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Textbooks, curriculum packages, standards, professional development and pre-service education, and national advocacy groups all utilize orientation terms to identify the pedagogical approaches, though no model for orientations has currently been validated against the lived experience of teachers. The purpose of the dissertation is to research a practitioner-informed orientation model for social studies, utilizing the lived experiences of teachers including their connections to and with technology. As a preliminary investigation to explore and understand the construct of orientations, the initial set of participants was bound to three secondary social studies teachers from an urban, suburban, and rural district, respectively. Data collection was completed through a series of detailed interviews including three modified narrative identity protocols, one elicited response interview, and one observation interview. Phenomenology formed the epistemological lens and the method that utilized various instruments as a
pathway into the teachers’ perceived life worlds. Research was conducted from a transcendental or psychological approach to phenomenology with a grounded theory approach to analyzing the data to generate theoretical themes rooted in the narratives. A detailed description of each case narrative along with the phenomenological essence of each teacher is provided individually before cross case analysis is presented. From this combined case data, a constructed model that captures the narratives, trends, and overlaps was created. Evans’ orientation model was utilized as exemplary of the field for comparison. There existed overlaps present with the utilized model yet current models explored failed to encompass all elements of teacher-held orientations and an emergent model is presented that includes the following orientation constructs: social efficiency, a social sciences core, a transformative role, and personal improvement. The findings also included four themes: the role of storytelling as a central concept in practice, the role of film and television representations of history in sustaining engagement, the value of the classroom environment and students in creating a sense of equity, and a close level of uniformity in orientation reporting out of step with current frameworks. Implications for learning environments, particularly in relation to the utilization of technology, are discussed in addition to necessary future research suggestions. 
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The purpose of the dissertation is to research a practitioner-informed orientation model for social studies, utilizing the lived experiences of teachers including their connections to and with technology. The number of participants was bound to three secondary social studies teachers from an urban, suburban, and rural district respectively. Data collection was completed through a series of detailed interviews: three modified narrative identity protocols, one elicited response interview, and one observation interview. Phenomenology formed the epistemological lens and the method from a transcendental or psychological approach to phenomenology with a grounded theory approach to analyzing the data. There existed overlaps with the utilized Evans’ model in comparison, yet current models failed to encompass all elements of teacher-held orientations and an emergent model formed to include social efficiency, a social sciences core, a transformative role, and personal improvement. The findings also included four themes: the role of storytelling as a central concept in practice, the role of film and television representations of history in sustaining engagement, the value of the classroom environment and students in creating a sense of equity, and a close level of uniformity in orientation reporting out of step with current frameworks. Implications for learning environments are discussed in addition to necessary future research suggestions.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The language of orientation is present in the work of all stakeholders in the field of Social Studies Education. Textbooks, curriculum packages, standards, professional development and pre-service education, and national advocacy groups all utilize terms to identify the orientational approach to be taken. Yet, while all of these groups freely engage the language of orientation models, originally created as a tool by academicians to organize the field of academicians, these models have yet to have significant empirical work performed to validate the models or engage the perspectives or experience of teachers in their creation or usage. While teachers have these labels applied to them, their materials, and educational opportunities, the efficacy of these models in capturing the lived experience that shapes their orientations remains largely unexamined.

Since the early 20th century studies and surveys have decried a perceived disconnect between what students are anticipated to know from a social studies classroom and how students perform on standardized measures. The suggestion that teachers are failing to properly instruct students in the subject would indicate either a disconnect between the pedagogical methods employed or the content being presented against the standardized measures in the studies. However, even if the pedagogical methods and content were in sync with these measures, the orientation of the teachers in interpreting and presenting the material through an orientated approach to pedagogy has not been explored as a potential factor in student performance nor effective training of teachers toward impactful practice.
Recognizing decisions are made through a series of unseen filters, Schoenfeld (2011) engaged the term of orientations inclusive of “beliefs, dispositions, values, tastes, and preferences” (p. 15).

In the Fall of 2013 the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) put forth a new framework that acts as an approach to teaching in the public schools. The aim is to prepare students within what NCSS refers to as the three C’s; college, careers, and community. The three C’s approach aligns to what is viewed as the purpose of social studies within official manuals; namely, civic competency. Further, NCSS promotes teaching social studies as inquiry, promoting civic learning’s six proven practices, taking informed action, supporting disciplinary literacy, and building 21st century skills which include information communication technologies. The approach includes a vision of the purpose of social studies, but also an orientation approach toward meeting the aims set forth. Yet, a single official purpose in manuals carries with it a multiplicity of ways to approach the official purpose; as outlined in multiple models created to detail orientations toward teaching the social studies. Without a core understanding of teacher orientations informed from teacher experience, the ability to create materials, training, and curriculum to match with the NCSS approach remains a challenge.

Even as there are many constructs to organize the field of social studies teachers into orientations, none of these organized models have been confirmed against how teachers conceptualize their own thinking of social studies, and none have been created taking into account the lived experience of social studies
teachers. While the language of orientations is being applied in materials that will inform, influence, and direct the practice of teachers, how the teachers engage and conceptualize within these constructs—or if the constructs represent the lived experience of teachers—remains unknown. This research is designed to take the teachers’ perspective into the exploration of goals and orientations in social studies education.

Recognizing the great complexity of experience in the lives of teachers requires special care be taken in representing their beliefs and orientations. Within phenomenology such care requires engaging the story of these individuals as much from their perspective as possible. Removing researcher bias and preconceived notions as far as possible while working to enter the life-worlds of the participant is a critical component. One goal of the study is to focus on the lives of three teachers as individual cases where the teachers explore their own orientations from their own story, how they view their practice, and ways they represent their own understanding of their practice. While not chosen because they stand as exemplary teachers in practice, these participants represent the common teacher currently practicing and the approach and current understandings within the subject. I am not trying to understand the nature of their day-to-day decisions or specific kinds of instructional behaviors per se; rather, I am interested in exploring their lives and stories as they conceptualize the goals and purposes for social studies education itself. This includes an exploration into the contextual external factors of context, individual characteristics, and even developmental factors that have enabled their emerging understanding of the goals and purposes
over time. The contextual external factors are detailed as revealed and captured in the narratives the teachers tell about their own practice.

In establishing and determining the life story of the teachers, I explore the construct of narrative identity in order to better understand the nature of their understanding and the development of their orientation. Narrative identity may be understood as the internalized and evolving life story that one constructs in order to make meaning of one’s life (McAdams, 2001). The construction of the narrative identity is an ongoing psychological process that helps the individual maintain a sense of coherent self through different contexts and across the life course. By the time an individual reaches adulthood, he or she will have a rich array of personal experiences drawn on to construct the life narrative. The internalized story that is ultimately constructed captures autobiographical experiences that reflect individual characteristics such as values, worldview, goals, and the broader context of culture (McAdams, 2001). Given the complexity of the classroom experience, the broad nature of the subject itself, and the myriad of potential approaches toward the subject, I assume that teachers must have an internalized story, or narrative identity, that explains how they came to develop their approach to the subject over time. To gain access to these narrative identities, I have employed a narrative methodology from a modified version of McAdams’ (1995) life narrative interview that asked participants to explore their association to the subject over the course of their lives. These narrative identity interviews were used as instruments, with additional interviews, to determine how the practicing participating teachers oriented to the subject of social studies as a
phenomenon from their lived experiences.

Given these perspectives, the study was guided by the following questions:

1. Framed through the themes or patterns related to teacher orientations in social studies (individual characteristics, contextual factors, change over time, and meaningful experiences) that emerge in the narratives (individually and collectively) shared by social studies teachers, how do teachers define and describe their teaching orientation through their lived experience narrative, and how do those definitions and descriptions compare to the Evans model (additions or omissions)?

2. What are the implications of these findings for the design of learning environments to promote and support social studies instruction; including technology usage and integration?

The Evans’ model (2010) referred to in question one references a model that engages the complexity of the orientation organizational field, envelops other perspectives and orientation models existing, and proposes five competing orientations fighting for control or influence over the direction of social studies. Evans’ model is discussed in the following chapter and as it is currently the most commonly utilized within the field.

To address these research questions, a designed and implemented exploratory qualitative research study was conducted in an attempt to identify emergent themes across narratives told by currently practicing teachers in the field. As no known previous research has focused on the intersection between narrative identity and orientation to social studies, a grounded approach to analyzing the
data in order to generate theoretical themes rooted in the narratives told by the participants was taken. From this data, a constructed model that captures the narratives, trends, and overlaps was created in this dissertation. The model includes a descriptive account of the narrative identities of individuals currently working as social studies educators.

In Chapter 2 I describe the theoretical foundations that have guided the study. This includes a summary of previous orientation models created to organize the field of social studies orientations, an analysis of orientation and beliefs related to orientation development, and contextual factors that link to orientation development. Within the discussion, belief mutability, pedagogical design in context, and how orientations link to belief systems are explored. Finally, an explanation of phenomenology and how it relates to the foregoing concepts is discussed as it forms the theoretical foundation of exploring teacher orientations in social studies education.

In Chapter 3 an overview of the methodological approach to collecting and analyzing the data is presented. A detailed description of the data collection process, the characteristics of the participant sample, and my own perspectives as a research in a qualitative study is discussed to establish the foundations upon which the research study was conducted. Finally, the data analysis process and concrete examples of the data were represented, organized, and coded to generate the theory and findings that are presented in the remainder of the dissertation.

In Chapters 4 through 6 each of the three teacher participants are presented as independent case studies that begin by coordinating all five interviews into a
single storyline narrative. Next, an exploration of the influences and factors that have shaped their orientations is presented with an analysis of how their declared orientations connect to the current models for orientations in the field. An elaboration of the themes and underlying emphasis points from their narrative are provided to further illustrate their example as a case study for the reader. Finally, a discussion of the overarching essence of their story is presented to describe the phenomenology of their story and their orientation story.

In Chapter 7 the three cases are analyzed together for major themes and representative statements correlated to the previous models, in creating a new model for understanding teacher orientations informed from the lived narrative of these teachers. Emergent themes from the narratives include: the critical role of storytelling, the role of film and television representations, the value of the classroom and students in creating a sense of equity, and a close level of uniformity in orientation and pedagogical methods out of step with the established and promoted frameworks. A discussion on the importance of the qualitative work to continue to explore the phenomenon of orientation to social studies as a subject is presented. Next, an elaboration on the implications of this work for the design of learning environment, with the inherent limitations and affordances of this study is discussed. Finally, suggestions on how this research might be added upon by future research to enhance the understanding of teacher orientations, and to impact learning environments and training programs that work with teachers is explicated.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

The Fall of 2013 saw the arrival of a new framework presented by the NCSS for teaching the subject called the C’s framework: preparing students for careers, college, and community. This framework follows along the current purpose for social studies outlined by that organization; namely, civic competency. Even as social studies itself has been referred to as a “schizophrenic bastard child” based on the inability of scholars and researchers to define social studies even as a singular or plural term (Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1975, p. 1), this new framework demonstrates a concerted focus within the teaching of social studies that indicates a defined and philosophically agreed upon orientation to the subject itself.

Orientations have been used to define curriculum packages (Stanley, 2010), National Curriculum Standards for Social Studies (NCSS, 2010), and in the development of the content and language of textbooks (Ravitch, 2004). Further, orientations help to define teacher education programs, professional development offerings, even professional standards.

Yet, for as widespread as orientation labels are, attempts to categorize general orientations and goals within social studies education have shifted over time, and can be recognized as a simplification of the overall debate in social studies (Barr et al., 1977). Kliebard (1986) identified four ideological positions within the school system: academic, developmentalist, social efficiency, and social reconstructionists. Schubert (1986) condensed these in three divisions; the intellectual traditionalist, social behaviorist, and the experientialist. While it is
recognized that more than three classification groupings are possible, and the prior is a simplification of the debate (e.g. Dynneson & Gross, 1982; Gehrke, Knapp, & Sirotnik, 1992; Hertzberg, 1981), all these organizational systems are designed to classify orientations toward the subject of social studies. However, even as there is some utility in using these orientation systems, they are all designed by academicians to organize the field of academicians and their research, lack empirical grounding, and neglect to take into account or inquire of teachers their perspectives in their construction.

Even the NCSS in their Official Bulletin 51 realized that any organizational structure for defining social studies must not focus on the content, but on the instructional goal (Barr et al., 1977). At that time, three traditions were identified as having emerged after decades of developing consensus: social studies as citizenship transmission, taught as a social science, and taught as reflective inquiry. Each of these traditions carried a different purpose, distinct methods, and content selection practices. They claim citizenship as the goal for social studies and each agree that citizens need to accomplish the objectives of gaining knowledge, acquiring some processing mechanism for new information, learning how to select values, and knowing how to apply knowledge and values toward civic participation. Yet even with similarities, each group may build a curriculum with vastly different meanings of the same terms. For example, one teacher may believe that citizenship involves decision-making in a socio-political context and may build a curriculum around inquiry into conflict and unresolved issues. Another may build a curriculum around a fixed body of knowledge believing all
students need to share the same traditional values and loyalties to contribute to their communities. While these teachers may be using the same terms and words to defend their actions, there may be radically different philosophies undergirding their understandings. Despite more than 35 years since this report was published identifying essential tensions within the field and the need for greater clarity, little by way of clarification has occurred. Ironically, the new C’s standards are focusing on a body of knowledge for preparing citizens through means of historical inquiry practice: a blending of all the ideological divergent purposes, methods, and content previously identified as needing to be explored and disambiguated.

Recently, Evans (2010) identified five competing orientations fighting for control of or influence over the direction of social studies. These include, first, traditional historians who support history as the core of social studies; second, advocates of social studies as a social science who seek to create a ‘structure of the disciplines’ approach to the curriculum; third, social efficiency advocates seeking to create a more controlled and efficient society preparing students for various life roles; fourth, social meliorists hoping to improve student’s reflexive thinking skills in an issue-centered curriculum that emphasizes social problems; and fifth, social reconstructionists who cast social studies in a leading role in transforming society. While encompassing the simplified three categories of other models, and the three identified approaches from the NCSS bulletin, this model also envelops other perspectives and nods to the complexity of issues in the
debate. Among the possible models for organizing orientations, Evans will be employed here as it is currently the most commonly utilized.

Of equal importance to understanding the orientation toward social studies, is the current way orientations are being applied by different stakeholders; often listed within the goal statement. The NCSS defines the goal of Social Studies as civic competency realized as citizens that are “informed and thoughtful, participate in their communities, are involved politically, and exhibit moral and civic virtues” (NCSS, 2010, p. 169). Such a definition is wide enough to encompass all five orientations Evans identified— as well as the conflicting terminology from their own report of more than 30 years prior—and many theorists are similarly vague (e.g. King, Newmann, & Carmichael, 2010; Parker, 2010; Seixas, 2006). Some theorists suggest that even the idea of citizenship education, declared by some to be the overarching orientation accepted by all (Thornley, 1994), can be broken into three additional areas that encompass and include other orientations identified by Evans with even the additional layers identified as oversimplified and overlapping (Barr et al., 1977; Stanley, 1985). This leaves teachers, according to Grant (2003), to potentially see the purpose as helping students become knowledgeable about the past, able to analyze current situations using social studies methods, reflective thinkers, or committed to social action. Note that Grant’s identified goals include all of Evans’ (2010) taxonomy items except social efficiency. In situating within this divergent and potentially competing field of ideas, it is important to understand the expressed orientation of major theorists, identified concepts related to teaching social studies history, and
the recommendations for instruction through their perspective lens as a means to better understand my perspective.

**A Survey of the Field**

Situating the individual theorists, or classifying teachers for that matter, within one of the orientations presented by Evans (2010) remain problematic. Expressed orientations may include a variety of elements as comfortable in one category as in another, or may remain as vague as the NCSS (2010) goal. However, while clear delineation may not be comfortably or casually identified, general grouping of expressed ideas can hone in on the field.

Taking six theorists together as a small sample of the field (Barton & Levstik, 2010; King, Newmann, & Carmichael, 2010; Parker, 2010; Seixas, 2006; Segall & Helfenbein, 2008; Wineburg, 2001), their statements appear to focus on the last three groupings in Evans’ (2010) construct: social efficiency, social meliorists, and social reconstructionists. Predominate among these ideas is the concept of taking various cognitive and intellectual skills and applying them toward the larger community, state, national, and global environments in an active way—as advocated by Barton & Levstik (2010), Parker (2010), King et al. (2010), Seixas (2006), and Segall and Helfenbein (2008). Such a perspective falls within the lines of the fifth construct of social reconstructionists. However, Parker (2010), King et al. (2010), and Seixas (2006) also suggested that the social studies instruction prepares students for various life roles at a personal level which may or may not engage an active public life, as suggested within the social efficiency
grouping. Wineburg (2001), however, focuses more exclusively on the student’s thinking skills with research that has engaged social issues, such as the perception of minorities, reenactments, the role of controversial media, and sources of personal influence in historical understanding, much along the lines of social meliorists.

To illustrate the relationships and overlaps, Table 1 engages the Evans’ model as the organizing construct. The center column links researchers and major theorists under the broad orientation advocated in respective writings. The column to the right lists major theorists writing in that orientation but lists the alternate name of the orientation used by that author. While not exhaustive of the field, the table organizes the major theorists discussed to aid comprehension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evans’ Model Orientations</th>
<th>Corresponding Major Theorists</th>
<th>Alternate Names for Orientations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History as Core of Social Studies</td>
<td>Grant (2003).</td>
<td>Intellectual Traditionalist (Schubert, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of the Disciplines Approach</td>
<td>Grant (2003); Kliebard (1986); Schubert (1986).</td>
<td>Taught as a Social Science (Barr, Barth, &amp; Shermis, 1977); Academic (Schubert, 1986);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Efficacy</td>
<td>Kliebard (1986); Schubert (1986); Wineburg (2001).</td>
<td>Reflective Inquiry (Barr, Barth, &amp; Shermis, 1977); Developmentalist (Kliebard, 1986); Social Behaviorist (Schubert, 1986);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Meliorists</td>
<td>Parker (2010); Grant (2003); King, Newmann, &amp; Carmichael (2010), Schubert (1986); and Seixas (2006).</td>
<td>Citizenship Transmission (Barr, Barth, &amp; Shermis, 1977); Civic Competency (NCSS, 2010);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Reconstructionists</td>
<td>Barton &amp; Levstik (2010); Parker (2010); Grant, (2003); Kliebard (1986); King, Newmann, &amp; Carmichael (2010); Seixas (2006); Segall &amp; Helfenbein (2008).</td>
<td>Experientialist (though this includes additional connotations; Schubert, 1986);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now with those orientations identified, it is valuable to examine some statements from each of these academicians. Barton and Levstik (2010) recognized and discussed the dichotomy that often exists in schools regarding orientations. While teachers may be focused on goals of behavioral control and content coverage, which they discuss as playing a major function in potentially limiting instruction to memorization and textbook reproduction, the more powerful method of engaging students is in the, “preparation for participation in a pluralistic society” (p. 39). Wineburg (2001) contends that the study of history provides a literacy of “discernment, judgment, and caution” that teaches us to, “make choices, balance opinions, to tell stories, and to become uneasy—when necessary—with the stories we tell” (p. ix). Parker (2010) extends this concept in stating that social studies education pushes students to systematically understand, care for, and think deeply and critically about the world in a way which allows them to, “take their place on the public stage, standing on equal footing with others” (p.3). King et al. (2010) argue that citizenship involves exercising, “principled and reasoned judgments about public affairs” (p. 62), and arriving at defensible positions in public debate requires conceptual skills found in social studies. However, they also contend that social studies education should reinforce personal competency to manage health, safety, and fulfillment concerns. Seixas (2006) adds that social studies allows students to make sense of their identity, where they stand, and what they can do, as members of various groups and as citizens with roles and responsibilities to nations, states, and the larger global environment. Although arguing for a greater role and attention focused to
geography within social studies education, Segall and Helfenbein (2008) suggested that an era of globalization and substantive interactions require citizens to have an understanding of geographic principles in functioning as a member of a “global village” (p. 275).

Yet while it is valuable to understand how researchers and academics fall within the spectrum of orientation to the subject of social studies, virtually nothing is known about how the teachers themselves are currently orienting to the subject professionally or personally. We know that the lived experience of teachers plays a role in their orientation to the subject, yet how teachers in the field can be organized into orientations remains unexplored. As we seek to improve and enhance the effectiveness of how teachers are performing in the classroom, this lack of understanding can have potentially counterproductive results dependent on how the teacher orients toward the subject of social studies itself and the goal-orientated decision-making in which they are engaged.

**Goal-Oriented Decision Making**

Recognizing the primacy of lived experience in the nature of our decision making process, there is need to approach teacher orientation understanding the interplay of these ideas. One theory that links the individual teacher lived experience and orientations with their decision-making processes is Schoenfeld’s (2011) theory of goal-oriented decision making. Within Schoenfeld’s theory, five main assumptions are identified. “First, they are all engaged in goal-oriented activities” (p. 15). Identified with this assumption are not only the long and short
term goals for the teacher, but the individual decisions within instruction dealing with student needs, questions, and concerns in reaching the educational goal.

“Second, how each of these people views his or her environment, and how he or she reacts to it, is fundamentally shaped by that person’s orientations…an inclusive term to encompass beliefs, dispositions, values, tastes, and preferences” (p. 15). It is important to note that all further assumptions build from this central concept of orientations and will be further explored below. “Third, much of what these people do in the conduct of their everyday activities is routine” (p. 16). The contention is that people function well because the majority of activities engaged in are well practiced and require little decision making. “Fourth, non-standard or non-routine events crop up all the time, and the ways people react to them are consequential” (p. 17). Recognizing the nature of the spontaneous event, Schoenfeld conceded that decisions are made from a, “subjective inner reality, not the external objective reality” (p. 17), and highlights once again the need to understand the orientations that form the basis for those decisions. “Finally, there is constant monitoring and self-regulation” (p. 20). This is done to ensure the goals are accomplished to an acceptable level, as determined by individual orientations.

Schoenfeld (2011) suggested that orientations, inclusive of the elements listed above, influence perceptions of various events and how they choose to frame those situations within their own mental constructs. Within the classroom that includes three major teacher orientations: the subject (what students should learn); teaching and learning, which includes student engagement and lesson structure;
and students as both learners and individuals. As the concept of an orientation forms the core and fundamental heart of the theory, determining the orientations currently extant in the field of social studies is of primary concern. Further, such a model highlights why the teacher’s descriptions of his or her orientation—and the lived experience of teachers—are essential to understand. Without such understanding the application of such a process is almost impossible to engage and establish with lasting impact.

**Teacher Beliefs**

One construct under the umbrella of orientations in Schoenfeld’s definition is the topic of beliefs. Defining the concept of teacher beliefs, or even the concept of beliefs in general, becomes a difficult prospect as there are multiple and, at times, competing definitions. Emerging from research with teachers in which a variety of decision-making concepts were unaccounted for, beliefs became partly a catch-all phrase for those elements not identifiable as knowledge (Speer, 2005). This definition through absence approach remained problematic as over time researchers have defined beliefs in a variety of ways as a conceptual construct to fit their research needs (e.g. Abelson, 1979; Brown & Cooney, 1982; Dewey, 1933; Eisenhart, Shrum, Harding, & Cuthbert, 1988; Harvey, 1986; Nisbett & Ross, 1980). Some researchers struggle to state that beliefs exist at all outside of attributed constructs (Schoenfeld, 2011), and others state beliefs may only be stated to exist within the confluence of behavior and belief (Aguirre & Speer, 2000). This explanatory construct has also been defined by what a teacher says,
intends, and performs in the classroom (Pajares, 1992); though it must be noted that teachers may act in a manner inconsistent with their stated beliefs (Shelton, personal communication, 2011; Speer, 2005). Schoenfeld (2011) contradicted the need for there to be confluence between teachers stating a held belief and performing consistently as if they held that belief. He further suggested that if a researcher attributes a belief to a person and the person acts consistently with the model, they can be said to hold that belief (Schoenfeld, 2011). Beliefs become an attributed explanatory construct provided as a means of making “otherwise inexplicable behavior explicable” (Schoenfeld, 2011, p. 51). Wilson and Cooney (2002) suggested that the importance of understanding teacher thinking supersedes the concerns over definitional specificity of the term belief. Still, Schoenfeld (2011) suggested that for beliefs to be useful, as the explanatory construct beliefs theoretically are, they need to describe likely triggers with an evidence chain to establish consistency.

Within this definitional debate lies a sub categorization of beliefs that are described as professed or attributed. Speer (2005) contended that all beliefs presented in research have been framed by researchers that shape the portrayal of teacher beliefs, making beliefs all somewhat attributed. Schoenfeld (2011) suggested such a parallel when describing attributed beliefs, explaining that while students could not explicate their orientations to the proof set (within math research), they acknowledged that his (Schoenfeld) attributions were consistent with their own. This potentially colors students’ understandings through the lens of the research construct. Speer (2005) suggested that more important than
engaging in the dialectic concept of beliefs as attributed or professed, the focus
should engage the “most accurate attributions possible” (p. 373).

As this study is focused through a phenomenology lens, a related ambiguity
must be addressed. As discussed in theory, a researcher may observe, a teacher
may demonstrate congruently, and the teacher may still state a held belief
contrary to action and researcher observation. Through Schoenfeld’s (2011)
model, the observed and demonstrated belief could be established as an attributed
belief for the teacher regardless what the teacher attests. However, through
phenomenology, in theory, how a teacher describes a personally held belief is part
of the lived experience and valid as an understood held belief. Based on this
tension and potential for contradiction two actions are being engaged. First,
through the lens of phenomenology the stated held beliefs of the teacher will be
accepted as held beliefs through self-report as part of his or her lived experience.
Second, to ensure an understanding of the beliefs expressed, an observation
interview was conducted to allow teachers to describe their beliefs through the
context of their teaching helping to establish an evidentiary chain of support as
well as ensure the most accurate attributions are possible through the teacher’s
perspectives (Schoenfeld, 2011; Speer, 2005). While not a perfect balance
between the tensions this method allowed for a baseline report consistent with
prior research suggestions (Speer, 2005) necessary for this study that can be
further established through subsequent research.


Variations in Beliefs

Further complicating the venture of defining beliefs is the concept that beliefs are not entirely knowable and they have been shown to shift within the research. Sturtevant (1996) included the attitudes, perspectives, and experiences—both personal and professional—as sculpting the beliefs within the classroom. Aguirre and Speer (2000) acknowledged that the full range of beliefs, or belief-related interactional constructs, connected to making a particular decision may not be available though a substantive number necessary to the fulfillment of a goal would be evident. The particular set of beliefs evident and relevant to the decision making is referred to as a belief bundle, composed on those related belief sets (Aguirre & Speer, 2000). Peterson (1991) presented the idea that beliefs form a semantic scheme-like network, and that decisions formed in praxis confront this network and are filtered by the belief bundle associated with the context. Contradictory beliefs may be held in different areas of the network while certain ideas become central and difficult to change. However, the unpredictability of how teachers process within this network, and how belief change can be effectuated, remains ambiguous. To the extent of which a belief is central, dominant, or carries most weight in any given decision process is suggested to vary by context and situational factors in any given moment (Aguirre & Speer, 2000).

Potential variation within the network of decision making is not the only potential variation. Individual beliefs have been identified as changing over time (e.g. Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), though the process and nature of
change is undefined. Literature suggests beliefs can be changed through reflection into held personal beliefs, hands-on experience, and engagement in authentic problems (e.g. Derry, Siegel, Stampen, & the STEP Team, 2002; Ertmer, 2005; Tochon, 1999) and have developed strategies for affecting pre-service teachers’ beliefs (e.g. Richardson, 2003; Tatto & Coupland, 2003). However, it is suggested that changing beliefs is partly a product of time and the resistance to change may be a product of how deeply the belief is held (Ertmer, 1999). Contrarily, Munby (1982) contested that held beliefs have the potential to overpower clear contradictory evidence making a change in the behaviors issuing there from to be equally challenging to change. Posner, Strike, Hewson, and Gertzog (1982) noted that for individuals to make a change in beliefs they must be discontent with their current beliefs. Ertmer (1999) ultimately conceded that many factors may play a role in the nature of these ascribed shifts in beliefs or lack thereof.

**Design Mutability**

One way in which beliefs may be shown to have perceptibly shifted within research is through a lack of shared understandings of the terms being used (Speer, 2005). Speers provided the example: if the teacher states that they engage in group work in the classroom, when observation occurs the researcher may judge that the teacher either does not perform group work (indicating a disconnect between belief and practice) or they do, in congruence with their held belief. However, the researcher may view group work differently from the teacher and the interpretation of the event by either party may vary because of a lack of shared
understanding of the terms in use. Speer (2005) contended that such a misunderstanding of terms may be the result of attempting to garner an understanding of held beliefs disconnected from the context of practice, and offered the use of videotaped classroom vignettes from practice as a base for exploration and developing shared understandings.

Another reason research suggests variation may exist within expressed and practiced beliefs observed, is a teaching environment restrictive to the ability to act in accordance with beliefs (Speer, 2005). Within social studies, teachers have expressed difficulty in achieving an inquiry model for their classroom based on time constraints (Boyle-Baise, Hsu, Johnson, Serriere, & Stewart, 2008; Doppen, Misco, & Patterson, 2008; Rock et al., 2006; VanFossen, 2005), and others have called for outright rejection of inquiry based on time concerns (Ehman, Glenn, Johnson, & White, 1992; Rossi, 1995; Rossi & Pace, 1998; Saye & Brush, 1999). While teachers may hold a belief that student-centered inquiry models are effective, contextual issues of content and control may not display that belief in observation (Barton & Levstik, 2010).

Perhaps the most significant concerns are methodological and data collection issues which may inaccurately indicate change where no change has occurred, focus on beliefs which are not core to the decision process and demonstrate change on the leaves but not in the roots, or—as mentioned above—fail to capture a variation in shared meanings that leads to analysis concerns (Schoenfeld, 2011; Speer, 2005). Based on the nature of research design and implementation,
research may show substantive change or no change in beliefs associated with underlying research or theoretical assumptions.

Acknowledging this risk present in other research, exploration of teacher orientations must include careful shared construction of definitional meaning for terms in use, extensive interviews to allow more deliberate cross referencing of ideas and story patterns to emerge, and for orientations to be viewed as a snapshot of time. Such measures can aid in alleviating inaccurate attributions and common methodological errors.

**Shaped Lived Experience**

Teachers have firm purposes and intentions about what they do in the classroom but have a difficult time expressing those purposes and intentions (Clandinin, 1985). It was determined that these constructs emerged from the teachers’ lived experiences (Cornett, 1990). Investigating this link between biographical experience and beliefs about teaching, learning, and content issues (e.g. Knowles, 1992; Shuell, 1992), factors such as prior career and work experience (Powell, 1996); college curriculum (Shuell, 1992); and biographical factors such as race, class, gender (Raymond, Butt, & Townsend, 1991) all have been shown to play a role in developing teacher constructs used in practice. However, teachers may possess a competing mixture of unexamined and unarticulated philosophies that are not constant over time or necessarily explicitly known to the teacher (Cornett, 1990; Evans, 1990). Further, these studies into the lived experience of teachers were angled toward an understanding of how a
particular type of lived experience could be evidenced in teacher practice, and
were not a more general understanding of how social studies teachers orient
themselves to the subject of social studies itself. Understanding the critical role of
teachers in shaping the classroom experience and educational environment, an
examination of the lived experiences of teachers offers great potential toward
understanding curricular decisions and implications for professional development
and teacher education (Fickel, 2000).

**Contextual Factors to Orientation**

In understanding beliefs as a construct in orientation formation, we must also
understand the context of the current pedagogical environment where social
studies education is occurring as a factor of Schoenfeld’s (2011) decision-oriented
model. These contextual factors involve models of instruction, delivery of
instruction variation, and technology access and usage.

Student-centered models of instruction, along a variation of inquiry, are
promoted by training programs, professional organizations, and educators
themselves (e.g. Cornbleth, 2002; Doppen, 2007; Dunn, 2000; NCSS, 2010).
Problem-based learning, project-based learning, case-based, critical inquiry in
social studies, inductive reasoning, and problem-based historical inquiry are all
examples of the types of advocated pedagogical forms of inquiry proposed within
the social studies discipline. These pedagogical forms are designed to enhance
student critical thinking skills with social studies along with their understanding
of the past and present (Levstik & Barton, 2001; VanSledright, 2002; Wineburg, 2001).

While current visions for effective social studies instruction focus on different flavors of student-centered inquiry (NCSS, 2010), the current state of the field indicates that practice consistently relies on teacher-centered delivery (e.g. Evans, 2004; Grant, 2007; Maloy & Laroche, 2010; Ravitch, 2010). Many elements within the public sphere influence how people interpret, enact, and reproduce the many flavors of pedagogical inquiry (Crawford, 2007; Windschilt, 2004). Among those, the propensity of teachers to revert back to teaching the way they were taught (Russell, Bebell, O’Dwyer, & O’Connor, 2003). Even involving pre-service teachers in experienced inquiry may not shift their disposition toward or conceptual understanding of inquiry (Windschitl, 2004). While the focus is centralized on creating a student-centered pedagogy modeled in some form of inquiry as effective teaching, consistent teaching practice appears to be rather steadily teacher centered (Olsen, 2009; Swan & Hofer, 2008).

Tensions between a transmission approach to teaching and teaching as a process, may be one area of focus in the struggle between fidelity and adaptation (Haefner & Zembal-Saul, 2004). This core construct of teacher belief and orientation toward social studies thinking as an act of dissemination (Evans, 2010) or process of thinking to prepare them for other pursuits (NCSS, 2010) remains a subject of greater research (Haefner & Zembal-Saul, 2004).
Teacher Resources in Context

While teacher orientation plays a dominant role in the model of instruction utilized, design of instruction within this current vision of effective teaching is complicated. It is recognized that teachers create learning situations through the mobilization of resources that include this vision (Brown & Edelson, 2001), but resources are also currently mobilized for teacher-centered ends (Olsen, 2009). Resources can be defined as the curricular, personal, and contextual resources utilized to achieve instructional goals (Brown & Edelson, 2001), but the risk in defining resources in such a way carries automatically the implication that more than simply the resources faithfully followed within the curricular materials will be utilized—basically suggesting adaptations within implementation. Remillard (2005) referred to curriculum use as a process of teachers working with the materials and aims of an established curriculum without subverting them; an idea at the heart of adaptation. Curricular resources can be defined as those resources provided within a designed and packaged curriculum that include the lesson plan, acknowledging they may provide resource lists required for student implementation. However, recognizing that teachers do and will adapt curriculum (Remillard, 2005), the process of how to aid teachers through adapting curriculum without subverting the established materials and aims in meeting the contextual and learning needs of their individual students remains the focus.

Yet personal and contextual resources also play a critical role. Personal resources include the knowledge, experience, beliefs, orientations, and skills possessed by the teacher at a given time. Contextual resources include the
complex package that is a student classroom with each individual student’s experience, beliefs, and perspectives, the technological resources available within the school, and all additional curricular, cultural, and conversational materials accessible to the teacher. This set of resources may impact small adaptations to a curriculum—such as switching a text-based library search with an online search—to major modifications of a curriculum design based on student interactions (e.g. Rivet, 2006; Rivet & Krajcik, 2004).

There is a suggestion that standards-based educational reform and mandatory competency testing has only entrenched teaching practices focused on teacher-centered practices (Evans, 2004; Grant, 2007, 2010; Ravitch, 2010; Wiersma, 2008). Even as massive expenditures are being made to increase technology access in schools, technology still appears only peripherally in history classrooms, and even then typically in support of teacher-centered instruction (e.g. Olsen, 2009; Swan & Hofer, 2008). Yet, even with the increasing number of technology resources available to a teacher, research suggests that teacher beliefs and orientations play a substantive role in how, when, or why such resources are used (e.g. Hofer & Swan, 2006; Saye & Brush, 2006; Swan & Hicks, 2007).

**Orientation Filter in Implementation**

Part of the issue in defining how resources are mobilized within adaptations remains challenging as the internal decision making process of teachers may be unknown to them (Brown & Edelson, 2001; Windschilt, 2004). It is important to recall that teachers carry personal theories, models, and common explanations that
are often incomplete, difficult to explain, and largely subconscious (Windschilt, 2004). Research suggests that the challenge in changing current practice is the probability that teachers will filter the reform through current understandings and shift the core aims to model those targeted for change in the reform (e.g. Cohen, 1988; Brown & Campione, 1994), a phenomenon present in social studies.

An NEA study (2004) found that while teachers were becoming more familiar with educational technology, training received was inadequate to integration in instructional practice. Successful integration requires an investment of resources into the faculty, not merely the new technologies (Fabry & Higgs, 1997), as technology alone does not produce more student-centered pedagogical decisions (e.g. Cuban, 2001; Haefner, 2004; Judson, 2006; Windschitl & Sahl, 2002). Grabe and Grabe (2004) suggested that the level of investment in teachers is directly proportional to the level of impact new technology will have in educational gains.

Still, Ertmer (2005) contended that the ultimate decision of how, why, and when a technology is used depends on teachers and their held beliefs in regards to technology (see also Karagiorgi, 2005; Niess et al., 2009). Windschitl and Sahl (2002) contended that no vision of technology use can exist detached from beliefs about learners, meaningful learning, and the role of teaching. Thus an understanding of the orientations of teachers as developed from their lived experience within the current context of their practice is a critical foundation.
Phenomenology

To engage the phenomenon of teaching social studies—specifically here as teacher orientation to that phenomenon—it is important to disambiguate the term from the myriad of uses that have developed from the first usage of phenomenology in 1764 to the present day (Schmicking, 2010). Even as it is potentially contentious, Spiegelberg (1972) provided the following definition:

Phenomenology is, in the twentieth century, mainly the name for a philosophical movement whose primary objective is the direct investigation and description of phenomenon consciously experienced, without theories about their causal explanation and as free as possible from unexamined preconceptions and presuppositions. (p. 3)

Following this train of thought, phenomenology is at its core a descriptive discipline not intended to provide causal explanations. This status as a first person experience exploration has caused some to view phenomenology as potentially hostile to theoretical explanation and of only bringing concepts to something we already know rather than claiming new knowledge (Glendinning, 2007). However, such claims deny work being done, for example, in developmental psychology, psychiatry, and neuroscience for which phenomenology has been used to discover new phenomena, experience, and structures unknown prior to analysis (Schmicking, 2010). Yet even phenomenological analyses are not present to determine or discover essential structures, but merely to study those phenomena themselves and in the way they appear in experience, carrying both the potential for new discovery within “known” phenomena and as being a
valuable heuristic tool to form new experimental questions and study designs. It should also be noted that the Spiegelberg (1972) definition does not detail a method, steps, or tools toward the use of phenomenology in research beyond suggesting direct investigation and description free from advanced notions. Methods within or a system to perform phenomenological research has not developed into a uniform process for application.

Schmicking (2010) suggested that those who work in phenomenology are both toolmakers and users of existing methods and tools. Yet, even while no format or static methods can be proscribed for working within phenomenology, the pioneering work of Husserl has become the lode star for orientation when arriving at any spot on the phenomenological map, either following or criticizing his methods and approach. While not holding the privileged place as the phenomenology, as this research and nearly all modern research drifts from his moorings, his foundational work must inform or contend with the studies that follow. This is partly due to the nature of his research that moved step by step, made nuanced distinctions, and pinned down each item before moving to the next development. Yet even for his structured work Husserl failed to create a static system of approach or an understood doctrine for all to follow.

In keeping with this idea, methods used for this study are discussed within the next chapter as they apply to this research study. However, for understanding here, Schmicking offered the following list of tools in phenomenology working complementary to Spiegelberg’s (1972) steps:

1. Phenomenological reductions
• Suspending commonsensical and scientific explanations
• Suspending belief in the existence of objects/world
• Suspending belief in extended biographical self

2. Investigating particular phenomena (‘description’)
• Detecting and grasping
• Analyzing
• Describing (embracing common and technical language as well as symbol systems)

3. Mereological analysis
4. Investigating invariant structures and relationships
5. Analyzing typical/invariant modes of appearing
6. Analyzing the static (embodied/kinesthetic) constitution of objects/experience
7. Analyzing the genetic (embodied/kinesthetic) constitution of objects/experience
8. (Hermeneutic) interpretation of the meaning of existential phenomena
9. Interpreting experimental (dysfunctional) data and explanations
10. Interpreting vicarious experience and second-person methods in general

These 10 tools for phenomenological research are not to be considered a complete list of options, or a prescriptive system for application within performing research, but rather merely detailed tools available to the researcher in phenomenology. Ultimately the tools used will depend on the research questions, the intent of the research, and the preferences and choices of the researcher, as
there is no single method or standardized tool for “doing” phenomenological research.

Despite the ambiguities, the limitations and the affordances present in phenomenology, the construct of social studies, and the lives of teachers, the next chapter will outline the methods, tools, and phenomenological perspective being used to conduct this study. Chapters 4 through 6 will present the cases of the participants in the study in light of emerging information and a discussion within the literature. Chapter 7 will then combine the information to provide the essence of the phenomenon in the lives of these participants.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

In considering orientations, the language of orientations informs professional standards as well as the approach to pre-service education and teacher professional development. It also provides insight into teacher decision-making. There exist many theoretical models built and written by scholars that form a critical foundational understanding and currently have application within these fields (e.g. Barr et al., 1977; Kliebard, 1986; Schubert, 1986). Yet, while critical work, these foundations need to be extended as existing models lack empirical roots or validation and are not theoretical models about teacher orientations built from teacher data. While also not empirical, Evans’ model (2010) encapsulates the modern debate and the language of orientations within the model are widely shared by the stakeholders. The purpose of the dissertation is to research a practitioner-informed orientation model, utilizing the lived experiences of teachers to include their connections to and with technology. Overlaps, additions to, and omissions from Evans’ model will be determined and discussed.

Questions

The following questions will be researched:

1. Framed through the themes or patterns related to teacher orientations in social studies (individual characteristics, contextual factors, change over time, and meaningful experiences) that emerge in the narratives (individually and
collectively) shared by social studies teachers, how do teachers define and describe their teaching orientation through their lived experience narrative and how do those definitions and descriptions compare to the Evans model (additions or omissions)?

2. What are the implications of these findings for the design of learning environments to promote and support social studies instruction—including technology usage and integration?

**Epistemological Lens**

In an effort to describe the participants’ life worlds, and to describe the essence of those life worlds in the context of their teaching practice, a phenomenological epistemology is recommended. The purpose is to engage the interpretivist perspective to describe the nature of individual participant experiences as well as shared experiences that cut across participants, which shape their orientation toward and relationship with social studies as a content area. Recognizing that each experience and life is uniquely lived, there exists a realization that no two teachers will have followed the same course or will necessarily share the same perspective. But each is equally significant in constructing their individual narrative.

Noting *Phenomenology* as “the study of essences,” it is intended to offer, “an account of space, time, and the world as we live them” (perceptually, of course) (Merleau-Ponty, 1962, p. 1). The intent of engaging in these discursive narratives the teachers share is to capture the essence of their experience through the nature
of the way these teachers describe and compose their experiences and perceived worlds and the perceived impact those experiences play on their current teaching practice.

Following this essence through the world of individuals suggests, “that the mundane world of our daily, taken-for-granted activities itself harbors the most complex philosophic commitments” (Natanson, 1973, p. 5). Phenomenology seeks to explore the, “essentially perceptual nature of our being-in-the-world…concentrated on our most basic experiences, those sensations which seem to span the gap between internal and external” (Davids, 2000, p. 642). Yet, even with the recognition that each teacher experiences the world in essentially different ways, phenomenology as a study carries an underlying assumption that there are features in any lived teaching practice that are common to all that teach (Natanson, 1973). However, the “fusion of horizons” (Gadamer, 1976, p. 93) that constitutes meanings the research arrives at, are an interpretive blending of meanings between researcher and participating teacher that inherently recognizes more than one single interpretation of narratives are possible depending on the focus of the research (Geanellos, 2000). In drawing meanings it becomes critical for the researcher to bracket their experience and perspectives to make clear their preconceptions and explain how those are being used within the research (LeVasseur, 2003).

Recognizing the critical intersections between perceptive lived experience—and the nature of how we live and operate within our spheres of influence—the focus of this research is one of engagement and understanding in the phenomenon
of social studies experience and orientation. Situated within the intersection of phenomenon and method resides the importance of recognizing the lived experience overlap with lived experience and teacher practice (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). A critical portion of being able to engage and understand the life worlds of these teachers, the phenomenological essence of their experience, is for teachers to be able to explain both their experiences as they perceive them as well as identify and articulate influences on that experience set. While phenomenology forms the epistemological lens, it is also a method to be described further in this chapter that utilizes various instruments including narrative identity as a pathway into their perceived life worlds.

**Narrative Identity**

In an effort to capture the lived experience of the teachers, narrative identity will be utilized. Narrative identity is formed in an ever evolving psychological process where the person builds a cogent narrative account of their life in order to make sense of the past, account for the present, and coordinate for the future. This constructed narrative serves as “an internalized and evolving personal myth that functions to provide life with unity and purpose” (McAdams, 2001, p. 132). The essential power of stories is recognized in communication with others, participation in various cultures and communities, and simply making sense of the teller’s personal life (McAdams, 2001). Furthermore, the construction of a narrative identity has been viewed as both healthy and even essential within the modern world—particularly within the Western world where the dissolving of
traditional social institutions present challenges in personal efforts to define self (McAdams, 1996). While the narrative will inevitably shift over time as the individual encounters differing social and cultural contexts, the formation of a cogent and personally meaningful narrative identity may serve to provide unity and coherence to the teller.

Narrative identity is expressed in the telling of one’s life story. In order to extract the stories that reflect that narrative identity interview, protocols such as McAdams’ life narrative interview have been created (McAdams, 1995). The narrative life story is not to be accepted as factual or even an accurate retelling of life events; rather, the choices made in crafting which events to share, the tone, imagery, themes, and images reflect the individual agency of the narrator. The individuality of the stories is framed within the narrative devices employed in framing events, interpreting impacts, and the culture, which may restrain the narrative structure for comprehension within understandable norms. These narratives may expose, “self-defining events and certain other salient episodes” as easily as they capture, “knowledge that is not technically part of the autobiographical knowledge base” (McAdams, 2001, p. 110).

Careful examination of these narratives can allow identification of various significant themes. For example, narratives which carry themes of agency and communion tend to reveal social motives for power and intimacy; redemptive sequences connect to individual measures of generativity; and even psychological well being has been linked to story structure elements (Bauer & McAdams, 2004; McAdams, 2001, p. 110; McAdams, Diamond, de St. Aubin, & Mansfield, 1997).
Yet, outside of testing correlations between personality and narrative measures, narrative identity may reveal links between human development and cognition and behavior. With the challenges inherent to teaching, narrative identity may reveal important links between observable behaviors in the classroom, teacher orientation, and the development of teachers within the domain.

Three critical factors provide support for the use of narrative identity in determining teacher orientation to the subject of social studies. First, the disclosed narratives give details on the way the narrator understands his or her world and those influences that lead to actions. Unique perspectives, characteristics, and interpretations are emergent in the nature of storytelling. In gaining entrance to these narratives we may acquire understanding to those influences that may influence their connection to and practice of teaching in social studies. Second, as autobiographical memories are compiled into a cohesive narrative, the narratives can provide a vision of the past. Obviously not to be taken as accurate representations, they can allow exploration of emergent and common themes between the participants’ developmental understanding of social studies as well as development as an educator of social studies. Third, both the shared and unshared patterns and themes emergent from the narratives reveal personal and potentially cultural variations. Identification of shared and unshared themes and elements across these stories aids in the understanding of the narrative that underlies teacher orientations.
Phenomenology

Phenomenology, in a reductionist definition, can be described as the exploration of a phenomenon within the context of lived experience. Operating under that definitional construct, once the phenomenon to be explored is identified the methods for capturing meaningful and relevant lived experience is key. As a life history is designed to portray the individual’s entire life story, a narrative story study is geared toward understanding the individual personal experience in a single episode or multiple (Denzin, 1989). Narrative itself may be the phenomenon being studied or may form the method used in the study, such as a procedure for analyzing stories told (Chase, 2005; Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007). When used as a method, materials to analyze begin as experiences expressed in lived and told stories of individuals as an account event/action or chronologically connected series of events/actions (Czarniawska, 2004). Focused on minimal participants (1-3), gathering data through collection of their stories, reporting, and chronologically ordering those experiences are critical elements of inclusion even though different fields of study maintain different approaches (Cresswell, 2013). For example, Moustakas’ (1994) transcendental or psychological phenomenology focuses less on the interpretations of the researcher and more on the experiences of the participants. Focusing on a Husserlian concept, researchers seek a fresh perspective of the phenomenon attempting as much as possible to see through the eyes of the other experience. Cresswell (2013) identifies seven common defining features within the various forms of phenomenology: (1) emphasis on a phenomenon to be explored phrased in terms of a single concept or idea; (2)
exploration of the phenomenon with a group of individuals who have all experienced the phenomenon; (3) a philosophical discussion about ideas involved in conducting a phenomenology (to note participants have the subjective experiences and objective shared experiences with others); (4) form depending, the researcher brackets himself/herself out of the study by discussing personal experiences with the phenomenon so as to set them aside and focus on the experiences of the participants in the study and allow the readers to judge the ability of the researcher to remove himself/herself from the presentation (Giorgi, 2009); (5) data collection (typically interviews of individuals who have experienced the phenomenon but may include additional data sources); (6) data analysis follows systematic procedures moving from narrow units of analysis (statements) to broader units (meanings) to include the what and how of experience; (7) the phenomenology ends with the essence of the experience incorporating the what and how of the experience for readers.

Even as approaches within these commonalities are widely varied, this study is nearing the research from a transcendental or psychological approach to phenomenology (Moustakas, 1994), requiring the researcher to bracket his or her experience out of the study and experience the phenomenon fresh through the experiences of others. While it is acknowledged that this state is rarely perfectly achieved, the focus is on attempting to remove oneself from interpretation as much as possible. A transcendental or psychological phenomenological study focuses on the individual stories told by participants, but describes the common meaning for several individuals lived experiences in relation to the phenomenon.
While reducing individual experiences with a phenomenon to a descriptive universal, the common experiences for a number of individuals is sought as a means to generate or discover a theory of “unified theoretical explanation” (Corbin & Strauss, 2007, p. 2007) with the phenomenon. This grounded theory approach implies that a common experience is generated from the participants’ experiences and is shaped by their views (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). While individual experiences and private statements are critical in establishing individual and cultural differences between teachers, these differences are used as a means to an end in defining the boundaries of the unified common experiences.

This research adopts a transcendental or psychological phenomenological approach. In combination with Cresswell (2013), the following steps will be taken: identifying a phenomenon to study, bracketing one’s experience, collecting data from several people who have experienced the phenomenon, and analyzing the results. Analysis involves reducing information first into significant statements (or a textual description of the person’s experiences), then a structural description to include how they were experienced around conditions, situations, or context, and then a combination of the two to encapsulate the essence of the experience (Gallagher & Schmicking, 2009). A description of how these individual phenomena are examined across multiple participant experiences is described below.
Methods

In approaching these concepts from the lens of a phenomenological perspective, the central conversations were collected and engaged so that an analysis of the component parts could be determined. As the purpose was to describe the teachers’ life worlds, the dominant method of data collected and used was interview (Koro-Ljungberg, Yendol-Hoppey, Smith, & Hayes, 2010). Such narratives did not necessarily provide all details or a completely clear picture of how and why the teachers oriented to the subject itself, but the nature of the way the teachers framed their narratives provided a window into understanding the assumptions and established norms of their lived experiences around social studies teaching. The nature of narratives is discussed in Table 2.

Participants

As this study is a preliminary investigation to explore and understand the construct of orientations, the initial set of participants was bound to a limited group. This limited group of three teacher participants aids in determining the initial boundaries of a teacher practitioner model in this preliminary exploration. Six criteria were used to determine participation of three select teachers recruited from potential teachers in urban, suburban and rural districts from the regional northern portion of the state by email as coordinated through the district offices. These criteria formed a guide to the search for participant teachers, but were not seen as exclusionary constructs or established here by order of importance.
### Table 2

**Overview of the Research Study from Questions to Implication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Theoretical Frame</th>
<th>Data Collection &amp; Analysis</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Framed through the themes or patterns related to teacher orientations in social studies (individual characteristics, contextual factors, change over time, and meaningful experiences) that emerge in the narratives (individually and collectively) shared by social studies teachers, how do teachers define and describe their teaching orientation through their lived experience narrative, and how do those definitions and descriptions compare to the Evans model (additions or omissions)?</td>
<td>Narrative identity allows teachers to construct their narratives and share their lived experience in a dedicated way. Teachers voice becomes the foundation of understanding as it allows the teacher to frame his or her understanding through storytelling, which may reveal elements previously unknown or unarticulated.</td>
<td>Narrative identity interviews are utilized (three narrative identity interviews, one artifact interview, and one observation interview) to refine definitions and shared understandings. Analysis from grounded theory categorization and interpretation permits emergent categorizations and constructs. Interviews will all be member-checked for understandings; interpretations will be cross-examined.</td>
<td>A practitioner-informed model of teacher orientations through the lived experiences of teachers. As the narrative is a constructed interpretation of the past lived experience, understanding the nature of the constructed narrative may reveal both social embedding and training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What are the implications of these findings for the design of learning environments to promote and support social studies instruction, including technology usage and integration?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarification of teacher orientations may carry design prescriptions for social studies learning environments (including technology integration).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those criteria included the following:

1. *High School Educator (9-12)*: The intent of this criterion was within the nature of certification itself as a secondary instructor. While teachers K-8 may be certified to teach any subject within the curriculum at grade level, secondary educators require an additional certification at the secondary level and generally teach within their certified areas. Teachers within this
level of education are afforded a certain certified level of competency within the domain (Macken, 2013).

2. *Teach Social Studies majority of their professional day:* This would imply that more than half of their teaching day is spent in social studies instruction—meaning 3 of 5 periods, or 4 of 6, etc. would be spent teaching a social studies course. Note this may include multiple courses within the domain (Grossman & Stodolsky, 1995).

3. *Professional preparation in Social Studies:* As there are multiple routes to certification to teach in social studies, the criteria was to find those that have a degree in one of the 16 subject areas (such as history, psychology, sociology, geography, etc.) that compose social studies education, and are now teaching, rather than those who merely passed the praxis exam (Darling-Hammond, Chung, & Frelow, 2002).

4. *Socio-economic status of school:* This criteria pulled teachers from urban, suburban, and rural districts for which the context of teaching included different socio-economic levels for students, as well as contextual factors that may include access to technology, diversity, and free and reduced lunch ratios (Hoover-Dempsey, Bassler, & Brissie, 1987).

5. *Years of service (3-10 years):* Throughout the teaching career there is a level of maturation and development that occurs—most especially within the first few years. Although the study was intended to use only teachers within this band, districts were hesitant to allow teachers to be utilized prior to five years of service in the districts, and this criterion was dropped
as a determining factor—allowing for one of the three to fall outside of these bounds. This resulted in the years of service arriving at 7, 10, and 27. Implications will be discussed in the cases themselves (Hoy, 2000).

6. *Local Formulation:* To ensure a common background, teachers who all gained their teacher certification training within the state were sought, as the common core requirements would loom large in their training process. All participants were chosen who completed their certification in the state in a teacher training program at the university level: Brigham Young University, Utah State University, and University of Utah (Russell, Waters, & Turner, 2014).

As accommodation was assumed within the criteria to include the best-fit candidates between all factors, as many factors as possible were included when selecting teachers. Only requiring three teachers for the project, all criteria were met, except the fifth criteria of years of service with one teacher falling outside the intended range due to availability and the district’s willingness to support the criteria of the project. Other factors related to the teacher—such as race, gender, access to technology, and predominate teacher style—will be presented as identity factors during the presentation of each case chapter as a means of establishing lived experience. Of the two men and one woman participating in the study, all were white/non-Hispanic, and members of the same dominant socio-religious group in the region. That socio-religious group being middle class members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, also commonly nicknamed “Mormons.” While a full description of religious ideologies that may contribute to
orientations are not presented here, each participant in his or her case shared personally held philosophies that refer back to this portion of his or her identity and those are included as presented in the individual cases. Pulling from local districts identified as suburban, rural, and urban for one participant teacher, each district was contacted for potential participation, which in turn contacted schools that suggested and invited individual teachers to participate. Recruitment materials are all included for review in Appendix B.

**Instruments**

Five separate interviews were utilized (see Table 3) to capture a narrative of their lived experience and to engage an understanding of their orientation from the purely emergent to the more explicit. Interviews are arranged in an effort to establish and maintain trust, as well as avoid contamination from one interview to the next. To avoid contamination with the format presented means to avoid the leading of research ideas from one interview to the next. By allowing the teachers to describe teaching practice from the purely interpretive and emergent prior to observation, teachers are not attempting to justify observed performance with theory. Rather, the expressed belief can be explored freely prior to reinforcing and clarifying the identified orientation through the observed practice. Each interview is designed to increase the clarity of expressed initial orientations from the emergent to the explicit, interpretive to descriptive, and from theory to practice.
Table 3

Sequence of Interviews for Data Collection and Analysis

While the interviews were eventually formed into a single narrative storyline, the procedural sequence of the interviews allowed for increasing levels of explicit description necessary to clarifying essential concepts and themes. Methods of analysis for clarification are discussed below.

Interviews

The three teachers selected engaged in a series of three narrative identity interviews on their orientations toward and experience with social studies, technology, and technology within social studies. These interviews were adapted from the life narrative interview employed by McAdams (1995), but modified so participants constructed the story of the topic selecting those elements from their life story specifically relevant to the topic. Developed under the help and support of a current social studies teacher, modifications were made to ensure questions supported participants’ narrative flow (Appendix A for the full interview protocol).
The protocol began by asking participants to imagine their connection to orientations as a story. The introductory comments were meant to foundationally form the process of the interview and set the stage for participant narrators to construct their story. The interview then established a common vocabulary and a shared understanding of terms used and commonly understood themes and asked the participant to change or add in ideas to define the terms as they understand them. Next, the interview moved into their current affiliation with the topic and then permitted an overview of their story as a means of creating a baseline for the general trajectory of the story.

The next section allowed participants to provide accounts of specific events as detailed as possible. They were also asked to include their interpretation of the impact the experience had on them and their continued impact. Five specific events were explored to include Earliest Memory, High Point, Low Point, Turning Point, and Other Important Scene. Following these five interviews, participants described a positive future scene and a negative future scene. Taken together, these seven scenes constructed the strictly narrative portion of the protocol and when combined are analyzed for the narrative themes and emergent elements. In the next section of the interview, participants detailed and accounted for additional influences on their story. Questions about people or groups, media, books, and unexpected events were asked to determine outside or cultural forces beyond familial associations that impact their story. These forces were then followed up with questions that require reflection of barriers and supports to their current thinking and ongoing development. The barrier and support questions
were followed by questions that discuss their social affiliations and the ways those social networks impact their thinking to tease out portions of their narrative identities as they relate to social studies and technology (depending on the interview). Next, questions related to their general philosophy and beliefs were asked that focus on political and spiritual constructs as they connect to and explain their development and current mental foundation. Finally, questions related to how the entire narrative they have shared impacts and relates to the other areas of their personal and professional life were asked. The relationship questions were intended to explore whether an isolated identity construct was created or whether they feel this narrative identity shared has a wider impact.

The protocols required participants to explore significant events and reflect on the impacts and meanings. Details included the contextual factors of the event itself and the broader fundamental impacts that shaped present action. As the protocols naturally created episodic and explanatory accounts, both the narrative themes (perspectives, themes, and models) and explicit content (beliefs, perspectives, and contextual factors) were explored in analysis.

After these three narrative identity interviews were completed, the teachers engaged in an interview utilizing stimulated recall (Parker, 1985). The teachers were asked to bring in an object or artifact that they felt was representative or indicative of their teaching style, approach, and orientation and explicated that perspective to the researcher. The purpose of the interview was to establish trust moving into the observation phase, but was also important in ensuring shared definitional understandings from previous interviews to ensure a common
vocabulary of orientation and perspective.

Additionally, one videotaped observation was performed, with a follow up interview utilizing clips from their observation for clarification and discussion after the narrative identity interviews were completed. This interview was also focused, not in observing practice or the way their orientations are present in practice, but in defining and clarifying previous statements in interviews to ensure the greatest level of understanding. Interviews and observations were all completed at the convenience of the participant as coordinated by the researcher.

Reliability of the interpretations was addressed through member checking, peer debriefing, multiple interviews and sources, extended and concurrent analysis, and disclosure of bias with bracketing interviews completed prior to the beginning of data collection (see page 62). While member checking was maintained as part of the research methods and held as a tool for clarification of interpretations, no member checking was performed. The nature of the interviews, permitting participants to describe their ideas more explicitly as the interviews progressed, provided the necessary triangulation of interpretations. All interviews were recorded and transcribed for consistent review. An example of the process is included below under the methods of analysis subheading below.

**Grounded Theory Approach**

To analyze the narratives, a grounded theory approach was utilized (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The approach is deemed appropriate for qualitative, exploratory work where claims and hypotheses are generated from the
data, rigorously examined for consistency and fit, and expanded to build theory. As indicated in the literature review, research has not uncovered teacher orientations to the subject of social studies or the factors that filter into that significant part of professional practice. As no studies have been found that establish this foundation, the root of analysis is within the data itself to generate new ideas and potentially theory, and the potential function of narrative identity in discovering orientation. In the following sections, I will describe the ways in which I appropriated the methods of grounded theory to facilitate the investigation of my specific research questions:

1. Combining Objectivity with Sensitivity: As Strauss and Corbin (1998) argue, one of the central challenges in conducting research is maintaining a balance between objectivity and sensitivity:

   “It is difficult to say which is the more problematic—maintaining objectivity or developing sensitivity. During the analytic process, we are asking researchers to set aside their knowledge and experience to form new interpretations about phenomena. Yet, in our everyday lives, we rely on knowledge and experience to provide the means for helping to understand the world in which we live and to find solutions to problems we encounter. Fortunately, over the years, researchers have learned that a state of complete objectivity is impossible and that in every piece of research—qualitative and quantitative—there is an element of sensitivity” (p. 43).
To accommodate the confluence between objectivity and sensitivity this work included detailed descriptions in the analysis of the process by which theoretical categories emerged, alternative ways of interpreting my findings, and instances of deviation from patterns within the data. Additionally through the dialogue my own inner biases were explained as far as possible to allow the reader the ability to judge the authenticity of the process and findings.

2. **Concurrent Analysis:** Rather than await the complete data set to be gathered in entirety prior to beginning the process of analysis, this study engaged in exploring emergent themes and relevant connections between the data sets as they were being collected as a means of generating new hypotheses about concepts, categories, and the relationships between them to provide a richer window into the phenomenon in the study (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). While not used as a means of theoretical sampling in line with the grounded theory approach, concurrent analysis provided potentially richer understandings through the process than post hoc analysis could garner.

3. **Coding, Organization, and Representation of Data:** Following the grounded theory method provided varied procedures to uniquely analyze, organize, and interpret the data. These procedures included: conceptualizing and reducing data into various representational forms, elaborating emergent conceptual categories in terms of their properties
and dimensions, and relating categories through propositional
statements (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). These procedures allowed the
focus to remain on the data and for the researcher to be able to open the
inquiry and make theoretical links and comparisons within the dataset.
The researcher also explored the data through different lenses, and
thereby expanded the process of analysis within the emerging
constructs from the data.

Working to develop codes and to identify themes inductively based upon the
data itself, moderated through a process of memo-making, or writing analytic
notes (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) allowed for the identification of categories, the
posing of additional questions, and multiple possible interpretations of the data
that also document the evolution of my thinking in analysis, as well as challenge
assumptions. Still, a number of analytic approaches were employed in organizing
the data. Consistent with the nature of phenomenological research, analysis first
involved reducing information into significant statements (or a textual description
of the person’s experiences). This analysis began by collating the five interviews
and creating a narrative that joined them all together into a single storyline and a
series of other significant statements that further highlight the phenomena. This
approach allowed for a deeper understanding of teacher experience beyond what
any single interview allowed. Next, a structural description to include how they
were experienced around conditions, situations, or context was performed. These
additional statements were pulled from the whole body of the interviews to
identify the supports and barriers—the essential tensions—present in their stories.
Examining the story structure helped to reveal the essential parts and widen the understanding of context. Finally, the first two approaches were combined to encapsulate the essence of the story detailed from the teachers’ experiences, and then explored together to provide the combined essence consistent between the cases (Gallagher & Schmicking, 2009). To balance the explicative nature of the analysis’ emergent themes the study includes representative examples, counter-examples that suggest alternate explanations, and examples that explicit the processes by which I identified emergent findings to make my work as transparent as possible.

**Method of analysis**

As interviews were conducted in a sequential fashion moving from the emergent to the more concrete, after each interview I went through and explored ideas and developed codes and themes inductively based upon the data. Comparing those emergent categories and ideas from the data back into the theoretical frames already discussed in the literature review and against already established models for understanding orientations, I was able to test and expand my ideas. I also engaged in writing analytic notes (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) that allowed deeper interpretations, the ability to pose questions about the data itself, and identify additional categories within the present constructs. I used these notes to consistently challenge and question my positionality and assumptions throughout the analysis process.

After each interview, conversations were transcribed and imported into
InVivo (a qualitative software program allowing for text coding and analysis) which allowed for each interview and phrase to be colored and commented on. Then specific ideas were sorted, compared, and contrasted across the participants and interviews. Such a system allowed for greater sorting of words, ideas, and representation so that I could identify patterns within the interviews. Mapping the data from the interviews themselves to my own analytic notes allowed me to recall my own thoughts and feelings from the interview process and make my own assumptions and interpretations transparent—and thereby more clearly presented as my own thoughts throughout the analysis process.

To make this process more clear to the reader, I will highlight how the steps were accomplished through a sample of raw interview data from one participant (who will also serve as the case presented in Chapter 4). To be clear that the narrative shared was not de-contextualized in performing the analysis, the entire transcript was read multiple times beyond the time spent both in the initial interview itself and in my transcription process. Then I condensed the narrative into the main ideas, and then distilled those ideas into emerging codes that were collapsed and created over time into high-level categories. To illustrate this process of coding, I will take a representative sample of text from a “turning point” scene:

Mrs. Ratliffe teaching us how to read with inflection in your voice so that as you read it, it was as the author intended it. Third grade. And she would have us sit at our desks and practice it alone. And then we would go back to a reading group and stand by her—which was semi-intimidating. It
wasn’t so bad for me, she loved me, some of the other kids were scared to death. And I heard what a difference that made in how you convey information. How just a flat read kills the best of reading and how intonation and all that can even make the phone book really interesting. And I remember sitting there and thinking, this is something I really need, this is a tool I need. And that is really one of the real differences for me. I know that in education they tell you, don’t lecture. Lectures are bad, for a bad lecturer, a bad lecture should never go more than two minutes. But a really good storyteller, someone who can really put together thoughts and they don’t stammer through it saying, um, um, well, you can captivate people for a really long time. And I credit all of that, the beginnings of that, to Mrs. Ratcliffe for teaching me about punctuation. Isn’t it funny that I remember that with such clarity? To me that’s really interesting. And in other ways, she kind of killed my spirit in other ways. And I remember that same teacher doing something that absolutely made me go, “Oh no, don’t do this.” And that was in the same teacher. So not everyone is so all perfect, and rad at it. This scene is—stands out as being—so memorable because I can visit with a room full of students and they can stay right with me. And I know that it’s not because I’m handsome. And I know it’s not because the invasion by the British in War of 1812 is so captivating. It’s not the text; it’s the delivery system. And if I speak publically or I am invited by a group to speak, which I am on occasion, the comment that is made to me is, “the way you say it.” So it keeps being
reinforced that that really is the key to it, and that really was the start of it. My mother was a very good reader and she read that way also, but Mrs. Ratliffe taught me how to do it. That an adult, who, at one moment is so important to me—I value our relationship as a kid—and at another moment can be crushingly difficult for my personality. And yet through the spectrum of those experiences, gives me a tool that is so invaluable. And it is something I have used ever since, ever since. And it was so distinct to me that she was doing it the way she taught it as she taught it. And it didn’t seep in; it was handed to me at a singular point. And I took it to heart. I thought about it again.

Based on this segment of text the following initial notes were taken: learning to read in third grade class; reading with inflection; practiced alone and in a reading group—not intimidated because his teacher loved him; Could hear the difference—made interesting; recognized as a needed tool; shouldn’t lecture but a storyteller can captivate for long time; current: can visit with roomful and they stay with them—not the material or his appearance, it’s the delivery system; occasionally asked to speak—reinforced the way you say it; mother had skill, but teacher taught him how; despite difficult personality of teacher, given invaluable tool; received tool, not seeped in; taken to heart.

While these initial notes lack specifics, these general notes in this format allowed me to capture elements that stood out as the initial “big ideas” in each chunk of narrative. After these notes, I worked to extract general conceptual propositions and categories that more generally capture the conceptual content of
the scene. I conducted close coding to identify potential categories that could more generally capture the conceptual content in the scene. For this selection provided above, I generated the following initial conceptual categories:

1. stories about educational influences (teachers, leaders, mentors)
2. formative experience with skill building (this idea would be later divided between modeled behavior and a modern skill of lecturing)
3. teacher mentored him, passed along knowledge/skill
4. perception of future need
5. positive emotion connected to utilization of skill
6. sense of doing something positive despite oppositional rhetoric

While these initial categories are useful in determining the major elements in this scene, I continued to review the complete narrative scene by scene (using my general notes as well) to capture new observations and discoveries from the full body of the text.

Early on in the analysis process a visual representation tool was crafted from the story dialogue in the form of a story flowchart. From the combined narrative of all five interviews per participant, a one-page flowchart for all three participants’ narratives was created so as to identify similarities and differences in their experiences, story forms, thematic patterns, and emergent details I would like to explore further. Although each are included in the chapter for each participant, the flowchart below (Figure 1) captures the story of Brian, the case in Chapter 4. Note that each flowchart includes key scenes (rectangles shaded in grayscale), other events (rectangles), contextual influences (ovals), and strategies
and beliefs (round-edged rectangles). Solid lines indicate the temporal flow (for example, Brian has a turning point that occurred before his high point as indicated by solid lines leading through several events before reaching the high point) and document the timeline of events. Dotted arrows relate to the ideas or influences Brian attributed to events (for example, Brian has stated that his mother read in the style he learned. She becomes a reinforcing idea to the turning point listed above). Information found in the flowchart only includes information explicitly stated by the participant in the narrative in an attempt to avoid bias introduced by assumption or interpretation. These flowcharts allowed me to view a representation of the narratives at a glance that permitted both comparison and condensing the narratives into comparable units of information in analysis.

Figure 1. Correlated flowchart for Brian Cain case study. Legend: Boxes=events, shaded boxes=key events, smoothed boxes=barriers or supports, circles=beliefs, solid lines=timeline of events, dashed line=relationships.
Even as a grounded approach was applied in the analysis, effort was taken to identify findings and ideas that may be situated and interpreted in light of the reviewed literature (Gallagher, 2003). Schmicking (2010) refers to such an approach as complimenting or correcting the potential limitations of free imagination or association within phenomenological studies. A number of approaches were utilized to identify and present findings consistent with phenomenological research and narrative analysis. First, themes and interesting ideas from the interviews were identified, in addition to those thoughts that collide or contribute with the literature. This involved both assembling the narratives into a solid and singular story from the five conducted, but also isolating those elements that clarify and define terms and ideas presented in prior interviews to assist in ensuring that the voice and experience of the person interviewed was as clear as possible.

For example, as Brian began to discuss his understanding of the philosophies that undergird the concept of the classroom acting as a microcosm of democratization, Brian discussed the democratic society idea as a key understanding in the first interview: “Everybody gets a shot, everybody does, but don’t try to be an exception to the rule, don’t try to unlevel that playing field.” In interview four, the metaphor was changed to derailing the lesson. Brian clarified by saying:

…poor behavior. That sort of thing. To try to intentionally have all the attention on them. It doesn't contribute, it detracts. There are some students who, until they get even to their junior year, are quite used to
running the classes they are in. Somehow their personality is such that they can overshadow, they can derail a class.

While agreeing that students that derail a classroom are also a valuable part of the microcosm of society, Brian added:

Those that try to derail get marginalized, get put in prisons, are given tranquilizers. They certainly without a doubt play a key role.... I don’t try to shut down their personality. It just needs to be within the bounds that are the social norms which is true of our society.

In interview five, Brian added:

I will not tolerate anyone being mean out of mean’s sake. Historically, if there are people who are in a situation of power who are just mean, just to control, just to keep...I have very little tolerance, and really, no admiration or real support for them. I think mean people don’t have a place anywhere. I think that, just a mean spirit. When I see that in my class it does not fly; it’s not allowed, not in front of me.

In understanding the concept of creating equal opportunity and balance in the classroom, again identified as a microcosm of democracy, the concepts of intentionally drawing attention to self, acting from a “mean” spirit, using their personality to sway the focus or attention of the class, or using “poor” behavior to disrupt the planned progression of the classroom were seen as methods to “derail,” “unlevel,” or “disrupt” the orderly flow of the classroom environment. Discipline in the classroom was viewed as an attempt to conform personalities to the “bounds of the social norm” as Brian viewed them. Combining these
statements together by means of triangulation of concepts allows for each to gain
greater clarity as well as the philosophical stance of the teacher in responding to
the concepts as they are encountered. Additional examples of this process are
found in the individual cases where multiple terms are used to describe events and
clarify meanings from multiple sources.

Second, once individually explored and coded, a comparison of narratives was
performed for cohesive themes, developmental ideas, and significant gaps
between the people that honor the complexities of personality and mark the
patterns of individual similarities and differences. Chapters 4 through 6 present
each case individually and situate them within their own thinking, as well as
against the literature with Evans’ model as the guide. The seventh chapter
combines the narratives primary ideas to detail the essence of their experiences of
the phenomenon as well as an exploration of the limitations and affordances of
the Evans model. Proceeding through the coming chapters I have endeavored to
describe emergent themes using both representative and counter examples, and
make explicit the processes used to identify elements of their stories that aid in
understanding teacher orientation. The process included identifying emergent
findings present in their narratives and using the participant voice as often as
possible to make this study as transparent as possible.

**Researcher Bracketing**

Additionally, I will next make explicit some aspects of my own perspective
and personal stance as the primary researcher that will allow the reader to judge
the authenticity of my analysis and my position as a phenomenologist to bracket myself from the study. I might be considered a semi-insider with regard to the communities of practice in which my participants engage, having been a social studies teacher myself, and a member of the same dominant religious group that frames part of the contextual framework of the study. However, I was not familiar with the specific practices of every district or the state from which I ultimately drew participants having come to study outside my region of practice. Yet, I am both professionally and personally committed to furthering my own understanding of issues in social studies education, remaining active in the professional and academic communities, and seeking to provide others with opportunities for learning and enhancing their skills and knowledge within social studies subjects. I acknowledge that to an extent I have already “bought in” to the importance of the narratives that my participants shared with me. I found that this personal investment helped to put my participants at ease when sharing their narratives, as I emphasized my own concerns for social studies teachers and my genuine interest in trying to understand their stories and share their experience with others. However, while conducting this study I was aware that my personal investment might at times serve as a hindrance. I made every attempt to critically consider the content of the narratives, to avoid drawing too many parallels between my own history and the narratives shared by my participants, and to ask follow-up questions to clarify my understanding during the interviews. In the remaining section of this chapter, I will explore my own story and experience with social studies to aid in bracketing my positionality from the analysis.
Bracketing Positionality

My interest in social studies teaching stems from my own particular context and the nature of my lived experiences in the history discipline, and within schools. As a white middle-class male citizen of the United States of America I have not only had great privilege inherent with that identity but have seen that power evident on three continents I have lived on. Further, I was raised in a family for which the acquisition of, at least, the bachelor’s degree in a field of our choosing was expected and supported financially. The value of a degree was seen as essential to the marketplace economy system in the U.S., which has placed a value on the acquisition of the degree with increased pay and human capital (Ross & Miroswsky, 1999). That genesis degree has provided the opportunity for me to attain two master’s degrees (one in Arts and the other in Sciences) and to engage in doctoral studies. Education in my life has been a defining factor to my sense of identity and my perceived value in a societal context. Still, while I have placed a focus in my life on the acquisition of historical understanding, I have been fortunate to live and travel in Europe, South America, Southeast Asia, and Polynesia and learn from each of these cultures and peoples. Living and traveling in these varied locations has given me an appreciation for the privilege of having the means and potential to attain the level of education for which I have been privy to engage in, as well as increased opportunities to learn and study the past in these different contexts.

While I have had access to information and course content on any subject of interest to me based on my privileged position in society, I recognize that my
connection to history and access to information and experiences have been rather unique. While serving historical societies, teaching social studies within the schools, or working with professional development in the schools, it is apparent to me that many teachers do not approach social studies from the same perspective or privileged experience I have enjoyed. The manner in which they have engaged history within their lives and teaching practice have emphasized different parts, and diminished others, for which I have viewed as essential. My own perspective about the nature of what education should look like—right down to the emphasis on history as the core of social studies education—comes from my own maturation within history as a degree. I recognize that in order to enhance the quality of education in others I need to come to know the life worlds of others and understand the essence of their orientation toward the subject.

My story with social studies first comes to mind the familiar ticking of a movie projector in elementary school. As long as I have been taking classes or teaching, films have played an important role in my thinking, conceptualizing, and learning of social studies. While I have enjoyed documentaries and Hollywood pictures, I have always realized their limitations and tried to learn the history behind the films after viewing them. Beyond those moments, my academic social studies have been almost exclusively tied to print books from the library or in a textbook. There have been papers, dioramas, lectures, demonstrations, and many lectures, but my connection to social studies most resonated within history, and revolved around storytelling that connected me to time and place through someone else’s eyes.
After a miserable experience in seventh grade where the subject of history was so poorly covered I actually felt more confused than interested, I determined that I wanted to know what was real. I began studying history specifically and it became a lifelong passion. Leaving public schools at 15 to begin my college education, I played around with different majors, but settled on a passion for the degree: history. After graduation I worked as a docent for the Washington State History Museum and determined that I loved teaching, which led me to my first master’s degree in Secondary Social Studies Education.

Upon entering the teaching profession I came to realize that my department did not necessarily share my approach to social studies—who favored textbook work to discussion, research, and writing histories—as I preferred. While I used the structure of the field of history as the frame for my social studies teaching, my view then was to create habits of mind that would allow them to be better citizens, parents, and workers. Seeing technology utilized as little more than an access point for more secondary and primary source materials, even if the homework outcomes remained as rigidly traditional as they had always been, I became disenchanted with the nature of how technology was integrated into the classroom. This dissatisfaction led to an additional master’s in instructional design and technology, and my current doctoral studies.

In a bracketing interview performed February of 2011 by Emma Smith (a fellow student in a qualitative research methods course), I became aware that my vision about the purposes and goals of social studies education had shifted. While still generally situating history as the core and focus of social studies education, I
became aware that my goal was not merely providing them skills to be more mindful people in their spheres of influence, but I was hoping that students would take their skills and knowledge to transform their various communities in a way that encouraged both social justice and active citizenship; using the latter to transform the former. Technology, therefore, was not merely a tool for understanding, but should be used in novel ways to make the material relevant and applicable to current issues and mindful opinion making.

Currently, I am involved with professional organizations including the National Council for the Social Studies, local organizations where I am currently serving as president of the county historical society, and private institutions that include museums over a two state region. My involvement is done with the intent of remaining current in my understanding of the field and relevant issues facing the community of teachers and scholars. I firmly believe that a dedicated understanding of the skills found within social studies can dramatically enhance all areas of a person’s personal and public life. My interest in improving the nature of social studies education for the coming generation remains rooted in my belief in the impacts possible when a society is both educated and given the skills toward effective participation in our republic.

While my experiences and connections to social studies have been varied and deep, I recognize that there is need to carefully balance the tendency to view statements and ideas from those I interview outside of my own perspective lens as far as possible. Adhering strictly to their own words and statements, making my own positionality clear both here and throughout the analysis, and member
checking my descriptions with the participants themselves are all methods to ensure as fair and representative a presentation of the lived experience of these teachers are as clear as possible. Realizing full removal of self from the process is impossible due to the generalized blindness present in us all, readers are encouraged to consider my positionality here, and statements throughout, both by those interviewed and myself, to evaluate how nearly objectivity has been achieved.

Overview

Throughout the remainder of the paper, reference will be made to a participant’s “story.” The term of story is used partly as a convenience to indicate the compilation of all five interviews into a conjoined single plotline or self-reported story. As the methods employed include narrative identity, the use of the term story falls within the reality of the experience shared and is consistent with other research utilizing this method. In no way is the reference to a story suggestive of fabricated deceit, dismissive reporting, or imagined experience. The story is simply a correlated telling of the multiple narratives collected for the study.

For the remaining chapters of this dissertation I focus on the findings of my analysis. In Chapters 4 through 6, I present each teacher as a full case—first through a full presentation of his or her story as a timeline combining all interviews, including the additional influences, barriers, and affordances present from their interviews. Each chapter ends with a description of the essential
statements that help each to understand the experience of each teacher. Chapter 7 focuses on the framework that I have developed to capture the patterns that have emerged in my interviews that include their connections to and with technology, overlaps, additions to and omissions from Evans’ model, and to offer a coherent account of narrative identity in the domain of social studies.
CHAPTER 4
CASE STUDY: BRIAN CAIN

Chapter 4 will begin by sharing the story of Brian Cain combining the interviews into a fluent storyline, including the barriers and affordances present in his story, and his own words about his orientation. Note that the chapter will be dividing the technology narrative (defined as his stories relating to technology) from the story of Brian’s connection with social studies directly as, uniquely, Brian maintained both stories and commentaries overwhelmingly divergent in life and discussion of teaching practice. Brian’s own narrative separation makes the division appropriate here in presenting Brian’s distinction between the two spheres, his use of technology and his life/teaching practice, in representing the shared experience more accurately. Afterwards, a visual correlation of the connections to the story and the influences are presented with an explanation of the corollary parts. The chapter will end with a description of the essential statements in understanding the experience of the story: the essence. An analysis of the case in light of the additional case studies is conducted in Chapter 7.

Background Information

Beginning with the selection criteria, Brian teaches in an urban school district within the same city he attended and received his university training. As the story will reveal, Brian’s focus since he was a child in the third grade was to teach history and all schooling, particularly university training focused on teaching history. The focus on teaching led to the degree in education that has been used
within the current position for the last 27 years. Brian’s position includes teaching U.S. history every period of the day in the first half of the year, and one section of sociology in the second half. All subjects taught within Brian’s teaching practice are within the umbrella of social studies.

**Timeline Story Social Studies**

The shared story of Brian began with an overview admittedly rehearsed as the introduction to all of the classes within Brian’s teaching practice. Brian feels it is important for the students to understand why he is so engaged as an educator. Refined over multiple retellings Brian confessed that he has told the experience of how he came to be an educator multiple times, including during the current academic year. Although greater depth is present from the interviews, the fact that the experience is a rehearsed timeline, the sharing of the opening conversation will be presented in Brian’s words without editing, and then the details will be explored in greater depths:

I started collecting antiques, arrow-heads, old bottles, that sort of thing, when I was six. And I was actively, it wasn’t that I just accumulated, some it was, but I remember a logical thought process and a real active engagement and process toward trying to gather a collection when I was six. And so it started about then. And not long after that I started school at Paul Elementary in Paul, Idaho, and I liked school. Not because I think that I was particularly good at it, I did not shine academically, it wasn’t that my name was always on the board for the plus awards, but I really
liked the interaction. I liked the people. And I got to meet people that were different than I was and different than I had been raised. And I was raised in a home where I was exposed to a lot of different things within a certain scope, as much as you can be in Kasota, Idaho; not traveled but just ideas and great thoughts and thinkers. Third grade, Mrs. Ratliff, I saw just how much of an impact a teacher could have on people. And I decided then I wanted to teach. And from third grade on I devoted whatever I did, essentially, either to honing information or acquiring things so that one day I would have a classroom that I could teach in. So third grade is really early. So sixth grade I was still in the elementary school, I would run with the class down to lunch, eat, and then I would have about 20 minutes of a lunch recess. And I do not remember how this came about, but there was a first grade teacher Mrs. Moore and she taught in my old first grade class, and my teacher had gone by that point. And she invited me to come and teach her class for that 20 minutes. I would go out, line them up from lunch. Ok, now I’m in sixth grade, these are first grade students, and get them lined up. The other teachers were out doing their classes, I would take them in, we’d go down the hall, they’d all go in to use the bathroom, then they’d line up. We’d walk back to the classroom, and then I was given complete free range of what to do for 15 minutes with that class. And it was just generally story time, is traditionally what it had been, and I would pick the books, I would read them. I decided then that a good thing to do would be to learn how to count to 10 in Spanish. I didn’t know how,
so I learned and I taught the class. And I had an absolute great time with it. But I noticed that everything I was doing had always leaned toward the social studies, it was not math, it was not the structure of the English language. It was all people; it was always centered around people. And then I’d go through and I get ready to declare my major, and there’s never been a question in mind what it is, because it’s what I had been working for. All that really changed was the age group I really thought I wanted to teach because in grade school I thought I wanted to teach grade school. In junior I thought I wanted to teach junior high. In high school I thought I really should want to teach high school. And when I got to college, I didn’t feel like I wanted to teach college. I felt like high school was where it was at. And so I moved on and history has always been my passion, always been my passion. And I tell my students, when I introduce the class to them, just how much I love history. I mean I eat, drink, and breathe history. And outside of class, rarely does a day go by that I don’t do something that isn’t history related in some way. It’s just who I am.

Within the shared experience it is significant to note that all events listed are housed within the elementary grades. Also it is within the early formative grades that Brian reiterated the third grade teacher as being the person providing what was indicated as a critical event within the story; giving a skill that, “didn’t seep in, it was literally handed to me at a singular point; and I took it to heart.” Mrs Ratliff taught the students how to read with inflection in their voice and to anticipate the punctuations in the text so that as they read it, it was as the author
intended it. Students would practice alone at their desks and then practice next to
the teacher in their reading groups, “which was semi-intimidating. It wasn’t so
bad for me, she loved me. Some of the other kids were scared to death.” It was in
performing the exercise that Brian heard what a difference that made in how
information is conveyed. “How just a flat read kills the best of reading and how
intonation and all that can even make the phone book really interesting.” Finding
humor in the clarity of the experience he stated, “and I remember sitting there and
thinking, this is something I really need, this is a tool I need. And that is really
one of the real differences for me.”

Brian then goes on to discuss that the ability to modulate inflection is an
important skill for a lecturer to have as the speaker gains the ability to captivate
people for a long time—even though current education typically tells people not
to lecture, a concept Brian agrees with for a “bad lecturer.” The scene was
identified as memorable because Brian can “visit” with a room full of students
and they will “stay right with me,” because of the technique, the “delivery
system.” Even as Brian is occasionally asked to speak publically, he continually
feels reinforced that the mode of speaking developed is the valuable asset
previously suggested. While crediting his mother as a good reader who also used
the skill, Brian stated that the third grade teacher “taught me how to do it.”

However, to avoid listeners thinking too highly of the teacher within the
narrative Brian states, “in other ways, she kind of killed my spirit…. So not
everyone is so all perfect at it; another valuable lesson.” After bringing in some
sand cherry blossoms from home to the teacher, the art project for the day was to
do a still life of the flowers. After coloring them in the palate of a faded Van Gogh print, being very pleased with the results, Brian took it up to the teacher and felt scolded as being lazy, not putting forth the effort to really color it, and demanded Brian redo it. Looking back on the experience Brian stated, “But I find it interesting that you can’t be everything to everyone all the time.”

Despite having the overview of the story so heavily situated within Brian’s early development in the primary grades, all other detailed stories emerged from Brian’s teaching practice within the classroom beginning with the earliest memory in the classroom. The memory began shortly after being hired and before any students ever entered the classroom. A couple of days before the school year he began sitting at the desk and realized that as the teacher, Brian was “wholly and solely” responsible for the success or failure of the classroom:

And I remember sitting there and being very intimidated by that process of getting material in a format in an amount and figuring out a way to convey it, because a good lecturer also knows not to do it all the time, and how to figure, that was very intimidating to me.

Drawing the parallel to being a first time father and taking a new-born baby home from the hospital for the first time, having everyone leave so that the husband and wife end up in the living room and going, “Wow, it’s all us.” Brian adds, “And it can be empowering, you can choose to have it be empowering, or it can be crippling, but that’s really just a choice.” Seeing this as a healthy process that was positive, Brian now feels like when a new teacher comes to teach, “if you are wise you don’t rush in where angels fear to tread….I think we get too enabling.”
Speaking of one learning experience, he discussed a low point quite early in his career when dealing with the reaction of parents to selected teaching style.

One mother came to a parent teacher conference and, “said I was single handedly destroying her child; and there are few things more disconcerting to a teacher.”

Allowing the mother to vent and remaining “stunned,” Brian then apologized and explained surprise as the son stayed after class and visited, “touches base, we visit about things, he tells me about life.” Brian then expressed positive experiences with older siblings in the classroom and the desire to visit with the student the next day if it was all right. The next day pulling the student aside after expressing feelings of being “caught off-guard, that I had no idea,” the student began to cry. The student explained, “When you say things in class, instead when you say things about people, like George Washington, I feel like you are saying them about me.” Straightening out that issue so that “everything was fine” Brian added that two years later the student was diagnosed bi-polar, nearly killed someone in a bi-polar swing, and the situation was discovered to be an early manifestation of the disorder (noting that bi-polar came from his mother’s side of the family).

However, the idea of a low point was meant to indicate a situation where a parent, “who gets mad to cut a swath because they don’t like how you’re teaching social studies… and that’s hard for me when that’s hard for other people.”

Despite the fact that Brian had known the student in the low point experience, Brian had taught the older siblings previously and later confessed the siblings are in the neighborhood and attend Brian’s faith. The highlighted turning point in practice came when, “My children became my students, and their friends… I
looked at them very differently.” While declaring that the event made Brian “just a little more mellow,” he indicated an example of the change would be the greeting to the day that became more “familial, familiar, and familiar” in approach. “Like saying hi to a friend as opposed to someone you don’t know,” reassuring that the greeting was not to an inappropriate level, but, “if I could feel the difference, pretty sure the kids could.”

It is important to recognize how significant relationships are to Brian in the way Brian interacts with people on a regular basis. More discussion on Brian’s relationships will follow when the discussion of influences that reinforce his commitments to social studies are presented. Each of the forgoing experiences have included comments and ideas about relationships and ties to them. In discussing a positive experience, a high point in Brian’s story, he mentions that there have been several, but they relate to a letter, card, or a note students write after leaving the classroom. In these letters the students will indicate who they are, what class they were in, what they are doing now, and they state, “What you did for me, I cannot thank you enough….and so it is in those notes, you have made a difference, and there it is on paper.” So significant are the letters that Brian stated, “One of them I want to have used as an epitaph on my headstone.” The example shared was a note Brian received through another teacher the week of the interview of what that student’s idea of an ideal classroom would be: “Class like Mr. [Cain]’s, everyone respects one another, people talk with the raised hand, teacher loves what they do, teacher uses personal stories to relate.”
Looking ahead toward Brian’s future practices, both a positive and negative scene was discussed. When asked about a positive future scene Brian quipped, “Retirement comes to mind,” before adding the hope that in the last year, the 30th year, still a few years in the future, “to still be in good form when I leave…still at a good pace.” The negative scene turned on the administration, hoping not to become so frustrated he becomes, “grouchy, and that I start to use vocabulary I have never used in my life, and I am not mean to other people because of it.” Indicating that “the trend is sliding that way” because the school is “as poorly run as I have ever seen it” the hope was reiterated that he would be able to let go as often as it keeps coming because of the, “inconsistency, the irrationality, the bizarre things that get said, and then the low performance of those that say they are going to evaluate me.”

While difficult to place on the general timeline, as this was an unexpected event in his story that began at the beginning of Brian’s teaching practice and continues today, Brian discussed the influence of his wife on the story. Noting his wife came from a background of “unbelievable international experience,” and marrying into that family, “My life took on that kind of international flavor.” Though the international flavor was not something that started from the beginning of the marriage, the experience did come. Jointly setting a goal to travel internationally and to be able to financially support that when the kids were, “old enough to remember what we were doing long-term,” the couple set out to make the goal of travel happen. Speaking to the frugality and thrift required to make the goal happen, and then the subsequent focus and benefits of that travel, Brian
stated, “You’re a more interesting teacher, whether you are talking specifically about it or not. There is a depth to what you are talking about that the students can sense.” This familial relationship and support toward engaging in such endeavors serves as an undergirding truss and theme that followed throughout the interviews.

**Influences to the Story**

In discussing the essential supports that undergird Brian’s commitment to social studies as a subject and as a profession, Brian centered thoughts on relationships. Discussing the people or groups that support him, Brian immediately heaped praise on department colleagues saying, “We have as strong a department right now as we have ever had.” Adding also that the colleagues are “fine,” “dedicated,” “smart,” bright,” “younger than me,” and that they have a relationship on a professional level as well as being friends and getting together socially. “They get relationships and are willing to invest in them…. They are good, they are so good. And they value each other, we value each other; they value me, I value them.” Brian concluded that, “department-wise it’s just a phenomenon.”

Discussion of relationships doesn’t end there for Brian, though. Considering media influences, Brian indicated a hero in Gandhi; so Brian shows the film of that name from 1982 with Ben Kingsley in the Sociology class. “The kids go, ‘How old is this?’ and I go, ‘It’s brand new, great film,’ but that stands out to me a great deal.” Continuing with books that influence him, Brian mentioned authors
and simply the genre of biographies. In addition to the Autobiography of Benito Cellini, Kafka and Kurt Vonnegut, and the writings of Maya Angelou, (which were described as, “like putting a perfectly blended and textured caramel candy in your mouth, you don’t want to bite it, you want it to last as long as you can, and you slowly roll it, her words are like that for me”) Brian discussed a biography of artists by a contemporary of Michelangelo and Rafael. While the name eluded him, Brian indicated that the text has been criticized because of the potential bias of the author’s associations. But Brian stated, “It doesn’t bother me because what you get is words from a friend about a friend…. See, it is all about human relationship, and that’s what I love.”

In discussing the reason for the impact these books have personally, Brian stated, “They did what I said I hoped I could do, they shined a light further than I knew to see…every one of them allowed for an intimacy to your soul.” Citing a statement made about Eleanor Roosevelt as a person who craved intimacy, Brian added, “I realized that that was a description of myself as well and all those books I listed allowed for an intimacy that I didn’t have otherwise—an intimacy of that person, or an idea, or a concept.” After wiping tears from the eye, Brian added, “It’s so important to me.”

Continuing the discussion of supports to Brian’s commitment to social studies, he indicated, “The main singular, without a doubt, force is how impressed I am with my students.” Referring to the students as “stunning on every level,” “eager to learn,” “wanting to learn,” “wanting to be here,” “respectful,” and “kind,” Brian asked, “Who doesn’t want to hang out with that?” Noting that these
students want quality, it is that desire for quality that drives Brian’s own desire to provide it. “Love them to death, and I tell them that.”

Without hesitation, when asked the barriers to the story, Brian responded, “The way the school is run, enormous classes, so many students that you can’t really do what you’d like to do.” Brian then spoke of administrative support of the teacher when a parent calls to complain and the feeling, “They don’t seem to care, and I certainly don’t think teachers are being valued at all.” This administrative barrier becomes more pronounced within the technology timeline and the restraints and demands placed in that realm. But throughout the interviews a feeling of administration not caring about the teachers’ needs and concerns, the relationships, and the, “inconsistent, the irrationality, and bizarre things that get said” by people that, “can’t even hardly do part of their job, let alone all of it” became a generalized theme.

Relating to those with different opinions about the classroom, and issues within Brian’s practice, he immediately retorted, “I don’t play well with others, I don’t like to be told no.” Brian then explained that if the opposite view is out there, if explained why a direction is being taken with “sound reasoning,” then “I’m ok.” However, if it is presented with an, “underpinning of false statements, misinformation, and say it louder and in multiple times,” Brian does not want to be made, “to feel the fool or not a team player because I don’t agree with the falsehood…it’s just misinformation.” In countering such confrontations Brian felt he comes off as “too emphatic” because by the time the decision to say anything is made, “I’m so riled up” credibility is lost. “I get so frustrated by people who
should know better, who don’t, who simply don’t.” It is within this pool of experiences that will help the reader to understand more of how Brian relates to the subject, practice, and the lived experience in which he operates.

Before an analysis of the timeline story with social studies is analyzed, attention now is turned to the timeline story with technology. Once completed the two timelines are discussed in a woven analysis of the narrative parts and discussion of the essence of the story.

**Timeline of the Story Technology**

Even as the technology narrative presented here covers the same space within the life narrative generally, Brian’s relationship and experience with technology is presented here as a distinct subset of the narrative. Part of the reason the story of technology is separate in this case rather than integrated into the whole of the story is that Brian himself indicated the “day is organized that I don’t need a great deal of that,” and indicated that age is most likely a factor as well as habit. The implication is that Brian is, “constantly trying to get it in my life rather than it just being there like it is for my students.” Even as Brian detailed the technologies owned personally, including and indicating now there was a cell phone, Brian added, “didn’t want that.” Statements such as his general disinterest in his phone only further distanced the story of relationships from technology regardless of ownership.

Beginning Brian’s technology storyline growing up in the Intermountain Western United States, there was only one channel on the TV growing up,
eventually moving to two channels, “that were fairly snowy but it was different information.” The telephone was a landline party line shared with two neighbors, “So if you went to make a phone call you would pick it up; if the others were on it you’d need to hang up and wait.” Only seeing that level of technology the majority of Brian’s growing up years, by high school, “They wouldn’t let us have electric typewriters in high school” because the teachers felt the technologies were only a “fad.” So the students would need strong fingers on the manual machines, “if we were to be able to type and have any skills at all.” Brian identified this as being an influence on the technology “idea of being a fad.”

Entering college Brian had a computer class where “They wanted to teach programming with the dots and dashes and O’s. I don’t remember what they were; did not do well.” Regarding the experience, Brian stated bluntly, “I saw no relevance for me to program, oh, it put me off…” Recognizing it was a large class, and Brian didn’t understand what was being said or make any sense of it, the experience stood out as an overwhelmingly negative experience regarding technology. Carrying that experience into the present, Brian spoke of going to a presentation when all of a sudden technology didn’t work. “Something didn’t download or we have to buffer, and I just sit there and go, okay, this is really poor instruction.” Viewing such an experience as detracting, the impatience for the “ineffectiveness of it” returned Brian to the desire to, “sit and have a relationship or conversation with someone [rather] than read a PowerPoint, Yazzi, or what’s that called? Prezi! Oh, yeah, they’re impressive; they make me mad.” A Prezi, as referred to above, is an Internet-based presentation software program similar to
Microsoft PowerPoint. As Brian viewed others seeing technology as, “the answer to all answers,” Brian referred to computer assisted presentation in terms of, “everyone thinks they are so great.” But personally the change toward the usage of the presentation tools is, “made more difficult if I see no reason for it.” However, Brian indicated that while “change for the sake of change” was something he would tend to resist, “Change I can see will make things better or really make a change that is needed, I am all over it. I will learn it. I will do whatever is needed.”

Moving into the teaching, Brian recalled, “We certainly did not have computers. Everything was done by hand.” Referring to the early teaching career as beginning in the “stone age” when teachers were still using the mimeograph machines—seeing the first Xerox copy machine was an experience rather vivid. “We were like a bunch of Amazon natives seeing a camera or a pair of binoculars; we stood around and aaaaahhh!” When they put a computer in his room and gave him access to a printer, he shared, “I could put in a grade and print off a class and have all my grades just right there at easy access. I’d never seen anything so slick in all my life.” This was described as a key scene in Brian’s narrative as teachers could now print out the grades and mail them off easily, whereas before, “We had been doing a three-page carbon copy and hand writing.” Calling this “miraculous” it remained memorable because the experience and change “alleviated a great deal of time” accomplishing the needed task well. “And all it required was a few clicks of a button and it was done.” It was during this time also that Brian experienced a high point with technology in viewing the film Gandhi (Attenborough, 1982) for
the first time. “I wanted the whole world to have to sit down and watch it,” because for Brian, “it spoke truth, it confirmed my own convictions” enlarging, “fundamentally humanly important ideas.” Recall earlier in the narrative that the film *Gandhi* was mentioned as still integrated in the classroom experience within the Sociology course.

Even with the high point of the film *Gandhi* (Attenborough, 1982) still finding place within the classroom, the earliest technology recalled beyond basic phone, was a reel-to-reel projector. Films would need to be acquired from the film repository at the university as a, “bit of a to-do, to-do, but I really liked it.” The sound of the reel being taken up, the feel, the experience, were listed as being reasons why if the availability of the films and the projector were present, Brian would continue to use reel-to-reel film in the classroom. “It seems like a million years ago…however… I would love for them to have that.” The continuation of the use of films in the classroom as a fully-integrated technology finds root in the very initiation of Brian’s practice, even as the technology for delivery has changed now.

Yet while there were positive experiences documented within the story with technology, the low point in Brian’s story was described as, “when the school implements any new program and fail to give any training,” or they give “what they call training.” That for Brian takes him back to, “talking lots of dots and dashes and O’s” in the college class. “Don’t, don’t, don’t tell me that I have to do something and not explain. Hurry, hurry, hurry….that elicits a violent
reaction.” An example that became a reoccurring concern and point of repeated frustration was the district-implemented attendance and grading programs:

New grading program and we are back to FIS grading pro as we were before overlaid with another program called Pinnacle that don’t talk to each other. Nothing works particularly well. We kept getting told they don’t talk to each other and I kept thinking if they don’t talk to each other why don’t we just end the conversation? …So now we are back to FIS but it’s different and there are things that you do that are just easy, like you take roll and another students comes in so you need to alter it, so you alter it and save it, and then it puts the old mark back, so you change it and save it, and it puts the old mark back, and every time you save it takes 40 seconds for it to save it. And it doesn’t sound like much but when you are trying to start a class, 40 seconds for each of those, and then when you finish with the last of those, 40 seconds for it to save is back the old mark…I finally just wrote it on a piece of paper and took it to the office and told them to fix it. …Hurry, Hurry, be sure your roles are accurate, it is so important the roles have got to be accurate, and then you can’t make them accurate. It’s very frustrating. That’s the definition of insanity, the same thing expecting different results and you don’t get it, oh my gosh.

For Brian, each time the technology doesn’t work to the expectation, “doesn’t matter what it is, when it just doesn’t work,” Brian feels it, “messes me up” and “derails what I am trying to do.” However, even with the seating chart debacle,
Brian described the experience as a turning point moment when the teachers were given a computer program that could be marked off stating, “that made a difference;” even while adding, “now if they could get it to save, that would be really cool, we will just be cooking with gasoline.” It was identified as a turning point, and a positive one at that, because Brian views that, conceivably, such a program would take a task “I need or want to do and makes it easy,” not a perfunctory function, but not one for which time was not desired to be spent on.

Most recently, the beginning of the current school year, the principal gave Brian an iPad as the school had extra iPads and “I had to have one.” Pondering the utility of the iPad, Brian stated, “Of all the things he could have given me and iPad wasn’t even on the list.” However, the possession of the iPad was made more palatable by the intervention of Brian’s wife. After Brian’s wife took it out of the box and charged it, the two took the iPad down into a larger metropolitan city to an electronic store that sells accessories and chargers. Admitting that a cover for the iPad, “just isn’t a priority” they found a red leather one. “Now we are back to books, a beautifully bound leather book. Well, now you’re talking my language.” Putting the red leather cover on the iPad, “Papal red, because it is the color of Pope Benedict’s slippers,” and having that cover for the iPad, “somehow that makes it palatable.”

In home life during the same period of receiving Brian’s first computer in the classroom there would be no purchased home computer as, “They weren’t common, we certainly weren’t shelling the money out; that wasn’t our priority.” The kids did not have any video gaming consoles or electronic gaming systems,
“Not because we are Amish; it’s just not where we were at.” Even while Brian now owns cell phones, laptop computers for both husband and wife, and a desktop computer in the basement in the media room where a DVD player is hooked up to a television, as, “We watch a lot of movies,” Brian referred to that inventory as “more than two people could conceivably need.” While Brian does text and email, “My wife said that email dates me, but that’s so 20th century; I still think they’re kind of cool.” A turning point for Brian’s personal life was when Brian realized the ease of communication with international friends and the ability to track the art market internationally. Notably Brian mentioned watching an art auction take place in Europe in which an agent bidding on Brian’s behalf was hired and Brian watched the agent win. “When I realized how much I could have that do for me, then I mellowed, not ecstatic, but mellowed.” Looking ahead at the potential for Brian’s children to move away the ability to use a tool, like Skype, where people can still maintain a visual connection and communicate was viewed as being “supremely important to me.” Again the reason came, “only because it’s relationship based; it’s human based.”

Adding a positive future scene to the timeline, Brian moved to current events hoping the new program the school switched to would allow for the input of grades, provide a percent out of the points possible, and a letter grade according to the teacher-designated scale when printed. “Today I was trying to get that. Guess what? Not there.” Feeling that having such a system would be “fundamental,” when Brian didn’t find that feature on the new program the question arose, “How did that feel like progress?” Adding perceived frustration that, “People are making
a fortune” and it, “appears the district hasn’t viewed it,” Brian reiterated a future hope was the ability to get a “decent report” from the system. However, on the obverse of the negative future was a hope, “that they don’t just take it all away” because, “What I have is good. I don’t want to go back to the handwriting of reports.”

When asked where Brian’s relationship with technology exists between the two contexts discussed—having value as a time-saving positive and a generalized frustration—Brian insisted there was no emotion either way. Brian suggested that emotions do not deviate more than if something worked or did not. “If I am told that I need to do something, and I see a rationale and it does what I have just been told it does, I am just ducky with it, I truly am.” However, Brian immediately added, “I am not one to pilot a program,” adding the analogy, “If you are going to electrocute me in a chair, make sure it is one that you have done several on. Don’t let me be the first one on a new model, because that’s what it feels like.”

**Influences to the Story**

Within the positive reinforcement to Brian’s commitment to technology, relationships came to the forefront as the primary positive support

Friends, colleagues, friends here, students, my wife and I call her when I have questions with things, my kids, the tech people here when it is a sort of widespread tech thing here when it is not just sort of user error, which I understand happens also, and I freely admit that.
However, “The one that gets used the most [speaking of supports] is simply the immense amount of information on the internet.” Describing his activities online as being able to take information, research it, and glean out information from so many different sources, Brian described it as “amazing,” “so good,” and “so valuable to me.”

However, when discussing barriers, two major themes emerged: the behavior of others encouraging integration and a generalized lack of appeal. Brian indicated barriers throughout the interviews with comments ranging from “Don’t make me feel like I’m inept, unprepared because I don’t know,” “but if they sigh or roll their eyes,” and “They start telling me assuming that I have either a certain body of knowledge or vocabulary that I simply don’t.” The general feel is of a proscriptive quality to the technology, a frustration at being made to feel infantile, and a frustration at a lack of background to simply use the tools without assistance patiently and straightforwardly given. The general disinterest in engaging the technologies themselves to explore features or functionality, “just doesn’t engage me.” “There is not even an appeal to me. Show me an old vellum bound book from the 1500s—that jazzes me. The barrier is that is just it is not appealing to me.” Admitting a lack of confidence with using the technology, and a feeling that he would not know what to ask for if asked what would help, another barrier is the “off-putting” nature of being given technology Brian does not want and does not know what to do with (like the iPad already detailed above).
Interrelation of Stories

Examining these two storylines together—technology and social studies—revealed a series of interconnections and related ties between events. As a reminder, this Figure 1 (also featured as an example in Chapter 3) captures key scenes (rectangles shaded in grayscale), other events (rectangles), contextual influences (ovals), and expressed beliefs (round-edged rectangles). Dark solid lines represent temporal causality—for example in Brian’s flowchart the solid line leading from the early memory to the key scene above it indicates that the key scene occurred after the early memory in the broad timeline of his story. The thin dotted lines capture the causality that Brian attributed to influences and events. For example, in the low point scene relating to the university programming class, Brian suggested this as emblematic of how technology can be a hindrance, detract from what Brian is attempting to do in the classroom, and can be highly ineffective teaching. Additionally, that at its most basic, technology holds no interest to Brian; it simply does not engage him. Finally, that the value of technology is based solely on the perceived utility to Brian—the technology is only as good as how the technology performs in relation to how others say the technology will perform. Brian expressed all three of the beliefs in connection to the story and the beliefs form an important core element to how Brian views and has learned from the experiences. Note also on the flowchart that the key issue of concern was relationships and the theme was so pervasive that the experiences where relationships were specifically noted are marked with an asterisks rather than simply a series of lines. With the development of the flowchart, care was
taken to include only information that was stated explicitly in the narratives to avoid any personal biases and introduced assumptions or interpretations of the data. The figure also helps to coalesce the salient elements of the narratives into a quick visualization that encapsulates the core components and related themes correlated to the additional experiences in Chapter 7.

Figure 1: Correlated flowchart for Brian Cain case study
Legend: Boxes=events, shaded boxes=key events, smoothed boxes=barriers or supports, circles=beliefs, solid lines=timeline of events, dashed line=relationships.

One critical step in analyzing the data was being able to visualize the elements of the narratives as a single cohesive story. Through the process of combining all of the narrative events in this timeline fashion, the narrative allowed for the details of the story to emerge as a cogent construct for analysis. Contained within this figure are the major influences for each event, the emergent belief sets, and
underlying themes. Containing a story structure in a condensed form became critical in the analysis work for identifying overarching themes, timeline continuities, and comparable influences between cases as well. Comparable details on these correlated flowcharts then directed attention back to the data to validate links, correlate details, and ensure diligence was paid to the larger essence of the story in addition to the details.

As a reader there are several key elements that can be gleaned from careful observation of the figure for Brian’s story. First, while the case began with the story of the experiences that brought Brian to teaching social studies, the experiences that are identified as highlights within the story are almost exclusively within the teaching practice. While critical in bringing Brian to his professional practice, the experiences which sustain and alter practice have taken place within his professional practice. Second, while the essence of the story centers on relationships, significance for the conclusion can be found by observing the starred events, the influences for each event, and the beliefs stated in connection with each event on the chart. Few events in the story deviate from the theme of relationships. Third, while the story of Brian’s connection to technology was presented as a segregated storyline based the manner the narratives emerged, when integrated back into the fabric of the storyline in the graphic analysis the cogency of the technology story finds greater meaning. For example, messages received in high school reinforced the idea that new technologies are a fad. This was reinforced and deepened in college with a computer programming class that technology can be a hindrance. In the present,
technologies are forced onto teachers without conversation and training. The development to the present ideas and disconnects with technology emerge both as a story of relationships to tools, but also a recapitulation of the undergirding essence of the story with relationships to other people. Following these threads, the themes that emerged will be discussed in greater depth.

**Goals and Purposes of Social Studies**

When initially asked to describe what the purpose for social studies education is, Brian laughed, “I know that I’m supposed to say, (laughs) and I do believe it, I believe it, that one of the main purposes of it is the democratization of a generation.” Recognizing the need for a literate society in accomplishing that end, Brian remarked that one of the primary concerns initially was the education level of the population sufficient to make informed and active decision—a context social studies provides. So, rather than merely counting ballots using math, social studies, “shows you the why and how you cast it the way you do.” Explaining that in order to keep going what we have going, we need, “not only an educated, literate population, but one that understands the role of civics and responsibility of people in a social setting.” Monitoring the change to see that it is a “healthy” change so we are not going, “sideways or backwards in ways we don’t want,” Brian suggests as a culture we generally are drawing on history as the subject to bring about that change. “Certainly the goal is to broaden that perspective so that your decisions are more informed with historical context.”
Related to the democratization, but highlighted as a conjoined idea, Brian stated, “It’s as much people getting along…and I think that if the course of study of history people learn how…then it serves a higher purpose than just the democratization.” Getting along also means not merely relative social order, but that every person is able to have a fair shake and chance at success or failure if they chose it. “I think those are two important aspects along with the democratization of our society.” Blending into the context and philosophies, Brian indicated that one goal within the overarching democratization idea is to model the larger society and turn the classroom into the “microcosm of the democratization.” Meaning that social studies not only carries the imperative to provide the historical context toward effective democratic participation, but also the socialization of students into the nature of our social constructs within the democratic system.

Evans’ Model Connection

Looking at the Evans model (2010) within the context of the forgoing statements, Brian followed orientation one in supporting history as the core of social studies education—but also quite clearly followed the third orientation of social efficiency creating a more controlled and efficient society, preparing students for various life roles. While standing astride the two orientations of the Evans model, the blending is not necessarily surprising considering it falls in line with the blended orientations of the C’s standards being published by NCSS specifically designed for teachers within their classroom. However, while that
model leans toward a historical inquiry practice as a means to acquiring information, Brian maintained a more traditional classroom approach discussed below.

**Philosophies That Underpin Practice**

Looking at the held philosophical underpinning for teaching social studies, Brian quoted, “All men are created equal, that they are endowed from their Creator with certain inalienable rights.” This means for Brian that everybody gets a chance regardless of his or her current status in the school or their potential in the future. “And to be completely fair, everybody gets to share in it. But you got to do your part to get the reward.” However, no one is allowed to try to be an exception to the rule, to “unlevel” the playing field. Students are treated, “with the utmost of respect,” as, “we are all in this together equally.” Just as the purpose is the democratization of society, the classroom is intended to be the great “microcosm” of that enterprise, as much about “getting along” while going through the course of study. Students can contribute “but not detract,” or, “try to intentionally have all the attention on them” as order needs to be kept. Those that try to derail are, “marginalized, get put in prisons, are given tranquilizers” as their personalities need to be within the bounds that are the social norms. “It’s a process; our country is a process. And they are part of the process by virtue of being here.” While he is the leader that runs the class with students told to interact democratically, students are told to be courteous and nice to each other. “I insist on it. Be nice, I mean it.” Approaching the classroom experience, “much more
from the human level,” the classroom environment has much to do with the way every behavior impacts the group:

I find that is true in my life as I live it, but as I study history I don’t tolerate some behavior very well and I am very critical of it. But I am of myself and those around me now, so it’s interesting how you project your own on that.

Additionally, Brian spoke of how those ideas impacted the teaching process so students can see the passion and see how Brian is trying to, “give them the best product that I can as far as teaching, pedagogical, informational, that’s me on top of my game.” Being able to draw correlatives to events in history and to show them how the old continues to pertain to them as relevant now, Brian felt is a part of the way in which he can offer the best product. Recognizing that, “You can’t teach it all” or every “aspect” or “nuance.” Teachers will tend to play to their strengths and passions and, “hope that passion is instilled as much as any information” so students will see the general appeal and, “there isn’t a turn off with it.” As discussed in the next section, choosing an unfinished portrait of George Washington to represent Brian’s teaching practice is highly indicative of Brian’s philosophical leanings.

Looking at technology, Brian defined the philosophy as simply, “If I can see a good use for it, and it improves upon what I already know and do, I will certainly use it.” This does not mean Brian will “adopt it just to adopt it.” But if Brian feels the technology can and will improve things, Brian “wont hesitate to use it.” All
usage and integration is based on Brian’s perception of what the technological
tool will do for him.

**Teaching Practice Represented**

In representing his own teaching practice, Brian shared a story repeatedly that
highlights, not only a significant artifact within his classroom, but a symbol of his
vision of education within those goals, purposes, and grounding ideologies:

It is a framed print from the early 1900s. The date on the top on the back
of the frame I believe is 1912. It is the copy of Gilbert Stuart's unfinished
portrait of George Washington. The reason I chose it is on a couple of
different levels. It hung originally in the elementary school that I attended
in Idaho. The school burned down. The principle—when they went in to
take out of the building what could be salvaged—went in the room where
George was hanging, and he was so smoke covered that you couldn't tell
what the picture was. It was just densely covered in smoke. Instead of
putting it in the van to take to storage, he put it in his car. He called my
mom and said, “When [Brian] comes home from college, (it was my first
year of college,) I have something that I think he would like.” When I
called him, he said, “Come to my house. I have something for you.” He
pulled George out and I was just dumbfounded. When I was little, and
when I say little, I was probably fourth grade when I started, maybe third,
through sixth grade I would go up into this old part of the school. It hung
in Mrs. Egbert's room, a Special Ed teacher. I would go to see it. One of
the reasons that I use it as the artifact is because I have hung onto it for that period of time with the sole intent for it to hang in my classroom. My goal from third grade on was to teach school. I wanted to teach school very badly. Few things represent American education more than Gilbert Stewart's unfinished portrait of George Washington. When that was placed in our elementary school in the early 1900s, I would dare say there was not a school in the United States that did not have a version of it, hanging in it as literally an icon to everything that the schools where charged with doing. It represented education completely in a historical context. For me, he has hung now in my classroom for 27 years. The continuity, the carrying on of that idea of American education, the democratization, the man who steps down after two terms when he certainly didn't have to. The man who had several, several women would have compromised his moral standing in the community, but he did not allow it. I just find the picture to be a good reminder of what I am here doing, and that I'm a portion of it. But there were a lot before me, and there will be a lot after. So hold to it. Do what I'm charged with doing. To me that is what it represents. Plus I really like the painting. That helps.

In describing the ideals behind this painting as a curriculum, Brian indicated that while the face is considered the most honest and un-idealized of all the Stuart portraits in that era, the remainder of the portrait including the shirt, tie, neckpiece, ruffles, and background all remain unfinished. “To me, that is exactly American history; I don’t think it is finished, or we will ever finish.” Referring
then to the current Miss America (who was facing racism based on her Indian
decent and was crowned during the week of the interview), Brian commented,
“tells me we are also the unfinished portrait of America.” His classroom was
structured to convey the relevance of the history so that students have that “solid,
you can see what it is” feeling; like the face of Washington. However, like the
portrait, “It is left to us to work on it” and to never see history, our lives, or this
country as “finished.”

Extending that metaphor as a representation of how Brian teaches, Brian
indicated that the picture is “real” in the original oak frame, wavy glass, and
although bolstered by archival backing under the wood to protect it from damage,
the fact that it is from 1912 gives it “value and substance.” Acknowledging that if
he was given the poster today he would not hang it because it feels like a façade
or guild front, cheap or fake, and because, “I try to be real; I want to be authentic
right down to the original wood on the back.” Recognizing that this object does
not represent all that Brian attempts to do or be in the classroom he felt it was an
apt representation of the, “bulk of the core of what I do—and I am very fortunate
to have something that actually does that.” Turning then to the additional art and
surroundings of the classroom filled with original paintings and sketches, busts
and sculpture, he indicated that he wanted the, “students’ surroundings to be
conducive to the thought of history…so in fact it puts it in historical context, and
that is exactly what he [the painting of Washington] is doing back there hanging
on the wall.”
Comments on Teaching

Now adding in the layer of complexity of the actual teaching practice, Brian describes his room as, “pretty orderly; pretty structured.” Once the tardy bell rings the room falls, “mortuary quiet…you can hear a pin drop.” Students have 10 minutes to write in a notebook (a journal that is designed to focus their thoughts and lay the groundwork for discussion). Then Brian gives the greeting and welcome and the day begins. If it is a typical lecture day, Brian will introduce the topic, write key things on the board, and the students will make notes and write in things between the key events identified. On a review day, if there are no questions specifically for the teacher, they review in small groups for half an hour, and then alone for the remainder of the time. If it is a film day they complete notes while watching the film. When the bell rings they are excused and leave. While this sounds like the traditional classroom decried by modernists, Brian insists that he has created an environment where students can bring in questions from their world exposures, that they know, “where we are headed and also know why,” as well as have daily opportunities to participate as much as they choose.

After watching himself teach, several things came to the forefront as interesting to him about his teaching: watching students decide on when to contribute—as calling on students “I find very elementary”, his own ability to listen and give “full weight” to what the students are saying, and his ability to share information with the class so that it, “sounds like it is the first time I am saying it.” He also praised himself for his physical movements and facial
expression being slightly more exaggerated as a cue for students to play off, the connection he made to a previous event in the curriculum the students recalled—as “I think it is good teaching,” and the subtle cue of calling them ladies and gentlemen because, “that is how I choose see them, how I want them to act, and I want them to see themselves that way.” Brian only found criticism with the number of “umms” in the conversation.

Describing what he is attempting to do with his classroom, Brian spoke of, “giving them a feel for history,” “giving them real information, and by so doing making them feel part of what is going on,” and, “trying to empower them to see they can affect how things go in our country, they can have that type of influence.” This rather standardized method of teaching is, “how I enjoy learning, and students tell me they enjoy it.” Calling the approach a “behavior modification through positive reinforcement,” Brian declared it effective at conveying information, “So, I’ll stick to that, if it’s doing that.” Defining the “ultimate goal” yet again, Brian hoped the students will create positive associations with history. And when the students see something historical they will, “lean to it, investigate it, and enrich their lives beyond it with history.”

**Essence of Experience**

Ultimately, to understand the essence of Brian’s orientation and approach to the phenomenon of teaching social studies, the reader must understand the core fundamental orientation of his personality toward relationships. His interest in art, in history, in the lives of people, the way he associates with technology, conflicts
with his administration, and engagement with students within the classroom are all extensions of his core desire for deep and meaningful relationships. As Brian referenced the quote of Eleanor Roosevelt, as a person who craved intimacy, he is entirely focused on and tied to the nature of how relationships are formed, created, nurtured, and perpetuated.

While focusing his pedagogical practices on now derided traditional methods, Brian’s focus and orientation toward those methods is to convey a passion for history, prepare students for positive social interactions within society, and empower them as citizens within the larger democratic system; all forms of relationship building. His own desire to bring in original art to fill the classroom as a means of creating the environment for thinking about history, has less to do with the art than it does with the desire for students to be in an environment where they as students can personally relate to history, within context, and begin to establish that personal relationship to history itself through the objects. Ultimately, the way Brian values his students, colleagues, family, biographies, and historical objects and art, all relate to ways in which they validate him, their relationship, and enhance or deepen their bond.

All the frustrations expressed within the interviews related to technology, with his administration, and parents who complained, relate to how those actions impact their relationships. When the technology does not work or he is required to integrate a new tool for which the rationale is not manifest to him, the reaction is negative because it detracts both time and attention away from his ability to establish and maintain relationships with his class or with colleagues or parents.
While the technology that saves time is an ultimate good, as it opens time up for personal interactions again, anytime the technology fails to perform perfectly it is now drawing away from the productive interpersonal relationship time. The conflict with administration centers around a feeling that they do not value or care about the teachers, they do not ask for their input, and consistently implement new requirements for the teachers to deal with without conversing with the teachers first—according to Brian. The disconnected relationship with administration ultimately sours all interactions in a negative way based on the perceived value they place on him and his colleagues. Further, the low point story of the parent complaining was so painful precisely because the parent invalidated a relationship he had formed with a student and tried to indicate him as a negative, even destructive force, through their interactions. In each instance, the negative perceptions for which Brian is highlighting are all based around things that either take time away from relationships, or attack and invalidate relationships he is attempting to nurture.

Looking again at Brian’s perception of the goals and purposes for social studies education, the orientation to the subject reflects the orientation toward life. Engaging history as the core of the curriculum relates to Brian’s understanding of history as a connection to people in the past while keeping them in context. Being able to establish relationships with the past ultimately aids in understanding the present and developing valuable and positive relationships in the future. Additionally, seeing the purpose as a means of preparing the students (as a social meliorist) for creating a more controlled and efficient society preparing students
for various life roles, is related to the ability of the students to relate with others and with the societal norms for which they will need to integrate. For Brian, social studies followed those two constructs specifically as they relate to a single core construct of establishing positive social relationships and meaningful connections within our democratic and social constructs.
CHAPTER 5
CASE STUDY: SUSAN HAYNES

Chapter 5 begins by sharing the story of Susan Haynes combining the interviews into a fluent storyline, including the barriers and affordances present in Susan’s story, and her words about her own orientation. Unlike the previous chapter, this story (combined narrative from all five interviews) includes within the description the story of technology woven throughout. Susan made no major distinctions between the life story and the technologies that inhabit it. After the general timeline, a visual correlation of the connections of the story and the influences thereto are presented with an explanation of the corollary parts. The chapter will end with a description of the essential statements that help to understand the experience of the story—its essence. An analysis of the case in light of the additional case studies will be conducted in Chapter 7.

Background to the Case

Susan teaches in a suburban school district that serves all in one suburb city within the county. While the story will review the importance of storytelling to Susan’s love of history and the eventual commitment to be a teacher, Susan eventually earned university training and a degree in history education that led to the current and only teaching position held for the last seven years. Susan’s position includes teaching five periods of U.S. history and a “flex period” that allows either theater courses (as her position also runs the afterschool theater program) or Susan’s “superhero” class—a class which uses the pop culture art
form of comics and the heroes of those books to view the history of the 20th century to the present day. All the courses, outside of the theater class, fall within the umbrella categorization of social studies during the teaching practice day.

Timeline of the Story

Beginning the story by describing herself as having “always been theatrical” since a “wee thing,” Susan identified the study of people as something that “always fascinated me.” Having “always been a people watcher,” people in general were described as “incredible,” “fascinating,” and leading to “wanting to know about them.” Beginning to hear stories about her parents regarding their early dating experiences, getting in trouble, their childhood, college experiences, and even about herself and siblings as children, “I always wanted to know how we were and what we did.” Recognizing this storytelling as Susan’s earliest childhood experience, she particularly remembered that her father had written a short book about his childhood containing experiences such as accidentally burning half the reeds off the local lake, or throwing golf balls under passing cars and hitting one. These helped Susan, “realize that he had this life before me and my siblings.” Taping stories of her mother’s life as well, it helped Susan to see “she was just like me” and noting “how her childhood shaped who she has become, who she is, and how she thinks.” Adding that her grandmother’s stories, “were my favorite things on the planet,” Susan identifies, “my first real connection to history and social studies,” as the hearing of those stories and asking questions to learn more. The curiosity extended to the point her family
“wondered why doesn’t [Susan] stop?” Events Susan had no memory of
“fascinated me” to know what happened, what the family was like, and what was
going on in their lives. Citing these early family stories, Susan felt the stories,
“made me care about other people's background; other people's point of view, of
how other people think.” Recognizing the great diversity in experiences that make
everybody different is now regarded as, “a huge moment for me.”

During this time Susan also grew up with technologies from the television,
“you know, Sesame Street and that kind of stuff,” to a single family computer in
the parent’s room. “We had to have special permission to get on it and use it.”
Early on, the computer usage for Susan was for an enchanted storybook program
where, “You got to create your own fairytales and have adventures; it was really
awesome.” Another impactful game was called “Chip’s Challenge” for which the
player solved puzzles. “And I remember enjoying the challenge of trying to figure
out how to get the chips.” Highlighted as “interesting, enjoyable,” and “tough,”
the game was credited as, “initiating first interest in technology.” As Susan began
to write papers for school and her mother would edit the writings, “There wasn’t
the auto-correct stuff that they have now.” But this began a love of writing that
would continue through Susan’s life.

The first memory expressed of reading history, Susan guessed, “maybe sixth
grade…who knows?” Susan was assigned a paper on any topic; she chose World
War II. “I got really into it and I got to interview my Grandpa.” Susan’s
grandfather would end up sharing photos of the peace treaty signing on the USS
Missouri. “That was really exciting for me and I just kind of latched onto it; I was
so fascinated.” Admitting it was exciting to see pictures from that time, Susan lamented, “Unfortunately I did not want to see pictures from World War II.” But the thing that “got” attention first was learning, “how people thought and why they did the things they did.” The initial foray into the field of history “got me thinking.” And Susan considered the idea; “this is intriguing a bit.”

The next year, seventh grade, Susan was home schooled and the most memorable experience, also described as a high point, was the creation of a timeline that went around “the whole house,” later narrowing that to “the whole dining room.” Without recalling when the timeline began, Susan stated that as they started to go through the history that, “in itself just kind of sparked more.” Describing this project as “exciting” and “fun,” the timeline “included little tidbits from history and so forth.” After researching different events, Susan would type the events up using WordPerfect, a computer typing software program, to put the events on the timeline. While the technology used in creating the timeline was not too “intense, big technology,” the exposure to the WordPerfect software ended up being the technology of choice for all typing until the later years of college when Susan would shift typing work to Microsoft Word; a competing typing software program.

Attending high school in New Mexico there was a combined schedule that blocked subjects together—for Susan this was history and English. “That’s why I have always put history and English together and I always loved the history part of things and the literature that went on with the history.” The school referred to the course simply as humanities, which meant even though Susan had taken the
classes, people would ask “So where is your English and history? Anyway, it was special.” However, despite the enjoyment of history, and the combined schedule concept, “I hadn’t thought of it as a career…until my junior year of high school.” Completing the sophomore year, Susan was moving into an advanced history (humanities) before one of the AP (college level advanced placement) teachers came and “yelled at me; I didn’t even know her.” After asking if Susan was related to her sister, the teacher asked, “Why aren’t you taking AP history?” “Really I’m glad she did because it really scared me into doing it.” Coping with the rigors of the AP curriculum and the combined subjects, the school combined the AP history and English as well, Susan had teachers that team-taught the AP classes together. “Some days we went to English and sometimes both were taught, so it was interesting.” Singling out the history teacher, Susan implied that there was “something about the way she taught,” and how the teacher, “made it connect to our lives and applied it.” That helped her to realize history was, “more than just fascinating people and fun stories.” The teacher helped history to “hit me” that, “being able to be aware of our past is what helps us really progress and understand who we are and as a community as a whole.” Even while the course was “just crazy” and Susan admits receiving the worst grade ever in her school career, the class caused her to, “stop thinking that history is just names and dates and things, and actually use critical thinking; I really loved it.” Susan was forced to “make the connections and figure it out” to determine different “cause and effect” understandings. “I really loved that teacher.”
Continuing the school career in Susan’s senior year, she won the department’s social study award. She described the experience that year as “really exciting,” “rocked,” and “it just went really well.” So well that after Susan won the award and finished the year, “I just knew I need to teach history. I’ve got to teach history; it’s so important.” During the senior year Susan also took a history class online using the Black Board system, a computer based learning management system. Viewed as a critical event, Susan was required to take quizzes online, write in forums, and engage the content online in a way, “I feel benefited me ever since for anything kind of similar to that.” This original genesis of Susan’s desire to teach history was directed toward teaching elementary, adding, “I’m glad I didn’t do that now…for me.”

Continuing the story with technology during her high school career, Susan indicated, “I enjoyed TV a lot. I like to blame it on my theatrical acting, but I have always been a TV fan; love TV.” Realizing “I was watching a lot of TV and probably more than I should have been,” an identified turning point came when Susan began to write rather than spend all the time watching TV, stating, “that in itself is a big turning point for me.” As the identity as a writer is, “a big part of who I am now” the beginning efforts were important to Susan, even if the products are not highly viewed now. “I started to do a lot of writing of books and so forth; books that I won’t let other people read at this point.” Finishing the first trilogy fantasy novel series was described as a high point with technology recalled as “awesome” because Susan was able to “press save and being like, save, I am done.” “That made the computer very exciting. It really gave me a sense of
accomplishment.” Interestingly, despite the focus on writing and computer usage since childhood, Susan, “actually never learned how to type correctly… I am very speedy with these four fingers (indicating the pointer and middle fingers on either hand)… I cannot do it correctly at all.” Noting in high school, “cell phones were like one of the rich kid” technologies, Susan gained a “hand-me-down phone from my younger brother” as a junior in college. She added that even now Susan has never “had the up-to-date whatever thing.” Susan even suggested that, “I have used more technology since college” with YouTube (a user uploaded Internet video streaming service),Utips (a Utah teachers instructional resource site), school library resources, and presentation software. Yet, even with further integration Susan acknowledged, “I always try to stay to a very basic level with things.” As technology progressed, “I just kind of feel like I kind of have gone along with it.”

Beginning Susan’s college career in a neighboring state, immediately the declared major in history education was filed; but the classes were far from satisfying initially. Beyond having hundreds of students, “They give you a study guide book and you fill in the answers as you go.” “I knew I was this ridiculous history nerd… there was this big section on World War II and I about freaked out; this is not enough information.” As Susan continued to take upper-level history classes the general feeling was, “much better and had a lot more information,” but it simply, “continued my love for history,” and Susan felt she “mastered” all the information. Yet, each time Susan added something new to the knowledge base, the feeling emerged that, “uh, people need to know this.” This was enhanced by
the only female professor in the department, someone “life-changing” and a, “huge part of my historical career,” as the professor was also able to bring it, “again more alive than it had already been for me.” Another professor in the department required Susan, “to be focused on thinking where is he going with these things?” as the professor would come to the class and, “just ask you questions on the spot.” The professor reinforced to Susan the importance of being, “aware of what is going on around you and knowing what is happening.” Eventually switching universities and graduating in-state as a history educator, by graduation, “I had 30 history classes and that is one of my big passions in life.”

During the college experience Susan described a high point in the story—an absolute surety of a future as a teacher. During a methods class the students were required to teach a lower-level history class several times. On one of the occasions Susan was teaching about civil rights and, “I had all the college students like way into it, it went really, really well.” Delivering a memorized portion of the ‘I have a dream’ speech, having the students singing to the tune of ‘Part of Your World’ from The Little Mermaid (Ashman & Clements, 1989)” with the lyrics changed to the history of the civil rights, and inserting jokes into the PowerPoint, Susan felt that the experience was, “a great day of teaching.” The experience was particularly positive as, “They were college students; some even older than me” who gave her, “really great feedback, connection, and discussion.” While walking home, Susan said privately, “I’m supposed to be a teacher, like there is my calling in life…I am meant to bring history alive for people.” “I just
know I knew. It's like it runs in the blood I guess you could say…I have always been like, absolutely, that this is my purpose.”

Working in student teaching the cooperating teachers for theater and history approached the design of their curriculum very differently. The drama teacher gave Susan lesson plans; the history teacher merely gave Susan a textbook.

“Which was great for me…I was so excited to create my own lessons.” Without the stress of end-of-level testing, Susan estimated that, “about 85 percent of the kids could care less about history, and probably more like 90 percent of the kids assume it is going to be boring.” The perception of student disinterest gave Susan the work and fun of trying to get the students “excited.” It was during student teaching that a student challenged Susan as “ain’t being no gangster” and leading Susan to prove the student wrong by writing a history rap on the Spanish American War and creating a, “Dr. Hot-Shizzle rapper thing.” Describing each time Susan did or does a rap or anything similar as being “crazy,” “life-changing,” and “enjoyable,” as history ceased to be, “the monotone thing that this person did,” Susan insisted that pop quiz scores after rapping lead to “excellent” results (particularly declaring “Boys will get it”). Identifying another significant event during the period, and referencing the student that challenged Susan into the rapping, Susan noted, “He frequently did not do well on tests,” but that on one occasion the student decided to come in for additional help, “which is very rare.” Feeling as though the training in theater helped in turning the history into a more comprehensible story, “I use that plot structure in general” and “I try to get maybe even more excited doing it,” with assisting the student. “I know the theater kind of
thing—storytelling—really helped to have things make sense.” Noting that this student then went on to score in the low A range, it, “was a really huge deal, and I remember thinking like to myself, oh I want to do that for all of my students.”

Looking for a career “either in the drama area or the history,” Susan admitted more initial interest in drama training, but insisted, “I would rather do the history” because, “when I see it taught it was so great.” Interviewing for the current job, “It was very stressful” because in the drama portion of the interview, “They asked me a question and I had no idea what they were talking about.” The history portion was, “all about today; which is not my forte…and I felt like I kind of low cut my way through it.” However, Susan was offered the position “almost right away after the interview.” Citing the student teaching as showing the students, “having gone from not liking history at all to being ok with it and liking it to now being engaged in it,” Susan immediately took the job. Citing the current job as a “dream job,” “wonderful,” and “exciting,” Susan is currently teaching American history, theater for one period, and during the “flex period” a “superheroes class” (previously discussed) because “it’s history,” and, “I love to be able to make those connections for that reason I am sneaky about how I throw in the history.”

Despite the enthusiasm as a teacher, Susan described a particularly low point during the first year of the teaching career. While trying to make history fun, joke around with the classes, and “not wanting the students to hate me,” there was a group of boys during a flex period (that was then being treated as a study hall for those students that were in the history class) that behaved poorly. Remembering, “All the kids in this class were just a pain and it was exhausting,” there was one in
particular who began to call her coach. Being a frustration to discipline, during one class period Susan reiterated that she was the teacher and the student’s behavior was not acceptable, to which the student responded, ‘you’re not our teacher, you’re our coach.’ “That hit me and it was like I have not been firm enough…It was a shift in how I did discipline. It doesn't matter if they are happy with me at that point in time.” Realizing that in the attempt to have them like her, Susan was not disciplining strong enough to maintain the environment for learning desired hit hard. “I might have gone home and cried, I don't know, but it was life changing in a sense that I changed how I do discipline.” Reestablishing the role as the teacher “first and foremost,” the experience ended up, “being a good thing; at the moment it was not.”

One event described as a critical event within the current teaching practice was trying a new practice called a fishbowl debate. Noting that every teacher does it a little different, Susan organized the room with about six students in the middle who are prepping a topic of some sort with the remainder of the class sitting around the periphery listening. Once someone comments in the middle, an observer on the outside periphery can tap them on the shoulder and go in to comment. There is only a small cadre of students that are allowed to discuss at a given time even though all can discuss if they come in wherever appropriate. Thinking “why not,” but wanting to ensure everyone participated, Susan set a requirement for each person to comment at least twice for a discussion about conscription. Prompting discussion through a variety of questions, Susan described the tactic as, “One of those instances where I was beginning to get the
students to apply into their own lives and make opinions on history and how really so important that is for them.” Ever since, “I have been on this kick of, they need to come up with their own opinions on history and they need to care, to apply it to their lives.” Susan saw this experience as a catalyst to incorporate in the social studies classes more, “inquiring questions that are more critical thinking not just knowledge based” on tests students create.

Another of the critical events related to technology came when Susan was introduced to a program called Utips (previously discussed) a few years back in her teaching practice. Susan recognized she was more of a traditional teacher in the preference for the whiteboard to computer technologies. “I don’t like PowerPoint.” But when introduced to the Utips program she thought, “I can use that in my classroom.” Noting that Susan’s current principal introduced her to the program and taught the class in only a one or two hour period, “I liked it because it was user friendly and I felt like I could understand; it wasn’t trying to use any special jargon.” Demonstrating how the user could make tests with easy formats, create class calendars with practice work for the students, find and integrate more films and clips, and run a type of blog system, “It just intrigued me so it made me want to go learn more about it; I have used it ever since.” Of particular note was the test-making feature that allowed Susan to set it up, save it, keep a bank of questions, and create practice quizzes for the students “I use all the time.” Identifying as a traditional person, Susan was “willing to add new change as long as it makes sense to me as it goes.” Seeing the program as beneficial with a good purpose in the classroom, Susan reiterated, “I have this whole big thing about
things that they need to have a purpose or why do I care if there is not a purpose?” Seeing the technology as, “beneficial to me and time saving and also beneficial to the students,” this has become something used and integrated on a regular basis.

Another technology integration identified as a high point followed along the lines of Susan’s history rapping from her prior related experience during her student teaching. Susan found two YouTube videos where people took two popular songs and changed the lyrics to reflect a historical time. The first video changed the lyrics of the song “Too Late to Apologize” as though it was Thomas Jefferson singing to King George for the Declaration of Independence. The second video changed the lyrics of the Lady Gaga song “Bad Romance” to discuss women’s rights. Calling them “just one of those little gems,” Susan noted that the entire history department now will always show them to the students because, “they are fun and funny entertaining, and they can relate to them because it is a spoof of a popular song” yet still “has all this funny historical stuff.” Being “out of the ordinary, but fun and still educational” these videos are “such a great way to get the students to like the history” that “always gets the kids excited.” Helping to “liven up the lecture” the high point videos remain integrated in the class.

Despite the high point being YouTube videos, the low point in the story was identified as being when you look up videos or find something else online and discover something inappropriate for the classroom when searching the Internet for videos or other information. “So there are always those fun little moments where you are like, that’s not what I put in.” However, a more poignant low point
identified was when Susan discovered a student had plagiarized, “just badly, like copy and pasted Wikipedia (an online user generated encyclopedia service); of all places you should not plagiarize.” Even worse than merely copying the Internet page, “it still had underlined parts like when you can click on the links; I mean it was bad.” Giving the student a week to rewrite, the student returned a paper on “the last day they possibly can,” and the paper sounded fine. But when Susan verified the work on the Internet, the student had merely found another article, “just a few links down from the Google search (an Internet search engine) word for word copied from the page.” Feeling the new plagiarism was, “almost an insult to my intelligence” the thought that after catching the plagiarism once, that Susan would not check it again, was seen as “really frustrating.” The student, “of course got a zero.” But Susan suggested, “at least go to the second page of results!” Knowing it was “not the technology that was bad,” Susan’s experience with the technology was still frustrating.

Noting that there have not been too many overwhelming turning points in Susan’s connection to technology, she did mention that having student teachers come into the classroom (where the student teachers are required to use technology all the time) had, “gradually changed me with the times and I added things here and there.” For example, Susan worked with one student teacher that had a, “fun little jeopardy (television quiz show) game, and I am not really sure how she did it.” While Susan was not positive of the changes that have occurred from having these student teachers, “it has been this gradual (hands motion pedantically from one side of the table to the other).”
Identified as an important, though unexpected, occurrence in Susan’s story and relationship to social studies, Susan went on a special trip to Washington D.C. with teachers. The trip included workshops and tours to enhance the teaching practice. Noting that “I don't love tours” as, “I want to read and not be guided” there was little excitement for the first few days of the trip where the tour took the teachers around town. However, when the group went to Lincoln’s summer cottage, the tour guide began to tell stories about Lincoln, “I had never heard before that made him very human.” Because Lincoln was, “not necessarily nice all the time” that changed Susan’s mind as, “she made him more real to me than the Lincoln I had ever experienced.” Suggesting that “everyone likes Lincoln” because of Lincoln’s accomplishments as president, Lincoln was now in Susan’s “top five because of that tour” that made Lincoln real, “like a real human being.” The experience helped remind Susan of the humanity of the presidents and the positive intentions for the country; even those like Andrew Jackson for which Susan holds little esteem. “I wasn't expecting that to happen ‘cause I don't like tours, but I was not expecting to suddenly have this new perspective.”

Taking the theme into an imagined positive future scene, Susan hoped that in five to 10 years she will be able to “make every little thing I teach actually really be applicable to their lives.” This hope carried the personal responsibility to constantly learn, as now Susan finds new articles, lesson plans, and books and thinks, “oh wow, I probably should have known that one.” Additionally Susan hopes that being able to have that knowledge will help in making the material more applicable to the students’ lives that, “will help benefit who they are as a
U.S. citizen and just in general in their community maybe making them want to vote.” But not merely to care about history enough to vote but to, “want to make history, that they care about what’s going on in their community, that they actually want to do things and be involved in movements.” Hoping that every student in the class will care about history, the feeling like the students can improve conditions “to be a positive thing” was believed to be possible through the telling of more history stories that can influence the student’s interest. To help that future scene, Susan also hoped to be able to, “have a blog that would be helpful for students,” with, “fun little history videos or really good places” that could also be home to history raps, student notes, and information to study. Referring to her freckles, Susan noted, “I call it a little historical freckle when something is important.” The blog would be called the “freckles blog” where things in the class are explained in “simply [Susan] terms.”

Negatively, the future scene centered on becoming a teacher that does worksheets all the time and, “goes through the motions because that is my job.” Hoping to never “burn out” or feel like teaching is a “get me out situation,” the hope was to remain positive and interesting throughout her entire career. “How many times have you heard of the boring history teacher? I never want to be the boring history teacher.” The focus of Susan’s positive scene encompassed the desire to engage students in a transformative interest in history toward application to themselves and the wider community. The negative scene was focused on Susan’s enthusiasm and the perception of being boring or giving up on commitments toward her career. With the technology, the future negative scene
was that the “students just think I’m an idiot because I can’t do technology.” The fear of falling behind and becoming ignorant to what people are talking about technologically remained a significant worry. She added that “my greatest fear” is that she will have something happen on the computer where it will crash, the grades will be lost, and there will be nothing that can be done to recover them because there is not a hard copy. With so many daily participation and mini assignment input into the computer all the time, the loss of the gradebook would cause Susan to “cry, I really would, a lot.”

Not knowing exactly where the event falls in the timeline of events, one low point in Susan’s technology story came, “back when people actually IM (instant message) more.” While conversing with a guy who Susan calls her “first love,” she brought up some concerns about the relationship. “And I basically was like, uh, I can’t continue.” Described as “probably my worst memory,” “sad,” kind of unfair,” “impersonal,” and “dumb,” Susan’s regret was not in the break up, but in the use of technology to do it. “That’s the thing too with technology is that you don’t have to meet them face to face and I feel like it would have been very hard for me to break up with him in person.”

Considering current technologies, Susan indicated that she had a cell phone and now has a smart phone, an iPad the school provided, “which is awesome,” and the increase from the single television in the home to multiple. Now each family member has his or her own laptop. While Susan only engaged in the “basics,” noting, “I can’t do nifty things, you know, like really crazy whatever,” Susan believed she has, “followed the times when it comes to technology.”
Influences to the Story

Among the identified positive reinforcements to her commitment story, Susan began with media influences noting, “Right now I am on this huge kick.” After visiting her sister a few months previous, Susan was encouraged to watch the *West Wing* (Sorkin, 1999-2006; a television presidential drama program), but expressed, “no desire whatsoever at all to watch this show” recalling, “growing up that was like the boringest TV show on TV, sadly.” However, after watching the first two episodes, Susan asked to, “just watch another one, and then just watch another one.” Harking back to the love of TV in general, and this show in particular, this show kept Susan’s, “lids glued to the computer as (she was) watching it.” More than simply finding interest in the show itself, it encouraged Susan to find out who current President Obama’s speech writer is, and purchase a text on the ghost writers in the White House. Recalling how now Susan will sit watching the show with her laptop open researching historical things they reference on the show, Susan stated, “I’m being honest, the *West Wing* has a little bit changed my life.” Turning to books Susan mentioned, “*All Quiet on the Western Front* changed my life,” along with *Warriors Don’t Cry*, *the Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, *the Great Gatsby*, and *Devil in the White City* that “all brought history alive to me and made me more passionate about different things.”

Beyond the media influences, Susan’s family remained the “biggest support in anything.” With her father a professor, sister recently earning a PhD and seeking employment as a professor, and her mother and brother both working as music teachers, Susan feels the family influence helped to always have, “a vision of the
importance of education.” With so many teachers in the family Susan explained that she also feels comfortable to “bounce ideas off them” and help to “pick up any of (her) bad day pieces,” noting that they are “one of (her) No. 1 helps.”

Additionally in her teaching practice Susan felt positive emotions toward the other teachers and the support of the administration. “I love all of the teachers…they have been very supportive.” Having the freedom to swap lesson plans and ideas with fellow department teachers Susan indicated they “get along really well.” Having the administration support, Susan admitted it is “intimidating” to be the youngest to teach in the department when the other teachers are “more knowledgeable,” but Susan felt like they, “actually ask my opinion all the time…and frequently will do what I suggest.” The students too have offered support and “daily encouragement.” Students will say, “You’re a good teacher. I learn more in your class than I ever learned in a history class. It’s moments like that that encourage me when I’m having a down time.” Such reassurance from the students, “is one of the things that I think is probably the biggest help and support.”

Finally, Susan mentioned that religion, as a member of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, “influences my teaching a great deal.” Susan’s religion is credited for providing “confidence” and “encouragement to try something new.” Noting that when, “I don’t know what to do about a certain situation I pray about it for me personally.” Reassuring that Susan is “not teaching religion in class” and “not breaking any rules or anything,” she added, “Everyone is shaped by their beliefs and who they are religiously.”
Thinking of the supports to Susan’s technology story, she identified four people primary to that interaction: mother, brother, sister, and a male friend who is, “super ridiculously good with computers” and “writes his own codes.” Remembering her mother has always been “pretty computer fabulous” from the early days of editing Susan’s papers and playing computer games, “When I was younger I would go to my mother.” However, as Susan grew, “My brother has actually become my go-to if I have questions.” Susan added her sister as “inspiring,” “awesome,” and, “the most incredible Google search person on the planet…a detective on the computer.” Susan’s sister helped Susan with blogging questions or ideas about what to do with the blog. Noting, “I hate to leave my father out” but “he gets it eventually.”

Nodding to the idea, “we could go TV show by TV show and I could talk for hours about each separate one and how they have developed me as a person,” Susan also noted that there are, “different technologies that made me want to go read certain books.” Yet, these books are more “focused on the people and what’s going on in their lives” than the technology present in those books. But comic books like *Iron Man*, and “how he uses technology” are “fascinating” and inspire about the value of technology. In an “age of technology” Susan feels it would “be crazy… to disregard and not try to use technology to benefit my teaching.”

Recognizing barriers exist to using technology in the classroom, Susan noted that one example is the response of the students to things integrated. For example, when Susan showed her students a video, if “I can tell almost immediately that they are falling asleep… I probably won’t use it again.” Additionally, PowerPoint
was identified as something that “messes” with students and, “I don’t feel it really engages the students.” Self-identifying as “a rather traditional person” that tries to “keep a lot of links to traditional teaching methods alive,” when people suggest a new online game or technology, “I don’t think much about it because I like how I (am) not always using the technology.” “I feel like my old school ideas get in the way of me always wanting to use technology.”

Susan observes that students surrounded by technology “feel like they need to be entertained at all times.” Within education, technology can “enhance things and it can be just a wonderful tool, but I also feel like it gets in the way.” Suggesting that people don’t “communicate as much as they used to” as they can craft the message or be hurtful, “it has created a whole new way of bullying and being horrible to each other.” Remembering her own guilt at being a TV viewer “every chance I get” and that occasionally you “need to get away from the meat,” that this entertainment culture means “some things are being lost,” including the decreased writing or the necessity to “read as much as they once were.”

The barrier within Susan’s commitment to social studies—beyond the technological barriers—was stated simply as “grading; seriously.” Having gone through materials several times, offered additional reviews, and still seeing students “getting certain questions wrong, I just want to be like, oh my gosh, really?” Even after offering the real quiz online the day before so that the students can practice and prepare, “in my like nine classes…only 12 students went online to take it…are you insane?” Calling it “frustrating,” “discouraging,” and “wondering why [they] don’t put effort into it” grading sat as a primary concern.
Adding to the grading issue, the “stressful worry” of “just not wanting to mess up… I don’t want to offend anyone,” the concern with bringing in materials and “(forgetting) there was some little swear word or something like that,” these barriers were identified as the “two main frustrations.”

**Interrelation of Stories**

Engaging the story from an overview graphic format can assist the reader in recognizing the essential and salient elements in the story that emerged from multiple narratives and repeated iterations. As a reminder, Figure 2 captures key scenes (rectangles shaded in grayscale), other events (rectangles), contextual influences (ovals), and expressed beliefs (round-edged rectangles). Dark solid lines represent temporal causality—for example, in Susan’s flowchart the solid line leading from the early memory to the key scene above it indicated that the key scene occurred after the early memory in the broad timeline of her story. The thin dotted lines capture the causality that Susan attributed to influences and events. For example, Susan’s low point scene related to the student challenging her as the coach rather than the teacher in the classroom. Susan used this as emblematic of how her position was to be teacher first and foremost; that it did not matter if the students necessarily liked her if they respected her and the position in the classroom. This belief was expressed in connection to this story and forms an important core element to how Susan viewed and learned from the experience. Note also on the flowchart that the key issue of concern was storytelling and this theme was so pervasive that the experiences where
relationships were specifically noted are marked with an asterisks rather than simply a series of lines. With the development of the flowchart, care was taken to include only information that was stated explicitly in the narratives to avoid any personal biases and introduced assumptions or interpretations of the data. The figure also helps to coalesce the salient elements of the narratives into a quick visualization that encapsulates the core components and related themes are correlated to the additional experiences in Chapter 7.

Figure 2: Correlated flowchart for Susan Haynes case study
Legend: Boxes=events, shaded boxes=key events, smoothed boxes=barriers or supports, circles=beliefs, solid lines=timeline of events, dashed line=relationships.

A few key points to observe as a reader are the centrality of storytelling to the nature of the story Susan related. Even when discussing the relationship to technology, Susan connected with the tools as they are able to enhance her ability to tell stories. From relating to the stories shared in class and within popular
culture, to the ability to extend the sharing of stories via a technological means, such as the historical “freckles blog;” each technology was prized for what stories are provided. Second, with the development of Susan’s story, the attachment to the subject, to new tools, and alternate methods were immediately drawn from a personal engagement with stories. From family members to college professors, television to personal writing, Susan related powerful narratives, personal connections, and influences to the teaching practice through how a connection was created by stories. Third, theater, technology, and people within the story are included based on how well they aid in furthering her work as a storyteller evenly spaced over the timeline of the story.

**Goals and Purposes of Social Studies**

Within the framework of social studies, Susan identified the subjects of sociology, history, economics, psychology, and political science, in addition to non-traditional social studies subjects such as English, art, and “theatrics,” as finding place within the curriculum, before clarifying the classroom was “basically the study of humans” with history as the core of the curriculum; based on teaching U.S. history. “I would say U.S. history, geography, and U.S. government would be the staples… and I stick to the staples.” Identifying several purposes for social studies education, Susan listed multiple ideas about the “needs for it” (numbers added for discussion):

1. “I believe that to really fully understand who you are, and why you think the way you think, and how you will be able to progress is having a
good understanding of your past and realize what shapes you and I over a very broad scale being aware of what has gone before. (2) Planning for your future is knowing how things happened in the past….including an appreciation for those who had gone on before, and be part of building a better community. (3) I think overall social studies allows us to become more familiar with how we work as human beings, and then we understand people; I think it promotes just a little bit more of a kindness in the human race the more that they are familiar with what is going on or what has gone on. (4) There is the government aspect of social studies and it is good to know how your government works and how it functions…. Hopefully we are helping the students to become eventually good standing citizens to go and vote like they should, and do things for the community and that sort of thing; being a good citizen.”

Adding that “when we understand people then we less likely to fear them, and less likely to do horrible things,” the hope with understanding people is increasing “people’s tolerance.” Yet, “an appreciation for those who have gone before,” a “gratitude and acknowledgement” was important for the lessons we could gain; both “great and horrible.”

**Evans’ Model Connection**

While there are four major themes identified in Susan’s expressed beliefs about goals and orientations of social studies, all four essentially are about building better individuals within the society. Within Evans’ (2010) model the
first thought expressed (following the first orientation of Evans’ model) is that history was the core of the curriculum and subject—although Susan noted several others that find inclusion in studying people. However, all four of the stated reasons for the education follow the third orientation of social efficiency with students learning about and blending into a controlled and efficient society, preparing students for various life roles. Rather than halt there, the second reason listed hints at the fifth orientation of Evans’ model toward transforming society. There are not only blended and efficient members of society, but potentially transformative members of the society. Outside of the three orientations from the Evans model, much of the discussion is not only centered on the social efficacy, but the individual betterment of the student—the idea of a rounded student being independently better through a study of the past.

Noting the traditional nature of how Susan viewed her own teaching, beyond the historical inquiry element of the new C’s framework published by NCSS (2013), Susan fell within the blended orientations outlined within that guide for teaching in the classroom. However, the additional construct of individual improvement is significant to note beyond the obvious bounds of the two constructs evaluated.

**Philosophies That Underpin Practice**

Identifying the underpinning philosophies, Susan stated, “My philosophy is that it has to matter to the students, they have to be able to apply it to their own life.” Feeling as though often the push is to, “just kind of throw information at
them…but why should they care?” Recalling that the first few years of teaching, Susan felt “like I have got to get this information in; they (the students) have just got to know it.” The feeling has shifted even from simply enjoying the class and material to, “we should care about it.” Seeing history as repetitious, “The past just repeats over and over again,” even an awareness of the past was not seen as sufficient. “It’s not about knowing it, what does that prove? It is about what is the purpose of our knowing it.” Referencing religious beliefs as part of Susan’s “love of people and trying to understand where they are coming from,” part of this drive to understand history is based on the thought that “we can be more loving and caring and better neighbors building community.”

Adding to the application concept, Susan expressed “the importance of respecting human beings and accepting each other despite whether or not you agree with them.” The ability to be exposed to two opposing views shaped, “a lot of why I think history is important,” and helps, to “build respect when things don’t go your way … Every single problem we have ever, ever had has resulted from a lack of respect for somebody else or someone else’s way of doing things.” Allowing people to realize it is okay to have thoughts and opinions different from others in their family or friends is important to Susan, and “History teaches that all the time.”

Looking at technology, Susan declared that technology is, “vital to progression and moving forward in the country.” But she also felt “some frustrations about it.” Noting that growing up, Susan was more connected with the community and knew all the neighbors. She is now distanced and expressed that
technology has, “caused us to kind of stick into our homes.” Yet, “I know things are going to change, [so] there is no need to be upset about it.” Feeling willing, “to give it a shot,” and that she has “tried to keep up with the technology,” there was no “strong belief” about technology Susan identified except to say, “I feel fine with technology for the most part.” As the previous predilection for “traditional methods” in the classroom and a generalized disinterest when presented with new technologies in the classroom was already discussed, there appears to be a general feeling of overt admiration, and an appreciation for the utility of technology, but a feeling that the current association with technology is within contemporary, though “basic” acceptability.

Teaching Practice Represented

Bringing in a black windbreaker jacket that has “Director” printed in large bold letters across the back, Susan began to share and reiterate the history rap experiences as one way she tried to bring history to life for the students. Referring back to the story shared of the Hispanic student that accused her of not being gangster—leading to writing the rap for the Spanish-American War—Susan reiterated the success the students had on the pop quiz after the rap as opposed to before it as a sign, “they could relate to it so they would be more interested in the information and willing to pay attention to it.” Declaring that Susan hated when a class became “boring, monotonous;” her aim was to “try to bring the history alive, and the rapper jacket is just one way that I bring history to life.” Noting that now there are additional raps for the New Deal and the Civil Rights Movement, they
are integrated, “usually after the lecture…before the assignment is given.” “Gets them jazzed, like all of a sudden they are awake again and working; so it’s good.” Recognizing student reactions are mixed, despite the previous statement, Susan added:

They will say, “Can we record this?” and I am like, no, that's ok. Although some of them have; can’t get 'em all. Especially students, if they have had me before for A and now they have me for B, they get really excited for the other student who have not ever experienced it and will say like, she is gonna rap; it's really cool. My favorite is their different facial expressions when I get into my mode. Some are just kinda, what is she doing? Others are really happy. So I get a lot of really good facial responses, everyone perks up. No one is sleeping. No one is looking bored. They all are just like, what is this crazy person doing? I get a lot of like laughter, you know, but everyone's focused, everyone's there. When I'm lecturing you can have students that will be there doodling or sleeping etc., but not, not when I do a history rap, they are all fully awake.

Explaining how the method is exemplary of Susan’s style of teaching, she said, “I try to bring the history to life when I am lecturing. I try to do more stories…add animation and character to things.” Noting that bookwork with study guides are not the main source of teaching in the classroom, Susan’s focus, the “main source of teaching is lecture and being animated.” Attempting to be out of the ordinary and fun, her teaching consisted of “telling a story, bringing things to life, and trying to get their attention.”
Comments on Teaching

Outlining the typical day in the classroom, students entered to some form of “bell-ringer kind of activity, whether it is a journal entry or have them read an article and answer some questions, something like that.” Then a lecture was presented on the topic, and there was an activity to go with that intended to reemphasize whatever topic was lectured. Those activities included “a writing assignment, or a reading assignment, or even a drawing assignment like a political comic strip, a cartoonish thing…something that helps reinforce.”

Upon watching the observation, noting a sense of improvement at the way she was able to manage and control the class, Susan observed, “There is such a difference from when I very first started teaching and how I’m teaching now.” Observing specifically when questions are initiated, “I’m glad that students start talking to one another and say, oh, I remember this…I do think it sparked them to be thinking and talking about a particular topic.” Noting the importance of the storytelling connection, she acknowledged that she will frequently share stories of events she remembers, things she has learned, her reaction to the events because “I feel like if I can relate to history then they can learn how to relate too.” Noting that students will have a tendency to “get off-task,” “lose focus,” and “chat” Susan will try to bring in articles that are “boring” to read as a class so that she can ask questions to keep the students’ attention more. Calling that a “horrible” idea, the hope was to have “better or more exciting articles” as the one read during the observation, “just wasn’t that entertaining.” Susan added that the questions also are a check for understanding during those challenging articles and
helps the students to remember by hearing it multiple times. Although part of the lesson included a worksheet Susan rebuffed the idea that worksheets are common stating, “I only have a couple every trimester; I always feel like students get more when I’m lecturing.”

Having seen areas for improvement, Susan mentioned a desire to do more specific calling on individuals to respond to elicit, more varied responses even though trepidation toward that approach centered on the emotion of not wanting students to “feel like I don’t like when she calls on me.” Throughout the interview watching herself teach, Susan would make comments such as “A little sway…I do that all the time….my eyes get really big, it’s funny…my hair looks great…Oh my gosh I looked like my sister there;” showing quite a bit of focus on the visual of herself teaching (mannerisms, movements, gesticulations) more than some of the methods and practices of teaching. Other comments related to content included “I keep saying ‘exciting,’ I want them to know that it’s exciting… I need to speak slower on some parts so I don’t almost say things wrong…it is smart to have them read at the end of the year, on task, because they get off…see that is when I just called on someone…,” showing a critical eye to the personal practice and a justification of the instructional practice. However, with some critical moments and statements about her practice, each time the video stopped her comment was that the moment was “pretty typical” for what would be seen on a regular basis in the classroom.
Essence of Experience

Throughout the interview sets, the common thread that emerged and was consistently reiterated was the idea that the students need to like and apply history—which for Susan was woven through the constructs of storytelling. Establishing her own connection to history through the storytelling of her family, impactful teachers, TV shows (all about the character development), and even the impactful tour guide—that helped to kindle a love for Lincoln because he came alive through stories of his humanity—stories were the critical thread to the way Susan perceived history, and the way Susan saw most valuable to pass along the love of history.

Ironically, the engagement with technology was derided for being something that has conditioned students to always feel they should be entertained, but the selection of materials and teaching methods was partly based on the level of entertained engagement students’ display in the classroom. Even Susan’s own personal usage was centered on the love of TV, the interest that medium of storytelling would engender within her, and the degree she personally interacted with those characters. As Susan used the technology personally for other tasks, she only referred to the use of the computer, a device used for the creation of fictional stories (novels and plays), and for investigating things of interest generated from TV shows and that can be entertainingly integrated into the classroom because the form of storytelling utilized is “fun and engaging.” Beyond the technologies used either for the consumption or creation of stories, only a
smart phone found application in her life—and even that was not something initially valued or desired.

Taking into account the methods cited for the classroom, from the history raps to the fishbowl discussion, the focus of the selected engagement methods with students were related to telling the stories in ways that entertain students, a frustration about the technology-obsessed youth culture, into caring about the stories of history. This was even discussed in relation to the nature of how YouTube videos or other content was integrated; if students responded favorably it would be integrated into the class, while if they looked bored (i.e. did not engage with the shared content in the form of that storytelling mode) that would cease to be used in the future. Even Susan’s focus on the use of lecture as the way students are able to “get more” from the class highlighted that the passion for history came from the act of storytelling, and is best passed along through the act of storytelling in a manner that ideally will entertain, be fun, and engage the students into a utilization of the content in their lives. While Susan would engage in what was derisively identified as traditional methods centered on classroom lecture, peppered with activities of a more “progressive” nature, the lecture for Susan was entirely in line with her connection to history as a discipline. This connection includes the elements of storytelling that compose the essential core elements of that subject, and the most efficacious means of transmitting that material and engaging the students within that genre of information. Conceivably, this is also why there is such confluence in the job position being connected to both the comic book class (the elective course Susan created to teach 20th century
history through popular culture), using the medium of comic book storytelling to engage the students in the historical context, and role as the theater teacher (an entire art sub-discipline devoted to the performing art of portraying stories through acting and re-enactment).

Susan’s vision for the goals and purpose of social studies education also fit within the pattern of her storytelling ideology. Having the students care about the stories themselves, be able to apply the history to their lives, and enhance their understanding and engagement with the wider world, were related to the nature of how Susan felt life was enhanced through the understanding of lives of those around her. Believing that people will become more tolerant, less prone to doing negative actions, and more loving generally, all stem from the idea that a wider comprehension of the stories of those people, the historical antecedents, and influences on their thought processes. Even Susan’s belief outside the realms of the typical orientations related to the personal betterment of each student through the study of history was a fundamental grounding philosophy to the approach in the classroom, in life, and in her hope for each student centered within storytelling.
CHAPTER 6

CASE STUDY: ADAM CAMPBELL

Chapter Six begins with a retelling of the story of Adam Campbell combining all the interviews into a fluent storyline. The story includes the barriers and affordances present in Adam’s words about his orientation. Like the previous case, this timeline includes Adam’s connections to technology embedded within the story as technology played a significant role in Adam’s life and the nature of how Adam engaged his teaching practice. Afterwards, a visual correlation of the connections of the story and the influences are presented. The chapter ends with a description of the essential statements from the experience of the story—the essence. An analysis of the case in light of the additional case studies is conducted and presented in Chapter 7.

Background to the Case

Adam teaches in a rural school district in the largest population center of that county. Although Adam earned a bachelor’s degree in history education, he also has a master’s degree in anthropology with a special emphasis in folklore and culture, a special education certificate and licensure, and serves as an AP history instructor. Adam has worked within the school of current employment for the last 10 years teaching AP world history and sociology, comprising the whole of the professional teaching day within the public schools. Adam previously taught special education and world studies.
Timeline of the Story

Beginning the story within Adam’s childhood experience, Adam observed that technology was “a constant in my home growing up;” partly because his father was an electronics repair man for television, video cassette recorders (VCRs) and that kind of technical work for employment. Possessing a television in every room, “except the bathroom, my mom forbade that,” TV “was always on” and was an “important [technology] in life in general.” Assuming the electronics were safe enough, the family was able to keep “the jerry-rigged MacGyver style stuff that my dad would never give back to a customer because it was a major fire hazard.” As a teenager, Adam’s father would pay him to take apart and fix some of the electronics. Without being able to identify an earliest memory with technology, the TV was viewed as “ubiquitous back then” being on when the family was home and even when the family left the house; “whatever we did the TV was on.”

Declaring himself on the “later end of the early adopters; when the early adopters get bored and start to sell, that’s who I buy it from,” Adam indicated a key event with technology came when a friend had a computer in the parent’s bedroom and the two friends would get together to play King’s Quest. While the two friends would only play for about an hour a day, the game was significant as, “That’s how I learned to type.” Adam observed that he can type about 75 words a minute with less than five mistakes. Further, the friend’s computer and his own family computer taught Adam to be comfortable with computers. Adam’s family had a Commodore 64 that his father purchased for his mother for business and
insisted that the family would not have games, but Adam was, “the only one who ever used it because (I) was the only one who would spend the time to figure it out.” Learning how to program it, despite his father’s insistence, Adam played games on it and his mother ran out and bought a game for it the very first day it was plugged in. “I remember my dad plugging it in and sticking in a disk and waiting, and waiting…” Remembering that during that generation of computers when the user purchased a game, the user “constantly had to update your hardware.” Adam learned to update the hardware on the computer to accommodate. Stating that this experience “was back before playing video games was cool” and “required technical know-how” and a “little bit of programming”, the experiences are viewed as “increasing my nerd cred” now but “led to some miserable experiences back in junior high…being a computer nerd wasn’t exactly a thing…” Despite that, merely having a computer “was like we were in the future or something, there was a computer in our house!”

Thinking back on social studies, Adam related the earliest memory of social studies being “incredibly negative.” In a seventh grade state history course, he mentioned that there could have been “great history” pieces, including native people, mountain men, Spanish explorers, Western wagon trains, Jim Bridger, WWII, and everything that followed from there. “But somehow, and I still don’t know exactly how, but my teacher managed to make it the most boring stuff on the planet.” Recalling sitting in “the left row, second seat from the back” near a curtain divider with another classroom designed for the older school that allowed for the curtain to open and share materials with the other class, “no one actually
did because it didn’t work at all.” From that seat position though, Adam was close enough to the curtain to lean on it, “and push it into the other classroom and they’d lean back…that’s what I remember about it. I remember being really bored and pushing on the curtain.” Continuing the theme with technology in the classroom Adam mentioned that as early as seventh grade he could recall watching Channel One News [a soft news and advertising program] but even though he was underwhelmed with the technology integration, the school had TV; which was significant. In the eighth grade a teacher put on Guns of Navarone, [Foreman & Thompson, 1961; a WWII film] that caused Adam to think, “This is the single most boring moment of my entire life.” The first time Adam felt that technology was effectively used in the classroom was in high school with Channel One when the teacher sat on the edge of the desk with the TV above her and explained what was happening on the screen. The event was Russian tanks shelling the parliament building in 1991, as “We were watching Communism fall.” “That was amazing; that was really good. It was just a great moment.” Otherwise Adam remembered watching movies through the rest of high school career ranging from 1776 (Warner & Hunt, 1972) to Attack of the Killer Tomatoes (DeBello, 1978), where “some were good…[and others] I don’t know why we did that in a social studies class.”

Adam felt that his story with social studies “really started in high school.” Having “hated every social studies class I ever had” until a ninth grade geography teacher Adam felt the beginning of positive associations. Adam’s connection to the subject continued with a “good history teacher in 10th grade.” Referring to the
teacher as a “great teacher” four more times while thinking on the experience, Adam would continue with the teacher for history and government during the high school years, “so when I got to college it was a natural thing” to continue with the subjects.

Beginning the college experience, Adam declared his initial major in anthropology, “and then dreamed of being an archeologist and doing all this great stuff.” However, the way the university was run shifted the educational direction. When an influx of money came in for the university, “We wanted it to go to our teaching professors,” but the school wanted it to go to the football coach, as Adam recalls it. “We actually held some protests, and because of that, public employees, their salaries are public record.” Taking advantage of the public record, Adam looked up the salary of the department head, “and she made $32,000 to $34,000 a year, which is less than my mom made teaching high school.” Thinking that was “ridiculous” to be in the career for so little compensation Adam thought, “I don’t want to do this for no money, so I decided instead I’d just teach high school, because that is the part that I liked.” Having worked as an undergraduate teaching fellow, “and I’d kind of help people with classes,” Adam decided to switch to another university to gain a second degree in history teaching—“Honestly because I had the most credits in that” based on taking “every spare class” in folklore focused on history.

Looking at technology, outside of a few videos, “I don’t think I saw technology used that much at the university.” This comment included a geology professor “who showed me how not to use PowerPoint,” because the professor
would create and read the text to the class. “He wouldn’t comment on them. He wouldn’t tell stories about them—he would read them to us.” It was not until student teaching that Adam would see technology used by a “geography teacher that had a gift.” Using videos “different than anybody I had ever seen before,” the teacher would show a clip for three to four minutes, pause and discuss, and make it a “video lecture.” Commenting that the first year teaching had “basically nothing” by way of technology besides a projector, Adam “finagled” for the classroom, the technology in the classroom, and the methods for effective integration have been learned and worked with along the way.

Sharing a significant story within the interaction with technology Adam noted that one day his sister was chatting on the Internet, and—after giving the sister a little grief—the siblings set up a profile for Adam so he began chatting with people online too. Always searching for girls, Adam began chatting with a lady from Florida that moved out to where he was. Adam subsequently dated, engaged, and married her. “You might think it was something sweet but actually it’s just humorous because I can’t stand doing things like chatting strangers online.” Seeing the event as not “fitting my personality at all” and “hilarious,” Adam laughed that his wife’s first words were “Who are you?” And the second words were, “Why are you talking to me?” Seeing the experience as an example of a willingness to try new things, Adam remarked that even “if I’m probably not going to like it, I’m willing to try it.” This experience is another example of the way technology has always played a pivotal role in Adam’s life.

It was during this time while working on the anthropology degree that Adam
shared a critical event in the story. Engaged in a folk material culture, a class described as “great” and “loved,” all the students were asked to bring in couch cushions and build something because the students had been learning about “children’s vernacular architecture.” Constructing, “like kids do” a structure, “the others all made forts; we made a pirate ship.” While “incredibly fun,” having the ship “raided,” and the three in the group throwing cushions at each other, the discussion after the activity was focused on what it meant for children to engage in such activities and how the activities fit into the child’s development. “And I remember thinking there for a moment, this is everything that I like.” Mixing psychology, human development, “a little bit of why people do what they do, a little bit of just fun, a bit of…and that’s the moment that I think I became destined to become a social studies teacher.” Thinking “if I can give my kids that moment, then…."

With this newfound commitment now moving into a master’s degree, Adam explained that while in that degree he learned to approach social studies in a different way. “I think that’s where it really changed for me from an experience of ‘this is what happened’ to where you go and explore what that happening means.” Without identifying a singular event as causing that turning point to occur, it was learning the skill and perspective that “changed my focus than any particular instance.” However it was during this turning point degree that Adam learned “if you get too narrowly focused, you’re just wasting your time.” This reinforced a belief discussed later that favors the focus on themes and concepts within history rather than detailed fact-based memorization.
Also while working on a master’s degree, Adam worked as a teacher’s assistant for a week-long seminar with a major folklorist, who in the recanted memory was an expert in pop culture. Utilizing YouTube and the film *Rize* (LaChapelle & Hawker, 2005; a documentary film about urban dance) in the classroom, the moment was viewed as key in the story as the class was the first time Adam had seen someone use “video as a primary document really effectively, besides my ninth grade teacher who may not have meant to.” Adam now referenced the event as the inspiration behind the use of videos like primary documents in the classroom. Seeing the class as an effective training because of the utility and immediate applicability of the method in the classroom, “I realized I could use it right then, right there, its something you can do really fast, something you can do really easily, or you could stretch it out, you could compact it, you could do whatever.”

During this period a turning point related to technology emerged from Adam’s best friend; “a computer guy.” Always taking the computer over to the friend as frequently as it would break, Adam’s friend would assist in repairing it; though, “he’d always make me kind of figure it out.” But one day the friend flatly refused to ever help Adam again in fixing the computer as the friend said, “You’re smart enough, do it yourself, you don’t need my help.” From that point on Adam, “started learning a great deal more about technology” so he could fix things himself. “It changed me from being the guy who kind of knows to the guy who does know,” adding that if other teachers ask Adam to fix things and he does not know how, Adam will figure it out for the teachers. Adam refers to this event as
the “shift in my interaction with technology” from being, “the friend of an expert or the son of the expert, to I can do it.”

Beginning a teaching career in special education, Adam’s skill in quantitative research from studies in anthropology made Adam “the only person who could understand the tests and norm referencing and all that…in our school.” However, not long into his teaching career, positions opened up in history, “and I liked that subject better so I switched over.” He began by teaching geography. After a year of that a call from the vice principal indicated an AP (advanced placement) teacher was retiring. “So I thought, yeah, that would be cool.” After teaching AP European history “for a few years,” Adam’s current position is teaching AP world history. Identifying the switch from being a “normal teacher to being an AP teacher” as a significant event within the story, Adam noted that it was as significant as any other major shift in what a teacher does within the schools—such as a switch from middle school to high school, or from U.S. history to European history and then to world history. Noting the significance was partly “because it is a lot more work,” Adam remembered after leaving special education to teaching “your average history,” a week after school began he graded all the papers, had all lessons planned, and still had half of the prep period remaining, “I was like, what do I do?” Now Adam has essays to grade, calls coming in, planning to do. “So it’s much more involved, it’s almost like that’s what I eat, and breathe, and sleep.”

Even while busy in the teaching position, Adam recalled the significance of getting a second job at a treatment center as a positive unexpected event in the
connection to social studies. While discussing a shortage of money after Christmas with his wife, an email came to all high school history teachers. “And I thought, I could do the treatment center.” Noting Adam’s special education license and certification, the position kept Adam “firmly in the quantitative too, kept me better at psychology.” Adam mused, “I didn’t expect to love doing that as much as I do; it surprises me.” Adam observed that “I’ve started to approach things very differently” and that “I see the practical in all this historical stuff I teach.” Because of the work at the treatment center, that has also “made (him) more tolerant of the kids, which in turn has made (him) more tolerant of those in history who made really dumb mistakes.”

Within this work environment Adam used technology to share current events with the class at the treatment center that will “always start with the news” as for him “it is a natural way for them to apply” history to the student’s current life. Harking back to the experience of integrating Channel One into the classroom Adam recalled that many teachers complained about integrating the news as, “We’ve got to teach Homer instead…. which seems ridiculous to me now.” Considering curricular inclusion, Adam reiterated the belief that history is “only important if it applies to the present, otherwise it has no value.” Described as a high moment in his teaching with technology story, one day Adam provided the news at the treatment center (a facility that helped students gain some life skills). After providing the three news stories and a human interest story (presumably someone accomplishing something impressive) to close the news segment of class, a discussion “about why he chose to do those things” and “what he had to
do to get ready to do those things” emerged. After discussing the little choices that led the performer to be the best in the world at that performance, the next day one of the students “didn’t hang out with his buddies for an extra half an hour, instead he went and practiced.” Suggesting that it really hit the students because the students, “came up with this, I didn’t come up with this, I wasn’t preaching this to them.” The idea that the real goal is to give the students “some life skills, helping them function, especially where they are so dysfunctional at the moment” became a poignant moment in Adam’s work.

With technology during this time, Adam listed another high point was when he completed a webpage training by a “great” though “random science teacher” that “didn’t know much more about it than I know right now,” but nevertheless taught the Dream Weaver (a web authoring software package) class. Commenting that engaging the program took “forever to learn,” afterwards Adam created the webpage and went back to visit the analytics. The observation that people had been using the website was positive. The year prior to the interview, Adam shared about one girl that emailed to thank Adam for the website as she passed the AP class because of the materials Adam put online. “And that’s it right there. Wahoo!” Believing in the ability to impact his environment with technology, Adam stated, “I see the problem, and figure out a solution, and I do it…I’m very pragmatic.”

However, during this period not all Adam’s experiences were described as positive. One identified low point came while working as an English resource teacher and working with a state-created testing aid designed to help students
prepare for the core testing. After spending hours in planning and preparing to get “everything perfect just for the kids,” the students tried to log into the site and it was down. The state had taken it down, “and it happened twice in two weeks, and I checked it every so often since then.” Suggesting the site may be functional now, “after about a year I thought, ‘this is useless.'” Observing that there is “nothing more frightening than standing in front of a group of adolescents and realizing that you have absolutely no plan whatsoever,” Adam added that now “I always have a back-up plan” so that if the school burned down he could teach outside, and could teach with or without a book. “I could teach my class whatever, I can handle it.”

This need for back-up was reiterated with another low point while teaching physical geography to AP students. Having had GS [global satellite] training in a physical geography course previously, Adam decided to take five to six hours setting up a map of sub-roads with a series of questions that could be asked, as the suggested lesson was, “some kind of introductory really dumb thing that was really easy.” Taking the students into the computer lab for the lesson, however, the district had blocked the URL. “So, I was sitting there, like, I don’t have another plan…my first year teaching AP history, I don’t know what else to do.” Despite being able to find a way around the block through search engines to find the lesson, the experience was described as “absolute terror,” “frustration,” “anger,” and “emblematic of a systemic failure,” because, the “network does not work half the time, and yet they (the district personnel) seem to just sit around and block stuff. Sometimes I wonder.” Seeing that the administration “wants us to use
this stuff, this new technology, and then they block it,” the experience was seen as simply one that “represents so many other low points that come from the same reason.”

Identifying a high point in his story, while acknowledging the difficulty was picking one story to share as “there are quite a few,” Adam indicated that once a year the school makes a trip to the state capitol. Faculty and students see the legislature and other important sites. Having the students ask questions that are “intelligent and insightful, and show that they understand why this matters” as well as questions that “reflect what I taught them,” remains a significant event. With 25 students on the most recent trip the group was exploring and encouraged to stop and ask questions. While on the top floor of one of the buildings while observing the names on the doors and the occupant’s accomplishments, one student began to draw comparisons “to the state government and national government, and between the national government and Britain’s government and then Russia’s government and others,” all of which had been discussed in class. As the students began to discuss and contribute with each other, “they were thoroughly entertained for 15 minutes…and they got it.” Suggesting that whatever these students decide to do, the students will be able to succeed—and could go on to be brain surgeons, or build bridges, or become president. When the day comes he suggested his excitement and said, “I’m going to sit and be like, yes, I did that.”

Even more recently, within two months of the interview, a turning point emerged that reinforced that, “This is a field that really affects people on a
Completing a master’s degree in American Shoshoni Indians and the nature of how those that converse with the press recall [a massacre] differently than another family in the tribe, Adam became close to the tribe. Even as it has been years since the first set of interviews for the research, Adam was recently contacted to conduct more with the tribe members, “because they don’t trust anyone else.” Feeling “weird to me” to hold that place of trust for these families he added, “I wish I didn’t, I wish they’d talk to other people, but I understand why they don’t.” Remarkng that the field itself is not “esoteric…deep down in their heart of hearts it affects who they are,” for Adam it “really nails down” how important the personal connection is. Taking the experience into the classroom Adam noted that every single person is important, has a story, and carries special interactions in “somebody’s world.” So one goal is to teach students to “function in that world” so they can fulfill a role. Declaring his job to teach these 15-year-old students to have empathy, Adam felt he needs to teach them to “sit back and think why these people did what they did” rather than “think these people were dumb” for what the historical actors did in the past.

Viewed as an unexpected event within the technology story, the way Adam’s classroom acquired technology over time was viewed as a positive surprise. This year with grant funding coming into the school for technology, the parents and administrators determined that the school should buy iPads for the classroom; “which if I had been on the committee I would have been like, ‘No.’” But as the principal asked “Who wants an iPad?” Adam took one and then asked, “heck, free iPad, what could I use it for?” Calling it now a “rather useful piece of technology”
Adam found a way to create and edit 15-minute video reviews for the classroom that take only 25 minutes to create; “so that surprised me.” Adam also mentioned the Promethian Board [interactive whiteboard] that was originally purchased for the faculty meetings that was stored in his classroom when not used for the other functions. “So that kind of surprised me and I can do a great deal more with that.”

Stating that “in my grand story they’re not really important,” as Adam still preferred his desktop computer for Internet searching and the iPad to carry his planner rather than the Kindle Fire he had been using, the large impact is in the reaction of colleague teachers. “Other teachers walk by, and they’re like, ‘holy cow, it’s like the bridge of the Enterprise in there…what’s he doing next?’”

Carrying the extensive technology story into a turning point, which harkens back to a previous turning point where he acquired self-efficacy by a computer friend to repair computers independently, Adam’s history department was able to save up their money for years and eventually purchase 50-inch platinum TVs for the classroom to mixed reviews. “One lady refused to get a new TV” and “one guy will use it if it’s available and simple enough.” Adam’s job was to set up all the TVs for the other teachers despite the trepidation. The process included running cables and making adaptations for other teachers, such as running the video inputs through a “switcher so (they) could still use the VCR that (they) had with the new technology.” Adam realized he “knew more about this than (he) felt like (he) knew.” Discussed as a turning point “in relationship between me and my colleagues because of technology” it was also a turning point “because I started
feeling much more comfortable while using technology…and so I started using it more often.”

Adam observed a particular low point came the week of the interview when another teacher yelled at Adam in the hall. While electing not to give specifics of the altercation, Adam suggested that much has changed in the approaches to teaching social studies in 30 years. With the district now requiring common assessments, “We are dealing with people like me who received a graduate degree in 2005 versus people who received their degrees in the 70s…I’m not sure we can make them mesh.” Adam felt that he is “not going to be able to accomplish any of those (good) things (for students in the classroom)” until that person finally retires. Providing the example of giving students a primary document and seeing how the students interpret the document—with many acceptable approaches and interpretations possible—another method of teaching is through giving students a set of dates. Meaning, “they’re not thinking and… I think my job is to get them to think…that (other teacher) is interfering with my ability to do my job.” The conflict was based in both what and how to teach most effectively, but the nature of the conflict implied an ontological and pedagogical disconnect within the department as a whole.

Carrying the idea into a positive future scene, Adam envisioned a class where the teacher has a “skeleton,” “bare structure,” “structured for the kids,” where “[students] can decide what they want to include.” Allowing the students to state what they want to investigate, to interact, and then come back and share what they learned and how it is applicable to the social sciences, Adam described this model
as, “structured perfectly on the latest kind of thing.” Based in what was referred to three times as something he “firmly believes,” the idea that “everyone likes the social sciences, everyone enjoys it, everyone finds it interesting…,” the question for Adam’s teaching resides in, “Can I find what that person finds interesting?”

Perhaps not surprisingly, based on the last two paragraphs of his story, the negative future scene that “frightens me the most,” was the idea of having more faculty come in who “won’t consider any alternate ways of teaching” and that there will be a common assessment that is “a collection of randomized facts that will basically require me to teach a collection of randomized and stupid facts.” Stating he was “really afraid” and “scared” the district or state will mandate that, Adam feared he would be kept from “teaching like big picture and essential questions.” Should something like that occur, Adam viewed himself coming in and typing up a “lovely letter of resignation—or switching to physics…I could teach physics.”

Viewing a positive scene for the integration of technology into the classroom for the future, the idea Adam had was to “flip my classroom.” Students would go home and watch the lecture materials on YouTube and then come back to the classroom the next day where “I have all kinds of other technology I can pull in and mesh together to create something pretty awesome.” Feeling the method was something Adam wanted to attempt in the coming school year—if he could find the time and the new principal was willing to entertain the notion—Adam felt unless “they invent a transporter and I can go wherever I want, I can’t think of any better...” usage for the technology.
Envisioning a negative future scene with technology, Adam created a scenario where he enters the class and is teaching “some minutia that I don’t think matters” and the students are not “really going to find it all that interesting… and I can’t get them back…I can’t even get them to connect in the first place…” Viewing attention spans as getting shorter, “so that kids are completely unable to focus on anything that matters at all,” the attitude of “Why should I learn anything if I can just look it up?” was viewed as becoming more prevalent and concerning as a byproduct of the technology-obsessed culture.

Influences to the Story

Referring back to his education degree, Adam felt “the most important social science is anthropology, because that to me sums up most of the others.” From ethno-history to geography, economics to psychology, Adam felt he approaches all the social sciences from the perspective of an anthropologist—focused on the humanities. “I know that everyone in this entire building would disagree with me, but I think that’s the key one.” Referring to anthropology, the centrality of that subject within his history instruction is unique.

Among those positive reinforcements to his commitment to social studies, Adam highlighted a folk narrative professor who was “the perfect social scientist,” as he was “always learning in a very tolerant way.” Described as “darn close to the single greatest influence,” the teacher’s influence led Adam to teach students “that my cardinal rule is tolerance.” Working at the treatment center, Adam referenced specifically that if anyone makes a comment about a person
from his news segment starter that is disrespectful, the news is off and they are required to read from a website instead. “I bore them to tears on purpose; so I think I get that from my emphasis on tolerance.” Additional positive influences include *Indiana Jones* (Lucas & Spielberg, 1981, 1984, 1989; an action/adventure film series), “not because he was cool,” but because “what I really liked was the storytelling.” He also referenced the book *Princess Bride* (Scheinman & Reiner, 1987; a historicized romantic comedy novel and subsequent film) because of its quality as a fake history “that says history can be fun, it can be informative, it can be lots of different things,” and the Internet. “I honestly don’t know how people taught without the Internet.” Used for research paper reading, research, and the AP world teachers that “have a pretty active FaceBook page,” Adam indicated a high usage of the Internet. Finally, a “really good administration” that has been willing to allow Adam to try new ideas, was identified as a positive support.

Within the technology story there have been several supports signified. Beyond his father providing exposure to technology, friends that helped to support and reinforce his self-efficacy with technology, and an employment that viewed him as a resource to assist with their technology needs, within his practice Adam identified a single group as being “absolutely phenomenally awesome:” the state education network that supports teachers with technology by providing websites, classes, software, and statewide licenses for all teachers to access various programs. Having provided “most of my training,” Adam was introduced to the Utah Education Network early on in his career and had “kind of kept in touch with them.” Additionally within his practice, Adam cited the ability to use
multiple films so students can “talk about the differences...between what happened in the movie and what happened in real life.” Within his personal life and story, Adam noted that his “first support” was the fact that he has a little house, as “we’ll tend to be early adopters of things that will save us space.”

Having moved many of his books and media to the digital media cloud, he acknowledged that using the cloud, “that’s a huge thing...that’s a big support.”

Looking at negative barriers to the use of technology, the constant changing and the proprietary nature of different services, such as the Promethean Board, caused Adam pause to consider, “What happens when the Promethean Board fails or when its no longer working?...I don’t want to be tied to their special little system.” With that, the desire to be up-to-date within the classroom and run modern cables rather than “running technology from 10 years ago,” remains a priority. However, within the classroom, “the single biggest barrier is time,” both to integrate and time to develop additional uses for technology. Within his personal life, Adam identified his main barrier was the financial concern both in the acquisition and the updating of technology for use within his small old home.

Identifying the barrier within his commitment to social studies, Adam replied, “Let me just say that Glenn Beck [a conservative radio personality] makes my job really hard,” adding, “parents are both the best help and the best hindrance to effective social studies instruction.” Adam Reminisced about a parent that came in and began “to explain how the dollar bill has Illuminati symbols and how so many people will run the earth and whatever...,” when Adam began teaching about the founding fathers in U.S. history and how they were normal people
rather than demi-gods. “To have a parent sit and say this was all done by the Illuminati, you have no impact on the future whatsoever…”. “If they are normal people we can expect better of ourselves,” but not if the founding fathers are demi-gods…. Yet, another parent came in to talk about all the places they had taken their daughter around the world to help the daughter understand the world. The highlighted difference between parents viewed as supporting and the parents hindering the educational process connected to a wider story than the interview permitted, but drew interesting points for further research.

**Interrelation of Stories**

Engaging the story from an overview graphic format can assist in recognizing the essential and salient elements in the story that emerged from multiple narratives and repeated iterations. As a reminder, Figure 4 captures key scenes (rectangles shaded in grayscale), other events (rectangles), contextual influences (ovals), and expressed beliefs (round-edged rectangles). Dark solid lines represent temporal causality—for example in Adam’s flowchart the solid line leading from the early memory to the key scene above it indicated that the key scene occurred after the early memory in the broad timeline of his story. The thin dotted lines capture the causality that Adam attributed to influences and events. For example, in his high point scene with technology related to completing a website positively used by others to help pass the AP history exam, Adam used the event as emblematic of how he felt he had the ability to positively impact the wider teaching environment, but also that he was able to see a problem, research a
solution, and work through a solution. The problem solving belief was also expressed in connection to this story and formed an important core element to how Adam viewed and learned from the experience. Note also on the flowchart that the key issue of concern was finding place and that the theme was so pervasive that those experiences where relationships were specifically noted are marked with an asterisk rather than simply a series of lines. With the development of the flowchart, care was taken to include only information that was stated explicitly in the narratives to avoid any personal biases and introduced assumptions or interpretations of the data. The figure also helps to coalesce the salient elements of the narratives into a quick visualization that encapsulates the core components and related themes that are correlated to the additional experiences in Chapter 7.

Figure 3: Correlated flowchart for Adam Campbell case study
Legend: Boxes=events, shaded boxes=key events, smoothed boxes=barriers or supports, circles=beliefs, solid lines=timeline of events, dashed line=relationships.
Engaging this figure as a reader, there are several important elements. First, as the central issue of the story centers on the concept of place, much of the story focuses on formative experiences, unexpected events, and conflict for which an assessment of place was required. Second, with technology playing a prominent role throughout the story the emphasis was placed on the nature of how to make it work, why it was valuable to the experience, and how that engaged future necessary skills. Third, despite the focus on place within the story, many events expressed fell outside of the storyline structure. These events could be inferred within the general timeline, but were not given a specific identifiable space within the timeline. While expressed beliefs within the narratives indicate specific events underscore a particular held belief, those events that fall outside the timeline were not identified with an attributable belief commentary. Each of these ideas are discussed in greater depth within the case below.

**Goals and Purposes of Social Studies**

Although the wording shifted between interviews, the elements only found themselves described in two major headings. First, the study of social studies allows people to understand their humanity, better know themselves, better understand their place in the social system, and ultimately have a richer life. “The unexamined life really is not worth living.” Identified as “the most important goal” and the “primary function,” the study of social studies was correlated with the possession of a better life that allows students to explore who they are. Stating
that people who know history, anthropology, or psychology, “just have a richer life,” the primary and consistent focus foundationally was the self-awareness concept. “The social studies is a study of the system that they are most a part of, that is most important, and this helps show them their place in that system.”

“So, first I guess you can change yourself and second you can change your system.” This quotation included the responsibility to teach the students “their place” within the systems the students find themselves, and how the systems function. Such knowledge would allow students to know “how to change places and change what places are,” to include democratic participation and business environments the students find themselves in. Using the example of not being able to get a job because the applicants are not dressed for the job, an understanding of systems, “all their responsibilities as citizens, as members of their family, and their friend groups and their businesses and whatever” are critical for the students to understand in order to operate in society. “And if you understand what you are then you can make efforts to change if you don’t like it…but if you don’t understand it, how do you function in society?”

**Evans’ Model Connection**

Taking the two primary descriptions of orientation into the Evans model (2010), there are two categories that find connection with Adam’s descriptions—both from the second category. First, the third orientation of social efficiency, creating a more controlled and efficient society, preparing students for various life roles, connects with Adam’s description of knowing their place in the world and
being able to function within the society as a whole. But Adam’s second category also connects with Evan’s fifth construct of transforming society: being able to make a change to the fabric of systems understood. Therefore, within the way Adam described it, knowing the place and having a transformative role in changing that place in society, are conjoined constructs within Adam’s descriptors. Outside of Evans’ orientations, the entire first construct of Adam’s description deals with the personal betterment of the individual and a personal exploration within the subject. This belief of a well-rounded student fundamentally improved and richer through an investigation of the subject is both not accommodated for in the Evan’s model and also outside other forms of orientation categorization.

Although Adam does not use the language of democratic education, or talk of his teaching in terms of the democratic polity, he does mention being responsible citizens, voting, and blending into a societal structure. More closely aligned to the C’s blended framework from NCSS (2013), Adam even more closely aligned to the construct of historical inquiry in thought; though the actual practice followed along the lines of more traditional interactive lecture methods, with the desire to escape static memorization in favor of exploring the time and meaning of an event.

**Philosophies That Underpin Practice**

When asked about the philosophies that underpin his practice he bluntly stated, “If you can’t point to one of those goals (referring to the orientations), then
it’s a waste of time.” Even if it may be an “interesting waste of time” the focus should be on a 20-year-out approach starting from this kind of big picture approach. Believing that the subject material is important for everybody, he stated, “We are all members of the human race and we all are going to interact with people; these are essential skills, these are essential thoughts…..” Observing, “If you think they (students) are all the same then you have been living under a rock.” Adam explained that the approach to teaching is also centered on the idea that “most of them will go on to be some kind of professionals” ranging from doctors and lawyers to engineers, manufacturers and plumbers, and “I try to find a balance.”

Explaining further the interaction between the goals of social studies and the philosophical approach to teaching Adam added:

First, knowledge and knowledge is earned, you can't, I can tell them something but they don't absorb it. I can have them experience something and they still won't absorb it. They absorb it when it becomes real to them, and when they in different ways for different things, they earn it. They get it that way, through study and effort and work. And so, you have to create opportunities for them to do that. Those opportunities have to be interesting enough for them to want to do that. And it has to seem pertinent to them. It has to be pertinent to them, you can't fake kids out, and then it all has to revolve around those other things, you have to keep the purpose in mind. If you don't keep the purpose in mind you are just wasting your time.
Explaining in education everyone exists, “or should exist,” to help the student learn, Adam declared, “everyone in the school is just support staff, and when you have somebody who has no experience really in education lecturing somebody on what their pedagogy should be, that’s a systemic failure.” Relating to technology, Adam reiterated that it was his “solemn duty to teach these kids,” and it was his “responsibility to use everything, every resource at my disposal” to accomplish that objective.

**Teaching Practice Represented**

Identifying the need for students to “understand they are members of a system,” Adam brought in an item used within the curriculum during the time he began talking about the historical trappings of power:

What I have right here is Mr. [Campbell]'s Byzantine throne and the story behind it is this is a gift from a student who put their initials down at the bottom by King [Campbell]'s name, they put their initials there and what happened was when we taught about and this gets into the reason I chose it too, I want my class to be very interactive, and one of the ways to make it interactive and help them remember is to tie the information in with something they already know. And so we were learning about Justinian and about how he had created in order to solidify his power, he had created a bunch of mechanical stuff inside his throne room. So, when you walked into his throne room, a mechanical bird sang and flapped their wings. Then he had, one of the things he had in this room was this throne
that would go up and down and so as you walked closer it goes up and you see him rising before you to show how awesomely powerful he is. How much better he is, and so it helped to solidify this idea of the power in their heads. I said: "If only I had, you know I am sitting on my stool telling this story, "If only I had a throne like that, it would go up and down and everyone would know that I was in charge." And we kind of talked about that. And I guess that was real enough for my students that at the end of the year, they made me my Byzantine throne; which is awesome, which does in fact, go up and down. It was built on a chair, an office chair base, and so it's a symbol of the way I teach, of trying to make things interactive.

Suggesting the “best class I ever had that actually prepared me for teaching was storytelling…and everything from classroom management to the way I interact with the kids, it’s storytelling,” the object in using the Byzantine stool is a prop to get the students to connect with the ideas. Intent on, “getting the audience into your story,” Adam’s goal was to make the students feel they were, “part of that culture for just about (snap) that long.” Feeling that he has “succeeded” if he is able to have the students not be students but, “approaching my Byzantine throne of awesomeness,” students can then interactively tie that experience in, “to something that they are already familiar with, with one relationship of power.”

Returning back to Adam’s original goals, specifically, “Life is richer if you understand the social studies,” he reiterated, “if I can get them to be members of the social studies for just a minute…then I will have succeeded, they understand.”
Commenting on his background in storytelling, and bringing up the influence of *Indiana Jones* (Lucas & Spielberg, 1981, 1984, 1989), Adam stated, “I came to a point where I realized that it was more interesting to tell the story than it was to try to go and do the thing.” Suggesting that “if it was truly terrible it is so interesting,” as the storyteller in the classroom he is able to go from “exciting thing to exciting thing to exciting thing…” in teaching the history. Still, Adam declared, “We don’t entertain these kids.” Adam immediately suggested that if he was not at least “mildly entertaining” he would “lose them” quickly. “I have got to be a little bit of a performer, I have got to be a storyteller or I am going to fail.”

Describing this artifact as “typical,” Adam added that his room is “full of stuff that isn’t what it is” but stuff he could use “that would make it come alive more.” With the idea that “social studies instruction involves a lot of imagination,” the idea that a desk can be merely a desk or carry significance based on what it was used for, like the desk in the Oval Office, or the desk used to pen the Declaration of Independence, and the students are the same. “Kids are going to be doctors, lawyers, presidents, ambassadors, Hitlers—they are kids and you have to acknowledge that they are that, they are something else.” Making the connection between the artifact, Adam’s philosophies that undergird his practice, and his understanding of the goals and purposes of social studies education he stated:

The first thing is that they have to understand the social sciences and I think it is because you understand what you are, what you could be, what other people think you are. I may not agree with say Gandhi with his religious viewpoint of what people are, but when he talks about how
we should treat everyone with dignity and respect then it makes me stand a little taller to think that I am part of his god. Do you know what I mean? When I see Michelangelo paintings and his viewpoint with how he thought people were wonderful and beautiful well then maybe there is some of that in me and I hope the kids pick up on that. And, then I hope they see again what their system, I hope they see how all of this interplays together, I hope they see, this is my place. Right now I am in this position. Right now I am a student but when I go home, I'm the big brother and I am the one sitting on the Byzantine Throne of Awesomeness. I'm the one who says this is the way it needs to be. I'm the one who has the power, and how am I going to use that power? Am I going to use it to intimidate people or am I going to use it to help people out?

**Comments on Teaching**

Identifying himself as “extremely picky about pedagogy,” Adam declared three concepts need to be present for someone to be able to teach well: the teacher needs to have a love and knowledge of the subject material, a knowledge and ability to use effective pedagogy, and a love for the students defined by a passion for helping the students succeed. “If you only know one or the other, or hate the kids, then you are going to screw it up; and I think I have very little patience for that in myself and my co-workers.” Integrating technology as part of this picky pedagogy in Adam’s class, he noted that when a tech glitch occurs it really derails
the lesson but that he sees it optimistically as “becoming smoother as technology becomes more integrated and as the district stops blocking.”

Describing a typical day in the classroom the students are greeted with either key concepts or what they are going to do on the board. Students are either to read the key concepts themselves or it is announced to them so they can watch for key ideas. Then the class begins with a review. Interjecting that Adam has previously had and will include in the coming year a “bell-ringer review” when students enter, this year the time was tight and the review was performed with questions that drew the answers from the students orally. After that, the class will “take notes, and we will do a kind of lecture/discussion.” From there the class will “have some kind of activity that will solidify the knowledge or expand it a little bit or show it in context.” Referring to the lecture/discussion, Adam added, “The kids tell me I do it weird, and they will complain that other people don’t do it that way.” Calling it “more interactive,” Adam was quick to suggest that he felt he is fairly common and even aware of other teachers he feels are “better at it than I am,” so “I really have no idea.”

Observing himself teach, he described the instructional strategy as, “lecture with a lot of questions,” adding, “I think it’s pretty typical really.” Describing his questions as “leading question activities,” Adam stated that the questions are now, “like an instinct, it’s just what happens” with regularity that is, “pretty, very, daily done; always daily done.” Declaring himself, “a good storyteller, and I think I’m a good lecturer,” Adam was quick to add, “to keep a teenager’s attention for 55 minutes I think it not possible.” And so with the methods employed, Adam
defended the class structure stating that it provided opportunities for remediation, group work, and even extension work within his normal class structure. Observing the summation at the end of the period Adam remarked, “this is the first time I that I wouldn’t really alter anything, yea!” Reflecting back on the lesson as “decent,” the reminiscence reverted to the goals to state, “I really emphasized who they are and what they can do to help in the global world, so we talked about the system, we talked about who they are.”

Noting some areas for improvement while watching the video, Adam noticed some comments or behavior out of what he would prefer and he mentioned a desire to have commented or pointed out the logical fallacy within the statement. Noting that even positive statements from the proximity of the camera were captured, but not acknowledged during the lesson, “I think I would like to do more…I didn’t do that at all this day because I had to get through, which is a horrible excuse.” Commenting several more times along the lines of “I should have talked about that more,” and “I don’t know why I didn’t talk about that more,” and “I could have switched things around a little more;” Adam’s self-reflection exhibited a critical eye toward self-improvement. Excusing this lag in what Adam feels should be done in noting that the terms he was using were determined by the department, and after describing a way to have corrected a perceived shortcoming in his teaching, Adam then recapped the issue and curtly stated, “but I didn’t, should have done, didn’t.” Observing the behavior Adam commented that certain people were “very good at pretending whenever I came over weren’t pretending for you,” observing that his proximity caused them to
appear “dutifully doing their stuff,” but not when he walked away. “I would change my seating chart.”

While the focus of Adam’s commentary was on improvement, it was clear that the focus of his thinking was on helping the students to identify and relate with their place in globalization—the lesson topic. All comments to improve the lesson were in determining how to enhance that understanding for the students through the pedagogical practices. While hoping to bring it all alive for the students, Adam was able to also consider his own thinking and adroitly consider alterations that would help the students place themselves within the context of the system.

**Essence of Experience**

While difficult to distill the full essence of Adam’s experiences, orientations, and beliefs, the common theme that ran through the entire narrative was the concept of place, carrying with it the substructures of belonging, and even identity. Within Adam’s practice the conversation is specific and distinct about discussing the goal to help the students to understand where they fit within the systems they discuss—like the Byzantine throne exemplar where the students were meant to come away understanding relationships of power. In establishing this position, even in the observation class where the focus was to have students understand their place in globalization, the distinct focus was always in situating themselves within the concept of place. Down to the selection of pedagogical methods, storytelling is selected as the vehicle toward helping the students situate the content within their current understanding. Adam’s use of news within the
treatment center, and technology in the classroom, were all carefully chosen to connect ideas to their current concept of place and working the student thinking into an enhanced concept of place in the world, potential impact in the wider world, and potential to alter and impact the environments as the students discover that environment. Stating that social studies is a study of the humanities focused on helping them understand and find their place in the world, this focus consistently finds application within Adam’s pedagogical methods and teaching practice.

The elements that caused dissonance within Adam’s story related to the loss of place, or struggle within finding place. The story of being the “computer nerd” at a time when that was not accepted demonstrates both a distress at finding place, and an expression that he has found place with that identity. Conflict with faculty surrounds what to include in the curriculum as well as how and where technology can be used to enhance learning. Struggles with parents centered on ideas they promoted that were perceived as contrary to the message of tolerance (an accepting and embracing of all into place). At each point of concern within the story a tension surrounding place, belonging, and even identity emerged. Contrarily, those moments of positive enthusiasm within Adam’s story related to finding or gaining a greater understanding of place, a sense of belonging, or a greater definition of his own identity.

While describing the two essential goals in social studies, both deal with the concept of place. The first essential goal deals with the exploration of identity, the discovery of where the students belong within the society and the forms and
norms within those environments, and then establishing the students place within that understood order. The second essential goal deals with impacting and potentially altering that place in the structure the students find themselves. For Adam, social studies and his connection with it is both explicitly and conceptually focused on helping students, and himself, identify his place and position within the environments and relationships in which he finds himself, as well as recognize ways to alter those places through positive means.
CHAPTER 7
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The study encapsulated in the foregoing chapters has examined the narratives of three social studies teachers currently within the participants’ respective teaching practice careers. An analysis of the narratives is explored utilizing the framework of narrative identity and other interview and methodological approaches to extend current understandings of the lived experiences of the teachers and the ways lived experience shaped their orientation to the goals of social studies education. While a number of themes and patterns have emerged independently through the case study chapters, in this concluding chapter I analyze the three cases together for emerging themes and constructs as outlined in the first research question. I then delve more deeply into the analysis of the themes to distill and describe the essence of the combined experiences toward the phenomenon. Finally, I discuss the implications for future work and suggest ways in which other researchers might build upon and extend the findings as implied in research question two.

Findings of Cases Combined

First, in beginning to combine the cases into those elements that reveal how teachers understand the goals and purposes of social studies education, it is important to identify the commonalities between the cases collected, and the areas where they diverge. Looking specifically at how the teachers spoke about and
identified the orientations, as discussed in each case individually, there are obvious elements that emerged related to the models presented. Examining the areas of commonality, and disconnect in the descriptions themselves, allows the reader to better comprehend the core constructs common between cases, and the lesson themes that remain prevalent though ultimately less common.

Principal among the constructs and orientations in common is the idea of students being prepared to move into society, along the social meliorist orientation within the Evans (2010) model. Adam, recognizing the industrial base of the community, discussed how it affected his teaching in considering what concepts of principles needed to be taught regardless of what position students obtained in the community. The focus was in attempting to assist students to join society with the knowledge and common vision needed to be effective in any respective field. Brian presented his view as enabling citizens to understand our shared vision, heritage, and social norms in the democratic system needed to maintain effective relationships personally, socially, economically, and politically. While equally engaged in helping students merge with society, the norms and responsibilities were the focus of the integration needs. Susan focused on helping student blend with the environment of work and society, and emphasized through teaching the establishment of more tolerance, understanding, and personal growth in society. While all three teachers shared the idea of creating a more efficient and controlled society, as the Evans model suggests, they each carried a different flavor on the theme that shows both cohesion and a level of differentiation significant enough to potentially suggest additional
constructs within the orientation of Evans’ model.

While only construct three of Evans’ model is common to all of the cases, Adam and Susan directly indicated and suggested the idea of students playing a transformative role in communities, with social studies playing a pivotal role in preparing students. The transformative view connects with the fifth of Evans’ orientations toward preparing students to have a transformative role in society. Both Adam and Susan inferred that one goal in studying social studies is for students to gain the knowledge necessary to improve their situation when not content in the context of society. Neither Adam nor Susan specifically suggested wanting students to go out and transform society directly, but to enable students with the ability to change the situation if unsatisfied was a theme for both teachers. While Brian did not necessarily imply the transformative role for the students, part of Adam’s view of creating students that will better blend into the environment was to assist students in monitoring change and ensure the change was in line with the commonly held views and historical positions, and ultimately a positive change. The view not only implied that change will occur, but also these blended citizens play a role in helping to keep change in check. While not directly suggesting a transformative role, his view of the students did permit the construct within the efficient citizen model previously discussed.

Outside the Evans model, Adam and Susan also shared a view of the goal to improve the lives of the students through the study of social studies—that life is fundamentally better when you study the social sciences. The concept of a well-rounded student through the study of the past remained an important part of how
the teachers viewed their work, and is an important addition to the conversation about teacher orientations in general.

Even as the Evans model contains the first orientation construct of viewing history as the core of the curriculum, interestingly, it does accommodate for the other dozen subjects that fall under the umbrella of social studies to similarly find place in that privileged position. Within the three cases, each teacher indicated that the subject each respectively formulated under was the most significant, even the core, of the social studies curriculum regardless of what they taught. For Susan and Brian, history formed the core of the curriculum, as both earned degrees in history education. For Adam, anthropology is the core and encompassing construct inclusive of all the other social studies as he completed his training in anthropology. In a departure from the restricted vision of history as core suggested by Evans, the expanded construct from the cases suggests that depending on the formal training, other social sciences may form the core of the curriculum in social studies (e.g. economics, geography, sociology, anthropology, history).

Pulling these discussed elements from the three cases presented in the foregoing discussion into a model for social studies would imply the following four constructs:

1) Social Efficiency: preparing students for personal, professional, social, and political participation in their environments for social stability and improved relations.

2) Social Transformation: preparing students to be able to make a change
in their environments if dissatisfied; potentially monitoring positive change.

3) Personal Improvement: preparing students for fundamentally better lives through the study of the social sciences.

4) Social Sciences Core: viewing the core of the curriculum from the social studies subject formulated within by the teacher.

Comparing these four emergent orientation and goal constructs into the current C’s framework (NCSS, 2013) we find both cogency and lingering gaps. Referring back to three “traditions” that had emerged by 1977—namely, citizenship transmission, taught as a social science, and taught as reflective inquiry—the current framework is focusing on a body of knowledge for preparing citizens through means of historical inquiry practice. If we could define orientations one and two from the emergent model as citizenship transmission, and construct four as teaching as a social science, there still remains the concept of personal improvement in the emergent model, and the concept of a historical reflective inquiry practice unaccounted for from the NCSS model. Recognizing that neither the Evans model nor the NCSS model generally capture the perspective of the teachers, the cases also generally viewed their orientations and goals asynchronous to the full models used to organize and indicate practice. The disparities between the cases and the proposed models are even more comprehensible when taken in context of additional factors within their stories. The next few sections will review important factors that play a role in establishing the orientations and viewed goals of the case study teachers.
Individual Characteristics

Among the personal characteristics that define what the case teachers do is the characteristic belief that actions in the classroom make a difference more widely than the classroom. Exemplified in the nature of how all three case teachers distinctly shared the orientation of social efficiency as a primary goal in the classroom, the teachers specifically stated the belief that the intent was to make the curriculum impactful and applicable in the students’ lives regardless of where the students find themselves. The held vision of providing students skills—through a knowledge of concepts and “big picture” perspectives for Adam, through direct application and meaning making for Susan, and establishing an engaged relationship with history for Brian—in providing students necessary preparation for the future, remained a central unquestioned construct for all three cases. Receiving praise for these efforts, as discussed below, confirms and sustains belief in the central importance of the work.

Equally significant in a negative self-reported vein, all three teachers explained a low point in teaching came as each teacher encountered opposition to selected pedagogical style. The characteristic of negatively responding to confrontations about practice could be seen as a human trait generally disliking oppositional confrontation, but in the context of the teaching practice played a potentially significant role for those seeking to alter the practice as currently manifested. Adam talked of a confrontation with another teacher who forcibly promoted changing Adam’s teaching methods and content in favor of presenting facts over concepts. Brian shared of a parent accusing Brian of destroying a student through
the way Brian was teaching the class; a misunderstanding but decidedly painful for Brian as the accusation was a personal attack on selected methods. Students who behaved poorly and insisted on calling her “coach” confronted Susan; an affront to Susan’s more gentle approach to discipline that required reassertion as the teacher in the situation. In each case, the low point expressed a distinct attack on the pedagogy, delivery, or management of the classroom. Such consistency of storytelling is significant to any seeking to impact change within the classroom to recognize the singular importance to the approach of suggesting any alteration of teacher practice.

Significantly, each of the teachers also carried the personal conviction that each was destined to be a teacher. This personal conviction about the centrality of the professional life to the sense of identity carried through all three cases. Determining as a child to become a social studies teacher, Brian indicated an almost inevitability when reaching college about what major he would declare. Brian’s story also indicated that throughout his own career as a student he was determining the environment for his classroom and pedagogical methods necessary to become effective. Adam did not indicate the moment when the desire to be a teacher began, but indicated the moment when he felt “destined” to be a social studies teacher. Susan equally did not identify the experience that started the conviction, but noted in high school the need to teach history. During college, she identified a moment when teaching decidedly ran in her veins; even that she was “meant” to teach. While the conviction in all three does not indicate a style, form, or orientation toward teaching, the conviction itself indicated an innate
quality within the teachers that reinforced commitment to teach social studies as a part of the teachers’ perceived identity.

**Contextual Factors**

In determining to become a social studies teacher, each teacher came into the presence of a teacher that impacted him or her toward becoming a social studies teacher. Brian determined to become a teacher in the third grade where he also learned the articulation skill of making a text come to life, but determined in the sixth grade to teach social studies when given an opportunity to teach younger students and realized all the lessons were focused in the social studies. Two teachers influenced Brian’s story and the direction to focus in the social studies at a young age. Adam determined to become a high school teacher in college when recognizing the low salary position of anthropology professors, but credited the teacher of a folk material culture course for giving the sense of “destiny” in becoming a social studies teacher that would ultimately guide Adam’s practice. Susan felt pressured into an AP course in high school and recognized what history could be, but “knew” she was to teach history in the senior year of high school after winning an award while working with another teacher. In the cases the influence toward becoming teachers was not only one teacher, but two within a few years span of each other that directed the focus toward becoming social studies teachers.

One contextual factor of interest was how each of the teachers described and viewed the classroom. Brian spoke of the classroom in terms of a dedicated and
concerted effort, museum like, to create an environment where students would be in history; to relate to and connect with things that are “real.” Adam, however, commented that nothing in his classroom was as it seemed, serving multiple purposes to help students use imagination in making the history more real. While one teacher wanted everything down to the wood on the back of the artwork to be the original, the other teacher focused the classroom around imaginary items or elements that could serve as multiple components depending on the lesson needs. While these two approaches showed a fundamental ontological divergence in the classroom design, both approaches expressed a desire to bring the subject alive and make it meaningful to the students through the approach. Susan made no specific conversational mention to classroom design, though Susan too desired to bring the history alive for the students. Significantly, of the artifacts brought in by the teachers to be discussed as representative or emblematic of the teacher’s pedagogy and understanding of the goals and purposes of social studies education, Susan was only one that did not bring in an artifact that represented the classroom environment—only her specific pedagogical choice. While the argument that Aaron’s Byzantine Stool of Awesomeness was merely an artifact of Adam’s teaching process, the focus of the discussion was as much about how the object was used as it was how it was symbolic of the classroom environment. The conversation around object use with Adam led to a conversation of the other objects that made up the classroom environment for learning.

Chief among the positive contextual influences is the role of other people in the stories. Notably family relationships form critical factors in exposing all three
cases to technology, encouraging the use and inclusion in both the personal and professional spheres, and in problem solving and repairing technology when those tools fail to function fully. Family also formed an emotional strength and connection for which only Adam suggested any disconnect between teaching and home life around the issue of time. Equally impactful resides the role of social studies teachers that encouraged, taught skills, and influenced the entrance into the field of social studies in the first place. Additionally, friends and colleagues—who were also discussed as friends for Brian—played critical roles in all three cases. Adam expressed reinforcement and support in learning and developing technology skills. Brian discussed emotional and social support within the school environment that impacted both practice and perspective. Susan discussed technological support, emotional strength, and the sharing of materials used within the classroom. All three teachers emphasized the relative importance of colleagues to the stories in positive ways. Such associations form an indispensible pillar in understanding the stories individually and collectively as social studies teachers.

**Change over Time**

In examining change over time it is important to note that the discussed change is not a product of interpreting statements correlated, but through the direct statements of the participants themselves as they presented change over time. For example, Brian discussed the decision about which grade level to teach as a process where he wanted to teach at each level attended at the time, until college
when high school was determined the level desired to teach. While that process that led Brian to eventually become a high school teacher was a process of change over time, that process was specifically delineated during the discourse rather than revealed once all the interviews were joined. Such was the experience with each of the participants in revealing the perceived change over time rather than having that process emerge naturally from the narratives themselves.

To highlight the idea of change over time, within Adam’s narrative notably the story of a connection with technology was a long emergent narrative that began with a father working as a repairman for electronics that allowed an early interaction and access to technologies. This access prompted Adam to learn to type, program, upgrade hardware in electronics, repair equipment, and gain a level of foundational knowledge about electronics and technology in general. Through the influence of friends that early supported an interest in programming, later encouraging Adam to fix the computer issues encountered alone, Adam gained self-efficacy as a person no longer associated with someone who could fix issues, but feeling empowered to repair without assistance. Later in helping to install and run wires for acquired televisions in the school the association with technology and Adam’s perceived relationships within the department shifted toward seeing capability to help others with technology. The change in association with technology from passive relation to capable source from which others can draw displays distinctive growth technically and perceptively.

Between the cases themselves no distinct patterns emerged to indicate, for example, turning points followed low points as shared in the narratives, or that a
particularly poignant series of events that each case shared supported each in developing an understanding of the goals and purposes of social studies. Rather each individual case carried significant change over time unique to each story; as highlighted with Adam above. Even as the construct of change over time failed to emerge a consistent story narrative plot of how the cases developed that can be generalized to all three, other commonalities indeed emerged in influencing factors, meaningful experiences, individual characteristics, and even patterns and themes that establish significant overlap across cases.

**Meaningful Experiences**

It is significant to note that the two teachers who formulated in history specifically, Brian and Susan, their interest and association with history began at a young age. This connection directly tied to the essence of the two case study stories. Brian began very early with a concerted effort made in creating a collection of objects; a foreshadowing of a later relationship focus with objects that connect physically and emotionally with the past. Susan’s connection to history began through the hearing of stories about the lives of parents and grandparents highlighting both a love of theater and a focus on storytelling personally and pedagogically. With the story of Adam, while formal educational training received was in anthropology, the fundamental essence was on the concept of place, and Adam’s early history and story show a decided struggle to discover place and discomfort with the situations encountered. While the essence for each teacher was decidedly different, each essence could be traced back to
early experiences attached to the subject.

Viewed as negatively meaningful through self-report, it is significant to note that all teachers indicated a technology low point experience with lost data. Brian told of frustrating attendance programs that would discard the input report when attempting to send and requiring multiple attempts to finally have a report record properly. Adam spoke of several experiences of spending hours in creating resources for a lesson plan, only to have the state or district block or remove access to the activity—effectually losing that time and lesson plan option for the day. Susan spoke of potential data loss as a future fear related to losing the grades input on the computer; both implying difficulties with losing information personally or experiences with others have been heard and that such a negative future scene is possible to encounter. All of the teachers indicated the contextual fear of data loss as a barrier to the increased integration of technology in the classroom.

When referring to a high point experience in the narratives all three cases shared an experience for which they received significant high praise for their efforts. Susan revealed an example during college in a methods course when asked to teach a course. Employing dramatized reading, a choral reading to the tune of Disney songs, and some group activity, Susan described positive feedback that contributed to a belief that teaching runs in the veins and that Susan was meant to be a teacher. Brian suggested that receiving any letter of praise and appreciation from students is a career-making event, and receiving several in the course of a career has encouraged the belief that what happens in the classroom
makes a difference for the students. Adam explained that while the creation of a website was already a high point based on the time required to complete it, a positive letter posted as a commentary from a student credited the website with helping her pass the AP exams. In each case whether the praise itself was the sole reason the experience shared was referred to as a high point remains unclear, but the consistency in which the praise connected to the stories formed a casual link for potential further investigation.

**Review of Research Questions**

Before continuing with the analysis, a return and review of the first research question is warranted. Question one read:

1. Framed through the themes or patterns related to teacher orientations in social studies (individual characteristics, contextual factors, change over time, and meaningful experiences) that emerge in the narratives (individually and collectively) shared by social studies teachers, how do teachers define and describe their teaching orientation through their lived experience narrative, and how do those definitions and descriptions compare to the Evans model (additions or omissions)?

Following the foregoing discussion on Table 4 below, each of the complex ideas in research question one were broken into summary statements. The component of the question is listed, followed by the page number the discussion section is found in the body of this study on the far left column. The next column examines the overarching discussion points from the combined cases listed by an
identifying phrase. The subsequent three columns explore each of the case studies in order of presentation in the body of the study. Synchronous to the combined case summary statements, divided by a semicolon, each individual case includes the corresponding example from the previous discussion.

From Table 4 it is evident that all components of research question one provided areas of effective commonality between cases, except the component of change over time. While each participant did describe representative examples of change over time, each example was specific to the individual case and directly related to the identified essence of his or her story. Further, while the individual cases did provide areas of cohesion related to how each described the orientation to social studies held, not all categorizations held true through all participants. However, each of the orientations created in the new model are attributable to at least two participants. Evans’ model provided three constructs of the proposed five common to at least two participants, while failing to capture another within the constructs. Common elements shared between the cases highlight critical aspects for further research.

Themes, patterns, and implications for learning environments are discussed through the remainder of this chapter in addressing research question two.
Table 4

**Quick View of Question One Elements Connected to Individual Cases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Combined Cases Summary</th>
<th>Brian Cain</th>
<th>Susan Haynes</th>
<th>Adam Campbell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>What they do in the classroom matters; social efficacy; opposed to confrontation about practice; conviction to be a teacher</td>
<td>Building relationship to the subject; confronted by parent; determined in elementary school to be a teacher</td>
<td>Direct application and meaning making; confronted by student; determined in high school to be a teacher</td>
<td>Focus on “big picture” life after school; confronted by teacher; determined in college to be a teacher—subject and level fluctuated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual</td>
<td>Encouraged by a teacher to teach; vision of classroom; family and friends critical supports</td>
<td>Two elementary teachers; classroom “in history;” complete congruency home/work</td>
<td>Two high school teachers; focus on pedagogy; emotional and technological supports</td>
<td>Two college professors; classroom infinitely flexible; disconnect over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 182)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Over</td>
<td>No distinct collective pattern</td>
<td>Grade level to teach shifted</td>
<td>From hearing to writing to sharing stories</td>
<td>Technology narrative of self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 184)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Connection to subject attached to early exposure; low point-lost data; high point-praise</td>
<td>History through collections; attendance program loses; letters of praise and appreciation</td>
<td>History through stories; fear of losing gradebook; reinforcement through peers</td>
<td>Struggle to find place—anthropology; lesson plans blocked; unknown student praise for website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 186)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>(Pg. 178) Social efficiency; social transformation; personal improvement; social sciences core</td>
<td>Enabling effective citizens; monitor change for positive; history core</td>
<td>Blend into society—tolerance; change situations; better individuals; history core</td>
<td>Prepare for position in society; improve society; well-rounded people; anthropology core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(page 175)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans’ Model</td>
<td>Construct 3 common to all; construct 1, 5 shared by two teachers</td>
<td>Social meliorists; history core</td>
<td>Social meliorists; transformative view; history core</td>
<td>Social meliorists; transformative view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engaging concepts from question one, question two asks:

2. What are the implications of these findings for the design of learning
environments to promote and support social studies instruction; including technology usage and integration?

**Themes and Patterns**

Despite the many areas of overlap and disparity in the conjoined cases, perhaps none are more surprising than the consistency of methods used within the classroom. While each method takes on the distinct flavor of the practitioner, the approaches to teaching generally follow the same patterns in each case studied on an average day of teaching. All three cases began the day with some sort of opening activity, bell-ringer, or journal to reiterate prior knowledge, focus their minds on the subject, and prepare them for the day. Once completed, there was some form of lecture/discussion/storytelling activity that took the students into the content. Then the class ended with an additional length of time that allowed students to perform personal or group work, or another activity to develop and solidify a knowledge of the topic. Even when films or additional technology media were brought into the classroom, the essential methods remained consistent between the cases. Though the three cases showed an almost identical character to derisively discussed classroom methods by Ravitch and Finn (1988) more than 20 years ago, the teachers showed no perceptible discomfort with the pedagogical choices or suggested any particular needs to change or alter those methods; only a desire to be more “effective” utilizing those methods.

Looking toward the future of where they hoped the teaching would lead, each teacher shared a similar thought slanted toward the essence of the story
experience each teacher shared. Adam hoped to create a more student-focused classroom where there could be constructed a framework and students would decide what to study within that structure; indicating a greater place for students in Adam’s practice. Susan hoped to improve in practice so that everything done pedagogically would “matter” and connect for the students; connected both to the story that students are not inherently engaged with history and the belief that storytelling is the method for students to connect with the curriculum. Brian hoped to finish teaching at a “good pace” and in a positive frame of reference; referring to the current relationship with the administration and hoped that despite the current conflict there could remain a connection to pedagogy and students until retirement. While on the surface these expressed future scene ambitions can appear puerile or even simplistic, these ambitions revealed the central core of the individual stories and indicate essential concepts, which stakeholders need to comprehend to affect lasting change to any intervention employed to change teacher practice.

In relation to the technology stories, responses to how technology was utilized in classrooms reflected the personal story with technology and the essence of the story in general. As Adam grew up in an environment for which technology was abundant, there was early training and encouragement to learn and in the current environment there was abundant technology and Adam was viewed as a resource for this technology skill. As the essence of Adam’s story was centered in finding place, place for technology within the classroom was viewed as both a valuable asset in moving forward the curriculum, and a tool that potentially fails and
derails the curriculum. This essential tension about the place of technology within the pedagogy generally found more positive application than negative as a perceived place within the faculty as a technology savvy teacher appeared to promote increased usage despite the tension. Brian grew up without a substantial amount of technology both in his personal life and early years of teaching. Brian’s story suggested technology was generally excluded unless it was made clear the fundamental enhancement to practice. This view was based on the essence of Brian’s story centered on building, nurturing, and sustaining relationships. When technology found purpose in building fundamental relationships with the students, parents, the curriculum or other faculty, technology was utilized. Susan grew up with technology, but the connection with technology centered on the stories the technology shared or that Susan could tell through utilizing the technology. As the essence of Susan’s story engaged storytelling as the means of relating to social studies and the world, technology found utilization as it aided her in telling stories in the classroom. For each case, the way in which the teachers engaged technology was both indicative of the experiences with technology, as well as the essence of the cases altogether.

The theme of technology extended beyond the story previously related in contradictory ways for the teachers’ personal lives; particularly with relationships. Considering Brian’s feeling that technology was organized out of normal life and must be worked back in, a turning point for Brian occurred when he realized how technology could connect him with international friends, art auction houses around the world, and help maintain relationships with children out of the area.
The value of technology was viewed as being extremely important only when it strengthened fundamental relationships. Even though technology is viewed as potentially playing a role in sustaining and maintaining relationships in Brian’s personal life, Brian maintained that technology in the classroom can be a distraction and is generally viewed as a fad unless an explicit value can be shown that enhances the current practice.

Adam expressed potential for technology to enhance the classroom environment, even expressing an imperative to find ways to enhance the classroom through the use of technology. However, in Adam’s personal life, despite insisting that meeting his wife through a chat room was out of character, Adam discussed the need to curb and control, restrict and impede the march of technology into the personal sphere.

Susan commented on the potential of technology to save time and benefit both professional practice and the students in the classroom even though the implementation of technology remained guarded and sidelined in favor of traditional methods. However, in Susan’s personal life she expressed strong connections to technology for entertainment, communication, and a private writing persona. While one sphere for technology was touted as positive and influential in each case, the other was restricted, viewed skeptically, and restrained even while insisting potential positive impacts for usage. The converse relationship between the personal and professional life relating to technology may indicate a larger field for future research.

Linking the use of technology resources specifically to the emerging
orientations identified at this stage also remains complicated. For example, Brian indicated the positive grade-book program that allowed him to print off grade reports to narrow specifications and mail the reports directly to parents as valuable and important for making connections within the classroom to the home environment. Even though Brian described the interaction in terms of relationships only, the central orientation of social efficacy, or reinforcing the standards, norms, and expectations of the classroom are clearly linked to the technology usage. The technology usage here suggests that while Brian only spoke of the technology in terms of the phenomenological essence of the story, namely relationships, that the technology use also clearly underscored an identified orientation. However, not all technologies described by teachers are readily identifiable to an orientation. Adam indicated the use of the news as an opening activity in the classroom described as a means of engagement. Adam expressed all four orientations in the emerging model as personally held. Classifying the news experience becomes complex in determining how to narrowly define the motivation for use within the four constructs—social efficacy, transformative, personal improvement, and social sciences core—as all may carry motivation to an outside observer and potentially the teacher as well. Ironically in the case with this technology, finding the place, the phenomenological essence of Adam’s story, remains complicated. While technology clearly supports and finds place within the emergent model, the extent to which, and which constructs specifically within the model, connect and support technology integration more directly remains a critical area of further study.
Summarizing the themes and patterns present in how technology was integrated and viewed within the individual lives of the participants, Table 5 identifies the theme or pattern from the foregoing discussion on the far left column. The central columns look at each individual case related to the theme or pattern presented. The far right column explores the similarities and differences of the participants from the discussion materials.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme/Pattern</th>
<th>Brian Cain</th>
<th>Susan Haynes</th>
<th>Adam Campbell</th>
<th>Similarities/Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology in classroom average day</td>
<td>Traditional methods</td>
<td>Traditional methods</td>
<td>Traditional methods</td>
<td>All followed Ravitch and Finn (1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired future story</td>
<td>Finish at “good pace” in positive frame of reference</td>
<td>Everything taught would connect and matter to students</td>
<td>Student-focused framework—students build within</td>
<td>Each emblematic of the essence of each story—change requires understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to technology utilized in classroom</td>
<td>Technology excluded unless enhances relationships</td>
<td>Technology useful as it aids in telling stories and engaging students</td>
<td>Technology both valuable asset and has potential to “fail and derail”</td>
<td>Indicative of their experiences with technology as well as the essence of stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application in personal life</td>
<td>Valuable in maintaining relationships; connecting to international community</td>
<td>Strong connection for entertainment, communication, and personal writings</td>
<td>Met wife in chat room, but feels need to curb and restrict and impede</td>
<td>All used for connection/communication with others. Minimal other usages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application in the school</td>
<td>Viewed as a fad and a distraction unless shown a classroom enhancement</td>
<td>Potential to save time and benefit students; sidelined for traditional methods</td>
<td>Potential to enhance the classroom; imperative to find usage</td>
<td>Converse relationship to personal life usages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications for Learning Environments

One belief expressed by teachers with implications for learning environments related to how the teachers view the students. As each teacher expressed belief that the central goal or purpose for social studies was to prepare students for the concept of social efficiency, as discussed previously, the view of the students’ interest in the subject itself was critical in understanding how to approach the preparation process. Each teacher held a vastly different view of what students bring into the classroom. While discussing the positive future hoped for, Adam suggested that every student likes the social studies, finds them interesting, and wants to know it; making the task discovering how to tap into that interest. Susan, referring to a significant student teaching event suggested the statistics that 90% will assume to be bored and 85% simply couldn’t care less about history. The lack of perceived implicit interest in students placed the pressure on Susan to create and generate the interest in the students. Brian did not make specific reference to the student interest in the subject in the interviews, but did highlight a view of the students when discussing the observation and noted that the attempt in language through calling them ladies and gentlemen was to encourage a reflective view of students and the expectation of behavior in the classroom microcosm of democracy. Without assuming or presupposing student interest or disinterest in the subject there is a concern for engagement discussed when referring to praise received from students that indicated an enjoyment of the teaching style and environment deployed in the classroom. Each view of where the students come into their classroom conceptually, even ontologically regarding the subject,
ultimately impacted the approach to working with those students.

While the teacher view of student interest may initially be seen as trivial, it does underscore how the teachers approach the curriculum and pedagogical choices. Brian was most concerned with creating the environment for learning and nurturing positive associations for the students. Susan felt the need to entertain, present novel or parody content students can relate to, and focus on stories that promote application to engage students in caring about the content. Adam focused the lesson structures on themes and concepts, viewing a fact based curriculum as a waste of time, and perhaps assumed that student interest will carry students to specific content given possession of the necessary conceptual hooks to organize the information. Exploring how teachers perceive the students may carry profound implications for how teachers approach pedagogy and ways to create change in practice if more generally and individually understood.

Implications for the classroom based on how teachers describe and explain student interest and engagement with social studies are summarized in Table 6. The concept or belief identified in this subheading is listed to the left, followed by the summary statements from each individual case in the next three columns.

Further implications for the learning environment and technology integration practices are discussed below in the paper coordinating the essential elements of these general constructs toward the larger goals of the research. First, however, a brief summary of four general themes that emerged from the narratives as critical elements across and between the cases will be presented drawing out critical elements from the analysis of cases individually and collectively.
Table 6

Implications for Learning Environments Summary: Student Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept/ Belief</th>
<th>Brian Cain</th>
<th>Susan Haynes</th>
<th>Adam Campbell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Interest in the Subject of Social Studies</td>
<td>No comment given on student interest</td>
<td>90% bored, 85% couldn’t care less; little to no interest</td>
<td>Every student likes the social studies; inherent interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Responsibility</td>
<td>Need to create democratic microcosm</td>
<td>Required to generate interest in students</td>
<td>Responsibility to tap into that inherent interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Implications</td>
<td>The environment for learning and nurturing positive associations is as critical as the content</td>
<td>Need to entertain; present novel/parody content; focus on stories to generate interest</td>
<td>Focus on themes and concepts; student interest will lead to specific content and needed conceptual hooks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings

In this dissertation I examined the narratives of three teachers in their professional teaching practice in public high school settings in order to identify patterns of similarity and variation that might explain the fundamental aspects that impact the perceived goals and orientations to social studies education. Performing both life narrative and additional interviews, strong case studies were built of each teacher in understanding the motivations, experiences, and beliefs as those motivations, experiences, and beliefs impact the understanding of the goals and purpose for social studies education. Engaging the three cases with the barriers and affordances present in the stories, four central thematic patterns emerged.

Role of Storytelling

Within the more formalized pedagogical choices lies one essential theme: the role of storytelling. Storytelling relates as much to their personal connections to the
social sciences as to the pedagogical choices in the teachers practice. Adam indicated that the “best” class during formative preparation to teach was a class in storytelling. Everything from classroom management to the use of props and examples are all tools intent on engaging the students with the story. Brian interchanged the terms of storytelling and lecture as a means of indicating a conception of Brian’s practice; using the term lecture derisively and storytelling as an esteemed method for engaging students for extended periods of time. Susan, even as the essence of the story revolved around the nature of storytelling, utilized films, historical raps, and debate circles allowed both the pedagogy and the students to engage in the act of storytelling toward the intent of engaging with history. Additionally for Susan, it appeared that a particular enthusiasm for different times and historical events were coupled with the nature of how stories have captured Susan’s attention and enthusiasm for the subject. Forming a critical foundational construct from which these cases compose the classroom experience, the nature of storytelling itself is a methodological and pedagogical concept that requires additional exploration if change is sought within the field.

**Use of Film and Television**

Deeply tied to the construct of storytelling—though forming a connected though secondary essential themes—the role of various film and television representations played a decisive function within the stories. All three teachers initially began the narratives identifying television as a primary influence on the early developmental years. For Adam the television was always on in every room regardless of what the
family was doing. Brian spoke of an early association with Saturday morning cartoons while Susan indicated both a love and an investment into the characters and what happened in the fictional lives. As the teachers continued through the story narratives the ongoing association with television was clearly still an influence in contemporary lives, but there are also films of subsequent importance in the conceptualization of social studies. Adam, as an anthropologist, credited the *Indiana Jones* (1981, 1984, 1989) film series for helping to realize that the telling of the story may be more interesting than performing the action. Brian referenced the movie *Gandhi* (1982) for teaching fundamental truths in such an impactful way that the film is still used in the classroom despite the film being now more than 30 years old. Susan, although a consumer of films, indicated an adoration for television that allowed for increased character development, noting that shows, like the *West Wing* (1999-2006), have propelled to perform substantive additional research because of how intriguing the show’s content was to learn personally. Even while each teacher used technology in the classroom in various forms and levels of integration, consistent was the pervasive use of films and film clips to engage and inspire the students through the storytelling.

Bound into the nature of how Wineburg (2001) described the impact of media representations influence on historical thinking and perceptions of the past, engagement with fictionalized representations found in popular media is indicative of how the connection to history is closely tethered to the fundamental nature of storytelling. Engagement itself as defined by the cases carries the notion that within effective storytelling students and the teachers connect to the past and find the
lessons necessary to engaging in the current worlds. The case studies tell the story that fact based approaches to assessment in determining how effective a teacher is performing in the classroom is fundamentally disconnected from the perceived effective pedagogical approaches of the teachers. Further, the approaches are in conflict with how those same teachers viewed a connection and application of the social studies into personal lives for enrichment and the creation of efficient societies. A principled exploration of the alterations under the umbrella of storytelling is foundational to create lasting change in the classrooms of the case teachers toward pedagogical and content learning gains.

**Equity Through Individuals**

The third theme, even while attached to the nature of how the teachers viewed the goals and purposes of social studies education, is the value of the individual students and the place of the classroom in creating a sense of equality among students. Brian defined the classroom as democratic as possible with no regard given any person above another. Adam explained working with the treatment center and performing interviews with the Shoshoni tribes having altered classroom-teaching practices that have engendered more tolerance and reinforced the personal value of each individual in the classroom. Susan described the idea of diversity individually as critical to society, but in her classroom the students needed to learn how to develop tolerance and acceptance to prepare for the larger society. Each student was described personally important and equal to all other students in the classroom. Yet, the classroom was also preparing students to view the value in
every other student as well. The developed tolerance and acceptance of others included learning skills, attitudes, and norms that would serve them in whatever environment entered after high school.

**Uniformity in Field**

The fourth theme that emerged from the data highlighted a close level of uniformity out of step with current models and frameworks in the field. While teachers carried a great diversity of personal and professional experience individually, collectively the views regarding the goals and purposes of social studies education and the pedagogical methods employed within the classrooms, coalesced between cases but not with the current ideology of the field. The current C’s framework (NCSS, 2013) is promoting a historical inquiry method for the classroom as a pedagogical approach outside the current format of a typical instructional day, or the conceptual importance of storytelling expressed by the teachers. The Evans (2010) framework included five orientations, of which only three found expression from the narrative identities of the teachers with some additions and alterations in form. While crossover exists between the frameworks and models, the overlapping nature of how the frameworks and models interact with the nature of how the teachers viewed the goals and orientations in social studies leaves room for focus to align the two perspectives.
Overview of Themes

While related concepts are evident within the four themes that emerged, an exploration of the related and relative importance of each distinct element is valuable for research. A summary review table of the four major theme findings is outlined in Table 7:

Table 7

*Overview Summary of Four Emergent Themes in the Narratives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Emergent Themes in Narrative</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Role of Storytelling</td>
<td>Central to personal connections to social studies, pedagogical choices, and classroom décor and resources, storytelling forms an essential foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Role of Film and Television Representations</td>
<td>Media representations form early and ongoing engagements, personally and professionally, with relationships to past figures, role-models in storytelling, and concept engagement over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Value of Classroom and Students in Creating a Sense of Equity</td>
<td>Classroom plays a critical role in preparing students to view the value of every individual that include learning skills, attitudes, and norms to diversity and tolerance where ever they move after high school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Close Level of Uniformity in Orientation and Methods out of Step with the Frameworks</td>
<td>Teachers described orientations (discussed previously), the typical day in the classroom format, and held ideas with high congruency, though these discussed concepts neither matched the current focus promoted through NCSS or the utilized language of the Evans’ Framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Identity as a Window into Orientation

The research was engaged with an interest in the ways that narrative identity, providing a window into the life worlds of the teachers, may assist us to better understanding teachers’ development of an orientation to social studies education. Designing the narrative interview protocol as a modification of existing protocols,
the principle assumption was that teachers would not only have a rich and coherent story to tell about the connection to social studies, but would also have a rich and articulate understanding of that orientation. Further, that the cases, despite the inherent differences, would begin to converge on key ideas that would indicate shared commonalities within the stories on the goals and orientations for social studies. The extent to which the narratives did converge around common themes and identifiable constructs, underscored the basic assumptions for using narrative identity.

It should be noted that many of the emergent patterns and ideas became evident because of the nature of the structured interview protocol that guided the narratives. The protocol delineated certain elements specifically sought in the research. Such a protocol was selected in part because of the quality of engaging individuals in a natural storytelling process even as it guided the stories to permit cross case comparisons. While the protocols were highly structured, case participants expressed an ease engaging in the questions through story. Participants indicated that an ability to consider and describe elements of the stories in greater depth and consideration than previously had been accomplished. Participants further expressed a potentially practical element of self-reflection and evaluation not originally intended as a result and benefit to the teachers. The reflection offered both fascinating insights for the study and important personal reflection for the participants as well.

While various themes that emerged from the narratives remained consistent with preconceived notions entering into the research, other unanticipated themes
emerged that nevertheless proved essential to the three case narratives as foundational constructs in their practice. The constructs include the centrality of storytelling as a driving force in the connection to the subject and underlying construct for pedagogical decision making. Such a foundational concept within the way teachers engaged and supported personal teaching practice not only connected the narratives through an ideological anchor, but illuminated rationale behind long derided pedagogical practices like lectures. Using a storytelling method of eliciting teacher’s narrative identity within a structured format, as opposed to a more open-ended approach, permitted the research greater leverage in identifying the common and different elements and patterns across cases consistent with a framework correlated to the teachers’ foundation understanding of the subject.

The potential power of using narrative identity in engaging the orientations of social studies teachers that also permit a deeper and more nuanced picture of the lived experience of the teachers to emerge is manifest. The nuanced picture includes impacts into the core essence of association to social studies. Engaging the lived experience not only aids in illuminating how teachers view the goals and orientations of social studies, but the foundational perspectives into the teacher role in the classroom, the perceived utility and function of technology in the classroom, and the essence of the experience for the teachers. Additionally, engaging the lived experience permits a greater understanding of how the foundational perspectives interact in impacting the classroom environment.
Supports for the Learning Environments

Engaging the research with the purpose of generating findings useful for practitioners, policy makers, and researchers seeking to promote and enhance social studies education in the public sphere, the study was designed to implicitly and explicitly develop a greater understanding of the factors and elements that influence and shape a teacher’s commitments toward the subject of social studies. Current orientations identified by the teachers individually from the life experiences shared and the factors that influence and support the orientations are critical to uncover. Within the case teachers identified, I will discuss the implications of the findings for the design of learning environments in social studies and in promoting technology integration within the subject to support and enhance learning.

Support of Social Studies

Focusing attention on the support of social studies classrooms carried many potential issues. First, the nature of how each teacher elected to engage pedagogical methods showed an almost surprising level of uniformity in the method selected—but not in the application or goal for the method based on the essence of each teacher’s story. The adaptive nature of using curricular and pedagogical methods and materials in unintended ways spoke to the tension outlined by Brown and Edelson (2001) and Remaillard (2005). For example, although each teacher discussed the use of lecture and a desire for students to have the material matter through the lecture, the way in which the lecture would matter for the students from
the perspective of the teacher related to the essence of each teacher’s story. Adam wanted students to understand and find connection to place. Susan wanted students to connect with and make application through storytelling. Brian sought to have students create and sustain meaningful relationships through the content. All three teachers used lecture to meet those ends as the primary means of content dissemination. While easy to simply dismiss lecture as a means of effective pedagogy (e.g. Levstik & Barton, 2001), the application of the lecture method carried potentially effective constructs based on the essence of each teacher story.

Second, despite the level of uniformity in the pedagogical choices and even reliance on film as a limited technology consistently engaged in all three cases, two classes utilizing clips on the day of observation, the uniformity of methods should not be confused with a uniformity of pedagogy altogether (e.g. Brown & Campione, 1994; Cohen, 1988). Brian was seeking to use the classroom as a microcosm of democracy and helping the students to learn how to function in society. Adam was aiding students in discovering what norms and standards existed so that the students could determine their level of integration within the system. Susan wanted students to make connects to the larger society through shared stories that would build greater tolerance and connection throughout personal associations. Even with the consistency of using lecture present, each approached the concept of lecture in a different way to accomplish the goals with no two methods of lecture following precisely the same format. The ability to utilize the same methods toward the same goals while engaging radically different approaches followed the conceptual lines Remaillard (2005) suggested in
adapting materials without subverting the purpose. Brian used the terms of storyteller and lecture interchangeably. Adam engaged in a form of conceptual Socratic questioning rather than content delivery. Susan both read accounts and created discussion where students shared stories. Again, all three teachers used the term of lecture to define the pedagogical practice despite radical differences in implementation. Simply dismissing the method of lecture present in all three cases denies the diversity possible in that pedagogical construct and the potential value of such a method in the teaching process.

Third and equally related to the pedagogical methods, the centrality of storytelling as a concept within how the teachers connect to social studies is a concept with far reaching implications. As the theme was explored for each teacher as a primary element emergent from the data, the implications of that theme were the concern. For example, assessments decrying the lack of social studies fact-based knowledge performed since the turn of the last century perhaps also require retooling to match the pedagogical focus of the teachers in delivering the content. Without recognizing the central role of storytelling and the connected use of popular audiovisual media as one pedagogical means of delivering stories, comprehension of the pedagogical orientation of the teachers will remain disconnected from the perception of the goals and orientations for social studies as a subject. Connecting new methods, constructs, and approaches to social studies teaching with the concept of storytelling may prove both positive and ideologically congruent with how teachers cognitively connect with the subject—just as having teachers describe the understanding of the goals and orientations of
social studies through the act of narrative identity here has shown rich engagement from the teachers and deeper understanding of the private lived experience.

Finally, each construct for orientation, pedagogical method employed, and support or barrier revealed through the narrative found root in the essence of each case. Lasting change and meaningful appropriation of new methods or perspectives may rely on an understanding of how the teachers themselves meaningfully connect to the subject. While an intimate understanding of how the teachers view the goals and orientations emergent from the discussion is critical in designing training, preparation, and interventions for the classroom is equally critical in determining how best to support the teachers individually in practice. Such an intimate understanding can be achieved through the means by which the teachers themselves orient by way of the essence of the lived experience to identified orientations. Each teacher carried common goals, utilized similar pedagogical methods and organization, and expressed similar contextual influences. The great diversity notable within the teaching practice grounded in the core essence within the domain is unaddressed.

**Support of Technology Integration**

Considering implications for technology integration, it is first important to consider the reactions to new technology (consider Brown & Edelson, 2001; Windschilt, 2004). For example, for the current academic year two of these cases, Brian and Adam, were given new iPads for the classrooms. Both teachers
expressed a level of indifference to the devices, as they did not see a valuable application for the technology to the teaching. Consistent to the essence of the experiences shared, Adam set about finding place for the technology and was able to discuss the utility in moving multiple functions spread over several devices onto a singular device, like Internet searching and calendar applications. Brian saw no relationship building possibility or inherent enhancement to current relationships for the device and only found value in the technology when a red leather cover was able to make a mental relationship to books. Although both now have the technology accessible to enhance teaching practice, neither Adam’s or Brian’s integration necessarily unlocked the potential for transformative instruction. Susan, when introduced to new ways of using technology in the classroom through the student teachers that enter the classroom—like the identified PowerPoint Jeopardy game—elected not to adopt these methods. Susan was consistent with her story essence by failing to identify how these new technologies would aid the storytelling practice. It is not only the exposure to the technology, but discovering how the teachers engage in the essence of the identified orientation to the subject that played a critical role in the adoption practice (e.g. Cuban, 2001; Judson, 2006; Haefner, 2004; Windschitl & Sahl, 2002).

To carry this idea of individual reaction to technology further, consider the example of the iPad under a different presentation (e.g. Cohen, 1988; Brown & Campione, 1994). Consider the impact the iPad might have for Bruce if the technology was presented as a means of enhancing the relationship students can
have with past figures and time periods in much the same way Brian was impacted through a viewing of the film *Gandhi* (Attenborough, 1982) for the first time. Consider how Susan might use an iPad if the tool were presented as a means to engage students through novel storytelling methods in aiding students to create connections and applications with the stories of the past. Consider how Adam might use the iPad for student application if presented as a means of helping students situate past events around essential concepts applicable to current societal issues. While such an approach would require additional layers of complexity and subtle presentation to avoid market manipulation, the potential for transformative adoption and lasting integration suggests an area for future research (as highlighted in Brown & Edelson, 2001; Windschilt, 2004).

Additionally, Ertmer (2005) contended there is a mental barrier established when connecting with technology (see also Karagiorgi, 2005; Niess et al., 2009). Beginning with a college course where programming language was taught, Brian developed a strong emotional rejection of the technical language of computing that has led to frustration when entering training and technical language is assumed known. Susan also mentioned that the program trained and currently utilized daily in teaching was taught without technical jargon that provided tools without complication. Capturing an essential element, the delivery of the training itself to introduce and promote programs must avoid the use of technical or specialized jargon in the promotion of new tools if teachers are to engage in the tool.

However, language in training was not the only mental barrier to successful
integration. As discussed previously, all three cases carried the idea of potential dysfunction with the technology. Adam experienced extensive efforts blocked when the time came for use of the tool. Brian experienced frustration with an attendance program that lost the input and a grading system that did not create a printout sufficient to the perceived need. Susan carried an abiding fear of losing the gradebook to a computer error. In addition to overcoming the technical hurdles there are mental barriers created around dysfunctional technology that have caused all three cases to always rely on a low technology alternative (e.g. Evans, 2004; Grant, 2007; Ravitch, 2010; Maloy & LaRoche, 2010; NEA, 2004).

Successful integration of technology from the teachers’ stories implied three necessary items: (1) a working understanding of how the teachers orient to the subject as a mere access to technology lacked transformative power, (2) training free of technical jargon where the trainer is willing to pedantically teach without judgment, and (3) the overcoming of mental barriers surrounding dysfunctional systems, programs, or tools that would provide peace of mind and the security of dependability. Without the three elements, effective and even transformative integration practices will remain stilted and sidelined to other traditional methods of teaching.

Table 8 summarizes the foregoing implications for social studies and technology integration in the classroom. Critical supports are identified on the left column divided by social studies and technology concepts previously discussed. Each case is then presented in the center three columns in summary statements that relate to the supports identified. The far right column encapsulates a central
message about the supports from the combined case information.

Table 8

**Support of Social Studies and Technology Integration Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Supports</th>
<th>Brian Cain</th>
<th>Susan Haynes</th>
<th>Adam Campbell</th>
<th>Combined Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Usage</td>
<td>Create and sustain meaningful relationships through content</td>
<td>Connections and applications through storytelling</td>
<td>Understand and find connection to place through lecture</td>
<td>Uniform usage of lecture; different goals for usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Learning to function in society; microcosm of society</td>
<td>Make connections to society through stories to build tolerance and associations</td>
<td>Discover the norms of society to determine level of integration desired</td>
<td>Uniformity of method not of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storytelling</td>
<td>Lecture and storytelling interchangeably used</td>
<td>Students read and share stories in discussion</td>
<td>A conceptual Socratic questioning</td>
<td>Forms connection to the subject and framework for pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essence Not Merely Access</td>
<td>Given iPad, ignored until covered; not for students</td>
<td>Given iPad, found a use; not for students</td>
<td>Shown Jeopardy; not used; does not enhance storytelling</td>
<td>Essence of story dictated usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jargon-Free Training</td>
<td>Programming class; developed emotional rejection of technical language</td>
<td>Training in Utips; utilized daily when taught in jargon-free environment</td>
<td>Regularly engages technology and learns independently</td>
<td>Presentation and training important to promotion of tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Barriers</td>
<td>Attendance and grading systems lose input or fail to function</td>
<td>Carries fear of losing grade-book to computer error</td>
<td>Technology blocked when needed</td>
<td>Fear of dysfunction limited usage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Power of the Narrative**

In considering the implications of the findings as seen in Table 8, it is critical...
to address the question: How unique are the cases and how closely do they represent the common experience within the field? The participants shared characteristics and experiences in common, such as the early exposure and engagement with a social science subject that gave each teacher an early focus and dedication to the subject itself. The influences that exposed each teacher to the subjects included family, audiovisual media, and authority figures that—when presented in the narratives—established an almost inevitability in the subsequent story of becoming committed to the social sciences. It is tempting to believe that the teachers were simply more externally focused at a younger age and of a mental and moral awareness that attracted the teachers more readily toward the social sciences in ways that match current views of the purposes and goals for social studies as opposed to other people that simply want to get along in life and blend into their surroundings.

However, there are important reasons to discount such a reductionist view of the cases. While early experiences were identified and looked back on as foundational toward engagement with social studies, the stories also indicated that the narratives emerged through a wide variety of influences that engaged each storyteller throughout the story. After all, no consistent change over time narrative emerged that tied together all three cases. The contextual factors that sustained the teachers ranged from personal and cultural, to educational and familial that converged within the stories to produce a series of positive supports and experiences. Individual contextual factors engaged key concepts in social studies and the way the teachers approach education today (e.g. Cornett, 1990; Knowles,
Further, the power of narrative identity should not be dismissed (McAdams, 2006; Walker & Frimer, 2007). While the narratives themselves indicated layers of consistency within the nature of how they developed as teachers in the social studies, the teachers were able to develop into the social studies teachers each is today, not merely through the experiences shared, but the interpretation and framing of the experiences in a cogent narrative. As storytelling forms developed as an important theme, the descriptions of the orientations and views on social studies may have been mediated by the construction of a coherent and meaningful narrative identity. For example, Brian’s story that now forms the introduction to classes taught as a means to explain why Brian is engaged as a teacher. Further research might explore the ways in which various educational and personal experiences can mediate the process of the development of narrative identity (Cornett, 1990; Evans, 1990).

**Limitations of this Research**

Observing the best of research carries inherent limitations, the foregoing study is no exception and there are several limitations to the research. First, the generalizability of the findings are limited (Glendinning, 2007). As a fully qualitative and exploratory phenomenological study engaging a small participant sample and focusing on generating understandings of the goals and orientations in social studies through the narrative identities of the participants, the scope of the study was narrowed to engage depth rather than breadth. The results, including the
orientations generated from the narratives, fit the data collected from participants within in the local context (a small collection of school districts within a limited geographic scope of a state in the intermountain western United States) and subject domain. Further, the scope did not seek to encompass the full diversity of potential teachers working in the field required for larger application of the model across diverse communities and situations. The model will doubtless require modification or expansion to capture patterns in different contexts and diverse situations. However, as phenomenological analyses are not undertaken to discover essential structures, but merely study phenomena through experience, the study presented here is a valuable heuristic tool for new experimental questions and study designs (Schmicking, 2010).

Additionally, the process of research must be observed for limitations in interpreting the findings. Conducting research as a singular researcher with restrained resources rather than in concert with a team engaged in collecting and analyzing data created inherent challenges. Certain advantages emerged through a singular researcher lens—such as deep understanding and familiarity with the data achieved through multiple iterations in conducting, transcribing, and analyzing each case personally (Schmicking, 2010). However, multiple lenses offered by including additional researchers could have benefited the presentation and analysis of the cases. Attempting to compensate for the limitation, throughout the presentation of cases I have attempted to root all the analysis in the data itself, expose personal assumptions or biases, and use the words of the participants as often as possible to ensure the findings remain as transparent as possible
However, there must also be conceded the limits to the thoroughness of analysis based on the nature of grounded theory. Personal perspectives, experiences, interests, assumptions, and knowledge shaped the work presented in the foregoing dissertation. Even while the analysis was grounded to the data collected, the work was guided through the use of research questions and a theoretical lens that attuned the thinking toward certain features in the data that then became more apparent to analysis—a mildly controversial practice within phenomenologist (Schmicking, 2010; Spiegelberg, 1982). Therefore, this research presents only one of myriads of possible interpretations and theories that could potentially emerge from the data under different lenses and guided through different questions. When engaged in the dissertation the reader need recognize that despite the thoroughness of the analysis and careful exploration of the cases as guided by the research questions, the account presented is to be viewed as neither exhaustive nor the only perceived account of the data possible (Glendinning, 2007).

**Future Directions**

The research intended to provide a qualitative analysis of goals and purposes of social studies education as viewed from teachers’ narrative identities. The teacher view was studied to provide a rich phenomenological reflective analysis on the perceived goal and purpose constructs. Through the narratives, the array of influences, perspectives, contexts, individuals, and personal factors have impacted
the narrative account leading to the formulation of the goals and purposes for social studies education. Findings here incorporate features of narrative identity and emergent concepts potentially meaningful and broadly impactful for all stakeholders within the social studies domain.

The study leaves many areas open to extension in a vast array of directions. As previously suggested, research may revise and expand on the theoretical model to broaden the explanations to diverse members of the social studies community. While the Evans model (2010) effectively encapsulates the field with language aimed at the academic environment, the emergent model in this study is informed by teacher lived experience and language that can aid in understanding teacher behavior in the classroom. Utilizing these orientations within the Goal Oriented Decision Making model (Schoenfeld, 2011), for example, may prove beneficial in making teacher decisions, adaptations, and spontaneous modifications in the classroom teaching process more explicit. While in many ways a validation of the Evans model there are also expansions in different ways that require validation in multiple contexts. Further, an exploration of this emergent model in the design of teacher preparation courses, professional development, curriculum materials, and technology integration training for how it will impact reception and engagement within the classroom remains fertile territory for further research.

While cohesive narratives were achieved within the small geographic area, pushing the narrative ideas into a wider social studies environment may expand and reveal areas of weakness in the explanatory power of the conclusions to a broader field of teachers. Potential questions include: What similarities and
differences emerge amongst narrative identities across wider subsets of the social studies teaching field? How do the individuals differ from individuals involved at various grade levels and geographic conditions? The nature of comparative work along the vein of the foregoing questions will broaden the scope and impact within social studies and across disciplines during the contemporary time of educational policy change and focus on other subject disciplines within the public school teaching environments.

Additionally, research is required to extend the scope of investigations into social studies connected to ethnicity, cultural membership, socio-economic status, gender identities, and religious affiliations. Focused along such identified lines may clarify and sharpen the orientation constructs identified here and create a generalizable model for how teachers view the goals and orientations for social studies. Efforts so focused will aid efforts to improve teaching and learning within the subject domain, but also create supports for policymakers, teacher education programs, professional development providers, parents, and professional organizations providing guidance and support materials to connect efforts to held beliefs and views, and thereby create lasting and meaningful change commensurate to the challenge.
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APPENDICES
INTERVIEW ONE PROTOCOL: ORIENTATION TO SOCIAL STUDIES

Introductory Comments

[Note: The interview will be adjusted slightly to reflect the background of the interviewee—in some cases, the term technology will be sufficient, but creating a shared understanding will be critical to discussion.]

This is an interview about the story of your orientation to the subject of social studies. As a social scientist, I am interested in hearing your story, including parts of the past as you remember them and the future as you imagine it. The story is selective; it does not include everything that has ever happened to you. Instead, I will ask you to focus on a few key things in your life—a few key scenes, characters, and ideas. There are no right or wrong answers to my questions. Instead, your task is simply to tell me about some of the most important experiences with technology that have happened in your life and how you imagine your life developing in the future. In telling me your story, you should concentrate on information about yourself and your life which says something significant about you and how you have come to be who you are. I will guide you through the interview so that we finish it all in about an hour and a half.

Please know that my purpose in doing this interview is to understand the nature of how you relate to the subject of social studies. The interview is for research purposes only, and its main goal is simply to hear your story. With this interview I am trying to understand the nature of how people engage with the subject of social studies, now that they are educators, and the significant experiences and issues they have encountered with the subject over the course of their life. Everything you say is voluntary, anonymous, and confidential.

I think you will find the interview enjoyable and interesting as most people do. Do you have any questions before we get started?

I. Actions/Practices

First I would like to ask a few questions about your current understanding of social studies as a subject area.

Conception of Social Studies

Now let’s ensure we are on the same page with how we interpret “social studies” for this interview. As I think social studies I view it in terms of the integrated study of the social sciences and humanities to promote civic competence. These studies include varied subjects and disciplines ranging from history to economics. In attempting to use the term of social studies for this interview I would like to understand how you use the term and what subjects are foremost in your curriculum and practice. For example, some teachers often use the terms of geography and social studies interchangeably, however, social studies includes more than a dozen other subject disciplines.

1) How do you use the term social studies? What are the dominate subjects in your practice? Are there any clarifications about what would fit within this construct?
2) How would you describe the purpose of social studies education?
3) Is there a different term you would consider better fitting your experiences with these tools or that you would prefer to use?

Through the remainder of the interview, please consider these various types of tools as you explore your experiences and describe your story.

Role in Organization
I am interested in any work you do with any organizations or groups that work with social studies disciplines. These may include volunteer organizations, or your workplace. Do you belong to any organizations?

If yes, follow up: For each organization, please describe your role, position, or any projects you’re working on currently.

**Current Practices as an individual**

I would also like to learn about the subjects you engage with in your current teaching practice for social studies.

1) What are those subjects you would say you engage with on a daily basis?
2) What are some additional subjects you engage with less frequently?
3) How would you describe your comfort with all of these various subject disciplines?

**Brief Plot Summary**

Now, I’d like you to start thinking about your experience with and teaching of social studies as a story. All stories have characters, scenes, plots, and so forth. There are high and low points, good and bad times, and so on. Long stories even have chapters, and I would like you to think of your story as having at least a few different chapters. Think about what those chapters might be and what makes your story unique. To promote this idea, I’d like you to give me just a brief summary of what this story may be in no more than 5-10 mins. In the next section I will ask you to focus on details, but for now I’d like just the big picture. So, let’s begin discussing your relationship with technology and how you relate to it.

[Note to interviewer: The interviewer should feel free to ask questions of clarification and elaboration throughout the interview, but especially in this first part. This first section of the interview should run between 15 and 30 minutes.]

**Critical Events**

Now that you have described the overall plot outline for your life, I would like you to focus in on a few key scenes that stand out in the story. A key scene would be an event or specific incident that took place at a particular time and place. Consider a key scene to be a moment in your life story that stands out for a particular reason—perhaps because it was especially good or bad, particularly vivid, important, or memorable. As an example, the first time you remember creating or presenting a project for a social studies class. It is a moment embedded in a particular time and place, complete with characters, actions, thoughts, and feelings. However, the weeks of your practicum teaching, though potentially significant, would not qualify as a key event as it occurred over an extended period of time. For each of the key events we will consider, I ask that you describe in detail what happened, when and where it happened, who was involved, and what you were thinking and feeling in the event. In addition, I ask that you tell me why you think this particular scene is important or significant in your life. What does the scene say about you as a person? Please be specific.

II. Key Events

**Earliest Memory**

First, I’d like you to think about an early event or scene in your story. It may be from your experience as a student in schools, or later in life where you first began teaching in a social studies classroom. Please describe this event in some detail including what happened, where it happened, who was involved, what you did, what you were thinking and feeling, what impact this experience may have had upon you, and what this experience says about who you were or who you are.

Follow up: Would you describe this event as positive or negative?
**High Point**

Please describe a scene, episode, or moment in your life that stands out as an especially positive experience. It would be a moment or episode in the story in which you experienced extremely positive emotions, like joy, excitement, great happiness, uplifting, or even deep inner peace...yes, related to teaching or learning social studies. This might be the high point scene of your entire story with social studies, or else an especially happy, joyous, exciting, or wonderful moment in the story. Please describe this high point scene in detail. What happened, when and where, who was involved, and what were you thinking and feeling? Also, please say a word or two about why you think this particular moment was so good and what the scene may say about who you are as a person.

**Low Point**

The second scene is the opposite of the first. Thinking back over your entire life, please identify a scene that stands out as a low point, if not the low point in your story; a specific experience in which you felt extremely negative emotions, such as despair, disillusionment, terror, guilt, etc. Even though this event is unpleasant, I would appreciate your providing as much detail as you can about it. What happened in the event, where and when, who was involved, and what were you thinking and feeling? Also, please say a word or two about why you think this particular moment was so bad and what the scene may say about you or your life.

[Interviewer note: If the participants balks at doing this, tell him or her that the event does not really have to be the lowest point in the story but merely a very bad experience of some kind.]

**Turning Point**

In looking back over your life, it may be possible to identify certain key moments that stand out as turning points—episodes that marked an important change in you or your relationship with teaching or learning social studies. Please identify a particular episode in your life story that you now see as a turning point in your life. Such a point may occur in many different spheres of a person’s life—in relationships with other people, in work and school, in outside interests, in your understanding of yourself, etc. If you cannot identify a key turning point that stands out clearly, please describe some event in your life wherein you went through an important change of some kind. Again, for this event please describe what happened, where and when, who was involved, and what you were thinking and feeling. Also, please say a word or two about what you think this event says about you as a person or about your life.

**Other significant scene**

Finally, I’d like you to select one other event that you believe to have been meaningful or important in some way. Once again, describe what happened, with whom, when, what you were thinking and feeling, the impact of this event, and what it says about you.

Now, we’re going to talk about the future.

**III. Alternate Futures for the Relationship Story**

**Positive Future Scene**

I would like you to envision a possible and realistic positive future scene in your relationship story—This is a scene that you hope will happen in the future. How would you describe this future scene?

**Negative Future Scene**

I would like you to envision a possible and realistic negative future scene—this is a scene that you hope does not happen. How would you describe this future scene?

**IV. Influences on the Social Studies Story**
People or groups
Looking back over your relationship with social studies, please identify the single person or group of people that have had the greatest influence on your story—either positive or negative. Please describe them and how they have impacted your story.

Media
Think back on stories that you have experienced from the news, movies, TV shows or other media. You might consider true stories or fiction. Have any of these stories been particularly impactful or had a powerful influence on you? Follow-up: What was the story about and what was the impact it had on you?

Books
Have there been any books, either fiction or non-fiction, that were particularly informative or impactful? What were they about, and what kind of impact did they have on you?

Unexpected events
Not everything we do in life is completely planned out, and sometimes chance events may play significant roles in our daily lives. Have there been any accidental or circumstantial events that were significant in your relationship story with social studies? If so, choose one event and describe it in detail and the role it played in your commitment story.

V. Maintaining Your Commitment

Supports
What have been the primary supports that have sustained you in trying to build a relationship with teaching or learning social studies? These supports may be qualities of yourself, such as knowledge or a particular conviction or outlook, or qualities of your surrounding environment, such as having access to certain resources.

Barriers
Have you experienced any obstacles or barriers to particular courses of action that you believe to be important regarding your relationship to teach or learn social studies? Again, barriers may relate to qualities in yourself or characteristics of your environment/life circumstances.

Relating to Others
Given your current relationship with social studies as a subject, I’d like to understand how you interact with or relate to others who don’t share the same viewpoints or beliefs.
1) Can you recall an incident in which you interacted with someone who disagreed with you on these issues? What happened, and how was this event significant for you?
2) Is this event typical of your approach towards interacting with others who have different views?

(follow up questions: How did you feel? What were you trying to accomplish? Would you say you actively seek interactions with others who disagree with you, or would you rather avoid them?)

VI. Philosophy Behind Your Commitment

I would like to understand your fundamental philosophy regarding technology use for social studies. Are there any core beliefs or values that you haven’t touched on so far? Are you guided by strong religious or spiritual beliefs, or a particular political point of view that affect your relationship toward or teaching of social studies?
VII. Personal Life

We are just about at the end of the interview. So far I've asked you to focus on events in your life that relate to your orientation to teach or learn social studies. Now I would like you to reflect very briefly on how these events and this interaction relate to your personal life. How does your work and family life connect with this teaching practice, or does it? Have there been any challenges, or do these different areas of your life fit together well?

VIII. Other

What else should I know to understand your orientation to social studies as a subject discipline?

INTERVIEW TWO PROTOCOL: TECHNOLOGY STORY

Introductory Comments

[Note: The interview will be adjusted slightly to reflect the background of the interviewee—in some cases, the term technology will be sufficient, but creating a shared understanding will be critical to discussion.]

This is an interview about the story of your relationship with technology. As a social scientist, I am interested in hearing your story, including parts of the past as you remember them and the future as you imagine it. The story is selective; it does not include everything that has ever happened to you. Instead, I will ask you to focus on a few key things in your life—a few key scenes, characters, and ideas. There are no right or wrong answers to my questions. Instead, your task is simply to tell me about some of the most important experiences with technology that have happened in your life and how you imagine your life developing in the future. In telling me your story, you should concentrate on information about yourself and your life which says something significant about you and how you have come to be who you are. I will guide you through the interview so that we finish it all in about an hour and a half.

Please know that my purpose in doing this interview is to understand the nature of your background with technology. The interview is for research purposes only, and its main goal is simply to hear your story. With this interview I am trying to understand the nature of how people engage with technology and the significant experiences and issues they have encountered with technology over the course of their life. Everything you say is voluntary, anonymous, and confidential.

I think you will find the interview enjoyable and interesting as most people do. Do you have any questions before we get started?

I. Actions/Practices

First I would like to ask a few questions about your current connection with technology.

Conception of Technology

Let's begin by making sure we are on the same page with how we interpret the term “technology” for this interview. As I think about technology I am thinking about information/communication technologies. These tools include everything from basic landline telephones to all the computer, Internet, and simulation environments currently being created. This also includes all the entertainment technologies ranging from movies and television to the gaming consoles.
1) Does this explanation capture the essence of the technologies you have encountered in your experience? Are there any clarifications about what would fit within this construct?

2) Is there a different term you would consider better fitting your experiences with these tools or that you would prefer to use?

Through the remainder of the interview, please consider these various types of tools as you explore your experiences and describe your story.

**Role in Organization**

I am interested in any work you do with any organizations or groups that work with these technologies. These may include volunteer organizations, or your workplace. Do you belong to any organizations?

If yes, follow up: For each organization, please describe your role, position, or any projects you’re working on currently.

**Current Practices as an individual**

I would also like to learn about the kinds of technologies you engage with in your current personal life.

4) What are those technologies you would say you engage with on a daily basis?

5) What are some additional technologies you engage with less frequently?

6) How would you describe your comfort with all of these technologies?

**Brief Plot Summary**

Now, I’d like you to start thinking about your interactions with technologies as a story. All stories have characters, scenes, plots, and so forth. There are high and low points, good and bad times, and so on. Long stories even have chapters, and I would like you to think of your story as having at least a few different chapters. Think about what those chapters might be and what makes your story unique. To promote this idea, I’d like you to give me just a brief summary of what this story may be in no more than 5-10 mins. In the next section I will ask you to focus on details, but for now I’d like just the big picture. So, let’s begin discussing your relationship with technology and how you relate to it.

[Note to interviewer: The interviewer should feel free to ask questions of clarification and elaboration throughout the interview, but especially in this first part. This first section of the interview should run between 15 and 30 minutes.]

**Critical Events**

Now that you have described the overall plot outline for your life, I would like you to focus in on a few key scenes that stand out in the story. A key scene would be an event or specific incident that took place at a particular time and place. Consider a key scene to be a moment in your life story that stands out for a particular reason—perhaps because it was especially good or bad, particularly vivid, important, or memorable. As an example, a first major interaction with a new tool could qualify as a key event. It is a moment embedded in a particular time and place, complete with characters, actions, thoughts, and feelings. However, the ownership of a typewriter for an entire year, though potentially significant, would not qualify as a key event as it occurred over an extended period of time. For each of the key events we will consider, I ask that you describe in detail what happened, when and where it happened, who was involved, and what you were thinking and feeling in the event. In addition, I ask that you tell me why you think this particular scene is important or significant in your life. What does the scene say about you as a person? Please be specific.

II. Key Events
Earliest Memory
First, I’d like you to think about an early event or scene in your story. It may be from your childhood, or later in life where you first recall personal interactions with technology. Please describe this event in some detail including what happened, where it happened, who was involved, what you did, what you were thinking and feeling, what impact this experience may have had upon you, and what this experience says about who you were or who you are.
Follow up: Would you describe this event as positive or negative?

High Point
Please describe a scene, episode, or moment in your life that stands out as an especially positive experience. It would be a moment or episode in the story in which you experienced extremely positive emotions, like joy, excitement, great happiness, uplifting, or even deep inner peace...yes, related to technology. This might be the high point scene of your entire story with technology, or else an especially happy, joyous, exciting, or wonderful moment in the story. Please describe this high point scene in detail. What happened, when and where, who was involved, and what were you thinking and feeling? Also, please say a word or two about why you think this particular moment was so good and what the scene may say about who you are as a person.

Low Point
The second scene is the opposite of the first. Thinking back over your entire life, please identify a scene that stands out as a low point, if not the low point in your story; a specific experience in which you felt extremely negative emotions, such as despair, disillusionment, terror, guilt, etc. Even though this event is unpleasant, I would appreciate your providing as much detail as you can about it. What happened in the event, where and when, who was involved, and what were you thinking and feeling? Also, please say a word or two about why you think this particular moment was so bad and what the scene may say about you or your life.
[Interviewer note: If the participants balks at doing this, tell him or her that the event does not really have to be the lowest point in the story but merely a very bad experience of some kind.]

Turning Point
In looking back over your life, it may be possible to identify certain key moments that stand out as turning points—episodes that marked an important change in you or your relationship with technology. Please identify a particular episode in your life story that you now see as a turning point in your life. Such a point may occur in many different spheres of a person’s life—in relationships with other people, in work and school, in outside interests, in your understanding of yourself, etc. If you cannot identify a key turning point that stands out clearly, please describe some event in your life wherein you went through an important change of some kind. Again, for this event please describe what happened, where and when, who was involved, and what you were thinking and feeling. Also, please say a word or two about what you think this event says about you as a person or about your life.

Other significant scene
Finally, I’d like you to select one other event that you believe to have been meaningful or important in some way. Once again, describe what happened, with whom, when, what you were thinking and feeling, the impact of this event, and what it says about you.

Now, we’re going to talk about the future.

III. Alternate Futures for the Relationship Story

Positive Future Scene
I would like you to envision a possible and realistic positive future scene in your relationship story—This is a scene that you hope will happen in the future. How would you describe this future scene?
Negative Future Scene
I would like you to envision a possible and realistic negative future scene—this is a scene that you hope does not happen. How would you describe this future scene?

IV. Influences on the Technology Story

People or groups
Looking back over your relationship with technology, please identify the single person or group of people that have had the greatest influence on your story—either positive or negative. Please describe them and how they have impacted your story.

Media
Think back on stories that you have experienced from the news, movies, TV shows or other media. You might consider true stories or fiction. While noting these are technologies themselves focus on the stories conveyed through these tools rather than the tools used to convey them. Have any of these stories been particularly impactful or had a powerful influence on you?
Follow-up: What was the story about and what was the impact it had on you?

Books
Have there been any books, either fiction or non-fiction, that were particularly informative or impactful? What were they about, and what kind of impact did they have on you?

Unexpected events
Not everything we do in life is completely planned out, and sometimes chance events may play significant roles in our daily lives. Have there been any accidental or circumstantial events that were significant in your relationship story with technology? If so, choose one event and describe it in detail and the role it played in your commitment story.

V. Maintaining Your Commitment

Supports
What have been the primary supports that have sustained you in trying to build a relationship with technology? These supports may be qualities of yourself, such as knowledge or a particular conviction or outlook, or qualities of your surrounding environment, such as having access to certain resources.

Barriers
Have you experienced any obstacles or barriers to particular courses of action that you believe to be important regarding your relationship with technology? Again, barriers may relate to qualities in yourself or characteristics of your environment/life circumstances.

Relating to Others
Given your current relationship with technology, I’d like to understand how you interact with or relate to others who don’t share the same viewpoints or beliefs.
3) Can you recall an incident in which you interacted with someone who disagreed with you on these issues? What happened, and how was this event significant for you?
4) Is this event typical of your approach towards interacting with others who have different views?

(follow up questions: How did you feel? What were you trying to accomplish? Would you say you actively seek interactions with others who disagree with you, or would you rather avoid them?)
VI. Philosophy Behind Your Commitment

I would like to understand your fundamental philosophy regarding technology use. Are there any core beliefs or values that you haven’t touched on so far? Are you guided by strong religious or spiritual beliefs, or a particular political point of view that affect your relationship and use of technology?

VII. Personal Life

We are just about at the end of the interview. So far I’ve asked you to focus on events in your life that relate to your interactions with technology. Now I would like you to reflect very briefly on how these events and this interaction relate to your personal life. How does your work and family life connect with this technology usage, or does it? Have there been any challenges, or do these different areas of your life fit together well?

VIII. Other

What else should I know to understand your relationship with and use of technology?

INTERVIEW THREE: TECHNOLOGY IN SOCIAL STUDIES

Introductory Comments

[Note: The interview will be adjusted slightly to reflect the background of the interviewee—in some cases, the term technology will be sufficient, but creating a shared understanding will be critical to discussion.]

This is an interview about the story of your relationship with technology within the social studies curriculum. As a social scientist, I am interested in hearing your story, including parts of the past as you remember them and the future as you imagine it. The story is selective; it does not include everything that has ever happened to you. Instead, I will ask you to focus on a few key things in your life—a few key scenes, characters, and ideas. There are no right or wrong answers to my questions. Instead, your task is simply to tell me about some of the most important experiences with technology that have happened in your life and how you imagine your life developing in the future. In telling me your story, you should concentrate on information about yourself and your life which says something significant about you and how you have come to be who you are. I will guide you through the interview so that we finish it all in about an hour and a half.

Please know that my purpose in doing this interview is to understand the nature of your background with technology. The interview is for research purposes only, and its main goal is simply to hear your story. With this interview I am trying to understand the nature of how people engage with technology and the significant experiences and issues they have encountered with technology over the course of their life. Everything you say is voluntary, anonymous, and confidential.

I think you will find the interview enjoyable and interesting as most people do. Do you have any questions before we get started?

I. Actions/Practices
First I would like to ask a few questions about your current connection with technology within social studies.

**Conception of Technology and Social Studies**

Lets begin by making sure we are on the same page with how we interpret the term “technology” for this interview. As I think about technology I am thinking about information/communication technologies. These tools include everything from basic landline telephones to all the computer, Internet, and simulation environments currently being created. This also includes all the entertainment technologies ranging from movies and television to the gaming consoles.

3) Does this explanation capture the essence of the technologies you have encountered in your experience? Are there any clarifications about what would fit within this construct?

4) Is there a different term you would consider better fitting your experiences with these tools or that you would prefer to use?

Through the remainder of the interview, please consider these various types of tools as you explore your experiences and describe your story.

Now lets ensure we are on the same page with how we interpret “social studies” for this interview. As I think social studies I view it in terms of the integrated study of the social sciences and humanities to promote civic competence. These studies include varied subjects and disciplines ranging from history to economics. In attempting to use the term of social studies for this interview I would like to understand how you use the term and what subjects are foremost in your curriculum and practice. For example, some teachers often use the terms of history and social studies interchangeably, however, social studies includes more than a dozen other subject disciplines.

4) How do you use the term social studies? What are the dominate subjects in your practice? Are there any clarifications about what would fit within this construct?

5) Is there a different term you would consider better fitting your experiences with these tools or that you would prefer to use?

Through the remainder of the interview, please consider these various types of tools as you explore your experiences and describe your story.

**Role in Organization**

I am interested in any work you do with any organizations or groups that work with either social studies disciplines or technology. These may include volunteer organizations, or your workplace. Do you belong to any organizations?

If yes, follow up: For each organization, please describe your role, position, or any projects you’re working on currently.

**Current Practices as an individual**

I would also like to learn about the kinds of technologies you engage with in your current teaching practice.

7) What are those technologies you would say you engage with on a daily basis?

8) What are some additional technologies you engage with less frequently?

9) How would you describe your comfort with all of these technologies?

**Brief Plot Summary**
Now, I’d like you to start thinking about your interactions with technologies for teaching social studies as a story. All stories have characters, scenes, plots, and so forth. There are high and low points, good and bad times, and so on. Long stories even have chapters, and I would like you to think of your story as having at least a few different chapters. Think about what those chapters might be and what makes your story unique. To promote this idea, I’d like you to give me just a brief summary of what this story may be in no more than 5-10 mins. In the next section I will ask you to focus on details, but for now I’d like just the big picture. So, let’s begin discussing your relationship with technology and how you relate to it.

[Note to interviewer: The interviewer should feel free to ask questions of clarification and elaboration throughout the interview, but especially in this first part. This first section of the interview should run between 15 and 30 minutes.]

Critical Events
Now that you have described the overall plot outline for your life, I would like you to focus in on a few key scenes that stand out in the story. A key scene would be an event or specific incident that took place at a particular time and place. Consider a key scene to be a moment in your life story that stands out for a particular reason—perhaps because it was especially good or bad, particularly vivid, important, or memorable. As an example, the first time you attempted to use an interactive whiteboard in the classroom. It is a moment embedded in a particular time and place, complete with characters, actions, thoughts, and feelings. However, the ownership of a teacher use laptop computer for the school year, though potentially significant, would not qualify as a key event as it occurred over an extended period of time. For each of the key events we will consider, I ask that you describe in detail what happened, when and where it happened, who was involved, and what you were thinking and feeling in the event. In addition, I ask that you tell me why you think this particular scene is important or significant in your life. What does the scene say about you as a person? Please be specific.

II. Key Events

Earliest Memory
First, I’d like you to think about an early event or scene in your story. It may be from your experience as a student in schools, or later in life where you first recall personal interactions with technology in a social studies classroom. Please describe this event in some detail including what happened, where it happened, who was involved, what you did, what you were thinking and feeling, what impact this experience may have had upon you, and what this experience says about who you were or who you are.

Follow up: Would you describe this event as positive or negative?

High Point
Please describe a scene, episode, or moment in your life that stands out as an especially positive experience. It would be a moment or episode in the story in which you experienced extremely positive emotions, like joy, excitement, great happiness, uplifting, or even deep inner peace…yes, related to technology for teaching or learning social studies. This might be the high point scene of your entire story with technology within social studies, or else an especially happy, joyous, exciting, or wonderful moment in the story. Please describe this high point scene in detail. What happened, when and where, who was involved, and what were you thinking and feeling? Also, please say a word or two about why you think this particular moment was so good and what the scene may say about who you are as a person.

Low Point
The second scene is the opposite of the first. Thinking back over your entire life, please identify a scene that stands out as a low point, if not the low point in your story; a specific experience in which you felt extremely negative emotions, such as despair, disillusionment, terror, guilt, etc. Even though this event is unpleasant, I would appreciate your providing as much detail as you can about it. What happened in the event, where and when, who was involved, and what were
you thinking and feeling? Also, please say a word or two about why you think this particular moment was so bad and what the scene may say about you or your life.

[Interviewer note: If the participants balks at doing this, tell him or her that the event does not really have to be the lowest point in the story but merely a very bad experience of some kind.]

**Turning Point**
In looking back over your life, it may be possible to identify certain key moments that stand out as turning points—episodes that marked an important change in you or your relationship with technology for teaching or learning social studies. Please identify a particular episode in your life story that you now see as a turning point in your life. Such a point may occur in many different spheres of a person’s life—in relationships with other people, in work and school, in outside interests, in your understanding of yourself, etc. If you cannot identify a key turning point that stands out clearly, please describe some event in your life wherein you went through an important change of some kind. Again, for this event please describe what happened, where and when, who was involved, and what you were thinking and feeling. Also, please say a word or two about what you think this event says about you as a person or about your life.

**Other significant scene**
Finally, I’d like you to select one other event that you believe to have been meaningful or important in some way. Once again, describe what happened, with whom, when, what you were thinking and feeling, the impact of this event, and what it says about you.

Now, we’re going to talk about the future.

**III. Alternate Futures for the Relationship Story**

**Positive Future Scene**
I would like you to envision a possible and realistic positive future scene in your relationship story—This is a scene that you hope will happen in the future. How would you describe this future scene?

**Negative Future Scene**
I would like you to envision a possible and realistic negative future scene—this is a scene that you hope does not happen. How would you describe this future scene?

**IV. Influences on the Technology Story**

**People or groups**
Looking back over your relationship with technology for teaching social studies, please identify the single person or group of people that have had the greatest influence on your story—either positive or negative. Please describe them and how they have impacted your story.

**Media**
Think back on stories that you have experienced from the news, movies, TV shows or other media. You might consider true stories or fiction. While noting these are technologies themselves focus on the stories conveyed through these tools rather than the tools used to convey them. Have any of these stories been particularly impactful or had a powerful influence on you?

Follow-up: What was the story about and what was the impact it had on you?

**Books**
Have there been any books, either fiction or non-fiction, that were particularly informative or impactful? What were they about, and what kind of impact did they have on you?
Unexpected events
Not everything we do in life is completely planned out, and sometimes chance events may play significant roles in our daily lives. Have there been any accidental or circumstantial events that were significant in your relationship story with technology? If so, choose one event and describe it in detail and the role it played in your commitment story.

V. Maintaining Your Commitment

Supports
What have been the primary supports that have sustained you in trying to build a relationship with technology for teaching or learning social studies? These supports may be qualities of yourself, such as knowledge or a particular conviction or outlook, or qualities of your surrounding environment, such as having access to certain resources.

Barriers
Have you experienced any obstacles or barriers to particular courses of action that you believe to be important regarding your relationship with technology to teach or learn social studies? Again, barriers may relate to qualities in yourself or characteristics of your environment/life circumstances.

Relating to Others
Given your current relationship with technology for teaching and learning social studies, I’d like to understand how you interact with or relate to others who don’t share the same viewpoints or beliefs.
5) Can you recall an incident in which you interacted with someone who disagreed with you on these issues? What happened, and how was this event significant for you?
6) Is this event typical of your approach towards interacting with others who have different views?

(follow up questions: How did you feel? What were you trying to accomplish? Would you say you actively seek interactions with others who disagree with you, or would you rather avoid them?)

VI. Philosophy Behind Your Commitment

I would like to understand your fundamental philosophy regarding technology use for social studies. Are there any core beliefs or values that you haven’t touched on so far? Are you guided by strong religious or spiritual beliefs, or a particular political point of view that affect your relationship and use of technology?

VII. Personal Life

We are just about at the end of the interview. So far I’ve asked you to focus on events in your life that relate to your interactions with technology to teach or learn social studies. Now I would like you to reflect very briefly on how these events and this interaction relate to your personal life. How does your work and family life connect with this technology usage, or does it? Have there been any challenges, or do these different areas of your life fit together well?

VIII. Other
What else should I know to understand your relationship with and use of technology to teach or learn social studies?

INTERVIEW FOUR: STIMULATED RECALL

For the Interviewer: It is important not to be so locked into the questions that you miss following a line of thought presented in the questions. These are suggested questions as a guide.

1. Explain what you believe to be the goals and purposes of social studies education.
2. How would you describe the key philosophies that underpin your teaching?
3. How would you describe a typical day in your classroom?
4. With the typical variations and demands on your school day how do these goals and purposes find expression on a daily basis?
5. Tell me about the object you have brought in to symbolize, or serve as an exemplar of your teaching practice?
6. Where would this fit into your curriculum? (Things before and after…)
7. What would be the goal and objective for this lesson from which this artifact would be found?
8. Tell me about the lesson this artifact came from this school year? How do the students generally interact with this artifact? Example?
9. How do you feel this artifact is exemplary to your style of teaching or philosophy of Social Studies Education?
10. If you could, how would you improve this artifact to better align with your philosophy and understandings of best practice in social studies teaching?
11. What influenced you to structure the lesson for this artifact in this way? Any technology or district demands that altered how you would have structured this lesson or shaped it more positively for you?
12. In what ways do these external factors weigh on your teaching practice or influence your views of social studies education itself?
13. What led you to select this artifact for this interview as being emblematic of your teaching or philosophical thinking about social studies?
14. Is this type of artifact typical for your classroom? In what way yes or no? Example?
15. Anything else you would like me to know about this artifact or your teaching practice?
INTERVIEW FIVE: GUIDED RESPONSE QUESTIONS

To the Interviewer: Begin the interview with the first five questions to establish an understanding for the lesson and to get the interviewee talking. From there begin by showing a clip from the classroom observation and pay attention to what the person says while watching. Ask follow up questions to their comments first, and then begin with the watch clips questions (5 questions). Once satisfied with the responses, watch the next clip and follow with the questions. Once finished with the clips, conclude the interview with five after clips questions. Feel free throughout the interview to ask additional questions, follow up questions, or clarifying questions and use this as a guide and aid to eliciting responses.

Guided Response Questions:

1. Let's begin in having you explain the goals and purposes of social studies education.
2. How would you describe the key philosophies that underpin your teaching?
3. How do you feel these ideas impact your approach to teaching?
4. Help situate this instructional day in your curriculum. Things before and after...
5. What was the goal and objective for this lesson?

Watch clips:

1. What is happening in the clip?
2. What is the instructional strategy being employed?
3. How typical would you say this moment is? Example?
4. What would you say your goal or the purpose of this segment is?
5. If you could, or would want to alter this moment in any way, your actions, teaching, method, content, what would you do if anything?

After Clips:

1. How do you feel this class session typifies your understanding of the purposes and goals for social studies education?
2. How do these ideas exhibited in your classroom as we have discussed them, present in your pedagogical practice?
3. What influenced the teaching of this class in this way for you?
4. Anything else you would like to share about this observation?
5. Anything else you would like to share about your philosophical understanding of the goals and purposes of social studies?
APPENDIX B: Recruitment Documents

*Introduction/ Purpose* Professor Brett Shelton and Doctoral Candidate Jeffrey Olsen in the Department of Instructional Technology and Learning Sciences at Utah State University is conducting a research study to find out more about how High School Social Studies Teachers orient to the subject of Social Studies. You have been asked to take part because of your exemplary service as a Social Studies Teacher in the State of Utah. There will be approximately three total participants in this research in three different districts across the state.

*Procedures* If you agree to be in this research study, you will be asked to engage in a series of interviews about your lived experience with Social Studies, technology, and your approach to teaching. There will be five interviews in all, ranging from half an hour to two hours depending on your willingness and the level of detail you elect to share; with an average of an hour to be expected. The first three will be simply related to your lived experience, orientations toward the subject, and current practice. The fourth will be a more detailed description of your current teaching practice. The fifth will be an interview utilizing clips of your teaching recorded prior to the end of the year and used solely for the purpose of clarifying and understanding previous statements rather than a critique or analysis of your teaching. The obligation to record the classroom session will be that of the teachers, and will be utilized only as a means of performing the additional interview. Recording can be done by the teacher or school or coordinated with the researcher to perform. At the completion of five interviews, there are no further obligations. These interviews will be scheduled at the convenience of both parties but not to exceed a five-week period.

*New Findings* During the course of this research study, you will be informed of any significant new findings (either good or bad), changes in the procedures, risks or benefits resulting from participation in the research, or new alternatives to participation that might cause you to change your mind.
about continuing in the study. If necessary, your consent to continue participating in this study will be obtained again.

*Risks* Participation in this research study may involve some added risks or discomforts; such as the nature of inadvertent disclosure during interview. All information will go through a process of confidentiality and you will have the option to review prior to publication of analysis if requested. Additionally, There is a small risk of loss of confidentiality but we will take steps to reduce this risk. Any loss of confidentiality will be discussed with the participant.

*Benefits* While no direct benefits may be directly identified by the participant, the research will help create a new model for understanding orientations to the subject of Social Studies potentially useful in local, regional, and national organizations in creating materials, instructional supplies, and professional development programs, potentially inadvertently beneficial.

Explanation & offer to answer questions  Jeffrey Olsen, Co-PI, has explained this research study to you and answered your questions. If you have other questions or research-related problems, you may reach (PI) Brett Shelton at (435) 727- or by email at brett.shelton@usu.edu.

*Voluntary nature of participation and right to withdraw without consequence* Participation in research is entirely voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without consequence or loss of benefits. You may be withdrawn from this study without your consent by the investigator.

*Confidentiality* Research records will be kept confidential, consistent with federal and state regulations. Only the investigator will have access to the data that will be kept in a locked file cabinet or on a password protected computer in a locked room. To protect your privacy, personal, identifiable information will be removed from study documents and replaced with a study identifier. Identifying information will be stored separately from data and will be kept for a period of time no longer than seven years. All recorded interview data will be immediately coded with the pseudonym, transcribed with a special identifier, and kept altered to remove any potentially identifying information at the time of analysis.

*IRB Approval Statement* The Institutional Review Board for the protection of human participants at Utah State University has approved this research study. If you have any questions or concerns about your rights or a
research-related injury and would like to contact someone other than the research team, you may contact the IRB Administrator at (435) 797-0567 or email irb@usu.edu to obtain information or to offer input.

*Copy of consent* You have been given two copies of this Informed Consent. Please sign both copies and keep one copy for your files.

*Investigator Statement* “I certify that the research study has been explained to the individual, by me or my research staff, and that the individual understands the nature and purpose, the possible risks and benefits associated with taking part in this research study. Any questions that have been raised have been answered.”

*Signature of Researcher(s)*

_____________________________  ______________________________
Brett Shelton                Jeffrey A Olsen
Principal Investigator      Co-PI, Doctoral Candidate
(435) 757-253-4008          (253)722-4008
Brett.shelton@usu.edu        Jeffrey.a.olsen@aggiemail.usu.edu

*Signature of Participant* By signing below, I agree to participate.

_____________________________  ______________________________
Participant’s Signature        Date
Recruitment email

Greetings,

Professor Brett Shelton and Doctoral Candidate Jeffrey Olsen in the Department of Instructional Technology and Learning Sciences at Utah State University is conducting a research study to find out more about how High School Social Studies Teachers orient to the subject of Social Studies. You have been asked to take part because of your exemplary service as a Social Studies Teacher in the State of Utah within the selection criteria. There will be approximately three total participants in this research in three different districts across the state.

If you agree to be in this research study, you will be asked to engage in a series of interviews about your lived experience with Social Studies, technology, and your approach to teaching. There will be five interviews in all, ranging from half an hour to two hours depending on your willingness and the level of detail you elect to share; with an average of an hour to be expected. The first three will be simply related to your lived experience, orientations toward the subject, and current practice. The fourth will be a more detailed description of your current teaching practice. The fifth will be an interview utilizing clips of your teaching recorded prior to the end of the year and used solely for the purpose of clarifying and understanding previous statements rather than a critique or analysis of your teaching. The obligation to record the classroom session will be that of the teachers, and will be utilized only as a means of performing the additional interview. Recording can be done by the teacher or school or coordinated with the researcher to perform. At the completion of five interviews, there are no further obligations. These interviews will be scheduled at the convenience of both parties but not to exceed a five-week period.

During the course of this research study, you will be informed of any significant new findings (either good or bad), changes in the procedures, risks or benefits resulting from participation in the research, or new alternatives to participation that might cause you to change your mind about continuing in the study. If necessary, your consent to continue participating in this study will be obtained again. All participation is voluntary and you may withdraw without consequence at any time.

If you would like to be considered for participation in this study, please respond to this email of your willingness to participate and information will be sent on to contact you.

Respectfully,
Curriculum Vitae

Jeffrey Allen Olsen
280 E 970 N
Logan, UT 84321
Jeffrey.a.olsen@aggiemail.usu.edu

QUALIFICATIONS

✓ Knowledge of, and experience using, qualitative, quantitative and mixed-methodologies from a variety of epistemic lenses in the behavioral sciences.

✓ Experience in cross-discipline, multicultural, and STEM collaborations in research and instruction for diverse communities.

✓ Experience with teaching and mentoring diverse populations from K-12 – practicing teaching professionals utilizing technologies.

✓ Knowledge of how to use a variety of technologies in teaching and learning contexts with adults and children, for face-to-face, blended, and online learning.

✓ Knowledge of, and experience teaching with, inquiry-based pedagogies in technology rich and non-technology rich settings.

✓ Knowledge of, and experience with creating blended learning and online classroom environments.

EDUCATION

August 2009- Present
Utah State University, Doctorate of Philosophy, Instructional Technology and Learning Sciences
Dissertation research: Social Studies Teachers Orientations to Social Studies: A Phenomenological Study.
Advisor: Brett Shelton, Ph.D.

January 2008-June 2009
Western Illinois University, Master of Science, Instructional Design and Technology
Thesis: Teacher and student perceptions of technology integration for teaching social studies in public schools.
Advisor: Leunda Hemphill, Ph.D.

June 2004-August 2005
Pacific Lutheran University, Master of Arts in Education, Secondary Social Studies Education with teacher certification.
Thesis: Like in that movie…: Effective use of film in social studies classrooms.
Advisor: Leon Reisberg Ph.D.
January 2000-December 2003
Brigham Young University, Bachelor of Arts - History, Minor - English
Advisor: Jared Ludlow Ph.D.
Additional work done at Brigham Young University in Laie, Hawaii, and Pierce Community College. Post Graduate Work at Southern Oregon University, Seattle Pacific University, and Brigham Young University.

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Summer 2010, January 2011-Present
Research Assistant, DRK12, Utah State University
Research areas: Qualitative research in science teacher beliefs in science pedagogy and inquiry, student learning, and technology integration over time during professional development training.
Supervisors: Brett Shelton, Ph.D., and Todd Campbell, Ph.D.

September 2010-December 2010
Research Assistant, Student Cameras at Tetons, Utah State University
Research areas: Student understandings of science through the lens of cameras in a situated science-learning context. Responsibilities include qualitative data collection, analysis, database creation and writing.
Supervisor: Victor Lee, Ph.D.

August 2009-May 2010
Research Associate, Digital Libraries Go to School Project, Utah State University.
Research areas: Qualitative measurement of teacher technology knowledge; reciprocal mentoring between pre-service and in-service teachers in technology professional development in K-12 schools; K-12 teachers pedagogical design capacity when using online educational resources; the impact of culture on various uses of technology; localization of open educational resources.
Supervisors: Mimi Recker, Ph.D. and Andrew Walker, Ph.D.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

June 2014- Present
Instructional Designer – Health Professions, Western Governors University
- Designing, developing, and creating courses with the college of health professions in distance online educational platforms utilizing novel technologies.
- Working with and managing of team of professionals in identifying learning resources, creating competency based assessments, and enhancing student satisfaction and learning success rates.
- Continually reviewing, updating, and revising current courses within the college, with emphasis on identifying and focusing quarterly on the ten worst performing
courses, in consistently enhancing the quality of our student experience and educational achievement.

**July 2007- September 2008**
Regional Education/ Training Specialist, Franciscan Health Systems.

- Acting as program manager of the hospital orientation system I completely redesigned the system wide orientation program collaborating with multiple departments and disciplines to develop a program that meet all the State, Federal, and facility regulatory requirements while enhancing employee satisfaction and utilizing technological development to accommodate a diverse community in seven languages.

- Coordinate, plan, administer, and track performance based development systems for all new nurse employees, designed to identify performance gaps and design solutions for individual performance and development plans, as well as maintaining regulatory compliance records for 6500+ employees.

- Member of the Hospital Safety Committee, Environment of Care Committee, Education Steering Committee, and Education Services Development Team designed to enhance organizational effectiveness, analyze data sets, and create sustainable changes to our systems.

- Collaborated with senior management team at Franciscan Health Systems and Catholic Health Initiatives to increase organizational efficiency, improve leadership and employee development educational offerings, and improve customer service through instruction, assessment, and evaluation using survey and assessment instruments.

- Worked with Infection Control and Employee Health Department in designing, developing, and evaluating programs and instruction used in Statewide and National presentations including the State-wide precautions signage change.

**June 2005- August 2007**
Theater Director/Instructor, World Studies and English Teacher, Graham Kapowsin High School

- Opened the new high school and developed curriculum in three subjects over three departments, as well as college advisory teams mentoring students and planning future development opportunities.

- Developed the award nominated theater program from nothing to four productions a year, four classes annually, and an International Thespian Troupe of 34 in two years.

- Acquired a variety of technologies for integration in the classroom for both the theater and general education classrooms.

- Developed integrated solutions for the acquisition of resources from local business leaders to be used in the theater and regular classroom to enhance student and staff performance.

**TEACHING EXPERIENCE (University)**

EDUC 3500 Technology integration for secondary educators.

Course Description: The goal for this course is to provide pre-service teachers with a working knowledge of instructional technology and the application of
technology to the teaching/learning process. Students should leave this class with a solid foundation of fundamental technology skills and a clear understanding of their applications to education.

One section taught. Experience teaching face-to-face university course that utilized blended learning technologies.

INST 6570 Performance Improvement Systems
Course Description: Application of theory, principles, and practice of organizational systems and human competence in designing performance support systems, job aids, and just-in-time instruction.

Worked with Nick Eastmond Ph.D. in transferring course to blended learning format and pilot testing for improvement. Experience with blended learning online course development.

Guest Lectures/ Presentations
October 2010, March 2011 “Copyright Law for Elementary Educators” Technology for Elementary Educators (EDUC 4300), Utah State University.
October 2010, March 2011 “Inquiry with technology for Elementary Educators” Technology for Elementary Educators (EDUC 4300), Utah State University.
Fall 2009 – Spring 2010: Instructional Architect & Online Learning Resources for Pre-Service Methods Classes. Assisted in teaching 1-3 hour workshops and assignments to teach pre-service teachers how to use online learning resources and the Instructional Architect, and coordinated qualitative research.

Course Management System Proficiencies: Blackboard Vista, Blackboard Learn, Moodle, Instructure Canvas, Captivate.

JOURNAL PUBLICATIONS
Robertshaw, Brooke; Olsen, Jeffrey; and Walker, Andrew, "Teacher professional development models: Inquiry into concurrent versus separate technology and pedagogical knowledge and use" (2010). *The Instructional Architect Research Group*. Paper 3.
Walker, Andrew; Recker, Mimi; Robertshaw, Brooke; Olsen, Jeffrey; Sellers, Linda; Leary, Heather; Kuo, Yu-Chun; and Ye, Lei, "Designing For Problem Based Learning: A Comparative Study Of Technology Professional Development" (2011). The Instructional Architect Research Group. Paper 7.

WORKS IN PROGRESS


INTERNATIONAL REFEREED CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS


Shelton, B. E., Campbell, T., Longhurst, M., Olsen, J., Great Ideas in Teaching and Learning Symposium, "Integrated scientific inquiry classrooms: Cyber-enabled learning and teacher professional development," Boise State University, Boise, ID. (Accepted: January 14, 2014).

Shelton, B. E., Campbell, T., Longhurst, M., Olsen, J., Great Ideas in STEM Education Research, "Integrated scientific inquiry classrooms: Cyber-enabled learning and teacher professional development," Boise State University, Boise, ID. (Accepted: January 13, 2014).


**WORK ACCEPTED FOR CONFERENCES**


**AWARDS & HONORS (Graduate)**

2012 Invited judge for MESA Wind Energy Challenge
2012 Invitation to Golden Key International Honors Society
2009-Present Phi Kappa Phi International Honors Society Member
2009 Summa cum laude, WIU, CGPA 4.00/4.00
2007 Excellence in Teaching Award, Bethel School District
2005 Summa cum Laude, PLU, CGPA 4.00/4.00
2005 Graduate Fellowship, Pacific Lutheran University

**SERVICE (Graduate)**

*January 2013-Present- Organizing Chair. Utah Ukulele Festival*
*February-June 2013- Vice-President/ Acting Treasurer. Top of Utah Entertainment.*
*August 2012- Present. President, Cache Valley Historical Society*
*October 2012- February 2013- Treasurer, Top of Utah Entertainment.*
*Fall 2011- Present. Board Member, Cache Valley Historical Society*
*August 2011-April 2012. Member, USU Graduate School, Excellence in Teaching Committee*
*September 2010-May 2011. Vice President, USU Instructional Technology and Learning Science Student Association*

**PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS**

American Educational Research Association
National Council for the Social Studies
Cache Valley Historical Society