What We Stand *For*, Not *Against*: Presenting Our Teacher Education Colleagues with the Case for Social Foundations in PK–12 Teacher Preparation Programs

By Nicholas D. Hartlep, Bradley J. Porfilio, Stacy Otto, & Kathleen O'Brien

Nicholas D. Hartlep is an assistant professor of social foundations of education in the College of Education at Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois. Bradley J. Porfilio is an associate professor and director of the doctorate in educational leadership in the College of Education and Allied Studies at California State University, East Bay, Hayward, California. Stacy Otto is a professor of social foundations of education and qualitative inquiry in the College of Education at Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois. Kathleen O'Brien is a lecturer in social foundations of education in the College of Education at Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois.

> Courses in the social foundations of education are under attack. But if we want to prepare truly professional, high-quality teachers, those courses are essential.
>
> —Neumann (2009), p. 81

As Neumann (2009) argues, Social Foundations of Education (SFE) courses play a critical role in preparing professional, effective PK–12 teachers, yet, for reasons argued here and elsewhere, six years later such courses remain under attack (see e.g., Ryan, 2006). We each teach Social Foundations of Education[1] courses and keenly feel our discipline's extinction threatens. In this article, by arguing what SFE *stands for* as opposed to what it *stands against*, we intend persuasively to present non-

SFE teacher educators with formerly unknown or unclear knowledge of the SFE discipline and its intended outcomes with the goal they may become comfortable with—if not outright advocates for—our courses' content and knowledgeable on its purpose(s), rather than viewing SFE teacher educators and our courses as unnecessary, radical, and burdensome to PK–12 teacher preparation curricula.

We first must express thanks and admiration to the group of SFE scholars who recently collaborated to produce a special issue of *Critical Questions in Education* (in spring 2013) guest edited by Benjamin Baez and Deron Boyles, whose work mounts an inspired defense of the Social Foundations of Education.[2] The *CQIE* special issue was created to address what we mean when we say "Social Foundations of Education"; to explore how and if it functions within teacher education institutions; and to examine whether our field is rendered obsolete and "replaceable" by generalized knowledge on race, ethnicity, class, gender, ability, and heteronormativity our non-SFE colleagues attempt to infuse across content-area and methods courses. Significantly, our colleagues' work was done without allowing our discipline to inhabit a monolithic or static status. Our disciplinary colleagues' hopes, reflections, and criticisms, along with recognition of maladies, tensions, and the fear we have become insular are represented in a powerful array of essays to which we refer as we explain the merits of SFE to our non-SFE colleagues, but also as we develop a way and means by which to communicate our utility and worth. We aim actively to work against the phenomenon that, "Over time, other departments have cannibalized [Foundations'] content while dismissing our relevance" (Schutz & Butin, 2013, p. 60), for there is not only room for many to be doing the important work of SFE, but, as U.S. demographics shift, so too does the rapidly escalating need for teachers fully to be prepared to serve all children, all families, all communities.

We begin by stating what we understand SFE to *stand for* as a discipline and why we know it to be a critical component of teacher preparation (deMarrais, 2001), contrasting that with what those outside of SFE assume it to *stand against*. Our approach here is intentionally proactive and positive because we perceive non-SFE teacher educators frequently misunderstand SFE to be unduly critical, polemic rather than practical, and ideological and indoctrinating rather than central to the morally just teaching of all children from all families, all communities. We then provide possible strategies for reasserting SFE within teacher preparation programs, concluding by highlighting unintended consequences we anticipate will result if SFE continues to be marginalized within teacher preparation—or worse, if the discipline of SFE is forced into extinction as some of us posit elsewhere (see e.g., Hartlep & Porfilio, 2015).

The Social Foundations of Education

The discipline "Social Foundations of Education" began at Teachers College, Columbia University during the 1930s as a progressive movement away from the prevailing discourses of the time (Butin, 2005; Council for Social Foundations of Education, 2004; deMarrais, 2001; James, 1995). Consequently, SFE developed

student- and community-centered models of education that approached teaching and learning from an interdisciplinary perspective. While this interdisciplinary approach did not feel empowering to everyone at first (and perhaps that criticism still holds for some), the field—its progenitors and its interlocutors—nevertheless continues to take into consideration marginalized populations, disempowered points of view, and silenced perspectives when envisioning education and enacting teacher preparation (see e.g., Ellsworth, 1989). A fundamental and overarching learning goal of SFE was (and continues to be) to challenge and change inequitable and oppressive conditions within society and schools (Carlson, 2008). Not surprisingly, then, SFE faculty have not much concerned themselves with the technical aspects of teaching content-area material and methods, but instead have traditionally been most concerned with addressing pedagogy within a broader sociopolitical context, especially as a means of acknowledging inequities and reaching for and achieving social transformation.

Interrelated to the discussion about teacher training, then, from a SFE perspective, is the idea of social reconstructionism. Social reconstructionism refers to the understanding that, at any given time, the cultural practices of society are what actually shapes schooling, not the actions of individual teachers or administrators or curricula. Consequently, social reconstructionism is something in which SFE as a field and discipline believes earnestly and why its scholars and pedagogues critique many sociocultural structures of U.S. schooling (James, 1995).

Given that SFE is, at its roots, interdisciplinary in nature and draws upon the lenses of various fields such as Psychology, Sociology, History, Economics, and Anthropology in order to examine and find solutions to both the dark effects of capitalism and systemic social injustices (Gottleib, 1994), democratic values, citizenship, and equity continue to be central concerns for SFE teacher educators. Indeed, broad scholarship across multiple SFE subfields continues to tackle ongoing critical inquiry into the (un)democratic practices of schools (Tozer et al., 2011), which partially explains why SFE teacher educators oftentimes are misperceived and labeled as hypercritical of and hostile to existing educational terrain. In other words, the scholarship SFE professors read, write, cite, and teach from, appears, at first blush, to those less knowledgeable about SFE, to be not just overtly critical but even outside of or tangential to PK–12 teacher preparation.[3] However, such a perspective proves myopic since it mischaracterizes SFE as "outsider" or "radical" when instead our work plays a central role in informing educational practices and policies, and very much gets at the heart of theory and practice of teaching and learning (see e.g., Kincheloe, Slattery, & Steinberg, 2000). The work SFE educators do with pre-service teachers is, in part, what stands to make the invisible, taken-for-granted, social institutions and the inequities inherent in these structures and their practices visible (Otto, 2014); at its best, SFE helps our students recognize and bring inequities to the surface and ideally invests them with the tools to question inequitable systemic effects on self, students, families, and communities.

For instance, it is wholly imaginable that a PK–12 teacher might lose sight of his or her democratic ideals during high-stakes testing and education's ensuing

teacher accountability movements because the neoliberal economic enterprise and its effects are creating ever-more-atomized and bureaucratized schools and schooling processes (Gunzenhauser, 2012) (e.g., common core state standards, top-down curricular mandates, and behavioral management programs). High-stakes-accountability practices and policies socialize PK–12 pre-service teachers to think, behave, and teach in ways that align with neoliberal interests, whereas SFE courses offer students alternative knowledges and wisdoms capable of identifying and challenging historically and presently dominant, structuralized inequities. Because SFE courses engage pre-service teachers in thinking and learning activities that discourage them from becoming anesthetized and losing sight of human, humane, equitable education practices (deMarrais, 2001; Fenstermacher, 2007), as a field SFE maintains educational excellence cannot be achieved without first achieving educational equity.

Marginalizing the Social Foundations of Education

Despite the best efforts of SFE faculty (and other progressive, equity-focused, and justice-oriented teacher educators), courses in SFE have become marginalized, if not out-and-out demonized, within teacher-education programs. And it is small consolation that today's marginalization is not the first. As Schutz and Butin (2013) sagely remind us,

> The decline of the social foundations field in schools of education is neither new nor sudden. Already in the 1950s, just a little over decade after John Dewey and others pioneered a foundational perspective at Teachers College, the signature foundations coursework was cut due to internal and external questions about its rigor, its lack of seeming value to the technical training of teachers, and to the seeming "un-American" attitude of critique. (McCarthy paraphrased, p. 61)

But, the "un-American-ness" of SFE's brand of critique only extends in a single direction—that is purposefully to damn or negate our discipline's criticism of existing inequities and social structures—whereas the un-American-ness, moreover the anti-democratic-ness of the neoliberal economic enterprise's full-scale war on public education is never similarly called into question. Rather, we find ourselves within an era during which the inflammatory, ignorant, and nuance-free National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) captures the attention and resources of many teacher preparation programs, shifting attention away from questions of equity, and at a time when neoliberal teaching organizations such as Teach for America (TFA) prove effective at persuading the general public that traditional teacher preparation programs, some of which still include SFE coursework in their programs, are overpriced, slow, and ineffective at preparing highly effective teachers. Ultimately it is little wonder SFE and its worth are called into question.

The ambivalence with which SFE courses' value is calculated among teacher education programs is reflected in increasingly scarce numbers. Neumann (2010) examines course requirements and descriptions for elementary- and secondary-level teacher preparation programs leading to initial credentialing at 302 U.S. universities

to determine the extent to which SFE courses are required. He finds "nearly half of university-based teacher preparation programs do not require a SFE course" (Neumann, 2010, p. 13). Neumann's study zeroes in upon the increasingly limited exposure pre-service teachers receive to SFE coursework. His research findings also support the need for SFE to become better integrated across teacher-preparation programs.

Marginalization within Teacher Preparation

According to Kuntz and Petrovic (2011), "There seems to be little doubt, at least among Foundations faculty, that the social, historical, and philosophical foundations of education finds itself, as a field, increasingly in the curricular margins of colleges of education" (p. 174). Its continued marginalization should come as little surprise, though, because the neoliberal agenda forefronts PK–12 teachers being trained as technicians and deliverers of tightly choreographed curricular scripts, as opposed to being trained as "intellectuals" (Giroux, 1988). It is precisely because SFE proves so very incompatible with Taylorist, factory models of teacher education banking (Freire, 2000) and neoliberal education rely upon that corporate-driven reformers wish to see SFE courses go extinct (Giroux, 1981, 1988; Hartlep & Porfilio, 2015; Labaree, 2004).

What pre-service teachers are being "trained" to do and learn (rather than being educated) in neoliberal-influenced teacher-preparation programs stands in direct opposition to SFE courses' objectives. Yet, teacher education programs increasingly are focused on streamlining curricula and ease of navigation for the student—after all, former normal schools remain the "cash cows" of many four-year institutions (Symonds, 2003). As a result of neoliberal-influenced teacher training, teacher-education courses deemed unnecessary for newly defined, highly effective teaching are excised from curricula, effectively wiping out courses deeply invested with critical content. In fact, many times the first courses schools of education cut by program faculty (and, in states such as Indiana, cut by legislators) are SFE courses, since, particularly because they challenge racial and class-based inequities, they are rebranded as unnecessary, if not out-and-out dangerous. The tragic consequence of such curricular "streamlining" or whitewashing is it supports and reinforces anti-intellectual, anti-democratic, neoliberal-influenced education.

In fact, for some time SFE scholars have identified and critiqued teacher-preparation programs for becoming increasingly and extremely anti-intellectual (see, e.g., Ayers, 2004; Giroux, 1981, 1988; Ohanian, 2013). Critical pedagogues and SFE faculty alike document how neoliberalism's inroads into higher education and teacher preparation have led to the elimination of SFE courses within colleges of education (Giroux, 1981, 1988; Hartlep & Porfilio, 2015). Therefore, like our many colleagues (Tozer et al., 2011), we are especially alarmed that, despite a body of research that points to the importance these courses play in preparing culturally

relevant, PK–12 practitioners, SFE courses continue to be marginalized (Ryan, 2006).

As SFE teacher educators, we pose to our teacher education colleagues two questions:

(1) "What does a high-quality teacher look like?" and,

(2) "How do we distinguish a high-quality teacher from a less-qualified teacher?"

We now take up these two questions while highlighting the characteristics that we, as SFE teacher educators, posit as closely associated with preparing high-quality PK–12 teachers based upon research. Importantly, we also maintain these characteristics are firmly rooted in the "canon," or long intellectual tradition, established by SFE scholars (Gottlieb, 1994).

What We Stand *For*, What We Stand *Against*

Students in SFE courses are educated to engage in the critical analysis of *what*, *how*, and *why* they teach as well as critical analysis of what education is *for* in a democracy. Frequently this is pre-service teachers' first and only opportunity during coursework to ask such questions and be guided in such introspective activity. Much of the curricular and pedagogical interaction students in content and methods areas focus on is what must be taught, when to teach it, and how to teach it in order to satisfy high-stakes accountability requirements, whereas curricula and pedagogical questioning students encounter in SFE courses differs markedly. Standing in contrast to a "banking format" (Freire, 2000) or even a child-centered focus of teacher preparation, pre-service teachers in SFE courses are encouraged to examine their moral and ideological stance within larger society as it relates to education using gendered, raced, queered, critical and socio-political as well as class-based analyses. SFE students learn that these contexts—some visible but most invisible—matter to how children and families experience schooling, and that systems of oppression, hegemonic socialization, ideals, doctrine, and values have shaped their own individual belief systems about the acts of teaching and learning.

For: Emancipatory Teaching and Learning; *Against*: Banking Education

King and Ladson-Billings (1990) insist "research on effective emancipatory teachers is needed which transcends a narrow, generic focus on teaching techniques or skills and re-conceptualizes the 'expert pedagogue'" (p. 27), meaning teacher-education programs need to be better informed about and proactive as to what goes into developing and supporting teachers whose practice is informed and driven by a liberatory pedagogical philosophy. SFE faculty offer a key to such transformation, for, as King and Ladson-Billings (1990) assert,

> If education is to contribute to more fundamental social change, teachers need to develop critical perspectives about the society and multicultural competence that helps them value diversity, not just tolerate it and which helps them oppose inequity rather than inadvertently perpetuate it. (p. 15)

Pre-service teachers ought to be involved in planning, creating, and developing their contribution to what democratic education will be since, in every discipline, in every classroom, a teacher chooses either to teach for social justice…or not (Otto, 2014). Similarly, pre-service teachers encouraged to reflect upon societal inequities and strategize the ways in which education (their teaching and their students' learning) can push back against these inequities stand the best chance of becoming liberatory pedagogues. SFE faculty delivering SFE courses are especially expert at exposing pre-service teachers to just this type of intellectual and philosophical work. We, as SFE teacher educators, toil under the knowledge that when our students are in the field as practicing teachers, they will educate, model, and push their students to follow similar paths of self-determined inquiry as we introduced to them.

We also know SFE courses reliably provide pre-service teachers with opportunities to interact in meaningful ways with people from various racial and ethnic groups and socioeconomic backgrounds in different community spaces. Oftentimes SFE courses require outside-of-class or community-based, experiential learning activities. Having interactions take place outside university settings is significant because pre-service teachers are afforded opportunities to see PK–12 students, families, and communities in authentic, indigenous settings. Also, if and when done well, these experiential, community-based activities provide pre-service teachers opportunities to view their soon-to-be students through a culturally affirming lens, like Yosso's (2005) theory on cultural wealth, and allow pre-service teachers at least to recognize, but at best to sidestep, challenge, and dismantle deficit-based thinking (Valencia, 2010). Developing assets-based paradigms is vitally important in PK–12 teachers since 86% of teachers are white and come from middle-class backgrounds (Hodgkinson, 2002). As a result of the demographic imperative—a monoracial, monocultural teaching pool and multiracial, multicultural schools—SFE scholars and teachers stress the importance of the largely white, pre-service teaching force interacting with people of color and children and families living in poverty in authentic, affirming ways (Hodgkinson, 2002).

For: Challenging Deficit Thinking; *Against*: Perpetuating Harmful Myths

SFE courses are designed to lay bare stereotypical, harmful myths teacher education students bring with them to teacher training regarding attitudes toward people of color and children living in poverty. Surprisingly, these racialized, class-demeaning ideas often are not reliably challenged in non-SFE courses. Challenging their deficit thinking is made vitally important because, given demographic trends in U.S. public schools, the chance is great that a large measure of pre-service teachers will come into contact with and teach students of color

and students who live in poverty (Valencia, 2010). If pre-service teachers are not introduced to the pitfalls and damaging nature of deficit perspectives, which most often become pernicious self-fulfilling prophesies while in teacher-preparation programs, chances are high pre-service teachers will internalize a culture of poverty and project this falsity on students. For example, we know certain deficit-based perspectives, like that authored and marketed by Ruby Payne (whose materials are estimated now to be in 80% of U.S. schools [Valencia, 2010]), frequently provide professional development trainings with and for urban school districts. It is clear highly effective teachers do not ascribe to such problematic frameworks as Payne's (Gorski, 2008), but if teachers are not told how and why Payne's (2005) *Framework for Understanding Poverty* is racist, classist, and deeply steeped in dangerous deficit thinking, they are likely to take Payne's deficit-based, yet seemingly logical ideas and techniques into the field.

Indeed, teachers who have yet to begin to develop a critical consciousness toward race, class, gender, privilege, and poverty raise high the possibility their relationships with students will erode into "othering" and deficit thinking (Valencia, 2010). Conversely, "Transformative teaching alters content, methods and classroom social relations and the power relations between teachers, parents and communities" (Weiler [1988], Cummins [1986], and King [1986; 1987] paraphrased in King & Ladson-Billings, 1990, p. 27), by educating students to examine what Lorde (1984) calls the "mythical norm"—White, heterosexual, Christian, male, and financially secure. By engaging in a critique of society's sociopolitical structures, SFE courses shepherd pre-service teachers to look for and address the ways race, gender roles, and culture are social constructs that *can be* reconstructed successfully within PK–12 classrooms (Ladson-Billings, 2000).

For: Enacting Critical Viewpoints; *Against*: Taking the "Experts'" Word For It

In SFE courses, pre-service teachers are taught specifically to develop a critical approach to curricula and practices of schooling and to apply culturally responsive theoretical models and frameworks to community and school structures. They read history (and critique history through the "interpretive paradox" inherent in history's creation [VanSledright, 2002]), are assigned activities, and view documentaries of U.S. ethno-racial and ethno-cultural groups, learning these lesser-known histories are purposeful omissions: a never-taught U.S. history (Loewen, 1995). Becoming enlightened about one's own miseducation is most often eye-opening for pre-service teachers, causing them to question versions of history represented throughout their PK–12 schooling experiences. The resulting cognitive dissonance, for lack of a more accurate term, that occurs in SFE courses and their accompanying anger, can be a moment of awakening for pre-service teachers in which they come to see the need to reframe their worldviews and consequently their teaching using culturally relevant pedagogy (Hartlep & Joseph, 2014). Bringing awareness to the ways marginalized groups tend to be positioned in society and subsequently in the

public-school classroom is critical, and why SFE courses are necessary for preparing thoughtful, highly effective teachers.

Also important to teacher preparation are the types of discussions on power that occur in SFE courses. Delpit (1988) describes five aspects of power effective teachers know and recognize, which she terms the "culture of power," describing power's rules, how one acquires power through knowing rules, and how taken-for-granted power is by those who have it, whereas those lacking power are most acutely aware of their powerlessness. Pre-service teachers must be educated to become aware of schools' and classrooms' power structures in order to create inclusive spaces for all children to learn; SFE courses aspire to do this.

For: Awareness of Social Reproduction of Inequality; *Against*: Colorblindness and Its Ilk

Gay (2000, drawing from Good & Brophy) writes about the phenomenon of deficit-order thinking creating "self-fulfilling prophecies" among one's students, and the ways student achievement is shaped by teacher expectations. Hatt (2012) expounds upon this work, revealing how a teacher's deficit thinking comes to affect, moreover dictate, how all students, but particularly poor students and students of color, perceive their own "smartness," or lack thereof, and how a student internalizes these messages, radically altering his or her own concept of self-worth. Even after obtaining evidence that proves otherwise, Gay (2000) reveals teachers' expectations are more powerfully influenced by negative information than by information indicating positive expectations. Because students' internalization of self-fulfilling prophecies is an actual, documented phenomenon, pre-service teachers must become attuned to unacknowledged biases and privileges they carry inside or they will surely dampen or extinguish their students' drive to experience success and potentially damage students' self worth. SFE courses help teachers foster the skills and dispositions needed to enact culturally relevant pedagogy in the classroom.

For: Cultural-Strength-Based Pedagogy; *Against*: Monocultural Pedagogical Practices

SFE courses espouse culturally relevant pedagogical approaches, since such approaches develop "in students an intolerance for all kinds of oppression, discrimination, and exploitation, as well as the moral courage to act in promoting academic, social, cultural, and political justice among ethnic groups" (Gay, 2000, p. 214). In most cases, pre-service teachers have not yet encountered culturally relevant pedagogy in methods or content-area teacher-education program courses. SFE courses engage pre-service teachers in learning about culture, tailoring teaching to resonate with various cultural practices to meet students' needs, and, most importantly, developing awareness around their taken-for-granted ways of enacting culture so they do not enforce monocultural practices which reinscribe white supremacy.

Joining and Collaborating with Teacher-Education Colleagues: What Together We Stand For

In supporting the good work SFE scholars and pedagogues stand for, and in eschewing the theory and practice we stand against, we call upon our non-SFE teacher-education faculty colleagues to join together in collaboration with us to elevate and make strong traditional teacher-education programs, for such a union can not only save SFE courses from the marginalized ghetto of "service" courses, but also has the potential to save traditional teacher-education programs from the neoliberal-inspired models that threaten to crush us and make our work appear ideologically radical or irrelevant. To enact such change will require our full attention, cooperation, invention, and the putting aside of such things as credit-hour squabbles that sap our energy so together we may resolve to do what is best for children, families, and communities.

Schutz and Butin (2013) opine, "In our experience…even when non-foundations faculty generally support the overall content and conceptions foundations faculty teach, they may increasingly question the uniqueness of the expertise that foundations faculty bring to the table" (p. 62). There are two troubling, damaging mythologies represented in this type of questioning of SFE faculty's expertise that, across teacher education programs, we must together work to dismantle. First, this assertion is rife with insistence that social-justice-focused content and pedagogy is infused throughout the curriculum of teacher-education programs. This first assertion regularly is belied by students who tell us their foundations course is the first they have heard of racism, classism, sexism, able-ism, heteronormativity, etc., even though they often are poised to enter student teaching the following semester.

Teacher-education colleagues across the institution may indeed be infusing some SFE-like content into their courses, but students tell us year-in and year-out that content is not reaching them with the same weighty messages our SFE courses offer. While we may be doing this work more thoroughly than some of our teacher-education colleagues who, for instance, may feel they lack the expertise well to teach equity-focused issues in education—we hear this sentiment expressed often and understand our colleagues' real trepidation—it is a more-likely scenario that SFE courses present these ideas differently, so the ideas are recognized, consumed, and enacted by pre-service teachers differently. Unlike most discipline-specific and methods course content, SFE courses are unapologetically political; our work is grounded in the idea that schooling is inherently, inescapably a political activity. We help students bring politics in the form of their biases and subjectivities to the surface for examination. Our courses eschew the pernicious myth of colorblindness, for instance, getting down to, revealing, and stirring up students' discomfort and radically challenging the utility and morality of political correctness. Our courses' content connects a teacher to his or her students within the classroom, but, more significantly, our courses' content connects to families, communities, and broader

society within the framework of a teacher's moral and ethical responsibility to seek out, recognize, empathize with, and act knowledgeably and thoughtfully upon difference. Our work in SFE courses should not challenge or dismantle what our teacher-education colleagues are doing in their courses, it should amplify and extend that work. Together, we can examine, "the distinctive interconnections between schools and their local communities and [expand] foundations into new areas where expertise in community and multicultural issues could be a real asset" (Schutz & Butin, 2013, p. 66).

The second problem Schutz and Butin raise at the start of this section is the underlying intimation that "anyone" can teach Foundations course content equally well as SFE faculty. Such a suggestion openly dismisses SFE faculty's hard-won scholarly and pedagogical expertise, branding professionally delivered SFE course content frivolous, extra-curricular, or, more sinisterly, radical. We know our teacher-education colleagues can agree it is hardly a radical notion pre-service teachers be prepared thoughtfully to reach and serve all students, families, and communities; moreover actively to avoid serving some students or casting them, their families, and their communities within a deficit-driven framework is wrong morally. SFE's ideas are not radical. What should be revealed as radical is teacher-education programs and faculty invested in curricula and pedagogy that supports and reinscribes pre-service teachers' racist, classist, gendered, heteronormative, able-ist, or even colorblind theories without drawing those to the surface and subjecting their theories to the moral light of day. Not everyone will be radically changed by SFE course content, but students tell us over and again they can no longer navigate even daily activities without an awareness of the larger sociopolitical context within which we operate as teachers and citizens. SFE and non-SFE, teacher-education faculty should be working collaboratively to make just such pre-service teachers' transformation possible.

The belief SFE course content can equally be taught by non-SFE faculty threatens more than the health of SFE departments. While the resulting lack of uniformity in delivery and outcomes serves further to undermine Foundations courses' credibility, usefulness, and strength of message, and makes easy evidence for cutting courses from teacher-education programs, preparation of pre-service teachers free of SFE coursework who emerge with unexamined deficit thinking threatens colleges of education and traditional teacher education programs in general. Not a slow creep, the adage "anyone can teach Foundations" proliferates wildly into, "anyone can teach students to teach." This second adage is manifest in the extreme push of alternative certification programs and neoliberal-inspired initiatives like Teach for America. The truth remains that SFE and non-SFE teacher education faculty need one another so as not to be overtaken by neoliberal, alt-cert programs. Currently within traditional, four-year, teacher-education institutions, the neoliberal grab for credit hours has caught fire the same as TFA outside colleges of education. Rather than focusing on what pre-service teachers need to serve all children, all families, all communities, internally we scrabble among ourselves over credit hours, SFE's

hours in particular, and the energy this empty fight consumes distracts us from the tremendous problem of the neoliberal economic enterprise's influence on higher (Giroux, 2014) and PK–12 education. So instead of faculty within colleges of education coming together to combat thinly veiled, racist politics desperate to reinforce white privilege and economic stratification using our intellect, scholarship, and pedagogy, we battle one another over details we are much closer to agreement upon than our in-fighting indicates.

What we should be concentrating upon, as a full, university-wide, teacher-education faculty, is what Schubert "optimistically suggests…[are] the best consequences of foundations inquiry: edification, inspiration, and wonder" (Baez & Boyles, 2013, p. 56). Through lessons learned from successful pedagogy and educational-reform initiatives, we as an entire teacher-education faculty could embark on curricular and pedagogical reform focused upon thoughtful, guided infusion of SFE course content throughout the traditional teacher-education curriculum through such techniques as co-planning, co-teaching, and co-assessing all coursework. A truly SFE-infused teacher-education curriculum could produce a cadre of pre-service and certified teachers who, as Worley (2011) says, not only *attend to* diversity, but teach *about* and *for* diversity as well as teachers who understand such things as how "to be more successful because they purposefully realign their habitus more effectively to match their students' habitus" (Woollen & Otto, 2014, p. 105) rather than imposing wholesale their own white, middle-class habitus and morality.

Such a curriculum could re-focus on a collectivist, democratic notion of schooling, encouraging pre-service and newly certified teachers' commitment to their place in the politics of education and society, for every pre-service teacher would be asked consciously to commit to teach *for social justice*, not against it (Otto, 2014). Such teachers would not be blind followers of high-stakes accountability movements, would not become readers of high-priced teacher-proof curricular scripts, would not allow parents and families to be hoodwinked by the confines of systemic social inequities, but would educate for social change, perhaps inspiring the reemergence of public intellectualism given SFE's strong ties to educational philosophy rooted in "the public." Such change importantly would render the NCATE/CAEP and Pearson/edTPA neoliberal structures and their token ties to pre-service teachers demonstrating attention to diversity—standards that now keep SFE courses in place as "service" courses to teacher education—wholly inadequate in scale to what we know must be done for education to have a chance at inspiring social equity.

SFE courses have a long tradition of *standing for* encouraging teachers to think about the processes of schooling and the acts of teaching and learning; the opposite goals of quick-through, neoliberal-informed, teacher-preparation programs. Ultra-conservative groups have accused SFE of being radical, un-American, and undemocratic. For example, the 2012 Lexington report "addresses nine representative examples of radical agendas found in teacher preparation programs in the United States" (p. 2). In one essay Holland (2012) states, "[m]any of the radical concepts espoused in many of the nation's teacher-preparation institutions,

including themes such as *teaching for social justice* and *Critical Race Theory*, have an underlying political agenda" (p. 6, emphasis added), that agenda being our "blatant propagation of left-wing ideology" (p. 12). Lexington's report illustrates the dramatic extent to which SFE has become politicized interior and exterior to education, and SFE-course content viewed as being at odds with the preparation of highly effective PK–12 teachers. If we are to combat the neoliberal influx into education and its blatantly racist and classist ploy to maintain the inequitable social status quo using education as its pawn, SFE scholars and pedagogues must come to see this historical moment as our chance meaningfully to collaborate with our non-SFE colleagues to build a strong, moral, thoughtful, equitable future for U.S. teacher-education programs. We cannot afford to ignore this opportunity.

Notes

[1] Because each of us teach courses in the Social Foundations of Education and because in the literature it has been the broadest term, in this article we have chosen to refer to our discipline as SFE rather than Educational Foundations (note to readers: we acknowledge the arguments we raise in this article are germane and highly related to other territories and taxonomies in the "Foundations of Education" such as Educational Studies, Philosophy of Education, History of Education, Sociology of Education, and/or Cultural Foundations of Education (see e.g., Cohen, 1976; Warren, 1998).

[2] By the order they appear in this special issue: Baez & Boyles, 2013; Schutz & Butin, 2013; Nuñez & Konkol, 2013; DeVitis, 2013; Schubert, 2013; Waks, 2013; deMarrais, 2013; Laird, 2013; Al-Daraweesh, 2013; Kline & Abowitz, 2013; Quantz, 2013; Gabbard & Flint, 2013; Gunzenhauser, 2013.

[3] Titles of books such as *Collateral Damage: Corporatizing Public Schools, a Threat to Democracy* (Saltman, 2000) and *Stealing Innocence: Corporate Culture's War on Children* (Giroux, 2000), as well as titles of articles such as "Revitalizing the Field of Educational Foundations and PK–20 Educators' Commitment to Social Justice and Issues of Equity in an Age of Neoliberalism" (Hartlep & Porfilio, 2015) are taken to imply SFE teacher educators only wish critically to bash and destroy every educational theory and practice considered mainstream or traditional.

References

Al-Daraweesh, F. (2013). Social foundations of education and the political equilibrium. *Critical Questions in Education, 4*(2), 146–155. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://education.missouristate.edu/AcadEd/156329.htm

Ayers, W. (2004). *Teaching the personal and the political: Essays on hope and justice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Baez, B., & Boyles, D. (2013). In defense of foundations [Introduction to special issue]. *Critical Questions in Education, 4(*2), 55–59. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://education.missouristate.edu/AcadEd/156329.htm

Butin, D. W. (Ed.). (2005). *Teaching social foundations of education: Contexts, theories, and issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Carlson, D. (2008). Conflict of the faculties: Democratic progressivism in the age of No Child Left Behind. *Educational Studies, 43*(2), 94–113.

Cohen, S. (1976). The history of the history of American education, 1900–1976: The uses of the past. *Harvard Educational Review, 46*(3), 298–330.

Council for Social Foundations of Education. (2004). *Standards for academic and professional instruction in foundations of education, educational studies, and educational policy studies*. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://www.uic.edu/educ/csfe/standard.htm

Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other peoples' children. *Harvard Educational Review, 58*(3), 280–298. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://lmcreadinglist.pbworks.com/f/Delpit+(1988).pdf

deMarrais, K. (2001). Reflections on a social foundations approach to teacher education. *Educational Foundations, 15*(2), 23–40.

deMarrais, K. (2013). In defense of foundations: An open letter to deans. *Critical Questions in Education, 4*(2), 118–129. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://education.missouristate.edu/AcadEd/156329.htm

DeVitis, J. L. (2013). Defending and goading the foundations of education. *Critical Questions in Education, 4*(2), 85–90. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://education.missouristate.edu/AcadEd/156329.htm

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 59*(3), 297–324. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://pedsub.files.wordpress.com/2010/11/ellsworth-1989.pdf

Fenstermacher, G. D. (2007). Deriving a pedagogy of educational foundations. *The New Educator, 3*(2), 171–178. doi: 10.1080/15476880701309914

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary ed.). New York: Continuum.

Gabbard, D., & Flint, L. J. (2013). Not too big to fail: How teacher education killed the foundations. *Critical Questions in Education, 4*(2), 181–191. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://education.missouristate.edu/AcadEd/156329.htm

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, & practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Giroux, H. A. (1981). *Ideology, culture & the process of schooling*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H. A. (2000). *Stealing innocence: Corporate culture's war on childre*n. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Giroux, H. A. (2014). *Neoliberalism's war on higher education*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Gorski, P. C. (2008). Peddling poverty for profit: Elements of oppression in Ruby Payne's framework. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 41*(1), 130–148. doi: 10.1080/10665680701761854

Gottlieb, E. E. (1994). *Foundations of education: Texts and the cannon*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Gunzenhauser, M. G. (2012). *The active/ethical professional: A framework for responsible educators*. New York: Continuum.

Gunzenhauser, M. G. (2013). An occupation's responsibility: The role of social foundations in the cultivation of professionalism. *Critical Questions in Education, 4*(2), 192–204. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://education.missouristate.edu/AcadEd/156329.htm

Hartlep, N. D., & Joseph, T. D. (2014). A 20-year perspective on *Dreamkeepers*: Using a balanced literacy approach for delivering culturally relevant pedagogy to prepare teachers. *e-Journal of Balanced Reading Instruction, 2*(1), 3–9. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://www.balancedreadinginstruction.com/uploads/1/8/9/6/18963113/hartlep5.pdf

Hartlep, N. D., & Porfilio, B. (2015). Revitalizing the field of educational foundations and PK–20 educators' commitment to social justice and issues of equity in an age of neoliberalism. *Educational Studies*. doi: 10.1080/00131946.2015.1053367

Hatt, B. (2012). Smartness as a cultural practice in schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 49*(3), 438–460. doi: 10.3102/0002831211415661

Hodgkinson, H. (2002). Demographics and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 102–105. doi: 10.1177/0022487102053002002

Holland, R. (2012). The cult of Paulo Freire. *Radicalization of teacher education programs in the United States: Nine essays* (pp. 3–6). Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/library/resources/documents/Education/RadicalizationOfTeacherEducationPrograms.pdf

James, M. E. (1995). *Social reconstruction through education: The philosophy, history, and curricula of a radical ideal*. Norwood, NJ: Alex.

Kincheloe, J. L., Slattery, P., & Steinberg, S. R. (2000). *Contextualizing teaching: Introduction to education and educational foundations*. Boston: Longman.

King, J. E., & Ladson-Billings, G. (1990). The teacher education challenge in elite university settings: Developing critical perspectives for teaching in a democratic and multicultural society. *European Journal of Intercultural Studies, 1*(2), 15–30. doi: 10.1080/0952391900010202

Kline, K., & Abowitz, K. K. (2013). Moving out of the cellar: A new (?) existentialism for a future without teachers. *Critical Questions in Education, 4*(2), 156–167. Retrieved December 1, 2104, from http://education.missouristate.edu/AcadEd/156329.htm

Kuntz, A. M., & Petrovic, J. E. (2011). The politics of survival in foundations of education: Borderlands, frames, and strategies. *Educational Studies, 47*(2), 174–197. doi: 10.1080/00131946.2011.554587

Labaree, D. F. (2004). *The trouble with ed schools*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 257–277). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Laird, S. (2013). An obligation to endure. *Critical Questions in Education, 4*(2), 130–145. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://education.missouristate.edu/AcadEd/156329.htm

Loewen, J. W. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong*. New York: New Press.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider.* Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press.

Neumann, R. (2009). Highly qualified teachers and the social foundations of education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 91*(3), 81–85. doi: 10.1177/003172170909100320

Neumann, R. (2010). Social foundations and multicultural education course requirements in teacher preparation programs in the United States. *Educational Foundations, 24*(3/4), 3–17. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ902669.pdf

Nuñez, I., & Konkol, P. J. (2013). Action foundations! A comic (book) tale of defending educational foundations. *Critical Questions in Education, 4*(2), 72–84. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://education.missouristate.edu/AcadEd/156329.htm

Ohanian, S. (2013). On stir-and-serve recipes for teaching. In A. S. Canestrari & B. A. Marlowe (Eds.), *Educational foundations: An anthology of critical readings* (3rd ed.) (pp. 117–124). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Otto, S. (2014, September 13). Policing terror: Reconsidering the lives and deaths of America's Michael Browns. Paper presented at the Ohio Valley Philosophy of Education Society annual meeting, Dayton, OH. [This idea emerged during discussion.]

Payne, R. K. (2005). *A framework for understanding poverty.* Highlands, TX: aha! Process.

Quantz, R. A. (2013). Backing in to the foundations. *Critical Questions in Education, 4*(2), 168–180. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://education.missouristate.edu/AcadEd/156329.htm

Ryan, A. M. (2006). The role of social foundations in preparing teachers for culturally relevant practice. *Multicultural Education, 13*(3), 10–13. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ759628.pdf

Saltman, K. J. (2000). *Collateral damage: Corporatizing public schools, a threat to democracy*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Schubert, W. H. (2013). On the need to live educational foundations. *Critical Questions in Education, 4*(2), 91–104. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://education.missouristate.edu/AcadEd/156329.htm

Schutz, A., & Butin, D. (2013). Beyond dependency: Strategies for saving foundations. *Critical Questions in Education, 4*(2), 60–71. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://education.missouristate.edu/AcadEd/156329.htm

Symonds, W. C. (2003, November 16). Cash-cow universities. *Bloomberg Businessweek Magazine*. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://www.businessweek.com/stories/2003-11-16/cash-cow-universities

Tozer, S., Gallegos, B. P., Henry, A., Greiner, M. B., & Price, P. G. (Eds.). (2011). *Handbook of research in the social foundations of education*. New York: Routledge.

Valencia, R. R. (2010). *Dismantling contemporary deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

VanSledright, B. (2002). Confronting history's interpretive paradox while teaching fifth graders to investigate the past. *American Educational Research Journal, 39*(4), 1089–1115. doi: 10.3102/00028312039004089

Waks, L. J. (2013). Social foundations of education for the information age. *Critical Questions in Education, 4*(2), 105–117. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://education.missouristate.edu/AcadEd/156329.htm

Warren, D. (1998). From there to where: The social foundations of education in transit again. *Educational Studies, 29*(2), 117–130. doi: 10.1207/s15326993es2902_1

Woollen, S., & Otto, S. (2014). Intended consequences: Challenging white teachers' habitus and its influence in urban schools implementing an arts-based educational reform. *The Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education, 46*(1), 86–111. doi: 10.1007/s11256-013-0253-6

Worley, V. (2011). Beyond myths, fetishes, and checklists: Discovering diversity's place in education, evaluation, and accountability. *Educational Studies, 47*(1), 3–25. doi: 10.1080/00131946.2010.524134

Yosso, T. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 8*(1), 69–91. doi: 10.1080/1361332052000341006