DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 408 271 SP 037 361

AUTHOR Dinkelman, Todd
TITLE Critically Reflective Teacher Education: A Preservice Case Study.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 48p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Action Research; Case Studies; *Critical Thinking; Higher Education; *Methods Courses; Preservice Teacher Education; *Reflective Teaching; Secondary Education; *Social Studies; Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS Preservice Teachers

ABSTRACT

An action research project was conducted to promote critically reflective teaching in a semester-long secondary social studies methods course. To encourage critical reflection, the instructor drew explicit attention to issues of rationale building in social studies, critical thinking, democratic education, and social transformation. Evidence of critical reflection was sought in multiple settings, including: interviews conducted with the three case study participants at the start, midpoint, and conclusion of the semester; observations of their class participation; and assignments and other written work collected from participants. Throughout the semester, data were collected that served as evidence of participant deliberation about the ethical and moral basis of their work as teachers, teaching practices informed by this deliberation, and factors that seemed to facilitate and/or inhibit the learning of critically reflective teaching. The results of the study suggested that teacher educators can influence preservice teachers to become more critically reflective, though this work appears to be inhibited by numerous programmatic and psychosocial concerns. Furthermore, while encouraging some amount of critical reflection about teaching appears to be a realistic aim for teachers of preservice secondary social studies teachers, influencing the quality and content of such reflection seems to be the greater challenge. Factors that helped and hindered this effort to promote critically reflective teaching are identified. The course syllabus is appended. (Contains 33 references.) (ND)

CRITICALLY REFLECTIVE TEACHER EDUCATION: A PRESERVICE CASE STUDY

Paper prepared for presentation at the
American Educational Research Association
Annual Conference in Chicago, Illinois, 1997

Todd Dinkelman
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
University of Wisconsin-- Madison
256 N. Mills St.
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Abstract

This paper reports on an investigation of an attempt to promote critically reflective teaching in a a semester-long secondary social studies methods course. Two main research questions are addressed: 1) What happens in an attempt to teach critically reflective teaching in a methods course at a typical research university secondary social studies teacher education program? 2) What factors impede/support my attempt to teach critically reflective teaching? To encourage critical reflection, I worked as a Methods class instructor drawing explicit attention to issues of rationale-building in social studies, critical thinking, democratic education, and social transformation. I employed an action research case study methodology utilizing typical qualitative reearch methods to investigate the experiences of three study particpants enrolled in this class. Evidence of critical reflection was sought in multiple settings, including: interviews conducted with case study participants at the start, midpoint, and conclusion of the semester; observations of their class participation; and, assignments and other written work collected from participants. Throughout the study's duration, data were collected that served as evidence of 1) participant deliberation about the ethical and moral basis of their work as teachers, 2) teaching practices informed by this deliberation, and 3) factors that seem to facilitate and/or inhibit the learning of critically reflective teaching. The results of this study suggest that, in different ways and measures, teacher educators can influence preservice teachers to become more critically reflective, though this work appears inhibited by numerous programmatic and psycho/social concerns. Furthermore, while encouraging some amount of critical reflection about teaching appears a realistic aim for teachers of preservice secondary social studies teachers, influencing the quality and content of such reflection seems to be the greater challenge. Factors that helped and hindered this effort to promote critically reflective teaching are identified.

Introduction

While reflective teaching has become a standard aim in teacher education, not a lot is known about how this aim is accomplished. Calderhead (1992) points to a dearth of relevant theory and empirical research on preparing reflective teachers and concludes that "... there is little to guide the practice of teachers and tutors involved in programs aiming to promote reflective teaching" (p.143). For what little is known about the process of teaching reflective teaching, even less is understood of how *critically* reflective teaching is promoted among preservice teachers (Sparks-Langer & Colton, 1991). Critically reflective teaching is a goal of numerous teacher preparation programs in the US and abroad (see for example, Clift, Houston, & Pugach, 1990; Valli, 1992). Among those teacher educators who have sought to promote critical reflection, reports of success have been limited. Their experiences suggest that critically reflective teaching appears to be an aim that is more desired than it is achieved.

Critically reflective teaching's elusiveness has prompted many unanswered questions about whether or not it is a realistic aim for preservice teachers in the first place (Calderhead, 1992; Rudduck, 1989). For example, Cochran Smith (1991) argues that critically reflective teaching can only be learned by beginning teachers working in schools with experienced teachers who themselves value critical reflection. Others have suggested that critical reflection is an aim that rests beyond the pale of typical preservice teachers' development, and is best thought of as a trait that is acquired by teachers who have several years of classroom experience (Berliner, 1988; Kagan, 1992). Are these views correct? The matter is far from settled. Progress on these questions will be made only through examination of the experiences teacher educators and preservice teachers have in programs that seek to promote critically reflective teaching. The study reported in this paper is an examination of one such experience.

As an instructor of a social studies methods class and a supervisor of field experiences, I examined the consequences of my efforts to promote critically reflective teaching among preservice teachers in the final year of their teacher education program at a large midwestern university. An instance of practitioner inquiry, the research consisted of a case study of three preservice teachers as they progressed through their final two semesters, a semester long methods course followed by a semester of student teaching. Given the lack of knowledge about promoting critically reflective teaching at the preservice level, the purpose of the research was to provide an empirically grounded examination of two main questions: 1) What happens in an attempt to teach critically reflective teaching in the methods and student teaching semesters of a typical research university secondary social studies teacher education program? 2) What factors hindered and supported my attempt to promote critically reflective teaching? This paper reports on the first half of this project-- the methods semester.

Research Methodology

General Orientation

This research was designed as an action research study. As defined by Karr and Kemmis (1983), this study was an instance of intentional, systematic inquiry into my own work with preservice social studies teachers in helping them become critically reflective teachers. Action research enabled an *in situ*, insider's perspective of this phenomenon. As Russell (1993) suggests, reflective teaching cannot be readily assessed except through observation of teachers in practice and in-depth discussion with them about how they approach their work. Conducting participant research put me in a unique position to make these observations and have such conversations. My direct involvement as both participant and researcher in the study participants' experiences was an important factor in the study, a factor I was sensitive to and attempted to reflect in my analysis.

This research utilized a field study methodology that closely approximated a qualitative case study. Qualitative case study yields an in-depth analysis of a limited number of subjects, who together comprise the case in question, in their natural setting (Stake, 1995). Such analysis enables the researcher to investigate social phenomena giving due attention to the broad range of personal and situational factors influencing them. Qualitative research methods, such as case study, tend to be holistic, empirical, interpretive, and empathic with respect to actors' frames of reference and value commitments (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1993; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). These characteristics are appropriate for this study because its research problems can only be properly investigated in context, as the process under investigation occurs, and honoring the perspectives of participants.

Though this research made use of qualitative methods of investigation, as an instance of action research, it departs from common forms of qualitative research, such as ethnography, in that my objective was to do more than merely understand a complex social phenomenon (preservice teachers learning critically reflective teaching). In this study, I also played an active role in influencing that phenomenon. As Fraenkel and Wallen note, there is usually no attempt to manipulate subjects or provide a treatment in qualitative research (1993, p. 383). Yet, in this research, my teaching and supervision represented a form of treatment, and I fully intended to manipulate (in an educative, non-indoctrinating sense of the term) the study participants. Throughout the methods semester, I attempted to carry out my role as instructor in ways that I hoped would encourage their critical reflection.

Participants

I recently taught a Secondary Social Studies Methods course at a major midwestern university. Three preservice students enrolled in this course volunteered to participate in this study. Each of these students were in the final year of their teacher certification program and would complete a student teaching assignment the following semester. Besides seeking a gender-balanced sample, no

effort was made to screen volunteers on predetermined criteria.[1] Amy was 23 years old, completing her undergraduate degree in education, and a native of the Midwest. Leonard, age 45 and a former pastor, was seeking teaching certification after already completing undergraduate degrees in anthropology and comparative religion and a Master of Divinity degree. Nick, age 25, was raised in the Midwest and had completed a Bachelors degree in psychology at an Ivy League school before returning to seek a teaching certificate in this program.

Data Collection

Collecting data for this study hinged on an operational conception of critical reflection and critically reflective teaching. In an area of research where no such widely accepted conception exists (Calderhead, 1992, Hatton & Smith, 1994), researchers are in a position to stipulate their own views. Yet as Korthagen and Wubbels (1991) argue, every conception of reflective teaching assumes some view of good teaching. Thus researchers who propose conceptions of reflective teaching (and critically reflective teaching) should make explicit their underlying notions of good practice. In this study, I have defined critical reflection as deliberation about the moral and ethical dimensions of education. Critically reflective teaching, then, are those instructional practices informed by critical reflection. Drawing from the work of van Manen (1977), critical reflection is distinguished from technical reflection, focusing mainly on the means to accomplish unexamined ends; and practical reflection, which allows for a deeper examination of means and ends and is concerned with clarifying assumptions underlying educational process and explicating the rationales for educational goals.

Going further, supporting this conception of critically reflective teaching is a view good teaching drawn from the social reconstructionist reform tradition in U.S. teacher education (Liston and Zeichner, 1991). Social reconstructionists argue that, because schooling practices are never neutral in relation to the larger social order, educators should strive to develop a democratic vision of the good society based on the ideals of community, equality, caring, and freedom. This vision can then be used as a referent in making the difficult curricular and instructional decisions that would help their students take part in social transformation. Here, critically reflective teaching is fixed to a notion of education's role in contributing to a more democratic and just society. Critically reflective teachers see the connections between what they do in the classroom, other schooling practices, and the broader social and political contexts surrounding their work.

Given this view of critically reflective teaching, evidence of critical reflection was sought in as many different arenas as possible. An encompassing and in-depth look at a range of participant behaviors and thought was desired. In other instances of teacher education research investigating critical reflection among preservice teachers, the range of sites in which evidence of critical reflection

[1] Four students made up the original sample-- two females and two males. The fourth volunteer withdrew from participation toward the end of the Methods class semester, and asked that the data she provided not be included in the final report.

was sought has been more narrowly circumscribed. For example, Gore and Zeichner (1991) examined written reports of student teachers' action research projects. Hatton and Smith (1994) also relied on written reports of preservice student experiences to form the basis for their investigation. And, though her work was not limited to an inquiry about critical forms of reflection, LaBoskey (1994) utilized student written case investigations as the primary data source for her study of preservice teachers' reflective practice. The limited number of participants, and my in-depth involvement as participant-researcher, afforded me an opportunity to go beyond written reports to seek evidence of critical reflection in multiple settings.

Data came in a variety of forms, clustered around three main sources. The first of these was a series of interviews conducted with case study participants at the start, midpoint, and conclusion of the semester. The resulting nine interviews were tape recorded and provided information regarding developing perspectives about social studies, schooling, and critically reflective teaching. My observations of their work and participation in class, and the field notes these observations generated, comprised the second primary source of data. These field notes included both descriptive and reflective material (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992) tied to direct observations. A third source was the assignments and other written work I collected from participants over the course of the semester.

Data Analysis

Throughout the study, data were sought that served as evidence of 1) participant deliberation about the ethical and moral basis of their work as teachers, 2) teaching practices informed by this deliberation, and 3) factors that seem to facilitate and/or inhibit the learning of critically reflective teaching in social studies. Analysis of these data was directed by two concerns-- providing sufficient evidentiary warrant to draw conclusions about research questions (Erickson, 1986), and providing enough descriptive material so that others can judge whether my inferences are reasonable.

In a very important sense, analysis was on-going throughout the semester. Yet the most thorough reflection on data took place after the semester ended when notes and other data sources could be read and synthesized in their entirety. In reviewing collected data, I looked for patterns of regularity and disconfirming evidence to formulate codes representing core categories relevant to my research questions. Initially data was coded as evidence of critical reflection, critically reflective teaching, and factors of influence. In addition, two main subthemes surfaced early in the process: democratic education and social studies rationales. Data analysis was an evolutionary process of careful and repeated examination of the data. Categories surfacing early in the process influenced subsequent data collection and analysis. Numerous data sources provided the possibility for triangulation of data, and the length of the investigation enabled the development and disconfirmation of interpretations through further encounters with study participants. To document the bases for conclusions drawn from the data, the participant's voices and perspective are prominently featured in the final report.

Research Setting

Methods Class

Guiding Framework

The setting for this study consisted of a semester-long experience in a secondary social studies methods class. The class had 14 students that met three days a week for nine weeks spread over three sessions during the semester. These sessions, lasting four, three and two weeks, were separated by two field experiences (practica) of three weeks in length. Because Amy and Nick elected for grades 6-12 certification, instead of a second practicum, they were placed in a half semester student teaching placement that overlapped the final two weeks of Methods and continued until the end of their respective schools' semesters.

This course was designed to enhance preservice social studies teachers' ability and disposition for critical reflection about their work as social studies teachers. A four--part framework gave structure to the course--

1) developing a democratic mission in social studies
2) learning curriculum and instructional methods supporting that mission
3) recognizing the obstacles to teaching this curriculum using these methods
4) exploring ways to sustain a commitment to a democratic mission when faced with these obstacles

Though all parts of the framework were dealt with throughout the semester, the general approach was to emphasize the foundational, theoretical content of Part 1, with some introduction to methods and obstacles (Parts 2 and 3), early in the course, during the first four weeks of the semester. The two shorter periods of methods class, lasting three and two weeks each, were more focused on the "how-to" concerns of Part 2. There were the fewest number of readings pertaining to Parts 3 and 4. Learning about these two components, I had hoped, would occur throughout the semester, especially as a result of their two separate field placements.

At the start of this semester, I realized that this outline set out an ambitious agenda. Short of enacting a wholesale transformation of their views regarding social studies as a form of democratic education, my hope from the onset was that this class would at least orient students towards the ideal of democratic education. The class was intended to help students understand that the social studies they likely will encounter in the field does not represent all that the field can or should be, set them in the general direction of a democratic civic education rationale for social studies, and develop some practical knowledge of how to teach in ways that respect educational equity, diversity, and excellence.

In planning methods class, drawing attention to critically reflective teaching became a vitally important aim for three reasons. First, was my belief that a democratic education rationale for social studies demands doing so. Democratic education calls for teachers who understand the normative basis of their work and are skilled in making decisions regarding complex pedagogical problems

arising in the context of their own classrooms. This view draws attention to the social, political, and moral dimensions of work in schools and the need for teachers who care about how these dimensions relate to their own practice. Second, in my work as a supervisor in past semesters, I saw many student teachers move from Methods to student teaching without a discernible awareness (let alone a developed understanding) of the critical dimensions embedded in their work as social studies teachers. And finally, as Valli (1993) has argued, under their current structures schools are unlikely to provide the kinds of experiences that encourage critical reflection among beginning teachers after they have left their teacher preparation programs. The four part framework was to provide the structure through which attention to critically reflective teaching would be drawn.

Readings and Topics

The readings for the course were selected for the manner in which they corresponded to the four part framework, as did the sequence in which they were assigned. That is, those readings that I felt addressed issues relating to Part 1 were assigned early in the semester. Readings topical to Part's 2, 3, and 4 followed. The course syllabus contains a complete list of these readings (Appendix A).

In general descriptive terms, the first four weeks (13 class sessions) dealt with the field of social studies, social reconstructionism, democratic education, student engagement, critically reflective teaching, critical thinking, school culture, text bias, and multicultural education. In this brief time, students were assigned a total of 30 different readings on these various topics. This theoretical push early in the semester was intended to raise issues of democratic education, multiculturalism, and social justice; and, in turn, to help students develop their own conceptions of what constitutes worthwhile learning in social studies. By the end of this period, we settled on a definition of good teaching--teaching that leads to active student engagement in worthwhile learning. From here, Methods members were placed in a three week practicum. For Methods class, they completed a journal assignment that asked them to seek out evidence of critically reflective teaching.

The rest of Methods, 15 classes spread between a three and two week session, saw a shift in attention from theory, toward exploring the Methods of instruction that bring about active student engagement. Theoretical concerns would not disappear from our agenda, for a main theme of the course was that all teaching practices embed critical and ethical concerns. However, from this point on the emphasis was on developing practical strategies for classroom use that could be used in subsequent field placements.

The second period of Methods, nine class meetings in three weeks, was intended as an exploration of issues surrounding lesson and unit planning. Readings on cooperative learning, role-playing/simulations, values education, public and controversial issues, and assessment were included. Lesson planning, sharing, and critique were emphasized as students were assigned the task of producing their best lesson or activity for distribution in class. The 14 lesson ideas this assignment generated, along with the lesson ideas I shared from my own teaching, were meant to add to a pool of

practical teaching ideas from which students could draw as student teachers. This session of Methods ended with a three week break from class in which all class members began 1/2 semester student teaching placements, except for Leonard, who completed a second three week practicum.

The final session of Methods (six class meetings) took place the final two weeks of the University's spring semester, a time period that fell in the middle of the 1/2 semester student teaching placements. In this brief final session, a day was planned for each of the following: a "debriefing" class in which students discussed their second field experience of the semester, a panel-discussion of experienced student teachers returning to Methods to share their experiences, a presentation from the school's Educational Placement Office, and course evaluations. This left only two class meetings where issues related to the four part framework were directly pursued The only reading scheduled for this time period was a National Council of Social Studies (1994) publication detailing recently adopted curriculum standards for the field.

The Methods of Methods

This accounting of readings and topics should provide some sense of the content of the course. As important is a description of how this material was taught. It was a main goal entering the semester that students be given the space to critically examine the ideas raised in the course and shape their own views about them. Critical discourse-- discourse characterized by open-minded, reasonable, and penetrating thinking became an important part, and end, of Methods. As Ross and Hannay suggest "development of critical reflectivity requires a new type of discourse in the classroom--critical discourse... [P]reservice teachers must learn to expose their thinking to others and open themselves to criticisms from peers as well as authority" (1986, p. 13). As instructor, I viewed my role more in terms of encouraging critical thinking about course content than passing on the accepted knowledge and practices of the field. Of course, there would be moments when I would impart practical how-to's and tips of practice, but these moments I hoped would number far fewer than those when students would engage in critical dialogue.

Not only did I want students to think and talk about critical issues in Methods, I also wanted them to actually practice translating this talk into real classroom strategies. Based on my knowledge of what students entering Methods typically hope to learn from the class, I anticipated that all this talk might come across as "more theory," at the expense of practical teaching suggestions desired by students. As Adler and Goodman note, "... perhaps the greatest challenge facing Methods courses is to discover ways in which critical perspectives of education can be raised, and at the same time, address students' desires for practical and meaningful teaching strategies" (1986, p.4). In prior work with student teachers, I have encountered numerous students who expressed an allegiance to the idea of democratic education, but who found themselves frustrated as they sat down to plan lessons They were at a loss as to how they might convert the grand-sounding theory of social studies' democratic citizenship mission into actual classroom practice.

Thus a key component of my plan for the semester was creating opportunities for students to build curriculum. In three different assignments, students would be set to the task of creating lessons that met our definition of good teaching-- active student engagement in worthwhile learning. In each case, they would share these lessons with their classmates. These curriculum building experiences were intended not only to provide experience planning good lessons in a setting where they would receive intelligent feedback from their instructor and peers, but also to equip them with a storehouse of ideas they could take with them into their field experiences.

At the end of the semester, and conforming to the course's four part framework, my plan was that critical dialogue on the issues raised during the semester would yield-- 1) at least a nascent understanding of what democratic education means for social studies, 2) a storehouse of practical teaching ideas they could take into their student teaching placements to advance the cause of democratic education, 3) an awareness of the difficulties they would encounter as reform agents, and 4) a sense of where to turn for support as they attempted to overcome these difficulties. If these outcomes could be met, I reasoned, these preservice teachers would be positioned to counter the tide of conformity in social studies practice and to resist the teacher-centered, barrage of worksheets, video upon video, and lecture/exam pattern of practice, so firmly established in many social studies classrooms (Armento, 1986; Schug, 1982).

Results

Methods Case One: Amy

Initial Frames

Upon entering Methods, Amy described her decision to become a teacher in terms of a personally held "grand vision" and "wanting to make a difference." Her sense of mission as a teacher was not about making sure that most of her students scored above 80% on a U.S. History exam; it was about helping her students become better people. In her own words:

> I'm kind of an idealistic person. I think that schools should help students and children learn to become better citizens, become better people, learn to function in our society, learn to think critically, and question their lives, and question who they are, and become knowledgeable about the things that are around them, help them, and then come to the realization of what they're good at, what they enjoy doing, what they'd like to do with the rest of their life. Give them a springboard for the rest of their lives, I think. (interview, 1-22-96)

At the start of Methods, her vision was obviously far reaching. At some basic level though, her sense of purpose was rooted in moral and ethical concerns, and thus reflective of some measure of critical reflection.

In her initial interview, Amy also connected ideas about her role as a teacher to larger social, political, and cultural dynamics taking place outside her classroom. She held beliefs about the larger society that she thought would influence her teaching. In her view, the greatest social problems faced by this society stem from a divisiveness that kept its members from working together. She saw

divisions "between the have's and the have-not's... the rich and the poor, or, you know, the white and the black, well, whatever division you want to put in between it, the educated and the non-educated" (interview, 1-22-96). Her understanding of the larger social order also shaped her vision of the kind of classroom she hoped to have. Amy explained:

> I want to have a place where it's open and we can talk about anything. I mean, the problems that are going on in the world, the problems that are going on in the community, the problems that are going on in their school. I mean, and everyone can have an opinion... (interview 1-22-96)

Here Amy stands apart from a more a technical, instrumentalist view of social studies. She rejects the idea of a standardized curriculum that lays out the knowledge and skills all students must learn. Instead, she sees the curriculum as a flexible construct, responsive to social problems and student interests. Such a view of curriculum can be interpreted as critically reflective for the manner in which it connects school practices with problems facing the larger society.

Though she held these ideas about schooling's moral basis and its relationship to the wider social order, she had not pulled them together with reference to critically reflective teaching prior to this course. The term itself was new to her. As well, her first exposure to the term 'democratic education' came in Methods. If she had been exposed to the idea of democratic education or related ideas in prior education coursework, either they had been signified by different words or they had disappeared from her working memory. She used my questions about the topic to affirm her desire for a classroom atmosphere that encourages open dialogue. She believed every student has a right to speak. In her classroom, she wanted to create a "safe environment" for her students to feel that their voices will be taken seriously.

Advocates for democratic education would find Amy's ideas about shared authority and student voice encouraging. However, these two ideas represent the limited extent to which democratic education had a place in Amy's thinking about the relationship between school and society. She was able to articulate a commitment to democratic education in only sweeping and general terms. In her mind, schooling should be for democracy but for a lot of other worthy aims too. She viewed her classroom more as a place where students would better themselves as individuals than as a place where students learn to function as participants in a society struggling to realize democratic ideals.

This lack of an articulated democratic theory to account for the relationship between school and society was mirrored by Amy's rationale for social studies. She had a sense in mind of the kind of social studies class she hoped to teach, but this was not predicated on a comprehensive, detailed conception of social studies role in the modern school curriculum. Her vision was more a result of personally held convictions and her belief that she could, as she put it, "make a difference."

Development over the Semester

Over the course of the Methods semester Amy developed both a conceptual understanding of critically reflective teaching and an awareness of its importance to her work as a social studies teacher.

By the middle of the semester she had gone from hazarding a guess at the term's meaning to articulating a fairly clear definition of the term and its importance to her developing sense of practice. She commented:

> ...[C]ritically reflective teaching is thinking about the moral, and ethical, and the social things that are going on... I think that it's something that you have to strive for in teaching... I mean, how can you be a good teacher if you don't sit and think about what you're doing, especially in terms of social justice and giving kids a voice? I mean, isn't that what it's all about?(interview, 3-18-96)

After Methods had finished, she was willing to speak in even stronger terms about the importance of critically reflective teaching. She acknowledged that the term was new to her at the beginning of the semester, and at the end of the semester she gained more than just an intellectual awareness of its meaning. At the end of her half-semester student teaching experience, she claimed critical reflection was a part of her beginning practice:

> ...thinking about how you are teaching, what's happening in your classroom, and thinking about that on a moral, social level,... it's like something that I've been thinking about, and maybe have been experiencing. It's not just like I read it. I understand what it means. I feel like I'm dealing with it. (interview, 6-6-96)

Further evidence of her emerging understanding of critically reflective teaching comes from her reports of her two field experiences during the Methods semester. Both journal assignments asked her to make an assessment of the critically reflective teaching apparent in the schools she visited. About her first placement, she noted that teachers demonstrated ample reflection about what was happening in their classrooms and individual student progress, but this reflection rarely crossed into the critical sphere. Amy was able to draw an example of critically reflective teaching from her own practice in this setting. Her lone opportunity to teach during this three week practicum had her doing a lesson providing an overview of Quebec as part of her cooperating teacher's unit on Canada. Amy said she struggled with what to include in this lesson as she planned the lesson:

> I was thinking, you know, "I just can't tell these kids, like, "Here's some French." It doesn't tell them how the French actually ended up there, and who were the people that were there before the French, and like what happened with all the Europeans that came to the New World and were fighting over this land. I mean, that's an issue to deal with. (interview 3-18-96)

Because of time constraints, she did not pursue this matter in her lesson. Instead she spent most of the lesson teaching her students a few French words, aware all the while that she was not taking advantage of this opportunity to pursue more critical aims. Afterwards, she thought, "I didn't do enough. You know, like I didn't show them all the moral implications of, you know, settlements, of people coming here" (interview, 3-18-96).

More examples are found in her second field placement at a local high school. In this field experience, the manner in which teachers dealt with students became a prominent object of her critical reflection. She turned her attention to the implicit messages students receive from teachers who give more attention to favored groups of students:

> I think there's a lot of hidden curriculum that goes on... I keep going back to how teachers interact with students, and some teachers just do treat kids differently. And I think kids learn from that...some teachers only talk to a certain group of students. I think that there's a problem. And that's where I would see that I'm being critically reflective-- in thinking about the hierarchies and the little, the junk like that that goes on in school. (interview, 6-6-96)

Here again, Amy demonstrates her belief that teaching involves more than just delivering a pre-determined curriculum; she learned that "there is so much more to teaching than the content you cover" (assignment, 4-30-96).

In reviewing the assignments and lesson plans she turned in over the course of the semester, there are examples of Amy's critical reflection. For the assignment asking her to produce her best lesson, she turned in an entire unit plan designed to help students "analyze the social walls which we face daily." She explained the rationale for the unit: "Prejudice, discrimination, labels, segregation, apartheid, and tensions between minority groups are all part of our society. This unit examines these issues past and present, and helps students to formulate opinions to change the future with these issues" (assignment, 4-2-96). Here and elsewhere during the semester, Amy emphasized the link between the kinds of relationships formed in her class and the problems (such as intolerance) afflicting the larger social order.

Over the course of the Methods semester, Amy developed an understanding of critically reflective teaching, expressed its importance to her professional development, and demonstrated through words and actions her capacity to critically reflect about teaching and learning in social studies. My analysis of the data collected during the semester indicates that critical reflection was not her primary concern during the semester, nor did it account for anything approaching the majority of her time spent thinking about educational practice. She, more than any other study participant, expected Methods to provide her with the practical tools of the trade. She was not so much looking for Methods to raise critical questions about pedagogy as she was looking for knowledge and skills of actual practice. Yet, the moral and ethical dimensions of teaching were never too far removed in her mind. Her call for practical teaching suggestions were predicated on her sense of how people ought to treat each other. She was mindful of the unintended messages students receive from the Methods teachers utilized in delivering lessons, the content of these lessons, and the manner in which teachers and students communicated with each other. When critical reflection is defined as the consideration of the moral and ethical dimensions of teaching, the work she produced for Methods, as well as her reflections on her own and others' teaching, indicate both her capacity and willingness to critically reflect.

However, the conception of critical reflection employed in this study extends beyond just thinking about the moral and ethical dimensions of teaching. The social reconstructionist framework supporting my work as a teacher educator focuses critical reflection on a particular set of values and issues. These concern the democratic mission of schooling and the interpretation of educational

practice in relation to those broader social and political forces which inhibit the realization of a more just and equitable society. Such values and issues provide a standard for moving this analysis beyond acknowledgment of whether and how often Amy was critically reflective. They provide a standard that admits consideration of the quality of her critical reflection.

Regarding the quality of her reflection, my assessment is mixed. Amy's critical reflection took into account the intersection of educational practice and broader social and political concerns. By the end of the semester, she had come to the realization that teachers influence society whether they acknowledge this fact or not. She explained, "I think by determining what a student is going to learn, how they're going to learn it, how you interact with students, how you help the students interact with one another, you're changing society" (interview, 6-6-96). However her thinking about the nature of teaching was more often framed with reference to the individual's role in society and than it was to creating a more just, equitable, and humane society. Her focus on the individual reflected the interpretive framework she used in making sense of society. The social theory she used to account for social problems tended to localize explanations on individual shortcomings. In general, her analysis of social injustice did not appear to take into account broader systemic and structural dynamics located beyond the individual. Broader dynamics, such as racism, sexism, and economic exploitation, may have had a place in her own social ideology, but they were not prominent features of the educational theory she expressed in her work during Methods.

As was the case with critically reflective teaching, Amy could not recall ever hearing the term democratic education prior to Methods. By the end of Methods, she had heard plenty. Unlike critically reflective teaching though, all that she heard did not leave her with as clear of a clear sense of what democratic education meant or how important it was in defining herself as a teacher. She spoke of her reaction to the emphasis on democratic education: "Initially I was like, "What is this?" and "Huh?" And then it was like this is the be all and end all of education for you, but where is it, what is it?" (interview, 6-6-96) As the semester progressed she struggled to make sense of the readings and discussions in which democratic education was featured. She found much of what she read and heard appealing. Yet she was not able to fully organize all that was appealing into a single, unified conception that helped to define her purpose as an educator. She saw problems in her field placements and was working on interpreting them through a democratic education framework that, in her mind, was only partially defined. She said:

> I see a lot of kids that slip down the cracks, and don't see a lot of help coming from teachers... [D]emocratic education is important and being able to treat each student with dignity and respect, but I see myself trying to figure out, I'm trying to figure out what else there is...I don't think this for me is the be all and end all. Maybe. But I'm figuring that out. (interview, 6-6-96)

She had come to an understanding of democratic education that encompassed how students are treated and how people in schools relate to each other. However she had not worked out a more

precise notion referenced to how democratic education addresses the relationship between schools and society.

Just as Amy had gone through the semester without fully sorting out the meaning of democratic education, so too did she go through the semester without developing a rationale to account for social studies' place in the modern school curriculum. She had a passion to make a difference in the lives of her students. She spoke of respect and responsibility as the central aims of her teaching. She talked of a desire to prepare her students to meet the challenges they would face later in their lives. She had little difficulty explaining why she wanted to teach. Amy had much greater difficulty explaining why she wanted to teach social studies: "I don't think I have a very good definition of what a social studies teacher is yet" (interview, 6-6-96).

Most noticeably absent from her conception of social studies' purpose was an expressed allegiance to democratic citizenship education. If asked, she would say that educating citizens for democratic living is an important aim, but the idea did not define her sense of her role in the classroom. She felt much the same way about developing her students' capacity to think critically. This too was an important aim, and a goal she would attempt to meet as a teacher; but rational deliberation was not a defining objective. Amy saw other, more pressing problems in schools deserving her attention:

> I just see so many kids that slip through and don't get recognized for effort and hard work.. And because they don't test well or whatever... They just get lost, you know And that kind of stuff really gets to me, more than I want kids to think critically. It keeps me up at night, where I don't sit up at night and think kids aren't thinking critically enough... That bothers me too, but the other stuff really bother me, gets inside. (interview, 6-6-96)

Summary

Over the four months of Methods class, Amy acquired a conceptual understanding of what critically reflective teaching is and an awareness of its importance to how she thinks about her teaching. When critical reflection is defined as consideration of the moral and ethical dimensions of education practice, this data analysis suggests that Amy was often critically reflective. Mostly such thinking centered on issues such as the fair treatment of students and teaching in ways that empower students to take deal effectively with others and the problems they face. Mostly her critical reflection was framed with reference to individuals. Occasionally though, her reflection took into account the broader social conditions surrounding educational practice. In a general sense of the term, there is ample evidence to suggest that Amy was critically reflective. However, when judged against standards set by the social reconstructionist theoretical framework supporting my approach to Methods, the content and quality of her reflection appear less than satisfactory. Amy did not adopt a sense of purpose about her work that drew upon the commitment to democratic education centrally featured in the social reconstructionist tradition. Nor did she come to view social studies as imbued with a responsibility for democratic citizenship education. In the third and final section of this case analysis,

I consider the factors that appeared to impede and support my attempt to teach critically reflective teaching.

What Helped and What Hindered

The factors and dynamics that influence a teacher's development as a critically reflective teacher are difficult to identify. Finding them involves searching through a murky, tangled mix of reported motivations, events, emotions, thoughts, and recorded observations. At best, we can only make tentative claims about that which appeared to influence a teacher's development based on an examination of an always limited stock of data. Nevertheless, if teacher educators wish to move the pursuit of critically reflective teaching beyond guesswork, such tentative claims must be made available for consideration. This case study enabled a close, in-depth examination of Amy's experience in Methods. As a result, I am able to suggest a number of factors that, at least in Amy's case, either helped or hindered my efforts to teach critically reflective teaching.

A supportive, trustful relationship

Amy felt that a trusting, mentoring relationship did not develop between us. In the absence of such a relationship, she was less receptive to the course emphasis on critically reflective teaching and democratic education. This emphasis brought many new and challenging ideas to her attention. Amy believed it was important that she feel supported by the person who raised these ideas. She did not feel supported. By the end of the semester, we worked through this issue via our interaction resulting from the study. Yet the poor quality of our relationship stands out as the single most important obstacle to her development as a critically reflective teacher.

Amy's case points to the sensitivity and care required to promote critically reflective teaching in a preservice program. The plan I put together for Methods pushed Amy to deal with extremely difficult questions of theory and practice at a time when she was confronting natural concerns and doubts about the kind of teacher she would be, at a time, as she described, "when we're at this vulnerable stage. It's not like an insecurity stage, but it's a just starting off stage" (interview 6-6-96). The need for sensitivity seems particularly vital for those preservice students, such as Amy, who have not substantively encountered critical studies in education prior to Methods. This is not to suggest that a critical agenda should not be raised, but that doing so should be done with an awareness of the level of trust and support felt by preservice teachers.

Processing time

Another vitally important factor inhibiting Amy's development as a critically reflective teacher were the enormous time constraints posed by Methods' limited number of class meetings. One semester simply did not provide enough time to process the ideas raised in the course. Amy was disappointed by readings that were not discussed in depth, or in some cases, even talked about at all. She had many concerns throughout the semester that she was unable to bring up in class because there was no time to do so. Given more time than nine weeks, Amy may have sorted through more of

her confusion about democratic education and her rationale for social studies and. Her experience indicates that the critical agenda set out for the course probably requires significantly more processing time than one semester affords.

Expectations for Methods

Amy's expectations regarding what she would gain from Methods also influenced the manner in which she responded to Methods' emphasis on critically reflective teaching. Amy entered Methods with a clear and certain expectation of what the class should teach her: "How to do it all" (interview, 1-22-96). She was much more concerned with how's of teaching than the why's of teaching. She was direct in what she wanted from me as her instructor: "How on earth am I ever going to do this? You better teach us!" (interview, 1-22-96). Of course she was disappointed and frustrated when she found the focus of the course so often veering toward more philosophical and moral concerns. Amy's comments over the semester suggest that she spent less time sorting out the complexities of democratic education and her rationale for teaching social studies because she expected Methods to provide her more practical knowledge about how to teach.

Experience in schools

In describing what helped her make sense of Methods' emphasis on critically reflective teaching and democratic education, Amy spoke repeatedly about the importance of time spent in schools, especially time spent teaching. Ideas discussed in Methods started to take on substantial meaning only after her first practicum. Before then, so much of what she heard and read struck her as just more theory, a continuation of the grand ideas, disconnected from the real world of classrooms; promulgated in her prior teacher education classes. Frustratingly abstract, these ideas were not, as she put it, "real" to her. She described how her field experiences helped her learn what critically reflective teaching meant and its importance to her emerging sense of practice:

> I think I couldn't really have much of an understanding until I've been out there and really see what goes on... I made huge jumps when I first went there and was just observing to when I actually started having to deal with things, and then when I got comfortable with what I was doing, and while I was doing the lessons, where I could start to think about that stuff even more. (interview, 6-6-96)

She claimed experience gave her a framework for interpreting theory. Across the span of Methods, this claim is corroborated by a comparison of her interview answers to questions regarding critically reflective teaching, democratic education, and social studies rationales. She was able to provide more detailed and sophisticated responses about these ideas by drawing illustrative examples from her field experiences.

Time spent in schools also was helpful for the ways in which it bolstered Amy's confidence as a teacher. Achieving the critical discourse I sought in Methods required asking difficult questions about the intersection of educational theory and practice. Before her first field experience, Amy felt somewhat reticent to put forth answers to such questions because her lack of experience made her

feel less than fully qualified to respond. She felt ill-suited to respond to the critical feedback I offered about her work. As she described:

> This is brand new. We've never done this before. I don't know what's right. I don't know what's not right. I don't have the experience behind that... You can make comments like, "Do you really know what you're talking about?" No, I don't." (interview, 6-6-96)

Before garnering any experience in the classroom, Amy did not feel that she was in any position to speak knowledgeably on issues such as democratic education. Once she gained that experience though, she became more comfortable in dealing with critically reflective issues.

Though the school experience Amy acquired helped her better come to terms with critically reflective teaching, the dearth of her school experience prior to Methods posed a major roadblock. She received only six weeks of field experience before Methods ended. In spite of all she learned in them, she ended the semester feeling these few weeks were woefully inadequate. In reflecting back on Methods after the semester had ended, she said, "I thought that I would have liked to skip it, have some experience, and come back. And then I think it would have been five million times more effective" (interview, 6-6-96).

Cooperating teachers

While I was not closely involved in supervising Amy's two practicum experiences, Amy's comments indicate another factor that appeared to influence her development as a critically reflective teacher-- the models of teaching provided by her cooperating teachers. In both experiences, Amy claimed that her cooperating teachers were critically reflective and concerned to some extent with democratic education. In her defense of these claims, I found little evidence to suggest that either teacher saw her work in terms of the democratic rationale for social studies raised in Methods class. Amy was impressed with how deeply they cared about their students' success, but neither pushed Amy to acknowledge the moral, social, and political dimensions of teaching in the same way that I attempted. While Amy appeared to view our divergent approaches as more complimentary than contradictory, I interpreted the absence of alignment between Methods and her field placements as a missed opportunity to fully explore critically reflective issues in practice. Had she had an opportunity to work in a setting that more fully demonstrated critically reflective teaching, perhaps she would have made more progress in developing a better understanding of social studies' democratic purpose.

Raising critically reflective issues

Another, and somewhat obvious, factor that played an important role in encouraging Amy's critical reflection is the fact that critically reflective concerns were prominently featured in Methods. The readings, discussions, and assignments pushed her to consider what critically reflective teaching meant and why it was important to her work. She was asked to think about her work as a social studies teacher in relation to broader social conditions of educational practice. She read different

ideas about democratic education and heard them discussed in class. Her practicum journal assignments had her apply these ideas as she interpreted what she saw happening in social studies classrooms. From a point at the beginning of the semester of never having heard the term before, she came to describe what critically reflective teaching was and point to examples drawn from her own limited time spent teaching. Methods enabled Amy to name her work as critically reflective: "I now have a label for what I think I wanted before. It's something that I guess I can recognize, that I can point out when I'm thinking about planning, that kind of thing" (interview, 3-18-96). Granted, she did not end the semester with a clear picture of democratic education, nor did she develop a detailed rationale to account for her role as a social studies teacher, but she was provided an array of critically reflective concerns to consider. About critically reflective teaching, she commented, "I'm sure that since we brought it up and did talk about it, maybe it was more on the forefront of my mind" (interview, 6-6-96). These concerns may not have surfaced in her thinking had they not been an explicit focus of the course.

Discussions with peers

Amy also noted that class discussions helped develop her understanding of critically reflective teaching. She learned from the diversity of viewpoints represented by class members. Course readings raised questions for her; discussions with her classmates both inside and outside of class helped answer them. Her interviews and assignments were rife with references to ideas she heard from other class members. She pointed to the manner in which discussions with classmates over the semester "made me realize, well, who am I? What am I bringing to teaching? What am I?" (interview 6-6-96). Talking with others in a community of preservice learners helped Amy to process the critical issues raised in Methods.

Initial Frames of Thinking about Teaching

My analysis suggests that Amy entered Methods somewhat predisposed to critical reflection. She started the semester already aware that teaching is essentially a moral undertaking. This view was not doubt influenced by significant events in her life, such as the auto accident that nearly took her life. In an important sense, she had already developed an interest in looking at teaching as more than just a technical or practical concern. It seems reasonable to believe that the work of teacher educators interested in promoting critically reflective teaching is made easier when teaching preservice students who already possess some awareness of the moral and ethical dimensions of teaching.

Social and political views

Given the social reconstructionist theoretical framework supporting my approach to teacher education, Amy's lack of familiarity with critical social theories inhibited her development as a critically reflective teacher. Critically reflective teaching, as defined in this study, is predicated on a view toward the broader social conditions in which teaching takes place and serious consideration of

social theories that account for dynamics of social reproduction existing beyond individual actors. In contrast, Amy's social world-view was focused mainly on individuals:

> If the members of our society would simply take responsibility and stop passing the blame onto someone else, there would be a greater sense of control of our lives, reduction in our apathy, and broadening in our individual sense of self" (assignment, 1-30-96)

In an important sense, Amy was limited in her ability to see connections between her teaching and the larger social order because she did not possess a theoretical framework that encouraged such a vision.

Prior coursework

My analysis of Amy's case suggests that promoting critically reflective teaching in a one-semester Methods class may be facilitated when students' prior coursework has addressed related issues and ideas. Though Amy's coursework did not provide her with any familiarity with critically reflective teaching, democratic education, or a defensible rationale for social studies, she did cite particular classes that encouraged her to look at critically reflective issues. She recalled a sociology of education course that drew into question the function schools play in society. She credited this course with helping her realize that schools do not exist simply because there are students who want to learn. Her view of the relationship between school and society changed as a result of that class: "I mean, there are a lot of other reasons why schools came to be what they are. You know, so I think that class definitely changed how I think about it" (interview 1-22-96). Though their influence was far from profound, other classes Amy took laid some of the groundwork to facilitate the conception of critically reflective teaching taught in Methods.

Methods Case Two: Leonard

Initial Frames

Leonard is the sort of person who makes strong first impressions. Beyond striking physical features such as his tall frame and flowing, long hair, Leonard quickly distinguished himself in my mind as a unique individual by the ideas he expressed about education and his tendency in speech and writing to, in his own words, "pull from a lot of different places" (interview, 3-19-96). As with Amy, the ideas about teaching he brought to Methods were steeped in a sense of the fundamentally moral basis of teaching. He did not talk about teaching as a technical enterprise concerned with delivering a pre-set curriculum. Rather he described teaching as an occupation whose purpose is to help people through "the complexities of everyday life," and he acknowledged that the reasons children should be in schools are fraught with "a lot of moral suasion" (interview, 1-22-96).

Education's moral foundations were apparent to Leonard before he began Methods. Furthermore, he also understood that schools play a role in influencing society. He believed, "Schools are a tremendously conservative agency of society. They're one of the most conservative" (interview, 1-22-96). In explaining this point, he pointed to the large sums of money giant corporations such as IBM and AT&T are willing to invest in school reform initiatives. To Leonard,

such investments are evidence that schools better serve some interests more than others. As a teacher, he did not see himself beholden to conservative interests. His job was to help people see alternative world-views, understand interconnections between social phenomena, and appreciate the complexity of social life. By teaching to these aims, he hoped to influence the larger social order. Because Leonard had considered both the moral dimensions of teaching and schooling's relationship to wider social contexts, he was, in a sense, preconditioned to Methods' emphasis on critically reflective teaching.

While both the term and its meaning were new to him, Leonard appeared to have a headstart on some of the understandings necessary for critically reflective teaching. For example, he had heard the term democratic education before. He offered a definition:

> Democratic education, as I understand it, is allowing, encouraging, evoking, as many voices as possible in a classroom, in order to sort of to bring into discussion sort of the current issues of the day, in the context of people's own experience and lived reality. (interview. 1-22-96)

Here Leonard first brings up an idea that he would continue to assert for the rest of the semester, the idea that, as he would say, "everyone has a voice." He believed that democracy was not really about the rule of the majority, "but it's the idea that everyone has a voice. And that democracy... is a way of encouraging, protecting, amplifying, I guess, in some ways, those voices that don't get heard" (interview, 1-22-96). Leonard held some understanding of democratic education and believed it was something about which schools should be concerned.

However he understood democratic education, he did not draw upon this understanding to explain his role as a social studies teacher. Like Amy, Leonard did not start the Methods semester with a reasoned, comprehensive rationale for his work in this field. He could communicate some ideas about social studies' purpose, but these were vague and unconnected to a coherent organizational framework. On the first day of class, he wrote, "Social studies is about living in real situations, learning from personal experience how to maneuver in the world and culture around us" (assignment, 1-22-96). He supplemented this view in the initial interview, conducted later that same day: "Social studies is sort of the whole area of how it all ties together... where the curriculum is tied together in a sort of a complex framework, where lots of different complexities, lost of different interrelationship can be pointed out."

Clearly the rationale Leonard articulated at the start of Methods is an inadequate guide for making curriculum choices. Yet his critical mindset regarding education, society, and the relationship between the two seemed to position him well to learn about critically reflective teaching.

Development over the Semester

Like Amy, Leonard developed a conceptual understanding of critically reflective teaching by the end of the first four weeks of Methods. He had gone from guessing that critically reflective teaching had something to do with self-reflection to advancing an awareness of its moral and ethical

focus. He also understood how critically reflection stood apart from other, non-critical forms of reflection. He realized he had not made this distinction at the start of the semester:

> I think critically reflective teaching is the real catcher... I felt the reflective dimension asked the question: How could I have done that better? How could I have dealt with that situation so that it didn't go that way? But then there's the critical part, and the critically reflective, it's actually the critically reflective part is: *Why* did I do it that way? *Why* did I teach that lesson? How did my biases show through when I was dealing with that disruptive kid? (interview, 3-19-96)

Not only was Leonard able to express his understanding of critically reflective teaching, the construct became an interpretive tool he could use to make sense of his field placements. In both practicum journals, he cited evidence of reflective teaching practice that could be characterized as both reflective and non-reflective. He came to understand that critically reflective teaching involved consideration of moral and ethical dimensions of teaching, but at no point during the semester did I find evidence that he ever extended his conception to include social reconstructionist emphases, such as reflecting on the social conditions of schooling and teaching for a more democratic society.

Although Leonard did not expand his definition of critically reflective teaching to include such concerns, this is not to suggest that his own thinking about teaching did not take such matters into consideration. In his assignments and interviews, there were instances of Leonard's thinking that could be characterized as critically reflective in the social reconstructionist sense featured in Methods. For example, in the first four weeks he was asked to put together four lesson ideas to share with his classmates. The topics he selected for three of his four lessons reveal Leonard's belief that curricula can be used to raise critical issues. His first idea was a small group activity called "Race and Politics." His second asked students to write a journal contrasting the "myth of war" with the personal experiences of people who have survived combat. He titled his third lesson idea "Indigenous People of the World." Here students researched ethnic groups chosen from various regions around the world and answered the question: "Why is there so much diversity in the world?" (assignment 1-31-96). Each of these lessons demonstrate Leonard's thinking about what counts as worthwhile learning in social studies. He wants to raise the issue of racism in American politics, challenge popular images of war's glamour and intrigue, and encourage thinking about indigenous groups of people that often escape the attention of curriculum developers.

Similarly, the final unit plan Leonard turned in at the end of the semester was intended as an introduction to culture utilizing various forms of literature to "help place the reader in other cultures via their imaginations and provide access to worlds and cultures inaccessible to direct contact" (assignment, 5-14-96). The plan was incomplete, vague in its rationale, and somewhat lacking in coherence, but Leonard did attempt to incorporate features that shed light on his critically reflective approach to teaching. He hoped this unit would teach tolerance for other cultures. He also sought to "provide opportunities for reflective, critical and skeptical thinking about other cultures and one's own." At one point in the unit students are introduced to "cultural variables like gender, race and

socio-economic class" as categories to be used in analyzing particular cultures. At another point students are asked to critique messages about their own society embedded in music videos seen on television. These features evidence Leonard's critical reflection in that they position Leonard as a teacher who thinks about how educational practice can reduce intolerance, prejudice, and ethnocentrism among students.

More evidence of Leonard's critical reflection is provided by his accounts of his field experiences. In his first placement, he was critical of the manner in which teachers failed to take advantage of the diversity present in their classrooms. He described how students' race, sexuality, home lives, and socio-economic status were frequently discussed among teachers in their offices, but these factors seemed to disappear in the classroom. He did not see teachers even entertaining the idea that they should shape their pedagogy in response to such factors. He also railed against the shame-based Methods of discipline he saw. He further developed his understanding that students learn more than what is written in a curriculum: "I realized that teaching is not just content, but rather the whole context of potential learning opportunities" (assignment, 3-19-96).

Though there were numerous examples of critical reflection in this account, it would be misleading to suggest that critically reflective teaching was his primary concern. On the contrary, he provided a list of unanswered questions this practicum raised for him, and none of these dealt with critically reflective issues. Instead he wanted to know more about practical issues such as "how to make the rough jumps and starts (like taking roll, dealing with last minute announcements) disappear" (assignment, 3-19-96). Nevertheless, critically reflective thinking was a part of Leonard's experience.

The journal describing Leonard's second practicum experience read much the same as the first. In addition to an emphasis teachers in this school placed on the one, correct interpretation of events, Leonard was struck by the sexism and flag-waving evident in some of the teaching he witnessed. He commented:

> The oft quoted remark about teaching students to be good citizens comes true in a backhanded way by producing a climate where simple answers predominate, dissent is discouraged, the American way is championed, and all others, if they don't agree are fools, stupid, or traitors. (assignment, 4-30-96)

Leonard's critically reflective approach to thinking about teaching allowed him to focus on the hidden messages teachers were sending to their students, and he did not like what he saw:

> Teacher was the expert-- lots of talk, lots of information, some of it helpful... Yet very one sided. Always favor Israel over Palestinians, always favor the US over any other country, always favor the government over dissenting voices. Militaristic images favored. Violence advocated as legitimate. Downplaying concerns for human rights and justice....No toleration for difference... Young men encouraged to speak, young women teased and ridiculed for their responses.. It made me angry and sad and frustrated...(assignment 4-30-96)

He talked about trying to introduce what he called "critical reflection" into the one lesson he taught on Bosnia-Herzogovenia by having students discuss the conflict while assuming different points of

view. His experience with this lesson appeared to push his conception of critical reflective teaching in a more social reconstructionist direction:

> I believe critically reflective teaching can be more than just asking why I taught this particular lesson or what are the ethical implications of a particular study. If the boundaries of issues, the intersection of values can be raised as the lesson itself, then social/political/cultural issues and concerns will be built into the classroom. (assignment, 4-30-96)

While Leonard was able to incorporate the idea of critical reflection into his thinking about teaching early in the semester, democratic education was an idea that resisted such assimilation to the very end. He began and ended the semester articulating democratic education with reference to encouraging everyone's voice. The result of all the attention paid to democratic education was to leave him with a greater sense of appreciation for the complexity of the idea. He may have been less certain of democratic education's conceptual boundaries, but the core idea establishing Leonard's understanding of the term did not change.

Leonard claimed both that he understood what democratic education means and that "it's foundational to the way I teach" (interview, 6-19-96). His practicum experiences helped clarify how important democratic education is to his practice. After commenting on how his cooperating teacher dismissed the idea of democratic education merely because it emanated from the University, Leonard wrote, "For me the main lesson about democratic education is it does not exist unless intentionally articulated and practiced" (assignment, 4-30-96).

As with his views on democratic education, Leonard's rationale for teaching and learning in social studies did not undergo a major transformation during the semester. As he noted, "I think I've developed and deepened my understanding of social studies, but I've not radically changed the focus or the direction" (interview, 3-19-96). The most important development occurred during the first four weeks when he connected his understanding of social studies' purpose to his notion of democratic education. In large part, the two became the same thing. According to Leonard:

> It's about each voice has a right to tell it's story, and that's what teaching social studies is about. It really is. It's looking for all the divergent voices, people that don't ever get to speak... And that's what a democratic education's about. (interview, 3-19-96)

The idea of student voice, always a core concept in his view of democratic education, became the centerpiece of his rationale for social studies after only one week of class meetings.

Leonard's emphasis on finding a place for silenced voices seems an important element of a critical project in social studies. Yet this important part appeared inadequate as the *entire* basis for a rationale. I challenged Leonard early and repeatedly to address to address questions I believed would help him fill in the gaps-- Does it matter what it is that these voices are speaking about? What is the teacher's next step once these voices have found expression? How does the notion of student voice relate to democratic citizenship? Either Leonard was unable to address these issues, or more likely,

did not see them as issues he needed to address. Either way, at no point during the semester did he fashion a response.

Summary

Over the Methods semester, Leonard learned the meaning of critically reflective teaching and displayed his ability to employ the term in analyzing school practice. There were numerous instances of Leonard's critical reflection about teaching throughout the four months of the course. He definitely saw teaching as more than just a practical concern of mastering the how-to's of practice. His various life experiences had left him with a sensitivity to the ways in which powerful social institutions such as schooling often act to silence those who, for whatever reason, are marginalized from opportunities to lead just and humane lives. Leonard wished to use his teaching to help these and all people find their voices. Speaking one's voice, listening to others, seeking alternative viewpoints, and making oneself open to the complexity of living-- these ideas were part of Leonard's thinking about teaching as he entered the class, and they all reflect his critical social and educational orientation. Methods caused Leonard to think about these ideas more deeply but did not direct him to develop them with reference to democratic education. Nor did he end the semester with a greatly enhanced sense of social studies' role in the democratic project of public schooling. Despite the critically reflective predisposition he seemed to possess when Methods started, Leonard's educational orientation resisted assimilation of the social reconstructionist emphases I planned for the course.

What Helped and What Hindered

Given the preceding discussion, pointing to those factors that helped and hindered my attempt to promote critically reflective teaching basically amounts to pointing to those factors that helped and hindered the development of Leonard's sense of social studies', and schooling's, democratic mission. He already appeared quite capable of interpreting school activities in light their often unintended consequences. His political, cultural, and social views already allowed him to see some of the ways in which schools contribute to the disenfranchisement of certain groups of people. My assessment was that he needed to go beyond this initial critical perspective. I hoped Methods would direct him toward a more articulate, systematic construction of his role as a reform-minded social studies teacher. There is not a lot of evidence to suggest that Methods accomplished this goal. This analysis suggests several factors that appeared influential in this endeavor.

A mismatch of teaching and learning styles

From early in the semester, Leonard noticed what he called "a rough slippage of the gears" in Methods. Simply put, Leonard usually felt at odds with what was happening in class and my decisions as instructor. He appreciated the stress on critically reflective teaching. He described my emphasis on the moral and ethical dimensions of teaching as "the best thing that's possible" (interview, 3-19-96) for preservice teachers. Yet this focus did not provide him as much he would have liked because of the poor manner in which it was put into practice. The end result for Leonard

was frustration. In the years to come, he did not think that Methods would become a class he would remember as an important part in his preparation for teaching. He explained, "I think that Methods could have been one of those courses you look back on, but, and it certainly will be one I'll remember, but I think that there were too many frustrating components" (interview, 6-19-96).

Leonard described the poor execution of my role as discussion leader as the most frustrating component of the class. In his view, we talked too much about certain topics and not enough about others. Although he was aware that he dominated class discussions, at least early in the semester, and understood that others needed a chance to speak as well, my attempts at limiting his contributions seemed to fall short. He viewed them as either punitive or arbitrary, certainly as unfair. It became apparent to Leonard that there was "another agenda going on.. I was still treated the same, mostly the same attitude, though I talked far less... I didn't feel you were listening to what I had to say" (interview, 6-19-96). His description indicated he felt that I was singling him out. The end result was frustration with the class. In turn, he may very well have resisted my attempt to help him elaborate a clearer mission for social studies, a mission that took into account the broader social conditions of schooling.

The mismatch that I describe here is not the same dynamic as the need for a supportive relationship described in Amy's case; Leonard was not so much asking for support as he was validation. But both cases point to a common theme. This analysis suggests that pursuing a critical project with preservice social studies teachers requires careful attention to the relationships teacher educators form with their students. In a Methods course whose aim is to challenge students' thinking about their future role as democratic educators, there is a need for sensitivity to how students feel about the class as it happens.

Processing time

Most likely, Leonard would have benefited had Methods offered more time to process the material covered in class. Time constraints meant that not all of the assigned readings were discussed. Leonard explained that he does not take much from readings that he does not get a chance to talk about: "To me, just reading something does not do any good" (interview 6-19-96). He needed to talk to others, to see how they reacted to the readings. The lack of time was not only a problem because it prevented Leonard from talking with others, but also because it added to his frustration with the course. He noted, "I was frustrated right at the beginning at that point. We really didn't talk about the readings. We didn't write about the readings" (interview, 6-19-96). Leonard's case suggests that developing more sophisticated ideas about democratic education probably requires more time to process ideas than was scheduled for this one-semester Methods class.

Experience in schools

Leonard described his two practicum placements as important experiences in helping him become a more critically reflective teacher. However, he did not describe their importance using the

same terms Amy did. Where Amy talked about time in schools providing an experiential framework to organize her thinking about critically reflective teaching, the value for Leonard was more in reinforcing what he already thought was and was not working in schools. As a self-described "visual learner," Leonard's experience in both of his field settings gave him the opportunity to see real manifestations of those ideas comprising his critical educational orientation. His practicum journal assignments were insightful, passionate, and critically reflective. If his time in schools did not provide models for the kind of teacher Leonard hoped to become, he was furnished a clearer sense of the challenges he was likely to face. Though he did not talk about school experience in the same terms as Amy, his comments in class after the first session of Methods often made reference to what he saw in his practica. Thus there is some reason to believe that Leonard's experience in schools also yielded an experiential framework that he could use in talking about critically reflective concerns.

Cooperating teachers

Leonard did not think that either of his cooperating teachers operated under a democratic mission. Thus neither offered much direct assistance in helping him sort out his own ideas about democratic education and critically reflective teaching. Leonard's work with these two teachers was influential in another respect though. Given his critical perspective, Leonard's contact with them helped him develop his sense of what does not qualify as democratic education. Rather than finding himself swept into a sort of acceptance of conventional teaching practices in social studies, he found his sense of critique sharpened and possible teaching ideas suggested. In his second placement, for example, he attempted to teach a lesson characterized by "a tone of listening, of accepting other possibilities, of dialogue, where there's some real authentic dialogue going on" (interview, 6-19-96) because he found these attributes lacking in his cooperating teacher's practice.

Raising critically reflective issues

Even though Leonard felt at odds with Methods, he did credit the class with raising important issues and directing his thinking in directions he might not have taken. Speaking about the critically reflective emphasis of the class, Leonard said:

> It gave focus to a lot of questions. It was helpful because there was time to reflect on a number of issues. There was a focus, again, you know, required reading. I mean, you read things that you wouldn't normally read, or like to read, but don't. You are forced to write on issues that are close to your heart, where you wouldn't before... So that's quite helpful" (interview, 6-19-96)

As an example, he talked about reading a selection from *Lies My Teacher Told Me* (Loewen, 1995): "I think that was a helpful focus about trying to get at what meant the critical part of critically reflective" (interview, 6-19-96). The explicit focus on critically reflective issues certainly did not have a negative effect on Leonard, and his own evaluation of the course suggested a positive outcome.

Initial frames of thinking about teaching

Leonard came to Methods speaking about teaching as a moral and ethical enterprise. To Leonard, teaching was not about covering a predetermined set of knowledge. Rather, he viewed teaching as an opportunity to help his students come to know alternative world-views, the complexity of social life, and the interconnections among social phenomena. This view may have favorably inclined Leonard to the course's emphasis on critically reflective teaching in that he already had ideas about the power of education to shape individuals when he started the class.

Social and political views

In a similar fashion, Leonard's social and political matched up well with Methods' stress on critically reflective teaching. Leonard claimed some knowledge of critical social theories, and he repeatedly expressed his concern for the silenced voices in society. The critical reflection sought in Methods asks preservice teachers to think about their practice in terms of its relationship to creating a more just, humane, and compassionate social order. Although Leonard's work infrequently evidenced that he made the connection between his teaching and the social conditions of schooling, his work did reflect a concern for peace, justice, tolerance, and, by his own definition of the term, democracy. The work of teacher educators who wish to draw attention to such issues is facilitated when their students possess social and political views that centrally feature concern for democratic values.

Prior coursework

None of the data I collected for Leonard's case give any indication of the effect of prior coursework on his educational, social, or political views. On several occasions he spoke enthusiastically about another course he took earlier in his teacher education program called "Writing, Speaking, Listening Across Middle/Secondary Curriculum." Leonard claimed this class helped shape his ideas about "relating your own experience and trying to move that through a process of collaboration" (interview, 6-19-96). He also credited an Educational Policy Studies course with raising questions about democracy and schooling. These two courses may have made teaching critically reflective teaching easier by raising related issues. On the other hand, his prior coursework did not leave him with a clear, coherent vision of how his teaching intersects with a democratic mission for schooling. Because other classes did not lay this groundwork, Methods shouldered a greater burden.

Methods Case Three: Nick

Initial Frames

Nick epitomized thoughtfulness. Maybe it was the pacing of his words when he spoke, or the way he looked at you in conversation, or the ever-so-slightly noticeable pause that preceded his answers to questions; probably it was all these. Whatever the cause, Nick gave me the impression that his words were always just a bit more measured than what I had come to expect in talking with preservice teachers. There is little doubt that the thoughtfulness apparent in speaking with him

reflected the thoughtfulness he brought to making sense of the world around him. This certainly seemed to be the case in talking about education. More than Amy and Leonard, Nick arrived at the start of Methods speaking about education in a way that demonstrated a coherent integration of his views on the value of the examined life with his views on education's role in society. This integration was the result of what Nick described as "a personal quest" begun six years earlier as a sophomore in college:

> I think it was my struggle with who I am... in answering life's questions, the bigger life questions-- What are we doing here? How are we supposed to interact with other people?-- sort of a more spiritual approach to understanding the world that has ultimately dictated how I look at any social question or any political question. (interview, 1-22-96)

Ever since then he has involved himself in a search for answers, a search that has led him "toward philosophy, and psychology, and religion as different ways to approach these questions" (interview, 1-22-96).

The disciplines Nick said he was drawn to are telling. He did not turn to political science, economics, and sociology, disciplines that would cast his gaze outward. His focus was on disciplines more oriented towards investigating the nature of individuals and their relationship to the world around them. Up to this point, his quest had been centered on refining his theory of the individual. Through study of Martin Buber's work and other philosopher/theologians, Nick had come to see an inherent capacity for growth in every person. The educator's role was to create the conditions in which this capacity would be realized. This represented the essence of what he termed his "vision" for his work as a teacher. His teaching was in the service of the "actualization of potential" (interview, 1-22-96), his own as well as his students.

His quest for understanding was steeped in moral and ethical consideration. Not surprisingly then, the resulting views he formulated on education were critically reflective. He was very aware of the role schools play in shaping society, and he felt school practices should be directed by teachers who acknowledge this role. He believed that schools should prepare student as active, caring, and open individuals, and in doing so, schools would make their contribution to a more just social order. He explained:

> I believe the individual and the classroom, I think it's a microcosm of the larger community, or what's going on outside. So the classroom reflects the outside community as well as what's going on in the classroom... And I think you ultimately change society by influencing individuals in the way that they engage in the world. So if you have a situation in the classroom where students become more open, and more engaging, and are maybe more caring and compassionate, then I think ultimately you will change society in a positive way. (interview, 1-22-96)

Even though he could speak about the relationship between the individual and larger social order, his emphasis was clearly on the former. He was cognizant of how his teaching might impact society, but his primary motivation was influencing individual students.

Perhaps more than any other component of his educational outlook, Nick's description of the ways in which schools influence students demonstrates the depth of his critical reflection. Nick believed the stated curriculum reflects only a small part of what students learn in schools. Students also learn from the life of the school, from the quality and kinds of relationships found in daily interactions among themselves, teachers, and administrators. He was sensitive to the hidden curriculum and could see its manifestation in school practices. He pointed to how discipline problems are handled as an example. He explained that control can be maintained through strict discipline, but this often comes at a cost. Too often, Nick felt, teachers ignored the harm caused by harsh, authoritarian measures.

Though he appeared to take a critically reflective approach to interpreting life in schools, critically reflective teaching was a term he had not heard before Methods. Democratic education was another matter, as evidenced by his ability to offer a three-part conception of the term. First he referred to a democratic classroom, where students have a voice in making decisions in a given class. Second, he spoke of the democratic school, where there is shared decision-making among all school participants, students and faculty alike. He spoke of his recent day-long visit to an alternative school "based on the Summerhill model" (interview, 1-22-96) as an example of democratic education in this sense. Third, he pointed to a more general definition of democratic education that addresses the relationship between school practices and the realization of a more democratic society. He observed:

> I think that it's almost becoming common knowledge now, that, at least in academic circles, that if you want a democratic society, you have to have a democratic school. Or you have to have a more democratic system, if you want to facilitate that type of behavior once they are out of school... How do we foster democratic type behavior so that when the students leave they can be, can fit into a democracy, a system where they have to make choices and decisions? (interview, 1-22-96)

All three senses of democratic education appealed to Nick, and he hoped that Methods would present further opportunities to refine his thinking about what each meant for his own practice as a teacher. Looking forward, he noted, "I would love to be in a situation where I could utilize democratic principles" (interview, 1-22-96).

Though Nick could express a fairly articulate conception of democratic education and talk about its importance to his views on education, the idea was not the core notion forming his sense of purpose as a teacher. His interest was in the actualization of student potential, in helping students initiate their own quest for knowledge of who they are and how they should live. He understood how this interest supported and made use of democratic education, but he maintained a distinct focus on individual growth. He was less concerned with preparing democratic citizens than he was with preparing people awakened to the value of exploring who they are and how they relate to others. He

would concede his belief that schools should be laboratories for democracy, but only in the sense that democracy was a by-product of students learning in ways that facilitate their own personal growth.

Such was his rationale for teaching. For teaching *social studies*, Nick did not have a rationale at the start of the semester. Nor did he view this as a serious problem. He found the separation of disciplines upon which the contemporary school curriculum is based inherently artificial, and preferred to view schooling as a project integrating all disciplines for the purpose of helping students understand themselves and their relations to others. He happened to be in a social studies certification program for two reasons-- academic credits and personal interest. Despite his lack of a rationale for social studies, he seemed well-suited for Method's emphasis on critically reflective teaching.

Development over the Semester

My analysis of Nick's critical reflection caused me to struggle with when to interpret thinking about teaching as critically reflective. Nick's course assignments, journals, and interviews did make occasional reference to broader social conditions of schooling, but more often they made reference to the individual. How did Nick's emphasis on the individual fit with my social reconstructionist conception of critically reflective teaching, referenced as it was to notions of a more just and democratic society? Nick's own words helped me answer this question. He explained:

> I see my being critically reflective would not occur as much on a societal level as it would be, would occur on an individual level, in how we interact with other human beings. So that, talking about society, and about justice, and about what's right and what's wrong, to me, occurs on an individual basis, individual reactions between human beings. (interview, 6-9-96)

Nick's developmentalist focus on individual growth so permeated his educational views that looking for evidence of critical reflection required an analytical turn inward. While he kept returning to the individual, there was always an implicit (though often explicit), and fairly sophisticated, theory of the individual's relationship to society supporting his reflection. In addition, he frequently returned to a view of the classroom as a microcosm of the larger society. Concerns for social justice, democracy, and equality were very much a part of his thinking, but his interest was in how these concerns played out in his relationship with his own students. For these reasons, I was able to identify critical reflection in much of his work.

Utilizing this somewhat expanded conception of critical reflection, examples of Nick's critical reflection abound in the assignments he completed for class. In one assignment, for example, he listed sample questions that he felt were worth asking in a social studies class:

> Why did the settlers feel like it was necessary to destroy the Native Americans? Why has the history of the world been measured and divided by wars and conflicts? Why, in an age of wealth and prosperity, do some people have so much and some people have so little? Why do people seem driven to keep acquiring wealth while other people starve?" (assignment, 1-30-96)

He also advocated asking such questions of the students-- why do they feel they need to be rich? Why do they get into conflicts? These questions stem from a combination of his own views about human development and his assessment of the social problems taking place around him.

His lesson planning attempts throughout the semester also revealed evidence of critical reflection. The topics he chose for an assignment early in the semester are examples. For a lesson about the Industrial Revolution, he wanted to counter standard textbook accounts of the period: "Generally, from what I've seen, the textbook will describe the IR as the greatest thing that has happened to the world" (assignment, 1-31-96). To counter the textbook view, he would have students read excerpts from a story about Luddite revolts in this period. For another lesson in this same assignment, he hoped to raise the question of meritocracy by having students "describe the controversy over the use of IQ testing in the United States." These examples convey a sense of what Nick felt was worth studying in a social studies curriculum, and they both emphasize helping students critique standard interpretations typically conveyed in social studies classes.

In addition to his responses to class assignments, Nick's observations and thoughts about his field experiences reveal numerous instances of critical reflection, and in a few cases even critically reflective teaching. In describing his first placement, at a large suburban high school, he noted his overall impression of the school was as a "massive, mechanical and largely impersonal system" (assignment, 3-18-96). He was especially concerned that the school appeared unable to help "those students who begin to fall through the cracks" (assignment, 3-18-96), and he noticed that a disproportionate number of these students were minorities. He measured the school against a multiculturalism standard and pronounced it a failure. When asked to provide evidence of his own critically reflective teaching, he spoke of thinking about these ill-served students in planning his lesson. He explained:

> If I look at social justice and democratic education, if I look at what moral aspects of teaching, if I look at it in a critical way, I did that, and I saw students on the periphery... [E]veryone seems blind to what's going on with these students... So in actual deliberations about how I was teaching in a democratic fashion, what I attempted to do was form relationships with students mainly, and to be open and engaging, and I think that's the best you can do. (interview 3-20-96)

He learned in this practicum that serving the needs of all students is a formidable task, not one that a teacher can expect to accomplish alone. Nevertheless, he left the practicum on a positive note: "I know that I can make a difference in their lives-- if it is only to create a haven in this impersonal world" (assignment, 3-18-96).

Nick continued these same themes in reports of his second field experience at a small town middle school. If anything his critique was even more pointed. His analysis of the special education program , entitled "The Aspirin and Bandage for the Disease-ridden School," captured his anger about the treatment given to those students designated with learning difficulties. His observations led

him to label the special education program at this school as a "sham" that serves to prop up a broken system. He wrote:

> The purpose of this program is to give special attention to students with 'problems,' so that they can get the ridiculous and meaningless work done in their classes... As a result, the school system can remain guilt-free and can continue the shameful process that is called educating the students. (assignment, 4-30-96)

Regular classrooms fared little better in Nick's assessment. His cooperating teacher let Nick know that "the emphasis was placed on the material in hand and not the ideas in the minds of the students" (assignment, 4-30-96). In this context, and given a limited amount of time in front of class, Nick pointed to several instances of his own critically reflective teaching.

There are numerous other examples of Nick's critical reflection over the methods semester drawn from his practicum journals, interview responses, and course assignments. As well, his contributions in Methods class were often critically reflective. On those occasions when frustrations surfaced, Nick offered insightful troubleshooting ideas that reflected his understanding of the power dynamics in class. He felt the difficulties in Methods rose from a failure to put the individual first. Critical discourse, Nick believed, only succeeds when it takes place among people who have built a trusting relationship: "Only then do I think we can enter into a critical dialogue with their ideas. If the student does not know that we respect them first, then an attack on their ideas, statements and creations, will be an attack on them" (notes, 2-15-96). Here and elsewhere Nick demonstrated his commitment to viewing teaching as an enterprise consisting of a moral and ethical foundation. His principles of right conduct, derived from his own melding of philosophy, theology, and psychology, guided his critically reflective interpretation of what happened throughout the methods semester.

Given the degree of critical reflection characterizing Nick's thinking, it is interesting to note that, of the three study participants, Nick was the slowest to pronounce a definition of critically reflective teaching that matched the conception employed in Methods.

At the end of the semester, Nick looked at democratic education in much the same way as he did at the start. In fact, he supplied a definition of democratic education in his third interview that mirrored the definition offered in his first. He claimed that his Methods experience helped him to develop his thinking about this three-part notion of democratic education. He came to a deeper understanding of the term, but his initial views had not changed. In particular, he credited the assigned readings with helping him come to a more refined conception of each of these three senses. Likewise, his two field experiences reinforced the importance of holding a commitment to democratic education: "The practicum experiences, I think, demonstrated how important or how lacking, in a sense, the schools were in these types of notions or ideas" (interview, 6-9-96). The methods semester challenged Nick to look outward, to think about how his approach addressed social problems residing outside of the individual. In the end, he was left with a more thorough

understanding of his original conception of democratic education and the conviction that his work with students must come from how his own personal view of the world.

To recall, Nick entered the semester without a sophisticated rationale for his work as a social studies teacher. His self-identity was as a teacher, not as a social studies teacher. He had very definite ideas about the kinds of learning experiences he wanted to provide students, but he formed these from his thinking about the development of individual potential, not from his thinking about social studies' place in the modern school curriculum. As the semester proceeded, he was pushed to reconsider his sense of educational purpose in relation to social studies. He claimed that issues and questions raised in Methods helped him to clarify his thinking about social studies, but he made little progress in developing a rationale for social studies.

My intention in Methods was to help these preservice teachers construct their identities as social studies teachers with reference to two important constructs: social education for democratic citizenship and social education for social transformation. Nick appreciated this focus for the ways in which it pushed him to clarify, if not extend, his own sense of mission. Ultimately he found himself interpreting both constructs utilizing his framework of concern for the individual. He was for democratic citizenship education, but not in the same sense that many interpret the term. To Nick, democratic citizenship education is furthered more through exposing students to just, compassionate classroom and school environments than it is through a curriculum emphasizing civic duties, skills, and values. He noted, "It's not going to matter as much if they're voting or not voting, and who they are voting for, as much as-- Are they treating other people with respect and dignity?" (interview, 6-9-96). Likewise he was for democratic social transformation; but, according to Nick, such transformation was best conceived in terms of transforming the way students understood themselves and their relationships to others:

> I just see it that the only way we can change society , if we wish to, is creating a place of justice and fairness, and it's up to those students then to change society. Hopefully they will be moved to do that. (interview, 6-9-96)

Nick had clearly thought a great deal about why he wanted to teach. By the end of Methods, it was clear that he felt he possessed a clear vision to guide his practice. I was left, though, with lingering questions. For one, Nick's sense of mission did not seem to provide much guidance in setting curricula. His stress on building a respectful, trusting, and open environment is important, but does it matter what students study once they find themselves in such a classroom? What specific skills and knowledge are important as students embark on the journey of learning about themselves and their relation to the rest of the world? Another unresolved questioned concerned the absence of emphasis on rational deliberation. Given the democratic citizenship rationale for social studies, critical thinking, decision making, or some other such variant, has long been advocated as an essential aim of the field (Hunt & Metcalf, 1955; Engle, 1960; Oliver & Shaver, 1966; Engle & Ochoa, 1988).

Yet critical thinking was virtually absent in Nick's discussion of his practice as a teacher. Apparently, Nick assimilated those democratic citizenship ideas presented in Methods within his initial frames of thinking about teaching. The consequences of this assimilation for his development as a critically reflective teacher remained to be seen.

Summary

Nick began the methods semester with a developed and thoughtful understanding of what he wanted to accomplish as teacher. This understanding, rooted in his personal theory of individual growth, did not change its substance during the semester. However, Nick did claim that his initial set of ideas about teaching were refined and deepened through the semester. These ideas led him to think about course assignments, readings, class meetings, and his field experiences in ways that I have interpreted as critically reflective. Though difficult to quantify, evidence of critical reflection seemed more liberally dispersed in Nick's data set than in Amy and Leonard's. Yet his critical reflection usually centered on the individual student rather than the social conditions of schooling. Methods' social reconstructionist emphasis on the democratic mission of public schooling and a democratic rationale for teaching social studies led to no major transformation in his thinking about educational practice.

What Helped and What Hindered

Compared to the other study participants, Nick's case yields a fresh perspective on those factors that helped and hindered his development as a critically reflective teacher. Methods "worked" for Nick in ways that it did not for Amy and Leonard. He appreciated the focus on democratic education. He felt the critical ideas presented in the course helped him to develop his thinking about what it means to teach. At no point in the semester did Nick personally feel what Leonard referred to as the "rough slippage of gears" in the course. Because his experience was positive, Nick's participation in the study was a fortunate occurrence. His data enabled a special basis for confirming conclusions drawn from the other two cases. That is, some of the factors identified as not helpful in Amy and Leonard's cases were substantiated by their surfacing as helpful factors in Nick's. This analysis also points to factors unique to Nick's own experience with Methods class. In either case, a review of his data enhances our understanding of what helps and hinders the promotion of critically reflective teaching.

Initial frames of thinking about teaching

Nick's developed and thoughtful understanding of what he wanted to accomplish as a teacher helped him to make sense of the critical ideas raised in Methods. Though his interests were firmly fixed on his particular conception of individual self-awareness, the depth of his thinking about education enabled him to assimilate Method's emphasis on democratic education. About democratic education, he said, "As for my development as a teacher, I feel that it has given me one area, one stream of thought in which to reflect on my own, the way that I think" (interview, 3-20-96). Nick

had already given a good deal of thought about the ethical and moral dimensions of teaching. Although his mission was creating what he called "internal revolutions" in the way students view themselves and the world around them, he also was able to articulate how this mission enhanced the broader project of building a more just, compassionate, and caring society. In this respect, Nick was spared from having to undertake the process of learning key components of critically reflective teaching. The nature of his responses to class assignments and interview questions revealed his relatively advanced personal theory of teaching, a theory of teaching that facilitated his thinking about critically reflective teaching.

Social and political views

In a similar fashion, the political and social views Nick held both assisted and obstructed his consideration of critically reflective issues. In essence, his social and political views were his views of the individual writ large. His sense of social criticism was steeped in his thinking about individual growth. Thus Nick's thinking about the just society reflected his thinking about the conditions that best enhance individuals' awareness of who they are and how they relate to the world. In this sense, his social and political views aided his reception of Methods' focus on democratic education. From a social reconstructionist perspective though, his social and political views failed to take into account social criticisms that were not rooted in the individual. For example, broader social dynamics such as racism, sexism, and economic exploitation, were not integral features of Nick's social philosophy. As a result they did not become integral features of his conception of critically reflective teaching.

A supportive, trustful relationship

Unlike Amy, Nick felt that a supportive, mentoring relationship did develop between us during the semester. He expressed his belief that the critical project I was attempting with Methods required a close relationship between instructor and student. From our relationship, Nick came to trust my motives as a teacher educator. Early in the semester he developed his understanding of what he called my "anti-status quo" and "democratic" mission for working with preservice social studies teachers. Knowing that I had his interests at heart made him more receptive to this mission. In this case, what was a weakness for Amy was a strength for Nick.

Nick also emphasized the supportive function of a healthy instructor--student relationship. Nick was self-confident in his approach to teaching. Thus he did not feel he needed as much support as did some of his classmates. Nevertheless, he did see my failure to provide support as a factor that influenced how others may have reacted to the challenge of critically reflective teaching:

> And I think you can make yourself insecure and unsafe, and maybe that's what happened with this class, when you're getting hit from all sides... And it really just makes you feel like, "You know what? I can't be a teacher. I can't get a hold of all these standards. I can't do things the way these authors are talking about." You know, this is too much to ask at this point tin time. (interview, 6-9-96)

This did not happen to Nick, but he saw it happen to some of his classmates. His observation raises a vital concern for teacher educators who pursue critically reflective teacher education.

Raising critically reflective issues

This analysis of Nick's case suggests that raising critically reflective issues can help preservice teachers become more critically reflective. In speaking of Methods' impact, he noted:

> I think I learned to think like a teacher, or to think about the different issues that are involved with teaching... I might have been able to say, 'Well, I think something isn't right here.' But I think maybe after Methods I was able to put more of label on it, define it better" (interview, 6-9-96)

Nick explained that he thought the course readings played an important role in his development as a critically reflective teacher. For example, he pointed to an article by Deborah Meier (1992), a founder of the Central Park East Schools, that deepened his thinking about the role the whole school environment plays in furthering democratic education. Furthermore, the practicum journal assignments directed his attention to critically reflective issues in real classroom and school settings. Had Methods not raised critically reflective issues, Nick most likely would still have been critically reflective as a result of his perspectives on teaching and human development. Yet it seems reasonable to believe that Methods' explicit emphasis on critically reflective issues enhanced Nick's development as a critically reflective teacher.

Experience in schools

Like Amy and Leonard, Nick stated that his time spent in schools aided his thinking about critically reflective teaching. He thought his greatest advance as a critically reflective teacher resulted from the combination of the critically reflective issues raised in class (primarily through course readings) and practicum experiences. At the mid-point of the semester, when asked about what was responsible for developing his understanding of critically reflective teaching, he replied, "If we look at the Methods' readings, and we look at the practicum experience, those two together have helped me to understand, especially the practicum" (interview, 3-20-96). Similarly, after Methods had ended, he looked back, "I was able to relate that [observations in field experiences] to the different notions that we've learned in Methods class or from the different readings. I was thinking in terms of worthwhile learning, I think. Was this worthwhile?" (interview, 6-9-96).

An open forum

Nick believed Methods would have been more helpful had it provided a more open forum to discuss issues related to critically reflective teaching. In part, Nick was uncomfortable with the amount of structure I brought to class activities. He disliked structure, believed he learned better in an open environment, and never felt he had an opportunity to raise the issues that most captured his interest. Given more space in class to explore the ideas he felt were important may have enhanced Nick's development as a critically reflective teacher. Perhaps just as important, Nick believed that my

continual defense of key ideas in the course worked against his classmates feeling as if their concerns were valued. He explained:

> I don't think people felt like they had an opportunity to be critical of democratic education and critically reflective teaching. And when they were critical of it, you put yourself in the position to defend it, and it seemed to be a personal, you know, it was personal because you believed so strongly in these ideas, but in a way, you had to step aside and look at these issues and not have to defend them. (interview, 6-9-96)

Through developing a relationship with me, Nick did not feel constrained in his freedom to criticize. Yet, the limitations to free expression felt by some of his classmates very well may have restricted the diversity of views Nick was exposed to over the course of the semester. In turn, the development of his critically reflective thought may have been restricted as well.

Prior studies

Prior coursework was a factor that appeared in both Amy and Nick's case analyses. In this case I have renamed the category to allow for all that Nick has encountered in his personal quest to learn who he is and his place in the world. Nick made frequent references to the impact certain writers have had on the development of his world-view. He drew from his personal inquiry into philosophy, psychology, and theology in constructing his understanding of education. This understanding, I have argued, was instrumental in shaping Nick's critically reflective approach to teaching. Thus his own personal journey for self-understanding pre-conditioned him for an emphasis on critical reflection. Also, he acknowledged the role his formal studies have played in developing his thinking. For example, he credited an educational foundations course called "Philosophical Conception of Teaching and Learning" with raising issues of freedom, the nature of teaching, and what it means to be educated. Clearly, Nick's prior studies were a significant factor in explaining his favorable reaction to Methods' emphasis on critically reflective teaching.

Conclusions

In this paper, I attempted to put forth answers to these research questions for each study participant: What happened in my attempt to promote critically reflective teaching in a secondary social studies methods course? Did I see evidence of critical reflection and critically reflective teaching? What seemed to facilitate and/or impede their adoption of critically reflective habits of thinking about teaching and learning in social studies? My intention with this research was to go beyond an impressionistic appraisal of this experience and toward an empirically grounded investigation of the possibilities for promoting critical reflection in this setting.

This analysis reveals evidence of both critical reflection and critically reflective teaching among the three cases. Each participant demonstrated critical reflection about teaching at various points during the semester. Such thinking was not predominant, but was present nevertheless. The findings of this study do not support the notion that secondary preservice students are incapable of critical reflection at this stage of their professional development. Not only were the moral and ethical

foundations of their practice apparent to these three preservice teachers but were an integral part of how they viewed their developing practice. In their reflection on school practices, each expressed a critique informed by moral and ethical concerns.

The social reconstructionist emphasis of Methods led to no discernible, substantive transformation of any participants' educational views, but it did direct attention to the intersection of educational practice with broader social conditions and democratic values. All three struggled with social reconstructionist concerns. If they never came to terms with democratic education and a social reconstructionist conception of critically reflective teaching, they all reported developing a better sense of the importance of such issues. At Methods' conclusion, Amy, Leonard, and Nick had not developed a comprehensive rationale for their work as social studies teachers, nor did they express much commitment to, or understanding of, the democratic citizenship and inquiry oriented rationale for social studies advanced in Methods. They did not construct a mission with reference to developing citizens who are capable participants in democratic life, nor did they place a high priority on developing their students capacity for rational deliberation.

The discussion of factors that either helped or hindered my effort to promote critically reflective teaching in Methods suggests numerous implications for teacher educators concerned about critical reflection. There was evidence that raising critically reflective issues helped all three learn about critically reflective teaching. It seems reasonable to assume that making critical reflective teaching and related issues an explicit part of the teacher education curriculum is an important step in the process.

Furthermore, the influence of their initial frames of teaching, and the depth of their social and political views, also have curricular implications. A one semester methods class probably does not afford enough time to fully address the linkages among democratic social and political theory, school and society, and educational practice, in addition to issues of curriculum and instruction. Critical educational perspectives were not a part of the curriculum Amy, Leonard, and Nick experienced in this particular program, at least not in any systematic or comprehensive manner. Had their prior coursework, both within and outside of the teacher preparation program, addressed these perspectives, the democratic education emphasis of Methods may not have seemed so foreign.

This research also stresses the importance of early field experiences. Waiting until the final year of a preservice program to place students in schools seems ill-advised. The lack of an experiential framework hampered understanding of critically reflective teaching. Conversely, their practicum experiences, including their relationships with their cooperating teachers, facilitated their thinking about critical issues raised in the course. When linked to a process of critical inquiry, field experiences seem to make real and amplify critical concerns. The course was successful in helping Amy, Leonard, and Nick develop critiques of school practices. For Leonard and Nick especially, field experiences seemed to sharpen and enhance their identities as school reformers.

Beyond curriculum and program issues, this study points to the need for critical-minded teacher educators to closely monitor the quality of they relationships they build with their students and the manner in which their students are responding to a critical agenda. The lack of a supportive, trustful relationship between Amy and me diminished Amy's receptivity to critically reflective issues; the presence of such a relationship between Nick and me helped in his case. Preservice students often lack confidence in their developing abilities, and there is a risk that a critical agenda will seem overwhelming. This is not to suggest that this agenda should not be raised, but that doing so requires a great deal of sensitivity to student reactions.

My experiences with Amy, Leonard, and Nick this semester indicate that there does appear reason to believe that, in different ways and measures, methods class instructors can influence preservice teachers to become more critically reflective, though this work appears inhibited by numerous programmatic and psycho/social concerns. Furthermore, while encouraging some amount of critical reflection about teaching appears a realistic aim in a secondary social studies methods course, influencing the quality and content of such reflection seems to be the greater challenge.

References

Adler, S. & Goodman, J. (1986). Critical theory as a foundation for methods courses. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(4), 2-8.

Berliner, D. (1988). *The development of expertise in pedagogy*. Washington DC: AACTE Publications.

Calderhead, J. (1992). The role of reflection in learning to teach. In L. Valli (Ed.), *Reflective teacher education: Cases and critiques* (pp. 139-146). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Carr, W. & Kemmis, S. (1983). *Becoming critical: Knowing through action research.* Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Clift, R. T., Houston, W. R., & Pugach, M. C. (Eds.). (1990). *Encouraging reflective practice in education: An analysis of issues and programs*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Learning to teach against the grain. *Harvard Educational Review*, 61(3), 279- 310.

Engle, S. H. (1963). Decision making: The heart of social studies instruction. *Social Education*, 24(7), 301-304, 306.

Engle, S. H. & Ochoa, A. S. (1988). *Education for Democratic Citizenship: Decision making in the social studies*. New York: Teachers College.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillan.

Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (1993). *How to design and evaluate research in education.* 2nd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gore, J, M. & Zeichner, K. M. (1991). Action research and reflective teaching in pre-service teacher education: A case study from the United States. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 7(2), 119-136.

Glesne, C. & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Gore, J, M. & Zeichner, K. M. (1991). Action research and reflective teaching in pre-service teacher education: A case study from the United States. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 7(2), 119-136.

Hatton, N. & Smith, D. (1994). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 11(1), 33-49.

Hunt, M. P. & Metcalf, L. E. (1955). *Teaching high school social studies: Problems in reflective thinking and social understanding*. New York: Harper and Row.

Kagan, D. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(2), 171-179.

Korthagen, F. A. & Wubbels, T. (1991). *Characteristics of reflective practitioners: Towards an operationalization of the concept of reflection*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago.

LaBoskey, V. K. (1993). A conceptual framework for reflection in preservice teacher education. In J Calderhead & P. Gates (Eds.), *Conceptualizing reflection in teacher development*, (pp. 23-38), London: Falmer Press.

LaBoskey, V. K. (1994). *Development of reflective practice: A study of preservice teachers*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Liston, D. P. & Zeichner, K. M. (1991). *Teacher education and the social conditions of schooling*. New York: Routledge.

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

Meier, D. (1992). Reinventing teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 93(4), 594-609.

National Council for the Social Studies (1994). *Expectations of excellence: Curriculum standards for social studies*. Washington DC: NCSS.

Noffke, S. E. & Brennan, M. (1991). Student teacher use action research: Issues and examples. In B. R. Tabachnick & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education*, (pp. 186-201), Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Oliver, D. W., & Shaver, J. P. (1966). *Teaching public issues in the high school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Ross, E. W. & Hannay, L. M. (1986). Towards a critical theory of reflective inquiry. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(4), 9-15.

Rudduck, J. (1989). *Critical thinking and practitioner research: Have they a place in initial teacher training?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco.

Russell, T. (1993). A conceptual framework for reflection in preservice teacher education. In J Calderhead & P. Gates (Eds.), *Conceptualizing reflection in teacher development*, (pp. 144-153), London: Falmer Press.

Sparks-Langer, G. M., & Colton, A. B. (1991). Synthesis of research on teachers' reflective thinking. *Educational Leadership*, 48(6), 37-44.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Valli, L. (Ed.). (1992). *Reflective teacher education: Cases and critiques*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Valli, L. (1993). Reconsidering technical and reflective concepts in teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 15(2), 35-44.

van Manen, M. (1977). Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6(3), 205-228.

Appendix A

Curriculum and Instruction 272-358/359
Secondary Social Studies Methods and Practicum
Spring 1996

Todd Dinkelman, Instructor
Office Hours: 1:00-2:00 PM, Tues., Wed., and Thursday, and by appt.

Description: This course is designed to help pre-service teachers in the final stage of their teacher education program become critically reflective teachers capable of making sound decisions regarding curriculum and instructional practices in secondary social studies. Numerous issues of concern to beginning teachers (e.g. teaching methods, classroom management, planning, assessment, etc.) will be addressed. The study of these issues will be grounded in a four-part framework providing the foundation for all aspects of the course:

Part 1-- Developing a democratic mission in social studies.

Part 2-- Learning the curriculum and instructional methods supporting (Part 1) that mission.

Part 3-- Recognizing the obstacles to teaching (Part 2) this curriculum using these methods.

Part 4-- Exploring ways to sustain commitment to a democratic mission when faced with (Part 3) these obstacles.

Classes will be largely discussion based. Students will be given frequent opportunities to put into practice methods discussed in the course. Collaboration among course participants will also be a prominent feature of class activities. The success of this class will depend on the active participation of all.

Course Requirements:

-- Regular attendance. If you will be absent or late, call 263-6262 and leave a message.
-- Participation in class activities.
-- On-time completion of readings and written assignments.
-- On-time completion of practicum and related assignments.
-- Final Unit Plan.

Grading: The methods course and the practicum experience, though listed as separate courses, are treated as an integral unit of instruction and the same grades will be recorded for both. The final grade will be determined by student performance in the requirements as stated above. After the first three-week practicum, students whose performance is considered inadequate will receive an interim personal evaluation describing improvements that must be made during the rest of the semester. Continuation into the student teaching semester is contingent upon successful completion of the requirements of C&I 272-358/359.

Required texts:

Bigelow, B., Christensen, L., Karp, S., Miner B., & Peterson, B., Editors, (1994). *Rethinking our classrooms: Teaching for equity and justice.* Rethinking Schools Limited: Milwaukee, WI.

National Council for Social Studies (1994). *Curriculum Standards for Social Studies: Expectations of excellence.* NCSS: Washington, D.C.

Postman, N, and Weingartner, C. (1969). *Teaching as a Subversive Activity.* Dell Publishing: New York.

Reading Packet.

Semester Outline:

The course is divided into five different sessions scheduled as follows:

1st Methods session--	Jan. 22 to Feb. 15 (four weeks)
Practicum 1--	Feb. 19 to March 8 (three weeks)
2nd Methods session--	March 18 to April 4 (three weeks)
Practicum 2--	April 8 to April 26 (three weeks)
or	
1/2 sem. st. teaching--	April 8 to end of school semester
3rd Methods session--	April 29 to May 9 (two weeks)

Week-Day Date	Topic	Reading Assignments
1-1 Jan. 22	Introduction Course Overview	none
1-2 Jan. 23	Social studies rationales & democratic education	1. Marker, G. & Mehlinger, H. (1992). Social studies. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 830-851). New York: Macmillan. 2. Excerpts from: Counts, G.S. (1932). *Dare the schools build a new social order.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.
1-3 Jan. 24	Social studies rationales & democratic education	1. *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*, Ch.s 1, 2 2. Beane, J. A. & Apple, M. W., (1995). The case for democratic schools. In M. W. Apple & J. A. Beane (Eds.), *Democratic Schools* (pp. 1-25). Alexandria, VA: ASCD. 3. A Dialogue with Noam Chomsky. (1995). *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(2), 127-144.

Week-Day Date (contd.)	Topic (contd.)	Reading Assignments (contd.)
1-4 Jan. 25	What is good teaching? Student engagement Knowledge Skills Values	1. *Teaching as a Subversive Activity* , Ch. 3 2. Bigelow, W. (1990). Inside the classroom: Social vision and critical pedagogy. In S. Tozer, T. H. Anderson, & B. B. Armbruster (Eds.), *Foundational studies in teacher education: A reexamination* (pp. 139-150). New York: Teachers College Press. 3. A Democratic Rationale for Secondary Social Studies
2-1 Jan. 30	Critically Reflective Teaching	1. Meier, D. (1992). Reinventing teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 93(4), 594-609. 2. Grant, C. A., & Zeichner, K. M. (1984). The teacher. In C. A. Grant (Ed.), *Preparing for reflective teaching* (pp1-18). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
2-2 Jan. 31	Intro. to lesson planning-- Teacher as curriculum builder Depth v.breadth/coverage Critical thinking	1. *Teaching as a Subversive Activity,* Ch.s 4, 5 2. Duffy, J. (1988). Getting off track: The challenge and potential of the mized ability classroom, *Democracy and Education*, 3(1), 11-19.
2-3 Feb. 1	Sample lesson presentations	None
3-1 Feb. 6	Text bias	Excerpts from: Loewen, J. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong.* New York: New Press. 1. Ch. 4, "Red Eyes" 2. Ch. 5, "Gone with the Wind" 3. *Rethinking our Classrooms*, pp. 150-156, "Why students should study history: An interview with Howard Zinn."
3-2 Feb. 7	School culture-- Part Three of the Four Part framework	1. Letters from the Trenches 2. Excerpts from Sizer, T. R. (1984). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of he American high school.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
3-3 Feb. 8	Multicultural education-- who are you teaching?	1. Perry, T. & Frazer, J. W. (1993). Reconstructing schools as multiracial/multicultural democracies: Towards a theoretical perspective. In T. Perry & J. W. Fraser (Eds.), *Freedom's plow: Teaching in the multicultural classroom* (pp. 3-24). New York: Routledge. 2. *Rethinking our Classrooms*, pp. 19-22, "Taking multicultural, antie-racist, education seriously: An interview with educator Enid Lee." 3. Lake, Robert(Medicine Grizzlybear) (1990) An Indian father's plea, *Teacher Magazine*, September, 48-53. 4. Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). The needsof our new teachers. In J. Anderson, et. al. (Contributors), *Insights on diversity* (p. 12). West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi. 5. Butchart, R. E. (1994). When making a difference makes no difference. In J. Anderson, et. al. (Contributors), *Insights on diversity* (p. 18). West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

Week-Day Date (contd.)	Topic (contd.)	Reading Assignments (contd.)
4-1	Multicultural education	1. Grant, C. A. & Sleeter, C. E. (1993). Race, class, gender, and disability in the classroom. In J. A. Banks & C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.), Multicultural education issues and perspectives, 2nd Edition (pp. 48-67). Boston: Allyn & Bacon. 2. Gilliom, M. E. (1994). The many ways of being human. In J. Anderson, et. al. (Contributors), *Insights on diversity* (p. 18). West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi. 3. *Rethinking our Classrooms*, pp. 44-48, "Tapping into feelings of fairness," by Karen Miller. 4. Ladson-Billings-- Culturally Relevant v. Assimilationist Chart. 5. Grant, C. A. & Sleeter, C. E. (1989). *Turning on learning: Five approaches for multicultural teaching plans*. New York: Merrill/Macmillan.
4-2 Feb. 14	Leading class discussions	1. "Mastering the art of interactive teaching" (pp. 152-167) from: McDonald, R. E. (1991). *A handbook of basic skills and strategies for beginning teachers.* White Plains, NY: Longman.
4-3 Feb. 15	Classroom management	1. *Rethinking our Classrooms*, pp. 56-57, "Discsipline: No quick fix," by Linda Christensen. 2. *Rethinking our Classrooms*, pp. 34-35, "The challenge of classroom discipline," by Bob Peterson. 3. TBA
5, 6, 7 Feb. 19- March 8	Practicum 1	None
8-1 March 19	Debriefing	1. "Organizing subject matter and planning lessons" (pp. 64-96) from: McDonald, R. E. (1991). *A handbook of basic skills and strategies for beginning teachers.* White Plains, NY: Longman. 2. Wiggins, G. (1989). The futility of trying to teach everything of importance. *Educational Leadership*, 47(3), 44-59.
8-2 March 20	Lesson planning-- Cooperative Learning	1. Excerpts from: Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubbec, E. J. (1994). *The new circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom and school.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
8-3 March 21	Lesson planning-- Values education	1. Excerpts from Lockwood, A. L. & Harris, D. E. (1985). *Reasoning with democratic values: Ethical problems in United States history.* New York: Teachers College Press.
9-1 March 26	Lesson planning-- role playing/simulations	1. *Rethinking our Classrooms*. pp. 114- 116, "Role plays: Show, don't tell," by Bill Bigelow.
9-2 March 27	Lesson planning-- public issues	1. "Types of Issues" Handout 2. Kelly, T. E. (1989). Leading class discussions of controversial issues. *Social Education*, 53(6), 71-73.

Week-Day Date (contd.)	Topic (contd.)	Reading Assignments (contd.)
9-3 March 28	Assessment	1. Chapter One, "What is authentic academic acheivement?" from: Archbald, D. A. & Newmann, F. M. (1988). *Beyond Standardized testing*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals. 2. Nickell, P. (1992). Doing the stuff of social studies: A conversation with Grant Wiggins. *Social Education*, 56(2), 91-94.
	And, Lesson planning-- assorted ideas	None
10-1 April 2	Lesson planning-- presentations/critique	None
10-2 April 3	Lesson planning-- presentations/critique	None
10-3 April 4	Unit planning	1. Onosko, J. J. (1992). An approach to designing thoughtful units. *The Social Studies*, 83(5), 193-196.
11, 12, 13 April 8- April 26	Practicum 2	None
14-1 April 30	Debriefing	None
14-2 May 1	NCSS Standards sample lessons/critique	1. NCSS Standard assignment from: National Council for the Social Studies (1994). *Expectations of excellence: Curriculum standards for social studies*. Washington DC: NCSS.
14-3 May 2	TBA	TBA
15-1 May 7	Student teachers return	TBA
15-2 May 8	Ed. placement day	TBA
15-3 May 9	Wrap-up day Course evaluations	TBA

TM026779

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Critically Reflective Teacher Education: A Preservice Case Study	
Author(s): Todd Dinkelman	
Corporate Source: University of Wisconsin--Madison	Publication Date: 1997

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at **Level 1**.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature: Todd Dinkelman
Printed Name/Position/Title: Todd Dinkelman
Organization/Address: U of Wisconsin Dept. of C & I 256 N. Mills St. Madison, WI 53706
Telephone: (608) 263-6262
FAX:
E-Mail Address: tddinkel@students.wisc.edu
Date: 3-27-1997

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
210 O'Boyle Hall
The Catholic University of America
Washington, DC 20064

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2d Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com