patton, 2002). By utilizing one class of students for all observations and visiting this class multiple times throughout the year, my goal was that the teacher would not have to explain my presence multiple times and I could become more of a fixture in the classroom. Any informal visits with the teacher or additional observations also took place during the time of the designated class whenever possible, so that my presence was not unusual. Even with this extended time and prolonged exposure I still had to heed Patton's (2002) reminder that researchers should never underestimate or overestimate the effects their presence can have on their subjects. As such, it was incumbent upon me to be reflective and constantly seek to determine if such effects are apparent.

### **Data Collection Procedures**

Table 6 displays my ideal data collection process aligned with a general timeline of procedures. This table assumed that participating teachers taught on a year-long period schedule. The timeline of procedures was modified for Matt, as he taught on a semester-long "block"

schedule. Further, the later addition Waylon to the study necessitated that all of his observations took place in the second semester of his year-long schedule.

*Table 6: Timeline of data collection procedures*

June 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal proposal</li> <li>• IRB completion &amp; approval</li> <li>• Development/refinement of instruments</li> </ul>
July 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal recruitment of participants</li> </ul>
August 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial interview with all five teachers</li> <li>• Collection of professional philosophy statements</li> <li>• Transcribe initial interviews for analysis</li> </ul>
September – November 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete first formal observation and related interview with all five teachers</li> <li>• Write case reports for Observation 1</li> <li>• Score Observation 1 using AIW rubrics for classroom instruction and task</li> <li>• Transcribe Observation 1 interviews</li> </ul>
December 2013 – February 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete second formal observation and interview with all five teachers</li> <li>• Write case reports for Observation 2</li> <li>• Score Observation 2 using AIW rubrics for classroom instruction and task</li> <li>• Transcribe Observation 2 interviews</li> </ul>
March – April 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete third formal observation and related interview with all five teachers</li> <li>• Write case reports for Observation 3</li> <li>• Score Observation 3 using AIW rubrics for classroom instruction and task</li> <li>• Transcribe Observation 3 interviews</li> </ul>
May 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final interview with all five teachers</li> <li>• Transcribe final interviews for analysis</li> </ul>
August 2013 – May 2014 (Ongoing)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Member checking of interviews and clarifications as necessary</li> <li>• Ongoing development of final interview protocol</li> </ul>

## **Data Analysis**

As noted in the table above, analysis of the qualitative data collected in this study occurred throughout data collection and in a holistic fashion at the end of the data collection period. Construction of each of the five cases occurred alongside data collection, and initial analysis of observations, interviews, and student tasks took place alongside case construction in order to inform subsequent data collection. For example, interview transcriptions or the creation of observation case reports sometimes generated necessary follow-up questions and opportunities for member checking with the participants. Additionally, the final interview protocol was a flexible instrument and was developed up until the final interviews, so that data collection and early data analysis could inform its development throughout the study.

While the process of data analysis began with the data collection period, in-depth data analysis took place at the end of the data collection period with the construction of all five cases. Individual teacher cases consist of all data collected during the year (see Table 4 above) and a narrative describing each participant along with the history and chronology of each case (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 2006). As is typical with multiple-case studies, within-case content analysis occurred first, with the goal to find patterns and themes within each case (Creswell, 2007). As noted by Patton (2002), patterns differ from themes in that patterns refer to basic descriptive findings, while themes take the form of reductive categories. In collective case studies, within-case analysis of each individual case typically allows the researcher to generate many patterns and some themes that can serve as units of comparison in a thematic cross-case analysis (Creswell, 2007).

The qualitative analysis of each case that allowed for cross-case comparison and contrast was primarily conducted through content analysis of teacher interviews and classroom observation

reports. Analysis occurred via a coding process that utilized both typological analysis with a priori codes and emergent codes derived from inductive analysis (Creswell, 2007). A priori coding criteria were derived from multiple sources such as existing research literature, the components of PBHI professional teaching knowledge, AIW categories, and the PIH framework that framed the pre-service education of study participants. Emergent coding also took place as the data suggested new units of meaning and themes for cross-case comparison and contrast.

As mentioned above, a priori themes and codes were primarily developed from the existing research literature discussed in chapter two. Because the initial interviews asked teachers to reflect on their pre-service and current rationales, the PBHI framework was used in tandem with numerous research studies to develop codes representing fidelity to and divergence from pre-service beliefs along with codes to represent the various purposes for teaching social studies (Barber, 1984; Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1987; Barton & Levstik, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2008; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Shaver & Strong, 1982; Engle & Ochoa, 1988; The National Council for Social Studies [NCSS], 2008; Ochoa-Becker, 1996; Parker, 2003; Parker, 2008; Saye & Brush, 2004; Sizer, 1992). The research on student-teaching and professional orientation proved valuable in developing a priori codes that addressed the induction period and potential obstacles therein (Angell, 1998; Bullough, 1990; Feiman-Nemser, 2008; Flores & Day, 2006; Hartzler-Miller, 2001; Howley, 2010; Hsieh, 2015; Kagan & Tippins, 1992; Koerner, Rust, & Baumgartner, 2002; Thomas, Wineburg, Grossman, Myhre, & Woolworth, 1998; Wilson, Konopak, & Readance, 1994). Codes to assess participants' discussions of high-quality, higher-order instruction were developed using the PBHI framework and the AIW rubrics ((Newmann, et al., 1996; Newmann, et al., 2007; Saye & Brush, 2004; Saye & Brush, 2007).

Individual case records also include AIW scores for classroom instruction and social science tasks that allowed for some basic comparison and contrast between each case during the cross-case analysis. While this basic numerical comparison is not as important as the more in-depth qualitative dimension of this study, such standardized numerical scoring allowed for further discussion of participants' classroom practice with regards to ambitious teaching and the level of higher-order thought required of their students. The common language and scoring of the AIW rubrics, along with these documents' similar focus on the rigor and relevance of the PBHI framework, was beneficial in assessing the quality of classroom practice, even though the cases primarily consist of qualitative data.

The ultimate goal of data analysis in multiple-case studies depends on the field, setting, and type of study. Answering the research questions that guide this study required that I develop an understanding of the endurance of PBHI professional teaching knowledge in graduates of South Plains University's pre-service teacher preparation program. Further, I sought to develop an understanding of the factors other than pre-service preparation that influenced the beliefs and practices of early career teachers. Because my participant selection process was designed to examine the experience of my studied population in a variety of contexts, the goal was not to generate a general explanation that fits each individual case (Yin, 2003). Indeed, given the wide variety of variables suggested to influence teacher belief and practice, a one-size-fits-all explanation was neither preferred nor possible. Rather, the ultimate goal of this multiple-case analysis process was to generate interpretations of the meaning of the cases in the form of common and aberrant patterns and themes (Creswell, 2007). In doing so, my goal was to discern "lessons learned" from the cases (Creswell, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These lessons provided the information necessary to address my final research question regarding this study's

implications for anyone seeking to promoting principled, professional teaching practice during pre-service preparation and beyond.



## **Chapter Four: Findings Regarding Teacher Beliefs**

### **Introduction**

In this chapter I examine the experiences of the five participants as they transitioned from their pre-service experiences to their current roles as full-time, in-service professionals. For this analysis, I relied primarily on the initial interviews conducted with each of the participants. These initial interviews provided a great deal of information on the experiences of each participant as they became full-time social studies teachers and moved through their induction periods, and also enabled me to discern common and divergent experiences across the group as a whole.

The following section contains case descriptions designed to provide an overview of each participant's transition from pre-service teaching through their early years in the profession. When appropriate, I utilize quotes from the teachers' initial interviews to better capture their lived experiences. Following the individual cases, I examine the common and divergent experiences of study participants organized by the factors suggested by the research literature to be major influences on teachers' beliefs about teaching social studies and education in general: pre-service teacher education experiences, induction period experiences, school and departmental cultures, teacher biography, and personal conceptions of teaching that cannot easily be attributed to pre-service education, formal induction experiences, or school and departmental cultures. All participants began their teaching careers in the pre-service social studies education program at South Plains University. However, their experiences after completing this same pre-

service program differed a great deal. So too did their beliefs about teaching and rationale for social studies education.

### **Individual Cases**

**Fiona.** Fiona's decision to complete a Master's degree in the same department at her alma mater differentiated her experience from that of the other participants in the study. Because she stayed on another year to study with the same professors, her pre-service experience was longer than that of her peers. Additionally, she worked in the social studies education department at South Plains University on a graduate assistantship. The fact that she had an extended period of contact with her pre-service educators is noteworthy in understanding her transition to in-service teaching. Even though her self-reported fidelity to the models of instruction she learned as an undergraduate was comparable to that of the other participants who lacked this extra contact time, it is difficult to pinpoint the relative effects of her undergraduate and graduate experiences on her current conceptions. Like the other study participants, Fiona articulated a belief that her current rationale and practices reflected problem-based historical inquiry (PBHI) and the beliefs she held in pre-service education, at least in the "big picture" sense. She believed that she still upheld the general spirit of PBHI, but noted that she didn't present the strategies in the same level of detail that she did as an undergraduate.

Fiona described her overall approach to her profession as being significantly different than it had been during her pre-service period. In her own words, her approach was now much more "student-focused" than it was "social studies-focused." Since her pre-service experiences, her focus had shifted to skill development in the field and overall character development, and her conception of the body of historical knowledge students must possess had shrunk significantly. When asked what she would change about her pre-service philosophy if rewritten in the present,

she responded that she would focus more on relevance to students' daily lives and current events as a means to develop civic skills and character. When asked what course she would like to have taken in addition to her mandated pre-service curricula, she expressed the need for a course on counseling, as she had no idea how frequently she would function as a counselor to her students.

Fiona acknowledged that many of her guiding principles were developed apart from her pre-service program, even if she stood by her overall position that the development of skills took precedence over knowledge or slavish devotion to cultural literacy. When asked if she regularly used any of the planning strategies developed during her undergraduate experience, she noted that she did, though she used these techniques in modified or abbreviated ways to fit her classroom and persona. She also believed that her school's alternating "A/B" block schedule limited her ability to have coherent units and worked to make her lessons less dependent on each other, even though this sometimes impeded her ability to plan ambitious units. She did express a great deal of continuity of beliefs when it came to assessments, however, as she still stressed the importance of non-traditional tests in the form of culminating activities that required the students to be investigators of history rather than passive receptacles of knowledge.

After graduation, Fiona experienced a highly formalized induction process within her school system that consisted of a weeklong system-level orientation, the formal assignment of a mentor, and monthly new teacher meetings, though her extracurricular responsibilities as a coach for the school's flag line and other duties often prevented her from attending the latter. In addition to formal induction supports, she noted that she received a "ton of support" from other teachers, many of whom gave her lesson and unit plans, some of which she still used regularly, if only in modified or piecemeal fashion.

Classroom management presented Fiona with a major obstacle during the induction period as she struggled to figure out what worked for her. While older teachers gave her the advice to be stern and consistent, she found that being transparent with the rationales for her policies and reasons for changing them was more important as students viewed her as being “real.” Similarly, when a lack of content knowledge proved to be an obstacle in some courses, she ameliorated this problem by “being real” with students and acknowledging when she didn’t know the answer to a question.

Fiona consistently spoke favorably of the teaching profession and stated that she would not have chosen another profession. She spoke a great deal about her role as a counselor and mentor to her students, a role that was very important to her.

*My goal for teaching social studies is to teach them how societies work together, how they have in the past, and how to love each other...Learn the lessons from history, learn how we hate, why we hate and how to change hate into love...or at least respect enough to value each other’s opinions.*

While Fiona spoke about the value of social studies in other areas of her interview, she continually came back to discuss her role as a teacher in a more affective, pastoral sense (Lang, 1983; Child Health Promotion Research Unit, 2006). Though I did not ask her directly what influenced her decision to become a teacher, it was clear that it was more than the content alone.

Indeed, she countered observations by Altieri (2011) and others that many secondary teachers are in the profession because of a love of their content area by stating that she believed that “most people are in the profession because they want to help students.” She discussed her difficulty on focusing on other issues when her students were going through something difficult in their personal lives and questioned “how to deal with all of their issues.” She explained, “I try

to make sure that they know they have value, rather than just being focused on the value of history.” She did not see the task of letting students know their value as being totally separate from her content-area instructional duties, however. She stated that she was willing to readily step away from planned curriculum and units to discuss issues that students were passionate about such as a tax referendum in their town or instances of racial discrimination in the news.

Fiona described herself as being well-prepared by her pre-service education program. She also felt well-supported by her colleagues and mentors at work. In her words, “I was as prepared as you can be. I don’t think anything can prepare you for your first three years of teaching.” Even so, the formal preparation that she received did not prepare her for what she saw as some of her most important roles as a teacher, those of mentor, counselor, and emotional support system. While it was unclear if this conception of her station as teacher existed prior to in-service teaching, it was clear that these roles framed her current conceptions of teaching as much as, if not more than, any rationale developed in her pre-service preparation program.

**Matt.** For Matt, the most important principle that guided his philosophy and practice as a teacher was his strong belief that learning was not something that just happened in the classroom. This notion was an area of heavy focus in his professional philosophy statement that was still very important to him currently, as evidenced by his statement that he “wants his classroom to not look much different than the world outside the classroom.” Matt also noted that it was his job to teach students how to learn by teaching them habits of mind. For him, his major beliefs regarding his content area were twofold. First, history provided him with a “vehicle” to teach students how to learn in general as they developed “habits of mind.” Second, historical content should be taught and organized in a way that that allows students to use it as evidence to craft and support their opinions. When asked how his views had evolved since the creation of his

professional philosophy statement, he again stressed his belief that the most important facet of his job was teaching students how to learn. For Matt, someone who can learn on their own and use the technological tools at their disposal to learn represented the epitome of a competent citizen.

Matt spoke highly of the support he received after completing pre-service education. In addition to a weeklong system-level orientation, he was formally paired with a mentor. In his case, his mentor had also served as the cooperating teacher for his internship. It was clear that Matt's early career mentor was very influential in helping him transition to in-service teaching. Indeed, he regularly supported his belief that history provided a vehicle to help students learn by quoting his mentor's statement that "history is not a subject, it is a tool." Both Matt and his on-site mentor believed that PBHI was well-suited to help students utilize history as a tool rather than experience it as a series of facts and stories.

In addition to sharing common beliefs, the continuity of their relationship made Matt feel comfortable going to his mentor about anything. Overall, Matt was extremely pleased with his mentor relationship and felt that he could always lean on his mentor for support without judgment with regards to his teaching abilities. In addition to mentoring him in his teaching practices, his mentor also provided invaluable assistance in helping Matt to understand power dynamics in the classroom and become a better classroom manager. This component was essential as Matt noted that one of his biggest struggles was learning how to manage people. Indeed, when asked what pre-service courses would have helped better prepare him for in-service teaching, he cited additional courses in classroom management and perhaps even management courses rooted in the world of business as being potentially valuable additions. While Matt's experience with his mentor was ideal and very beneficial, he also noted that

individual trial and error and personal reflection were of equal importance in helping him navigate the induction period.

Because his school was located in close proximity to the site of his pre-service training, Matt and the other history teachers at his school worked to stay connected not only to one another, but also to his alma mater. He noted that his department tried to participate in a lesson study exercise every year that involved a summer workshop, the co-creation of a lesson and unit, and reflections on the successes and failures of their creation. Because they completed this exercise with the assistance of professors that had overseen Matt's pre-service experience, his peer collaborations also served as refresher courses of his pre-service experiences. In addition to this annual experience, he also participated in two "vertical" planning sessions each year with all middle and secondary school social studies teachers in the district.

Matt's overarching school culture was also characterized by formal and informal attempts at grade-level, or "horizontal," planning sessions in which teachers met with their grade-level colleagues at least once each semester. He also met with the other teachers on his interdisciplinary "team" at least biweekly, though he noted that these meetings were usually focused on the dissemination of information rather than in-depth collaboration and planning. Matt also described the early phases of an attempt to promote collaboration with the English teacher on his team through the collaborative development of units that could be logically taught in both courses.

Like all of the participants, Matt believed in being involved in his students' lives outside of the classroom. He was involved in a number of extracurricular activities and even helped start a competitive bass-fishing team for the school system. He also participated in a leadership institute and worked to pass leadership skills to his students. Though he did not speak as

consistently or passionately about the affective roles of the teacher as Fiona and others did, it was clear that Matt's overall conception of teaching did include many aspects of this role. Still, he did not discount the importance of the content or the overall framework he developed as a pre-service teacher. When asked about his personal conceptions of the profession, he noted that he still believed in the "big picture" of PBHI even if he did not regularly use many of the strategies that he learned as a pre-service teacher as much as he would like.

**Frank.** Frank was the only member of the sample who had not completed graduate work or continued other formal relationships with his pre-service program. He also began his career at the age of thirty, having worked in other professions before entering his pre-service program. These factors, as well as a self-professed love of coaching sports that rivaled his love for teaching, differentiated him from his fellow participants.

When asked to review his professional philosophy statement, Frank was struck by the strong emphasis he placed on the subjects of government and civics as an undergrad. This emphasis was still important to him, as he noted that he still did not believe that government got enough attention in the course of study scope and sequence. As such, he was glad that he got to teach civics for half a year in his capacity as a seventh grade teacher, though he noted that connecting this content to younger students was sometimes challenging.

When reflecting on his philosophy statement, he also stated that there was "no excuse for not being able to bring PIH to the classroom." This approach to instruction mirrored and supported his own belief that he must make social studies relevant and connect it to the lives and experiences of his students. This connection between social studies content and "real life" was also central to his purpose for social studies as he believed that government and citizenship in particular possessed content that citizens should use every day of their lives. By teaching



students what he viewed as a critical content area and connecting it to their lives, Frank believed that he could help his students utilize their knowledge to improve their community and world, as we “have a lot that needs to get better.”

Frank also expressed great continuity of belief with the other major ideas that comprised his philosophy statement. He still believed strongly that his students needed the opportunity to question themselves, talk to one another, and experience multiple perspectives on major issues. In particular, the Socratic questioning aspects of PBHI continued to be of great significance to him as he believed that it was important to get students to “second guess” themselves as they articulated their perspectives and encountered the views of others.

Frank’s induction experience was not unlike that of the other participants in the study. He took part in a weeklong orientation designed by his school system before being assigned a mentor at his school. Unlike some of the other participants, Frank did not discuss his relationship with his mentor or discuss specific takeaways from said relationship. He did, however, discuss classroom management as a specific area of improvement during his first year in the classroom, noting that he shifted from “wanting students to like me” to having high expectations for students and then building relationships with them. He regularly stressed the importance of relationship-building in both the classroom and in his secondary role as a coach and sponsor of extracurricular activities. Indeed, more than any other participant, Frank expressed his love of coaching and noted that it was important to him to be as involved as possible outside of the classroom.

For Frank, time in the classroom was the most important teacher as he noted that he now felt much more comfortable with behavior management in the classroom, and stated that “the second year was easier than the first.” He described many of his peers from his pre-service cohort as

“washing out” due to poor management skills amongst other factors. In his estimation, the classroom provided the opportunities for teachers to learn by doing, and sometimes “things may have to go bad before getting better.” Frank believed this experiential, trial-and-error process of improving one’s practice to be of the utmost importance.

Frank described himself as being well-connected to many of his colleagues, as he regularly collaborated with other social studies teachers at the school. He also planned regularly with the members of his grade-level team, which included the core subject teachers of English, math, and science. He also noted that there were many opportunities for team and collaborative planning at his school that were there when he needed them. In addition, Frank participated in a Teaching American History grant with colleagues from his school system as well as peers from a neighboring school district.

Much like Fiona, Frank’s personal conception of his profession focused heavily on the roles not directly tied to content-area instruction. He volunteered that he came to the teaching profession because he wanted to affect positive change and help people, desires he was unable to fulfill in a previous career path in finance that involved a great deal of debt collection and associated unpleasant interactions. He expressed his desire to be as involved as possible in the lives of his students outside of the classroom through extracurricular activities, stating that he was “young and had the time.” Although he articulated his belief that there was “no excuse for not being able to bring PIH to the classroom,” it was clear that he also valued his non-instructional activities as being of preeminent importance. As he put it, “Coaching is a passion for me, too. I would do it for no stipend.” Indeed, he was not entirely convinced that he would remain a social studies teacher for the rest of his career, citing athletic director as a possible career goal. Even so, he was glad he participated in his specific pre-service teacher preparation

program, as it put him “ahead of the curve” when he entered the classroom. He also described the importance of the program placing him with a detail-oriented cooperating teacher during his internship. He credited this individual with helping him to be more detail-oriented and professional. He saw this as an important bridge to his in-service teaching experience because having to work full-time throughout his undergraduate experience made full engagement with his pre-service preparation program difficult.

**Bram.** Bram believed that his philosophy statement represented his ideal vision for social studies with the caveat that the current educational testing culture made it difficult to implement. Although other participants also taught content assessed by standardized tests, Bram was the only participant to explicitly focus on testing culture as a limitation to his implementation of idealized instruction. This is likely due to his status as the lone Advanced Placement (AP) teacher in the study. While his beliefs about the viability of his ideal scope and sequence might have changed, his stated purpose for teaching social studies was largely the same as when he initially crafted his philosophy statement. In his words, the purpose of social studies was to “give students the tools and knowledge, and the ability to get the knowledge, needed to become competent citizens and members of society.” Bram also credited his pre-service experiences with influencing his planning style, as he continued to plan backwards. In his estimation, the best way to plan was to “pick your destination, and then draw your map.” When reflecting on his pre-service experiences, Bram believed himself to be well-prepared for the most part, though he did feel that he needed more training in educational accommodations as outlined in Individual Education Plans (IEPs) and 504 plans.

Because he began working at his school in January, Bram did not take part in his system’s formal new-teacher orientation program that typically took place over the summer. While his

school had a formal mentor program, he was also not assigned a mentor due to his status as a mid-year hire. However, he was employed at the school where he had just completed his internship experience. As a result, he was accustomed to the rules and norms of his school, and he had a preexisting relationship with his cooperating teacher. Even though he acknowledged that his fellow teachers were much more helpful than school administrators during his induction period, he also agreed with other participants in the study that much of the learning that took place during the induction period was an individual process.

Bram went further than other participants in describing the obstacles he encountered during the induction period, noting challenges both large and small, as well as a number of pragmatic concerns. He again reiterated the importance of preparing teachers to work with IEPs and 504 plans, and also discussed the high levels of stress faced by new teachers. He also discussed other challenges of the induction period including difficulties in forming positive relationships with parents and very practical concerns related to a lack of experience working with copy machines, paper jams, and software such as Microsoft Excel. Bram was extremely reflective as he considered all of the obstacles of his early professional career. While many of these concerns might not have been easily remedied by his pre-service education program or a formal mentor relationship, all influenced his early career. He spoke often about the importance of building relationships with parents in order to ameliorate many of the difficulties he faced, and noted that one of his biggest takeaways of his early years in the profession was that “you should contact parents for good things, too” and focus on building positive rather than negative relationships.

Intradepartmental collaboration was mandatory at Bram’s school, though it was not helpful to him as he taught AP courses that no one else at his school taught. Despite this, he spoke favorably of his social studies department. Quite a few of his colleagues were graduates of his

pre-service teacher education program and continued to work together and with faculty from their former pre-service program as part of a summer seminar and lesson study series. Thus, while he was unable to collaboratively plan directly for his exact courses with his peers, he did describe his department as being a close-knit group that regularly bounced ideas off of each other and collaborated in a more informal fashion.

Because he exclusively taught AP courses, Bram spoke a great deal about his responsibility to prepare his students for success on the AP exam. This duty extended beyond regular class hours, as he regularly came to school early and stayed late in order to prepare students for the exam. This focus on the AP exam and the need to cover a much larger amount of content than in the non-AP version of the course made it difficult for him to enact his ideal vision for social studies on a regular basis. Still, he did find some opportunities to teach in the rigorous, problem-based fashion he championed as a pre-service teacher.

Bram's personal conceptions of his profession were likely affected by what he described as a "rough year" the year prior to data collection for this study. He faced a complex issue with a disgruntled student and parents, and found himself in a number of tough situations when dealing with the student, parents, and school administration. Indeed, he described himself as still being unsure of how to navigate his relationship with administrators and called for teacher preparation programs to do more to help future teachers understand educational law and teachers' rights. While this particular situation was resolved, it was clear that he still faced a number of issues unique to the pressures of AP courses and expectations for AP students that set him apart from the other participants.

**Waylon.** When asked if his beliefs were still in line with those in his professional philosophy statement, Waylon stated that they were similar for the most part. However, he found it easier to

implement his pre-service vision for social studies when he taught United States History courses than in his World History courses. Waylon also added that he found that time constraints and student ability levels sometimes altered the transferal of his pre-service rationale into practice, as some World History classes in particular required “so much scaffolding” that time restraints did not make it feasible to reach the in-depth levels of engagement with the content that he wished.

Student-led exploration and student-focused learning strategies were a central focus of Waylon’s philosophy statement, and he still believed this to be important. He conveyed dismay that many of his students did not readily engage in critical thinking, and believed an important step to help students do this was to teach them how to find answers and information that they might not readily possess. As such, student-led exploration into problems was still a prominent part of his rationale for education. When it came to the “older students” in particular, Waylon still preferred not to be the center of the classroom experience. Asked directly to describe what he believed to be the central purpose for teaching social studies, Waylon again stressed the importance of developing critical thinking and self-directed learning skills in students.

When asked to discuss any of the planning and teaching strategies from his pre-service education that he still utilized, Waylon noted the importance he still placed on planning backwards from an end unit goal. He also liked and believed in many of the teaching strategies he had been exposed to as an undergraduate. As part of the Plowing Freedom’s Ground (PFG) summer institute, he had worked with colleagues from his school to develop an in-depth lesson that was philosophically cogent with his pre-service rationales. While he acknowledged that this lesson was strong and coherent with his beliefs, he also pointed out the difficulty of consistently developing such strong lessons as a full-time teacher and coach. Typically, such in-depth lessons that represented his idealized beliefs were best developed during the summer months. As such,

he advised that new teachers needed to “pick their spots” when developing and implementing his ideal type of instruction. In his mind, traditional, teacher-focused or lecture-based teaching still had a place and must be used when teachers are unable to develop the idealized problem-based lessons and units.

Waylon was the only participant who had worked in two different schools at the time of the study. As such, his experience was unique among the members of the sample, and his experience at each of his two schools was unique. When discussing his one year at a previous school in a neighboring state, he described this school as having a “mentoring program in theory, but not in fact.” He felt that he did not have a great deal of support as a first-year teacher at this school. At his current school, Waylon was fortunate to have a more formalized mentoring program that involved informal observations by his mentor as well as meetings with his mentor at least once a month. He was also fortunate to be assigned a mentor who had been prepared in the same undergraduate teacher education program and thus understood his pre-service background and experiences. Waylon described himself as doing well in both environments, though his observations of others’ situations led him to prefer the more involved, in-depth new teacher mentoring program at his current school.

Reflecting on his experience teaching at two different schools, he described unique early career obstacles at each location. At his first school, a key challenge was a lack of technology and resources where he was given “nothing but a chalkboard.” Waylon perceived this lack of technology as the main impediment to being able to implement the types of ambitious instruction he was exposed to as a pre-service educator as he believed access to technology in the form of computers was essential to implement his pre-service vision. As a result, he felt that he “did those kids a disservice” in his first year as an educator.

Pietsch & Williamson (2010) suggest that a teacher who moves schools within the first few years of his career may begin a whole new induction process; however, Waylon felt that his orientation to his second school was a much smoother process as he had also completed his internship at this school and knew his department. Because of this, and because of a formalized mentorship program, Waylon described his arrival at his second school in a much more positive light. He had access to greater technology and colleagues that shared his vision for social studies. However, this school also brought unique challenges in the form of classroom management and disciplinary issues, challenges common to teachers in their early careers.

Despite being a member of the same department as Bram, Waylon's experiences with his colleagues differed greatly. Whereas Bram saw little use in collaborating with non-AP teachers in his subject area, Waylon collaborated with his subject-area peers on a more consistent basis. Even though the school mandated weekly collaboration within each subject area, the quality of the collaborative experience varied by course. Waylon specifically described his different experiences collaborating with World and U.S. History teachers. He felt much more autonomy in the World History collaborative group, whereas the collaboration in the U.S. History group was characterized by a desire to stay on the same page and teach the same content in the same fashion. This less autonomous approach to teaching was a big adjustment for him, as he felt some of his creativity as a teacher taken away.

Like all participants in this study, Waylon's conception of his profession extended beyond content-area instruction. He was also a coach, and had even been recognized for excellence in coaching. His numerous coaching duties took a great deal of time, and he described this lack of time as a key factor in his decision not to pursue graduate work. However, social studies content was important to him and he was committed to continuing his graduate work in the area of social



studies education when he did begin some sort of non-traditional, online graduate studies program.

Waylon's experiences as a teacher were more varied than those of the other participants. He was the only teacher in the study to have taught at two different schools. He was also the only participant afforded the opportunity to craft his own elective courses focused on a non-traditional social studies topic. This was a positive for Waylon, as he valued creativity and creating lessons from scratch. While he also taught traditional United States History courses, these elective courses such as "Teaching as a Profession" and "Issues in Education" offered him a place to be creative and design from the ground up, a privilege he was not afforded in his United States History courses. Because he wanted to be a teacher since high school, these courses ostensibly offered Waylon a chance to mentor the next generation of teachers. In reality, however, many of his students in these courses did not express a real desire to become teachers, and instead took the course for other reasons. Though many students did not elect to take this course in the traditional sense, these courses offered Waylon the chance to teach in an "ideal" fashion free from the pressures of standardized testing, pacing guides, or mandated intradepartmental lessons.

### **Cross-Case Examination**

While the individual cases discussed above provided insight into evolution of participants' beliefs during their early careers, this section presents a cross-case examination of these individual cases. While each participant's early career experiences were unique, similarities and differences emerged between the teachers' experiences as well as the relative impact these experiences had on their self-reported beliefs. The purpose of this cross-case examination is to discern commonalities and divergences in the lived experiences of these teachers as they transitioned from pre-service to in-service teaching, and the potential impacts that these

experiences had on their pre-service beliefs. In order to discuss these multi-faceted early career experiences in a sensible fashion, the following section is organized chronologically by participants' reflection on their pre-service experiences, their induction periods, and their current school and departmental cultures. The exception to this chronological progression is the final factor, that of teacher biographies and personal conceptions of teaching.

**Factor one: Reflections on pre-service education.** In the initial interviews, all participants stated that, despite a variety of induction experiences, teaching loads, and extracurricular responsibilities, their beliefs regarding social studies education were largely unchanged since the creation of their undergraduate philosophy statements. As the interviews continued, it became clear that a number of new factors had emerged as determinants of beliefs and practice since the completion of pre-service education. These specific takeaways illustrated the values of each teacher that remained static throughout their pre-service and in-service experiences, as well as those that had been altered by in-service experience in the profession. Ultimately, all members of the study were convinced that the process of reflecting on their pre-service beliefs revealed far more continuity than divergence when compared to their current beliefs about social studies education. Even so, while all of the teachers touched on a variety of beliefs that guided their classroom practices, certain components of PBHI and their pre-service program emerged more frequently than others.

For example, all of the five participants spent a good deal of time discussing the importance of organizing units around nontraditional assessments and planning backwards from these assessments. "Backwards planning" is a key component of PBHI as well as the social studies education program at South Plains University, and it is clear that numerous backwards-planning experiences had led all of the participants to see value in this model of preparation, particularly

when paired with a non-traditional assessment or culminating unit activity. Used in the context of the PBHI framework, backwards planning supports unit coherence as well as teachers' overall purposes for their lessons, unit, and course. This tenet of unit design and lesson preparation seemed to endure in the beliefs of the participants even in the face of competing models, though all of the participants did not always couple their backwards unit planning with coherent goals for every single lesson contained within. Waylon in particular critiqued a commonly-observed practice of teachers looking at state standards to design lessons with a traditional assessment likely designed after the fact.

Another aspect of pre-service beliefs that still held true for the majority of the participants was their purpose for teaching social studies. Matt, Fiona, Frank, and Bram all explicitly discussed the development of competent citizens as the key purpose for social studies education. While Waylon did not spend as much time explicitly describing this as the key purpose for social studies education, he did discuss the importance of inculcating skills related to the development of competent citizens, notably that of critical thinking and student-led exploration of problems. In all cases, the participants in some way addressed the notion that their ultimate goal was to help develop students who could be competent participants in society and engage with current issues.

Many participants openly acknowledged that while their beliefs had stayed the same, their practices had changed somewhat in response to the realities they faced in their current teaching positions. Most notably, Waylon and Bram discussed their professional philosophy statements as representative of their beliefs in an ideal situation. Waylon discussed his difficulties with realizing his ideal beliefs outside of his United States History course, as he found his pre-service model of instruction to be less well-suited to World History and other courses. He also discussed PBHI as being somewhat contingent on the ability levels of his students when he noted that,

“Some of the lower-performing classes, I would have to create so much scaffolding that it did not make it feasible time-wise to create that much scaffolding.” While he did believe that students of all ability levels could be successful in his ideal model of social studies education, Waylon believed that the massive scope of content he was expected to cover, as well as time devoted to planning, limited his ability to craft his lessons and units in an ideal fashion.

Bram, who taught in the same school and department as Waylon, found that his inability to totally realize his pre-service vision of teaching was tied more to an overall culture of testing and accountability. As Bram put it:

*The only thing I would have added (to the professional philosophy statement) is ‘in an ideal situation,’ and the ideal situation is one where there is no state- and federally-mandated tests and standards that you had to cover.*

Though it might be tempting to assume that two teachers at the same school who explicitly discussed their pre-service beliefs as too idealized did so because of departmental or school culture, their differing reasons for the disconnect between beliefs and practice suggest otherwise.

Further, Matt and Fiona also discussed the difficulties inherent to realizing their pre-service visions in real-world settings. Whether due to time constraints, state standards, or testing concerns, four of the five teachers described their practices as being somewhat modified or altered from their beliefs. Even Frank, who stated that there was “no excuse for not being able to bring PIH to the classroom” noted that the ability to do so successfully was contingent on classroom management skills.

**Factor two: Induction experiences.** In the initial interview, teachers were asked to reflect on their first three years in the profession. Teachers discussed the types of support and mentorship that they received during this period as well as well as the obstacles that they faced

and how they overcame each. Generally speaking, every participant spoke positively about the types of support they received during their induction experiences. Interviews with participants from four different schools in three different systems revealed a remarkable continuity in the formal induction supports offered “on paper.” With the exception of Bram, who was hired mid-year, all participants experienced an official system-level orientation and were assigned a formal school-level mentor teacher. Even without the assignment of a formal mentor, Bram participated in a number of informal mentor relationships with other teachers at his school. While the quality of these mentor relationships varied, all participants acknowledged the value of an experienced mentor in helping them through the induction process. In all cases, this relationship-based induction program was seen as more valuable than formal new-teacher orientations.

Whatever the major obstacles faced by teachers in their early careers, all described their informal and formal mentor relationships as being important in helping them to deal with these obstacles. Even so, the majority of participants also described the induction period as a process in which they improved apart from their mentors’ support through “trial and error” in their classrooms. Ultimately, the participants discussed the importance of active experience in the classroom. For Bram, who received no formal orientation or mentor assignment, his prior experience as a student-teacher at the school where he was currently employed ameliorated the potential difficulties brought on by a lack of formal support structures.

The teachers who spoke most favorably of the benefits gleaned from their mentor relationships were those teachers who were mentored formally or informally by colleagues that also had experience with the pre-service preparation model at South Plains University. At the time of the study, Matt, Bram, and Waylon all worked at the same schools where they had completed their internship experiences under cooperating teachers familiar with their pre-service

preparation. Like these teachers, Fiona also worked at a school surrounded by more experienced teachers who were graduates of her same pre-service program. Frank also had access to a handful of graduates of his program on-site, though this peer group was smaller than that accessible to the other participants in the study. While working with comparably-prepared colleagues likely had some impact on the participants' beliefs, the relative influence of each of these colleagues on each study participant is difficult to gauge without more in-depth study of these formal and informal mentors. However, continuity of support from like-minded individuals along with the aforementioned individual "trial and error" was important in helping each teacher through the induction period.

**Factor three: Departmental and school culture.** While support during the induction period is critical, the cultures in which teachers continue to operate have proven to be influential on teacher beliefs and practices (Ladwig, 1991; Newmann, 1991a; Onosko, 1991). All study participants described their departments in a favorable way, though their descriptions of departmental cultures and the benefits of their departmental structure varied by school. However, even membership in a common school and department does not assure a shared experience. Bram and Waylon were both teachers in the social studies department at the same school, but their experiences within this same department differed, largely due to the courses taught by each.

While all teachers described themselves as participants in both mandated and voluntary intradepartmental collaborations at their schools, the utility of collaborative experiences varied amongst the participants. Beyond this variety of experiences, it also seemed that different participants experienced departmental and collaborative cultures differently depending on their own personalities, needs, and other responsibilities. All participants believed that voluntary

collaboration in their schools and departments was very helpful, and due to their close proximity to their alma mater, they were usually able to collaborate with peers who had also graduated from South Plains University's social studies education program. While collaboration with like-minded peers who shared at least some of their own beliefs was valuable within their schools and departments, with the exception of Frank all of the participants also participated in professional development opportunities outside of their schools that brought them into contact with other graduates and faculty of their university program.

While informal, self-determined collaboration with similarly-prepared colleagues frequently discussed by the participants as being particularly valuable, school- and department-mandated collaborative experiences varied with regards to acceptance by, and influence on, the teachers in the study. Although Matt and Frank both found a great deal of value in mandated planning sessions with content-area peers, the other participants were often unable to participate in these sessions due to extracurricular responsibilities that overlapped with after-school departmental sessions. Further, Bram felt that he had little use for the sessions as he was the lone AP teacher at his school and any collaboratively-designed work could not easily be utilized in his classroom.

For Waylon, mandated collaboration in one subject area proved beneficial, while mandated collaboration in another subject took on a less helpful form as his peers viewed collaboration in a different manner. In one group, Waylon was paired with colleagues who wanted to teach the exact same lessons and stay on identical pace throughout the year. While he was exposed to weekly collaboration with these peers, the loss of autonomy he felt as an individual teacher outweighed any of the positives of group collaboration. In the other subject-area group, Waylon was paired with teachers who enjoyed collaboration but left room for teacher autonomy as well, and as a result he greatly preferred this latter collaborative culture. While Waylon clearly valued

his autonomy as an individual teacher above collaborative efforts, Fiona provided a counter-example as she enjoyed getting usable, ready-to-go lessons and ideas from peers, particularly those who were fellow graduates of her pre-service program.

Whatever the collaborative culture of each department, the participants all valued informal, voluntary collaboration over any school-mandated intradepartmental relationships. When given the chance to choose their collaborative partners in each department, the teachers typically went to like-minded individuals, most of whom were also graduates of South Plains University. These informal collaborative configurations allowed for more natural relationships and a greater continuity of beliefs from pre-service to in-service teaching. However, individual variations rather than school or departmental differences may prove to be more important determinants in teacher's beliefs and rationales for teaching social studies.

**Factor Four: Personal Conceptions of teaching/teacher biography.** Lortie (1975) and many others have advanced the perspective that experiences that occur before a teacher education program may be more significant influences on a teacher's beliefs and practices than the formal teacher education program itself. Indeed, the unique experiences of each teacher's life as well as their own "apprenticeships" as students serve as shaping experiences. Additionally, teachers' personal convictions and continuing biographical experiences may continue to alter and evolve teacher beliefs and practices as much as any other factor throughout their careers. Although the individual experiences of teachers in their pre-service preparation, induction experiences, and current departmental or school paradigms seemed to influence beliefs and practices, conceptions developed from experiences apart from any of these areas appeared as perhaps the most significant determinants on some of the teachers' beliefs.



Most notably, prior experiences and current values seemed to shape the beliefs of some participants more than other factors such as pre-service preparation and school culture. This was most apparent in the cases of Fiona and Frank, who openly discussed their conceptions of their jobs as teachers as leaning much more heavily towards the pastoral role. For Fiona, being a counselor and mentor for her students was of equal, if not more, importance than her role as a teacher of content. Social studies was one tool that could be utilized in order to teach students to be happy and work with others in spite of differences. She spent most of her initial and subsequent interviews talking about the affective areas of her profession rather than content-related pedagogy.

Similarly, Frank took on a number of roles in his school and saw this as a way to form stronger relationships with his students. He valued content, in particular Civics-related content, to a greater extent than Fiona, but he spoke most passionately about his desire to start a career in teaching later in life in order to do something meaningful and positive. Like Fiona, Frank spoke about making his students better people. While on the surface, Frank seemed to be an anomaly in this multiple-case study due to his lack of continued involvement with his alma mater, this did not set him apart in this regard from Fiona, who completed a Masters' degree at South Plains University and continued to have much more contact with the college. Both Fiona and Frank seemed to be drawn to teaching for a number of affective reasons beyond their content, and both carried current beliefs that their most important roles as teachers went far beyond course content. However, neither Frank nor Fiona saw their conceptions as being in conflict with the tenets of problem-based historical inquiry or their pre-service preparation, as both saw PBHI and their content area as tools to accomplish their affective and emotional goals.

Matt, Waylon, and Bram were not as vocal on the non-instructional components of the profession as Fiona and Frank, but their involvement in numerous extracurricular activities may suggest that they too valued these other, more affective roles. It is difficult to assume this, however, as it is not clear how many extracurricular activities were voluntary. Still, they primarily focused on social studies content and their rationale for teaching social studies during their interviews. As a result, it is more difficult to discern other biographical factors or personal components that drove each to the teaching profession in general and social studies education in particular. While Waylon noted that he knew he wanted to be a social studies teacher since he was in high school, he did not go in-depth with his reasons for this. Whatever the reasons for Matt, Bram, and Waylon, it was clear that Fiona and Frank were the most passionate about the affective and pastoral roles of a teacher that extended beyond the teaching of social studies content and skills.

## **Conclusion**

In their interviews, study participants all stated positive views of their pre-service preparation at South Plains University. They also largely held their professional induction experiences and current departmental cultures in high regard. However, closer examination of their responses revealed a great deal of nuance in the aspects of their pre-service program that still endured in their current careers. While participants demonstrated great fidelity to some aspects of PBHI and their pre-service preparation, other components were not mentioned or were perceived by participants to be incongruous with other aspects of their individual experiences, most notably individual conceptions of their role as teacher, access to like-minded peers, and their assigned course loads. However, this chapter is based largely on teacher self-reporting through interview responses. Further analysis is needed to determine if and how these teachers transformed their

beliefs into practices and the challenges they faced in doing so. In chapter five, I present findings gleaned from observations in each teacher's classroom along with follow-up interviews and other data sources.

## **Chapter Five: Findings Regarding Teacher Practice**

### **Introduction**

While the interviews with participants allowed them to discuss their past and current beliefs regarding social studies education, problem-based historical inquiry, and teaching in general, classroom observations served as a window into their typical classroom practices. Researchers have often observed dissonance between teachers' beliefs and practices (Goodman & Adler, 1985; Hawley, 2010). Further, though all of the participants discussed the connection between their pre-service and in-service beliefs as being one predominantly characterized by continuity, what teachers believe and what they do can sometimes be very different (Kagan, 1993). Such differences are not necessarily due to obfuscation or a desire to please the interviewer, but may instead be due to disconnect in vocabulary or initial misunderstandings of PBHI and related concepts (see chapter one for a concise definition of PBHI). Observations allowed me to examine the extent to which participants were able to translate their stated beliefs and rationales into meaningful practice. Follow-up interviews accompanied each observation to allow me to better understand each teacher's goals and any potential differences between lesson planning and implementation. In this chapter, I discuss the classroom practice of each participant and the connections between their stated beliefs and practices as well as factors that may help explain any dissonance.

In the sections that follow, I present a case study focused on each teacher's observed practices along with commentary from the participants' stated beliefs as discussed during interviews.

Authentic Intellectual Work (AIW) scores accompany qualitative descriptions of the observed practices of each teacher as well. Whereas the thick, rich descriptions of each teacher's actions are the primary focus of this chapter, the AIW numerical scoring process that accompanies these allows for a common language and basis for further discussion and comparison within a research-based framework. Because teachers were asked to invite the researchers to their classrooms on days that typified their teaching style, this qualitative and quantitative data work together to provide insight into the normal, day-to-day practices of these teachers.

### **Individual Cases**

**Fiona.** As discussed in chapter four, Fiona's interview responses typically focused on the pastoral, affective nature of the teaching profession, and it was clear she valued her roles as counselor and mentor as much as those of instructor or content-area specialist. When asked to specifically discuss PBHI as it pertained to her content-specific beliefs and goals for students, she explained that:

*The purpose of it (PBHI) is to have the students be like investigators for history so that they are trying to figure out the meaning behind it for them, rather than us just telling them the meaning.*

This conception of PBHI implied practices that were inquiry-based and student-centered rather than teacher-focused. This belief was evident to some extent in all three of Fiona's lessons that I observed during the 2013-2014 academic year.

*Table 7: Overview of observed lessons in Fiona’s classroom*

Observation	Date	Lesson Topic	Tasks	AIW Instruction Score (out of 20)	AIW Task Score (out of 10)
Fiona #1	12/11/13	The Great Depression: Solutions	Lecture & Document Analysis	9	5
Fiona #2	2/5/14	World War II Propaganda	Lecture, Video, Propaganda Poster Analysis	10	6
Fiona #3	5/5/14	“Progressive Dinner” – Civil Rights Movement	Small Group Discussions, Whole-Group Discussion	8	8

Indeed, all three of Fiona’s lessons featured periods of student-focused inquiry and analysis of materials. In the first two lessons depicted in the table above, Fiona’s students spent a portion of each lesson engaged in the analysis of primary source documents and propaganda. In both cases, students followed this up with a whole-group discussion over the topics and discussed all of the documents in a holistic fashion. Each of these observations also featured teacher-focused lecture as strategy prior to students beginning their own investigative experiences. In each case, Fiona’s lessons provided the opportunity for higher-order thinking. In practice, however, student thinking was not pressed or challenged, and students did not spend a great deal of time engaged in higher-order thinking.

Fiona’s third lesson exhibited more creativity in design and consisted of several, rotating small-group discussions. Students discussed topics of the 1960s from the perspective of a specific Civil Rights leader in a role-playing “progressive dinner.” While the lesson strategy was more a role play than a student-led inquiry or document analysis, students were still required to engage in individual investigation in order to put themselves in the perspective of their particular

historical leader. In this way, all three of Fiona’s observed plans were at least somewhat consistent with her major belief that PBHI strategies were designed to make students “investigators for history.”

However, while the discussion-centered progressive dinner provided even more potential for higher-order thinking and substantive conversation than the previous lessons, student experiences with higher-order thinking varied greatly dependent on group configurations. While a few student groups engaged in sustained, higher-order conversation at times, the majority of student discussion groups did not engage in substantive conversation. A minority of groups engaged in minimal discussion of any kind. Due to this uneven experience, this lesson was very similar to Fiona’s other lesson implementations in that the potential for critical inquiry was present, but in-depth inquiry and higher-order thinking proved to be the exception rather than the rule.

Indeed, Fiona’s lesson plans and materials were supportive of higher-order thinking, but her instructional practices did not always press students to reach deeper levels of thought and inquiry. While this observed difference between the tasks assigned to students and the in-depth quality of instruction is evidenced by the AIW instruction and task scores assigned to all three lessons, it is particularly noticeable in the case of lesson three with its “Progressive Dinner,” an activity that merited one of the higher AIW task scores in this study. While the AIW scores support my observations regarding lesson design and lesson implementation, it is more difficult to discern reasons for this disconnect.

Although Fiona’s self-described pastoral vision of her role made it tempting to assume that she prioritized the affective components of the profession over rigorous instruction and scaffolding, there is little evidence to support this notion. Her lesson plans, materials, and

activities were designed to provide the opportunity and hard scaffolding for higher-order thinking and all of these pieces also evidenced an understanding of the basic tenets of problem-based historical inquiry. In other words, these materials and plans were internally consistent with her view of PBHI as student-directed investigations of historical content, and the documents and materials she utilized were consistent with PBHI strategies. Her conception of her role did not lead her to water down expectations for students at the lesson planning stage.

Thus, possible explanations for disconnect between planned and observed student performance likely had more to do with the quality of Fiona's soft-scaffolding and questioning of students during the lessons. While it is difficult to discern if Fiona's predominantly pastoral conception of teaching directly contributed to a lack of rigor in her scaffolding, such a connection between her soft-scaffolding style and an overall lack of rigor is supported by multiple researchers (Cohen & Ball, 1999; Tekkumru & Stein, 2015; Tekkumru, Stein, & Schunn, 2015). As noted by Tekkmuru and Stein (2015), the inherent cognitive demands of a task do not ensure high levels of rigor if not coupled with close monitoring of student thinking and teacher responsiveness in the form of scaffolding that supports higher-order thinking. Because rigorous scaffolding can create student discomfort, it is possible that Fiona saw this type of scaffolding and academic press as incongruous with her affective goals of a warm and comfortable classroom environment.

A lack of student experience with small-group discussion may also have contributed to the overall lack of depth in the third observation, as this was the only observed activity that was new to her students. Fiona indicated that her students were accustomed to all of the other tasks observed during the study and had prior experience with each. It is also worth noting that Fiona herself acknowledged a general lack of depth after the implementation of her first lesson, and



attributed this to her view that the lesson was a set-up lesson for more in-depth activities to follow.

Fiona's focus on the pastoral role of teacher and her desire to serve as mentor and counselor to her students was a major guiding factor in all of her instructional decision-making. She emphasized that this affective component of her profession was more important than any particular historical content. Even so, Fiona still considered PBHI and her pre-service preparation to be powerful influences on her practices. She believed that students should be investigators rather than passive receptacles of knowledge, and this belief was somewhat realized in all of her observed lessons as each featured partnered or small group document analysis and investigation of propaganda.

Even so, two of her observed lessons still consisted of a large amount of teacher-focused instruction. This somewhat piecemeal implementation of her vision was similar to her stated belief that she regularly used PBHI, but in a modified or abbreviated fashion. In other words, she regularly asked students to focus on problems in history, make relevant connections between topics, and engage with multiple perspectives, but these cognitive processes typically occurred over the course of a class discussion or a brief assignment rather than through the maintenance of a sustained, unit-long focus. As discussed above, it is possible that her truncated or rushed implementation of PBHI is as much due to her beliefs about her students' abilities and a reluctance to press their thinking as it is due to her self-reported reason of a lack of time. Though she did not allow the time for a complete implementation of PBHI at the unit and lesson level, it was clear she continued to value nontraditional assessment strategies she was exposed to as a pre-service teacher, even if these did not occur in large, philosophically coherent units. As she explained:

*Its not always 2 ½ weeks with seventeen different groups and perspectives and they are all fighting it out in the classroom...it's just based on timing and a lot of times based on classes...*

This view of modified or abbreviated practice captured her stated belief that her pre-service program had been fairly influential on her practices, though she altered these practices for time and often modified her instruction based on her perceptions of her students' ability to engage in self-directed investigations of historical content.

**Matt.** For Matt, relevancy was the key component of his vision for social studies education and the biggest takeaway from his undergraduate work with PBHI. When asked specifically to think about how he would explain PBHI to a new teacher, he focused heavily on the importance of making historical content relevant to students' lives. Throughout the study, Matt repeatedly returned to the notion of relevance, and the importance of being to explain why historical content was important to students' lives. As he put it, "Problem-based historical inquiry, and using central questions, and forming your units around that, gives so much more relevance to your historical content."

In order to make World History content relevant to his students, Matt decided to rely on previous experience assisting with Model United Nations summer camps at South Plains University, and implement Model U.N. strategies in the second half of the semester. In early April 2014, his students were assigned to represent individual countries for the purpose of participating in Model U.N. Summits. They were also encouraged to examine the "regular" World History content from their country's perspective when possible.

*Table 8: Overview of observed lessons in Matt's classroom*

Observation	Date	Lesson Topic	Tasks	AIW Instruction Score (out of 20)	AIW Task Score (out of 10)
Matt #1	1/22/14	What is History?, the Historical Method, Intro to European Exploration	Lecture, Whole-Group Discussion, Web Research Activity	10	4
Matt #2	4/7/14	Model UN Introductions	Carousel-style Country Introductions	7	5
Matt #3	5/16/14	Model UNI Summit on Child Labor, related issues	Model UN Summit (whole-group discussion)	15	9

In addition to relevancy, Matt also placed a heavy focus on the development of skills, particularly those germane to the work of historians. My first visit to his classroom occurred on one of the first days of the semester, and he spent most of the time introducing students to “history” as a field and concept rather than beginning with the chronological coverage of historical content. Borrowing a line from his mentor, Matt repeatedly reiterated that “history is not a concept, but a tool” and that they were “not in a classroom, but a workshop.” He spent a significant amount of time discussing historical methodology before beginning his course content with the varying perspectives on Christopher Columbus. Whereas Matt’s focus on historical skill-building was evident in his first observation, his stated belief regarding the significance of making content relevant to students’ lives was not easily observable during this lesson. In a follow-up interview, Matt did note that this was the first full day of the course with this group of students, and thus the lesson could not be described as “typical.” However, observing the way that Matt set up the semester and introduced students to “history” as a concept did offer further insight into his beliefs.

My other two visits to Matt's classroom occurred on days which featured his students engaged in Model U.N. proceedings. He believed the Model U.N. format to be an ideal way to have students engage in a real-world activity while also discussing issues relevant to their lives. While the first of these two observations consisted solely of introductions to each other's countries, the final observation featured the students engaged in a Model U.N. summit on child labor, child soldiers, and related issues. This was the final summit of the year, and it was clear that students had been building their skills throughout the semester as they engaged in this group discussion over real-world topics. By this point, the students were well-versed in debate etiquette and rules, and they passed two resolutions over the course of the proceedings. Most students participated in the discussion and the quality of the discussion merited one of the highest-scoring lessons of the study with regards to the AIW rubrics. This discussion clearly represented Matt's ultimate goal for his students to utilize the skillsets they built throughout the semester.

As noted earlier Matt's most significant influence continued to be his cooperating teacher and on-site mentor. When discussing his perspectives of PBHI and his conceptions of social studies education, he regularly quoted this individual. While it might be tempting to view this in-service mentor as a more significant influence on Matt's beliefs and actions than his pre-service program, it should be noted that this individual maintained a regular working relationship with Matt's pre-service professors by supervising interns and working on lesson study projects. As such, it is difficult to determine what aspects of his influence on Matt's beliefs and practices could actually be traced back to the tenets of Matt's pre-service program. It is possible that Matt's apprenticeship under this mentor as well as his continued involvement with his college through the Model U.N. summer camps served as extensions of his pre-service education.

Harkening back to his oft-repeated quote that “history was a tool, not a subject,” Matt prized the use of history to develop skills as much as the content itself. When discussing PBHI, he noted the importance of relevance and real-world significance for the content, and also the necessity of establishing purpose with culminating activities that mirrored the real world. In his own words:

*If we are just here learning stories and facts, I believe that is what makes history really boring. They (students) have a right to ask... “Why is this important? Why do I need to learn this? How am I going to use this in my life?”*

This notion was evident in his Model U.N. session in particular as this culminating activity required a great deal of preparation and connections to the real world were evident. Matt also believed that his students were successful in developing real-world civic skills of debate and discussion, skills that were evident in his students’ performance during their final Model U.N. session. Matt’s focus on the role of discussion in establishing relevancy and helping students achieve both content-related and personal goals could also be observed in the beliefs and practices of the other participants, most notably in the cases of Frank and Waylon.

**Frank.** When asked to describe the most important components of PBHI, Frank spoke at length about the importance of forcing students to question and second-guess themselves. He also articulated his belief that students could best question themselves and truly learn when they were given the opportunity to discuss with their peers. Frank also considered discussion to be a way to make the content interesting and keep students from “tuning out.” As he put it:

*It’s more than about doing busy work and the reason why is that kids are going to tune out, and anybody can read a sentence and write an answer...I form my lessons in a way that makes my children have to second-guess themselves. It (PBHI) has to be something that*

*causes some type of questioning of themselves. They have to have chances to talk with their peers.*

*Table 9: Overview of observed lessons in Frank's classroom*

Observation	Date	Lesson Topic	Tasks	AIW Instruction Score (out of 20)	AIW Task Score (out of 10)
Frank #1	1/27/14	Extreme Weather Phenomena	Lecture, Partnered Discussions, Individual Questions	6	5
Frank #2	4/4/14	Cross-Cultural Communications, the Silk Road	Lecture, Partnered Discussions, Whole-Group Discussion, 3-2-1	8	4
Frank #3	4/22/14	Foreign Policy: North Korea	Whole-Group Seminar, Follow-up Individual Essay	12	8

Frank's self-reported conceptions of PBHI and his vision for social studies focused heavily on the importance of student discussion and building discussion skills. While discussion was a component of all three of the observed lessons, only the final lesson featured sustained, substantive discussion. The first two lessons did feature discussion as a minor component, though the length of these discussions was brief and they were lower-order in nature. In each of the first two observed lessons, students were given a two-page, fill-in-the-blank handout to aid in taking notes during the lecture. In addition to serving as an outline for note-taking, the handout also had embedded questions designed to spark individual brainstorming and partnered discussions.

Such lessons organized by multiple activities on a guided note-taking handout were a common fixture of Frank's classes as he found this to be a successful approach for students at the

seventh-grade level. For Frank, one of the more rewarding aspects of these lessons came during the small- and whole-group discussion segments as he noted that many of the students who were very vocal during such activities began the year very shy and introverted. Such personal growth goals were especially important to Frank. In both the first and second post-observation interviews, Frank discussed his note-taking and discussion guides as being important to realizing skill growth in addition to content knowledge. In addition to the discussion supports included in his handouts, these documents were also designed to help his seventh-grade students develop note-taking skills, a skillset he believed that most had not yet mastered. In both interviews, Frank made it clear that he wanted to include a variety of individual work, small-group discussion, whole-group discussion, and teacher-focused instruction in as many lessons as possible in order to help students build their skills in all of these instructional configurations.

These first two observed lessons, while multi-faceted with regards to content and skill development, did not press students to engage in higher-order thinking and critical inquiry. Students did not engage in substantive conversation or develop deep knowledge. Frank described these lessons as being somewhat typical of the day-to-day activities in his classroom, but also discussed his desire to build up to high-level, whole-group discussion activities by the end of the semester. I was able to witness one such activity during my third and final visit to Frank's class, when students conducted a whole group seminar on the topic of North Korea and United States foreign policy in the region.

Whether lessons such as this were the exception due to Frank's conceptions of PBHI or his own internalized beliefs regarding the abilities of his seventh-grade students was unclear. However, the students performed remarkably well during this discussion and it was the most rigorous and relevant of any of the lessons I observed in Frank's classroom, as evidenced by my

notes and the AIW scores assigned to this lesson (see Table 9 above). Frank had spoken to me previously about this lesson, as he believed that this whole-group, seminar discussion was an ambitious lesson for seventh-grade students. As with prior lessons, Frank made the skills that he hoped students would develop very clear to the students themselves, as a list of rules regarding conduct during a whole-group discussion was displayed on the board and discussed thoroughly.

Almost all of the students participated in the discussion at various points, particularly during periods when the discussion focused heavily on North Korea's nuclear program and threats. While much of the discussion occurred between the teacher and students, with little organic back-and-forth between the students themselves, all participants conducted themselves appropriately and were genuinely engaged with the topic. Despite a lack of "real-world" discussion between students without the aid of the teacher, Frank was largely pleased with the students' content knowledge and discussion skills, particularly because this was only the second discussion of this type that he held this year. Unlike the first two observed lessons, this seminar strongly represented Frank's self-described conceptions of PBHI and the importance he placed on discussion in this model of instruction.

Much like Fiona, Frank spent a great deal of time discussing the affective, pastoral roles of his profession. When asked directly about PBHI and how he would explain this to a newcomer, Frank discussed the importance of discussion between students. Indeed, he highly valued conversation and questioning between students as a way to help them learn and develop civic skills. While two of Frank's three observed lessons saw him engage in teacher-centered learning, he made sure to script brief opportunities for partnered discussions between students. Though these discussions were sometimes ill-focused and never reached the depth seen in his seminar lesson, it was clear that Frank valued conversation with and between students and



sought to include it whenever possible. For Frank, discussion was key to both his content-related and skill-based goals for students, as he believed that his seventh-grade students needed experience in learning how to discuss complex issues. Even so, his discussions did not occur within the context of philosophically coherent PBHI units.

**Bram.** As discussed in chapter four, Bram was the sole teacher in the study who taught only Advanced Placement courses. When asked to describe the central focus of PBHI, Bram spoke at length about the importance of making content relevant to students, echoing many of the same sentiments as Matt. He also discussed the importance of connecting events across history with persistent issues:

*I would probably take two situations and show them how they can use two situations that are completely different and show them (another teacher) how they rhyme, how they are connected, and then go off of that...I would show them my PWS about Thomas Jefferson and the LA Purchase and government overstepping boundaries, and then go into something like the NSA today...so making it more relevant to today.*

While Bram articulated a strong conceptual understanding of PBHI and the PIH model of instruction, he did not speak in-depth regarding specific strategies to realize this conceptual frameworks. Further, he acknowledged that AP courses were very coverage-oriented and he must teach a great deal of content as well as test-taking strategies in order to prepare students for success on the AP exams. This focus on coverage and test preparation was especially evident during my first and third observations with Bram.

*Table 10: Overview of observed lessons in Bram’s classroom*

Observation	Date	Lesson Topic	Tasks	AIW Instruction Score (out of 20)	AIW Task Score (out of 10)
Bram #1	11/13/13	Jefferson, LA Purchase, Lewis & Clark	Lecture (no real student task)	7	4
Bram #2	3/10/14	Populism	Socratic Seminar	13	8
Bram #3	5/7/14	AP Exam Review	Practice AP Exam	4	3

During the first of my visits in Bram’s class, I observed a lesson typical of coverage-focused AP courses of this type. The entire fifty-five minute class period was spent in a lecture configuration common to the college courses that AP courses are ostensibly designed to imitate. Despite the teacher-focused nature inherent to lecture-based instruction, Bram regularly engaged students in discussion over the content and utilized a handful of video clips to get students’ attention during the lecture. Though seemingly not a lesson designed to elicit a great deal of active student participation, Bram’s AP U.S. History students were engaged throughout the period and regularly discussed the content and asked questions outside of the discussion activities that he built into the lesson. Other than note-taking, no assessed student task was built into the lesson. Bram described this lack of a formal student assignment and the lecture format observed as being pretty typical of the day to day activities in his AP courses.

When I visited Bram a third time, I observed yet another activity typical to AP courses, namely reviewing in the form of practice testing. During this period, students spent the entire 55 minutes completing an 80 question practice test derived from a previous version of the AP exam they would take in a few weeks. While this was not a particularly exciting observation, Bram explained that he had me visit on this day because such activities were typical of AP courses, and

he spent a great deal of time before school, during class, and after school reviewing with students and giving them practice AP exams to complete. Because AP exam scores were extremely important to the students and the county school system, and because the course curriculum was vast, days spent lecturing and practice testing greatly outnumbered the days that students were able to spend engaged in in-depth, PBHI-supported instruction.

Though this perceived reality of the nature of AP courses served to limit Bram's implementation of in-depth, complex instruction throughout the semester, I was able to see that Bram's students had the potential to engage with the content on a deeper level through whole-group discussion on one occasion. On this day, Bram led his students in a Socratic seminar on "Henry Littlefield's Parable on Populism." Students were required to read this piece, which discussed the potential of *The Wizard of Oz* as an allegory for the Populist movement in the United States, before participating in the discussion. The resulting discussion was very strong and was one of the two lessons that scored the highest on the AIW rubrics over the course of the study. This seminar was one of only a handful of similar discussions held throughout the year and demonstrated the potential of high-achieving students engaged in in-depth discussion. In addition to leading some of the discussion and engaging in organic discussions amongst themselves, the students also made a number of original observations and possible connections between the parable and the Populist movement not suggested by Bram or the author. As a result, Bram was happy with his students' performance and wished for the time to engage in more of these seminar-style activities that reflected his personal conceptions of PBHI.

As mentioned above, Bram's key takeaway from his pre-service preparation was the importance of relevancy and of making connections across topics in history. He spoke a great deal about the importance of helping students to see the persistent issues across the historical

curriculum. When discussing other aspects of PBHI and PIH, however, Bram was quick to note the problem of time. For him, teaching in this idealized fashion required a great deal of time. As such, his connections to other events in history were typically made by him as side comments during lecture and discussion with students. He valued the connections across topics and eras, and wanted to help students see these, even if he was making the connections for them rather than allowing them to do so over a protracted period of time.

The content-heavy AP curriculum was not the only influential factor on his vision for his AP history course, however, as pressure from his school system and parents led him to focus heavily on test-training and broad knowledge over the depth and time he saw as essential to problem-based historical inquiry. While he acknowledged that he still believed in the tenets of PBHI, the perceived time-crunch of the AP class led him to value traditional AP practices over his current ideals. As Bram put it, “The time issue is going to come up as well and you have to do what you can in the time that you are given.” When he allowed the time for in-depth inquiry, as was the case with his seminar on Littlefield’s Populist parable, his students were actively engaged in the activity and excelled at the approach. However, pressures for coverage and testing dominated his instructional planning, and he reported that this seminar was one of only two in-depth discussions implemented during the year.

**Waylon.** As discussed in the previous chapter, Waylon taught the most unique courses of any of the teachers in the study. In addition to traditional social studies courses, he also taught courses on the teaching profession and the course that I observed, “Issues in Education.” Because the course was issues-focused and mandated standards were sparse, Waylon was afforded the freedom and time to implement the problem-based instructional strategies he preferred on a regular basis. Indeed, I observed some type of student debate or discussion

focused on a social issue in all three of my observations in Waylon’s class. Waylon worked hard to implement his vision of PBHI through student discussions that dealt with complex issues and forced students to consider multiple positions on said issues. As Waylon described PBHI:

*It (PBHI) is really focused on student-directed learning, and the teacher has to know when to let the students be frustrated...Allow them to get frustrated, allow them to go home frustrated until you get through the unit and tie it all together at the end.*

*Table 11: Overview of observed lessons in Waylon’s classroom*

Observation	Date	Topic	Student Tasks	AIW Instruction Score (out of 20)	AIW Task Score (out of 10)
Waylon #1	3/5/14	Teacher Unions	Small-Group Speech-Writing, Debate Preparation	10	8
Waylon #2	3/25/14	Public Schools v. Charter Schools	Group Discussion/Debate	12	8
Waylon #3	5/7/14	Gender Gap in Schools	Document Analysis, Small-Group Discussions, Whole-Group Discussion	8	7

This conception of PBHI focused on discussion and complexity was evident during my visits with Waylon. During my first visit with Waylon, his students were preparing for a debate on the topic of teacher unions. The second lesson I observed in Waylon’s room was also built around a debate, in this case a debate over whether traditional public schools or charter schools represented the “best” option for public education. As this second lesson progressed, students began to rely on Waylon less and discuss the issues more organically amongst themselves, perhaps evidencing a growth in discussion skills over the course of the semester. For Waylon,

the freedom and time this nontraditional course afforded had allowed him to prioritize the development of such civic skills.

Discussion was also the central component of the third and final lesson I observed in Waylon's class. In this instance, the students analyzed two articles focusing on a potential gender gap between males and females in school and discussed these pieces in small groups before engaging in a whole-group discussion over the topic. While not as structured as the previous two discussion-based lessons I observed, this lesson was also characterized by high levels of student involvement as students discussed the articles in both settings, and even began to discuss correlations to potential race gaps in school and the relative influence of nature and nurture. Though this discussion contained less sustained and substantive conversation between students than in previous observations, Waylon was pleased with his students' progress in discussing issues over the course of the semester. The continued focus on discussion and debate in this course led to consistent AIW scores for Waylon's lessons and student tasks.

Discussion and debate formed the core of all three of Waylon's observed lessons, and according to him, his course as a whole. While this course, free from rigid standards and testing, gave Waylon the opportunity to enact his ideal vision of social studies education, he also reported that such strategies were the exception rather than the rule in his other, more traditional classes. He agreed with Bram that time was a key limitation to his instructional objectives. As he put it:

*We always find ourselves running out of time...I would say pick and choose where you are going to use that kind of inquiry and where you are going to use a traditional PPT method.*

Because I did not observe his other classes, I was unable to determine the extent to which he was able to enact his ideal instructional strategies in a more traditional setting. Though he

valued discussion and the “messiness” of complex content, he discussed the time required to guide students through complex, in-depth issues as a limitation on this type of instruction.

Though he did not teach AP courses, he taught in the same school as Bram, and a focus on broad coverage of state standards in preparation for end-of-course testing was a powerful influence in the school system. While he stated that he believed PBHI as an ideal, he also acknowledged that he had to pick his spots to implement this instruction, something that he found easier in nontraditional courses.

When he was able to implement his ideal vision in these courses, Waylon did so regularly and effectively, and provided a level of rigorous scaffolding and academic press that matched his lessons at a conceptual stage. Along with Matt, Waylon’s instruction and student tasks consistently scored at higher levels on the AIW rubrics and were more likely to reflect his vision and that of his pre-service program than was the case with activities observed in other participants’ classes. Seeing Waylon in this idealized setting, he demonstrated a great deal of fidelity to his pre-service preparation and his specific focus on the importance of the messiness and complexity of social issues. It should also be noted that his class size did not exceed a dozen students, making it easier to implement various instructional strategies. It is unclear if the nature of the course or the small class size was the most influential factor in his ability to translate his beliefs into meaningful practice, and thus it is difficult to determine if he might be more successful in implementing his ideal instruction in a core class if the class size was reduced. However, Waylon believed that it was the nature of the course, rather than the class size, that allowed him to succeed in realizing his instructional goals which remained largely in line with those of his pre-service, inquiry-based program at both a micro- and macro-level. Along with

Matt, Waylon was one of the two observed teachers who most frequently implemented PBHI in a holistic, rather than piecemeal, fashion at both the lesson and unit level.

### **Cross-Case Examination**

Though all participants in the study discussed multiple aspects of PBHI and the strategies they learned as undergraduates, each teacher devoted particular attention to one or two aspects of this framework. As discussed in chapter four, participants reported that other components of PBHI were challenged by additional factors such individual experiences, most notably individual conceptions of their role as teacher, access to like-minded peers, and their assigned course loads. Analysis of classroom observations allowed me to examine the extent to which the aspects they did discuss manifested in their practice, as well as how successfully they were able to translate their unique visions of PBHI and social studies education into practice.

As evidenced by the above cases and AIW scores, Matt and Waylon were the most consistent in implementing lessons aligned to the PBHI and PIH principles they encountered as undergraduates. Both utilized real-world issues as organizing frameworks for their instruction and regularly designed opportunities for their students to engage in authentic discussion over these issues. While Matt spoke more frequently about the importance of making content relevant to his students, the development of the skills related to evidence-based discussion of real world problems was a stated goal of both teachers and their classes were designed to support in-depth study of fewer issues. In addition to demonstrating great fidelity to the principles of PBHI, the practices of both teachers continually aligned with their stated beliefs.

Their sustained focus on the preeminence of classroom discussion and debate was only one of the factors that set Matt and Waylon's practices apart from those of the other participants. While the other teachers spoke to the importance of classroom discussion or implemented it erratically,



discourse formed the core of Matt and Waylon's goals for their students as well as their practices. This is important as classroom discussion, specifically disciplined discussion over problematic civic issues, is a significant part of the PBHI framework. As discussed in chapter one of this study, the PBHI framework requires students to build knowledge and make ethical judgments with the goal of using evidence and values to answer a persistent historical question at the end of a philosophically coherent unit (Saye & Brush, 2007). Because of the inherency of controversy to this model and the complexity of the inquiry students are required to engage in, multiple studies have pointed to the importance of structured classroom discussion in developing students' skills and allowing them to develop a well-reasoned position on controversial issues that often underlie this type of persistent, unit-level question (Hess, 2008; Hess, 2009; Hess & Posselt, 2002; MacArthur, Ferretti, & Okolo, 2002).

The simple presence of classroom discussion does not indicate the successful implementation of the PBHI framework, however. Again, an understanding of the importance of classroom discussion to PBHI was evidenced to some extent by all participants. Even so, Matt and Waylon were more likely to implement structured classroom discussions that were rigorous and relevant. In addition to the frequency and rigor of their classroom discussions, Matt and Waylon also came closer than their peers to implementing PBHI holistically. Their classroom discussions were more likely to occur in the context of a unit organized around a complex public or persistent history issue.

Whereas Waylon was afforded the opportunity to teach in this idealized fashion because of the nature of his elective course, Matt's close proximity to, and continued involvement with, his pre-service program supported his efforts at more rigorous, problem-based instruction. His inclusion of Model U.N. in the general course content supported the use of strategies in line with

PBHI and in-depth engagement with issues. While the extent to which Waylon demonstrated fidelity to his pre-service preparation or personal beliefs in his traditional social studies courses is unclear and represents a limitation in this study, both he and Matt found ways to make in-depth, PBHI-based instruction work in the settings in which I observed them.

What also set Matt and Waylon apart from the other teachers in the sample was their implementation of PBHI during philosophically coherent units that ended with nontraditional culminating activities. The other participants demonstrated an understanding of PBHI and their interview responses revealed that each had spent some time thinking about their own short- and long-term goals. For example, Frank joined Matt and Waylon in articulating the importance of discussion to accomplishing his goals and agreed with them that he needed to explicitly help his students develop discussion skills. With the exception of his whole-group deliberation on North Korea and one other discussion that he described to me, his discussions were typically brief and lower-order in nature, however. While discussion, an important component of PBHI, occurred in Frank's room, it often happened in a vacuum rather than in the context of a larger unit or culminating activity. Despite this disconnect, Frank attempted to utilize discussion and introduce multiple perspectives even during more traditional lessons.

Like Frank, Fiona frequently designed lessons that focused heavily on multiple perspectives and discussion, and also regularly included document analysis to support her focus on the importance of developing students to be investigators, though she also did so in an admittedly abbreviated or modified fashion. While she did attempt to utilize philosophically coherent units to a greater extent than Frank, both she and Frank often made connections and articulated the complexities of problems for their students. They believed in the principles of PBHI but sought to implement these principles over shorter periods of time within the context of a breadth-

focused curriculum, rather than by covering any topics with a great deal of depth or sustained focus. Both Fiona and Frank placed great value on the affective, pastoral role of the teacher above all else, though there is no evidence to support a direct connection between their pastoral views with their tendencies towards piecemeal implementation of the PBHI framework. As evidenced by a comparison of the AIW scores of both with those of the other participants, Frank and Fiona were both capable of reaching higher levels of rigor and relevance in their lessons at various times, though the consistency with which they did this was limited by their beliefs about students and a seeming reluctance to really press student thinking.

Overall, focus on the pastoral roles of the teacher affected Fiona's persona in the classroom and interactions with students more noticeably than that of Frank, but this did not set her apart from him or from the other participants in any manner that was easily evidenced by AIW scores. However, as noted earlier, Fiona seemed to be less likely than Matt or Waylon to challenge her students' thinking and provide rigorous, uncomfortable levels of scaffolding. Whether this was due to her proficiency with soft scaffolding or a desire to maintain a comfortable, warm environment, this observed disconnect between her lessons' potential and implementation limited the extent to which her students reached higher levels of rigor and thus led to decreased AIW scores for rigor.

Most noticeably, however, it was the modified, piecemeal adoption of PBHI rather than their conceptions of the role of the teacher that set Frank and Fiona apart from Matt and Waylon in practice. Because strategies complementary to PBHI were often observed in an intermittent or isolated fashion in Frank and Fiona's classrooms, it was more difficult than was the case with Matt and Waylon to determine the typical success each had in translating their vision into practice over the course of the semester. While Frank's patchy implementation of PBHI tenets

and strategies might be attributed to his beliefs about his students' grade-level abilities and pre-existing skillsets, Fiona openly acknowledged that she applied the philosophy of PBHI but not the prolonged, philosophically coherent units that built to culminating activities. Her rationale for this modified implementation of the framework was rooted in her perception of time constraints as well as beliefs about her students.

Like Frank and Fiona, Bram also regularly implemented his vision of PBHI in an abbreviated or modified fashion rather than in the context of coherent, problem-based units. While he and Frank each implemented one relatively high-scoring and high-quality discussion during the observed lessons, these instances were exceptions rather than typical practices in their classes. While Frank's more traditional approaches may be attributable to his students' age or the curriculum of his geography course, Bram's approach was clearly a reaction to the nature of the AP course and pressures of the AP Exam. Like Fiona, he explicitly acknowledged that he utilized PBHI in a modified fashion. Frank, Fiona, and Bram all implemented PBHI strategies and tenets in a less coherent fashion than Matt and Waylon, and while perceived time constraints and beliefs about students governed this decision in the case of Fiona and Frank, Bram was candid that the coverage-oriented, content-heavy AP curriculum and related testing pressures drove his decisions. With the exception of his Populist seminar, Bram's students regularly engaged in lower-order, traditional models of instruction and test preparation. Bram was aware that this type of instruction did not match the philosophical framework of PBHI or even his own idealized vision, but perceived lecture and test preparation strategies as necessities in the AP course environment. Bram was thus perhaps the most cognizant of his departures from PBHI and his own ideals, even though his approach had led to him being regarded as a successful AP teacher and model of excellence amongst peer AP teachers in his school system.

## **Conclusion**

The participants demonstrated varying degrees of fidelity to the tenets of their pre-service preparation program, with Waylon and Matt most consistently demonstrating this fidelity to both personal and program ideals. While Frank expressed a strong belief in PBHI and the tenets of his pre-service preparation, his beliefs about his students' abilities and affective focus seemed to limit his successful implementation of rigorous lessons and units congruous with PBHI practices. Though Fiona's beliefs regarding the pastoral role of the teacher were even more fervent than Frank's, she did implement instruction that more closely mirrored higher-order instructional strategies observed in inquiry-based classrooms, though her instruction's higher-order potential was rarely realized and these strategies often occurred in an erratic fashion without the larger purpose observed in Matt and Waylon's classes. Bram was upfront that his beliefs about PBHI were strong but idealized, and that his AP courses' coverage and testing pressures greatly tempered his reality so that his practices did not align with his beliefs.

In all cases, the lessons that most closely mirrored the participants' pre-service preparation were those that featured well-structured, meaningful discussions or debates, as these practices are key components to student success in PBHI units designed around controversial public issues. These were also the lessons that scored highest on the AIW rubrics for rigor and relevance. Even though his lessons and units were frequently well-designed according to PBHI principles, Waylon himself acknowledged that this was not always the case in his content-heavy, traditional courses that I was unable to observe. Indeed, time was frequently cited as an obstacle to ideal instructional practice by all of the participants except Matt. Fiona, Frank, and Bram compensated for this by taking certain aspects of PBHI that they valued and implementing these in a modified fashion, prompting questions over whether single aspects of this approach are

effective when separated from a larger purpose, coherent units, and sustained, in-depth study of fewer topics.

Bram was the most forthright and explicit in acknowledging the ways in which “real-world” teaching had explicitly led to disconnect between his ideals and daily practices. Bram was acutely aware that his practice differed due to the unique goals of his AP course, and still sought to include his ideals whenever possible within the fast-paced AP context. Despite his observed practices being much more closely aligned to his personal beliefs and the PBHI ideal than Bram’s, Waylon also articulated many of the same struggles as Bram. Waylon’s unique elective course, freed from these struggles and the pressures of standards, testing, and external oversight offered him the opportunity to enact his ideal vision of PBHI, and he did so readily and with enthusiasm in a classroom just down the hall from Bram, whose particular course assignments made him feel somewhat divorced from his beliefs.

All participants expressed a strong belief in the underlying philosophies of their pre-service preparation, but the extent to which each translated their beliefs into practice varied due to perceived external, individualized factors such as time, testing pressures, beliefs regarding student abilities, and their own conceptions of their instructional priorities. Whether real or imagined, these factors limited the ability of most of the teachers to translate their visions into meaningful practice. Waylon and Matt succeeded more consistently than their peers in marrying their practices and beliefs during the time of the study, and the practices of both were still rooted in a holistic, rather than piecemeal implementation of PBHI, even though Waylon himself believed that holistic implementation of PBHI was not always a reality for him. Implications and recommendations that can be gleaned from their experiences, as well as the experiences of all participants, will be discussed in chapter six.

## **Chapter Six: Summary, Limitations, and Recommendations**

### **Introduction**

This study examined the variety of factors that influenced a sample of five teachers' early career beliefs and practices. In doing so, my goal was also to discern the enduring effects of a pre-service teacher preparation program on the beliefs and practices of teachers. After situating my study in the existing body of related research literature in chapter two and establishing my methodology in chapter three, chapters four and five presented the findings of one year of data collection in the field. Whereas chapter four revealed the early career experiences and stated beliefs of participants in the study, chapter five presented a summary of their classroom practices and the relationship between their beliefs and these practices. My findings, synthesized and discussed in this chapter, suggest the most powerful influences on the teachers' beliefs and practices after they completed their pre-service program at South Plains University. Further, I discuss the implications of this study's findings for anyone who seeks to promote principled, professional teaching practices. This chapter concludes with a look at possible alternative explanations, study limitations, and final implications and recommendations.

### **Summary & Discussion**

My study was organized by three research questions. These questions governed the methodological framework of my study and the first two questions are utilized here to organize my findings. The third research question explicitly called for the implications of this study and is thus discussed in the "implications" section below. The questions were:

1. How does pre-service preparation in problem-based inquiry professional teaching knowledge influence teacher rationales and practice?
2. What factors other than pre-service preparation influence teacher rationales and practice?
3. What are the implications of this study's findings for promoting principled, professional teaching practice?

With regards to the first question, findings suggested that the philosophically coherent PBHI-oriented pre-service program of South Plans University continued to have an impact on the beliefs and practices of all of the teachers, though this was more evident in some cases than others. All of the participants reported that their pre-service program was still a powerful influence on their beliefs, and reiterated significant aspects of the model such as backwards planning, philosophically coherent units, and nontraditional culminating activities in their interviews. Observations of teacher practice revealed that Matt and Waylon were the most successful at translating a holistic interpretation of PBHI that matched the pre-service model they had encountered to classroom practice, while the other participants implemented components of PBHI erratically or in a piecemeal fashion.

All of the teachers discussed the importance of PBHI as a way to make content relevant to students, and all touched upon the importance of discussion and deliberation to their pre-service conceptions of PBHI and their current models of instruction. The presence of higher-order discussions has been established as characteristic of rigorous and relevant lessons. (Newmann, 1991b; Newmann, F.M., King, M. B., & Carmichael, D. L., 2007). Here again, Matt and Waylon emerged as the two participants most likely to focus on these aspects of relevance and student discussion in a consistent way at the lesson and unit levels. As discussed in chapter five, discussion and deliberation are key components in the successful implementation of PBHI as



these activities allow students to actively develop and defend a well-reasoned position on controversial issues of the public good that frame the core of PBHI units designed around such issues. (Hess, 2008; Hess, 2009; Hess & Posselt, 2002; MacArthur, Ferretti, & Okolo, 2002). While all of the teachers were observed utilizing a complex student discussion strategy at least once, Matt and Waylon utilized discussion more regularly and as part of philosophically coherent PBHI units.

With the exception of Bram's AP lectures, test reviews, and two of Frank's observed lessons, the lessons implemented by all participants were rarely traditional lectures or similar teacher-centric fare. Both Bram and Frank held high quality whole-group discussions once during the study, but these discussions occurred in a vacuum and did not serve a greater purpose as part of a coherent PBHI unit. Also, unlike the other teachers, these discussions were exceptions rather than rules. Indeed, all of the lessons observed in Matt, Fiona, and Waylon's classroom were based on strategies and beliefs in line with PBHI design principles and their own views. While Bram and Frank were less likely to demonstrate PBHI principles in their lessons, and Fiona implemented PBHI in a less coherent fashion than Matt and Waylon, all of the participants evidenced a continued reliance on their PBHI-based pre-service program when discussing their rationales for social studies education. All participants could still "talk the talk" with regards to their undergraduate program and PBHI, but differences emerged in classroom practice when other influencing factors came into play.

With the second research question, I sought to explore these other influential factors that may have led some teachers to abandon their self-reported fidelity to their pre-service rationales. I posited that a number of the factors that would lead teachers to alter their beliefs and practices would be presented during their induction periods. As discussed in chapter four, however, all of

the participants were generally happy with the support they received during their first three years in the profession. All felt that they were able to forge helpful relationships with coworkers, many of whom were also similarly prepared at South Plains University, and none of the participants reported feelings of isolation often described by researchers such as Onosko (1991) and Lortie (2002). Most of the participants described their current departmental cultures as having the characteristics of the natural, organic collaborative cultures that have been described as ideal (Flores & Day, 2006). Of the participants, only Bram did not participate in a formal induction program and receive a mentor, but he was employed in the same school where he had interned as an undergraduate.

The only challenge of the induction period that was commonly discussed by all participants was that of developing classroom management skills, with four of the five participants explicitly discussing this and the fifth alluding to it. This common struggle of new teachers may have served to temper the implementation of PBHI practices as management fears often lead teachers to adopt what McNeil (1986) refers to as “defensive teaching” practices that prioritize order, efficiency, and control of the classroom environment (Evans, 2004; McNeil, 1986; Rossi, 1995). Defensive teaching practices promote classroom order by eliminating the “messiness” associated with rigorous, higher-order teaching. This messiness or discomfort was discussed by Waylon as being absolutely essential to problem-based historical inquiry.

While classroom management was a commonly-described factor in the induction period, the factors that proved to be determinants in altering or modifying the beliefs and thus practices of the participants were largely those factors that existed beyond the struggles unique to this three-year time span. All of the participants except Matt discussed content coverage pressures and a lack of time as influential factors that led them to modify their ideal visions. This focus on the

pressures of content coverage and time echoed studies that have spoken to these pressures as limiting factors that lessen the prevalence of higher-order methods in social studies courses (Rossi, 1995; Van Hover & Pierce, 2006). Bram was the most forthcoming in describing time and coverage pressures, a finding that is unsurprising given the vast amount of content covered in AP courses (Brooks, 2013).

At various points in the study, Frank, Fiona, and Waylon all articulated internalized beliefs about students that were likely influential factors in their rationales. For Frank, his practices were modified to fit his perceptions of his seventh-grade students' ability levels. For Fiona, classroom management concerns, possibly a continuation of her induction struggles, and her own pastoral view of the profession led her to modify her expectations for students. In the case of Waylon, he reported that he believed all of his students could succeed within a PBHI framework, but he considered the time it would take to develop additional scaffolding for struggling students to be a limiting factor. This mixture of lower expectations of students and a lack of time to plan and implement complex strategies has long been noted as a combination likely to present a barrier to thoughtful instruction (Onosko, 1991). Further, modified expectations of students also led to a reluctance to press student thinking in a challenging fashion. This lack of press not only reduces the rigor of lessons, but also potentially lessens students' engagement as rigorous, authentic work is more engaging for students (Newmann & Wehlage, 1993; Marks, 2000). Waylon also discussed course assignments as an influential factor, as he found it much easier to implement his vision of PBHI in elective courses. Because my observations took place in one such elective course, I did not observe the extent to which Waylon's perceived lack of time and beliefs about students proved to be a barrier to his ideal practices.

In summation, it was clear that all of these teachers in their early careers believed that their pre-service program was still a powerful influence on their beliefs and practice, and they were still able to articulate many important aspects of PBHI, and perhaps more importantly, their own unique takeaways from this model. A lack of time, content-coverage pressures, classroom management concerns, beliefs about students, and the nature of specific courses all emerged as powerful influences that led to alterations in belief and practice. While Bram and Frank seemed to stray further from their beliefs during lesson implementation, Fiona also unevenly translated her beliefs into practice, and her lessons often failed to reach their potential for higher-order thinking and critical inquiry, and were also frequently implemented apart from larger unit and course goals.

The examples of Bram, Frank, and Fiona presented further questions regarding whether high-level activities and strategies supportive of the PBHI framework are any more effective than traditional models of instruction when implemented in an isolated fashion without connections to a greater purpose as part of a philosophically coherent unit. Implementation of PBHI-supportive strategies apart from a unit and larger goals co-opts the PBHI framework, as coherence and long-term purpose are key components of PBHI. The relative success of these nontraditional strategies is unclear when these activities are implemented in a piecemeal fashion by these teachers, and it is unknown if these instructional practices are any more successful than conventional strategies when implemented in a vacuum apart from the greater purpose and coherence of a fully realized PBHI unit focused on a culminating activity and designed around a unit-specific central question. It is possible that students could engage in a highly rigorous, higher-order activity but fail to connect the content therein to any other knowledge when the activity occurs without greater purpose and connection to the rest of a unit.

This failure to link in-depth instruction of one topic or activity to other pieces or a greater purpose led to lessons that did not meet the traditional characteristics of thoughtful social studies classrooms as described by Newmann (1991a), and underscored the importance of connections to larger unit and course goals in addition to rigorous individual lessons. To be worthwhile, these strategies conducive to PBHI must also be presented in an engaging, authentic fashion with this larger purpose in mind, as engagement and authenticity of tasks make the tasks “worth doing” and lead to greater buy-in from students (Newmann, Wehlage & Lamborn, 1992; Brush & Saye, 2014; VanSickle, 1996). It is likely that Bram, Frank, and Fiona believed that they successfully implemented PBHI at the lesson level, but these lessons and strategies did not reach their full potential when separated from the larger purpose and cohesiveness necessary for the successful implementation of PBHI at the unit level and beyond.

Ultimately, Matt and Waylon emerged as the two teachers whose practices were most aligned to their PBHI-influenced beliefs. In the case of Matt, an in-depth, continued relationship with his pre-service program and a prolonged relationship with a like-minded mentor were powerful influences and supports as his beliefs manifested into a holistic acceptance of his pre-service model. While he acknowledged that he could still use more research-based strategies and could continue to improve, he joined Waylon as the other teacher most likely to implement his vision, one strongly influenced by his pre-service, PBHI model, in a holistic fashion. Waylon was not as connected to the pre-service program or as close to his mentor, but he was also successful in a whole-cloth transfer from beliefs to practice. He openly acknowledged my own suspicion that his success came because of his autonomy in his nontraditional, issues-based elective course. Freed from the pressures of time, content coverage, and standardized testing pressures, Waylon

felt free to teach in his ideal fashion, and his course structure closely aligned to the tenets of PBHI inquiry on a regular basis.

Whether real or perceived, the influencing factors discussed above served to significantly alter the practices, if not the beliefs, of the other three participants. While implications from the cases of Matt and Waylon are further discussed below, both cases demonstrated important recommendations for teacher educators and instructional leaders. Matt's example suggests the potential for a teacher to continue to pursue a philosophically coherent, rigorous, and relevant PBHI model when they continue to be supported by the teacher educators in their pre-service program (Saye, et al., 2013). Matt's case also underscores the importance of continued mentoring in the careers of new teachers. Waylon's example, meanwhile, serves as a source of hope that teachers who are freed from common limiting factors, whether real or imagined, could take the opportunity to pursue rigorous, issues-based instruction rather than rely on traditional, lower-order methods.

### **Alternative Explanations**

In this chapter, I have briefly recounted the major findings from the data sources utilized in my study. Before discussing limitations inherent to the study, it is important to consider alternative explanations for the findings I suggest here. First, it is worth noting that my findings regarding teacher beliefs relied on participant self-report. As a result, it is possible that my findings, particularly those discussed in chapter four, represent an embellished or idealized version of participants' beliefs. In addition to my role as lead researcher of this study, four of the five participants also knew me in other capacities associated with their pre-service teacher educators. As such, it is possible that they were more likely to express a continuity of beliefs that still aligned to those of their pre-service program. Because this was a possibility that was

anticipated, the observations of practice also served to confirm or disconfirm teacher interview responses.

With regards to the observations of practice, it is also possible that the teachers may have invited me to observe lessons that they believed to be extraordinarily strong and atypically aligned to PBHI tenets. Because I only observed each participant three times during the course of the study, it is possible that their observed lessons were not truly representative of business as usual in their classrooms. I asked the teachers to invite me on days that typified their instruction, but with a small number of observations relative to the number of class days, it is possible that I saw the best examples of practice. This alternative explanation is less likely in some cases than others. For example, Bram invited me to observe two lessons that were not closely aligned to PBHI principles of the tenets of his pre-service education. Both my first and third visits to his class saw lessons that were lower-order in nature and relatively low-scoring with regards to AIW standards for rigor and relevance. He acknowledge this openly, and explained that he wanted me to see days that were typical of the AP course experience. Without more observations, it is more difficult to discern if other participants invited me on days that represented typical or best practices.

A third explanation that relates to teachers' self-report of their beliefs has to do with the nature of their PBHI-aligned pre-service education itself. While I sometimes took participants' discussions of the importance of backwards planning, discussion, student-centered learning, relevancy, and persistent issues in history to be evidence of their continued fidelity to their pre-service model and the tenets of PBHI, it should be noted that many of these principles are also apparent in other instructional models and "best practices" in social studies. Further, descriptions of the continued implementation of these individual PBHI components do not

indicate an overall adherence to the overarching goals of PBHI or a holistic implementation of PBHI at the unit and course levels. Because I saw isolated lessons, I relied on teachers' self-reported descriptions of how the lessons fit in to larger units and cohesive goals.

Finally, with the exception of Frank, all participants had some degree of continued involvement with their pre-service program through professional development initiatives, graduate work, or by serving as cooperating teachers for interns. Even Frank worked and collaborated with multiple peers who were graduates of his pre-service program. Thus, it is difficult to fully attribute continued fidelity to PBHI principles to the ongoing influence of pre-service education only. In order to mitigate or help disconfirm this alternative explanation, I initially recruited a sixth participant who taught in a location three hours away from South Plains University and had no continued involvement with the pre-service program. While an initial interview suggested that he still believed in many PBHI principles and found some degree of success in implementing these at two of the three schools where he had taught thus far, this participant dropped out of the study before I was able to observe his classroom or engage in any further interviews. As a result, I was unable to report on the experiences of a teacher who totally disengaged from the pre-service program after graduation.

### **Limitations**

While some of the above alternative explanations also serve as potential limitation of this study, other limitations must also be noted. First, my small sample size makes it difficult to transfer the findings of this study to other contexts and settings. While Creswell (2007) suggests that generalizability is not necessarily the goal of a largely qualitative study such as this, had I attempted to secure an even more heterogeneous or larger sample, the findings and lessons learned discussed here may have been more easily applied to other contexts and settings. The



inclusion of the aforementioned individual who taught far away from South Plains would also have been helpful in this regard.

A related limitation is the number of observations with each participant. While three observations in concert with five interviews with each teacher and the collection of lesson- and unit-level materials did result in relatively well-informed cases, it is likely that more observations would have strengthened the cases. It is also likely that increased contact with the participants would have further evidenced the typicality of the practices I did see. As discussed above, it is somewhat difficult to know if I truly gained an authentic understanding of the typical practices of each participant.

In chapter three, I anticipated further possible limitations due to social desirability and my presence as an outside observer in the classroom environment. As discussed above, it is possible that I often heard what the participants perceived that I wanted to hear. While the observations served as confirming and disconfirming evidence of teachers' stated beliefs, it is possible that all responses to my questions were not entirely representative of teachers' true beliefs. Because the researcher is the central tool of inquiry in qualitative research, ongoing reflection on the effects of my presence on participants was a necessity in this study (Patton, 2002). I attempted to mitigate the effects of this limitation on transferability by visiting the same class each time I had contact with the participants, though the nature of an outside observer as a potential influencing factor on participants' behavior cannot be totally discounted.

As the study progressed, I began to perceive another limitation with regards to my interview protocol. Because the research of Lortie (1975), Goodson (1992), and others suggests the importance of teacher biography and their own apprenticeship as students, I should have worked to account to a greater extent for the teachers' existing beliefs prior to entering college. I also

should have asked the participants why they chose their professions. While Frank volunteered this information and thus shed light on his focus on the affective, pastoral roles of teaching, I did not gain a sense of what personal experiences led the participants to the social studies education program at South Plains University. Greater insight on this and other preexisting factors might have gone further in explaining why some participants demonstrated greater fidelity to the tenets of PBHI than others.

A final limitation was somewhat unique to Waylon, and is significant as he emerged alongside Matt as one of the two teachers most aligned to their pre-service beliefs, the tenets of PBHI, and a commitment to rigorous, relevant teaching. Though he emerged as a powerful model of continued fidelity to his pre-service beliefs in the study, he openly acknowledges that his beliefs and practices were somewhat different in his more traditional courses such as United States and World History. Because all of my observations took place in his PBHI-friendly “Issues in Education” course, I was unable to determine the extent to which he found continuity of beliefs and success in the more traditional settings in which the vast majority of social studies teachers operate. Further observations with Waylon in his non-elective courses would have been valuable in this regard. While Waylon emerged as an example of what is possible when a teacher is given a blank canvas on which to translate beliefs into action, his experience is not easily transferrable to other contexts.

### **Implications**

The results of his study underscored the importance of other research findings. It has been suggested that continued belief in, and success with, complex models of instruction such as PBHI requires ongoing support by teacher educators beyond the awarding of teaching credentials (Saye, et al., 2013). With the exception of Frank, all of the participants in this study had a great

deal of continued involvement with, and support from, their pre-service program. The most powerful example of continued support of PBHI in a typical setting emerged in the case of Matt, who engaged in continued graduate work within his pre-service program, mentored interns from his program, and participated in lesson study and professional development with the same teacher educators who prepared him as an undergraduate. In some cases, the transfer of his continued experiences was easily observable, as was the case with his adoption of his Model United Nations summer institute experiences into his own classroom. Matt's example also underscored the importance of a supportive departmental culture, a common vision, and continued mentoring by a veteran teacher committed to higher-order, rigorous instruction (Ladwig, 1991). Matt explicitly credited his mentor with his successes and improvement, and this mentor served as yet another extension of his pre-service preparation.

Waylon's example may provide teacher educators with hope that their protégés will, apart from real and perceived limitations on their practices, commit themselves to the more rigorous models of instruction such as PBHI. Given the chance to realize his idealized model of instruction in an atypical setting, Waylon readily returned to the ideals of his pre-service program and sought to holistically implement PBHI as frequently as possible. While his issues-based elective course represents a very atypical setting, Waylon's case and his self-reported struggles to achieve the same success in more traditional courses demonstrate the power of outside factors and pressures such as a lack of time as extremely influential factors on teachers' beliefs and practices in more typical settings.

Finally, it should be noted that all of the participants demonstrated a strong level of self-awareness with regards to the connection between beliefs and practices. Fiona openly acknowledged that she utilized many of the tenets of PBHI, but also noted that it was unlikely to

see these implemented in a holistic fashion at the unit level due to her perceptions of time, coverage pressures, and beliefs about students. Frank similarly discussed his beliefs about his students' skill levels as a limiting factor on the realization of his beliefs. Bram openly acknowledged that the goal of student success on the AP exam trumped his own beliefs regarding PBHI in most cases throughout the year. Even though these participants were not as successful as Matt and Waylon in a holistic transfer of the PBHI framework into practice, all of them demonstrated an awareness of their individualized, "real world" rationales and the factors that influenced them. Further, they openly acknowledged when they did not meet their own standards or the ideals of their pre-service program. The development of a coherent rationale and the significance of self-reflection were also tenets of their pre-service preparation, and were evidenced even in the cases of teachers who had abandoned some of the tenets of PBHI or were unable to realize their own ideals. This accentuates the importance of coherent rationale development and the advancement of self-reflection skills in teacher education programs (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2008; Dinkelman, 1999; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Goodman & Adler, 1985; Hawley, 2010; Shaver & Strong, 1982).

## **Recommendations**

Because the findings of this study support the notion that continued support by pre-service teacher educators is of great importance, further research into the specific ways this support can be offered to program graduates is significant. Lesson study projects, intern mentorship, graduate work, and other examples of continued involvement were observed and discussed by teachers in this study. Multiple studies of the lesson study cycle have shown this process to be effective in changing teachers' practices (Lewis, 2009; Lieberman, 2009; Saye, Kohlmeier, Brush, Maddox, & Howell, 2007). Studies of a more specific form of lesson study scaffolded to

incorporate the PBHI framework have demonstrated the promise of this specific type of lesson study in furthering PBHI professional teaching knowledge (Howell & Saye, 2015; Saye et al., 2007). Further research into the enduring effects of participation in such lesson study cycles is necessary. Specifically, more needs to be known about the extent to which teachers transfer wise practices learned and utilized during lesson study cycles to their daily practices.

Supervision and mentorship of student-teachers also served as a continuation of some of the participants' relationships with their alma mater, and three of the five participants supervised interns from South Plains University. As discussed in chapter two, student-teachers can serve to update their cooperating teachers on current practices and create a dynamic relationship that is mutually beneficial to both parties (Arnold, 2002). Such a relationship also continues the partnership between program graduates and their pre-service teacher educators beyond the induction period. Further research into the effects of intern supervision, particularly the supervision of interns from one's own pre-service program may provide further insights for teacher educators seeking to extend their support of program graduates. If teacher educators want their program graduates to continue to implement high-quality instruction, specific ways of continued support such as lesson study, intern supervision, and other, more novel configurations of professional practice communities should be advanced and evaluated.

Inhibiting factors such as coverage-focused curricula, a lack of time, and standardized testing pressures continued to emerge in the cases of multiple teachers in this study. Whether real or perceived, these factors influenced teacher beliefs, practices, and successes at merging the two. While further study into the actual extent of these factors as inhibitors may be valuable, it would certainly behoove teacher educators who advocate for PBHI and similar rigorous models of instruction to help their pre-service teachers and in-service graduates to understand how to

realize complex models of instruction in a variety of real-world contexts. Further research on how best to adapt PBHI to a variety of settings and courses and subsequent adoption of the findings into teacher education programs may be necessary to help prospective and current teachers to see how such a model can work in various contexts without a “watering down” process or abandonment of core principles.

A first step in bridging the gap between research and practice may be exposing in-service teachers to research findings that counter traditional notions regarding the perceived incompatibility of content coverage and test preparation with higher-order, inquiry-based models such as PBHI. For example, recent research indicates that, at the very least, devoting time to in-depth inquiry instead of broad curricular coverage does not harm student achievement on high-stakes tests (Parker et al., 2011; Saye & SSIRC, 2013). Similarly, a study of over 8,000 college science students found that those who experienced high school curricula of breadth had no advantage over students who completed high school curriculums focused on in-depth inquiry of fewer topics. In the case of the field of biology, those students who experienced curriculums of breadth were actually at a significant disadvantage (Schwartz, Sadler, & Thai, 2008). Findings such as those of these two studies may seem counterintuitive to practitioners focused on broad coverage and test preparation. This is all the more reason to expose in-service teachers to such research findings.

Finally, a related area for potential study emerged in some of the cases of this multiple-case study. Whereas Matt and Waylon were the most successful at a holistic implementation of PBHI, the other teachers sought to implement certain aspects of the PBHI framework while abandoning others. This abandonment might have occurred due to divergent beliefs or their perceptions of the power of the aforementioned inhibiting factors, but in either case the result

was the same, a piecemeal or partial implementation of PBHI in their classroom practices. More research is needed to determine the relative efficacy of partial adherence to PBHI principles and patchwork implementation of the related supportive strategies. Piecemeal implementation co-opts the key goals of the PBHI framework, that of establishing purpose and relevance, and does not allow students to engage in purposeful, scaffolded inquiry over an extended period of time. Divorced from their greater purpose, it is unclear if these strategies are any more effective than traditional modes of teaching. This type of partial implementation was evident to some extent in all participants at various times, but was most notably observed in the cases of Fiona, Frank, and Bram.

## **Conclusion**

The findings elaborated upon in this chapter indicate that PBHI and other tenets of pre-service education continued to be influential factors on the beliefs, and in some cases, the practices of the sample of teachers. Even so, other factors such as time, the nature of course curricula, internalized beliefs about students, and testing pressures also served as factors to modify beliefs or inhibit the ability of participants to translate beliefs into practice. Models of continued success in translating PBHI-influenced beliefs into practice occurred in one of two contexts. While the case of Waylon and his nontraditional course should give teacher educators hope that their graduates will engage in rigorous, principled instruction when given carte blanche to do so, this example is not typical or easily transferrable. The other success stories observed in this study, and especially the case of Matt, demonstrate the significance and importance of prolonged mentoring for new teachers and the necessity of continued support of in-service teachers by teacher educators if they seek to make PBHI and other models of principled, professional practice a reality in secondary social studies classrooms. The good news is that the beliefs and

practices of teachers who are still in their early careers are likely to be more malleable than those of veteran teachers (Knowles, 1992). Early career teachers such as the participants in this study are also more likely to be receptive to continued support and enthusiastic about the potential of professional relationships (Thomas et al., 1998). Thus, if rigorous, higher-order instruction is to become the norm in secondary social studies classrooms, it is incumbent for teacher educators to continue their relationships with program graduates well into their careers and to find new ways to support them in the field either directly or through veteran teacher mentors and communities of practice supportive of such instructional models.



## References

- Adler, S. (1984). A field study of selected student teacher perspectives toward social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 12(1), 13-30.
- Altieri, J.L. (2011). *Content counts! Developing disciplinary literacy skills, K-6*. Newark, DE: International Literacy Association.
- Angell, A.V. (1998). Learning to teach social studies: A case study of belief restructuring. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26(4), 509-529.
- Arnold, P. (2002). Cooperating teachers' professional growth through supervision of student teachers and participation in a collegial study group. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(2), 123-132.
- Barber, B.R. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkely, CA: University of California Press.
- Barton, K. C. & Levstik, L. S. (2004). *Teaching history for the common good*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Beck, J., and Earl, M. (2001). *Key issues in secondary education*. London, New York: Continuum.
- Boyd, D.J., Grossman, P., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., Michelli, N.M., and Wycoff, J. (2006). Complex by design: Investigating pathways into teaching in New York City schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57 (3), 155-166.
- Bransford, J. (Ed.). (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

- Brill, S., & McCartney, A. (2008). Stopping the revolving door: Increasing teacher retention. *Politics & Policy*, 36(5), 750-774.
- Brooks, S. (2013). Teaching for historical understanding in the advanced placement program: A case study. *The History Teacher*, 47(1), 61-77.
- Brown, A. (1992). Design experiments: Theoretical and methodological challenges in creating complex interventions in classroom settings. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 2(2), 141-178.
- Brush, T., & Saye, J. (2014). An instructional model to support problem-based historical inquiry: The persistent issues in history network. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, 8 (1).
- Bullough Jr., R.V. (1990). Supervision, mentoring, and self-discovery: A case-study of a first-year teacher. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 5 (4), 338-360.
- Burn, K. (2012). "If I wasn't learning anything new about teaching I would have left it by now!": How history teachers can support their own and others' continued professional learning. *Teaching History*, 146, 40-49.
- Caron, E. (2004). The Impact of a methods course on teaching practices: Implementing issues-centered teaching in the secondary social studies classroom. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 28(2), 4-19.
- Child Health Promotion Research Unit. (2006). Pastoral care in education: A report prepared for the Department of Education and Training of Western Australia.
- Chant, R.H. (2002). The impact of personal theorizing on beginning teaching: Experiences of three social studies teachers. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 30(4), 516-540.

- Chong, S., & Low, E. (2009). Why I want to teach and how I feel about teaching – formation of teacher identity from pre-service to the beginning teacher phase. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 8, 59-72.
- Chong, S. (2011). Development of teachers' professional identities: From pre-service to their first year as novice teachers. *Korean Educational Development Institute Journal of Educational Policy*, 8(2), 219-233.
- Cochran-Smith, M., McQuillan, P., Mitchell, K., Terrell, D.G., Barnatt, J., D'Souza, L., Jong, C., Shakman, K., Lam, K., & Gleeson, A.M. (2012). A longitudinal study of teaching practice and early career decisions: A cautionary tale. *American Educational Research Journal*, 49(5), 844-880.
- Cohen, D.K., & Ball, D.L. (1999). *Instruction, capacity, & improvement* (CPRE Research Report no. RR-043). Philadelphia, PA. University of Pennsylvania, Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- Cohen, D.K., & Ball, D.L. (2000). *Instructional innovation: Reconsidering the story*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Craig, C. J. (2014). From stories of staying to stories of leaving: A US beginning teacher's experience. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 46(1), 81-115.
- Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cuban, L. (1993). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms, 1890-1980*. New York, NY: Longman.

- Cuenca, A. (2010). *In loco paedagogus: The pedagogy of a novice university supervisor. Studying Teacher Education*, 6(1), 29-43.
- Cuenca, A. (2011). The role of legitimacy in student teaching: Learning to “feel” like a teacher. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Spring 2011, 117-130.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21<sup>st</sup> century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(3), 300-314.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2008). The case for university-based teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D.J. McIntyre & K.E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 333-346). New York: Routledge.
- Davis Jr., O.L. (2001). A view of authentic mentorship. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 17(1), 1-4.
- Dewey, J. (1998). *Experience and education* (60th anniversary ed.). West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.
- Dinkelman, T. (1999). Critical reflection in a social studies methods semester. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 27(3), 329-357.
- Doppen, F. (2007). The influence of a teacher preparation program on pre-service social studies teachers’ beliefs: A case study. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 31(1), 54-64.
- Dorn, C. (2008). “Treason in the textbooks”: Reinterpreting the Harold Rugg textbook controversy in the context of wartime schooling. *Paedagoica Historica*, 44(4), 457-479.
- Engle, S.H. & Ochoa, A. (1988) *Education for democratic citizenship: Decision making in the social studies*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Evans, R.W. (2004). *Social studies wars: What should we teach the children?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Evans, R.W. (2008). Pedagogic creed as foundation: An approach to teaching social studies methods. *The Social Studies*, March/April, 57-59.
- Fehn, B. & Koeppen, K.E. (1998). Intensive document-based instruction in a social studies methods course and student teachers' attitudes and practice in subsequent field experiences. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26 (4), 461-484.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1013-1055.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2008). Teacher learning over time. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D.J. McIntyre & K.E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education: Enduring Questions in changing contexts* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 697-705). New York: Routledge.
- Feistritzer, C.E. (2009). Teaching while learning: Alternative routes fill the gap. *EDge*, 5(2), 3-15.
- Flores, M.A., and Day, C. (2006). Contexts which shape and reshape new teachers' identities: A multi-perspective study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22, 219-232.
- Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. California: Josey-Bass.
- Goodman, J. & Adler, S. (1985). Becoming an elementary social studies teacher: A study of perspectives. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 13(2), 1-20.
- Goodson, I.F. (Ed.) (1992). *Studying teachers' lives*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Grant, C., & Zeichner, K. (1981). Inservice education for beginning teachers: The state of the scene. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 14, 99-111.

- Grossman, P., Wineburg, S., and Woolworth, S. (2000). What makes teacher community different from a gathering of teachers. Occasional Paper No. O-00-1. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Grossman, P. & Loeb, S. (2010). Learning from multiple routes. *Educational Leadership*, 67(8), 22-27.
- Grossman, P. & Davis, E. (2012). Mentoring that fits. *Educational Leadership*, 69(8), 54-57.
- Hahn, C.L. (1996). Research on issues-centered social studies. In R. Evans & D. W. Saxe (Eds.), *Handbook on teaching social issues* (pp.25-41). Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Hartzler-Miller, C. (2001). Making sense of “best practice” in teaching history. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 29 (4), 672-695.
- Hawley, T.S. (2010). Purpose into practice: The problems and possibilities of rationale-based practice in social studies. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 38(1), 131-162.
- Hess, D. (2002). Discussing controversial public issues in secondary social studies classrooms: Learning from skilled teachers. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 30(1), 10-41.
- Hess, D. (2008). Controversial issues and democratic discourse. In L. Levstik & C. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in Social Studies Education* (pp. 124-136). New York: Routledge.
- Hess, D. (2009). *Controversy in the classroom: The democratic power of discussion*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hiebert, J., Gallimore, R., and Stigler, J.W. (2002). A knowledge base for the teaching profession: What would it look like and how can we get one? *Educational Researcher*, 31(5), 3-15.

- Howell, J., & Saye, J.W. (2015). Using lesson study to develop a shared professional teaching knowledge culture among 4<sup>th</sup> grade social studies teachers. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 40 (1), 25-37.howell
- Howey, K.R. & Zimpher, N.L. (1989). *Profiles of preservice teacher education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hsieh, B. (2015). The importance of orientation: Implications of professional identity on classroom practice and for professional learning. *Teachers & Teaching: Theory & Practice*, 21(2), 178-190.
- Jackson, P.W. (1990). *Life in classrooms*, New Edition. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Ingersoll, R.M. (2003). "Is there really a teacher shortage?" Co-sponsor by the *Consortium for Policy Research Education* and the *Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy*. Available online at: <http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/PDFs/Shortage-RI-09-2003.pdf>
- James, J.H. (2010). "Democracy is the devil's snare": Theological certainty in teacher education. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 38(4), 618-639.
- Johnson, S.M. & Kardos, S.M. (2008). The next generation of teachers: Who stays, who leaves, and why. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D.J. McIntyre & K.E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 445-467). New York: Routledge.
- Johnston, M. (1990). Teachers' backgrounds and beliefs: Influences on learning to teach in the social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 18(3), 207-233.
- Kale, U., Brush, T., & Saye, J.W. (2009). Assisting teachers' thinking and participation online. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 41(3), 287-317.

- Kagan, D.M. (1993). *Laura and Jim and what they taught me about the gap between educational theory and practice*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Kagan, D.M., & Tippins, D.J. (1992). The evolution of functional lesson plans among twelve elementary and secondary student teachers. *The Elementary School Journal*, 92(4), 477-489.
- King, M.B. (1991). Leadership efforts that facilitate classroom thoughtfulness in social studies. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 19 (4), 367-390.
- Kleickmann, T., Richter, D., Kunter, M., Elsner, J., Besser, M., Krauss, S., & Baumert, J. (2013). Teachers' content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge: The role of structural differences in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(1), 90-106.
- Knowles, J.G. (1992). Models for understanding pre-service and beginning teachers' biographies: Illustrations from case studies. In I.F. Goodson (Ed.), *Studying teachers' lives* (pp. 99-152). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Koerner, M., Rust, F., & Baumgartner, F. (2002). Exploring roles in student teaching placements. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(2), 35-58.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ladwig, J.G. (1991). Organizational features and classroom thoughtfulness in secondary school social studies departments. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 19 (4), 391-409.
- Lang, P. (1983). Perspectives on pastoral care. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 1(1). 61-62.
- Lewis, C. (2009). What is the nature of knowledge development in lesson study? *Educational Action Research*, 17(1). 95-110.
- Lieberman, J. (2009). Reinventing teacher professional norms and identities: The role of lesson study and learning communities. *Professional Development in Education*, 35 (1), 83-99.



- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lortie, D.C. (2002). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study* (Second Edition). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- MacArthur, C.A., Ferretti, R.P., & Okolo, C.M. (2002). On defending controversial viewpoints: Debates of sixth graders about the desirability of early 20<sup>th</sup>-century American immigration. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 17(3), 160-172.
- Maddox, L. & Saye, J.W. (2014). Authentic pedagogy and the acquisition of lower order knowledge in history. *Social Studies Research & Practice*, 9(1), 1-18.
- Marks, H. (2000). Student engagement in instructional activity: Patterns in the elementary, middle, and high school years. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(1), 153-184.
- McCormack, A., Gore, J., & Thomas, K. (2006). Early career teacher professional learning. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(1), 95-113.
- McNeil, L.M. (1986). *Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge*. New York, NY: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Inc.
- Mead, N. (2003). Will the introduction of teaching standards in professional values and practice put the heart back into primary teacher education? *Pastoral Care in Education*, 21(1), 37-42.
- Melnick, S.A., & Meister, D.G. (2008). A comparison of beginning and experienced teachers' concerns. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 39-56.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Morgan, M., Ludlow, L., Kitching, K., O'Leary, M., & Clarke, A. (2010). What makes teachers tick? Sustaining events in new teachers' lives. *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(2), 191-208.
- National Council for the Social Studies (2008). *A vision of powerful teaching and learning in the social studies: Building social understanding and civic efficacy, a position statement of National Council for the Social Studies*.
- Nelson, J.L. (1996). The historical imperative for issues-centered education. In R. Evans & D. W. Saxe (Eds.), *Handbook on teaching social issues* (pp. 14-24). Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19(4), 317-328.
- Newmann, F.M. (1991a). Promoting higher order thinking in social studies: Overview of a study of 16 high school departments. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 19(4), 324-340.
- Newmann, F.M. (1991b). Classroom thoughtfulness and students' higher order thinking: Common indicators and diverse social studies courses. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 19(4), 410-433.
- Newmann, F.M., King, M. B., & Carmichael, D. L. (2007). Authentic instruction and assessment: Common standards for rigor and relevance in teaching academic subjects: Prepared for the Iowa Department of Education.
- Newmann, F.M., & Associates. (1996). *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.
- Newmann, F.M., Marks, H.M., & Gamoran, A. (1996). Authentic pedagogy and student performance. *American Journal of Education*, 104, 280-312.

- Newmann, F.M., & Wehlage, G. (1993). Five standards of authentic instruction. *Educational Leadership*, 50(7), 8-12.
- Newmann, F.M., Wehlage, G., & Lamborn, S.D. (1992). The significance and sources of student engagement. In F. Newmann (Ed.), *Student Engagement and Achievement in American Secondary Schools*, 11-39. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Nishino, T. (2012). Multi-membership in communities of practice: An EFL teacher's professional development. *Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 16 (2), 1-21.
- Nystrand, M., Gamoran, A., & Carbonaro, W. (1998). *Towards an ecology of learning: The case of classroom discourse and its effects on writing in high school English and social studies*. Albany, NY: A Report of the National Research Center on English Learning and Achievement (CELA).
- Ochoa-Becker. (1996). Building a rationale for issues-centered education. In R. Evans & D. W. Saxe (Eds.), *Handbook on teaching social issues* (pp. 6-13). Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Onosko, J.J. (1991). Barriers to the promotion of higher-order thinking in social studies. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 19(4), 341-366.
- Parker, W.C. (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life*. New York, NY: teachers College Press.
- Parker, W.C. (2008). Knowing and doing in democratic citizenship education. In L. Levstik & C. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 65-80). New York: Routledge.
- Parker, W.C., Mosborg, S., Bransford, J., Vye, N., Wilkerson, J., & Abbott, R. (2011). Rethinking advanced high school coursework: Tackling the depth/breadth tension in the AP US Government and Politics course. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 43, 533-559.

- Patterson, N.C. & Luft, J.A. (2004). Creating a continuum: Considering induction programs for secondary social studies teachers. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 32(2), 138-152.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pietsch, M. & Williamson, J. (2010). "Getting the pieces together": Negotiating the transition from pre-service to in-service teacher. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(4), 331-344.
- Rice, S.M. (2013). Working to maximize the effectiveness of a staffing mix: What holds more and less effective teachers in a school, and what drives them away? *Educational Review*, 66(3), 311-329.
- Rinke, C.R. (2008). Understanding teachers' careers: Linking professional life to professional path. *Educational Research Review*, 3, 1-13.
- Rodgers, K.R. & Scott, K.H. (2008). The development of the personal self and professional identity in learning to teach. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D.J. McIntyre & K.E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 732-755). New York: Routledge.
- Rogers, J. (2000). Communities of practice: A framework for fostering coherence in virtual learning communities. *Educational Technology & Society*, 3(3), 384-392.
- Rogers, Y., & Ellis, J. (1994). Distributed cognition: An alternative framework for analysing and explaining collaborative working. *Journal of Information Technology*, 9(2), 119-128.
- Ronfeldt, M. & Grossman, P. (2008). Becoming a professional: Experimenting with possible selves in professional preparation. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 35(3), 41-60.
- Rossi, J.A. (1995). In-depth study in an issues-oriented social studies classroom. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 23(2), 88-120.

- Saye, J. W., & Brush, T. (2004). Promoting civic competence through problem-based history learning environments. In G. E. Hamot & J. J. Patrick (Eds.), *Civic learning in teacher education* (Vol. 3, pp. 123-145). Bloomington, Indiana: The Social Studies Development Center of Indiana University.
- Saye, J.W., Kohlmeier, J., Brush, T., Maddox, L., & Howell, J. (2007). *Using Lesson Study to Build a Professional Knowledge Community for Problem-Based History Study*. Paper presented at the National Council for the Social Studies, CUFA, San Diego, CA.
- Saye, J.W., & Brush, T. (2007). Using technology-enhanced learning environments to support problem-based historical inquiry in secondary school classrooms. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 35(2), 196-230.
- Saye, J.W., Kohlmeier, J., Brush, T., Howell, J., and Maddox, L. (2013). Assessing the effects of a teacher education program on pre-service secondary teachers' instructional decision-making. IN PRESS.
- Saye, J.W., Kohlmeier, J., Brush, T., Mitchell, L., Farmer, C., & Kohlmeier, J. (2009). Using mentoring to develop professional teaching knowledge for problem-based historical inquiry. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 37(1), 6-41.
- Saye, J.W. and the Social Studies Inquiry Research Collaborative. (2013). Authentic pedagogy: its presence in social studies classrooms and relationship to student performance on state-mandated tests. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 41(1), 89-122.
- Schoeman, S. (2012). Student teachers' opinions of the pastoral role module in a postgraduate certificate in education programme. *Africa Education Review*, 9(2). 327-343.
- Schultz, K., and Ravitch, S.M. (2013). Narratives of learning to teach: Taking on Professional Identities. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(1), 35-46.

- Scott, S. & Baker, R.G. (2003). Determining the effectiveness of a teacher preparation course by exploring the transfer of complex teaching models by graduates. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 31(1), 67-85.
- Schwartz, M.S., Sadler, P.M., & Tai, R.H. (2008). Depth versus breadth: How content coverage in high school science courses relates to later success in college science coursework. *Science Education* (published online in Wiley Interscience at interscience.wiley.com), 1-29.
- Seixas, P. (1998). Student teachers thinking historically. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26(3), 310-341.
- Seixas, P. (1999). Beyond “content” and “pedagogy”: In search of a way to talk about history education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 31(3), 317-337.
- Sexton, D.M. (2008). Student teachers negotiating identity, role, and agency. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Summer 2008, 73-88.
- Shaver, J. P., & Strong, W. (1982). *Facing value decisions: Rationale-building for teachers*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Shermis, S.S., & Washburn, P.C. (1986). Social studies educators and their beliefs: Preliminary data from Indiana colleges and universities. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 14(4), 331-340.
- Shulman, L.S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-21.
- Sizer, T. R. (1992). *Horace's school: Redesigning the American high school*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Smethem, L. (2007). Retention and intention in teaching careers: Will the new generation stay? *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 13(5), 465-480.

- Swan, B.G., Wolf, K.J., & Cano, J. (2011). Changes in teacher self-efficacy from the student teaching experience through the third year of teaching. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 52(2), 128-139.
- Stake, R.E. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Tatto, M.T. (1998). The influence of teacher education on teacher's beliefs about purposed of education, roles, and practice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(1), 66-78.
- Tekumru-Kisa, M., & Stein, M.K. (2015). Learning to see teaching in new ways: A foundation for maintaining cognitive demand. *American Educational Research Journal*, 52(1), 105-136.
- Tekumru-Kisa, M., Stein, M.K., & Schunn, C. (2015). A framework for analyzing cognitive demand and content-practices integration: Task analysis guide in science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 52(5), 659-685.
- Thomas, G., Wineburg, S., Grossman, P., Myhre, O., & Woolworth, S. (1998). In the company of colleagues: An interim report on the development of a community of teacher learners. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 14(1), 21-32.
- Thomas, L., & Beauchamp, C. (2011). Understanding new teacher's professional identities through metaphor. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 27, 762-769.
- Thompson, J., Windschitl, M., & Braaten, M. (2013). Developing a theory of ambitious early-career teacher practice. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(3), 574-615.
- Thornton, S.J. (2008). Continuity and change in social studies curriculum. In L. Levstik & C. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 15-32). New York: Routledge.

- Van Hover, S.D. & Pierce, E. (2006). "Next year will be different:" Two first-year history teachers' perceptions of the impact of Virginia's accountability reform on their instructional decision-making. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 30(2), 38-50.
- Van Hover, S.D. & Yeager, E.A. (2003). "'Making' students better people?": A case study of a beginning history teacher. *The International Social Studies Forum*, 3(1), 219-232.
- Van Hover, S.D. & Yeager, E.A. (2004). Challenges facing beginning history teachers: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Social Education*, 19(1), 8-21.
- Van Hover, S.D. & Yeager, E.A. (2007). "I want to use my subject matter to...": The role of purpose in one U.S. secondary history teacher's instructional decision making. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 30(3), 670-690.
- VanSickle, R.L. (1996). Questions of motivation for achievement in social studies. In B.G. Massialas and R.F. Allen, Eds., *Crucial Issues in Teaching Social Studies K-12*, 81-105. New York, NY: Wadsworth.
- VanSledright, B.A. (2010). *The challenge of rethinking history education: On practices, theories, and policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Vinson, K.D. & Ross, E.W. (2001). In search of the social studies curriculum: Standardization, diversity, and a conflict of appearances. In W.B. Stanley (Ed.), *Critical issues in social studies research for the 21<sup>st</sup> century* (pp. 39-71). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, E.K., Konopak, B.C., & Readance, J.E. (1994). Pre-service teachers in secondary social studies: Examining conceptions and practices. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 22(3), 364-379.



Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and method*. (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zeichner, K. & Conklin, H.G. (2008). Teacher education programs as sites for teacher preparation. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D.J. McIntyre & K.E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 269-289). New York: Routledge.

Zumwalt, K. & Craig, E. (2008). Who is teaching? Does it matter? In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D.J. McIntyre & K.E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 404-423). New York: Routledge.

## Appendices

## Appendix A: Professional Philosophy Statement Assignment

### Final Project: A Professional Statement for Social Studies Teaching:

CTSE 4060 aims to assist you in developing and refining a conception of social studies teaching. By the end of this course you will have reflected on your educational experiences and beliefs, addressed schooling dilemmas that affect social studies teaching, examined various conceptions of the social studies and proposals for scope and sequence, worked at length in a social studies classroom, and judged assorted social studies curriculum materials. All of these activities should shape your philosophy for schooling, teaching, learning, and social studies. Your final assignment is to synthesize all of these activities into a professional philosophy and rationale statement. This essay will become part of your exit portfolio following internship. The audience is a potential employer.

- I. Thinking about teaching and learning (10 pts)
  - A. What is the purpose of school? How would you assess the current success of our school systems? How should we educate the modern democratic citizen in the 21<sup>st</sup> century? Critique the current preparation students receive for life after graduation and what you feel should be kept or changed. Explain why you feel this way.
  - B. Consider the best student thinkers you have seen. What distinguishes them from others? What does a good thinker do? How can schools develop good thinkers?
  - C. What types of experiences provide the most powerful learning? What should graduates be able to know and do? (general, not social studies specific)
  
- II. Social Studies philosophy (75 pts)
  - A. Many people find it easier to define science or English as a subject than social studies. What is social studies? (5)
  - B. What are the most important purposes or goals of social studies instruction? Why is it important that social studies be taught? Be sure to include an explanation of the society for which social studies is preparing its students and you might consider organizing this using the four dimensions of the SS laid out by the NCSS. (10)
  - C. What kinds of general teaching strategies best help us to achieve those goals and purposes? What specific types of activities and materials should be emphasized? In what ways would you include parents and the community in learning and assessment? (15)
  - D. Which is most important in making decisions about teaching the social studies content area: broad coverage of a wide range of information or in-depth exploration of fewer important topics? Explain criticisms your position would receive and how you would respond. (10)
  - E. Outline and defend a 7-12 social studies scope and sequence plan. Some questions to consider are: What is the role of world and U.S. history? How would you plan for periodization of global history? Will you use discipline-specific or interdisciplinary courses? Are any of the disciplines more important to you than others? Begin with at least one paragraph that describes the overall rationale for your plan – explain the order and defend it. List the six courses in order to provide an overview. Then begin a section for each of the six courses in detail. This should include: Title (heading); paragraph describing major topics and themes (what will students learn and why?); paragraph with a few examples of activities you would use (how will students experience

the content and why?). Include detailed illustrative examples from at least one course. (Use “snapshots of practice” in NCSS standards as examples (pp. 105, 108, 111, 114-115). This should be a new lesson idea – not one used in 4050 or 4060 assignments. (20)  
F. Respond to critics. Discuss at least three distinct criticisms of your position by three or more advocates for social studies reform and explain why you feel they are incorrect. (15)

- III. Social Studies realities (10 pts)
- A. How has social studies practice changed over time?
  - B. Describe contemporary social studies practice. How is it similar to and different from the past? What needs to change? Use lab experiences to illuminate.
  - C. What type of world will the 21<sup>st</sup> century citizen inherit? How is technology impacting politics and the skills of a 21<sup>st</sup> century democratic citizen? How does your plan for social studies prepare them?
- IV. Style Points (5) – clarity, organization, form (grammar/spelling)

**Evaluation Details:**

Part I is introduction, Part III is conclusion. Focus most of your attention on Part II. I expect ample evidence that you have used the course readings. Do not focus on only one or two readings. Show me that you have considered the body of work we have addressed in order to come to your position. Beware of plagiarism. Cite sources for your ideas. Be careful to attribute quotes. You should also cite (e.g. Newmann, 1988) ideas that are not directly quoted but that are substantially unaltered in concept from the original source. Your position should be unique. I expect that you will borrow ideas from various authors, but that you will combine and adapt them in original ways to arrive at a position that is yours alone. Your position should not be a slight alteration of one of the positions we have read.

This is a reflective essay. Do not merely describe. Do not be superficial. Use examples whenever possible. REFLECT. Be introspective and analytical – write in first person. The essay should run approximately 20-25 double-spaced pages. Use section headings to add clarity. Number pages. Do not staple or bind pages. Place essay in file folder with your name on the tab. For specific guidelines in evaluation see the rubric included in the reading packet.

## **Appendix B : Initial Interview Protocol**

### Background Information

- When did you complete your undergraduate degree at South Plains University?
- When did you begin teaching social studies on a full-time basis?
- Have you completed any graduate coursework since you completed your undergraduate work at A.U.? If so, where? In what field?
- Please describe the professional development activities you have participated in thus far in your career.
- Have you taught at any other schools?
- Please describe your course load. How many preps do you have each day? Do you have any other responsibilities beyond classroom instructional duties?

### Initial Interview Questions

1. Prior to this interview, you reviewed the Professional Philosophy Statement you authored as a pre-service teacher. Is this statement still an accurate representation of your professional philosophy?
2. If you were to re-write your Professional Philosophy Statement today, what would you change and why?
3. In your opinion, what should be the central purpose or goal for teaching social studies?
4. Do you regularly use any of the planning techniques or instructional strategies that you learned in your methods courses? Which ones?
5. If another social studies teacher asked you about Problem-Based Inquiry, how would you explain this approach to him or her?
6. Reflect on your first years as a social studies teacher. Did you participate in any formal mentor relationships or induction programs? What types of support did you receive?
7. Describe 1-2 of the biggest obstacles you have encountered thus far in your career. What strategies have you implemented to overcome these obstacles?
8. Is your school organized departmentally by subject? Do you regularly collaborate with other social studies teachers to plan or design lessons? If so, describe your typical collaborative experiences with peers.
9. With regards to your teaching career since leaving A.U., what should I have asked you that I didn't? What else do you want me to know?

### **Appendix C: Observation-Based Interview Protocol**

1. Describe your goals for today's lesson. How did these fit in with your goals for the unit or course as a whole?
2. Describe the process by which you designed this lesson. What influenced your planning decisions? What resources did you use?
3. How much experience do your students have with this type of lesson or activity?
4. Please describe 1-2 things that happened during the implementation of this lesson that you expected to happen.
5. Did anything happen during the implementation of this lesson that you did not expect to happen?
6. Did you make any major modifications to your lesson plan while you were teaching the lesson?
7. What will you do differently next time you teach this lesson? If so, please describe specific adaptations you will make and the reasons for these.
8. Overall, do you think this lesson is consistent with your overall purpose for social studies education? Why or why not?
9. Is there anything else you want me to know about the development or implementation of this lesson? Is there anything else I should have asked you that I did not?

## **Appendix D: Final Interview Protocol**

Note: The final interview protocol will continue to be developed throughout the data collection process. New items will be added as the data suggests additional lines of inquiry.

1. Overall, do you believe your students reached your goals for them in the course this year? Why or why not?
2. Did you experience any obstacles this year that prevented you from implementing the kind of instruction you wanted to in this course?
3. If you teach this course next year, will you do anything differently? Describe what you will do and how it differs from your practice this year.
4. Can you think of any additional resources or professional development opportunities in the future that would help you to better realize your vision for this course or your purpose for social studies education?

In the initial interview, I asked you to think about your pre-service preparation and transition into the teaching profession. Considering that you now have another year of experience:

5. What could teacher educators from your preparation program do to better prepare graduates so that they can succeed at translating their own visions of social studies into powerful teaching?
6. What advice would you give a recent graduate of your teacher preparation program who is just beginning his/her career?

## Appendix E --- AIW Rubrics for Classroom Instruction & Task

### Criteria for Classroom Instruction

**Scoring instructions:** To determine scores for the four standards, follow the technical scoring criteria as outlined in the tips below. Consider the descriptions for scores 1-5 on each standard to constitute the *minimum* criteria for that score. If you find yourself between scores, make the decision by asking whether the minimum conditions of the higher score have been met. If not, use the lower score. In determining scores for each standard, the observer should **consider only the evidence observed** during the lesson observation. “**Many**” students refers to at least 1/3 of the students in a class; “**most**” refers to more than half; “**almost all**” is not specified numerically, but **Scoring** should be interpreted as “all but a few.”

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Class Observed: \_\_\_\_\_

Observer: \_\_\_\_\_

Score	HOTS		Deep Knowledge						
	To what extent do students use lower order thinking processes? To what extent do students use higher order thinking processes?		To what extent is knowledge deep? To what extent is knowledge shallow and superficial?						
	Lower Order thinking only	Higher Order thinking is central	Knowledge is shallow	1	2	3	4	5	knowledge is deep
5	Almost all students, almost all of the time, are performing HOT.		Knowledge is very deep because the teacher successfully structures the lesson so that almost all students sustain a focus on a significant topic and do at least one of the following: demonstrate their understanding of the problematic nature of information and/or ideas; demonstrate complex understanding by arriving at a reasoned, supported conclusion; or explain how they solved a complex problem. In general, students' reasoning, explanations and arguments demonstrate fullness and complexity of understanding.						
4	Students are engaged in at least one major activity during the lesson in which they perform HOT operations, and this activity occupies a substantial portion (at least 1/3) of the lesson and many students are performing HOT.		Knowledge is relatively deep because either the teacher or the students provide information, arguments or reasoning that demonstrate the complexity of an important idea. The teacher structures the lesson so that <b>many</b> students <b>sustain</b> a focus on a significant topic for a period of time <b>and do</b> at least one of the following: demonstrate their understanding of the problematic nature of information and/or ideas; demonstrate understanding by arriving at a reasoned, supported conclusion; or explain how they solved a relatively complex problem.						
3	Students are primarily engaged in routine LOT operations a good share of the lesson. There is at least one significant question or activity in which some students perform some HOT operations.		Knowledge is treated unevenly during instruction; i.e., deep understanding of something is countered by superficial understanding of other ideas. At least one significant idea may be presented in depth and its significance grasped, but in general the focus is not sustained.						
2	Students are primarily engaged in LOT, but at some point they perform HOT as a minor diversion within the lesson.		Knowledge remains superficial and fragmented; while some key concepts and ideas are mentioned or covered, only a superficial acquaintance or trivialized understanding of these complex ideas is evident.						
1	Students are engaged only LOT operation; i.e., they either receive, or recite, or participate in routine practice and in no activities during the lesson do students go beyond LOT.		Knowledge is very thin because it does not deal with significant topics or ideas; teacher and students are involved in the coverage of simple information which they are to remember.						

#### Tips for Scoring HOTS

- Lower order thinking (LOT) occurs when students are asked to receive or recite factual information or to employ rules and algorithms through repetitive routines. As information receivers, students are given pre-specified knowledge ranging from simple facts and information to more complex concepts. Such knowledge is conveyed to students through a reading, work sheet, lecture or other direct instructional medium. Students are not required to do much intellectual work since the purpose of the instructional process is to simply transmit knowledge or to practice procedural routines. Students are in a similar role when they are reciting previously acquired knowledge; i.e., responding to test-type questions that require recall of pre-specified knowledge. More complex activities still may involve LOT when students only need to follow pre-specified steps and routines or employ algorithms in a rote fashion.
- Higher order thinking (HOT) requires students to manipulate information and ideas in ways that transfer their meaning and implications. This transformation occurs when students combine facts and ideas in order to synthesize, generalize, explain, hypothesize or arrive at some conclusion or interpretation. Manipulating information and ideas through these processes allows students to solve problems and discover new (for them) meanings and understandings.
- When students engage in HOT, an element of uncertainty is introduced into the instructional process and makes instructional outcomes not always predictable; i.e., the teacher is not certain what will be produced by students. In helping students become producers of knowledge, the teacher's main instructional task is to create activities or environments that allow them opportunities to engage in HOT.

#### Tips for Scoring Deep Knowledge

- Knowledge is shallow, thin or superficial when it does not deal with significant concepts or central ideas of a topic or discipline. Knowledge is also shallow when important, central ideas have been trivialized, or when it is presented as non-problematic. Knowledge is thin when students' understanding of important concepts or issues is superficial such as when ideas are covered in a way that gives them only a surface acquaintance with their meaning. This superficiality can be due, in part, to instructional strategies such as when teachers cover large quantities of fragmented ideas and bits of information that are unconnected to other knowledge.
- Evidence of shallow understanding by students exists when they do not or can not use knowledge to make clear distinctions, arguments, solve problems and develop more complex understanding of other related phenomena.
- Knowledge is deep or thick when it concerns the central ideas of a topic or discipline and because such knowledge is judged to be crucial to a topic or discipline.
- For students, knowledge is deep when they develop relatively complex understandings of these central concepts. Instead of being able to recite only fragmented pieces of information, students develop relatively systematic, integrated or holistic understanding. Mastery is demonstrated by their success in producing new knowledge by discovering relationships, solving problems, constructing explanations, and drawing conclusions.
- In scoring this item, observers should note that depth of knowledge and understanding refers to the substantive character of the ideas that the teacher presents in the lesson, or to the level of understanding that students demonstrate as they consider these ideas. It is possible to have a lesson that contains substantively important, deep knowledge, but students do not become engaged or they fail to show understanding of the complexity or the significance of the ideas. Observers' ratings can reflect either the depth of the teacher's knowledge or the depth of understanding that students develop of that content.



## Appendix E --- AIW Rubrics for Classroom Instruction & Task

Score	<b>Substantive Conversation</b> <i>To what extent is classroom discourse devoted to creating or negotiating understandings of subject matter?</i>  <b>no substantive conversation</b> 1   2   3   4   5 <b>high level substantive conversation</b>	<b>Connectedness to the Real World</b> <i>To what extent is the lesson, activity, or task connected to competencies or concerns beyond the classroom?</i>  <b>no connection</b> 1   2   3   4   5 <b>connected</b>
5	All features of substantive conversation occur, with at least one example of <u>sustained</u> conversation, and almost all students participate.	Students study or work on a topic, problem or issue that the teacher and students see as connected to their personal experiences or actual contemporary or persistent public issues. Students recognize the connection between classroom knowledge and situations outside the classroom. They explore these connections in ways that create personal meaning and significance for the knowledge. This meaning and significance is strong enough to lead students to become involved in an effort to affect or influence a larger audience beyond their classroom in one of the following ways: by communicating knowledge to others (including within the school), advocating solutions to social problems, providing assistance to people, creating performances or products with utilitarian or aesthetic value.
4	All features of substantive conversation occur, with at least one example of <u>sustained</u> conversation, and many students participate in some substantive conversation (even if not part of the sustained conversation).	Students study or work on a topic, problem or issue that the teacher and students see as connected to their personal experiences or actual contemporary or persistent public issues. Students recognize the connection between classroom knowledge and situations outside the classroom. They explore these connections in ways that create personal meaning and significance for the knowledge. However, there is no effort to use the knowledge in ways that go beyond the classroom to actually influence a larger audience.
3	Substantive Conversation Feature # 2 (sharing) and/or #3 (coherent promotion of collective understanding) occur and involve at least one example of <u>sustained</u> conversation (i.e., at least 3 consecutive interchanges).	Students study a topic, problem or issue that the teacher succeeds in connecting to students' actual experiences or to actual contemporary or persistent public issues. Students recognize some connection between classroom knowledge and situations outside the classroom, but they do not explore the implications of these connections which remain abstract or hypothetical. There is no effort to actually influence a larger audience.
2	Substantive Conversation Feature # 2 (sharing) and/or # 3 (coherent promotion of collective understanding) occur briefly and involve at least one example of two consecutive interchanges.	Students encounter a topic, problem or issue that the teacher tries to connect to students' experiences or to actual contemporary or persistent public issues; i.e., the teacher informs students that there is potential value in the knowledge being studied because it relates to the world beyond the classroom. For example, students are told that understanding Middle East history is important for politicians trying to bring peace to the region; however, the connection is weak and there is no evidence that students make the connection.
1	Virtually no features of substantive conversation occur during the lesson.	Lesson topic and activities have no clear connection to anything beyond itself; the teacher offers no justification beyond the need to perform well in class.

### Tips for Scoring Substantive Conversation

- This scale measures the extent of talking to learn and to understand in the classroom. There are two dimensions to this construct: one is the substance of subject matter, and the other is the character of dialogue.
- In classes where there is little or no substantive conversation, teacher-student interaction typically consists of a lecture with recitation where the teacher deviates very little from delivering a preplanned body of information and set of questions; students typically give very short answers. Because the teacher's questions are motivated principally by a preplanned checklist of questions, facts, and concepts, the discourse is frequently choppy, rather than coherent; there is often little or no follow-up of student responses. Such discourse is the oral equivalent of fill-in-the-blank or short-answer study questions.
- In classes characterized by high levels of substantive conversation there is considerable teacher-student and student-student interaction about the ideas of a topic; the interaction is reciprocal, and it promotes coherent shared understanding. (1) The talk is about subject matter in the discipline and includes higher order thinking such as making distinctions, applying ideas, forming generalizations, raising questions; not just reporting of experiences, facts, definitions, or procedures. (2) The conversation involves sharing of ideas and is not completely scripted or controlled by one party (as in teacher-led recitation). Sharing is best illustrated when participants explain themselves or ask questions in complete sentences, and when they respond directly to comments of previous speakers. (3) The dialogue build coherently on participants' ideas to promote improved collective understanding of a theme or topic (which does not necessarily require an explicit summary statement). In short, substantive conversation resembles the kind of sustained exploration of content characteristic of a good seminar where student contributions lead to shared understandings.
- To recognize sustained conversations, we define an interchange as a statement by one person and a response by another. Interchanges can occur between teacher and student or student and student. Sustained conversation is defined as at least three consecutive interchanges. The interchanges need not be between the same two people, but they must be linked substantively as consecutive responses. Consecutive responses should demonstrate sensitivity either by responding directly to the ideas of another speaker or by making an explicit transition that shows the speaker is aware he/she is shifting the conversation. Substantive conversation includes the 3 features described above. Each of the features requires interchange between two or more people. None can be illustrated through monologue by one person.

### Tips for Scoring Value Beyond School

- This scale measures the extent to which the class has value and meaning beyond the instructional context. In a class with little or no value beyond, activities are deemed important for success only in school (now or later), but for no other aspects of life. Student work has no impact on others and serves only to certify their level of competence or compliance with the norms and routines of formal schooling.
- A lesson gains in authenticity the more there is a connection to the larger social context within which students live. Two areas in which student work can exhibit some degree of connectedness are: (a) a real world public problem; i.e., students confront an actual contemporary or persistent issue or problem, such as applying statistical analysis in preparing a report to the city council on the homeless. (b) students' personal experiences; i.e., the lesson focuses directly or builds upon students' actual experiences or situations. High scores can be achieved when the lesson entails one or both of these.

## Scoring Criteria for Social Science Tasks

### General Rules

The main point here is to estimate the extent to which successful completion of the task requires the kind of cognitive work indicated by each of the three standards: Construction of Knowledge, Elaborated Communication, and Connections to Students' Lives. Each standard will be scored according to different rules, but the following apply to all three standards.

- If a task has different parts that imply different expectations (e.g., worksheet/short answer questions and a question asking for explanations of some conclusions), the **score should reflect the teacher's apparent dominant or overall expectations**. Overall expectations are indicated by the proportion of time or effort spent on different parts of the task and criteria for evaluation, if stated by the teacher.
- **Take into account what students can reasonably be expected to do at the grade level.**
- When it is difficult to decide between two scores, give the higher score only when a persuasive case can be made that the task meets minimal criteria for the higher score.

	Construction of Knowledge	Elaborated Communication	Connection to Students' Lives
4	N/A	Analysis / Persuasion / Theory. Explicit call for generalization AND support. The task requires explanations of generalizations, classifications and relationships relevant to a situation, problem, or theme, AND requires the student to substantiate them with examples, summaries, illustrations, details, or reasons. Examples include attempts to argue, convince or persuade and to develop and test hypotheses.	N/A
3	The task's <b>dominant expectation</b> is for students to interpret, analyze, synthesize, or evaluate information, rather than merely to reproduce information. To score high the task should call for interpretation of nuances of a topic that go deeper than surface exposure or familiarity.	Report / Summary. Call for generalization OR support. The task asks students <b>either</b> to draw conclusions <b>or</b> make generalizations or arguments, OR to offer examples, summaries, illustrations, details, or reasons, but not both.	The question, issue, or problem clearly resembles one that students have encountered or might encounter in their lives. The task explicitly asks students to connect the topic to experiences, observations, feelings, or situations significant in their lives.
2	There is some expectation for students to interpret, analyze, synthesize, or evaluate information, rather than merely to reproduce information.	Short-answer exercises. The task or its parts can be answered with only one or two sentences, clauses, or phrasal fragments that complete a thought.	The question, issue, or problem bears some resemblance to one that students have encountered or might encounter in their lives, but the connections are not immediately apparent. The task offers the opportunity for students to connect the topic to experiences, observations, feelings, or situations significant in their lives, but does not explicitly call for them to do so.
1	There is very little or no expectation for students to interpret, analyze, synthesize, or evaluate information. The dominant expectation is that students will merely reproduce information gained by reading, listening, or observing.	Fill-in-the-blank or multiple choice exercises.	The problem has virtually no resemblance to questions, issues, or problems that students have encountered or might encounter in their lives. The task offers very minimal or no opportunity for students to connect the topic to experiences, observations, feelings, or situations significant in their lives.

## Appendix E: AIW Rubrics for Classroom Instruction & Task

### Tips for Scoring Construction of Knowledge

- ❑ The task asks students to organize and interpret information in addressing a concept, problem, or issue.
- ❑ Consider the extent to which the task asks the student to organize, interpret, evaluate, or synthesize complex information, rather than to retrieve or to reproduce isolated fragments of knowledge or to repeatedly apply previously learned procedures. To score high the task should call for interpretation of nuances of a topic that go deeper than surface exposure or familiarity. Nuanced interpretation often requires students to read for subtext and make inferences. Possible indicators of interpretation may include (but are not limited to) tasks that ask students to consider alternative solutions, strategies, perspectives and points of view.
- ❑ These indicators can be inferred either through explicit instructions from the teacher or through a task that cannot be successfully completed without students doing these things.

### Tips for Scoring Elaborated Communication

- ❑ The task asks students to elaborate on their understanding, explanations, or conclusions on important social studies concepts.
- ❑ Consider the extent to which the task requires students to elaborate on their ideas and conclusions.

### Tips for Scoring Connection to Students' Lives

- ❑ The task asks students to address a concept, problem or issue that is similar to one that they have encountered or are likely to encounter in life outside of school.
- ❑ Consider the extent to which the task presents students with a question, issue, or problem that they have actually encountered or are likely to encounter in their lives. Defending one's position on compulsory community service for students could qualify as a real world problem, but describing the origins of World War II generally would not.
- ❑ Certain kinds of school knowledge may be considered valuable in social, civic, or vocational situations beyond the classroom (e.g., knowing how a bill becomes a law). However, task demands for "basic" knowledge will not be counted here unless the task requires applying such knowledge to a specific problem likely to be encountered beyond the classroom.