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"[...]The preference of Negro future teachers are more compatible with the market than are those of the majority; too few of the latter, relative to the clientele requiring service, prefer blue-collar or low-ability children or prefer to teach in racially heterogeneous schools, or in special curriculum, vocational or commercial schools. [...]"


This article contributes to a newer debate in teacher education research regarding the professionalization for the work in multicultural urban classrooms. In a social studies didactics’ perspective teacher-learner-mismatch seems to be an important factor influencing the ability to construct meaningful social studies learning environments – and thus represents an important challenge for the education of future teachers in our domain. But what are the social origins of diverse teacher professional identities in the social studies domain? This article refers to a biographical-narrative study on teacher students from very heterogeneous backgrounds exploring their basic beliefs and attitudes towards becoming a social studies teacher.
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1 Introduction: Heterogeneous Teacher Recruitment and Social Studies Didactics: Bringing the Sociology of Education Back In

Teacher education doesn’t exist in a vacuum but is embedded in a context of social, cultural and political beliefs and practices. More and more research focuses on the contextual variables explaining the professionalization and accommodation processes with the teaching profession from a sociology of knowledge and sociology of education perspective (see Bendixen, Feucht 2010). Even researchers who do not subscribe to a genuine critical view of the teaching profession (like the German “structural” school, see Combe, Helsper 1996; or the new sociology of education in a Bernsteinian or Bourdieuan tradition, see Muller, Davies, Morais 2004) but to more ‘mainstream’- oriented competences and professionalization theories (Baumert, Kunter 2006, see for an overview of the social studies domain: Reinhardt 2009), face up sooner or later to the
problem of beliefs and preconceptions of pre-service and in-service teachers.

Today the effects of teacher beliefs on students’ motivation and learning outcomes are practically undisputed (Blomeke 2008). But what are the social origins of teacher professional identities and special beliefs and attitudes about teaching and learning in a certain domain?

Earlier positions that seemed to be optimistically based on a kind of “tabula rasa”– vision of young teacher students and professionals focusing on the all-trainability of the ‘professional self’ and job relevant skills and competencies seem to get recently relativized. The call for assessment and selective recruitment has been repeatedly voiced by eminent colleagues like Oelkers and others (see in his FES-report: Oelkers 2009). In a similar vein, critical teacher education research demands an “affirmative action” in view of the still all too homogenous social background of today’s teaching staff: prominent US-colleagues denounce the detrimental effect of hidden social segregation processes at the allocation side of the teaching resources for today’s school systems (Zeichner 2009, Cochrane-Smith 2009). They see the ensuing difficulties of growing mismatch between teachers and learners in 21st century’s heteronomous urban classrooms as a crucial problem of present-day schools and of public education in the multiethnic and multicultural “Global North” in general (Apple 2011, 227f.). One answer could be “teacher education for multicultural classrooms” as promoted by most of the relevant teacher education programs in the United States (Jennings 2008) in the context of the “No child left behind”-Campaign (NCLB, see for the social studies: Heilmann 2010), another solution is the recruitment of teachers from more diverse backgrounds (see below).

As schools in many other OECD-countries, Germany’s urban schools are characterized by heterogeneity and cultural diversity alike. Today statistically heterogeneity is the normal case, homogeneity of young urban Germans without immigrant background is the exception case: In 2010 31% of the German population under 18 had an immigrant background, 46.2% in municipalities over 500 000 habitants. However comparisons at the macro-level of national and/or state-level school systems show a great variety of institutional arrangements within OECD that impact performances and educational achievements of immigrants and their second/third generation offspring in very uneven ways. In some countries, school systems mirror important social segregation and a lack of equal opportunities for students with lower socio-economic status (SES) and from immigrant families. In some countries resulting educational inequality is even blatant. Germany counts among the unfair countries, where middle class children encounter quite favorable circumstances that enable them to yield a significant educational advantage (OECD 2006). Although the public debate on the legitimacy of a spectacular UN-fact finding mission on that issue (see the 2006 UN human rights commission special inspection in Germany, Vernor Munoz) was controversial, it highlighted a growing discomfort with the perceived unfairness of the German system. Until then “educational inequality” as a collective debate had been completely out of


2 Thanks to parents who are able to deploy different forms of capital to gain educational advantages for their children - see a newer post-bourdieuan French and Anglo-american research on the new ‘parentocraties’ and the middle class educational hypostasis (for an overview see Nogueira 2010).
sight: in the eyes of most non-immigrant Germans, the ‘expansion’ and democratization of education was an accomplished mission, since the transformation of the emblematic ‘rural catholic blue collar worker’s daughter’ as the typical case of disadvantaged youths into a ‘son of a low SES-Turkish immigrant’ (Allmendinger, Ebner, Nikolai 2009) remained fairly unnoticed. The PISA-wake-up call not only slowly but surely harms the trust in core values of postwar Germany such as the meritocratic norm of a fair and just middle class society based on equal opportunities’ standards. But the actual integration of immigrant persons in Germany also suffered throughout the nineties and the first years of the new millennium from an ever-increasing tendency to socio-economic marginalization and segregation of persons from diverse cultural backgrounds and from growing educational inequality (Kalter, Granato 2004). As a result, the German government made special efforts to regulate and to innovate educational policies at the federal level and to invite the German Länder to implement reforms encouraging a fairer allocation of educational resources and opportunities to immigrant persons (Gogolin 2009): the recruitment of more teachers from immigrant families being one measure amongst others to enhance diversity, the just recognition of school performances and anti-discriminatory practices, reducing effects of stigmatization and prejudices on immigrants in the German educational system (Bundesregierung 2009, 65).

This most recent policy innovation attracts scientific interest since teacher recruitment now untypically refers to criteria that complement the ‘blind’ meritocratic norms - the recruitment based on socio-ethnic criteria. Several German Länder (regional entities) just started to enhance the enrollment of persons with diverse social and “minority” origins, e.g. North-Rhine-Westfalia (Stiller, Zeoli 2011, 280), where special diversity recruitment programs seek to attract and to support teachers from families with an immigration background.

This trend points to a transformation of norms and ideas, which is also highly critical for the understanding of social studies teacher recruitment and teacher education at university colleges: As these new policies quasi-officially confirm the basic diagnosis of an all too homogeneous profession, which is notorious for being a social “closed shop”, given the extremely high social reproduction rates of the teaching profession in Germany and in other countries throughout the OECD. A most recent initial case study of the German situation of a small number of in-service teachers with immigrant backgrounds describes thus some of the typical difficulties encountered at German schools, namely at grammar schools (“Gymnasium,” Georgi, Ackermann, Karakas, 2011, 216ff.). The Hertie Foundation-analysis displays a scientifically speaking not fully representative but nevertheless irritating picture: Immigrant teachers’ narratives refer to school experiences at grammar school describing feelings of alienation and not belonging. Another difficult period seems to be the preparatory internship at school, when immigrant teacher-candidates repeatedly confront challenging

3 Fortunately these tendencies seem to be reduced in recent times (Migrationsbericht 2010), unfortunately in recent years the societal debate on integration gets more and more polarized.

4 In Germany the teaching profession is a sector earmarked for the upper lower middle classes, or a social step stone to get ahead to the higher middle classes. Today, any fourth new teacher has at least one teacher parent (see Kühne 2006); the key transmission path being that from father to daughter (Ibid.). Like in other domains of the German public sector immigrant minorities are underrepresented.
situations and ethnic ascriptions: immigrant background candidates are via randomly often approached for being immigrants explaining ‘their’ culture, other professional competencies and qualities being neglected (ibid. 218ff.). This confirms a bulk of newer research, which has not only focused on the systemic effects of new mechanisms such as the free choice of schools (see for a thorough explanation of the organizational origins of educational segregation: Radtke 2004), but on micro-level processes of stereotyping, ethnic ascriptions and unfair grading of students from families with an immigration history (see e.g the biasing effects of Turkish names on grading: Sprietsma 2009).

However, the basic underlying assumption that the important German teacher-learner mismatch produces socially biased teaching and learning outcomes is still to be proven for the social studies domain. Earlier empirical analyses carried out at the school class-level are limited to subjects like math and sciences and they do not fully explain the demographic achievement-gaps in Germany (see for this line of argumentation Ditton, Aulinger 2011). Could these findings be generalized to other domains such as the social studies and citizenship education? The scientific discussion is quite controversial because the causal effects between achievement gaps, teacher perceptions and prejudices about learners and learners’ origins tend to be multidirectional since learners’ own low status perceptions produce influences on self-concepts, even in most regular situations, when concrete teachers do not discriminate at all against low-SES or immigrant students (‘stereotype threat’, see also below).

This paper seeks to contribute to the emerging debate by provisionally sidestepping the effective biasing outcome-problem and by focusing potential causes for biasing at the teacher side of teacher-learner-relation: The analysis aims at capturing and exploring the differential of basic attitudes and aspirations of future social studies teachers from very heterogeneous social backgrounds. Are there different approaches to being a social studies teacher and to the legitimization of a professional choice towards the social studies? If there were no distinctive attitudes, further investigation on teacher demographic biasing and specific needs for teacher education purposes would make no sense. But if so, what may be the specific critical features linked to socialization and other biographical stances of future social studies teachers from dissimilar backgrounds? In my view two key systematic arguments justify a closer look on current and future challenges linked to diversity and the teaching profession in our domain.

First, the recent German special didactics debate on citizenship education of persons from low SES-backgrounds creates new opportunities to reflect on the sociological basis of political learning not only from a unidirectional “How to deal with low SES and at risk-learners?”-perspective, but also from a reflexive teacher-learner-relations-perspective. Secondly, experiences from other systems such as the United States ratify a further discussion of the mismatch problem in the social studies domain.
2 The Mismatch Problem in Social Studies Teacher-Learner Relations

Why is awareness of teacher-learner-mismatch an important factor influencing the ability to construct meaningful social studies learning environments – and thus represents an important constituent for the education of future teachers?

German didactics always paid special attention to the socialization conditions of learners: Not only didactical conceptions, such as the learner-orientation as a didactical core principle preventing students’ alienation (Hedtke 2011), but also the teaching goals, such as citizens’ identity construction, as well as social and political conflicts as a didactical driving force (Reinhardt 2009; Petrik 2010) refer to the individual developmental and social conditions of students in the field of citizenship education.

As social studies are nurtured by the societal substance, in which they are embedded, they are as a teaching domain surely less socialization blind than other fields of education in public schools. Furthermore, from a perspective of negotiating sense(s), and of co-constructing social, economic and political knowledge (Sander 2008), socialization and cultural backgrounds of students and teachers deeply shape teaching and learning processes and outcomes.

Most German social studies teacher educators, in-service-teachers and teacher students will still subscribe to the commonly acknowledged position formulated by Hermann Giesecke (1972) that social studies teacher curricular activities may correct and/or enhance, but never substitute the real world socialization and political learning processes. In real world circumstances, teachers are on par with students. As Gagel puts it: ”The teacher loses his competence lead when it comes to debating real political conflicts.” (Gagel 1994,15). But whose conflicts?

Perhaps different from other domains, social studies teachers realize parts as social actors, curricular gate-keepers, social models, mediators and facilitators of the educational process of meaning making all at once. As they are themselves involved in dynamic social and political learning processes, their own socialization is anything but trivial and may produce considerable channeling effects on societal world views and on lines of legitimization of the given political, economic and societal state of affairs in actual classrooms: the effectiveness of social studies teachers as curricular gate-keepers is without any doubt shaped by the individual teacher’s frames of reference. Therefore, for a long time, social studies didactics reflect potential risks and hazards of overwhelming students in actual learning contexts by imposing strict professional norms of self-restraint with respect to students’ autonomy and independent political judgment. The 1976 German Beutelsbach Consensus is an example of how such professional norms may enhance the teachers’ ability to cope with this problem (Schiele, Schneider 1996):

“2. Treating Controversial Subjects as Controversial: [...] In affirming this second basic principle, it becomes clear why the personal standpoint of teachers, the intellectual and theoretical views they represent and their political opinions are relatively uninteresting. To repeat an example that has already been given: their
understanding of democracy presents no problems, for opinions contrary to theirs are also being taken into account [emphasis added]."

The didactical debate about the implications and consequences of the Beutelsbach Consensus is rich, especially with regard to the principle of controversy, which is a core principle of citizenship education in pluralistic societies (Grammes 2005). At the epistemic level, these debates implicitly originate in the homogeneity assumption, that controversy consists of the presentation of multiple opinions and perspectives and that all these perspectives are equally discernible by whichever involved actor. The basic supposition is that they can be shared between teachers and learners from utmost diverse social and cultural backgrounds: Newer research would characterize such a proposition as “naïve egalitarian” (Causey, Thomas 2000, 34). Because there is a relatively small epistemic doubt about the broadness of the spectrum of societal and political realities, which are in the range of the curricular spectrum, and those, which do not make their way into social studies classrooms and teaching programs. Sociological curricular theory that theorizes those selective social mechanisms (to speak with Basil Bernstein: “the use of the pedagogical device”) has not yet been applied to special didactics curricular production and to the basic organizing principles of knowledge production in our field (Maton 2004).

There are still continuous debates about which educational purposes are maintained, reproduced and transformed: These debates represent power relations of knowers (ibid.), which are shaped by dynamics of social change, namely in the field of citizenship education for learners from low SES and immigrant backgrounds. In Germany, an intense curricular discussion about what knowledge for which learners in the citizenship education field (labeled "elementarization"-debate) currently replicates some archetypical forms of conflicts between hierarchies of knowledge and of knowers. In this context the growing social mismatch between ‘knowers’ and ‘learners’in a multicultural society is slightly under-theorized. Educational actors from immigrant minorities have no voice since till today they are underrepresented in the didactics community. A first analysis of educational beliefs of immigrant teacher candidates in our domain may therefore pave a bit the way to the future facelift of the ‘Beutelsbach’-Consensus upon the terms and conditions of a progressively more heterogeneous German society.

What can we learn from the US-experience? Today, ethnic minority students represent at least a half of the population in the 25 largest US-cities, but still about 88% of all teachers in the US are white, in some areas even up to 99% (Ladson-Billings 2005, 229). But the US research on ethnic achievement gaps and teacher-learner- mismatch has a long tradition from the civil rights movement and the Coleman-Report (1966) till recent times.

In a critical vein, Ladson-Billings denunciates the current "disconnection between and among the students, families and community and teachers and teacher educators" since “in school, students do not experience an accurate picture of what it means to live and to work in a multicultural democratic society” (ibid. 231). Teacher education in the United States faces challenges

---

similar to those in the German urban regions: there is growing teacher-learner-mismatch at urban schools, since students’ populations grow more and more heterogeneous. The measures taken at the allocation side of the teacher profession are quite critical. Ladson-Billings shows that white majority teacher students “enter teacher education programs believing strongly in an optimistic individualism, the inevitability of triumph over any obstacle through hard work and individual efforts (Ahlquist 1991; Finney, Orr 1995; McCall 1995; Nieto 1998). Beginning teachers also tend to believe in absolute democracy when it comes to students, that 'kids are kids' regardless of their cultural background or that the same ‘good pedagogy is equally elective for all students' (Finney, Orr 1995; Nieto 1998; O'Grady 1998)” (ibid. 22). After multicultural honeymoon in-service-teachers have tendencies to adopt a more cynical attitude. In his thorough research-report on mismatch, Howard (2010) discusses its most central damaging effects: differential on grading, discrepancy of time spent on race-matched and mismatched learners; lower expectations towards some mismatched minorities. Race-matched teachers provide social role models for SES-students as well as they raise students’ academic motivation and self-concept, because there is no stereotype-threat, which is not only attached to race and gender, but also to social class, see Croizet (1998) and has a fully detrimental impact on school performances. However, as Gay (2010, 205) asserts: “Similar ethnicity between students and teachers may be potentially beneficial, but it is not a guarantee of pedagogical effectiveness.” Milner (2008) states that “Teachers from any ethnic, cultural, or racial background can be successful with any group of students when the teachers possess (or have the skills to acquire) the knowledge, attitudes, dispositions, and beliefs necessary to meet the needs of their students.” But: “Minority teachers seem to be more akin to the potential of diverse socio-cultural background and have less fears with regard to culturally mixed classrooms.” (ibid. 386)

If not active discriminatory practice but actual mismatch is the point, what are the special challenges with regard to citizenship education classes? As Milner states: “White teachers and students of color, in some ways, possess different racialized and cultural experiences and repertoires of knowledge and knowing both inside and outside the classroom, racial, and cultural incongruence may serve as a roadblock for academic and social success in the classroom.” (ibid. 387). Indeed Pang and Gibson (2001) state that curricular work in race-matched classrooms may enhance the construction of meaningful learning environments. Finally, socio-culturally and politically omniscient teachers, who are able to construct meaningful learning, indiscriminately successful in any kind of classroom, tend to be rare: In the US as well as in Germany.
3 Two Biographical Narratives and the Representation of Different Systems of Reference for Becoming a Social Studies Teacher

The University Duisburg-Essen (DUE) has high proportions of students having an immigrant background (24.9%) and with parents without any academic education. The 7 DUE-campus is well-known for being a university for “Bildungsaufsteiger” (“educational climbers,” e.g. students without any parent with academic education), which is typical of the universities of the Ruhr region, but untypical of German universities in general, since the middle class academic reproduction rates are still important (BMBF 2010). At DUE very low educational basis and an immigrant background intersect, because 90% of students, whose parents have both not completed any vocational training, have an immigrant background (above 10% of the immigrant students have parents with no vocational training at all). 54% of the students with an immigrant background get public funding (BAFÖG) or do student-jobs in order to be able to attend university; therefore their age and living conditions are quite different from those of non-immigrant students. Students with an immigrant background have educational careers, which are often dissimilar from a ‘typical’ non-immigrant student, who attends grammar school and then starts e.g. teacher training at a university: Students with immigrant backgrounds have via randomly often attended comprehensive schools (“Gesamtschulen”) and/or ‘Berufskollegs’, which are vocational schools offering opportunities to get an A-level (“Abitur”), as well (Universität Duisburg-Essen 2011).

During my guest-professorship at the UDE’s department for social studies teacher education, numerous students with an immigrant background frequented my introductory courses to social studies didactics. I observed some fairly different approaches from what I had experienced at two other teacher education departments. E.g. for the first time in my academic career, several students wanted to know if I had a polish immigrant background since they had themselves a polish immigrant background. There was a constant allusion to the potential commonality between teacher educator and teacher students and to the opportunity to have an immigrant professor. The second notable difference consisted in the high level of politicization of discussions about social studies topics and didactical controversies, which I hadn’t experienced at teacher education departments with a more homogenous – and more apathetic – studentship. I started to reflect about similarity and commonality of values and the role of educational inequality perceptions in teacher education and I wondered if these factors could be connected to my second observation. Then I explored possible theoretical approaches, which I found not fully satisfactory (see above, part 2). I decided to do some field research and initiated the project ‘How I became a social studies teacher student.’

Self-study and narrative research have a special tradition in teacher education research. Biographical narratives as a research method are quite often used (in Germany in particular in the tradition of F. Schütze), e.g. when exploration of professional identities and crisis are under consideration. In the research field of educational inequality and exclusion, narratives are most common methodological approaches as well, because micro-level
processes and persons’ sense making cannot be easily ‘objectivized.’ However, according to Bruner (1986), narrative thinking reflects definite cognitive structures: Narrative genres are therefore seen as mental models representing hypothesis on how the world may be, they are therefore no singular phenomena but represent process structures and shared cultural artefacts, which can be made visible and can be used to construct tentative models in a Grounded Theory- style:

“What makes ... texts “narrative” is sequence and consequence: events are selected, organized, connected, and evaluated as meaningful for a particular audience. Storytellers interpret the world and experience in it; they sometimes create moral tales – how the world should be. Narratives represent storied ways of knowing and communicating” (Hinchman, Hinchman, 1997).

This assumption, which has become a commonplace since the linguistic turn in the social sciences, promotes the use of narrations as centerpieces for documentary and reconstructive qualitative research (the thorough discussion of variants and methodological subtleness would certainly go far beyond the scope of this paper). A newer approach combines reconstructive documentary methods (Bohnsack 2008) with the biographical narrative approach since both are interested in the interconnections between layers and varieties of knowledge in a Mannheimian tradition (Nohl 2010). We made use of “classical” narrative biographical interview techniques and applied then transcription techniques and analysis in a ‘documentary’-analysis mode (as in Bohnsack 2010), not without referring to core facets of the classical biographical narrative method e.g. the elementary biographical process structure as it was introduced by Schütze.

The project seeks to explore the effects of socio-economic origins on motivation, perspectives and beliefs about the teaching profession in the social studies domain. It therefore started from a most simple tentative assumption that social studies teachers’ biographies produce different motivations, which are not trivial for professional beliefs. Participants have been recruited on a voluntary basis around the teacher education department. The public call did explicitly not focus on low SES-students and/or students with an immigrant family background since the selection of interviewees for thorough narrative interviewing was based on methods of theoretical sampling and with the intention to collect data from students from quite diverse backgrounds. We gathered seventeen narrators, whose selection was based on information on family and educational backgrounds and the serious intention to be a social studies teacher. All three interviewers had training on biographical narrative inquiry. The interviews took place from May to October 2010 and lasted between one and about three hours. The following table summarizes some basic demographic features of the interviewees.
Table 1. Demographic features of the students participating at the DUE-narrative research project 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interviewees without an immigrant background</th>
<th>Interviewees with an immigrant background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigrant Background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents’ educational background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farther without vocational education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least one parent with academic background</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least one teacher parent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the following presentation I selected two narratives which represent two extremely emblematic and polarizing cases. These extreme cases refer nevertheless to general situational and process features, which are represented in their structure. It is interesting to note, that a comparison of the cases equally reveals habitual modes of communication at the university, where these interviews took place. They surely do not represent a representative stance as single cases (that is at least what I wished to avoid), but serve as conceptual anchors that help zooming on social and educational configurations which should be analyzed and discussed. For controlling for my own stereotyping, I presented the interview 10 in a
- Narrative 1: Lukas (Interview 5)

Lukas has an academic family background with a father (teacher at a comprehensive school, “Gesamtschule”), who is deeply attached to equal opportunities values and to a ‘no child left behind’-philosophy. Lukas has an extremely straight educational career, since he has – without attending the army – quasi completed his teacher education program at DUE at the age of 24 and expects now to be an intern at a secondary school (“Realschule”) in the Ruhr-region. He is quite anxious about passing his last exams and doubtful about the assignment to a ‘difficult’ school district: He explains emphatically his school choice (justification of not choosing a comprehensive school), since this would imply a certain risk to be placed at a “Hauptschule,” a ‘lower’ secondary school with the reputation to be ‘difficult’ due to its high proportions of immigrant students especially in the Ruhr-region. The main topical focus of his narrative is how to successfully cope with becoming a teacher and didactics. There is no reference made to politics/political science as a discipline and/or to his political socialization at school or at university. In table 2, I replicate the very first sequence of the interview after the short narrative impulse of the interviewer (“Please tell me the story of your decision to become a social studies teacher student.”)

Table 2. Lukas [Interview 5, sequence 1.1]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>German Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Yeah, well I was actually unambiguous quite early anyway; | Ja also bei mir war das eigentlich schon recht früh irgendwie klar, allein auch durch mein Vater eben, dass ich eigentlich immer zumindest in die Richtung geschielt habe. Also im Anfang gab’s auch noch so Sachen wie Rechtsanwalt, was ich mir hätte vorstellen können, aber nach meinem Praktikum in der Kanzlei, @ hat sich das recht schnell erübrigt@ ehm ja und dann ist halt Mathematik im Effekt das, was ich sagen würde, was ich wirklich allerbesten kann und gerade im sozialwissenschaftlichen Bereich eben auch viele Verbindungen entdeckt habe, was eh empirische Forschung: und=und Wahlforschung vor allem eben auch angeht, was im stochastischen Bereich ja schon sehr interessant ist. Und ehm nen großer Punkt gerade in die Richtung vom politischen Bereich her hat ich dann und dem wirtschaftlichen Bereich, hat ich dann in der neunten Klasse, als wir dann eben den zweiten Wahlbereich hatten und Politik/Wirtschaft angeboten wurde, aber eben schon in einer richtig schön offenen Form, in Form, dass wir eine Schülerferma gegründet haben, mit der wir sehr erfolgreich waren, sogar Bundesschwiebewerbe gewonnen haben und auf Ausstellungen waren und eben auch mit außerschulischen Institutionen ehm und Akteuren kooperiert haben (.) und=und gerade diese offene Form, diese-diese Projektform irgendwie, das, das hat mir schon sehr sehr gefallen und weil wahrscheinlich auch jeder schon mal langweiligen Politikunterricht gehabt hat, ehm, hat man schon irgendwie das Gefühl gehabt, dass wenn man das als Lehrer machen will, das schon so in diese Richtung auch gehen soll, in diesem projektorientierten, fächerübergreifenden Unterricht teilweise auch hinein, ja:, ehm, das sind so, was so wirklich der-Hauptsatzpunkt. Ehm dann war’s in der Oberstufe so, dass ich im Endeffekt Mathematik-und-und ehm Sportleistungskurs gewählt habe, dann mich verletzt habe, Sport nicht machen konnte, und dann eben auf Sozialwissenschaften da auch eh umgestiegen bin und ab dem Moment war dann im Endeffekt auch klar, dass ich mit den beiden Fächern an die Universität gehen würde (. ) ja (. )
- Topical Structure of the opening sequence of interview 5

1-2 Metadiscourse: the decision to be a social studies teacher is straight. There is no real alternative to the actual decision to become a social studies teacher.

3-4 Social background/family: father is an instance, has no explicit concrete influence.

5-8 Reference to metadiscourse/Straightness: quick exclusion of an alternative option.

9 Personal competence/Positive self-ascription: being a good student in math.

10-13 Disciplinary perspective: connections between math and the social sciences; transmission of competence from math to social studies.

14-16 Personal Interest/Individual disciplinary perspective: economics as a field of interest leading to politics.

17-19 Pedagogical disciplinary reference: positive reference to school experience and to the curricular and didactical frame.

20-24 Personal competence/Positive self-ascription: successful learning project, recognition from outside instances (winning a price).


29-33 Individual disciplinary perspective/Positive self-ascription: transmission of the experienced positive didactical strategy on imagined future practice as a social studies teacher. Interviewee was a student, who already wanted to be a good teacher, when he was at school.

34-40 Metadiscourse/Straightness: underlining coherence of the decision. Decision to become a social studies teacher student is based on the choice of the two main school subjects for the A-level exams: replacement of physical education by social studies because of physical damages.

41-43 Metadiscourse/Straightness: there is no alternative to be a student at XXX because of restricted admission.

- Interpretation

Lukas is fully aware of the organizational and educational context of the interview. There is a clear cut perception of the interviewer (the author) as a specialist in social studies education and of her (imagined) ideal vision of a young teacher student. Further, there is a permanent tacit allusion to the common social studies didactics background and to common values about how ‘good’ social studies education may look like. The opening sequence of the interview has a clear structure, which above all aims at controlling the auditor:

- metadiscourse valuating the decisiveness of the following;
- allusion to a common professional and middle class social background;
- ascription of competence for being a good student;
- ascription of disciplinary competence;
- ascription of deep interest;
- ascription of competence for being a good future teacher.

The narrative’s driving force is commonality of perspectives and shared values with the interviewer. The aspiration to present a coherent picture leads to a construction of a very personal and individual professional vocation, which seemingly lacks alternatives. At the end of the opening sequence a purely pragmatic rationality emerges, which at least ‘counterweights’ the rationale of professional inclination and of individual aptitude: finally, the decision to become a social studies teacher basically seems to be due to fate and misfortune. But even this accidental event doesn’t harm a vision of the self as being a consistent and regular part, which totally fits into the mechanisms of the educational system: The reference to a helpful ‘rule’, that consisted of choosing two main a-level school subjects and make a profession out of them is an impressive example. There is no dissonance at all between Lukas and the educational system – and above all the school: The University as an institution is a place, where one qualifies for being a school teacher. The educational venture stops at this point, since Lukas strictly avoids expressing any direct personal interest in politics (math and economics bridging the gap). The individual political socialization and the developmental tasks of young adulthood are – if not vague – at least not connected to the professional and educational challenges ahead.

- Narrative 2 Gökhan (Interview 10, sequence 1.2)

Gökhan has a family background with both parents not having any vocational training. His father is a retreated immigrant, who left East-Anatolia in the early seventies to be an unskilled industrial worker in the Ruhr-region. Gökhan is the family’s eighth and last child, his siblings having all failed the Abitur (A-level), while he had delivered at a comprehensive school in the Northern Ruhr. He describes his mother’s educational ambitions (“you are my last child”) as a major influence for him trying to bring academic laureate to the family. His family wanted him to be a computer expert; they express concern about the opportunity of a ‘Turk’ to be a teacher, to be a civil servant in Germany. Gökhan is German; he is 26 years old and before starting the teacher education program at UDE (University Duisburg-Essen), he has given up an information technology program at another university. He describes himself as an educational ‘loser’ (a fact that he had only recognized, when he compared himself to his peers studying at the University) and accuses the comprehensive school of not preparing to successful university education. He is still far from passing the final exams since he has spent a lot of time studying political sciences (attaining good grades), which he describes as being a discipline that has helped him to overcome his educational deficits and facilitated a deeper understanding of the Turkish political system (which he studies by himself since the DUE’s political science department has no specialization in Turkish politics). This political science knowledge has already contributed to a new
role in his community ("der Bekanntenkreis"), where he is said to be an expert, when it comes to debates on politics and society in Turkey as well as in Germany. He describes the old men circles and especially his father as persons, who are "not very competent." The main topical focus of the interview is being a Turk in Germany and the question how to cope with the risk of a general personal failure (social-educational-economic).

Gökhan's German original interview contains a slight accent, dialectical expressions and abbreviations in word order, of which I try to give an account in the English translation. For purposes of better presentation and comparison of the two interviews I cut the very beginning (sequence 1.1.), where Gökhan relates his failure at the XXX-University.

Table 3. Gökhan [Interview 10, sequence 1.2]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>German Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. G. of course stopped then my program at the (XXX)-University / eh / then I wanted to enroll in XXX, but in addition to history, what to study?</td>
<td>G. Habe ich natürlich an der XXXuniversität dann abgebrochen mein Studium / eh/ mich dann in XXX einschreiben wollen, aber neben Geschichte, was studiere ich? So, dann ist natürlich so eine ganze Familiengeschichte (\beta \rho \iota \iota \iota) in der türkischen Familie muss man haben. Ganz große Türkei / eh/ verfassene Land eigentlich schon von meinem Vater, der hat immer die Nachrichten gehört, damals noch im Radio. Köln-Radio hieß das immer, auf Türkisch wurde das immer, ich glaube 19.00 Uhr jeden Tag ja, 19.00 Uhr gab es dann immer türkische Nachrichten. Hat man dann immer so mitbekommen und wuchs auch fast schon damit auf, mit Politik, obwohl man nie genau wusste eigentlich, was die da machen. (\beta \rho \iota \iota \iota) So, dann dachte ich mir Sozialwissenschaften, hat mich an der Schule nix interessiert, ehrlich gesagt. Hat was mit Politik zu tun, okay, schreibe ich mich da ein. Ich weiß nicht, was mich da erwartet, ich .. geh mal einfach rein. Und das war eigentlich die Geschichte, die Anfangsgeschichte. Warum ich eigentlich zur Sozio zum Lehramt komme. Eigentlich nicht direkt so .. ein Kindheitstraum gewesen, (so\ seit 5 Jahren): Ich will Lehrer werden! So wie Leute wie Kinder, die Feuerwehrmänner werden wollen oder so. Eigentlich nur .. okay, studier ich mal und dann auf Lehramt. Hat sich dann entwickelt natürlich, fand ich dann immer interessanter, und war ich dann natürlich super interessiert im Laufe meines Studiums, okay, Lehrer, hört sich gut an, will ich auf jeden Fall will ich auch werden, kann ich mir gut vorstellen. Aber am Anfang stand das auf jeden Fall nicht in meinem Plan, im Lebensplan ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Well, then, of course, a whole family history (\beta \rho \iota \iota \iota) in the Turkish family it is always like that .. you have a little affinity to politics, you have to. Very great Turkey / eh / abandoned land actually by my father, who has always listened to the news, on the radio then. Cologne-radio was always in Turkish, always, I think at 19.00 clock, yes every day at 19 there had always been Turkish news. One then has always noticed and then grew up with that, with politics, although actually you never knew exactly what they were doing there. (\beta \rho \iota \iota \iota) So then I thought social sciences at the school told me nothing interesting, really. Has something to do with politics, okay, I will enroll there. I do not know what awaits me, I .. simply go for it. And that was really the story, the beginning of the story. Why do I actually go for Socio.. for teaching. Wasn't really directly so .. a childhood dream, so to say since you are 5: I want to be a teacher! Just as people, as children, who want to be a firefighter or so. Actually, only .. okay, I' ll study then, and then teaching. Afterwards everything developed naturally, then I found it more and more interesting, and then of course I was super interested in the course of my education, okay, teacher, sounds good, is definitely what I want, what I also want to be in any case, I can well imagine. But at the beginning, that was definitely not on my agenda, on my life plan ..</td>
<td>3. Ich weiß nicht, was mich da erwartet, ich .. geh mal einfach rein. Und das war eigentlich die Geschichte, die Anfangsgeschichte. Warum ich eigentlich zur Sozio zum Lehramt komme. Eigentlich nicht direkt so .. ein Kindheitstraum gewesen, (so\ seit 5 Jahren): Ich will Lehrer werden! So wie Leute wie Kinder, die Feuerwehrmänner werden wollen oder so. Eigentlich nur .. okay, studier ich mal und dann auf Lehramt. Hat sich dann entwickelt natürlich, fand ich dann immer interessanter, und war ich dann natürlich super interessiert im Laufe meines Studiums, okay, Lehrer, hört sich gut an, will ich auf jeden Fall will ich auch werden, kann ich mir gut vorstellen. Aber am Anfang stand das auf jeden Fall nicht in meinem Plan, im Lebensplan ..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Topical Structure of the opening sequence of interview 10**

1-3 Personal competence/Metadiscourse: failure at another university, in a completely different academic discipline; confusion about the choice of a second subject.

4-6 Social background/the community: Turkish families in general are inclined to politics. Political interest is an obligation.

7 Reference to politics/the community: normative political vision of Turkey as a great nation.

8-11 Social background/Family: father is a migrant, who listened to Turkish radio programs, which had been produced in Germany.

12-14 Personal Interest/Personal Competence: as a child the interviewee
listened to the Turkish radio show, but didn’t understand. General lack of knowledge.

15-16 Personal Interest/Pedagogical disciplinary reference: not at all interested in social studies as a school subject.

17-19 Personal Interest/Personal competence: diffuse interest in politics but uninformed about university education.

20-24 Metadiscourse/Pedagogical disciplinary reference: difficult decision to become a teacher, no vocation.

25-28 Personal Interest/Disciplinary reference: studying at the university furthers the political interest.

29-30 Personal interest/Pedagogical disciplinary reference: there is a vague self-conception of being a teacher.

31-32 Metadiscourse: unclear perspective on the professional choice, lack of early vocation.

- Interpretation

Gökhan has a special frame of the interview situation. The tacit assumption is the mismatch-assumption: He sees the interviewer as a person completely unfamiliar with his personal social background, it is unthinkable for him, that the author knows a German-Turkish family and therefore he fully explicates the context. He interprets the Turkish immigrant family as a social topos and his own family as a special case of this typical arrangement. Above all, he does not try to hide his educational failures: They are a part of the identity construction of his narrative, a fundamental lack of knowledge constitutes his self-concept. However, in a way his narrative generates a kind of self-assurance, as he generalizes on the one hand and on the other hand he also takes his distances above all from the vision of Turkey as a great nation and from a passion for politics, which lacks competence and understanding. ‘Turkey’ is shrunken up into a non-understandable radio show, that is not even produced in Turkey, but which constitutes the sole possibility for his father to escape from an isolated social situation in Germany. On the other hand, ‘Turkey’ equates ‘politics’ and therefore politics is positively connoted even if specific competence is lacking. The decision to be a political science student could be interpreted as a way to reconnect with his father’s “abandoned land”.

The interview has a basic structure similar to the Lukas narrative, which confirms a quite correct analytical abstraction of an elementary biographical process structure with regard to the biographical trajectory that constitutes his professional decision to become a teacher (Schütze 1987, 248):

- metadiscourse valuating the un-decisiveness of the following and previous failure;
- allusion to a completely alien social background;
- allusion to a diffuse personal interest for politics paired with incompetence;
- allusion to a lacking disciplinary interest and at school;
- ascription of deep disciplinary interest at university;
- allusion to a diffuse conception about being a future social studies teacher.

There is no coherent and straightforward vision of the educational and
professional growth since knowledge about educational opportunities at the university is completely missing. It seems like a social accident that Gökhan is enrolled at the UDE. He sees himself not only as somebody lacking competences, but also lacking a deep vocational decision, which he stipulates being a norm. He makes quasi no reference to social studies as a school subject and to social studies didactics. School as an institution is a blank space. He therefore has not yet developed any clear vision for himself as a teacher in Germany, but focuses on the improvement of his political competences, which will also enhance his status in his reference group, the German-Turkish community. However, he experiences educational achievement at the university, which seems to produce positive effects on the attitudes towards school as well, since finally “teacher sounds good” to him. The university is an educational institution, which enhances his educational self-concept as well as his individual development as a person, who has to cope with an educational challenge, which may also alienate him from his peers. But it is also a place, where he gets opportunities to confront the extremely difficult development and socialization tasks of early adulthood between two quite different social worlds.

4 Conclusions

Is heterogeneity a challenge that may lead to a need for revision of teacher education programs and turn them into thorough diversity-oriented programs for the social studies domain? The answer is yes, and the narrative analysis helps to identify some very first basic fields of future concern. First, the structure of the opening sequences points to an important topic: For both cases the first reference is social background when it comes to school and to the decision to become a teacher. Referring to a communal or to an un-communal background with the interviewer (who is in both cases a teacher educator—a teacher of teacher students) is decisive not only for the faith to be a teacher, but also for the coherence of the entire narration of the educational career. This structure massively highlights the significance of match and mismatch in educational contexts.

A second most important problem is social studies at school as it is presented in the narratives of future social studies teachers. The Gökhan narrative represents a constellation, where social studies as a school subject are absent. Unfortunately, most of the interviews with DUE-immigrant social studies teacher students display that tendency towards a complete irrelevance of politics at school for those in real world contexts of the narrators. The relevance of political and citizenship education in the case of the young son of a teacher is marginal as well. In both cases, there seem to exist massive socialization deficits, which are compensated in the case of Gökhan, not at all treated in the case of the middle class-son.

A third point highlighted through the two narrations presented here is the paradoxical cross-cutting constellation of high-low politicization with high-low educational and professional conviction. This is a difficult problem for teacher educators who should reflect their perceptions of persons with diverse backgrounds, and after all being extremely aware of matching and
other reciprocal effects.

A fourth point is the current discursive background as regards the “citizenship education for low-SES-student”/elementarization-debate. It is absolutely unthinkable to question a thorough citizenship-education of students coming from all types of milieus and ethnic backgrounds. It is absolutely harmful not to think about diversity as an enormous opportunity to enhance and to further civic education and social studies teacher education. It is equally unthinkable to frame a debate on people with low SES backgrounds as being persons with low interest in public affairs holding politically apathetic attitudes: As the narrative analysis shows, quite the contrary might be the case.
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