EDUCATIONAL STUDIES
2023, VOL. 59, NOS. 5–6, 541–554
https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2023.2271587

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

The Purposes and Pedagogies of Social Foundations in Teacher Education

Christopher Hu

Department of Education Leadership, Foundations and Policy, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, USA

ABSTRACT

The social foundations of education (SFE), an interdisciplinary educational field of study, occupies a tenuous position in university-based schools of education. In the era of teacher professionalization and practice-based teacher education, SFE has been relegated to the fringe and its value to teaching practice has been largely disregarded. Focusing specifically on conceptual essays and qualitative studies published by SFE university faculty that advocate for a closer relationship between SFE and teacher education, this literature review examines the ways that SFE teacher educators articulate the value, purpose, and contributory role of SFE in teacher education and explores the pedagogical approaches that they use in their pre-service teacher education classrooms. After analyzing the purposes of SFE in teacher education, as defined by SFE faculty, and the pedagogies that inform their teaching practice, I conclude this review by discussing the fundamental tensions and deeply embedded conflicts between teacher professionalism and the cultural perspectives and knowledges that are highly valued within the SFE discipline and by offering recommendations concerning the future of SFE.

The social foundations of education (SFE)—a broadly-conceived interdisciplinary field of educational study that has traditionally involved drawing upon theoretical perspectives from other academic disciplines in the humanities such as history, philosophy, sociology, and anthropology—occupies an undeniably tenuous position in university-based teacher education programs (Tozer & Butts, 2010; Tozer & Miretzky, 2005). Since its initial conceptualization, the central goal of SFE has remained unchanged: to critically examine the sociocultural contexts and the foundations upon which educational policy and practice are formed (Counts, 1934). The *Standards for Academic and Professional Instruction in Foundations of Education, Educational Studies, and Educational Policy Studies* summarize that the purpose of SFE coursework is to provide "opportunities [for individuals in educator preparation programs] to acquire interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education" (Tutwiler et al., 2013, p. 109). However, within schools of education, SFE has become increasingly relegated to the fringe and "rendered obsolete" (Hartlep et al., 2015, p. 136) in favor of coursework that

CONTACT Christopher Hu ch7dm@virginia.edu Department of Education Leadership, Foundations and Policy, 405 Emmet St. S, Charlottesville, VA 22904, USA

emphasizes methodology and pedagogy (Baez & Boyles, 2013; deMarrais, 2013; Schutz & Butin, 2013).

If the pattern of eliminating SFE coursework from the required curriculum continues in university-based teacher education programs, then it is likely that "contemporary conditions will soon drive educational foundations into academic extinction" (Gabbard & Flint, 2013, p. 181).

Although teacher educators claim that an understanding of teaching and learning, properly situated in its sociocultural context, is a critical component of the knowledge base of teaching (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005), SFE is rarely called upon to fill this void; instead, non-SFE faculty attempt to incorporate SFE-oriented ideas and concepts into content-area and methods courses (Hartlep et al., 2015, p. 136). For example, at the large public university with which the author is affiliated, pre-service teachers are required to take an introductory course titled "Understanding Educational Contexts" that ostensibly addresses SFE-related theories, ideas, and concepts, but because the teacher education and SFE programs are divided into separate departments, pre-service teachers never take courses offered by the SFE faculty, such as "Social Foundations of Education," "History of American Education," and "Anthropology of Education." Set in the context of increasing marketization and competition within higher education, the declining state of SFE is partly due to interdepartmental competition for student enrollment. Schutz and Butin (2013) suggest that SFE occupies a "position of dependency" because "we 'take' enrollment from other departments, but do not 'give' enrollment to them or bring independent enrollment to the school" (p. 60). Because it is preferable—from an enrollment standpoint—for pre-service teachers to take introductory courses within the department instead of courses offered by other departments, SFE is often left in an isolated and siloed position, detached from teacher preparation.

Even at smaller universities and colleges where teacher education and SFE are not departmentally separated, SFE coursework is still plagued with accusations of being overly theoretical, impractical, and irrelevant to teaching practice. In the new "technicist era of teacher education" (Darling-Hammond, 2006, p. 93), teacher preparation programs have shifted toward practice-based and standards-based approaches that emphasize professional assessment, standardization, and evaluation (e.g., Brownell et al., 2019). Training pre-service teachers to employ high-leverage practices has become the central goal of teacher education (Burns et al., 2020, Hurlbut & Krutka, 2020; Nelson et al., 2022; O'Flaherty & Beal, 2018), and perhaps a key reason for the decline of SFE is that the popularized notion that teaching practice can and should be standardized in a universalistic manner is fundamentally at odds with SFE's attention and critical inquiry of sociocultural context.

As the goals and purposes of education are continually re-contested and issues related to justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion have reemerged to the forefront of contemporary educational discourse, the existence of SFE as a critical field of educational study must be reexamined and reevaluated. Does the field of SFE have any distinct contribution to teacher preparation? Are the interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives gained from SFE valuable components of the knowledge base of teaching? Does SFE have a collaborative role in teacher education or are they entirely distinct educational

fields? Finally, as many pre-service teachers wonder, "How will coursework in the foundations of education make me a better teacher?" (Tozer & Miretsky, 2005, p. 5). As an attempt to revisit these critical questions, this literature review examines the ways that SFE teacher educators articulate the value, purpose, and contributory role of SFE in teacher education and explores the pedagogical approaches that they use in their teaching practice to help pre-service teachers gain interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives on education. Within university-based schools of education, there are both SFE faculty that have little to no connection with teacher education (particularly at larger institutions) and teacher education faculty that have limited training and expertise in SFE. The latter is increasingly common as schools of education "staff the teaching of required foundations courses with non-foundations-trained faculty" (Tozer, 2018, p. 93). But there is also a third category: SFE-trained faculty that teach a variety of courses (SFE, methods, etc.) and prepare pre-service teachers in teacher education programs. I have termed this third group of university/college faculty as SFE teacher educators: those who work at the intersection of SFE and teacher education and generally advocate for a stronger and more prominent role for SFE in teacher education. The two central questions that this review seeks to address are: (1) How do SFE teacher educators conceptually frame and articulate the purposes of SFE in teacher education? (2) What pedagogical practices and approaches are used by SFE teacher educators to support the attainment of these purposes?

Method: Finding a path in a forest

I conducted a survey of the relevant literature by searching educational research databases using key phrases, such as "social foundations," "social foundations course," "teacher education," and "teacher preparation." I focused on contemporary U.S.-based research (2000 to present) and limited the search to studies and essays that explicitly mentioned the term, "social foundations," in the context of teacher education. As a result of the specificity of the search, a total of 20 articles were identified and selected to be included for review. It should be noted that SFE perspectives are often included in teacher education programs and schools of education under other names, such as "schools and society," "education policy studies," etc., and, as discussed previously, teacher preparation programs may embed SFE-oriented teaching into other courses. The analysis presented in this review is limited to published literature that explicitly mentions social foundations and teacher education.

In the initial stages of analysis, I identified two broad categories of peer-reviewed publications: (1) conceptual essays written by SFE faculty that attempt to justify and defend the role of SFE in teacher education, and (2) qualitative self-studies focused on data collected from either university SFE courses or other initiatives within teacher education programs. Following Merriam and Tisdell (2016) step-by-step process of qualitative analysis, I first open-coded the printed text of each of the articles and studies by highlighting and noting any segment that might be useful or related to the research questions. Next, I compiled and reviewed the open codes (i.e., the comments and notes written down), and then I engaged in axial coding by grouping and reassembling the open codes into particular recurring themes (Charmaz, 2010). The recurring themes

that I identified are the five subsections that follow in the analysis section. Based on the guiding research questions, I divided the five themes into two overarching categories, purposes and pedagogies. Finally, I re-analyzed each of the articles to ensure that any other recurring patterns or themes were not excluded.

Analysis

How do SFE teacher educators conceptually frame and articulate the purposes of social foundations in teacher education?

The authors of the essays and studies included in this review stand in strong opposition to the widespread belief that SFE coursework is impractical and irrelevant to teacher preparation. On the verge of "[the] discipline's extinction" (Hartlep et al., 2015, p. 135), these SFE scholars seek to reclaim a legitimate and contributory position in teacher education and to justify SFE's existence as an educational field of study. I identified three shared purposes that define the role of SFE in teacher education: (1) to make the invisible visible, (2) to contest dominant discourses, and (3) to resolve the tension between theory and practice.

Making the invisible visible

Perhaps the most prominent purpose of SFE among those who advocate for a closer relationship between SFE and teacher education is to make what is invisible visible. They emphasize that the classroom is not a disconnected and independent space; rather, the classroom (and also the school) is situated within a particular sociocultural context. In the same manner, teaching and learning are not merely cognitive tasks but socially situated practices. SFE aims to situate teaching and learning in its broader context, attempting to cultivate in pre-service teachers a critical understanding of the social forces and institutions—which often remain invisible and taken-for-granted—that influence students, teachers, classrooms, schools, and communities. This metaphor of making the invisible visible is a commonly used conceptual frame that articulates one of the main purposes of SFE. For example, Hartlep et al. (2015) suggest the goal of SFE is to "to make the *invisible*, taken-for-granted, social institutions and the inequities inherent in these structures and their practices *visible*" (p. 137, emphasis added), while Bowman and Gottesman (2017) maintain that SFE should help pre-service teachers grapple with "what remains invisible" (p. 233). Similarly, others conceptualize the purpose of SFE as uncovering the "often '*invisible*' institutionalized inequities of public schools" (Tinkler et al., 2015, p. 17, emphasis added) and unmasking "prevalent assumptions about education in this country" (Sevier, 2005, p. 249).

From the perspective of SFE teacher educators, pre-service teachers often begin teacher preparation programs with a narrow and limited understanding of broader sociocultural and historical contexts; thus, it is the responsibility of SFE faculty to expose pre-service teachers to the complexities of education and to provide opportunities to deeply analyze educational issues from a critical and sociocultural lens that is attentive to broader structures, including (but not limited to) race, class, gender, inequality, and power. With an aim toward "a broad, socio-politically conscious

understanding of social contexts," SFE coursework "provides the necessary conceptual framing for students to approach the work of teaching as socio-politically engaged intellectuals who can work in solidarity with public school students, families, and communities" (Bowman & Gottesman, 2017, p. 235). SFE is fundamentally intended to "open the eyes" of pre-service educators and to help them see what they were initially unable to discern, perceive, and understand.

Contesting dominant discourses

Given the field's propensity for critique, a second critical purpose of SFE is to contest the dominant discourses in teacher education. For example, in their explicit critique of the dominant progressive and constructivist paradigm that permeates many university-based teacher education programs, Liston et al. (2009) express concern over "professional preparation that relies solely on *any* single, dominant educational framework" (p. 107, emphasis in original). They suggest that many pre-service teachers are offered a singular theoretical framework, and not a plurality of understandings, approaches, and practices, which in turn limits their ability to make reasonable judgments and critical discernments about themselves and their teaching practice. Thus, Liston et al. (2009) position SFE as a means to develop a sense of critical inquiry that yields "distinct and varied understandings" (p. 107) about education, rather than a singular and narrow set of particular methodological techniques. Butin (2005) makes a similar argument by suggesting that teacher education programs tend to rely upon a singular way of understanding or perceiving, rather than "employing *alternative* lenses … to frame educational issues differently" (p. 218, emphasis added). The contributory role of SFE is to provide pre-service teachers with the opportunity to "grapple with counter-intuitive and counternormative ways of thinking about and engaging with our educational system" (Butin, 2005, p. 215). Consequently, SFE aims to contest and critique mainstream educational discourses, even the ones prevalent in teacher education. In some ways (and perhaps a reason for its marginalization), SFE necessarily involves a "language of critique" (Tozer, 2018, p. 97) and is fundamentally defined by its tendency for counter-normative critique.

Additionally, in the professionalized, technicist era of teacher education, standardization discourse has become commonplace, which is rooted in the assumptions that "students, teachers, and curriculum can be fairly easily standardized" and that "the work of the school is largely context-free" (Darling-Hammond, 2006, p. 93). The implication of standardization is that teaching practice can be dissected into a series of best practices or a toolkit of pedagogical practices that composes a singular model of teaching that applies to all contexts. Hartlep et al. (2015) critique this model of teacher education as a neoliberal product in which "teachers [are] being trained as technicians and deliverers of tightly choreographed curricular scripts" (p. 139). Like Liston et al. (2009), they strongly critique teacher preparation programs for their "increasingly and extremely anti-intellectual tendencies" (Hartlep et al., 2015, p. 139). In doing so, Hartlep et al. (2015) suggest that SFE is valuable and worthwhile because it offers students "*alternative* knowledges and wisdom capable of identifying and challenging historically and presently dominant, structuralized inequities" (p. 138, emphasis added). Thus, the value of SFE is its ability to offer alternative perspectives and knowledges, thereby challenging mainstream and dominant discourses in education.

Resolving the tension between theory and practice

The final purpose of SFE coursework is to resolve the tension between theory and practice. In pre-service teacher education, this theory-practice gap has been famously termed the "problem of enactment" (Kennedy, 1999, p. 70), which refers to the difficulties of translating the concepts, pedagogies, and methods learned in university coursework into everyday practice in actual classrooms (i.e., the "two-worlds" pitfall; Tate, 1993). SFE teacher educators submit that SFE coursework can effectively address this tension in teacher education. For example, acknowledging that the "gap between teacher education aspirations and public school reality needs to be more thoroughly addressed," Liston et al. (2009) present the case the SFE has the potential to produce a "wisdom of practice" that can form the "basis for a more thorough and nuanced action" (p. 110). SFE provides an understanding of the reality of schooling and of "how social issues have real implications for everyday pedagogical practice" (Ryan, 2006, p. 12); it also helps to "reduce conceptual error or confusion" by identifying "confused, self-contradictory, or self-defeating educational approaches" (Bredo, 2005, p. 236). As a result, SFE is seen as the foundation of informed, reflective, and equitable educational practice.

The authors here ultimately believe that SFE bridges the gap between theory and practice. In accordance with Freire's critical pedagogy, SFE is a field that emphasizes the "importance of *praxis*—that is, the integration of theory and practice" (Provenzo, 2005, p. 59, emphasis in original). If pre-service teachers understand the sociopolitical and sociohistorical realities of teaching in addition to developing critical and reflective understandings concerning education, their teaching practice is more likely to be culturally competent and sustaining (Paris & Alim, 2017; Seeberg & Minick, 2012; Taylor, 2010). The contradictions between idealistic university coursework and the actual reality of classroom teaching may, in turn, become less jarring and more understandable and interpretable. In my view, this purpose is counter-intuitive because the field of SFE has consistently dealt with criticisms of being overly theoretical, impractical, and ideological, yet one of the common arguments that SFE teacher educators articulate is that SFE, in fact, should produce more critical and reflective educational practice. Far from being solely theoretical, the authors of the reviewed work included here conceptualize the field as the critical link between theory and practice.

What pedagogical practices and approaches are used by SFE teacher educators to support the attainment of these purposes?

I noted previously that the aforementioned purposes are often articulated in defense or in response to the notion that SFE coursework is impractical and irrelevant to teaching practice. Given the nature of academic writing and its audience, SFE scholars predominantly convey these messages to other teacher educators and education researchers. However, in the university classroom setting, SFE teacher educators are tasked with educating pre-service teachers who may, in fact, be harsher critics of teacher education and SFE than fellow faculty. A common student sentiment can be summarized with the following statement: "teacher education is a waste of time and foundational studies are even worse" (Bullough, 2008, p. 9). Compared to other academics who may in theory support educational studies, it may be even more of a challenge for SFE teacher

educators to convince pre-service teachers that SFE coursework is meaningful for their future teaching practice. My analysis reveals that SFE teacher educators have turned to two overarching pedagogies to support and attain the goals and purposes of SFE coursework: (1) a beyond-the-classroom pedagogy, and (2) modeling transformative and critical practice.

A beyond-the-classroom pedagogy

A common pedagogical approach in SFE coursework is to incorporate experiences that involve settings outside the classroom, such as volunteering in community- and service-based projects or participating in neighborhood organizations and after-school programs in diverse settings. Teacher education programs typically embed classroom-based clinical experiences and practicums into methods courses, all of which are generally within traditional K-12 classrooms. Understanding education as a sociocultural process that extends beyond formal classroom teaching, SFE teacher educators view their courses as an opportunity to "combat the increasingly formulaic and uni-dimensional progression of teacher education" (Hardee & McFaden, 2015, p. 34). Hardee and McFaden (2015), for example, integrated collaborations and partnerships with local community organizations (e.g., community learning centers, service-learning mentorships, organizations that work with migrant and out-of-school youth) into their social foundations course as a means to revitalize their teacher education program. By necessitating a degree of personal commitment and investment, these out-of-classroom experiences provide pre-service teachers with opportunities to step outside of white, middle-class normativity and to build "authentic relationships across cultural, racial, and class identities" (Carson et al., 2020, p. 220). Participation in service-learning contexts often results in a "greater awareness of diversity" (Tinkler et al., 2015, p. 22) and may provide the first meaningful and personal interaction that pre-service teachers have with individuals from minoritized communities. This "place-conscious approach" to SFE (Bowman & Gottesman, 2017) seems to both cultivate greater awareness, broader perspective, and deeper self-reflection, especially in regards to institutionalized inequalities and cultural difference, and strengthen the relationships and partnerships between local educational systems, local communities, and university-based teacher education programs. Finally, these types of out-of-classroom opportunities and subsequent self-reflection may reaffirm student commitments to just and equitable teaching and to the teaching profession itself.

From the point of view of SFE teacher educators, leveraging learning experiences beyond the classroom dismantles the traditional barriers that have been erected between the university classroom and the local school classroom and between the classroom and the local community. Bridging the divide between theory and practice, these experiences may render more tangible and visible the content discussed in SFE courses that may otherwise appear theoretical. The choice to incorporate learning experiences with programs and organizations outside of traditional classrooms is deliberate and intentional, one that attempts to situate education in its broader sociocultural context by elucidating the larger social, political, and cultural forces that influence U.S. schooling. Participating in informal and nonformal educational settings may help pre-service educators understand that the school classroom and the broader community are connected spaces, and that they are inextricably tied together. But a potential pitfall of this pedagogical

approach is that delineating a pre-service teacher's experiences into out-of-classroom and in-classroom experiences may, in fact, implicitly convey a clear dichotomization between teaching within a classroom setting as a professional activity and activities outside the classroom as "unprofessional." SFE teacher educators must be wary that their pedagogy may prioritize and/or strengthen teacher professionalism discourse, which positions teaching and learning within the confines of a traditional classroom as the only legitimate and accepted forms.

Modeling transformative and critical practice

The second pedagogical theme is that SFE teacher educators seek to model the transformative and critical pedagogies that they hope their pre-service teachers will enact and practice in their own classrooms. University teacher educators have little to no control over the types of practices and pedagogies that are observed in clinical placements; however, they do have control over the pedagogies that they enact in the university classroom. Though program context varies, SFE teacher educators generally express a desire to critically examine their teaching practices, to adapt and change based on student needs, and to embody the pedagogies that they claim to support. For example, in his self-study, Sevier (2005) acknowledges that his "teaching merely replicated forms of pedagogy that [he] had experienced as a student in higher education" and that he had contradicted and "violated [his own] teaching philosophy" (p. 256). In his introductory SFE course, Sevier's (2005) students felt that the course topics and readings, specifically issues related to class-based inequalities, were irrelevant to contemporary education. Viewing this as an opportunity to initiate change in his teaching and to enact culturally relevant and transformative practice, Sevier (2005) serendipitously discovered a local case of class-based inequality in school resources, curricula, and policies between two local high schools and invited the high school students and the social studies teacher who presented their case before the school board to speak to his pre-service teachers. Then, Sevier (2005) and his students collectively constructed a course-end research project focused on investigating contemporary class-based inequalities in public schools. If university teacher educators expect pre-service teachers to enact transformative, culturally relevant, and critical pedagogies in their future classrooms, teacher educators must enact and model these practices.

Following Freire's critique of the banking model of education, SFE teacher educators who hope to embody critical pedagogies attempt to position their students as co-creators of knowledge and learning and to disrupt the teacher-student binary. Instead of empty vessels that must be filled with knowledge, students come to the university classroom with lived experiences, knowledges, and skills that can be incorporated and utilized in attaining the conceptual goals of SFE coursework. For instance, in his analysis of his course cumulative statement on the purposes of SFE, Philip (2013) conceptualizes his students as "interactive partners" and "critical friends" whose perspectives and views function as a primary data source in shaping the document (p. 216). The course statement is a product of an on-going dialectical relationship between current/former students and the teacher. Similarly, in framing his introductory SFE course, Bullough (2008) subverts the traditional teacher-student divide by positioning his students and himself in a collaborative and co-constructing community of learning. Instead of

claiming expert status, he encourages students to share their personal stories and experiences with prior schooling, recognizing personal biography as a legitimate source of knowledge, and "invite[s] students to consider carefully *our* practice" (Bullough, 2008, p. 8). Framing it as *our* practice points to collaborative intention: both the teacher and student are learning in a mutually-dependent manner, seeking to improve a shared practice. Alternatively, involving students in educational research is also an approach that contests the traditional banking model. Provenzo (2005) proposes that involving pre-service teachers in student-selected and community-based oral history projects is an effective means to "contextualize the actual work and practice of teachers in the classroom" and to "[raise] the critical consciousness of teachers" (p. 60). Each in their respect, these examples attempt to model critical teaching practice by redefining and contesting what it means to teach and learn.

Discussion

In this literature review, I have suggested that the purposes of SFE in teacher education, as conceptualized and articulated by SFE teacher educators, are to make the invisible visible, to contest dominant discourses, and to resolve the tension between theory and practice. In addition, SFE faculty strive to attain these conceptual goals and purposes in the context of an SFE course by providing learning opportunities beyond the classroom (e.g., service-learning, local- and community-based projects) and modeling transformative and critical pedagogies. My hope is that this analysis proves to be a succinct and useful summary of the role of SFE in teacher education. I conclude this review by discussing several key implications and questions for the field of SFE moving forward.

First, the studies described and highlighted in this review generally emphasize the positive rather than the negative experiences of pre-service teachers in SFE coursework, which—due to selection bias—may not reflect the average student experience. While there may be a plethora of qualitative studies that suggest that incorporating a service-learning component or a social justice field experience into SFE coursework may enhance student experiences, the issue of student disinterest and disengagement with SFE remains a central issue that SFE teacher educators must examine. If the statement that "teacher education is a waste of time and foundational studies are even worse" (Bullough, 2008, p. 9) approximately encapsulates student sentiment, then we must examine why students feel this way and what conditions have led to this outcome. Critical self-reflection regarding our own pedagogical practices and their relation to student engagement in SFE courses is a necessary first step. If we are able to persuade our students that SFE is meaningful and important to their future teaching practice, then it is more likely that the same case can be made to teacher education faculty, administrators, policymakers, and other educational stakeholders. Yet, even if students understand the value of SFE and have perspective-shifting experiences in university coursework, the question of whether these experiences and reflections from SFE coursework genuinely transform teacher educational beliefs and daily classroom practices in the long term remains. This issue is certainly not limited to SFE. The extent to which general university-based teacher preparation "matters" in teacher quality and effectiveness has long been debated (Ballou & Podgursky, 2000; Darling-Hammond & Bransford 2005; Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002).

Secondly, there remains a paradigmatic point of contradiction or conflict at the intersection of SFE and teacher education. I noted earlier that some (e.g., Liston et al., 2009) have critiqued teacher education programs for inculcating a singular paradigm (progressive/constructivist) and for not exposing pre-service teachers to a multiplicity of educational philosophies and perspectives. I suggest that we should also be wary of a bias toward critical and culturally relevant pedagogies. If one of SFE's key contributions is counter-normative critique, then it would be contradictory to not inspect and critique these pedagogies with the same rigor and attention in comparison to other dominant paradigms in teacher education. At a more fundamental level than counter-normative critique, a key tenet within SFE is—what I will call—critical analysis, or the ability to analyze both sides of any issue, to assess the merits and evidence of any argument (along with counterarguments), and to construct reasoned judgments. This is perhaps one of the most important analytical skills or habits of mind that SFE can offer.

Thirdly, I also see a deeply embedded conflict between the professionalism of teacher education and the cultural knowledge and perspectives of SFE. In their analysis of the professional standards movement, Tozer and Miretzky (2005) maintain that SFE teacher educators should seek to critique the movement in hopes of improving the model: they must simultaneously "sustain an effective critique of the standards movement that will prove compelling to nonfoundations scholars" *and* "demonstrate that social foundations experiences can make a difference to teacher practice and to assessed teacher performance" (p. 17). Tozer and Miretzky (2005) suggest that SFE *should* be involved and connected to teacher education. However, there is an underlying fundamental tension between the professional identity produced within teacher education programs and the core perspectives of SFE. As mentioned earlier, teacher preparation programs inculcate a specific pedagogical paradigm; in doing so, teachers who are professionalized through such programs acquire the profession's identity. In becoming a teaching professional, teachers learn to adopt the field's mainstream (progressive) beliefs, practices, and discourses. However the uniform professionalization of the teacher, at times, works against the incorporation of cultural knowledge and cultural competence that are highly valued in SFE. Though there might be the rhetoric of culturally competent or culturally responsive teaching within the professionalism discourse, the field's professional knowledge often conflicts with what it might mean—in practice—to be culturally competent and responsive in the classroom. For example, Delpit (1986) famously noted that Black teachers questioned their cultural knowledge because they often conflicted with progressive "best" practices. Adair et al. (2012) report a similar finding with immigrant teachers: Despite sharing a linguistic and cultural background with student families, many immigrant teachers were cognizant of the incompatibility between their cultural knowledge and professional knowledge (e.g., "learning through play" instead of direct instruction in reading and writing). Teachers are consistently conflicted between following progressive pedagogical practices in accordance with professional standards and engaging in culturally responsive teaching that honors parental wishes. This tension between teaching professionalism and the interpretive, normative, and critical perspectives of SFE lies at the root of the SFE/teacher education divide.

In Darling-Hammond and Bransford's (2005) conceptualization of the knowledge base for teaching, a knowledge of learners (and how they develop within social contexts) and an understanding of curricular content and goals in light of the "social purposes of education" are supposedly critical components of this knowledge base (Darling-Hammond, 2006, p. 83). From both the side of SFE scholars and teacher educators, there is mutual agreement that SFE should contribute to teacher education in meaningful ways. As Tozer and Miretzky (2005) articulate, the professional standards movement offers an opportunity for SFE to flourish if SFE teacher educators demonstrate the value of SFE to teaching practice. However, the relationship between SFE and teacher education must be mutual, in the sense that while the field of SFE should take responsibility for demonstrating its value and importance to teacher preparation, the field of teacher education should also work to understand, foster dialogue, and collaboration with, and ultimately advocate for SFE.

I conclude this review with a set of recommendations for SFE moving forward. First, I suggest that we should begin with reevaluating our teaching with a particular focus on seeking to understand student experiences within our institutions. Revitalizing SFE begins with our students themselves, especially within contexts in which we have influence (e.g., our classrooms and courses). Secondly, I suggest that both SFE and teacher education should work in mutual collaboration toward a unified purpose of preparing future educators. Such a collaboration between SFE and teacher education would require a substantive shift in the competitive interdepartmental structure that currently characterizes higher education, a shift away from self-preservationist competition for funding, resources, student enrollment, etc. toward a shared and collective effort for the pursuit toward common goals. Practice-centered teacher education programs need SFE, just as much as SFE needs teacher education.

Finally, I suggest that SFE should seek to foster synergistic relationships with the other educational subfields that have emerged in relation to and from within SFE. With the emergence of many "types" of education (e.g., multicultural education, culturally responsive education, social justice teacher education, urban education, etc.), there is often confusion as to where the boundary lines begin and end. For example, Schiera (2019) locates the social foundations course that he teaches as social justice teacher education, implying that social justice education has superseded SFE, while on the other hand, Warren and Venzant Chambers (2020) attempt to emphasize that "UE [urban education] is not and should not be considered a replacement for SFE" (p. 369). I suggest that moving forward, SFE should seek to explore its connections and relations with these other educational subfields. Perhaps focusing on these intersections provides a fruitful way forward for SFE. Although others warn of SFE's imminent extinction, I remain hopeful that SFE can reclaim a position of relevancy in contemporary educational discourse. My view is that the most promising path forward is to stake a claim in teacher education. Along with the other aforementioned recommendations, I believe that the intellectual tradition of SFE can be maintained and enriched in the years to come.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my advisor, Diane Hoffman, for her comments and feedback on this article.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

ORCID

Christopher Hu http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9778-1277

References

Adair, J., Tobin, J., & Arzubiaga, A. E. (2012). The dilemma of cultural responsiveness and professionalization: Listening closer to immigrant teachers who teach children of recent immigrants. *Teachers College Record: The Voice of Scholarship in Education*, *114*(12), 1–37. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811211401203

Baez, B., & Boyles, D. (2013). In defense of foundations. *Critical Questions in Education*, *4*(2), 55–59.

Ballou, D., & Podgursky, M. (2000). Reforming teacher preparation and licensing: What is the evidence? *Teachers College Record: The Voice of Scholarship in Education*, *102*(1), 5–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146810010200105

Bowman, M., & Gottesman, I. (2017). Making the socio-historical visible: A place-conscious approach to social foundations in practice-centered teacher preparation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *68*, 232–240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.09.001

Bredo, E. (2005). Addressing the social foundations "accountability" dilemma. *Educational Studies*, *38*(3), 230–241. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326993es3803_3

Brownell, M. T., Benedict, A. E., Leko, M. M., Peyton, D., Pua, D., & Richards-Tutor, C. (2019). A continuum of pedagogies for preparing teachers to use high-leverage practices. *Remedial and Special Education*, *40*(6), 338–355. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932518824990

Bullough, R. V. Jr, (2008). Teaching and reconsidering the social foundations of education: A self-study. *Studying Teacher Education*, *4*(1), 5–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/17425960801976206

Burns, R. W., Jacobs, K., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2020). A framework for naming the scope and nature of teacher candidate supervision in clinically-based teacher preparation: Tasks, high-leverage practices, and pedagogical routines of practice. *The Teacher Educator*, *55*(2), 214–238. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2019.1682091

Butin, D. W. (2005). How social foundations of education matters to teacher preparation: A policy brief. *Educational Studies*, *38*(3), 214–229. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326993es3803_2

Carson, S., Bailey-Fakhoury, C., & Holohan, K. J. (2020). Into the field with foundations: Social foundations of education and university/public school partnerships. *Educational Studies*, *56*(3), 213–232. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2020.1745804

Charmaz, K. (2010). *Constructing grounded theory: A practice guide through qualitative analysis*. SAGE.

Counts, G. S. (1934). *The social foundations of education*. C. Scribner's Sons.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education*. Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., Holtzman, D. J., Gatlin, S. J., & Vasquez Heilig, J. (2005). Does teacher preparation matter? Evidence about teacher certification, Teach for America, and teacher effectiveness. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *13*, 42. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v13n42.2005

Darling-Hammond, L., & Youngs, P. (2002). Defining "highly qualified teachers": What does "scientifically-based research" actually tell us? *Educational Researcher*, *31*(9), 13–25. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X031009013

Delpit, L. (1986). Skills and other dilemmas of a progressive black educator. *Equity and Choice*, *3*, 9–14.

deMarrais, K. (2013). In defense of foundations: An open letter to deans. *Critical Questions in Education*, *4*(2), 118–129.
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.
Hardee, S. C., & McFaden, K. (2015). (Re)imagining our foundations: One social foundations of education program's attempt to reclaim, reestablish, and redefine itself. *Educational Foundations*, *28*, 31–50.
Hartlep, N., Porfilio, B., Otto, S., & O'Brien, K. (2015). What we stand for, not against: Presenting our teacher education colleagues with the case for social foundations in PK–12 teacher preparation programs. *Educational Foundations*, *28*, 135–150.
Hurlbut, A., & Krutka, D. (2020). Where do we start? Initiating a practice-based teacher education program around high-leverage practices. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators*, *9*(2), 169–199.
Kennedy, M. M. (1999). The role of preservice teacher education. In Darling-Hammond. L. and Sykes, G. (Eds.) *Teaching as the Learning Profession: Handbook of Teaching and Policy*. (pg. 54–86). Jossey Bass.
Liston, D., Whitcomb, J., & Borko, H. (2009). The end of education in teacher education: Thoughts on reclaiming the role of social foundations in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *60*(2), 107–111. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108331004
Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
Nelson, G., Cook, S. C., Zarate, K., Powell, S. R., Maggin, D. M., Drake, K. R., Kiss, A. J., Ford, J. W., Sun, L., & Espinas, D. R. (2022). A systematic review of meta-analyses in special education: exploring the evidence base for high-leverage practices. *Remedial and Special Education*, *43*(5), 344–358. https://doi.org/10.1177/07419325211063491
O'Flaherty, J., & Beal, E. M. (2018). Core competencies and high leverage practices of the beginning teacher: A synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *44*(4), 461–478. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2018.1450826
Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. Teachers College Press.
Philip, T. M. (2013). Articulating the purpose of a social foundations of education course through instructor self-interviews. *Studying Teacher Education*, *9*(3), 203–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2013.829770
Provenzo, E. F. Jr., (2005). Making educational research real: Students as researchers and creators of community-based oral histories. In D. Butin (Ed.), *Teaching social foundations of education: Context, theories, and issues*. (pp. 59–70). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Ryan, A. M. (2006). The role of social foundations in preparing teachers for culturally relevant practice. *Multicultural Education*, *13*(3), 10–13.
Schiera, A. (2019). Justice, practice and the 'Real World': pre-service teachers' critically conscious visions for teaching amid the complexities and challenges of learning to teach. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *32*(7), 929–946. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2019.1609125
Schutz, A., & Butin, D. (2013). Beyond dependency: Strategies for saving foundations. *Critical Questions in Education*, *4*(2), 60–71.
Seeberg, V., & Minick, T. (2012). Enhancing cross-cultural competence in multicultural teacher education: Transformation in global learning. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, *14*(3), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.18251/ijme.v14i3.569
Sevier, B. (2005). "What does this have to do with us?": Pursuing transformative possibilities and cultural relevancy in a social foundations teacher education course. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *33*(3), 347–375. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2005.10473286
Tate, P. M. (1993). The two worlds of teaching. *Journal of Education*, *175*(3), 15–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/002205749317500302

Taylor, R. W. (2010). The role of teacher education programs in creating culturally competent teachers: A moral imperative of ensuring the academic success of diverse student populations. *Multicultural Education*, *17*(3), 24–28.

Tinkler, B., Hannah, C. L., Tinkler, A., & Miller, E. (2015). The impact of social justice service-learning field experience in a social foundations course. *Critical Questions in Education*, *6*(1), 16–29.

Tozer, S. (2018). Social foundations of education as an unwelcome counter-narrative and as educational praxis. *Educational Studies*, *54*(1), 89–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2017.1397518

Tozer, S., & Butts, R. F. (2010). The evolution of social foundations of education. In S. Tozer, B. P. Gallegos, A. M. Henry, M. B. Griner, & P. G. Price (Eds.), *Handbook of research in the social foundations of education.* (pp. 4–14). Routledge.

Tozer, S., & Miretzky, D. (2005). Social foundations, teaching standards, and the future of teacher preparation. In D. Butin (Ed.), *Teaching social foundations of education: Context, theories, and issues*. (pp. 3–28). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tutwiler, S. W., deMarrais, K., Gabbard, D., Hyde, A., Konkol, P., Li, H., Medina, Y., Rayle, J., & Swain, A. (2013). Standards for academic and professional instruction in foundations of education, educational studies, and educational policy studies third edition, 2012, draft presented to the educational community by the American Educational Studies Association's Committee on Academic Standards and Accreditation. *Educational Studies*, *49*(2), 107–118. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2013.767253

Warren, C. A., & Venzant Chambers, T. T. (2020). The imperative of social foundations to (urban) education research and practice. *Educational Researcher*, *49*(5), 369–375. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20923289