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CHAPTER ONE
Introduction

In the 20 years since the publication of “A Nation at Risk” (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), a major reform movement has placed accountability on the shoulders of K-12 teachers. Proficiencies, benchmarks, standards, and other measures are part and parcel of the lexicon of teachers. Only recently, however, has attention been paid to the preparation of teachers for public classrooms. For example, the federal government is considering how to “improve” teacher preparation and hold colleges of education more accountable for preparing a “highly qualified teacher in every classroom by the 2005-2006 school year” (U.S. Department of Education, 2002a; 2002b). Further, Congress is considering adding to the federal Higher Education Act of 1965 a clause that would open the gates for the equivalent of charter schools for K-12. The Ready to Teach Act of 2003 (H.R. 2211) is a bill that would fund states that establish “charter colleges of education.” In effect, this bill is one of a number of measures that stresses accountability for schools of education and formal teacher preparation programs. These are all parts of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, signed into law by President George W. Bush on January 8, 2001.

The central feature of the law is to ask states to set criterion-referenced tests for all students in Grades 3-8 as a means of measuring academic performance. The law also requires states to ensure that all elementary and secondary school teachers are highly qualified by the 2005-2006 school year. The phrase “highly qualified” means that the teacher holds a bachelor’s degree, have state certification or pass a licensure exam, and
demonstrate competence in core academic subjects. Critics of education point to colleges of education as weak in phonics “training” and “transmission models” in preparing teachers to assist their students to do well on proficiency tests and meet outcomes of the standards and benchmarks.

From the 1983 A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education) to the No Child Left Behind Act (U.S. Department of Education, 2002a; 2002b), a result of federal mandates for accountability has been an increasing emphasis on standards, benchmarks, proficiencies, and test-oriented classroom pedagogy. Within these proficiencies there is little or no mention of democracy or attention paid to democratic relations. Is there an assumption that performance-based standards and test-oriented pedagogy will result in our students learning civic responsibility in a democracy? If so, this is problematic. Where do the young learn and practice living a democratic life together? John Dewey (1916/1966) argued that institutes of schooling should be the place to practice a democratic way of life for civil responsibilities. Schools have been the primary place for students to learn about how to be democratic citizens (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Meier, 1995). Yet these educational mandates neglect students’ and teachers’ opportunities to experience the process of democratic education.

One of the requirements in the No Child Left Behind Act for “highly qualified” teachers is that school teachers, by passing rigorous subject exams, demonstrate competence in each academic subject in which they teach (U.S. Department of Education, 2002a; 2002b). Is subject matter competence alone sufficient to develop “highly qualified” teachers? Some claim this requirement weakens the teaching profession by emphasizing subject knowledge, rather than subject and teaching knowledge (Kaplan and
Owings, 2002). Other ways of approaching the professional development of teachers are not included in the No Child Left Behind Act, yet other approaches bring to the argument a deeper understanding of what it takes to teach well.

**Background of the Study**

Research on teacher knowledge and teacher education has argued that an integrated teacher preparation program should be based on preparing future teachers with “pedagogical content knowledge” (PCK) (Cochran et al., 1993; Gomez & Housner, 1992; Grossman, 1990; Housner, Gomez, & Griffey, 1993; Shulman, 1986a, 1986b; Tuan et al., 1995). PCK is the knowledge that a teacher holds for engaging students’ understanding of a specific content or conception (Shulman, 1986a, 1986b). For example, teaching mathematics to children is more than knowing about mathematics. It is an understanding of how mathematics concepts can be taught to age-specific learners.

The question of how teachers learn this understanding of ways to help their students comprehend the content they teach was one of my teaching inquiries that helped develop this research. On the other hand, in the effort to understand how teachers teach what they teach (PCK), questions emerged and further directed my teaching inquiry about who teaches teachers and what the PCK is for teacher education. To answer this, one must examine how teachers are taught and what educational aims are inherent in schools of education.

The traditional aim of public schools is a civic education which seeks to “serve the general focus welfare of a democratic society” (Butts, 1980, p. 114). As Novak (1994) stated:
If democracy is to become a way of life in contemporary North American society, we certainly need to have schools with strong democratic commitments. … [I]f we are going to have democratic schools, we certainly need teachers with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for developing sustained democratic ways of educating. … [I]f we are going to seek and sustain democratic teachers, we will also need to have democratic teacher educators … who can call forth democratic possibilities in a wide variety of situations. (p. 1)

The above statement articulates the rationale of this research: that an investigation of what democratic teacher educator’s PCK is and how they put it into practice is a valuable effort in order to understand the essence of democratic teacher education. To explore college teacher educators’ PCK in teacher preparation, research has emphasized that the teacher educators’ views, values, and experiences should be examined, because their values, views, and experiences are incorporated into their teaching (Cortazzi, 1993). In other words, how teacher educators teach has its influence on student teachers’ perception of what teaching is and what education aims for. Shulman (1987) argued that in order to meet the challenge of preparing future teachers for democratic education, creating and modeling effective pedagogy becomes an important mission for college teacher educators.

However, little is known about how democratic ideas and values are integrated in teacher educators’ practice while fostering student teachers for democratic education. As an effort to understand how democratic teacher educators teach what they teach in teacher education, this study aimed to examine what democratic values and principles
teacher educators held and how those values and principles influenced the constitution of their PCK which informed their teaching to prepare future teachers.

**Focus of the Study**

This dissertation used a qualitative case study to explore the PCK of teacher educators in a democratic teacher preparation program. The teacher preparation program, Creating Active and Reflective Educators (CARE) for Democratic Education, is part of the licensure programs of the Department of Teacher Education in the College of Education at Ohio University. CARE is a program that fosters a democratic learning environment for preservice teachers. In the CARE program, the CARE instructors reflect on the civic mission of educating for democratic ideals associated with the values of freedom of expression, equality, participation, and social justice (Dewey, 1916/1966). During the three years in CARE, from sophomore to senior year the CARE students consciously develop their visions, ideas, and values in their pedagogy for democratic education. For the purpose of this study, PCK is defined as the knowledge that a teacher holds for engaging students’ understanding of a specific content or conception (Shulman, 1986a, 1986b). Teacher educators (CARE instructors), in this study, refer to those who provide required college course work for students in a teacher education program.

In this study, the conceptual framework: knowledge constructivism, concept of self, and critical theory of education, was used to examine related theories regarding teaching and learning. The conceptual framework used these three theories as a critical lens to examine the ways that teacher educators construct their PCK and practice it in classroom teaching. In addition, the use of “narrative inquiry” (Clandinin & Connelly,
1990, 2000; Connelly & Clandinin, 2000) was the methodological approach in this case study. Narrative inquiry is life-story research, a study tool to capture the understanding of the meanings that teachers give to their teaching experiences. In this qualitative case study, the narrative inquiry was used as a research tool to explore how the CARE instructors’ PCK informed their teaching practice while enhancing CARE students’ understanding of pedagogy.

Overview of Pedagogical Content Knowledge

In his studies, Lee Shulman (1986a, 1986b) claimed that teaching is characterized as transforming the understanding of knowledge. He argued this transforming knowledge is “Pedagogical Content Knowledge” (PCK) that a teacher holds for helping students understand specific content or conception (Shulman, 1986a, 1986b). The PCK study highlights a broader vision in our understanding of teaching and learning with an emphasis on PCK as a translation or transformation of knowledge which every teacher practices in his/her individual way (Shulman, 1986a, 1986b, 1987). In this sense, to understand the essential nature of teaching is to realize that PCK requires teachers’ “personal way of knowing” of the contents they teach and the teaching environment with which they are involved. In the process of developing PCK, teachers play a role as key mediators who consciously construct meanings and sense of knowledge and transform them into forms accessible to their students. As Clandinin (1986) indicated, to conduct research on understanding teaching is to study how teachers interpret and personalize theoretical knowledge and integrate it into a teaching framework that guides their teaching actions in practice. It is reasonable in the field of research that explores the
essence of the teacher education itself to focus on an understanding of how teacher educators organize and conceptualize their PCK in order to enhance student teachers’ understanding of the content being taught.

Responding to the impact of PCK on the reform of school education and teacher education, researchers have shown their interest in the investigation of the development of teacher’s knowledge (Fennema and Franke, 1992). Research regarding PCK has focused both on the areas of preservice and inservice teacher education (Gomez and Housner, 1992; Housner, Gomez, & Griffey, 1993; Marks, 1990; Tuan et al., 1995). By exploring the question of what knowledge informs teaching, some research findings organize the domains of teacher knowledge (Cochran et al., 1993; Grossman, 1990; Turner-Bisset, 1999; Wilson, Shulman, and Richert, 1987). Studies about PCK also focus on the investigation of specific subjects, such as science (Magnusson, Borko, and Krajcik, 1994), mathematics (Adams, 1998), chemistry (Tuan et al., 1995), geography (Ormrod and Cole, 1996), or English (Grossman, 1990) where teachers develop their PCK. In addition, levels of expertise (teacher training, novices, and experienced teachers) and their structures of PCK are compared and examined (Rink et al. 1994). Some studies investigate college professors (Count, 1999; Fernandez-Balboa and Stiehl, 1995; Lenze and Dinham, 1994).

Through the literature, research shows that the study of PCK has mainly focused on subject-specific areas and levels of expertise of K-12 teachers. The PCK research about how college teacher educators transform their subject matter knowledge into pedagogical innovation for the preparation of student teachers is limited. Little attention is given to the teaching process of teacher preparation and the professional knowledge of
college teacher educators (Clandinin, 1986; Cochran-Smith, 2003; Smith, 2003). However, questions that explore and purport to understand the structure of college teacher educators’ PCK are critical in an environment concerned with greater accountability in the professional development of teachers. For example, how does a teacher educator consider presenting a particular concept such as reflective teaching to student teachers? How does a teacher educator decide to use a particular strategy to teach a concept? What factors influence a college teacher educator’s teaching decision making? To what extent does the philosophy and configuration of a teacher education program influence a college teacher educator’s classroom practice? To what extent does a college teacher educator’s understanding of teaching and learning influence his/her practice in the preservice teacher education courses? How does the student teacher in a teacher preparation program acquire the knowledge and pedagogy of the college teacher educators? For a better understanding of how teacher educators transform subject matter or content knowledge into teaching practice, the exploration of these questions about teacher educators’ PCK is the entity of this case study.

Statement of the Problem

I am interested in teachers’ professional development, namely, the pedagogical practice in teachers’ teaching reasoning and action through their careers (Kansanen et al., 2000; Lipka & Brinthaupt, 1999). In the enterprise of teachers’ professional development, I am particularly interested in the role and performance of college teacher educators while they are fostering student teachers’ novice pedagogy. The college teacher educators’ teaching for teacher preparation is different from K-12 school teaching. As
Loughran (1997) indicated, the knowledge of pedagogy that an experienced school teacher acquires by teaching is not in itself sufficient for teaching student teachers’ who are learning about pedagogy. This is because the process of learning about teaching in teacher preparation program, for both teacher educators and student teachers, operates at two levels of practice (Loughran, 1997). One level of practice concerns student teachers’ need to learn about learning through the experiences offered in the preservice teacher education program. The other level concerns the simultaneous learning about teaching. Reflecting on his own teaching practices, Loughran (1997) reported that teacher preparation is a synchronous learning and teaching process. On the one hand, teacher educators need to help student teachers to reflect on their cognitive development as learners, under the pedagogical environment that teacher educators create. On the other hand, college teacher educators also facilitate student teachers reflecting on the pedagogy itself—how and why it is used, adapted, understood and developed. When we weave these strands into the context of teacher educators’ PCK, the concept “teaching” should be highlighted as content knowledge in teacher preparation. The study of PCK needs more inquiry on how the concept of “teaching” is transformed into curriculum and instruction of teacher preparation.

This concern led my study interest in the understanding of pedagogy in teaching about teaching. The literature review of PCK study in the field of teacher education indicates that further exploration is needed of college teacher educators’ pedagogical thinking and how their PCK informs teaching performance in classroom. Therefore, this study sought to understand how teacher educators give meaning to their teaching experiences and how these teaching experiences influence their practices.
John Goodlad (1990a) argued that reform of K-12 schools should include teacher preparation programs as well. One response to the reform of preparing future teachers is what counts as teaching knowledge and how does a teacher’s knowledge inform his or her practice. As mentioned earlier, Shulman (1986) defined teaching as transforming the understanding of knowledge. He called this transforming of knowledge for teaching “pedagogical content knowledge.” It is the knowledge that a teacher holds to engage students’ learning and understanding. PCK is a domain of teachers’ knowledge where content knowledge and knowledge of pedagogy are reflectively mingled in practice to engaging students’ learning (Shulman, 1986a, 1986b).

PCK is a realm of teacher’s knowledge that distinguishes between the content expert and the experienced teacher. A content expert is one who possesses content knowledge while an experienced teacher possesses content knowledge specific for teaching. In teaching practice, content or subject matter refers to topics, problems, concepts, or issues that teachers plan to teach while pedagogy refers to teaching strategies that teachers use for transforming the content or subject matter knowledge in forms that help students’ comprehension (Shulman, 1987). This is why, in response to the reform of preparing professional teachers, it is important to explore and analyze the construction of PCK of college teacher educators and how it is practiced to inspire preservice teachers’ novice pedagogy.

However, the literature about the understanding of college teacher educators’ PCK is scant. Throughout the literature in the research field of PCK and teacher
education, studies have reflected interest in the development of student teachers (Cochran, et al. 1993; Gomez & Housner, 1992; Grossman, 1990; Housner, Gomez, & Griffey, 1993; Tuan et al., 1995), with only a few studies about college professors (Counts 1999; Fernandez-Balboa & Stiehl, 1995; Lenze & Dinham 1994).

But no PCK studies focus on “teacher educators” who teach student teachers in teacher preparation programs at the college or university level. To understand how college teacher educators organize and conceptualize their teaching practice is to explore the very essence of teacher education itself. A study of how college teacher educators construct and deliver their PCK in the process of fostering preservice teachers in teacher preparation would enrich the literature and add to the dialogue on the reform of teacher preparation.

The Need of Understanding of Preparing Teachers to Teach Democratically

Generally, preservice teacher education is the formal starting point for student teachers to experience and learn about teaching and learning. In addition to the previous experiences they had in K-12 schools, student teachers’ perceptions of the teaching profession are influenced by their experiences during their studies in teacher preparation programs. In this sense, in addition to the important role of PCK, the views and values that college teacher educators hold to guide their practice are also central in teaching (Shulman, 1987).

College teacher educators’ views and values are embedded in their teaching practice, as in, for example, their choice of materials and in how they present a concept (Cortazzi, 1993). These principles and values guide teaching action and use of
pedagogical strategies in practice. Teacher educators’ views and perspectives are considered important because they have the potential to influence the way student teachers are taught and what they learn about teaching through modeling.

In the effort to prepare students to become responsible citizens in a democracy, the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996) argued that the improvement of teacher education is one of the most critical challenges for the twenty-first century. The teaching force has the potential to make a significant shift to educating for democracy in schools of education. It means that in order to meet the challenge of creating a democratic way of life within the classroom, not only do teacher educators have to model democratic practices, but they also have to promote opportunities for the student teachers to engage in such practices. The education college classroom should then become a learning community in which democratic practices can be learned and experienced by student teachers. Student teachers will later transfer these practices in their classrooms.

Fullan (1995) indicated from his observation that related studies on the democratic process are mostly at the organizational level. Little documentation is on analysis of change in classroom teaching and learning. If teacher education programs are to prepare future teachers to function successfully within reform movements for democratic schools, modeling effective pedagogy becomes a particularly important teaching tool for teacher educators (Schulman, 1987). However, little is known about how democratic values and principles inform teacher educators’ PCK in practical teaching. In a teacher preparation program like the CARE program, based on democratic values, teachers are expected to reflect the civic mission in preparing their students for
democratic responsibility and participation. To better understand college teacher educators’ teaching practice, it is helpful to have a study that examines how democratic values guide college teacher educators’ practice. Through the case study of the CARE instructors, this work critically examined how teacher educators connect the democratic values in their PCK and help student teachers identify the influence of democratic values on their own teaching pedagogy.

**Research Questions**

The purpose of this study was to explore CARE instructors’ PCK and analyze how it reflected on the democratic classroom practice of a preservice teacher preparation program.

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What are democratic values and principles? And how do those values and principles influence the development of college teacher educators’ pedagogical content knowledge in a democratic teacher preparation program?

2. What is the structure of the pedagogical content knowledge of college teacher educators who teach in a democratic teacher preparation program?

3. How does pedagogical content knowledge inform college teacher educators’ teaching practice?
Theoretical Framework

Knowledge Constructivism—Knowledge Constructed in Process of Inquiry with Experience

What is knowledge? What is truth? What is reality? How do we come to know what we know? The study of knowledge can often be divided into two general clusters: objectivism and constructivism. Objectivists claim that knowledge is outside of the learner (Jonassen, 1991). Truths are there for students to discover them and acquire them.

On the other hand, constructivists view the acquisition of knowledge differently. Based on the work of educational philosopher John Dewey (1916/1966, 1938/1997), and educational psychologists Lev Vygotsky (1978), Jean Piaget (1971, 1973), and Jerome Bruner (1966, 1990), the major idea of constructivism is that knowledge is constructed in the minds of people (DeLashmutt & Braund, 1996; Gergen, 1995; von Glasersfeld, 1995). Human beings are active seekers and knowledge constructors with innate goals and curiosities (Banks, 1996). Knowledge is not something separated objectively from a knower. The ideas teachers teach and students learn do not correspond to “reality”; they are human constructions. Reality is, as Hutcheon (1989) claimed, “made by us, not given to us” (p. 2). In other words, human beings actively create or construct knowledge as they try to convey meanings to their experience.

Dewey (1916/1966) argued that the conception of education is the continuous reconstruction of experience. Contrasting with the traditional view from Socrates that truth pre-exists human inquiry, Dewey claimed that knowledge is bigger than truth (Noddings, 1995). Experiences are central to Dewey’s theory of knowledge and pedagogy (Noddings, 1995; Novak, 1994). Teaching and learning in this sense is not an
instrument or means to attain a preset goal; instead, it is a transformation of experience. Dewey argued that we have experience prior to knowledge. For Dewey, knowledge is the tool for managing experience, because there is “no such thing as genuine knowledge and fruitful understanding except as the offspring of doing” (Dewey, 1916/1966, p. 275). Knowledge originally starts from our experience. However, experience itself is not knowledge; knowledge will be transformed only through the process of inquiring into our experience. Since the learning results from careful inquiry, Dewey preferred “knowing” to “knowledge” (Noddings, 1995; Novak, 1994). In this sense, knowledge is not to acquire a static entity but is an activity of inquiry.

Experience in this inquiry process plays a role as an undivided continuous interaction between human beings and their environment. Knowledge is the product of an interaction between our ideas about the world and our experience of the world (Beck, 1996). This view of knowledge is seen as a situational perspective, which highlights that cognition is situated in specific physical and social contexts (R. T. Putnam & Borko, 2000). When teachers teach in a classroom, the physical and social contexts in which they are involved—the school culture, content knowledge, personal values, teaching strategies, and the understanding of students’ characteristics—will all become integrated in the teachers’ pedagogical reasoning process to help them take teaching action. The function of inquiry is to clarify the uncertain and confusing aspects of a situation so as to provide a stable basis for action.

For Dewey (1916/1966), to study knowledge is to study inquiry. The philosophy of “education as the ‘constant reorganizing or reconstructing of experience’ is an inquiry process that is coextensive with human life” (Boisvert, 1998, p. 105). In this inquiry
process, teachers and students are building a reciprocal relationship. The teacher plays a role as a facilitator of learning, and as such the teacher emphasizes “how we come to know” and less “what we know.” Students are involved in constructing knowledge through active involvement. It is the idea of “interaction” between different kinds of knowledge that teachers take teaching knowledge into teaching practice (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1990). Based on a constructivist view of teaching and teacher preparation, Cochran et al. (1993) also emphasized knowing the PCK for teaching practice as active processes rather than as a set of knowledge based in combinations. Shor and Freire (1987) explored the notion of the “act of knowing, not a mere transfer-of-knowledge” process as dialogue (p. 13). From the communicative perspective, both Freire (1970) and Habermas (1984) advocated that knowledge and theory are constructed through a reciprocal interaction process—a dialogue.

A dialogue is a conversation in which different opinions are critically evaluated, distinctions are made, and arguments and evidence are put forward with a view to reaching agreement on whatever comes to light as most reasonable—and with the expectation that something new and better will come to light. (R. W. Grant, 1996, pp. 474-475)

Unfortunately, what generally has been done in schools is that students are led to become passive receivers of the text before the text (Freire, 1970). Banks (1996) argued that the main goal of presenting different kinds of ideas is to help students understand how knowledge is constructed, how it reflects the social context in which knowledge is created, and to enable students to develop the understandings and skills needed to become knowledge builders themselves.
Concept of Self—Self as Active Meaning Maker

What makes college teacher educators who they are within a particular educational arrangement and organizational culture? What makes college teacher educators feel they belong to a certain kind of educational community culture within which they work? How do they learn to embody and enact the professional selves required by general or/and particular teaching situations? Answering these self-identity-related questions becomes more complex once we outline the notion of self with the postmodern concept that self is constituted theatrically through role-playing and image construction (Rorty, 1989). Instead of seeing self-identity as a fixed substance as in the modernist tradition, the ongoing idea of self is seen as situated in actual performances.

One thing that modernity certainly requires, as Taylor (1991) pointed out, is an awareness of personal identity different from that of all others. Exploring the meaning of “identity” is trying to answer the questions “who am I?” and “where did I come from?” “Defining myself means finding what is significant in my difference from others,” wrote Taylor (1991, pp. 35-36). However, one cannot answer the questions without searching through the stream of memory in order to select those items that one considers “significant” to one’s identity. Researchers have pointed out that only through ongoing relationships with others can we develop the concept of self (Gergen, 1990; Taylor, 1991). What makes our lives meaningful is not a mere matter of choice but the fact that our choices are always made in relationships and contexts that lend them meaning.

In order to point out the importance of experience to the growth of self, Bruner (1990), utilizing Michelle Rosaldo’s word, argued that self “grow[s] not from ‘inner’
essence relatively independent of the social world, but from experience in a world of meanings, images, and social bonds, in which all persons are inevitably involved” (p. 42). The logical analysis based on rationalistic orientation not only underlies pure and applied science but also explains human behavior by means of ordinary rules (Bruner, 1990). When people interpret behaviors in accordance with Roger Barker’s principle of situation rules, or with Paul Grice’s maxims of conversational exchange, we do not ask “why?” (as cited in Bruner, 1990, p. 48). As Bruner (1990) argued, “because it is ordinary, it is experienced as canonical and therefore as self-explanatory” (p. 48). The behavior performance is predictable and no further explanation is needed. The logical analysis based on a modernist’s view with preordained standards has given us the only right rational answer. Any new or different interpretation will be seen as an irrational deviation.

However, a human being’s mind is not a thing; talking about our minds is talking about world-involving capabilities that we have and activities that we engage in (H. Putnam, 1999). As Dewey (1934) put it, “Mind is primarily a verb. It denotes all the ways in which we deal consciously and expressly with the situations in which we find ourselves” (p. 268). The interpretation we make and action we take from the interaction between our ideas about the world and our experience of the world is what Bruner (1990) called narrative—“between real and imagination.” (p. 55). Narrative negotiation focuses not on “behavior” but on “action,” with an intention to interpret situated action—action situated in a cultural setting, and in the mutually interacting intentional states of the participants. “We knew from our own experience in telling consequential stories about ourselves that there is an ineluctably ‘human’ side to making sense” (Bruner, 1990, p. 55). A narrative, for Bruner, is composed of a unique sequence of events, mental states, and
happenings involving human beings as characters or actors. These are its constituents. However, these constituents do not have a life or meaning of their own. Their meaning is given by their place in the overall configuration of the sequence as a whole—“its plot or fabula.” (Burner, 1990, p. 43)

A person’s decision to become a teacher involves not only the acquisition of a knowledge base, but also the conscious development of a refined sense of self (Tusin, 1999). All philosophy, knowledge, and skills built upon during the teacher preparation process are directed to shaping a new professional self which will be relating to other people with certain responsibilities, attitudes, and behaviors that might be outside his/her original self. In her study of the factors related to selecting teaching as a career, Tusin (1999) found that it is a process of implementing a concept of self as teacher. It is necessary for teachers to actualize their personal sense of self to a point that they can enter into meaningful and growth-facilitating relationships with students (Tusin, 1999). In his study of the teacher’s professional self, Kelchtermans (1993) indicated that teachers’ cognitions about teaching and being a teacher are organized in a “personal interpretive framework” (p. 147). This framework functions as a lens through which teachers’ concerns, principles, and values inform their professional action in classroom teaching. To identify with this profession, and to develop the capacity to teach, teaching is seen as a process of trustworthy development which goes beyond what is required for an average person, because teachers play a role with moral and ethical expectations in terms of influencing people’s lives. This professional development process for teachers is not like the natural growth for biological maturity but a stimulated growth process in which the self is consciously involved in teaching actions and behaviors.
Therefore, the understanding of teachers’ professional development should be located in a linked context of teachers and the environment with which they interact. Well-constructed knowledge bases are important and necessary for teachers to be professional. However, deep content knowledge is not a sufficient condition that prepares a content expert to become a good teacher. The professional development process is not only for the acquisition of teaching knowledge but also an explorative process of self-reflection and self-analysis. In a classroom, a teacher, while standing in front of students, is not only presenting his or her knowledge but also presenting himself/herself as a whole person with a cultural background, personal views, and stories. As Craig (1995) noted, the individual teacher is “a moral agent who can have a shaping effect on situation” (p. 23). Teachers make their teaching meaningful by engaging in inquiry or dialogical processes where personal views and experiences can be shared and reflected in the form of stories. Emphasizing the role of reflection on practices, Schön (1987) asserted that teachers’ professional development is participating in a developmental process as “reflective practitioners.” Later he defined this developmental activity as “reflective transformation of experience” (Schön, 1987, p. 25). In this developmental process, Schön maintained, teachers use knowledge as a means to improve their teaching behavior. With self-identification process consciously involved, this practice allows teachers to use their personal and theoretical backdrops as underpinnings and to transform them into re-story opportunities in their teaching decision-making process.

Following Dewey’s notion that knowledge is constructed through experience (1916/1966, 1938/1997) Clandinin and Connelly examined and described this experiential knowing as “personal practical knowledge” (Clandinin, 1986, 1992;
Clandinin and Connelly, 1986). Clandinin (1992) described the personal practical knowledge as in a person’s past experience, in the person’s present mind and body and in the person’s future plans and actions. It is knowledge that reflects the individual’s prior knowledge and acknowledges that contextual nature of the teacher’s knowledge. It is a kind of knowledge, carved out of, and shaped by, situations; knowledge that is constructed and reconstructed as we live our stories and retell and relive them through processes of reflection (p. 125).

This knowledge-constructing process involves teachers who embody their personal and social images and their values of educational practices. It is the personal ways of knowing educational situations in which teachers construct and reconstruct knowledge through continuous interacting with the people and the environment involved. Personal practical knowledge (Clandinin, 1986; Clandinin & Connelly, 1986) is a cutting point to explore the connection between personal and professional knowledge of teachers that provides a path for conceptualizing the development of professional self while the teacher constructs knowledge bases for teaching profession.

Critical Theory on Education—Schooling as a Transformative Process

The concept of democratic education advocated by Dewey (1916/1966) is an empowering notion. Schooling associated with democratic ideals that promote liberal thinking, freedom of speech, equality of opportunity, social justice, and human rights are critical to emancipatory education. Dewey (1916/1966) argued that there are four components that distinguish a democratic society, “shared interests, freedom in
interaction, participation, and social relationships” (p. 93). Dewey (1916/1966) emphasized that democracy should become the mode of social and political life:

A democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience. The extension in space of the number of individuals who participate in an interest so that each has to refer his own action to that of others, and to consider the action of others to give point and direction to his own, is equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory which kept men from perceiving the full import of their activity. (p. 87)

However, as Apple (1993) indicated, democracy becomes problematic as privilege confers economic, political, and social power to the dominant culture. The dominant culture means the social values and interests are affirmed by those people who control the material and symbolic wealth of society (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990; McLaren, 1998). Not only is there a gap between the democratically ideal society and conflicting reality (Apple, 1993), institutions of schooling, functioning as agents of socialization, are reproducing the conflicting realities and maintaining the status quo. As Bell and Schniedewind (1987) stated, “Critical theory articulates a penetrating critique of the current social order and the schools’ role in maintaining it.”(p. 55) Critical theory argues that the role of school is as an agent of transmitting a particular set of ideological cultural values to ensure that students take their rightful place in the social and occupational order and society at large. For example, in their study on the “hidden curriculum,” Giroux & Purpel (1983) pointed out the process of social and economic reproduction in daily school life. In some schools, students from different social classes
are subjected to a socializing process in which class-specific roles are prepared and
designed. Gergen (1991) also indicated that because our educational curricula are largely
controlled by “those who know,” the educational system operates to sustain the existing
structure of power. Students learn “the right facts” according to those who control the
system, and these realities, in turn, sustain the powerful in their positions of power
(Gergen, 1991, p. 95).

In this situation, institutions of schooling serve the interests of the existing power
elite and are not a force for democratic goals (Bowles & Gintis, 1976). Critical theorists
advocate that the notion of democracy needs to be deconstructed in teaching practice with
an effort to challenge and create a citizenry concerned with the struggle for equality and
social justice. For example, Giroux (1985) viewed human beings as change agents,
claiming that “schools do not merely reproduce dominant social relations and interests
but are also socially constructed sites of contestation, actively involved in the production
of lived experiences” (p. 23). The role of teachers in this sense is not only guiding
students to emancipate themselves from the dominated relationship but also serving as a
progressive change agent in transforming schools and thus society. In this sense, critical
theory offers the potential for both critique and new directions in teaching and learning as
it concentrates on issues that are related to social justice, equality, and democratic values.
As they recognize the reality that immense struggles have to be faced to achieve the goal
of social justice, critical educators are committed to the notion that schooling can be a
transformative process in which schools should play a significant role in changing the
world, not just conveying information.
In critical theory, the focus for teacher and students is the realization of the restrictions of content, history, and society which limit them to what they can know and how they can know it. For critical theorists, knowledge is not value-free object but culturally, historically, ethnically, and linguistically constructed (Giroux, 1988; Jenks, Lee, & Kanpol, 2001). Giroux (1988) advocated critical pedagogy for the purpose of enabling learners to become aware of conditions in their life and in society, as well as to acquire the necessary skills, knowledge and resources to be able to plan and create change. The focus in a critical theorist classroom is on the awareness of socially and historically imposed rules of play (Giroux, 1988; Jenks, Lee, and Kanpol, 2001). In this sense, teacher education should develop a synoptic vision that connects cultural, social, and political phenomena with classroom practice. This effort would provide the opportunity for student teachers to develop critiques of the status quo and form new meanings for teaching and schooling.

**Purpose and Significance of the Study**

This study used a qualitative case study approach to investigate college teacher educators’ PCK in a democratic teacher preparation program. Through a narrative analysis of CARE instructors’ PCK, the purpose of this study was to contribute to a broader understanding of the PCK as it applied to a democratic teacher education program at the college teaching level. Values and perspectives held by teacher educators have the potential to influence the way student teachers respond to teacher education (Cortazzi, 1993). The investigation of how democratic values and principles were practiced in teacher education in this study is a valuable effort to add the understanding
of how teachers are prepared in a democratic teacher education program. This study can help other teacher educators as they prepare their students to understand what teachers do during the process of learning to teach and what this means for fostering democratic teachers for democracy.

The concept of PCK has been central to the effort of advocating the value of teacher education by making a case for teaching as a unique intellectual enterprise involving special forms of knowledge and skill (Bullough, 2001). This study’s description and analysis helped engage CARE teacher educators in considering what narrative inquiry allows them to see in their own pedagogical reasoning and actions. The findings of this study of PCK thus can enrich the resources for teacher education and enhance the understanding of the structure of PCK that not only teacher educators who educate student teachers in the teacher preparation program but also the student teachers who will teach in the future.

**Limitations of the Study**

One of the frequently cited limitations of the case study method is the concern for generalizing the findings. Generalizing from case studies is not a matter of statistical generalization, generalizing from a sample to a universe, but a matter of analytic generalization, using single or multiple cases to illustrate, represent, or generalize to a theory (Yin, 1984, 1998). This case study was based in and limited to the CARE program, with its particular social, cultural, and educational context. The PCK is an individually constructed and personal way of knowing of teaching. The findings of this study were limited to one particular teacher education program. The purpose of this study was not to
generalize to all cases. Selecting four out of ten CARE instructors as participants selected for this “narrative inquiry” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) case study is reasonable due to the fact that the study purpose is to increase a broader understanding of the PCK that teacher educators hold and to build a framework about teacher educators’ professional teaching practice in a democratic teacher preparation program.

PCK is “the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding” (Shulman, 1987, p. 8) and it is “highly context dependent” (Bullough, 2001, p. 664). The PCK framework that the teacher educators developed is an open-ended construction. The purpose of investigating the forms of knowledge that constituted the CARE instructors’ PCK in this study was not to match with the prior research findings of PCK structure or to build as an application-of-theory model. Instead, this case study focused its attention on the CARE instructors’ PCK components and investigated how they informed the instructors’ pedagogical reasoning and actions.

“Narrative inquiry” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) was applied as the methodological tool to collect study data gained from class observations and interviews. Emphasizing the narrative characteristics of teaching and teacher knowledge (Clandinin, 1993; Preskill, 1998), narrative inquiry provided a necessary configuration for data collection while leaving space for the CARE instructors to tell their stories and experiences in their own words. However, using narrative interview as a research tool to collect teacher educators’ teaching stories and experiences from their memories might lead to selective information. The retrieved information that teacher educators provided also might be influenced over time by new experiences, events, and other people in the context of their daily teaching. In order to avoid the biases that the teacher educators
might have, triangle data collection sources were utilized in this study to increase the research reliability (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993).

Definitions of Terms

Pedagogical Content Knowledge. Pedagogical Content Knowledge, or PCK, refers to a personal practical way of knowing the subject matter, the curricular texts, the student teachers, and teacher education contexts within which teacher educators practice their teaching.

College Teacher educators (Instructors). In this study, college teacher educators refer to instructors who provide required college and university course work for prospective teachers in a teacher education program. It includes instructors who teach foundations courses as well as those who teach methods courses and supervise practice teaching.

Narrative Inquiry. Narrative inquiry is a life-story research (Clandinin & Connely, 2000). It is concerned with “telling someone else that something happened” (Gudmundsdottir, 1995, p. 25). In this study, narrative inquiry is employed as research content and method to capture the understanding of the meanings that college teacher educators give to their teaching experiences.

Democratic Teacher Education. In this study, democratic teacher education refers to a program (like CARE) in which teacher preparation is devoted to instilling the democratic values advocated by John Dewey (1916/1966). In a democratic teacher education
program, college teacher educators reflect on the civic mission of preparing democratic teachers who will fulfill their democratic responsibilities, such as promoting liberal thinking, freedom of expression, equality, participation, and social justice.

Knowledge Constructivism. The basic idea of constructivism is that all knowledge is invented or “constructed” in the minds of people (DeLashmutt & Braund, 1996). Human beings actively create or construct knowledge as they try to convey meanings to their experience. Knowledge is not a static entity but is an activity of inquiry. Experience in this inquiry process plays a role as an undivided continuous interaction between human beings and their environment. The function of inquiry is to clarify the uncertain and confusing aspects of a situation to provide a stable basis for action.

Concept of Self. A person’s decision to become a teacher involves not only the acquisition of a knowledge base but also the conscious development of a refined sense of self (Tusin, 1999). Instead of seeing self-identity as a fixed substance as in the modernist tradition, self is perceived, in a postmodern sense, as an ongoing process, situated in actual performances. Self is constituted theatrically through role-playing and image construction (Rorty, 1989).

Critical Theory on Education. Critical educators recognize that immense struggles have to be faced to achieve the goal of social justice, and they are committed to the notion that schooling can be a transformative process in which schools play a significant role in changing the world, not just imparting information. Critical theorists advocate that the
notion of democracy needs to be deconstructed in teaching practice with the ultimate goal of creating a citizenry concerned with struggling for equality and social justice.

**Organization of the Study**

The following represents the organization of this study. Chapter one provides the rationale and the insights of the origin of the study which includes the researcher’s methodology approach. Chapter two is a review of the literature related to the PCK study. Chapter three describes the methodology employed and study design of the research. Chapter four offers the description of the research result. Chapter five is the analysis of the research data. Chapter six, the final chapter, provides the research conclusion and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

The literature review in this chapter focuses on related research and theory regarding the concepts of pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) (Shulman, 1986a, b, 1987) and teacher education. The review of the literature has five sections: a general overview of PCK is introduced in the first section; the second section provides a profile of knowledge base for teaching; the third section discusses democratic education as an educational philosophy provides democratic values and principles in teacher education; the four section describes research on the field of PCK and teacher education in relation to the reform of teacher education and teacher preparation; the final section presents the research on professional development of teacher educators with a focus on teacher educators’ practical teaching in teacher education programs and the interaction between knowledge development and professional self.

**Overview of Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

Research in teaching which draws its attention to “what counts as knowledge base for teaching” recently has produced numerous findings that impact on the reform of teacher education in terms of understanding how teachers’ knowledge informs their practice. In 1986, by arguing that the study of understanding of subject matter content and the relationships between such understanding and the teaching strategies teachers apply is the “missing paradigm” (p. 7) of educational research, Shulman (1986a) advocated the comprehensive study of the three types of knowledge needed for classroom...
practice: subject matter knowledge, curricular knowledge, and PCK. For Shulman (1986a), PCK describes “the most useful forms of representation…, the most powerful analogies, illustrations, examples, explanations, and demonstrations – in a word, the ways of representing and formulating the subject that makes it comprehensible for others” (p. 9).

In his research on teachers’ subjective matter knowledge, he highlighted the phrase “pedagogical content knowledge,” which gives a broader vision in our understanding of teaching and learning. This form of teacher knowledge, according to Shulman (1986a), “goes beyond knowledge of subject matter per se to the dimension of subject matter knowledge for teaching” (p. 9). PCK here is conceived of as emphasizing subject matter and how to present and translate it into practical teaching.

In his 1987 article on teacher knowledge, however, Shulman located PCK in a broader context as one of seven categories of the knowledge base of teaching: (1) content knowledge; (2) general pedagogical knowledge; (3) curriculum knowledge; (4) pedagogical content knowledge; (5) knowledge of learners; (6) knowledge of educational contexts; and (7) knowledge of educational ends, purposes and values, and their philosophical and historical grounds. Shulman (1987) described the PCK as the “special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understandings” (p. 8). With this broader view, PCK focuses more on pedagogy or professional knowledge and less on the emphasis on subject matter (Sosniak, 1999). In this sense, PCK “represents the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organized, represented, and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners, and presented for instruction” (Shulman, 1987, p. 8). In teaching practice, the content refers to the
organization of the subject matter knowledge, while pedagogy refers to instructional strategies used for transforming the content knowledge in a way that students can comprehend it.

The declaration of the missing paradigm advocates the study of subject-matter content and its interaction with pedagogy and has encouraged further inquiry in the areas of research and practice of K-12 education and teacher education. Several studies regarding PCK focused its research areas on both pre-service teachers (Gomez & Housner, 1992; Housner et al., 1993; Tuan et al., 1995) and in-service teachers (Marks, 1990). Some researchers applied the model of PCK to teacher education programs (Cochran et al., 1993; Wilkes, 1994). For example, seeing Shulman’s (1987) model of pedagogical reasoning as a set of processes for the development of PCK, Wilkes (1994) applied it to a pre-service teacher education program of business education studies. Cochran et al. (1993) described PCK based on a constructivist view of teaching and teacher preparation, emphasizing knowing and understanding as active processes. In their study, Cochran et al. (1993) found that pedagogical content knowing requires teachers to understand students’ learning and the environmental context in which teaching and learning occur.

Researchers have also shown their interests in the investigation of the development of teachers’ PCK and its impact on teaching practice (Fennema and Franke, 1992). Studies focused either on specific subjects, such as science (Magnusson, Borko, & Krajcik, 1994), mathematics (Adams, 1998), chemistry (Tuan et al., 1995), geography (Ormrod and Cole, 1996), or English (Grossman, 1990), or on levels of expertise including teacher training, novice, and experienced teacher (Rink et al. 1994). Literature
also included a related study of college level teaching (Lenze & Dinham, 1994). In her research of knowledge base for teaching in teacher education, Grossman (1990) investigated both the nature of PCK in English among beginning teachers and the role of subject-specific teacher education course work in contributing to graduates’ knowledge and values about teaching English. In the process of unpacking the concept of PCK, the differences in what teachers believe and value were being pictured. How the values get practiced in the classroom was also being explored. On the other hand, in their science teachers’ PCK study, Loughran et al. (2000) summarized that the PCK is a combinational notion in which the different mixtures of elements influence the richness of the PCK. The changes in any of the elements inevitably influence the nature of the PCK that is being portrayed. According to their research, the elements that influence the development and structure of PCK are perspectives in learning; perspectives in teaching; the understanding of content; time—teaching time/length of unit/unit of work; context—school/classroom/year level; understanding of students; views of scientific knowledge; pedagogical practice; decision making; reflection; and explicit vs. tacit elements of knowledge of practice/values/ideas. To understand PCK well is to understand the mixture of interacting elements which, when combined, help to give insight into PCK.

Further lines of research based on the thread of Shulman (1986a, 1986b, 1987) evolved the study of constructions and sources of teacher knowledge (Cochran et al., 1993; Grossman, 1990; Turner-Bisset, 1999; Wilson, Shulman, and Richert, 1987). In the definition of knowledge bases for teaching and their interrelationships, Grossman (1990) characterized “four general areas of teacher knowledge…as the cornerstones of the emerging work on professional knowledge for teaching: general pedagogical knowledge,
subject matter knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and knowledge of context” (p. 5). In her 1991 definition, Grossman categorized four aspects of PCK: (1) knowledge of purpose and goals for the subject area (focus on the subject matter); (2) knowledge of student, prior knowledge, misconceptions, and difficulties with the subject (focus on students); (3) curricular knowledge, both intra- and inter-course, within the discipline (focus on curriculum); and (4) knowledge of instructional strategies for the subject area (focus on pedagogy). In a study of primary teachers, Turner-Bisset (1999) developed a model of teaching knowledge in which eleven sets of knowledge are presented. In this model, the PCK is the set which contains all of the other sets: substantive subject knowledge, syntactic subject knowledge, beliefs about the subject, curriculum knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge, knowledge/models of teaching, knowledge of learners: cognitive, knowledge of learners: empirical, knowledge of self, knowledge of educational contexts, knowledge of educational ends. In an attempt to apply PCK to teaching and teacher preparation, Cochran et al. (1993) proposed a modification of PCK based on a constructivist view of learning and teaching. Instead of focusing on the changes of understanding subject matter knowledge, which implied PCK is simply a new type of traditional subject matter knowledge, Cochran et al.’s (1993) extended the definition of pedagogical content knowing, maintaining it was more than a new type of content knowledge. It comprised an integration of four components which include the knowledge of students, the knowledge of environmental contexts, the knowledge of subject matter, and the knowledge of pedagogy.
Knowledge Base for Teaching

There is a growing consensus about the need for a “more common knowledge base” to good teaching (Sikula, 1996). A lot of knowledge that informs teaching can be categorized in different ways. However, useful knowledge that informs good teaching practice is a central element for framing future teacher education. For example, Cochran-Smith (2000) organized three contrasting views on the knowledge that underpins good teaching: the first view asserted that the knowledge teachers need is the formal knowledge for teaching that has been generated by university-based researchers; the second view recognized and elevated the practical knowledge that very competent and experienced teachers have; and the third view emphasized that the knowledge teachers need is generated when teachers across the professional lifespan work with others in inquiry communities. By answering the question of “what should a newly licensed teacher know and be able to do,” practical and research studies identified four domains of teaching tasks and knowledge/skills: general principles of teaching and learning, content, content-specific pedagogy, and enabling skills (reading and computational skills) (Reynolds, 1995). In addition, in her empirical study of primary teachers, Turner-Bisset (1999) used the concept of “pedagogical content knowledge” (Shulman, 1986a, 1986b, 1987) to frame a model for knowledge base for practice teaching. Eleven sets of knowledge are presented in this PCK model as listed above. Later, Hegarty (2000) grouped Turner-Bisset’s (1999) eleven sets of knowledge into four categories: subject knowledge, teaching knowledge, content knowledge of learners, and knowledge of self. Organizing from above researchers’ findings, the domains of teacher knowledge can be categorized as follows:
• **Subject Matter Knowledge**

Substantive subject knowledge, syntactical knowledge, and beliefs about subject are all aspects of content knowledge, or subject matter knowledge (Shulman, 1987; Turner-Bisset, 1999). The substantive knowledge consists of the facts and concepts that comprise the knowledge of a subject. This knowledge also organizes frameworks to cluster the core concepts of a discipline. Syntactical knowledge refers to the means by which the proposition knowledge is generated. Views about subject knowledge indicate that the different conceptions teachers hold about a subject definitely impacts teaching practice.

• **Curriculum Knowledge**

With particular grasp of the material and programs, Shulman (1987) saw curriculum knowledge as “tools of the trade” for teachers (p. 8). Turner-Bisset (1999) further advocated that curriculum knowledge demonstrates that teachers need not only understand the materials and program of study available for each subject but also be able to evaluate curricular materials critically.

• **General Pedagogical Knowledge**

General pedagogical knowledge is knowledge about teaching, usually gained from practice (Turner-Bisset, 1999). As Hegarty (2000) put it, this is craft knowledge and encompasses expository skills, classroom management, questioning, and differentiation. Because teaching strategies and approaches
have to be explored from the practice of teachers, this craft knowledge is better understood in a context-specific situation.

- Knowledge of Teaching
  Seeing teaching as transmitting facts or stimulating student response impacts differently on what teachers do and how they do it in classroom teaching.
  Knowledge of teaching can be described as values about teaching. Research (e.g. Turner-Bisset, 1999) showed that knowledge about teaching from their own school experience shapes the student teacher’s perceptions of teaching and their own developing practice.

- Knowledge of Learners and Their Characteristics
  Knowledge of learners includes cognitive and empirical aspects of describing learners and their characteristics (Turner-Bisset, 1999). Empirical knowledge of learners is knowledge of general characteristics of learners at a particular age range. The cognitive knowledge of learners is the knowledge of child development, which encompasses the theoretical base of how learners’ learning activities should be structured. As demonstrated in research (e.g. Cochran et al., 1993), for constructivist educators, learning is created by the student, not the teacher. The understanding of how students construct and use their understanding is crucial since each student’s knowing is a unique construction, and students’ prior knowledge has an influence on learning.
• Knowledge of Educational Ends, Purposes, and Values
  Teaching activities are purposeful and are influenced by the social-moral framework in which teachers construct their values of educational ends, purposes, and values.

• Knowledge of Educational Contexts
  Knowledge of educational contexts, according to Shulman (1986a), is knowledge of schools, classrooms, and all settings where learning takes place. Teachers’ understanding of the social, political, cultural, and physical environmental contexts that shape the teaching and learning process contributes to the development of PCK (Cochran et al., 1993). Turner-Bisset (1999) also found in her study that educational contexts have a significant impact on teachers’ performances.

Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Teacher Education

Democratic Education Paradigm

With a vision of creating a way of “associated living” and “conjoint communicated experience” (Dewey, 1916/1966, p. 87) in human society which a democratic society stands for, democratic education aims to educate students as active and responsible citizens. In a democratic society, citizens have the willingness to “share common interest” and engage in “free interaction between groups” (Dewey, 1916/1966, p. 86).

Emphasizing the value of individual growth and social development, as Thayer-Bacon & Bacon (1998) argued, democratic education should be promoted as an education
paradigm for schools of education. In democratic education, students are seen as active participants in the learning process. Democratic education also values the role of social context in which the knowledge, skills, and attitudes students learn can be applied in the real world. A lack of effort to develop a body of knowledge that inspires students to question social issues and to solve social problems is what Barber (1984) called thin democracy.

Respecting the value of individuality and diversity which advocate equality is what democratic education strives for (Gay, 1997). In its attempt to respond to the increasing cultural diversity in the United States, as C. A. Grant (1995) argued, school education must do what must be done—and what must be done is to educate all of our students to praise diversity.

In democratic education, learning is not a top-down knowledge delivery process from teacher to students (Miller, 2002). In a top-down learning classroom, only the teacher has the voice of authority while the students are seen as empty vassals that need to be poured knowledge in order to be equipped as functional citizens. This kind of authoritarian approach is what Freire (1970) called “banking” education.

In a democratic classroom, during the mutual interaction process, both teacher and students have the responsibility as “full partners” in the effort to create a mode of associated democratic living (Lee, 1996). For this to happen, however, teacher must have the capability to build the process of what Goodlad (1990a) called “an effective teacher-student connection” (p. 49) in which the teacher cares about teaching, learning, and students simultaneously.
The goal of democratic education is to develop an inclusive classroom and school environment where students and teacher are engaged in a reciprocal teaching and learning relationship (Campbell, 2000). As Pearl and Knight (1999) indicated, a democratic culture begins by creating space where everyone feels safe to engage in open conversation with respect for one another.

Dewey (1916/1966) argued that schooling should connect with home and social life. Seeing school as the moral equivalence of home, Martin (1992) advocates that schooling bonds to moral boundaries within which all elements in a pluralistic and diverse society can be engaged in meaningful discourse. The role of democracy in school and society is that, school serves as the center of democratic community life, where the role of education is to connect the school to the community and engage in social life. In democratic education, schools are places where students learn to live by living, and learn morality by engaging in moral behavior (Dewey, 1916/1966).

Accordingly, the fulfillment of the educational mission depends primarily on the responsibility of teachers “to cultivate the democratic oriented classroom setting (moral stewardship) and to create learning opportunities that embrace all of their students (caring pedagogy)” (Goodlad, 1996, p. 113). Teachers need to take responsibility for teaching reciprocal communication and shared vision to make the creation of a learning community possible.

With an emphasis on the individual’s contribution to meaning and learning through interaction between individual and social activity, constructivism as a pedagogical approach embodies democratic education in the teaching and learning
dimensions (Wolk, 1998). From the constructivist view, knowledge building is an active process. As Wolk (1998) observed, people learn best what is meaningful to them.

Differing from the Perennialist philosophy of education which Hutchins (1936) advocates, that people need common values and common knowledge in order to communicate, Dewey (1916/1966) argues in a democratic view that the values and knowledge are products of inquiry and construction through social interaction. In other words, we do not begin with common values; we construct them.

In democratic education, it is an inquiry process by which individuals shape new visions and interactions with others and their social and cultural surroundings. Instead of highlighting students’ end products, the constructivist approach pays more attention to learning, to encourage students to develop the habits of what Dewey calls “reflection” (Dewey, 1916/1966, p. 163).

By learning and understanding who we are and what knowledge we have, the teacher in a democratic classroom is encouraged to situate new knowledge within students’ lives and understand students’ experience, knowledge, and cultures to create the curriculum. This is what Shor and Freire (1987) called “situated pedagogy.” Situated pedagogy can be done with virtually any topic. Not only does it help students connect new knowledge with their prior knowledge and experience, it enables students to make better sense of new ideas by placing them within the context of their own lives.

Connecting school learning to students’ personal ideas and experience as learning activity is what Novak (1994) calls “a down-to-earth philosophy” that studies everyday life in the terms of the social or democratic ideal (p. 1). An important implication to
teacher education is that knowledge in a teacher preparation program is not restricted to an academic subject.

Teacher education students must be given the opportunity to learn how what they teach can be used to solve important personal and social problems. They must also have the opportunities to develop their understanding of the social context of schooling and students. From the constructivist view, the learning experiences student teachers have in the teacher education program will be pre-existing experiences connected with their later teaching as classroom teachers. In this sense, a democratic teacher education is designed to help prospective teachers become the constructors of their own classrooms.

Reform of Teacher Education

Pedagogy is the intrinsic feature to teaching (Hegarty, 2000). There is a dichotomy view on teaching—seeing teaching as transmitting facts or teaching as stimulating student response. In his study of framing the future of teacher education, Cochran-Smith (2000) indicated the new approach to teacher learning is more constructivist than transmission-oriented, and the focus has moved from what teachers do to the knowledge teachers hold. The traditional approach known as the instrumental orientation approach tends to focus on teaching as a craft opposed to a knowledge-based activity. The trend of shifting the teaching of learning to a more reflective orientation reveals a new vision that competencies or skills are important but an excessive focus on them leads to a narrow image of teaching. This notion reduces teaching to the unreflective application of pre-made rules where insight and creativity are void.

One of the limitations of the structure design of traditional teacher education
programs is the lack of rigorous coursework and intellectual challenge (Grossman, 1990; Shulman, 1990). Research reflected on the teaching effectiveness and indicated that the discussion of teacher knowledge should recognize the importance of the theoretical framework underpinning the knowledge base (Grossman, 1990; Shulman, 1990).

However, C. A. Grant and Wieczorek (2000) criticized the discussions of knowledge within teacher education that do not include issues of race, class, gender, or power relations, which they emphasized as knowledge of “social moored” (p. 913). They argued that the current discussion of teacher education coursework ignores the component of social moorings, and such processes of knowledge would prevent student teachers from being effective in this multicultural society. In the traditional approach, instead of centering the curriculum on social, cultural, and political dimensions of teaching, most programs are reduced to simply “training” teachers by applying research based theory, which makes the act of teaching more scientifically and technically measurable while neglecting the critical aspects of culture and schooling.

As reactions to problems and weaknesses of the traditional approach to teacher education developed, many attempts emphasizing reflective teaching emerged (Calderhead, 1989). In the attempts to construct the theoretical basis for the new approach of reflective teaching, a collaborative effort of a one year study involving 30 representative institutions of higher education for the purpose of redesigning the way that prospective teachers are educated was conducted. This study identified five themes of the intellectual underpinnings of teacher education: subject matter understanding; general and liberal knowledge; pedagogical content knowledge; multicultural, international, and other human perspectives; and recruitment into teaching (Murray and Fallon, 1989). On
the other hand, Korthagen and Kessels (1999) organized different lines of research which included applying the notion of constructivism to formulate cognitive psychological underpinnings; using sociological consideration as study methods to reach the research goals; involving the ethical dimensions in the discussion; and offering related teaching strategies and effects in the field.

Instead of seeing knowledge about teaching as a pre-set subject, reflective teaching implies teacher knowledge is a process of experiencing, according to Cochran-Smith (2000). In teacher education, teacher knowledge is a subject to be created by the student teachers in the interactive contexts in which reflection and insight are developed through the interaction process of practical teaching and learning situations. Underpinning the paradigm of reflective teaching is a perspective that preservice teachers should be given the opportunity to engage in the critical analysis of schooling where the social, cultural, political, and economic aspects are the fundamental dimensions for understanding teaching and learning.

**Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Teacher Preparation**

In contrast to the emphasis on the subject matter and pedagogical skills which characterized teacher competency in the 1970’s, since the 1980’s attention has shifted to the evaluation of teachers with an emphasis on the assessment of capacity to teaching (Shulman, 1986a). By introducing the concept of PCK, Shulman (1986a) has made us aware of the seriousness of “the missing paradigm” (p. 7), in which teacher educators and educational researchers have ignored the role of subject matter in effective instruction.

Recognizing that knowledge of subject matter has been a major concern in
national calls for education reform, Holt-Reynolds (1999) explored the role that such knowledge plays in a prospective teacher’s conceptualization of skillful and successful teaching. By using cases to explore PCK, Kleinfeld (1992) found that student teachers need prior subject background to benefit from cases of PCK. Research on the relationship between teachers’ subject area knowledge and teaching effectiveness found that teachers’ subject knowledge influences their choice of instructional strategies (Grossman, 1990). Betts and Frost (2000) suggested that to create a positive relationship between knowledge and effectiveness, a greater focus on breadth of subject knowledge in teacher education programs is the best way to prepare teachers to implement curricular requirements at all grade levels, particularly grades K-8.

In her study, Turner-Bisset (1999) suggested that the concept of PCK as the set containing other sets of knowledge bases can be the comprehensive framework in designing the content and structure of initial teacher education courses. Zeidler (1999) explored the role of PCK with a focus on the influence of it in the teaching of learning. If the PCK is not sufficiently present, teacher educators may merely be quite efficient in presenting students with rote information.

However, if the PCK is sufficiently present, students are exposed to the teachers’ explicit and implicit teaching message and afforded the opportunity to construct meaning from symbols and images in a manner that allows them to comprehend and restructure the underlying relationships that represent the character of the subject. Accordingly, in teacher preparation the act of exemplary teaching requires the combination of subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge with PCK. As Ashton (1990) claimed, “teacher education strategies are needed to help prospective teachers develop their understanding of PCK and skill in pedagogical reasoning” (p. 2).
From the viewpoint of constructivists, Cochran et al. (1993) extended the notion of PCK by emphasizing that teachers must develop their PCK and subject matter knowledge in the context of two other components of teacher knowledge: teachers’ understanding of students and of the environmental context of learning. For constructivists, a comprehension of each student’s understanding and the environmental contexts (the social, political, cultural, and physical environmental contexts) that shape the teaching and learning process are crucial elements to effective teaching and learning. Teachers must develop their pedagogical knowledge and subject matter knowledge in the context of these two components.

According to Cochran et al.’s (1993) statement, “If the construction of teacher understanding is situated in context, then teacher preparation must occur in contexts that promote active, simultaneous learning about all components of teaching” (p. 4). In this sense, “teacher education should promote learning in contexts where the goals are focused on teaching specific content to specific students in specific contexts” (p. 4). Cochran et al. (1993) suggested that the developmental model of pedagogical content knowing for teacher preparation includes four components: the knowledge of pedagogy, the knowledge of subject matter, the knowledge of students, and the knowledge of environmental context.

For Cochran et al. (1993), the model of PCK served as a framework for providing pre-service teachers with a coherent and integrated set of skills and understanding of teaching. For the development of pedagogical content knowing, a series of principles (Cochran et al., 1993, pp. 269-270) were suggested that can be constructed in the teacher
Pedagogical content knowing development requires conceptually integrated instruction across liberal arts, pedagogy, and subject area courses for these types of knowledge to develop concurrently.

How we develop pedagogical content knowing in teacher preparation programs may depend on the grade level focus of those programs.

The construction of pedagogical content knowing results from multiple opportunities to teach, to observe, and to reflect on one’s own teaching and that of others in a content area.

Development of pedagogical content knowing requires early, continued, and authentic field experiences with opportunities for real teaching and follow-up reflection and feedback.

Because of its integrated nature, pedagogical content knowing development cannot occur only in a separate course, such as a capstone seminar.

Case studies, peer coaching, cooperative classroom methods, hypermedia, microteaching, and team teaching promote pedagogical content knowing development.

Competent beginning teachers continue to develop toward more integrated pedagogical content knowing with experience.

Professional Development of the Teacher Educator

The goal of renewal in schooling is directly linked to renewal in teacher preparation programs (Goodlad, 1990a). The reform of teacher education programs has a
tendency to replace the traditional application-of-theory model with more reflective approaches (Kortagen & Kessels, 1999). According to Goodlad (1990a), the argument for this shift is that traditional teacher education programs prepared prospective teachers who could not manage the realities of the classroom. Teacher educators in this sense are expected to understand and apply the ideas and knowledge, which would enhance the best teaching practices.

**The Role of Teacher Educator**

In order to provide an integrative curriculum to student teachers for their best understanding of subject content and educational reasoning in teaching, Placek and O’Sullivan (1997) advocated that teacher educators should be able to help student teachers develop PCK to provide meaningful and challenging integrated curricular experiences.

By calling for attention to pedagogical content knowledge, Shulman (1986a, b) has argued convincingly that pedagogy needed to shift from generic to more content-specific approaches to conceptualizing and studying teaching and educating teachers. In the field of teacher preparation, a major role a teacher educator plays is to teach teaching. In this sense, “teaching about teaching” in the teacher education programs should also be seen as the subject matter knowledge. In teacher preparation, teacher educators should organize content and pedagogy with the knowledge of “teaching how to teach” to the diverse interests and abilities of student teachers (Loughran & Russell, 1997).

Rethinking teacher education programs in terms of designing curriculum, Sosniak (1999) suggested that a helpful mechanism is for teacher educators to use principles of
decision making as a basis value position to define their teacher education programs for themselves and for their students. Principles here serve as underpinnings embedded in all curriculum decisions. As Sosniak (1999) puts it:

Decision about what knowledge is of most worth for teacher education, about how we should balance and integrate the various components of a preservice teacher education curriculum, and about what rules or principles of practice should determine the content of teacher education are decisions about what we value and how we believe we can best serve those values. (p. 201)

With the discovery of prospective teachers’ deficiency in making connections between subject matter knowledge and related experiences (Adams, 1998), a challenge teacher educators faced is how to focus on the subject matter preparation and meaningful subject related experiences of prospective teachers. Holt-Reynolds (1999) further suggested teacher educators should help prospective teachers recognize their subject matter expertise and learn ways to share and model it with students. The methods that teacher educators have employed to help teachers learn included providing learning experiences for practicing teachers, learning experiences for prospective teachers, and case-based learning experiences for teachers (R. T. Putnam & Borko, 2000).

However, Wood and Geddis (1999) observed that there is little consensus about the nature of programs to prepare novices for teaching, and there often appears to be a lack of coherence between what teacher educators claimed to be desirable pedagogy and the means that are sometimes used to teach these pedagogical skills. Wood and Geddis (1999) explored the use of a strategy call self-conscious narrative—a modeling of effective teaching behaviors to provide insight into the practice of teacher educators.
According to this study, the strategy of self-conscious narrative helped to provide student teachers with insights into the thinking and pedagogical intents of the teacher educator and provided a way to monitor the coherence between what teacher educators profess and how they profess it. In this study, by using self-conscious narrative, the teacher educator was able to represent for his pre-service students both pedagogical actions and the pedagogical thinking that underpins them.

The Narrative Way of Understanding the Pedagogical Content Knowledge of Teacher Educator

The beliefs, understanding, and know-how to inform teacher educators to teach as they do make up the practical knowing region of teacher educators—their own special form of professional understanding. For teacher educators, the explanations of a teaching model are not only presenting something, they are also always for someone—prospective teachers. Teachers’ PCK is a complex set. The act of transforming understanding into teaching someone to comprehend represents the intrinsic narrative characteristic of PCK (Gudmundsdottir, 1995). It can be better presented by understanding how the teacher was shaped by the larger professional knowledge context and also the ways in which the professional knowledge context has been reshaped in the unique situation in which the teachers' lives and works were constructed.

Seeing narrative inquiry as part of the phenomena of educational experience, Clandinin (1993) advocated that teachers construct and reconstruct their personal practical knowledge as they story and re-story their educational experiences. The narrative inquiry provides an approach to understanding how teacher educators
professionalize the subject matter knowledge of teaching how to teach. The professional self formation is an ongoing process that involves the interpretation and reinterpretation of experiences as teacher educators live through them. As D.E. Polkinghorne (1988) said, “we achieve our identities and self-concept through the use of the narrative configuration and make our existence into a whole by understanding it as an expression of a simple and unfolding story” (p. 150). The process of constructing and reconstructing the self is a meaning making search process in which we carve ourselves from our families, our past, and our lives. The narrative becomes the vehicle of choice for teacher educators in capturing the ways by which they constitute their own teacher knowledge while carving personal meaning by building their lifelong experiences.

Professional and Personal Knowledge of Teacher Educator

Based on the structure of teachers’ knowledge proposed by Shulman and Sykes (1986), Tamir (1991), in his study of analyzing the relationship between professional knowledge and personal practical knowledge of teachers, indicated that the professional knowledge of a teacher educator consists of four components: subject matter knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge, subject matter specific pedagogical knowledge, and teacher education pedagogical knowledge. The teacher education pedagogical knowledge can be seen as the knowledge of “teaching how to teach” with which teacher educators engage student teachers in learning activities such as presenting effective ways of communicating or modeling a useful teaching strategy to novice teachers concerning the distinction between problem, hypothesis, and assumption. With an emphasis on personalizing professional knowledge, Tamir (1991) identified a big challenge every
teacher educator would face: “to create occasions which would enable him or her to communicate the professional knowledge in such a way that its becoming personal knowledge of the student teachers is facilitated” (p. 266). Teacher education pedagogical knowledge, however, is accumulated by each teacher educator during the years in which he or she is engaged in teacher education: the experiences vary. The way in which the knowledge a teacher educator applies such knowledge in a certain class activity under certain environment for particular purpose is personally characterized.

In response to the calls for the reform of teacher education that places pressure on teacher educators to modify their program of instruction for nurturing prospective teachers, Bodycott (1997) advocated one approach that helped teacher educators examine the influence of personal history on preservice teacher thinking. Morine-Dershimer and Kent (1999) also emphasized that general pedagogical knowledge is ultimately combined with personal pedagogical knowledge, which includes personal beliefs and perceptions about teaching. They argued that the most important aspect of generic knowledge that impacts teaching is context-specific pedagogical knowledge. This knowledge was created through reflective, active processing and the integration of general pedagogical knowledge and personal pedagogical knowledge. In this sense the teaching experience is seen as a critical aspect of pedagogical knowledge because the general pedagogical knowledge has to apply to varied classroom situations where teachers perform practice.

Romanowski (1997) found from his personal experiences as a supervisor of student teachers that a teacher’s personal life, experiences, and values play an integral role in shaping the manner in which the discipline is taught. Therefore, understanding individual approaches to transforming content knowledge would help teachers understand
what they choose to teach, why they choose it, and how it affects student education. As Romanowski (1997) put it, “It is important for pre-service teachers to understand that there are multiple ways of viewing content knowledge and that these perspectives rely upon one's understanding of the world” (p. 28). In response, teacher educators must provide prospective teachers with the skills and knowledge necessary to uncover the values embedded in PCK.

In order to enrich the resources of teacher education, Tamir (1991) concluded that “a teacher educator must have a repertoire of learning experiences for student teachers which is designed to match the present state of professional and personal knowledge of his or her student teachers” (p. 266). The more personal-professional knowledge a teacher educator has from the reflection of their teaching experience, the more professional teacher education pedagogical knowledge will be developed. Having personal-professional knowledge of teaching from the experiences of case studies written by teacher educators based on their own teaching experiences in teacher education will not only benefit the teacher educators in their field of educating future teachers, but also facilitate a meaningful and highly retentive learning process for student teachers.

Teacher Reflection and Professional Development

The model of pedagogical reasoning and action originally developed by Shulman (1987) provided a key to understanding the professional growth of teachers. The synthesis between teachers’ pedagogy and their understanding of content is thought to be the foundation of their PCK, so teachers’ PCK influences their teaching in ways that will best stimulate students’ learning for understanding.
According to Gudmundsdottir (1990), Shulman’s ideas of transformation of subject matter emphasized that “the content in pedagogical content knowledge has to be reorganized to take into consideration students, classrooms, and curriculum” (p. 47). Marks (1990) saw the development of PCK as a process involving interpretation and transformation of subject matter. In the process of interpreting and transforming the teaching content, it is the idea of “interaction” between different kinds of knowledge that takes teaching knowledge into teaching practice (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1990). Cochran et al. (1993) also held similar perspectives and described pedagogical content knowing based on a constructivist view of teaching and teacher preparation which emphasizes knowing and understanding as active processes rather than a set of knowledge bases in combinations. There is a new view of knowledge and thinking known as the situative perspective which states that cognition is situated in specific physical and social contexts, is social in nature, and is distributed across individuals, other people, and tools (R. T. Putnam & Borko, 2000). For example, the composition of the PCK bases varies according to what subject is being taught. Seeing knowledge as interacting sets imply on the knowledge bases for teaching are instantly adjusted depending on interactions with different students, different context, or different subjects.

How to teach and what is teaching are not crafts but art-like works. Teaching is a complex process; no two teachers have the same teaching cognition for certain teaching activities. As Kelchtermans (1993) put it, teachers’ cognitions about teaching and being a teacher are organized in a “personal interpretive framework” (p.447). The framework is a lens through which teachers’ concerns, views, values are underpinning their classroom practice. In order to understand the development of the professional self as a teacher, the
exploration of the teacher’s subjective educational theory is intrinsic (Janssens & Kelchtermans, 1997). Through reflection, the cognition of “professional know-how,” instead of being tacit or only partially conscious for teachers, can be explicitly evoked and stated. In their research on experienced teacher’s professional development, Janssens and Kelchtermans (1997) found two main interconnecting grounds which construct the personal interpretive framework: “a set of conceptions about oneself as a teacher, the professional self and a personal system of knowledge and values concerning teaching and being a teacher, the subjective educational theory” (p. 1). In a self-analysis study, Gibson (1998) found the intersection between her personal beliefs and teaching practices becoming apparent to her while she engaged in a practice-theory dialectical process. In examining the instructional approach that absorbs culturally relevant pedagogy, the study revealed what had existed within her value system as an invisible background moved to the foreground. One implication of this study is that in face-to-face encounters with others in communities and through group activities, the opportunity exists to engage in a process that can expose and explore the dynamic quality of the relationships among ideologies and practice.

Summary

There is a growing attention in the research field of teaching on what counts as a knowledge base for teaching. With an effort toward advocating the intrinsic notion of PCK in the reform of school education and teacher education, researchers have showed their interests in the investigation of the development of teacher’s knowledge and its impact. PCK is seen as a practical way of knowing the subject matter, the curricular texts,
the student teachers, and teacher education contexts within which teachers practice their teaching.

Research regarding PCK is focused both on the areas of preservice and inservice teacher education. Some studies investigate either specific subjects such as science, mathematics, chemistry, geography, or English or they focus on levels of expertise including on teacher training, on novices, and on experienced teachers. Another research line involves the study of constructions and sources of teacher knowledge. By answering the question of what useful knowledge informs good teaching, the domains of teacher knowledge that drew from the related researchers’ findings can be categorized as subjective matter knowledge; curriculum knowledge; general pedagogical knowledge; knowledge of teaching; knowledge of learners and their characteristics; knowledge of self; knowledge of educational contexts; and knowledge of educational ends, purposes, and values.

A shifting trend of how and what is perceived as knowledge about teaching is seeing it as a pre-set subject compared to seeing it as a process of experiencing. The impact of this new approach on the reform of teacher education is seeing teacher learning as more constructivist rather than transmission-oriented, and the focus has moved from what teachers do to the knowledge teachers hold. While advocating the reflective-oriented approach for teacher preparation, teacher educators are expected to help student teachers develop PCK with which to learn how to teach and provide meaningful curricular experiences that would be integrated as student teachers’ personal practical knowledge. In addition, the conception of PCK provides a key to understanding the growth of the professional selves of teacher educators. From the point of view of PCK,
teaching is an interactive process that takes different kinds of knowledge including knowledge of the subject, student, classroom, and curriculum into teaching practice. Through narrative reflection, the teacher educators’ professional know-how can be explicitly presented.
CHAPTER THREE
Methodology

The qualitative design of this research encompassed a “narrative inquiry” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) case study of CARE teacher educators’ pedagogical content knowledge (PCK). This study articulated and examined the components of CARE instructors’ PCK structure and how they incorporated educational perspectives and values in the framework of their PCK.

Case Study as Qualitative Research

Choosing a study design requires understanding the philosophical fundamentals underlying the particular type of research to be done. Qualitative research is an umbrella concept which may embody several forms of inquiry, such as ethnography, phenomenology, field research, grounded theory, and case study. The key philosophical assumption about qualitative research is the idea that reality is constructed by individuals interacting with their social world (Merriam, 1998). The case study is one type of qualitative research that is particularly interested in investigating a contextual phenomenon of a limited number of people and events and their relationships. A case study design is employed to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and its meaning for those involved. The purpose is “in process rather than outcomes, in context rather than a specific variable, in discovery rather than confirmation” (Merriam, 1998, p. 19).
Qualitative case studies are prevalent in research in the field of education. The elements constituting a case study vary depending on the focus. Placing an emphasis on the research process and research method, Yin (1994) defined a case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p. 13). On the other hand, researchers, Merriam (1988) and Wolcott (1992) saw a case study in terms of its end-product and defined a case study as an intensive description and an analysis of a unit or set, rather than a strategy or method. Some other researchers who placed an emphasis on the “case” are focused on a “bounded system” (L. M. Smith, 1978) or “unit of study” (Stake, 1995) as the definition of case study.

Even though the definitions are quite different, it is generally true that if the phenomenon a researcher is interested in studying is not intrinsically bounded, it cannot be considered a case. In order to assess the boundedness of a topic, Merriam (1998) suggested that one ask how finite the data collection would be. For example, in this study, I chose as the research setting a college teacher educator’s teaching practice in the classroom, and this “teaching practice in classroom” could be seen as a bounded system. In this study setting, there were individual college teacher educators, in a particular circumstance, doing a particular task. If there is no end to the number of people who could be interviewed or there is a field with no limit on the number of observations that could be conducted, then the phenomenon is not bounded enough to qualify as a case (Merriam, 1998).

My research interests were more focused on understanding the teaching process rather than the outcome of the selected phenomenon, thus requiring a qualitative type of
case study. In this qualitative case study, because the research purpose has been chosen by the researcher to investigate how teacher educators’ teach what they teach, the goal of the study is insight, discovery, and the interpretation of people in context, rather than the test of a hypothesis. Because the concentration of the qualitative case study is on a single phenomenon or unit in a case study, Yin (1994) emphasized the importance of the analysis of the context-related investigation and interpretation, noting that it is impossible to separate the phenomenon’s variables from their context. As Sanders (1981) concluded, the spirit of case study is to help us “understand processes of events, projects, and programs and to discover context characteristics that will shed light on an issue or object” (p. 44).

**Narrative Inquiry as Case Study Tool**

From the perspective of narrative inquiry, Connelly and Clandinin (2000) linked the relation between narrative and knowledge and saw teacher knowledge as something lifelike and storied that appears in ever-changing shapes. They argued that a teacher’s knowledge is narratively constructed by the teacher’s personal reflection in the teaching context (Connelly & Clandinin, 2000). Thus, for teacher educators, teacher education is a process of involvement in a reflective storying and restorying journey, which they experience as they teach student teachers in a classroom. This study used narrative inquiry as a case study tool (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) to explore the college teacher educators’ PCK in teacher preparation.

Narrative is seen as a phenomenon and method in educational research (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, 2000). Narrative expresses the structured experiences to be explored.
At the same time, it articulates the approach of inquiry for its exploration. According to Clandinin (1992), the narrative inquiry process “is a process of data collection, mutual narrative interpretation by practitioners and researchers, more data collection and further narrative reconstruction. The narrative inquiry process itself is a narrative one of storying, restorying, and restorying again” (p. 128).

The Narrative Nature of PCK

Researchers have found that how teachers use their knowledge is highly interpretive, socially negotiated, and continually restructured within the classrooms and schools where they work (Clandinin, 1986; Grossman, 1990). The concept of PCK refers to the teachers’ ways of knowing and understanding the content they are going to teach. The knowing and understanding is “unique for teachers and teaching” (Shulman, 1987). This individualized way of knowing portrays teaching as an interpretative activity in which teachers’ personal and social values and meanings are embodied in the curriculum they teach.

Because human beings are meaning makers, the mind is not like a mirror that reflects only the outside world. One’s mind is an “active verb” (Dewey 1934, p. 268). In this regard, Riessman (1993) has reminded us that “informant’s stories do not mirror a world ‘out there.’ They are constructed, creatively authored, rhetorical, replete with assumptions, and interpretive” (pp. 4-5). In the process of narrative construction, teachers and students not only reflect their own cultures, but they also respect and tolerate conflicting views from other cultures. From the narrative view, as Bruner (1990) argued, “the act of grasping a narrative is a dual one: the interpreter has to grasp the narrative’s
configuring plot in order to make sense of its constituents, which he must relate to that plot” (p. 43). Aristotle’s notion of “mimesis” has an important meaning in terms of education. The notion of “mimesis was the capturing of ‘life in action,’ an elaboration and amelioration of what happened” (Bruner, 1990, p. 46). With “mimesis,” teacher and students have the space to feel free to question and interpret the experiences and realities constructed in their culture and history, and this is where the “transformation” and “creation” come from (Bruner, 1990).

In the field of teacher education, researchers have valued the work done on personal teaching knowledge, viewing it as an important source in understanding the process of learning to teach (Clandinin, 1993; Tamir, 1991). In her study, Carter (1995) found that with an emphasis on the interplay of teachers’ interpretations with classroom situations and the broader world of educational ideologies, the focus of teacher education shifts from the knowledge bases that teachers should have to the teachers themselves and their understanding of their own teaching.

Gudmundsdottir (1995) emphasized that PCK is developed by teachers in the process of working with teaching content, students, and environments. It is a personal method of transformation in which stories and narratives are the tools teachers utilize for making sense of experience and developing practical knowledge. In the process of interpreting and transforming the teaching content, it is the idea of “interaction” between different kinds of knowledge that transforms teaching knowledge into teaching practice (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1990). This approach echoes the analysis made by Bruner (1990) about the narrative ways of knowing about the self and the world. The narrative
approach is interpretive, where the teacher engages in the interactions among teacher, students, and environment.

*The Narrative Inquiry of PCK*

Teachers both define and think about their teaching knowledge narratively (Connelly and Clandinin, 2000). Narrative can be viewed as phenomenon and method (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; 2000). As a phenomenon, a teacher’s knowledge is a narrative and it is studied and thought about as a narrative. On the other hand, the study of a teacher’s knowledge is a result of the work of narrative inquiry. The narrative way of thinking needs interpretation. A reader or a listener is invited into dialogic interaction with the story context and creates an interpretation that is meaningful. Narrative inquiry is a tool for organizing cluttered events into a coherent and meaningfully constructed whole. In this sense, a narrative approach to exploring professional development holds rich potential for enhancing our understanding of college teacher educators and the possible roles they might play in student teachers’ developmental processes.

Because she sees narrative inquiry as part of the phenomenon of educational experience, Clandinin (1993) advocated that teachers construct and reconstruct their personal practical knowledge as they story and restory their educational experience. Teaching knowledge can be better presented by understanding how the teacher was shaped by the larger professional knowledge context and also the ways that the professional knowledge context has been reshaped in the unique situation in which the teacher lives and works.
Narrative inquiry provides an approach to understanding how college teacher educators professionalize the act of teaching student teachers about the concept of teaching. The professional self-formation in teaching is an ongoing process that involves the interpretation and reinterpretation of experiences as teacher educators live through them. D. E. Polkinghorne (1988) says that “we achieve our identities and self-concept through the use of the narrative configuration and make our existence into a whole by understanding it as an expression of a simple and unfolding story” (p. 150).

The process of constructing and reconstructing the self is a meaning-making experience in which we define ourselves based on our families, our past, and our lives. The narrative becomes the vehicle of choice for teachers in capturing the ways by which they constitute their own teacher knowledge. They accomplish this while seeking personal meaning by building on their lifelong experience.

In the process of narrative inquiry, I, as the researcher, played the role of an active and accepting listener trying to capture and understand the meanings that teacher educators made in their pedagogical reasoning. In this study, narrative inquiry provided the necessary structure for data collecting and analysis while leaving space for the teacher educators to tell their stories and narratives in their own words.

*Approaching Data Collection: Appreciative Inquiry*

The context of this study was the world of the democratic teacher educators’ classrooms. Through the use of narrative inquiry methodology, this case study explored the PCK of college teacher educators in their daily world of teaching teachers.
As a qualitative case study, to make the field entering purposeful rather than arbitrary and the onset of data collection with a theoretical perspective, the approach of appreciative inquiry served as the base for the designing of interview questions. Given the exploratory nature of this study, there was no preconceived framework to start the data collection. Therefore, in conducting interviews, I chose appreciative inquiry as a tool to frame the interview questions.

Appreciative inquiry, as introduced by Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987), is a methodological tool aiming to inspire people to discover the values and strengths of their organization and community, and hence to develop a collective vision that will support the building of a desired community or organization.

Appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987) was originally developed as a new paradigm created to replace the conventional problem-solving methods used in the study of organizations. By asking positive questions, appreciative inquiry represents a new way of seeing the world. The later development of appreciative inquiry was extended to various fields of study such as community development (Bowling & Brahm, 2002), social innovation (Cooperrider, Sorensen, Whitney, & Yaeger, 2000), and education (Egan & Feyerherm, 2004; Norum, Wells, Hoadley, & Geary, 2002; Ryan, Soven, Smither, Sullivan, & VanBuskirk, 1999; Yballe & O’Connor, 2000).

In the field of education, building on the values of appreciative inquiry, Yballe and O’Connor (2000) developed an appreciative pedagogy approach to classroom management by inquiring about the peak performances and successful experiences of students and professors. In their research, they found that the development of the classroom culture during the appreciative pedagogy process opened up new possibilities.
and the focus on the positive image could lead to “anticipatory realities” (Cooperrider, 1990, p. 96).

The source of the positive vision is drawn from people’s previous and current best experiences with the related forces, success factors, people, and the environment that contributed to the experience. The process of appreciative inquiry usually is accomplished through face-to-face interviews with organizational members.

In this case study, although with goal of exploration and discovery rather than the building of collective vision or anticipatory results, the interview techniques developed by researchers in appreciative inquiry were seen as valuable when constructing the teacher educator’s interview questions and student teacher’s questionnaire. In other words, the approach of appreciative inquiry gave the data collection of this study a theoretical perspective in terms of raising and framing interview questions.

Within the context of narrative inquiry, I attempted to use appreciative inquiry to initiate the identifying and examining of the strengths and knowledge of the CARE instructors’ PCK structure. As an exploratory case study, however, this investigation remained a naturalistic narrative inquiry into the CARE instructors’ teaching stories and the interpretations of their pedagogical reasoning and actions.

According to the appreciative inquiry method, the resulting information comes primarily in the form of stories. Four types of questions are categorized to construct the framework of appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider & Whitney, 1999, 2002; Hammond, 1998). It is outlined as the following “4D” model:

1. Discover: appreciate “best of what is” (about yourself and other people)
2. Dream: envision “what might be” (the knowledge of what works best)
3. Design: create “what should be” (the image of the ideal)

4. Destiny (Delivery): be innovative about and collaborate on “what will be” (to share and sustain the efforts)

The appreciative inquiry method was developed mainly through the study of organizational development and community development (e.g. Bowling & Brahm, 2002; Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987). Although the goal of this study was to extend the understanding of teacher educators’ classroom teaching in a context of democratic education rather than to build a 4D model of the CARE program at the organizational level, I used appreciative inquiry to collect teacher educators’ successful experiences as a starting point to understand their interpretations and to identify the elements of the strengths and power that made their teaching come alive.

To give an example of how appreciative inquiry was merged into this narrative inquiry study, in the sharing of their best teaching experiences, a teaching approach which emerged from the four CARE instructors’ pedagogical views was class discussion. From the interviews and class observations, it was found that the four CARE instructors’ best teaching moments all happened in the context of class discussion activities. The class discussion as the CARE instructors’ instructional delivery approach further directed my inquiry into the CARE instructors’ pedagogical reasoning of the utilization of class discussion and how the CARE teacher educators used class discussion activities to engage CARE students’ learning and understanding of being a democratic teacher.

Applying the appreciative inquiry framework to the CARE instructors interview questions and the CARE students’ learning experience questionnaire, the first type of question (discover question) for the teacher educators, for example, was to ask for a
teaching story about the best experience or high point of their teaching practice, in terms of transforming content or concepts into the instructional realm.

In the interviews, I asked the CARE instructors to reflect on their teaching time with the CARE students and describe one high point, a time when they felt most energetic and engaged in a creative, meaningful teaching performance in terms of fostering democratic teachers. The narrating process was a reciprocal interaction between the informants and researcher. During the interview, the CARE instructors were encouraged to recall and to have self reflections on what topic or activity they were talking about or conducting, what they did to make it a peak teaching experience, who was involved, and what other contributing components combined to make it a high point for them.

The second type of question (dream question) was about valuing the people and the system. The CARE instructors were asked what they valued most about themselves, their teaching, the people they worked with (CARE students, CARE instructors), the PCK creation process, and the CARE program. The third type of question (design question) was what was it that gave life to their PCK and to the CARE program? This question extracted the specific scenario about what gave life to the configuration of teacher educators’ PCK and sought to understand why it made the teaching come alive. In this group of questions, the CARE instructors were expected to describe, in detail, the core factors that make teaching work best. The fourth type of question (destiny question) was a question about the future and invited people to picture an ideal image of the future function system. The purpose of this question was to engage members of an organization or system in building a shared vision to create better possibilities.
In this study, the research goal was to understand “what” the college teacher educators’ PCK was and to investigate “how” the educational values and perspectives that the teacher educators stand for were incorporated into their classroom teaching. With the understanding of the strengths of appreciative inquiry approach, the structure of the four-type questioning techniques were selectively used in framing the interview questions in this narrative inquiry exploratory case study.

_Design of the Study_

_Setting_

In the College of Education at Ohio University, within the Teacher Education Department, there is a teacher preparation program called Creating Active and Reflective Educators (CARE) for Democratic Education. The CARE program is a partnership between the Teacher Education Department in the College of Education at Ohio University and the Federal Hocking Local Schools. The CARE program’s premise is based on John Dewey’s views on the connections between democracy and education. This program was selected as the setting to study the college teacher educators’ PCK.

The CARE program initially was called the Teacher Education for Civil Responsibility (TECR) program, during its first two years, from 1989-1990. It is “an intensive and rigorous undergraduate three year program that blends theory with practice so that teachers can make educational choices reflectively in order to ensure that their classroom practice enhances learning and democratic citizenship” (CARE Handbook, 2003, p. 1).
Based on John Dewey’s views on the connection between democracy and education, five fundamental themes are integrated in the CARE program’s course work and classroom experiences (CARE Handbook, 2003, p. 4-5).

Theme one – SOCIAL/CULTURAL: In a democratic society, a primary role of the school is to develop in students the habits of the heart and mind that make active and full democratic citizenship possible. Education is not a neutral endeavor. It is both a social activity and an institution that is embedded in an always changing socio-cultural context.

Theme two – NATURE OF THE LEARNER: Students will explore the nature of the child as learner and how psychological, emotional, cognitive, and physical development impacts learning and teaching in the classroom. The child comes to school as a naturally curious learner and meaning-maker. CARE students will explore how to keep this natural wonder and curiosity alive throughout all grade levels by opening a window to the world.

Theme three – CURRICULUM: Curriculum may be defined as the sum total of the experiences that a child has in school. The choices that teachers make should be predicated upon enhancing the intellectual, moral, and social development of each child within the context of a democratic society.

Theme four – PEDAGOGY: The role of the teacher in the democratic classroom goes beyond providing students with information to enhancing their social, emotional, and intellectual development through experience. Understanding that children have different learning styles, teachers will explore how to utilize creative and active strategies
that allow children to have experience with various educative processes, as well as multiple ways to construct knowledge.

Theme five – PRAXIS AND PARTNERSHIP: The CARE partnership adheres to three basic commitments in teacher education. These are: (1) praxis: that the best teacher preparation includes a blending of theory and practice, and that these two domains inform each other to create a stronger sense of teaching, (2) partnership: the preparation of teachers should involve practicing educators, students, and university researchers as an educational team. In addition, education should connect with the community in a variety of settings for learning and service and (3) a commitment to explore the democratic notion of the “common good amidst diversity” as it applies to one’s local, national, and global citizenship. These approaches will prepare teachers to be active and valuable educational leaders in the classroom, school, and community.

Participants

In qualitative research, a sample must be selected from those who possess special experience and competence so as to provide insights for understanding and discovery (Merriam, 1998). The selection processes need to consider whether those selected will reflect the rationale of the study and answer the research questions posed. This reasonable selection strategy is called “purposeful sampling” in qualitative research (Patton, 1990, p. 169).

There are ten instructors in the CARE program. In this study, four participants were selected on the basis of their current status as teacher educators within the CARE program. Two CARE instructors taught educational learning courses while the other two
CARE instructors taught teaching methods courses in the CARE program. The design of this research was an in-depth investigation, and the four CARE instructors were invited as research informants along with two CARE cohort groups of sophomore and junior classes totaling 55 students.

In order to obtain rich information about the PCK, the variety of CARE instructors expertise in different fields (early childhood, middle childhood, and adolescent young adult), and their past and present teaching experiences (the involvement in college and/or K-12 school teaching) were the criteria for selecting instructors as study informants. Because of the teaching expertise that instructors had in different fields, this case study was conducted to capture multiple insights into the understanding of the components of the CARE instructors’ PCK. The different teaching experiences which the CARE instructors possessed contributed rich and diverse information for a broader conceptualization of teacher educators’ PCK in fostering future teachers.

Information and insights about PCK provided by CARE instructors offered a cross-comparison and analysis data to articulate a holistic picture of what democratic teacher education was. The class observations and interviews were conducted over two academic quarters during the 2003-4 school year. Research data was collected by taking field notes during four separate classroom observations totaling sixteen hours in each CARE instructor’s class and from three interviews of each CARE instructor during the quarter I observed in his/her class. Pseudonyms were assigned to protect the identity of this study’s informants, the CARE instructors and CARE students.

As discussed in the literature review, the PCK, rather than a static teaching craft, is depicted as individualized and contextualized teaching action. Little attention has been
given to the study of college teacher educators’ PCK. Thus, research into college teacher educators’ PCK such as that which has been conducted in this study was a preliminary inquiry in the research field of PCK. This research purpose was to examine a common and particular representation of college teacher educators’ PCK in a teacher education program. Therefore, I focused my investigation on the teacher educators in one teacher preparation program to identify components that constitute their PCK. The study finding was presented and compared as a data analysis of the CARE instructors’ PCK in the CARE program.

Data Collection and Analysis

Triangulation and member check were used as the major strategies to establish the trustworthiness of this study. The purpose of establishing trustworthiness is to convince other researchers and readers that the research findings are worth attention and are valid for the context (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990). Triangulation is a study method that ensures the utilization of multiple data sources in a study. In this study, interviews, class observation, and documents analysis constituted the three methods for data collection in order to avoid bias and increase the research reliability (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). Data collecting from triangulation methods, as sources of evidence, was compared and contrasted with cross-check data and interpretation to confirm the data.

Interviews. Interviews for each of the participating CARE instructors were conducted as data resources for this study. In order to obtain rich information about teacher educators’ PCK, a general PCK interview and pre- and post-class unit interviews
were used to collect the data. The interview questions were designed as data-collecting tools to gather research information (see Appendix A and Appendix B). Pilot interviews on four former and current CARE instructors were conducted to test the interview questions and some of the questions were adjusted to meet the desired results for this study.

(1) PCK of teacher preparation interview: An audio-taped interview with semi-structured, open-ended questions was conducted for each participating CARE instructor. The philosophy of appreciative inquiry informed the framework for conducting interviews, citing best experiences of teaching CARE classes, and encouraging the CARE instructors to retrieve the high points of their teaching and reflect on the scenario and other components. The interview was characterized as a self-stimulated reflection process in which the instructors were asked to look back reflectively at teaching stories and experiences contributing to their roles as teacher educators in a democratic teacher preparation program. For example:

Q: Share a highlight moment of your teaching in CARE. As you share your story, consider the following: What made it a great teaching experience? What subject or content were you teaching? What did you do to engage student teachers to explore the subject or content? What knowledge and teaching strategies did you use? Who was involved? What did the students do to make it a good experience? What other things contributed to making it a high point of teaching CARE student teachers?
Q: What characteristics or components of the CARE program affect you most in your classroom teaching? How do they affect your thinking and teaching about what and how you teach?

Q: Based on your personal and professional experience in CARE, what do you value most about your teaching?

Q: In CARE, how do you explain to student teachers that the concept of democratic education is important for them to learn?

Q: If “teaching” is a subject matter that you are going to teach in a CARE class, what would you do to organize the concept in your teaching and do to engage student teachers to explore it? In doing so, what materials, knowledge, and strategies are you going to use? How would you decide which ones to use?

Q: If there are pedagogical strategies a democratic teacher educator should map as essential for teaching, what do you think they are? Why?

(2) Pre- and post-class unit interview: Teachers are not always aware of their pedagogical reasoning in their daily classroom teaching (Polanyi, 1967; Zanting et al., 1998). Thus pre- and post-class unit interviews were designed for this study. Participating CARE instructors were invited to have pre- and post-class interviews. Through the interviews, both I, as the researcher, and the participants had the space to communicate about their pedagogical reasoning and actions by having a conversation about the class activities and clarifying ideas expressed in the prior interviews.

In the post class interview, by reviewing the specific teaching instances in the class, the CARE instructors were able to make more explicit
about how they engaged CARE student with their pedagogical thinking in specific situations. Instead of talking in the pre-class interviews about what ideas and activities they planned to apply in the class, post class interviews provided opportunities for the CARE instructors to further articulate how ideas and activities were organized that underpinned their pedagogical reasoning and actions.

With the agreement of the teacher educators, a class unit was selected and observed. Before the selected class unit, an interview was conducted with the CARE instructors to elicit information on how the teaching material and ideas would be organized and presented in the class. The pre-class interview question examples are:

Q: What general concerns did you have in teaching a CARE class?

Q: What content or topic are you going to teach in this coming class unit? How are you going to organize tonight’s class, and what are your reasons for doing so? What other ways might you think about organizing it?

Q: What teaching materials and strategies are you going to use to enhance CARE students’ learning and understanding of the subject matter in this coming class unit?

Q: How would you describe your knowledge and skills of the subject or topic you are going to teach for this class unit?

Q: In the CARE class, how and what do you do to help CARE students integrate subject matter, pedagogy, and learning environments in learning to teach?
After the pre-class unit interview was transcribed, a post-class interview with the CARE instructors was conducted, which was an effective method to stimulate the CARE instructors’ recall of their thinking during the class and to have a self evaluation about what they intended and what they actually experienced. The following are examples of the questions asked.

Q: Share the best teaching moment of this class. What made it a high point? What did the student teachers do to make it a good experience? What did you do to make it a good experience? What other components contributed to it?

Q: How do you evaluate your teaching performance in this CARE class in terms of building a democratic learning community?

Q: If you were going to teach the same unit again to the same group, how would you organize it? Would you organize it in a different way? What parts would be changed?

Q: If there are three essential components or strategies to effectively integrate democratic ideas into your teaching practice, what do you think they are?

Class observation. CARE classrooms were the field study sites for the collection of observation data. Classroom observations in this study included two CARE cohort groups (one sophomore and one junior) of four classes in two quarters. Each class underwent four periods of sit-in observation, totaling sixteen hours of observation in each class. During the observation period, field notes were taken as the first impression of teaching practice data for analysis. Observing what CARE instructors did in the classroom was more productive than only interviewing them for acquiring their PCK
because, for the narrative inquiry, a scenario was needed to tell the CARE instructors’
teaching stories. The opportunity for observation also allowed me to ask specific
questions regarding events and behaviors that occurred during observations. The
situational events served as excellent illustrations of the knowledge, values, and views
that the CARE instructors talked about in their interviews.

Class document analysis. Document analysis, in this study, functioned as a
supplementary source for data triangulation to increase research reliability. Documents
included the CARE program handbook, course syllabi, teaching materials, and the CARE
students’ reflection sheets (Document and personal communication list see Appendix C).
The purpose of analyzing the CARE program handbook and class-related documents was
to examine the evidence of educational philosophy and values, which were embedded in
teacher educators’ teaching practice. In addition, a CARE students’ questionnaire (see
Appendix D) was designed as a data collection tool to understand the CARE students’
learning experiences in the CARE instructors’ classes. For the purpose of increasing the
research reliability, the two CARE cohort groups of students were asked to complete the
questionnaire. The questionnaire was employed to understand their learning experience in
CARE classrooms and examine the CARE students’ comprehension of the CARE
instructors’ teaching and modeling. Data collected from the CARE students’
questionnaire were used as supplementary and compared evidence that helped strengthen
the validity of the findings collected from other sources such as in the CARE instructors’
interviews and class observations. The CARE students’ questionnaire questions were:
Q: Please describe the best experience that the instructor has facilitated in your learning about becoming a teacher for democratic education. As you share your story, please retrieve the scenario of that moment. What was happening? What made it a good experience? What did the instructor do to make it a good moment? And what did you do to make it a good moment?

Q: Based on your experience with this class so far, what would you identify as core characteristics of the instructor’s pedagogical plan with this class (in other words, without these elements, the class would not be what it is)? Please be specific.

Q: Based on the experience you had in this class, in what ways did you see that the concept (or components) of democratic education was practiced and/or embedded in this course organization? Please use examples to explain.

Q: Based on your experience with this class so far, what do you value most about the instructor’s teaching? And how do those components affect your realization of being a teacher?

Q: Envisioning an ideal CARE classroom, if you walked into any given CARE classroom, what would you hope to see? Describe (write) an affirmative statement that describes the idealized CARE future as if it were already happening.

Data Analysis. As this study tried to analyze the PCK of college teacher educators in a democratic teacher education program, the PCK was seen as something flexible and situated within a set of teaching contents and strategies. Therefore, while utilizing
narrative inquiry as a research method to analyze the PCK, sources of data collected from this study were analyzed in the “temporal (past, present, and future), personal/existential, and place” three-dimensional framework (Connelly & Clandinin, 2000). The analysis focused on examining how the CARE instructors connected the democratic values in their PCK and put them into practice for teacher preparation so as to inspire CARE students’ pedagogy. The three-dimensional framework was utilized as the analytical underpinning upon which the interview transcripts, the field notes, and questionnaire were read and analyzed inductively looking for themes or patterns (Patton, 1990). The categories and themes derived from the descriptive data were synthesized, interpreted, and discussed to contribute to the understanding of the democratic teacher educators’ PCK structure.

**Summary**

This research used qualitative case study to explore the teacher educators’ pedagogical content knowledge in a democratic teacher preparation program. Narrative inquiry was the methodological approach used in this case study. Narrative inquiry as a study tool was used to capture the understanding of the meaning that the teacher educators gave to their teaching practice. Through narrative inquiry, the teacher educators’ teaching practice was explored through the lens of the structure of the PCK identified in their teaching.

The CARE teacher preparation (Creating Active and Reflective Educators for Democratic Education) was the setting to investigate the college teacher educators’ PCK. Four CARE instructors as research informants along with two CARE cohort classes
totaling 55 students participated in this study. Interviews, class observation, and
document analysis were tools for data collection. Appreciative inquiry provided a
framework constructing the interview questions by which the components of the CARE
teacher educators’ PCK were identified and examined. Themes and categories that
emerged from data analysis were interpreted and discussed for the understanding of the
democratic teacher educators’ PCK.

In the next two chapters, the four CARE instructors’ teaching practices will be
presented by addressing the themes that emerged from the collected data. In addition, a
cross-examination and comparison of the results will be discussed with a focus on each
component that contributed to the structure of the CARE instructors’ PCK.
CHAPTER FOUR

Description of Data

Introduction

In this chapter, the four CARE instructors’ pedagogical reasoning and teaching practices are presented. This narrative approach addresses how they teach and what they teach. Teaching actions become meaningful when presented in a narrative form (Clandinin, 1986, 1992; Clandinin & Connelly, 1986). From a methodological perspective, to construct the framework of the CARE instructors’ pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) is to engage in depicting their narrative reasoning. Narrative reasoning plays a central role in the development of their teaching, an ethical dimension of their professional teaching (Clandinin, 1992; Connelly & Clandinin, 1995, 1999).

Within the educational context of preparing active and reflective teachers for democratic education as the goal of the CARE program, the narrative presentation in this chapter focuses on the democratic values and principles the CARE instructors held and how those values and principles were incorporated into the framework of their PCK that informed their teaching practice. In the later sections, the descriptions of the four CARE instructors’ PCK will be reported respectively.

In the sophomore year of the CARE program, there are three sequence courses titled “Childhood in America” (EDCI 201A, 201B, and 201C). These courses focus on the impact on children of the cultural contexts of school and society. Integrated into the cultural context is the literature on theories of learning. How children learn is delineated in EDCI 201 courses over three quarters. The fall quarter, “Childhood in America,” EDCI
201A, focuses on early childhood (birth-8 years). The winter quarter course, EDCI 201B, focuses on middle childhood and early adolescence (9-14 years). The final quarter course, EDCI 201C, focuses on adolescents (14 years-young adult).

Two of the EDCI 201 instructors, Connie (201A) and Mike (201B), participated in this study. The two other CARE instructors who participated in this study were Brian who taught the CARE sophomores EDCI 210/L, “Introduction to Democratic Methods,” and John who taught the CARE juniors EDCI 310/L, “Advanced Democratic Methods.” EDCI 210 is a winter quarter course in the CARE sophomore year. The course focuses on the exploration of the characteristics of a democratic classroom and the development of teaching skills in the creation of a democratic learning environment. EDCI 310 is a fall quarter course in the CARE junior year. Following the pedagogy developed in EDCI 210, EDCI 310 focuses on the study of teaching methods that could be utilized to foster democratic classrooms.

In this chapter, the four CARE instructors’ teaching practices will be described. The description of the research data collected from the classroom observations and interviews will be presented in a way to represent the themes that emerged from each CARE instructor’s teaching. In chapter five, the data analysis will provide comparisons and discussions on the four CARE instructors’ teaching through the lens of the structure of PCK identified in their practice.

Connie—Caring and Reflective Guider

The first course in the sequence is EDCI 201A. “Childhood in America” is 4 credit hours with 2 credit hours of field experience (DCI 210L). The course focuses on
exploring different cultural aspects of emotional, cognitive, physical, and social
development of children and their relationship with school up to eight years old.

Connie is an elementary school teacher and was one of the CARE sophomore cohort’s first CARE instructors (EDCI 101, Introduction to Democracy and Education, is the other CARE course sophomores take. Connie reported in an interview that she acknowledged her role was “to model reflection in teaching to the new CARE cohort group as the students learned the course content” (Connie, personal communication, October 21, 2003). One of Connie’s goals was to develop a sense of community among the cohort students and to model how to value all their contributions to the learning community. As Connie said:

I think it is important that all our students are honored and included. I think it’s important to establish a learning community, a place where people learn to live together, to express different opinions, and to be accepted instead of being made fun of or having people get angry. We as a group, we get to learn learning together, working together, living together, what things do we need to agree upon, so that the time we are together we will understand each other and we will each feel comfortable. (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003)

Regarding how to explore the concept of education and to learn how to teach, Connie described the process for the class as a journey of going through a “steep learning curve” (Connie, 2003, class syllabus). The CARE sophomores were exposed to ways of viewing public education that frequently challenged their previous assumptions about and experiences in school.
To Think Like a Teacher—Making Connections

All CARE courses are taught in conjunction with field experience in partnership schools for 4 to 6 hours a week. The purpose of having the field experience was to provide CARE students with a continual learning experience in school settings.

In Connie’s class, the CARE sophomores were placed in selected school classrooms for weekly observations. Connie stated, “I put them in pre-school through third grade classrooms so they can see what a democratic education classroom looks like” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003). She asked the CARE sophomores to write a one page “field experience journal” of their field experiences each week. The field experience journal was a result of “experiential learning” (Borzak, 1981) in which the CARE sophomores examined the direct encounter they had with the classroom phenomena.

According to the class syllabus, the purpose of the field journal is “not to document descriptions about what the CARE sophomores saw in the classroom. Instead, the ability to make connections is emphasized in this writing assignment” (Connie, 2003, class syllabus). Connie used different components, such as written reflections about observations to deliberately foster insights on how theory and practice are interwoven. Regarding the field observations and writing reflections, Connie said, “They are trying to identify what things make a democratic education classroom and what things don’t” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003).

Connie asked her CARE sophomores to analyze and synthesize their observations by making connections from readings and class discussions with what they observed in the field (Connie, personal communication, October 8, 2003). It was Connie’s aim that
“gradually, through this class, the cohort students will develop the ability to reflect on how their values form a lens through which they make these observations” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003). As Connie indicated, one of the class objectives was for the CARE sophomores “to understand their overall impressions of their experiences in the field” (Connie, personal communication, September 17, 2003). As a result, their observation, inquiry, and confirmation were lenses through which their previously held values and knowledge could be critically scrutinized.

In addition, when Connie assigned the weekly readings and “reading reflection journals”, she tried to help students develop the capacity to reflect on the authors’ arguments and articulations and link with their reflections from the field. The purpose of writing a reading reflection journal “was to push students to expand their thoughts in the form of reflections, questions, feelings, insights, goals, dilemmas, and connections between readings and [their] personal experiences, other readings, other discussion, field experience, and observations” (Connie, 2003 class syllabus). For Connie, the reading reflection journal was neither a review paper for the assigned reading nor conventional report writing. Instead, the reading reflection journal was for the CARE sophomores to use as a personal learning reference when they brought it into the class discussions. The reading reflection journal also contributed as a resource from which they chose a topic for an in-depth midterm and a final project, as well as a resource for their learning evaluations.

The reading reflection journal was a learning tool for the CARE sophomores to adjust and establish their own visions of schooling and teaching practice (Connie, personal communication, September 17, 2003). More importantly, Connie expected that
the visions of philosophy and views on education that the CARE sophomores developed were “from the point of view of a teacher, rather than a student” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003). The purpose of the reading reflection journal, as Connie reported, was a vehicle for students to:

*Think beyond the text, beyond the course, and beyond the instructor. It is a means for them to explore and expand their critical consciousness…. And all of these take a lot of thought and reflection on how to be a teacher. There are books that give you a lot of ideas, and I think some teachers get trapped in just using textbook and teacher’s guide. I think they are rich, but what you have to do is to pull from those things and mesh them with the use of your students, and certainly integrate them for their use.* (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003)

Connie reminded her students constantly to consciously reflect on what they were reading and relate that with what they saw in the field observation because, for Connie, it was important to enable the CARE sophomores to practice writing down thoughts as a way of examining their new and old understandings. Connie explained:

*I encouraged them to personify or give life to ideas for their own learning so that connections could be made between literature and real life. They will get more out of this thinking and reflection process if they keep digging deeper for content than just skim pages.* (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003)

In order to help the CARE sophomores build connection between teaching and learning and teacher and student, Connie usually relayed her personal teaching experiences in the classroom to enrich the class discussion. She said:
I have a lot of experience working with children. Sometimes I do have things to share when they are having a conversation where I can share a similar situation with what we’ve done. I think that experience makes sense in their learning. It is helpful. (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003)

The teaching experience Connie shared in class was to help the CARE sophomores learn how to think and see things from a teacher’s perspective instead of student’s. This gave the CARE students a positive and inspirational outlook with children and helped them think like a teacher. One CARE student recalled her best learning experience in Connie’s class. The CARE sophomore said:

I don’t think I could narrow my best experience down to one specific experience. This whole class, all the books we’ve read, and the discussions we had really helped me to think more like a teacher. The discussions led by Connie were open and honest and she did a great job of sharing her experience in the classroom and talking about our field placements with us. (CARE students, personal communication, November 12, 2003)

Discussing “Dangerous Topics”: The Reality of Children in Education

Being a teacher in a democratic education environment is a “down to earth” (Novak, 1994) experience when the actions teachers take in the classroom play a significant role in shaping their students’ learning and the world around them. Connie confirmed this view and explained that:

The CARE cohort students come as a particular kind of people. Just like special education majors they are particular kinds of people who have a vision in
education. They want to make education better. They approach education with more than a vision of license. They love to teach and more than that, they are willing to think about the process of education. They come to realize that they are teaching people instead of just teaching subject matters. (Connie, personal communication, October 21, 2003)

Connie tried to model for the CARE sophomores how a democratic classroom began with teachers who brought “a habit of reflective mind” as a foundation to their own practice (Facione, 1996). With the habit of reflective mind, students could look deeply into their values to deconstruct the façade of surface realities. As stated in the class syllabus, Connie provided a window for her students to start viewing “the down to earth” experience with a framework of fundamental questions as class contents to explore (Connie, 2003, class syllabus):

- What are the characteristics and needs of young children?
- What are the goals of early childhood education? Whose goals are they? Why?
- How has early childhood education evolved? How will it be in the future?
- What is the relevance of early childhood education to middle childhood educators and high school educators?
- How can children “know” and “be” in ways that transcend racist, classist, and sexist oppression?

These questions were explored in the context beyond the classroom, so that different angles were offered to think about the subject of childhood in America. According to the syllabus, the course framework included:

- Child development and narratives of childhood histories
Transitions from home to school

The role of play in the curriculum

Literacy learning with social relations at its center

Goal(s) of critical literacy education

Developing an educative community

How schooling is institutionalized in America

The implications for schooling in our increasing “global community”

Connie initiated issues and raised the questions for the CARE students to explore. However, the framework was not limited to the categories above. The CARE sophomores were encouraged to add their questions and perspectives. Connie explained that:

*The goal of creating a democratic learning community was to provide opportunities for every member of the group to create, question, and learn together as critical learners…. I value every student as important to me, to the group. Every student has something to contribute to what we want to do, and I value every student’s contribution.* (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003)

For Connie, a democratic classroom should be a safe and trusting place for each student to examine real life issues. The majority of teacher education students come from a middle class background and above. And these CARE sophomores are no different. Equality, social justice, and cultural differences, among others, may be taken for granted by students who have not thought about these issues in their own lives. Connie stated, “To pretend everything is going well around us does not mean it really is, or nobody is
suffering from injustice or an ignorance situation” (Connie, personal communication, October 8, 2003)

Connie thought a safe classroom climate encouraged CARE sophomores to willingly explore previously unexplored or little-explored territory as “dangerous topics” in their learning and to take risks about challenging the status quo (Connie, personal communication, September 17, 2003). An example of a dangerous topic might be one that challenges what students take for granted, such as white privilege or social class. Connie expected the discussion in the class to be meaningful. She wanted to impact her students’ lives by touching some “dangerous topics” which would inspire her students instead of staying with “safe” topics such as classroom management.

Connie guided the class discussions about teaching and learning to intentionally explore underlying issues in depth. For example, when the class discussed how a teacher should be caring about his/her students’ needs, the CARE sophomores discussed that “a teacher should be a good listener so that students would be encouraged to share their feelings and ask questions,” (Connie, personal communication, September 17, 2003). Connie agreed with them, but in order to push them to think further, by contrasting the ideal and realistic classroom, she confronted her students with a dilemma situation. In the discussion, Connie reminded her students that “with the pressure of meeting the requirement of standardized tests, do you think teachers have time to listen to their students when most of their teaching time was devoted to doing things to meet the mandated goal” (Connie, personal communication, September 17, 2003)?

The midterm and final projects revealed that the CARE students’ extended interests and concerns had gone beyond the comfort zone. The projects also showed their
willingness to inquire about the real world. The reading topics, field work, and class discussions chosen by the CARE sophomores as personal projects varied. Some excerpts from the presentations in the midterm projects are as follows:

“As a little girl, I never realized racism, classism, and sexism in the world. It was easier to just be shielded by my parents and my community than to have to face the reality of the world. In many ways, I wish I hadn’t been so protected because I now have to learn about all of the scary parts of society at once, and I feel embarrassed and ashamed about my childhood. ...Now my sense of belonging was thrown off. I had to work at rebuilding myself up to the point where I can be the best teacher and student possible.” (CARE students, personal communication, October 8, 2003)

“I believe that a critical literacy education is a great way to engage a student’s mind. With goals set, the helpful and willing attitude of an educator, and the willingness of a student can really set this idea on the go.” (CARE students, personal communication, October 8, 2003)

“At the beginning of the quarter, if a question such as ‘how might early childhood classrooms implement democracy in Education principles’ was posed to me, I would have been lost and had no idea how to answer. Now, after having a better understanding thus far, I can answer that question with several different answers and reasons.” (CARE students, personal communication, October 8, 2003)
“We see it in the movies but we don’t want to admit it’s there. We read about it in the newspapers but the media says it’s just irrelevant news. The current news topic is racism. ...I have the responsibility to my students...[e]ven though some parents may be offended...” (CARE students, personal communication, October 8, 2003)

“Children do not just decide to be a certain gender. Gender [identity] is shaped in relation to the specificities of those early words and attachment. They learn from their culture community, family, and school what is the normal gender identity they have to portray.” (CARE students, personal communication, October 8, 2003)

“How many teachers actually practice the educational view that students can succeed and help them discover their own potential? Are we aware of our own stereotypes and expectations of our students? ... I believe that having expectations for students is a natural and important part of being a teacher. We must be aware of different students’ strengths in the classroom and work with them to maximize their learning potential.” (CARE students, personal communication, October 8, 2003)

The midterm evaluation project presentations demonstrated that they met with Connie’s expectations. As stated in the syllabus, “The evaluation project should be an endeavor that will be most productive and fulfilling for students’ personal growth from the readings, class discussions, field experience, and inspirations from the IDE conference” (Connie, 2003, class syllabus). In doing so, the project served as a channel
through which each student was expected to develop a ‘working’ personal philosophy of education, including their aspirations and goals as a future teacher.

The midterm evaluation project topics that the CARE sophomore chose to explore showed that they did not hold back their enthusiasm and willingness to challenge the real life issues. The students showed their passion for being involved in the teaching profession. As one CARE sophomore recalled in the student questionnaire:

“I’d have to say that being in this class made a big impact on my outlook of being a ‘good teacher.’ It’s so much harder than I thought. I just figured you have to be a cool teacher, but no! Being a good teacher requires working outside the box and putting in extra hours and efforts to make the learning experience more realistic and valuable. It opened my eyes. Being in Connie’s class has made my passion for learning and teaching grow stronger. I felt education on the inside of my heart not [just] in my mind. My excitement has grown each day and I will be forever grateful for CARE because now in my heart I CARE, too. (CARE, personal communication, November 12, 2003)

Construct the Class with Openness

A characteristic of Connie’s teaching performance was openness: open to ideas, open to words, and open to thoughts. A commitment to openness is a commitment to the promise that makes free discussion possible. In Connie’s class, “There was a flow of ideas between students and teacher and among students,” said one CARE sophomore (CARE students, personal communication, November 12, 2003). For Connie, it was important to allow students to initiate topics for class discussion. Connie also consistently asked for suggestions on how the class activities should proceed. Even for the little things,
such as how to order pizzas for the class when they wanted to have a small party (Connie, personal communication, November 12, 2003).

As one CARE sophomore reflected on Connie’s teaching:

*Connie is open minded and considers what that students want to do. She always asks for suggestions or opinions on how we should proceed for even the simplest things. She leaves the class up to us, for our discussion. She is more like a facilitator than a typical professor.* (CARE students, personal communication, November 12, 2003)

Through discussions and collaborative decision making, Connie shared the leadership with the CARE students. As she said:

*I think students should have a voice on issues that matter to them. It doesn’t mean they get to do whatever they want to do. It means they need to have a voice to describe what their needs are in terms of how education could be, how they approach to it, and even somewhat what they want to learn.* (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003).

Seeing herself as a facilitator, Connie guided the discussion while letting it be directed by her students’ ideas. Connie said:

*Sometimes we get in the middle of the discussion about a book, and then we start talking about the field experience that has some connection to the readings. Sometimes we go off in another direction that I had not planned, and it becomes student initiated. ... I believe a better job in teaching is to become a better facilitator.* (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003)
As one student said, “Connie truly wants us to be in charge of where our class goes, thus putting learning in our hands” (CARE students, personal communication, November 12, 2003). In the process of engaging the CARE sophomores in the circle of thinking, questioning, expressing, in order to make the class understand each others’ points of view, Connie often used clarification strategies as a communicative bridge. Connie would ask students questions about the situation and at the same time, expected other students to ask questions and add comments on what others thought. Connie showed her ability to carry on a class discussion about a topic and facilitate students in directing the discussion. One CARE sophomore identified the characteristics of Connie’s teaching:

I think Connie’s strong point is her ability to facilitate discussions while letting the discussion go where we take it. This way, we are able to discuss what seems important to us, and are able to hit on broad amounts of information and insights. (CARE students, personal communication, November 12, 2003)

As expressed in an interview, Connie saw her role “as a facilitator to guide the class discussion to inspire students to become passionate teachers” (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003). Connie evaluated her teaching style with “a feature of openness and a non-threatening personality to her students,” Connie added:

I think I build a relationship with students in which they realize that the content of what we are doing is very important, and the process of what we are doing is very important. I highly value what we do together as a group, and I am very open to them. I am not threatening. I am not judgmental. Consequently, I hear things from them of whether that’s the thing they really want to do. Of course, I don’t agree with them all the time about what they are trying to do, but instead of saying ‘no!"
no! no!,” I ask questions. I ask them to think and tell me what they think is going to happen. (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003)

For Connie, in order to build a democratic learning community that matters to students, it was very important to have time to discuss everyone’s ideas. As Connie said, “That is how you learn. Hearing others’ ideas helps you to formulate yours” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003). Connie’s openness was an attitude that resulted in letting the class decide what to do, inviting students to contribute to each class meeting agenda, giving students a voice on their own learning evaluation, and sharing her past personal experiences, good and bad, with other CARE sophomores. According to one CARE student’s evaluation:

[Connie] was there to listen to us and to give us some of her own insight! It really helped to hear from an experienced teacher and discuss issues that pertain to all of us as educators. This allowed me to use my own knowledge and let other people hear my views and allowed me to hear their views as well. (CARE students, personal communication, November 12, 2003)

Student Directed Learning

Connie always began the class meeting with an agenda to which all students were invited to contribute. For Connie, it was important for students to go over what they were going to put time and efforts into. In Connie’s class, a smooth feeling flowed during the whole class meeting. “No subject was pushed to the side or left untouched,” said one CARE sophomore (CARE students, personal communication, November 12, 2003). Another CARE sophomore indicated that:
I love how Connie lets us talk about anything we want to and if someone poses a question that is off-topic, but a concern to them, she always encourages discussion. I liked how she could sense that we didn’t want to talk about ‘Reading Lives [:Working-class children and literacy learning’ (2002)], so she didn’t push conversation about it. I loved how she was so open and easy-going.

Connie welcomed students’ comments and questions. She stated:

*I think one of the concepts about democratic education is being inclusive. To have people involved, which means not everybody is on same thing, but everybody has something they can contribute. I think making a place for everybody is how our school should be designed: as a place of a democratic society.* (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003)

For Connie, class objectives and activities were pre-organized for the class, but suggestions for agenda change were welcomed. Connie explained:

*I don’t have a set schedule, but each night we came to class, we have things we need to do, like they have reading assignments to do, or they need to discuss on the Institute for Democracy in Education (IDE) conference. So there are things we need to address as a group.* (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003)

Although there was no set schedule that Connie asked her class to follow, she was always open to alternative ways to proceed with class activity. She led the class as a leader, but she allowed students to add to the flexible agenda. For example, in one of the class meetings, the CARE sophomores were expected to have reflections and discussions regarding the Institute for Democracy in Education (IDE) conference they attended as a
class activity. Connie asked students for ideas on how they would like the discussion to proceed.

Connie’s educational view was that “teachers must practice what they preach” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003). Connie consciously modeled the ideal of democratic education in her classroom that students should direct their own learning. For example, in their first class meeting, a class agreement was initiated and produced as a result of the students’ discussion. Connie stated:

*I think of democratic education not as a subject, but as a process. It’s the way you live with children, the way that values everybody, gives voice, and requires people to be very reflective about what they are thinking and what they are doing, ... something that will stay with the group when it comes to communication with the group, and it is important you can’t impose them. It is important that it comes from the students.* (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003)

Connie modeled a democratic way of learning by inviting the class to develop a class agreement (Table 4.1) In their first class meeting, the CARE sophomores proposed making a class agreement for EDCI 201A with class rules that every class member should follow. During the process of developing the class agreement, all ideas were posted on the chalkboard, followed by open discussion about reasons why some rules should be kept and others should be removed. Seven class rules were voted on and later made as a poster that hung as the class guidelines in every class meeting.

When students take ownership of learning, it does not mean that everything goes with students’ wishes. Connie emphasized to the CARE sophomores that democratic
education does not mean “do whatever you want at whenever you want” (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003). As she said:

It certainly is not good to allow children go to the classroom or the playground and just do whatever they want all day long ... I don’t believe democratic education means teachers do nothing, but just sit back and let free flow happen. I think there is some guiding ... because there are goals of education, how students implement the principle of democracy, having a voice, appreciating diversity, including everybody regardless of their ability, their race, their gender, their class. (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003)

Table 4.1 EDCI 201A’s Class Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDCI 201A’s CLASS AGREEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall CARE 2003-2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Be open
2. Accept difference
3. Have the courage to speak out
4. Hear others out before voicing your own opinions
5. Understand that different people have different opinions
6. Don’t be offended if you disagree
7. Be respectful of ideas and feelings

Connie had a calm way of putting options and opportunities out on the table, expecting the class to make the decision through democratic group discussion and voting, but she
was not without reservation. The issue of compromise, for example, came up in one interview. As Connie explained:

*I don’t think people should compromise the basic value and sell out the basic values that you have. I think you can compromise in an honorable way the things that you sit back and look at in a different way and see what would be different. You and I might have different opinions about something and doing things, but it doesn’t undercut our core ethic. So we can come to agreement where we compromise. I don’t have to have my way. You don’t have to have your way. The whole concept of cooperation is that you can only accomplish it if you can do some compromising. Again, I’m talking about compromise, but I call it an honorable way, because you aren’t compromising your basic ethics and values. But you may have to give up a little bit about the way you insist on doing things.*

(Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003)

In this class, students directed their own learning in what they want to talk about, how they want to talk about it, and how they want to organize the class. “[Connie] made each one of us feel a part of this class and we felt like an important asset to the class,” said a CARE sophomore (CARE students, personal communication, November 12, 2003). The way Connie decided to grade the CARE sophomores for the entire course was based on her democratic ideals. She gave the CARE sophomores a sheet of paper (Table 4.2), told them to assign percentages to each evaluation category, and decide what they thought as appropriate. The whole process of assessing student learning is transparent to those being assessed.
“Everybody is different and has their own priority of what is important and meaningful to them,” said Connie (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003). This perspective was incorporated in the midterm and final evaluation, which encouraged the CARE sophomores to present what they learned in the best forms they chose for expressing themselves. Connie gave them the freedom of choice, and trusted them to take responsibility. As Connie explained:

Table 4.2 EDCI 201A Course Assessment Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Self Eval</th>
<th>Inst Eval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reading &amp; Reading Reflection Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Class Attendance/Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Field Experience and Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I.D.E. Conference and Summary/Reflections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Class Reflection Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Midterm Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Final Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Course Grade</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Course Grade:

Total for the 7 items is 100%. No single item may be less than 10% nor greater than 40%.

Self-Evaluation: Honest assessment of your effort and learning. What grade do you assign yourself in each of the 7 items? See “Expectations” section of syllabus attached.

Instructor-Evaluation: Honest assessment of observed effort and learning. Syllabus description of expectations as attached.

Actual Course Grade: Determined by instructor evaluation with insight and consideration from student Self-Evaluation.

You are invited to be briefly written your rationale for the grade you would give yourself, but it is not a requirement.
I see them as a community, as a group. I believe they have a strong influential impact. It is important to share the process with students. I value their interests beyond leader’s limit of what curriculum and evaluation are. The meaning of democracy is when freedom is taken responsibly. (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003)

One student wrote a paper, another chose to draw a picture and write a story about it. As one student recalled:

“Our midterm and final projects...I think I learned the most through my classmates’ projects. It gave me a sense of how everyone learns differently and this was presented in creative enthusiastic ways that gave you insights into them and how they learn, but you realize that you learned something else that you didn’t even realize.” (CARE students, personal communication, November 12, 2003)

Self Expression as the Bottom Line

“Talk in class” was one of the expectations by which Connie evaluated her students’ participation and progress (Connie, 2003, class syllabus). The evaluation of discussion participation assessed the extent to which students’ ideas and questions indicated their growing knowledge, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of the principles of democratic education. Connie encouraged her students to “contribute, orally, from your experience to enhance the learning of the whole class. Move outside your ‘comfort zone’ to seek out other class members as resources for your leaning” (Connie, personal communication, September 17, 2003).
In the beginning of the quarter, in order to encourage participation, Connie organized the students into small groups in various ways. From her teaching experience, Connie indicated that “the small group discussion is a useful strategy to engage students to open themselves to others as to build a safe and comfortable class atmosphere” (Connie, personal communication, October 21, 2003). “Different way of forming small groups provided the CARE sophomores more chances to know their cohort classmates,” said Connie (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003). For Connie, students’ familiarity with other CARE students was a crucial medium to invite more voices and self-expressions in the class discussions. Speaking your ideas in public is one element in democratic education. She said, “I think it is essential to learn and practice communication, listening, and understanding as well as being able to express your ideas and to have dialogue long enough for people to understand another point of view” (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003).

In the spirit of respecting individuality and diversity, midterm and final evaluation projects topics were discussed and determined collaboratively. Connie reported, “The midterm and final evaluation projects had actually only one real guideline: to reflect and present a topic this class has been discussing thus far through the class, whether it was in class or in the field experience. (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003) Connie recalled the midterm project presentations as a high point of her teaching experience with CARE students:

*I think that [the midterm] is really an extraordinary example of democracy in education. There was a structure, you know. We have content around which they have been studying, discussing, writing, and for them to be able to design, produce, and share*
their own project, and how they were assimilating and connecting the information. For me it is a really high point of democratic education. ... It made that especially good for me that not one person took advantage of the fact that I have given them the freedom to design. ... Freedom for me means responsibility. (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003)

Figure 4.1 Partial pages of the What You Need To Know With The ABC' letter book

---

Students should feel comfortable expressing their opinions freely. They should also be able to learn in different ways. Not everyone learns the same.

The needs of working-class children aren't usually met in the middle-class school system. Family life for working-class children is very different from middle-class kids. They have cultures.
For the presentations, the CARE sophomores chose various forms of representing their learning. Some of the presentations included writing a paper, making a poster, creating a scrapbook, designing an ABC letter book, editing a small book, and making a pop-out story book (Connie, personal communication, October 8, 2003). According to the finding of class observation, it was surprising to see how CARE sophomores decided what and how to represent their new understandings; and then how other students reacted. The presentation topics varied and included issues of gender, race, trust, the role of play, critical literacy in education, and democracy in education (Connie, personal communication, October 8, 2003).

It was in this individualized evaluation project that Connie found “so much energy and creativity came out from students, beyond what I might have anticipated in the first place with the intention of ‘respecting difference’” (Connie, personal
communication, October 22, 2003). One CARE sophomore created a letter book entitled “What You Need To Know With The ABC’s” (Figure 4.1) in which she used 26 letters to organize what she learned from the class. For example, the letter “F” represented the word freedom, which referred to the fact that students should feel comfortable expressing their opinions freely. They should also be able to have the options to learn in different ways. Not everyone learns the same. She used the letter “W” to indicate that teachers should be aware that the “working class” culture is different from the middle class. A pop-up mouse story (Figure 4.2) used Erikson’s development theory to explain how a child acts and reacts to his surrounding environment, and how a child’s attitude is directly acquired from his parents, teachers, and peers. As Connie said:

The midterm project and presentation was a result of cooperative group working of the whole class. Ideas were formed together by brain storming and individual contribution which made the class fuel with energy ready to run. (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003)

Being able to make up their own midterm assessment was new to the CARE students. Two CARE sophomores reflected on their group midterm assignment:

When we were assigned this midterm, we were apprehensive about it because there were no specific guidelines. After the class started to form ideas on how to put it together, the midterm project became exciting and we were enthusiastic about getting started. Being able to make up our own midterm was not something we had experienced before, but it encouraged us to be creative and allowed our imaginations to run wild. ... Some people felt that papers would be the best way to get across what they learned. Others felt that scrapbooks and posters would be a
creative way to display the knowledge they had gained. We decided to make scrapbooks not only to be crafty, but also to show what we had learned from our class and our field experience. When all the midterms were completed, each class member was able to share their projects. This gave us pride on our work, and allowed the class to see how each person put together their midterms. We think the midterm project was an excellent way to reflect on the previous weeks’ classes. It went along with another CARE class as well, and made every class member think about the connections between the two. We hope that in the future our other projects will be similar to this, in a way that allows us to show our individual ideas and teaching/learning styles.

Connie reflected that it was a surprising moment for her to see how well everyone’s work turned out. It confirmed that “everyone has a talent or special way to make ideas stand out” (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003).

Mike—Warm and Steady Organizer

Mike’s class, EDCI 201B “Childhood in America: 9-14 years”, was the second quarter of the EDCI 201 sequence of courses, the one which focused on the development of the middle-school student. Like the EDCI 201A course, it was a 4 credit hours class in conjunction with 2 hours of field experience. EDCI 201B continued with the theme of “school as an institution” in America. The overriding question that encompassed the exploration of the class topics throughout the quarter was posed by Mike as “What should the priority goals of public schooling in a democracy be” (Mike, 2004, class syllabus)?
Transforming Readings and Ideas in Different Forms

The learning content in the center of Mike’s teaching structure was middle school age children. Books, handouts, videos, class activities, discussions, field reflections, and a case study project conducted in the class were all aimed at understanding middle schoolers and the educational settings that impact them. As part of curriculum design, Mike proposed the following questions for the CARE sophomores to begin with as they started the journey of communicating with middle schoolers using the knowledge the course members had developed about childhood in school settings (Mike, 2004, class syllabus).

- *Are these the goals (the priority goals in a democracy) one most often encounters in the mainstream public discourse about public education?*

- *Who are the “stakeholders”? Who are the “goal-setters?” Are they the same group(s)? Should they be?*

- *Do the various stakeholders speak with one voice, or do they each have their own agenda? Are various agendas complementary or contradictory? Does it matter?*

The pedagogical design of Mike’s class was the development of a teaching timetable that exposed the CARE sophomores gradually to a wider range of aspects of the learner at the adolescent level and to related issues. Mike provided a contextual framework in which the above questions were explored (Mike, 2004, class syllabus).

- *Child development theory, including physical, emotional, social, and cognitive development*

- *The role of play in the curriculum*
• Learning as a function of race, culture, gender, and socio-economic status

• How schooling is institutionalized in America

• The implications for schooling in our increasingly “global community”

Mike designed the class to help the CARE cohort understand how children think and behave at the middle school level. In his class, for example, Mike encouraged his CARE students to “discuss what adolescence is like based on the books they read and films they watched in their discussion as well as their experience in the field” (Mike, personal communication, January 13, 2004). Mike organized the class by focusing on the different behavioral aspects of the students, and situations that they encounter. Related issues such as suicide, sex, drugs, and alcohol were brought up during the class discussion (Mike, personal communication, February 24, 2004). As Mike said in an interview:

Different issues were brought in. I tried to help them build a more complete picture of what [middle school students’] lives look like. You know it’s there, but you don’t often think about it: think about what you can do, what you can help, what you can guide, and what you can support. (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004)

Mike provided opportunities for the CARE sophomores to present their discussions to the class in a variety of ways. The CARE students chose to role play, to discuss, or to draw the parts of the book they read. This decision was up to the class as individuals or as small groups. As Mike said, “To give them some sense of how activities can be organized, we try to do things I used in my own school classroom. Some
One of the class readings was *Joey Pigza Swallowed the Key* (Gantos, 2000). It is a story written from a boy’s point of view in which it describes what the boy’s life is like when he appears to have Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD). When the class was reading the book, the class usually broke into small groups and each group chose a theme or issue based on a chapter or incident in the book to present to the class. For example, one group acted out a scene. Through role play, the CARE sophomores tried to get in touch with middle school age students’ feelings and behaviors and to understand their world. One CARE sophomore reflected how her group presented the reading assignments in a role play.

*While we were reading Joey Pigza we were broken down into groups and told to present something to the class based on a chapter or incident in the book. My group acted out a scene. It was fun and a good experience because the instructor let us draw, sing, or act.* (CARE students, personal communication, March 2, 2004)

Mike used this activity several times and the students gave positive feedback to it. “I made it a good moment by being fun,” expressed one CARE sophomore who enjoyed the class activities that Mike set up (CARE students, personal communication, March 2, 2004).

The activities and games that Mike used in the CARE classroom functioned not only as tools to engage the CARE sophomores in learning and understanding, it also “demonstrated teaching approaches to the future teachers that could be utilized in their
own classrooms” (Mike, personal communication, March 2, 2004). For example, in their first class meeting, as an ice-breaker and to encourage interaction among the class members in this new class, Mike started the class with a BINGO game (Table 4.3). Every student had a sheet of paper with many squares on it and each square had a brief description in it such as can bake a pie, from another state, or the only child of the family, among others. Students walked around the classroom and got the signature of someone who fitted the specific description in each square.

Feedbacks and discussions usually followed after class activities so that the students had the immediate opportunity to analyze and evaluate the functions and benefits of the activity. In this first class meeting, after the BINGO game Mike asked the class how to use this activity in the classroom and what kind of meaning the activity could have for the classroom (Mike, personal communication, January 13, 2004).

Mike: How can this BINGO game be used in the classroom or in the tutoring [field work] in terms of teaching and learning? How do you find this useful?

Student A: To contact people by thinking of who they are or what they might be good at.

Student B: It’s helpful to get to know each other.

Mike: Good! [Was there] anything surprising or anything you learned from each other? The first day of school we do a different version of this BINGO and then periodically during the year you can revisit this activity. Besides getting know each other, anything else, how you find this useful?

Student C: Getting people to move around might motivate their learning.
Student B: People may not know each other very well. It got us to learn something new about us like we have only one classmate who is the only child in her family.

Mike: Good, what else?

Student D: It builds a sense of community! Talking to each other gives you some knowledge about each other and gives you a chance to build a relationship.

Mike: Very good point. So, because you know something about another person that is memorable and interesting, then you have a chance to talk to that person further. And also for the common goal, the whole class has to work together to achieve BINGO. They have to talk to get different persons to sign the BINGO card. You work with others and they work with you to try to achieve a common goal. Find ways that we can cooperate with each other to reach the goal. So that’s what you want to try to do in your classroom. Find a way that we can cooperate, to learn together so we can build a relationship with each other, get to know each other better. Learn at the same time, we learn about each other and learn about the subject areas. So, this activity could be the start of some of academic work. What kind of questions could emerge from it?
Table 4.3 Bingo Game

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likes rap music</th>
<th>Favorite subject is science</th>
<th>Comes from another state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can bake a pie</td>
<td>The only child of the family</td>
<td>Has a brother or sister went to the same high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes to walk in the rain</td>
<td>Read more than one novel this summer</td>
<td>Didn’t see the movie Shrek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variety of class activities kept the CARE sophomores actively engaged. When they were discussing book readings, the sophomores reflected on how to translate their ideas into presentable forms like drawings or poems. For Mike, “different teaching techniques should be alternatively used in class activities so that everybody can benefit from the lessons” (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004). He added, “Sitting and just talking for hours is very draining mentally; I recognized that and I alternated more methods and adapted the class accordingly” (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004).

Mike provided a platform for the CARE sophomores to express themselves in different ways including skits, drawings, poems, or role play. Mike’s pedagogy was
based on his teaching experience that showed him students have multiple learning styles. “Everyone is different and not all people learn in the same way” (Mike, personal communication, January 13, 2004). He encouraged his CARE sophomores to look at the child as a whole person with individual characteristics, personality, and learning style. As he explained the importance of this view in children’s learning, Mike said,

“That is another way of looking at development, how do people learn? How do they get smart? What are the other ways people get smart? And then we look at school. I mean, school is only one part of affecting how people learn, but it’s the important part, you spend a lot of time there. That’s the heart of it, how to make the kids different.” (Mike, personal communication, January 13, 2004)

The CARE sophomores were asked to read and reflect on the assigned texts before the class meetings. Their comments, thoughts, and questions were the basis on which class discussions were built and developed. By examining readings against CARE sophomores’ own living experience, Mike found they could better integrate their lived experience into their knowledge base for teaching. In Mike’s class, CARE students were not simply expected to adopt others’ ideas for field practice and classroom teaching. The class was organized in a way so that they were prepared to challenge and form their own values and perspectives about teaching and learning which are grounded in their living experience, research based theories, and the interaction between the two.

Mike reflected from the class discussions and indicated that “they generated much of our discussion from the assigned reading” (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004). However, for Mike, what made the democratic teacher education program
different from a regular one is in how the pedagogical actions are modeled in class practice. As he explained:

_The CARE program is only going to work if it is a cooperative method of pedagogy. You have got to have teacher [educators] who are teaching democratically, otherwise [the CARE sophomores] are not going to do it. That’s different than being in social studies. I mean, we say you want to produce educated citizens, so you can go and get your social studies [license] at the university. But you might get lectured a lot. It makes it harder for those teachers who encourage democratic practices in their own classrooms._ (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004).

Two CARE sophomores reflected and identified how the democratic ideas were incorporated in the class activities (CARE students, personal communication, March 2, 2004):

_We got to see many ways in which educating children in a democratic matter was efficient and the best way. For example in the books we read, we learn that teachers who ran their class in an old-fashioned manner were not as successful as teacher’s who were different and more caring to their students._
Discussion-Based Instruction

Mike expected that through this class, the CARE sophomores would be able “to understand students in middle schools and how to facilitate their learning by exploring different aspects of social, biological, and emotional development factors that would influence adolescents’ external behaviors” (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004). For example, he led the discussion on the development of brain in understanding that adolescents do not think the same way as adults, largely because their brains are not as fully developed as adults’. Mike sometimes brought in some other materials, like articles, films, or stories of his teaching experience that were relevant to the topics the class discussed. He used these materials as springboards to engage students in discussion and reflection on the issues and problems. As Mike stated:

*I think I understand kids that age, so I bring in my experience. I bring in my research, my skills, my knowledge, and literature in the field, so that’s an advantage. Bringing in quotes is something I would like to do. Students also like to identify things that have been interesting to them. I got a couple of things from the newspaper to enrich the discussion. And they can do that, too. *... In my class, I haven’t changed much except I used different videos in class. I am trying to fire the discussion with it ...and we can talk.* (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004)

Either in large group or small groups, class discussion was a major pedagogical approach. Democratic education was practiced through large and small group discussions. One CARE sophomore identified the practice of democratic ideas in the class activities:
Democratic education was practiced in our small or large groups work. The instructor always used different teaching techniques so that everyone can benefit from the lessons. We also have the freedom to express ourselves how we want to do a lot of times during class. (CARE students, personal communication, March 2, 2004)

Discussions dealt with the topics of the readings, reflections from the field experiences, and ideas from peers and from Mike. For Mike, “class discussion was an essential teaching and learning approach in practicing democratic education” (Mike, personal communication, March 2, 2004). As he expressed:

An essential concept for democratic pedagogy is to have discussion-based instruction so that all the voices are heard. The concept of discussion provides space to students so that they can question information and other people’s opinions. Critical thinking can be fostered. (Mike, personal communication, March 2, 2004)

Through various discussions, students talked and taught each other. This encouraged critical thinking, reflection, and increased equity of participation about who gets to speak. For Mike, giving students a voice was critical to understand their learning needs. He explained:

What you want to do is to encourage a lot of voices to be heard. Some people wouldn’t talk while the other people talked a whole lot. The uneven dynamic didn’t seem really democratic. Then you have to figure out who talks too much and who talks less. [Teachers] have to create this space, so that everybody has an
opportunity, so the people sort of waiting also get the chance to speak. (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004)

According to the class observation, in Mike’s class, class discussions were usually based on substantial readings for students to learn from different perspectives to interpret (Mike, personal communication, February 24, 2004). However, in one class discussion when the topic focused on the CARE sophomores’ secondary school experiences, the class sat in a circle and students shared their personal experiences with each other. It was evident in the discussion that the CARE sophomores’ “personal experiences (rather than readings) were important sources of knowledge for understanding the lives of the local middle schoolers” (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004).

In prior class discussions, personal experience usually functioned as a contrasting view to illuminate points in the readings. In this discussion, however, personal experiences were the pieces of information needed to build a base for understanding their middle school students. In this case, they were engaged in providing a certain kind of knowledge to their classmates. The discussion led the class to another level of participation and interaction in terms of learning from each other. As Mike recalled:

_That’s a great moment. They looked into each other, so they were actually responding to what was in the voice and tried to build on that, so they were engaged in the process, and learning together._ (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004)

Messages in the students’ reflections revealed that for many of the CARE sophomores, discussion was a quite new experience. They were surprised that they could
learn so much information and knowledge from each other’s stories. One CARE sophomore recalled group discussion and how she learned from it. She said:

*I learned a lot from that discussion about how other schools worked and what my CARE members went through. I had a wonderful moment of discussing teachers and students in schools. Everyone in the class had stories to share, which made it a really good experience. The instructor helped move the discussion along and gave us insight on different issues. We, as a class, were more responsive when we had each other as a whole class to talk about and share ideas. I enjoyed very much hearing others’ stories and contributing to the group by sharing my own story.* (CARE students, personal communication, March 2, 2004)

**Two Way Street—Becoming a Democratic Teacher**

To understand if the CARE sophomores had benefited from the readings and class activities, Mike asked students to reflect on which readings, films, or class activities were interesting and useful. At the end of each class meeting, for example, the CARE sophomores wrote a personal reflection to Mike that he would read and respond to.

*I definitely think that the article was worth reading. It made me realize that issues such as stereotypes can be addressed in the 4th grade. I thought it was powerful that students took it upon themselves and write a letter to try to make a difference in their world.* (CARE students, personal communication, February 10, 2004).

*I really liked “School Girls.” It gave both a critique of how life for girls really is as well as a way to start the process of fixing the problem. I also thought “Beyond*
Pink and Blue” was an interesting article. My group discussed the article in terms of life and gender roles more than in teaching. But that is important because we will be teaching our generation’s kids. (CARE students, personal communication, February 17, 2004)

The class reflection folders provided the CARE sophomores and Mike a space to give feedback, post questions, and share what they might not have expressed in the class. The following are some CARE sophomores’ folder reflections and Mike’s responses.

Student E: As a group we have gotten used to free-flowing conversations with the teacher involved and facilitating. I know you mean well by wanting everyone to talk only after everyone has had a chance. But I think that could limit conversation and break up the free-flowing nature

Mike: I don’t want to limit speakers to a single turn, but I do want to create enough space for those who need more encouragement or time to speak to contribute, your group does discuss well—I’m excited by that. (CARE students, personal communication, January 13, 2004)

Student F: I wish that our conversations/discussions would focus a little more on preventing and helping children we will be teaching. I know that this will help me immensely.

Mike: Thanks for your suggestion. To help others you have to know yourself well and the young people we are/will be teaching are the main concern of the class. (CARE students, personal communication, January, 20, 2004)
Student G: I feel that every night I am at class I learn so much. Our group discussion tonight was awesome. We talked about some very serious things yet we had some funny laughs. I really am enjoying the large group discussions.

Mike: Well-stated. Learning + Having fun = Enjoyment. Thanks for your thoughts.

(CARE students, personal communication, January 20, 24)

As in Connie’s class, the student reflection folder was “a private interactive space between the individual student and the teacher’” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003). In Connie’s class, the reflection folder was mainly used for the CARE sophomores’ self-reflections on their learning. In Mike’s class, the self reflection folder was used “as a means for continuing class dialogue” (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004). The reflection folder provided a private space between the individual students and Mike where he “invited students’ thoughts and suggestions on how the class was run and should be run” (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004). The CARE sophomores also used the reflection folder to evaluate the effectiveness of class materials and discussions for their learning. Each time the class met, Mike would summarize students’ general impressions on the previous meeting based on what the students wrote in the reflection folders. “The [class] reflection folders became an essential component of democratic education in that we had a voice and influence to the class and we were involved in shaping our learning,” reported one CARE sophomore (CARE students, personal communication, March 2, 2004).
A Sense of Ethical Decision-Making

“Mike usually started the class by writing down agenda items on the chalkboard and asking students to add on the agenda or to change the arrangement,” said one CARE sophomore (CARE students, personal communication, March 2, 2004). For Mike, this was an important aspect of a democratic classroom where students and the teacher were “co-creating the classroom and deciding how students wanted to cover the materials” (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004). As Mike said:

Writing down the agenda on the chalkboard in the beginning of class is one thing I try based on the comments from the students’ reflection folders. This year is the first year I’ve used the agenda. They wanted to see the agenda organizationally. That’s a method, a democratic method that we tried out together. I like, at the beginning of the class, to give them a choice. They want to see the class agenda. I like that. It gives them a chance to respond. I think they appreciate the explanation of the class. (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004)

Mike thought that freedom of choice is important in learning and he gave everybody the chance to express how they want to learn. Mike reported in an interview how the idea was incorporated in the class organization:

The notion of freedom of choice was practiced not only in the agenda adjustment, but was also in group presentations, discussions, and class activities which modeled to [CARE] students how to embed democratic ideas in classroom practice. (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004)

However, for Mike, the freedom of choice “had to be balanced and ought not to compromise the essential learning activities that were to be accomplished for the course”
(Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004). With Mike’s goal to encourage student involvement, he had to ultimately decide how much change students can make regarding the class agenda. For example, in Mike’s class, the case study project (Figure 4.3) was one essential part of the class curriculum. As Mike said, “the case study project is designed to give the CARE sophomores an in-depth experience in getting to know one student in middle school” (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004). The case study project became an ethical consideration. When students asked to discontinue the case study project Mike did not just say yes. When the class entered the last third of the quarter and the CARE sophomores felt “this assignment was too heavy a load” (CARE students, personal communication, February 17, 2004), and they requested a change. They proposed discontinuing the case study project as they thought “it was not very useful for their learning” (CARE students, personal communication, February 17, 2004). Mike did not agree with that proposition. In Mike’s teaching plan, to explore “the relationships among children, school, and education” was of much significance (Mike, 2003, class syllabus). While he was open to suggestions for the class agenda and he encouraged students to lead the directions of the discussions, he was clear and insistent about the aims of the course and the activities that would help to achieve those aims.

Mike’s pedagogical concept for a democratic teacher was to “have an ethical sense of decision making” (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004) So Mike had to negotiate his decision making with students’ request to discontinue the case study project. In this event, from the class observation, he modeled “the tension of ethical decision-making which must attend to both academic as well as social aims” (Mike,
personal communication, February 28, 2004). As Mike mentioned in one of the interviews:

*A democratic teacher has got to have the distinguishing sense to know what it means when some students say “we don’t want to do that,” and the other students say “yes we want to do that.” Teachers have to tell students what decision they are making and why.* (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004)

“The case study project provided the [CARE sophomores] substantial learning experiences on adolescent life,” said Mike (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004). For the case study project, Mike selected and organized readings about middle-schoolers’ feelings and behaviors, social learning, emotional issues, and multiple intelligence. This project was designed to help them see the world from an adolescent’s point of view. As Mike said:

*Students learned how to look at one student as a microcosm of what the issues are attached to him or her. So for them, what students are facing becomes real, which is essential if you are going to teach in that classroom. They can see how they could change the middle childhood life, how the system helps them to understand people’s life, so that’s the point.* (Mike, personal communication, January 28, 2004)
“The CARE sophomores prepared for their case study research through activities like assigned readings and discussions and viewing films about teenagers and their worlds’ issues, said Mike (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004). He added, “They learned and practiced observational skills, constructed interview questions and studied examples of published case study research.” (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004) For Mike, the intensive case study experience prepared the CARE
sophomores by conducting in-depth case study research in middle school students’ ways of thinking and doing things. As one CARE sophomore recalled:

    [Mike] appears to be leading the class to understand how the students think at the middle school level. The case study forces us to focus on one individual student’s life and ways of thinking. I enjoyed doing the case study. It helped me learn a lot more about students at this age level. It was very helpful for me to hear some of my classmates’ case study questions. It helped clear up some confusion. (CARE students, personal communication, March 2, 2004)

*Brian—Active and Passionate Advocator*

The three years of the CARE program began in the students’ sophomore year. The course EDCI 210, “Introduction to Democratic Methods,” was in the second quarter of their sophomore year and was the first course that dealt with teaching methods in the CARE program (CARE handbook, 2003). The purpose of this class was to “identify the characteristics of a democratic classroom and to develop teaching skills in the creation of a democratic learning environment” (Brian, 2004, class syllabus). The instructor, Brian, stated in his course syllabus that “the CARE [sophomores] will examine and articulate their understandings, values, commitments, and actions, which define their intentions to become a democratic teacher” (Brian, 2004, class syllabus).

For this goal to be reached, “different approaches paralleling the principle of democratic education were introduced and incorporated into class activities so that the CARE sophomores’ teaching knowledge and skills were developed and practiced. To
reach this goal, the process itself was democratic,” said Brian in an interview (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004).

**Preparing Reflective Practitioners**

“Democratic teaching methods and skills were the learning content of this class,” said Brian (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004). Brian focused on how to incorporate these methods and skills in the CARE sophomores’ personal pedagogical reasoning and practice. One CARE sophomore reflected on Brian’s teaching and indicated that:

> I think Brian is the poster teacher for democratic education. I think one of the best things Brian did was to allow and encourage us to discuss how democratic ideas were effecting on us and what we thought needed change. I think it is important to continuously analyze our philosophies. (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004)

“Different teaching approaches were introduced to the class in combination with lesson plan exercises,” said Brian (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004). The textbook used in this class, *Methods that Matter—Six Structures for Best Practice Classrooms* (Daniels & Bizar, 1998), was a teaching tool which showed the CARE sophomores approaches on how to structure and organize their curriculum and instruction democratically. One CARE sophomore reflected on the class organization and the use of the text book and stated:

> I really feel I can be open in [Brian’s] classroom. This class embodies the democratic way of teaching we’ve been talking about. The textbook, “Methods
that Matter,” will be a book I will use later on during my own teaching career someday. I have gotten a lot out of this class, and feel I am better prepared to be a teacher. (CARE students, March 11, 2004)

However, Brian’s expectation was “for the [CARE sophomores] to realize that teaching was not only about using various ways to organize curriculum but also a journey of self discovery” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004). As Brian said:

*We talked about many issues in the class. We talked about tolerance, differences, and respect. Then we talked about personal feelings and emotions. We tried to understand where the emotion is coming from. I don’t believe you would understand yourself if you don’t know what makes you frustrated and what makes you happy. Examine all the conditions that make you feel this way or the other way and we have the chance to understand the environment we are living in.*

(Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004)

Brian’s pedagogical purpose was to foster “a mode of critical analysis and transformative thinking” in the CARE sophomores (Brian, 2004, class syllabus). In one of the interviews, Brian defined the idea of democratic education as “choice of the people, by the people, and for the people. Schooling should be the opportunity for children to learn how to make choices from them, for them, and by them” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004). In Brian’s syllabus, the ideas of a democratic class and teaching approaches were characterized with three principal class activities: critical reading, dialogical class participation, and reflective writing (Brian, 2004, class syllabus). According to the class syllabus (Brian, 2004, class syllabus):
Students would enter a thinking conflict and challenge stage so that their vision and philosophy on education would be questioned, challenged and be broadened, their consciousness would be raised, and their problem solving skills would be enhanced.

Critical reading. For Brian, a reflective teacher started with reading critically. Brian provided a framework of critical reading in his syllabus (Brian, 2004, class syllabus):

- Develop an understanding of controversial issues and the counter-issues.
- Determine the foundation on which various positions are taken, such as: the frame of reference, the object of analysis, what the analyst brings to the process namely, their perceptions, assumptions, values, purpose, and intellectual skill.
- Attempt to view the writer’s voice from “their shoes” in order to understand the cultural, historical, and political implications of the time of the writing.

As in Connie’s and Mike’s classes, this class organization was discussion-based. In addition to the assigned readings, “the CARE sophomores were expected to bring in reflections, comments, and questions to share with their cohort peers,” said Brian (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004). For Brian, to read and reflect on the readings before the class meeting was important for students’ learning, especially for a discussion based class like CARE. Brian explained:

It is imperative to have their participation in class activities. They are expecting to bring with them what they thought about the reading content, what they felt
was the most exciting part of the reading. They are also expected to share their reflections of their reading, which is an interactive result between their knowledge and the text. (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004)

**Dialogical class participation.** As a democratic teacher, indicated in an interview, Brian emphasized that “there was no one right way of teaching to be used in a democratic classroom” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004). He stated in one class meeting:

> Effective teaching is a process of contemplation and adjustment in which all kinds of possible variables are to be considered, such as students’ knowledge level, subject matter, time, and teaching environment. All of those could be the factor that determined when and how to use certain teaching skills and strategies. (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004)

For Brian, class participation was central to the social construction of knowledge and the development of different levels of understanding. Brian said, “It is important for student’s learning to be engaged in a dialogical approach because ideas and notions should be explored through analysis and reflection rather than the regurgitation of facts” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004). Usually Brian used small group discussions and activities to engage students in reflective dialogues. “From my teaching experience, I find [small group discussion] is an effective way to engage students in talking and speaking,” said Brian (Brian, personal communication, 19, 2004).

To encourage dialogical participation, different approaches were used to invite the CARE sophomores’ interest and enthusiasm. For discussions, for example, Brian would
use various techniques to proceed. For example, “Find some one you are not so close
with and sit beside her/him and to exchange your reflections on chapter three of the
readings” (Brian, personal communication, January 15, 2004); “Use a pencil to write
down things that you would like to give feedback to your classmates like ‘I like this
point,’ ‘a useful strategy’ something like that” (Brian, personal communication, February
19, 2004); “Make sure to be genuine, critical, and truthful in your talking and reflection”
(Brian, personal communication, January 19, 2004); “Identify one sentence on one
paragraph that strikes you most that you would like to share it later with the whole group.
Later I will ask you to read it and we can dig into it further together” (Brian, personal
communication, February 26, 2004).

In Brian’s class, knowledge and ideas were explored through discussions on
readings, films, and various issues. For Brian, the purpose of encouraging each student’s
participation in the discussion was, as he said:

> Each person represented a unique contribution to the whole discourse and
> thinking process. ...A lot of voices, a lot of talking, a lot of discussion, a lot of
> interaction, and a lot of reflection is the rewarding image I would like to see in
> my classroom. (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004)

**Reflective writing.** The development of reflective writing was one of the class
objectives. As said in the class syllabus, “The purpose of writing a reflection paper was
not to re-describe what was read but instead a process and a product of conversation
between the reader and the author” (Brian, 2004, class syllabus). Brian asked his students
to address the following questions in their reflection papers:
• Do you agree or disagree? Why?
• What is the basis of your agreement or disagreement? (It is important to bear in mind that disagreeing just because you believe it to be so is inadequate.)
• What personal experience can you relate with respect to the issues raised that make the method(s) democratic?
• What implications does it have for educational reform?
• What experience do you have that relates to what you are reading?
• What personal insight do you gain?
• How does the information challenge or enhance your philosophy of teaching?

For Brian, reflective writing was “a means by which thinking is clarified, refined, and expressed” (Brian, 2004, class syllabus). It was an effective way to articulate personal standpoint by which, according to Brian, “the level of intellectual, emotional, and spiritual consciousness, or state of mindfulness was informed and transformed” (Brian, 2003, class syllabus).

Democratizing lessons. The class activity of lesson plan “was a challenging task since CARE sophomores practiced them in different subject areas with different teaching methods,” said Brian in an interview (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004). In order to enhance the CARE sophomores’ practical knowing of how to design a lesson plan, Brian provided a five-point procedure as a guiding principle (Table 4.4).
In the exercise of doing lesson plans, what Brian did was try to accommodate the various levels of teaching and subject areas in his class. As Brian said:

*Generally, each week I take one approach in the class. We look at it and see what we can do about it. If possible, we practice it in the class, like mini teaching, for example. The teaching approaches in the book covered most of the characteristics of democratic way of teaching. I try to let students know different approaches they*
can use and to get general principle ideas of teaching. (Brian, personal communication, Februray 19, 2004)

The use of various grouping techniques was a way how Brian embedded democratic ideas in his teaching. While practicing the design of lesson plans was a regular class activity, according to the evidence from class observations, Brian sometimes asked the CARE sophomores to count off from one to six to randomly group them into six working groups; sometimes Brian grouped students by different concentration areas; sometime by levels of teaching. “By grouping students in small groups to create lesson plans together, the lesson plans would include perspectives from different subject perspectives, teaching levels, and student backgrounds,” said Brian (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004). As one CARE sophomore observed, “Grouping is one manifestation of Brian’s democratic way of teaching and learning” (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2003). For Brian, the weekly lesson plan activities were not only part of students’ learning activity, but were also “a process of collaborative work in which democratic ideas were conveyed and practiced” (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004).

Building Relationship Individually and as a Whole

Building relationship through listening. “A core characteristic of Brian’s democratic teaching methods class was listening,” said one CARE sophomore (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004). Another CARE sophomore also observed that “[Brian] emphasized the importance of listening in a democratic classroom and practiced it in the class activities” (CARE students, personal communication, March
11, 2004). Brian made it clear that listening was important in his classroom interaction.

As Brian said,

*It involves the concept of respect in the interaction between teacher and students, I mean, if anyone in the class has got something to say, as an equally important part of the group, they all listen, respect his position and respect his point of view.*

(Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004)

For Brian, democratic education means teacher and students are engaged in “continuous listening to each other in dialogue while maintaining mutual respect for others” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004).

One of Brian’s goals was to create a classroom environment in which students learned how to express their ideas and listened to others’. As Brian described:

*I create the classroom environment. I try to show them tools and skills they learned are useful and can later be used in their classrooms. I also create the classroom environment in which we could talk about everything, with respect for each other; willing to listen to other people.* (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004)

In the democratic environment of listening and respect, the CARE sophomores shared the decision-making in directing their learning and learning activities. “Brian would listen to the [us] carefully and also share his insights on as how he organized the class activities without taking an authoritative stance,” described one CARE sophomore (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004). Comparing Brian’s teaching approach with traditional way of teaching, one CARE sophomore indicated that “[Brian] was willing to interact with students in a reciprocal way and not in the traditional
hierarchical relationship that teachers had with students” (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004). Brian listened when he sat together with the students in the group or he walked around the room during the activities. In this relationship-building process, as one CARE sophomore reported, “Brian managed to keep control of the classroom while still keeping himself on the same level as the rest of us. This is very important in democratic education where we strive for equality and abolishing hierarchies” (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004).

*Exit slips.* In order to gain more understanding of the CARE sophomores’ experience about the class, Brian asked them to turn in an exit slip before they left the classroom in each class meeting. The students briefly reviewed what was done in the class and gave feedback on issues such as the class’s overall organization or the conducting of certain class activities (Brian, 2004, class syllabus). Brian used the exit slips as a communication tool to understand his students. One CARE sophomore (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004) reflected on the function of the exit slip and wrote, “The exit slip was an unreserved channel through which [Brian] had chance to get to know us better.” At the same time, the exit slip also “provided information for evaluating and adjusting my teaching strategies,” said Brian (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004). He added:

*Over all, it seems to be very rich about what we did in class. But when you read these things they write, you know how they felt. For me, even in only one paragraph they let you know what they think and it says a lot about the class. And*
I think they send you a message. (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004)

Caring. Brian’s caring attitude influenced his CARE sophomores’ attitude in caring for their cohort peers. Brian explained how he encouraged quiet students to be brave, to try to speak up and talk in class:

To express yourself is an important activity in a democracy. But I think for some people to express themselves is difficult. You are shy or you have a bad day; you have different reasons. I look out for those who are quiet. I use small group activity to help them join in the discussion. I encourage them in the small groups ...[to] make sure they talk. Without saying everybody talks as a rule, I tell everybody to share. Share what you think and how you feel with your group classmates. (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004)

Study findings from the class observation (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004) revealed that it was an exciting moment for Brian and his class when one quiet CARE sophomore at the seventh class meeting was encouraged by her group peers and decided to represent the group as the speaker. She later stated in her exit slip reflection that Brian’s class had great impact on her becoming open. The CARE sophomore said:

I really enjoyed class today. At first I wasn’t thrilled about doing a lesson plan on the spot because it was scary at first. When I’m put on the spot my brain freezes and I don’t know what to do. You really do encourage us to get involved and speak out more. I feel more comfortable now speaking up in your class because
you do make a point to call on me and later you just talk to me. That’s cool because when I feel there is a foundation, I’m more open. (CARE student, personal communication, February 19, 2004)

Trust in students. The level of trust between Brian and his students was evident in the interactions. “Brian was willing to adjust the class plan and agenda to address the emerging issues and our concerns,” said one CARE sophomore (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004). The events of changing the class syllabus occurred in the middle of the quarter when the students proposed making some adjustments to the class activities.

One occasion of syllabus change was when students expressed their desire to terminate the bi-weekly reflection journal assignment. One CARE student recalled that event and described how Brian showed his trust in students. As she said, “Brian fully discussed with the whole class about the journal assignment and, as a result, took it off the syllabus after he confirmed with the class that it was what they really wanted to do” (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004).

In another occasion, the students wanted to “try mini-lessons with the class to add some extra components such as art lesson or conflict management” (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004). Brian offered advice and facilitated the process. Brian believed in his students as capable beings and based his pedagogy in this. He expressed, “They have capabilities for thinking, choosing, making decisions for what is best for their learning. I trust them fully” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004).
Brian’s confidence in his students invited positive responses and enthusiastic attitudes in the CARE sophomores. Brian reported in an interview, “The content of the exit slips demonstrated that they had the willingness to challenge what they can do about themselves and about changing the world” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004). They were motivated to come to class to learn. As one CARE sophomore reflected, “We are positive about our potential that we CAN help and make a different in children’s lives.” (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004)

*Taking Action*

Brian shared his teaching philosophy of “You have to be active in what you believe” with his CARE sophomores (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004). “Teachers need to be active, to play an active role in the community, and to know that they can change the world,” said Brian (Brian, personal communication, Feb 19, 2004). For Brian, democratic teacher education is modeling what the teacher educators believe about teaching and learning. He expressed this idea in the class:

*If we are just to confess and pontificate different theories and not practice it and not show it through [your actions], then we are standing along side. All we are trying to tell students is “Do what I say but don’t do what I do.” How can we expect them to go out and do something different? They are doing the same thing exactly as they saw in the college classroom because people are practicing what they see.* (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004)

This is the critical pedagogy Freire (1970) called “praxis”: teachers are part of the community and they should take actions toward social justice. Brian’s aim of democratic
education was “taking actions for what you want to be” (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004). For Brian, democratic education is about dialogue and taking action in their community and world. He told his CARE sophomores not only to speak out in class but to “speak out in the community and to be activists” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004).

In one of the class meetings, Brian arranged for the class to watch a film “Children in America’s Schools” (1996). In the discussion, Brian talked about the role of students and teachers in democratic education and why they should be more active in their communities. Brian reminded the CARE sophomores:

...to think about why you joined the CARE program in the first place. I believe you have passion. It’s not enough for you to have passion in CARE. It’s not enough for you to be a part. You need to become active; you need to talk; you need to actively make your point; you need to make people know why you think something is wrong. Don’t think it is too difficult for you; think about something you can do. Don’t think small; that individuals do not have the power to change. Go there and talk about that. Sometimes people don’t know what to do; that’s why you bring them knowledge, you bring them tools. Never give up and do your best.

It’s never enough for only voicing out. It’s important for you to [be] working out and taking actions. (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004)

For Brian, “democratic teaching is working for transformation and change” (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004). Brian provided democratic discussions and activities in class and encouraged the CARE sophomores “to continue to be active in taking actions and therefore your cohort group as a network would become a force in
extending their influences into the educational system and the society” (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004).

It was a very powerful moment when Brian advocated to the CARE sophomores to do more in their schools and communities. As one CARE sophomore recalled:

My favorite day was when Brian gave us his little speech about getting up and doing something rather than just talking about everything, such as our tuition increases. He really inspired me to be an activist and to find a solution to our problems and concerns. It was a very powerful time in the classroom and it inspired us to do more for our school and community. (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004)

John—Calm and Sincere Facilitator

Building on the concepts and content in EDCI 210, John’s class, EDCI 310, “Advanced Democratic Methods,” was the CARE juniors’ exploration of teaching methods in progressive and democratic classrooms. The class was designed with the principle of helping the CARE juniors to “develop different approaches to teach democratically by adapting lesson plans to reflect democratic practices” (John, 2003, class syllabus). As John said:

In this class, I expect them to learn how to create an educational experience for kids in the classroom by adapting a preset lesson plan in a teaching manual or creating one to incorporate democratic components in it while state standards and benchmarks are included. (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003)
This 4 credit hour class also involved 2 hours of field work which placed the CARE juniors in partnership classrooms. As with the three other CARE instructors, the CARE juniors were encouraged to play a key role in class activities and in the learning content. John organized the class by focusing on the exploration of the students’ field experience and a hands-on expeditionary learning project.

*Teacher in a System*

The learning goal that John set up for this class was trying to answer the question of “how do we provide rigorous, meaningful, and democratic learning experiences for ourselves and our students?” (John, 2003, class syllabus). John pointed out the dilemma that a democratic teacher faced when trying to “balance between the state mandated standards and teaching in accordance with the reflective democratic principles” (John, personal communication, September 18, 2003). John brought in a notion of “people in a system” which exists in every social organization as a general realistic constraint (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003). For John, the tension between teachers’ teaching and the demands of the educational system was a general phenomenon. “In general, the educational system does not encourage teachers to use so-called progressive or democratic teaching approaches,” said John in an interview (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003). John stated in the class that “democratic teachers need to have the courage to stick with what they value and practice it in their own teaching settings” (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003).

He confronted the class by questioning the CARE juniors: “Which one is going to change? You as a teacher or the system? Chances are, if you are not trying to change the
system, the system will change you” (John, personal communication, October 2, 2004). John constantly encouraged the CARE juniors to have confidence in their educational views and try to practice them in their teaching. As he said in an interview:

*In my teaching, I try to convey a message to [the CARE juniors] that they will get it and they can do it. It’s kind of a responsibility they have to take in their learning. It takes a while for them to understand. I mean, people like not to have responsibility. It takes patience for that to happen.* (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003)

**No Child Left Behind Act as Case Study**

In their first class meeting, John asked the question “What is democratic education and how does it relate to the current trends in education” (John, personal communication, September 18, 2003)? This question became the leading theme of the class activities for the quarter. John then organized a class discussion on The No Child Left Behind Act (2001) and asked students to write a reflection paper about it. John described how he planned the class activities on the learning topic of The No Child Left Behind Act. He said, “The jigsaw approach of cooperative learning was used to address discussion questions … and to develop a rubric for the paper assessment” (John, personal communication, September 18, 2003). The class was divided into small groups of four students each to discuss the following proposed topics:

1. **(1) Analyze the No Child Left Behind Act from a democratic perspective;**
2. **(2) Compare its underlying philosophy to your own;**
3. **(3) Describe how this legislation will impact the use of democratic practices; and**
(4) Outline how you will meet the demands of this and similar legislation and still remain true to your philosophy of education.

After the discussion, the students all came back together to the large group and shared their most important comments from the discussion period with the class. An assessment rubric was also developed as the criteria with which to critique students’ reflection papers. The No Child Left Behind Act rubric (Table 4.5) contained 4 criteria of very good, good, adequate, and poor and 3 levels of performance which were: coverage of material, effective use of democratic teaching principles, and spelling, grammar.

Based on the class observation, it was evident that this first class activity and writing assignment had set a signpost for the direction of the class (John, personal communication, September 18, 2003). “The class curriculum focused on exploring how to develop ways to adapt lesson plans and teaching approaches to reflect democratic practices in an environment that may not encourage democratic teaching,” said one CARE junior (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003). As seen from the syllabus (John, 2003, class syllabus), the objectives of the class were the following:

- To help establish and participate effectively in a democratic community
- To develop ways to teach democratically under conditions which do not encourage democratic teaching styles
- To refine skills needed to adapt lessons to reflect democratic practices
- To work with colleagues to develop democratic learning experiences
- To participate in the planning and execution of a learning expedition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage of Material</th>
<th>Effective Use of Democratic Teaching Principles</th>
<th>Spelling, Grammar, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Addresses all four questions in a thorough and complete way.</td>
<td>• Clearly articulates democratic teaching practices</td>
<td>• Spelling and grammar show few or no problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gives clear, thorough explanations and makes several points for each question</td>
<td>• Teaching strategies proposed are democratic, but could be articulated more clearly.</td>
<td>• Paper organized in a logical and easy to follow manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explains the NCLB Act completely and in an understandable way. Includes information from sources other than the class discussion and handout.</td>
<td>• Tells why these practices are democratic.</td>
<td>• Standard usage evident throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shows creativity in how you will meet the requirements of NCLB and still remain true to your philosophy. Ideas well thought out.</td>
<td>• Teaching strategies you propose could be democratic, but are not clearly articulated.</td>
<td>• Spelling and grammar errors do not interrupt the flow of ideas or distract from the clarity of the paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clearly states your personal philosophy and compares and contrasts it to NCLB Act’s letter and spirit</td>
<td>• Your philosophy is well stated and is compared and contrasted to the NCLB Act’s provisions.</td>
<td>• A logical organization is apparent and the paper is generally easy to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May not address all questions completely.</td>
<td>• Nonstandard usage detracts somewhat from the paper.</td>
<td>• Maybe one or two instances of nonstandard usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explans all parts of the NCLB Act, but gives only a little more than what was discussed in class.</td>
<td>• Ways you will teach are well thought out and creative. Occasionally you do not give much detail about how they meet requirements of the NCLB Act or how they remain true to your personal philosophy.</td>
<td>• Spelling and grammar errors occasionally interrupt the flow of ideas or distract from the paper’s clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Your personal philosophy is vague and/or not well compared/contrasted to the NCLB Act.</td>
<td>• Ways you will teach are well thought out and creative. Occasionally you do not give much detail about how they meet requirements of the NCLB Act or how they remain true to your personal philosophy.</td>
<td>• Organization is present, but the paper is sometimes difficult to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ways you will teach are well thought out and creative. Occasionally you do not give much detail about how they meet requirements of the NCLB Act or how they remain true to your personal philosophy.</td>
<td>• Teaching strategies you propose are likely to have little democratic effect and are not clearly articulated.</td>
<td>• Nonstandard English usage detracts somewhat from the paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Your philosophy is not well stated, and not compared/contrasted to the NCLB Act well.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Spelling and grammar, organization, and nonstandard usage detract from the paper and make it difficult to understand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.5 No Child Left Behind Act Paper Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Good (4 points)</th>
<th>Good (3 points)</th>
<th>Adequate (2 points)</th>
<th>Poor (1 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Address all four questions.</td>
<td>• Address all four questions.</td>
<td>• May not address all questions completely.</td>
<td>• Does not completely address all the questions and/or does so in a shallow, vague manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explanations clear, but could be better developed. Makes more than one point for each question.</td>
<td>• Explanations clear, but could be better developed. Makes more than one point for each question.</td>
<td>• Explanations and points made are occasionally vague and do not always exactly meet the requirements of the NCLB and/or your personal philosophy.</td>
<td>• Explanations, ways you will teach, and points made are vague and do not necessarily relate well to the questions asked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explains all parts of the NCLB Act, but gives only a little more than what was discussed in class.</td>
<td>• Explains all parts of the NCLB Act, but gives only a little more than what was discussed in class.</td>
<td>• Your personal philosophy is vague and/or not well compared/contrasted to the NCLB Act.</td>
<td>• Ways you will teach are not well explained and show little creativity. You do not tie the Act’s requirements to your personal philosophy well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ways you will teach are well thought out and creative. Occasionally you do not give much detail about how they meet requirements of the NCLB Act or how they remain true to your personal philosophy.</td>
<td>• Ways you will teach are well thought out and creative. Occasionally you do not give much detail about how they meet requirements of the NCLB Act or how they remain true to your personal philosophy.</td>
<td>• Ways you will teach are well thought out and creative. Occasionally you do not give much detail about how they meet requirements of the NCLB Act or how they remain true to your personal philosophy.</td>
<td>• Your personal philosophy is not well stated, and not compared/contrasted to the NCLB Act well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Your personal philosophy is vague and/or not well compared/contrasted to the NCLB Act.</td>
<td>• Your personal philosophy is vague and/or not well compared/contrasted to the NCLB Act.</td>
<td>• Your personal philosophy is vague and/or not well compared/contrasted to the NCLB Act.</td>
<td>• Ways you will teach are not well explained and show little creativity. You do not tie the Act’s requirements to your personal philosophy well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spelling and grammar errors do not interrupt the flow of ideas or distract from the clarity of the paper.</td>
<td>• Spelling and grammar errors do not interrupt the flow of ideas or distract from the clarity of the paper.</td>
<td>• Spelling and grammar errors occasionally interrupt the flow of ideas or distract from the paper’s clarity.</td>
<td>• Spelling and grammar errors, organization, and nonstandard usage detract from the paper and make it difficult to understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A logical organization is apparent and the paper is generally easy to follow.</td>
<td>• A logical organization is apparent and the paper is generally easy to follow.</td>
<td>• Organization is present, but the paper is sometimes difficult to follow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For John, teaching was not instilling a body of scientific facts in students’ heads. “Teachers were not dealing with scientific subjects but knowledge construction activities. There is something more complex than completing a checklist that teachers have to deal with every day in their teaching, said John in an interview (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003). He further explained,

*Teaching is not about getting a check list done. It is about how you get it done. I learned from my teaching experience that learning could make students really empowered if they have a commitment to learning how. It involves ways you make students engaged and active in their learning in real activity.*

*As a teacher, when you are in a classroom with a bunch of kids, it is in your mind that something you are going to deal with is beyond the lesson plan.*

*Learning is more on how students are taught than on what they are taught.* (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003)

In the class activity about the No Child Left Behind Act, John challenged his students that if “teach to the test” is the motto that shapes your teaching practice then what is driving your principles? A result of this could be, as John reported, that “other approaches such as hands-on assessment of children’s learning and the trust in children’s ability and creativity were squeezed out by the demands for test preparation” (John, personal communication, September 18, 2003).

It was John’s class goal that the CARE juniors were expected:

*To learn to see kids as capable individuals who can learn and grow. [CARE juniors must] put efforts to change ‘the system’ to fit their educational views. In addition, to transforming lesson plans to make the ones out of the book more*
democratic, because it is the mission and challenge a democratic teacher would have faced. (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003)

Teaching Experience as Curriculum

Sharing of personal teaching experiences was a technique that John often used to help the CARE juniors “make connections between theory and practice in teaching,” said one CARE junior (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003). For John, providing his personal teaching experience and stories in the CARE classroom was not only “offering CARE students an opportunity to learn and reflect from an [experienced] teacher”, but also an opportunity for John to “examine his teaching conceptions and understandings” (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003).

In order to help the CARE juniors understand how to cope with “real” teaching situations, John provided his own personal experiences as examples, such as how to conduct an expeditionary learning project of “how to make a pond”. When giving his personal experience, John would provide realistic scenarios so that the CARE juniors could understand where the teaching knowledge and skills were situated. For example, in the pond expeditionary project, John demonstrated how different subject matter knowledge like math (volume, measuring (pond, area), drop ratio, cost, etc.), science (geology, plants, water, etc.), and reading (technical and scientific information, writing letters or articles to other audience, etc.) could be incorporated in the learning process (John, personal communication, October 23, 2003).

While learning and debating and reflecting on the scenarios, the CARE juniors would often “touch on how they could be adjusted to fit different teaching situations,”
said one junior (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003). It was seen that CARE students were gaining insights about the practical classroom issues and learning how they could be dealt with. John thought that “giving personal experiences as examples allowed the CARE juniors to think and discuss what they might do when they were faced with similar situations” (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003).

Messages from the CARE juniors’ class reflections indicated that the experience and stories that John described were vital for them in that it helped build their confidence about their teaching in the future. One student expressed how she benefited from John’s personal stories. She said:

*I feel that [John’s] personal teaching experience truly helps teach us because he always has a story/experience that dealt with issues that we are talking about in the classroom, whether it is classroom management, lesson plans, or creating a sense of community. It is important to hear about real situations because we have analyzed ‘made-up’ scenarios so many times.* (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003).

*Draw the Line*

For John, an important principle of democratic education was “engaging students in active participation while having flexibility under the teacher’s leadership” (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003). He stated in an interview that “democracy in a classroom is possible when both [the above] elements can be integrated” (John, personal communication, November, 13, 2003). “Because of the flexibility, I felt we have the privilege to question what we are doing and not to be afraid of questioning
ourselves,” said one CARE junior (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003). Another CARE junior shared her learning experience of how to teach democratically in John’s class. She said,

*John showed us to learn how to facilitate your classroom democratically but to avoid being walked all over because you are nice. I learned it from John’s teaching that as a teacher you have to build order and respect in your class.*

(CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003)

“I always keep an open mind about anything and everything students want to do. It is up to a teacher’s decision whether to actually lay down the rules or come up with something for students to do,” said John (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003). John demonstrated in his teaching how the flexibility and reliance on students was practiced in his CARE class organization. For example,

*John came to the class with an agenda of things that he planned for the class to accomplish. But, if situations emerged and the class needed to take a different direction, then he would drop his original plan without hesitation.* (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003)

However, having flexibility in democratic education does not mean everything goes without boundaries. As John explained:

*I showed [the CARE juniors] not to have authoritarian control over the class, but I don’t mean let kids get wild, I think that’s wrong. Kids need to learn how to take and share the responsibility. It is not an easy job. It takes a while to establish an expectation that they can and will take responsibility. I told CARE [juniors] to*
give yourself some time to work with kids. It takes a lot of patience for that to happen. (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003)

For John, the essential knowledge and skills that the CARE juniors had to build was “to learn how to run your class democratically and fostering a culture of respect” (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003). John said, “As a teacher you have to maintain order and respect. It’s a teaching decision you need to make between students’ wishes and academic concerns. In democratic education, you have to know when to draw the line” (John, personal communication, October, 2, 2003).

For many times, John’s class organization was guided by the CARE juniors’ initiations, and John helped it happen that way. He stated his pedagogical philosophy that:

They have a voice in class matters and I feel comfortable that the class is guided by them working together cooperatively. I will give time to listen to their thoughts and wishes before moving on to the next agenda or activity. I mean, if they can do the procedures and they still don’t know what they’ve done, you have to take a number of times to get them to understand what that means by doing so. You have to sense their feeling and ask them what they need and want to learn. (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003)

One student confirmed that the way John taught demonstrated that the class is democratic in nature. The CARE junior said:

We have a lot of say in what goes on in the class. I think that his organization is in his ability to be unorganized and flexible. The flexibility keeps him working apace with us. He always tries to understand our feeling and what we want to do, which
I think it is extremely important because it demonstrates it is very democratic of him. (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003)

Hands-on—CARE Expeditionary Learning

One student recalled a learning experience in John’s class: “I feel John has demonstrated how important forming a community is in a classroom” (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003). John shared with the CARE juniors the expeditionary projects that he had done in his classroom. For example, “The Pond Expedition” in which students explored where and how to make a pond and what they learned from it. Another was “When Do We Need This Math Project” in which students interviewed adults to see exactly where math is applied in real life. Learning from John’s experience in how to organize an expeditionary learning experience, the CARE juniors, according to the class observation, were inspired by the cooperative learning ethic and hoped that they would have the chance to experience it themselves (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003).

During the class, the CARE juniors frequently expressed their concerns about “whether the CARE program could give them what they needed to become the best teachers they can be” (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003). Through the course of several discussions, the class decided to create their own learning expedition project on the CARE program. One CARE junior considered the project forming process as a crucial moment for democracy to happen.

The night that we decided to base our learning expedition on CARE program itself was amazing. For the first time we were allowed to turn around and openly
question what we were being taught. John sat back and listened to our concerns once at a time, making the most out of each comment and putting a positive spin on anything that came down the pipe. Although I felt that many of my fellow CARE students were over reading to the situation, I still think that it was properly addressed, people had concerns and they were allowed to voice them, which is democracy at its best. (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003)

During the discussion of what should be the main theme of the CARE expeditionary learning project, John suggested a discussion strategy to form the leading questions for their expeditionary project:

Don’t talk about what the problems are about the CARE program now. Talk about where you want to be when you are done with any program in teacher education, and then look at it as “does it give you skills and knowledge to be eligible?” (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003)

Two core theme questions were formed in several following discussions during two class meetings (John, personal communication, October 23, 2003): “What questions or concerns do you have about being a good teacher?” “What questions or concerns do you have about the CARE program?”

Substantial questions emerged from group discussions and negotiation. John recalled the discussion process and indicated that “the questions raised by the CARE juniors for the CARE program expeditionary learning had a special educational meaning for their teaching prospects” (John personal communication, November 13, 2003). He explained:
About the project of CARE expeditionary learning, the concept, I think it is a hard thing for them. They actually have to be responsible in designing the curriculum. Be responsible in their own learning, I think it is the biggest part of what education is about. (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003)

The six leading questions for the CARE expeditionary learning project were (John, personal communication, October 23, 2003):

1. What are the core values of CARE and how did they come to be?
2. How do CARE professors express the program core values to their students?
3. What skills and knowledge do specific courses give us?
4. Do people in this program get information effectively?
5. What ideals have graduates been able to maintain and how have these helped them develop their classroom?
6. Does CARE make us marketable?

For John, the expeditionary learning project was a very important teaching approach in a learning community. It is his teaching philosophy that “the best way to learn something is by doing it,” said John (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003) Messages from the class reflections on the process of the investigation indicated that the CARE juniors got a chance to see how “these questions were tied to each other even though they were independently important, said John (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003). The CARE juniors’ expeditionary learning project on the CARE program became an intensive learning experience. They learned how to “negotiate and decide the questions to investigate” (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003); they learned to “divide the class into proper groups so each question could be addressed”
(CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003); they also learned how to “present the expeditionary project and invite people to attend the project presentation” (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003).

A variety of activities were conducted by the CARE juniors to try to answer the above questions. One CARE junior reflected on the hands-on experience of conducting the CARE expeditionary project:

*We studied the ideas and values of the CARE program, used various materials and informants as evidence, interviewed or designed questionnaires to collect information, discussed and evaluated findings, negotiated ways of doing project presentations, prepared reports and papers, etc. The hands-on experiences are so vital that it helps build my confidence in my future teaching.* (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003)

John felt the process of doing the expeditionary learning project had an influential impact on the CARE juniors’ learning. He said he felt that “the CARE expeditionary learning involved not only skills and knowledge for teaching, but also the values of a democratic way of life, which were demonstrated while doing the project” (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003). One CARE junior evaluated the expeditionary learning as a very important teaching approach in a learning community. She stated:

*The experience of the learning expedition is very valuable. The day we finalized our project was a very good experience. We worked together, debated some different ideas and then choose something that everyone could agree on. Learning expeditions are an important method of teaching and are democratic when*
developed by students with a teacher as a facilitator. One of the best ways to
learn something is simply by doing it. Since we are doing a learning expedition
ourselves we will be better able to use this method in our own classrooms. (CARE
students, personal communication, November 13, 2003)

Summary

In Connie, Mike, Brian, and John’s classrooms, one common theme that emerged
was democratic education as an educational philosophy that guided the four CARE
instructors’ pedagogy. The CARE instructors tried to create a learning community where
students were all included and valued. They helped the CARE students understand that
they, as students, were the point of strength in the learning process. The CARE
instructors empowered CARE students to engage themselves in the inquiry process: to
explore their teaching role in a democracy and build knowledge and skills for their
teaching pedagogy.

The spirit of student-centered teaching was practiced in the four CARE
instructors’ classes. The CARE instructors emphasized the importance of understanding
their students and the nature of schooling in developing their pedagogy. The pedagogical
thinking and actions were related to the CARE students’ knowledge level and
comprehension of teaching. The CARE instructors demonstrated how to share class
leadership with students to allow students to plan and organize class activities and have
the ownership of their learning. To help the CARE students master subject matter
knowledge and pedagogical knowledge and the relationship between the two, the CARE
instructors demonstrated a variety of instructional methods. With the concern about
practical use of knowledge in teaching, the CARE instructors emphasized that knowledge entails lived practice, not just accumulating information.

In the next chapter, a framework of the pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) in CARE teacher preparation will be constructed. The analysis will focus on those components that contributed to the four CARE instructors’ PCK. In addition, the PCK as a teaching framework that informed the CARE instructors’ teaching practice will be discussed.
CHAPTER FIVE

Analysis of Data

Introduction

With a narrative inquiry framework, in Chapter Four I presented how the four CARE instructors engaged CARE students using their pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) framework to facilitate activities and content through democratic values. This process of the four CARE instructors’ teaching is the focus of this study. In this chapter, a framework of the four CARE instructors’ PCK is presented; each component of the PCK structure is elaborated; and research data is analyzed along with the PCK structure and presented as evidence.

Since the introduction of the term by Lee Shulman (1986a, b, 1987), pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) has been interpreted as the blending of content knowledge and Pedagogical knowledge. With pedagogical content knowledge, teachers translate or transform subject matters, concepts, or issues into understandable forms to engage students’ learning and understanding. As discussed in Chapter Two, every teacher has his or her own ways of translating content knowledge, which helps students make sense of subject matter, concepts, or issues (Shulman, 1986a, b, 1987).

With the individual differences the four CARE instructors had in their teaching areas and teaching styles, within the context of the democratic education CARE program, common themes and categories of PCK did emerge from this study. During the data analysis process, seven constituting categories of PCK were identified: 1) knowledge of educational aim (teaching for democracy); 2) knowledge of democratic teacher education; 3) knowledge of content (teaching about teaching as content knowledge); 4) knowledge
of curriculum for democracy; 5) knowledge of learners (two-fold nature of learners); 6) knowledge of democratic pedagogy; and 7) knowledge of professional self.

The categorical presentation of the framework of the PCK of the CARE instructors can be shown as in Figure 5.1.

Figure 5.1 Categorical Framework of Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) of CARE Instructors

Two noteworthy distinctions can be made from Figure 5.1 when compared with the conceptual framework of PCK proposed by Shulman (1987) and Morine-Dershimer
& Kent (1999). The first one is the existence of the overarching knowledge of teaching for democracy as the educational aim. In the examination of the four CARE instructors’ PCK for teacher preparation, the idea of teaching for democracy guided the CARE instructors’ teaching curriculum and pedagogy. That is, the values and perspectives about democratic education guided their teaching. The findings showed the ideal of democratic education as the overriding knowledge branches and nurtures three categories:

- Knowledge of democratic teacher education
- Knowledge of democratic pedagogy
- Knowledge of curriculum for democracy

The second distinction that emerged from this research data of the four CARE instructors’ teaching is the knowledge of professional self. The notion of “professional self” refers to the professional role or character that teachers perceive of themselves (Bauer, 1999; Connelly & Clandinin, 1999; Kelchtermans, 1993). Professional self is the teacher educator’s self image in the teaching profession where they envision how they should speak, listen, behave, and act in order to be perceived as professional within the paradigm of democratic education. This study’s finding revealed that when the CARE instructors talked about their teaching, they were also talking about their characters as democratic teacher educators. The professional teaching image consciously involved in their pedagogical thinking and reasoning underpinned their teaching actions. Later in this chapter, I will discuss how the professional self is an ontological idea in which the CARE instructors see themselves as professional teacher educators and act accordingly.

As stated in Chapter One, the purpose of this study was to understand, in a democratic teacher education program, 1) what are the democratic values that the teacher
educators perceived as their educational philosophy; 2) what is the structure of the teacher educators’ PCK, and 3) how does the PCK inform their teaching practice?

In accordance with the research questions, the data analysis in this chapter revealed that democratic values and principles were embedded in the CARE teacher educators’ PCK of the educational aims which guided their pedagogy. In addressing the connections between the democratic values and the knowledge of educational aim, there will be discussions in the section of knowledge of educational aim—teaching for democracy.

The second study question of what the structure of the CARE teacher educators’ PCK is and its contributing components are shown in Figure 5.1, the Categorical Framework of Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) of CARE Instructors. The contributing component will be discussed in the following sections.

The third study question is in regard to how PCK informs CARE instructors’ teaching practice. This study’s findings revealed that the professional awareness and self reflection associated with the knowledge of professional self were the key media that weighed the mingling of the CARE instructors’ PCK in their teaching. The third research question of how the CARE instructors’ PCK informed their pedagogical reasoning and actions is covered in the section of knowledge of professional self.

In the following sections, I will use the framework of the CARE instructors’ PCK as the structure for presentation of this data analysis. The discussions on how democratic values influenced the four CARE instructors’ PCK and how PCK informed their teaching practice will be included within this presentation structure.
In this chapter, the data collected from interviews, class observations, student responses to questionnaires, classroom events, as well as class syllabi will be used as evidence and indicators of how democratic teacher educators teach what they teach. In addition, literature references will be used to support and validate the understanding and interpretations.

**Knowledge of Educational Aim—Teaching for Democracy**

Teaching for democracy as the aim of education involves the idea of nurturing student teachers in teacher education programs with an understanding of and commitment to the democratic way of schooling (Novak, 1994). The four CARE instructors intentionally approached their courses with the aim of teaching for democracy. Their pedagogy was to empower the CARE students to construct their pedagogical knowledge and skills so as to integrate democratic values and principles for their future classrooms.

**On the Concept of Democracy**

Carr and Hartnett (1996) categorized existing theories/understandings of democracy into two groups: classical (direct) democracy and contemporary (representative) democracy. These two approaches have different educational implications. Theories of classical democracy include Rousseau’s (1968) direct democratic theory, J. S. Mill’s (1976) developmental theory, and MacPherson (1973) and Pateman’s (1973) modern participatory theory, and Barber’s (1984) strong democracy. Based on the basic principle that every community member can develop their abilities and capacities, classical democracy is a moral ideal requiring opportunities for direct
participation in the community. The classical idea of democracy is compatible with Dewey’s (1916/1966) idea that democracy is fundamentally a way of living and not simply a form of government. As Dewey stated, “it is primarily a mode of associated living, a conjoint, communicated experience.” (Dewey, 1916/1966, 87)

On the other hand, according to Carr and Hartnett (1996), as a result of twentieth century political theories and practice in the modern market economy, contemporary democracy refers to the generation of political leaders and representative government under independent judiciary (Dahl, 1985; Goodwin, 1992; Hayek, 1976; Lippmann, 1925; Schumpeter, 1942). Goodwin (1992) described the common traits of the contemporary idea of democracy as follows:

Democracy is seen purely as procedure, a procedure justified as being the most efficient or the best utility-maximizing method. … The new theories often emphasize as goals the maintenance and stability of the system, rather than its … role in … educating citizens. (p. 231)

It was revealed in this study that the CARE instructors were more inclined to the idea of classical democracy. They iterated that a democratic education was to “educate students to value every included individual’s contribution” (e.g. Connie, personal communication, November 13, 2003); to “foster informed citizens who will be engaged in on-going discussion and dialogues” (e.g. Mike, personal communication, March 01, 2004); and to “encourage every student to actively participate in their learning and class activities cooperatively” (e.g. Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004; John, personal communication, November 13, 2003). As one CARE junior observed, The CARE instructors shared how they “viewed the classroom as a learning community
where [CARE students] learned how to solve problems through cooperative group activities” (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003). In practicing the cooperative learning processes, for example, during the process of conducting the CARE Expeditionary Project in John’s class, the CARE juniors also learned what John saw as the cornerstone of democratic spirit of “how to communicate with each other across differences and how to develop shared interests for the class” (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003).

Grounded in the spirit of democratic education, the CARE program aims to foster informed citizens with values, attitudes, and abilities for their active participation in democratic communities (CARE Handbook, 2003). The CARE instructors viewed school functions as an important building block for that purpose. As Mike stated, the goal of the CARE program is to integrate CARE students’ engagement “with knowledge and skills to build values, attitudes, and behaviors to actively involve them in the democratic way of life” (Mike, personal communication, March 01, 2004). John emphasized in his teaching that the democratic way of learning in teacher education involved not only “skills and knowledge for teaching,” but also “the values of a democratic way of life” (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003).

In this sense, two objectives of private and public aspects of education are integrated in democratic education while passing knowledge and skills on to students. In the democratic ideal, as Barber (1984), Gutmann (1987), and Moe (2000) argued, not only does public education prepare the nation’s children with knowledge and skills for productive lives and careers, more importantly education is to prepare them with
democratic values and attitudes to be active and informed citizens in a democratic community.

The CARE instructors’ idea of teaching for democracy echoed the above researchers’ perspectives that on the private side, “[school] education provides students with knowledge and skills for their [economic and social] lives” (Mike, personal communication, March 01, 2004); on the public side, “school education should be the place where students are engaged to enhance their participation in community and society” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004).

Research on democratic values indicates that the idea of democracy has met its greatest challenge in the notion of free market economy, which is transcendent in modern governmental policies and social lives (Moe, 2000). The challenge democratic teachers have to face is that the idea of free market economy has a great impact on the evolution of what education means in a democracy. “It seems like a normal notion in this society that the purpose of schooling is nothing more than the preparation for job world or working world” (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004).

Related research indicated that the meaning of democracy is evolving almost exclusively as a matter of personal choice and self-interest, and the notion of a public or common good is disappearing (Apple & Beane, 1995). In his research on contemporary democracy and education, McDonnell (2000) argued that one of the barriers to the classical democracy in education is the dominance of private and individual goals of schooling over its collective and public purposes. This version of democracy reduces its emphasis on the public purpose of education. McDonnell (2000) observed the democratic
goal of participation in associational membership has become a less important focus in schools.

The four CARE instructors’ pedagogical view on democracy in education emphasized both personal development and social development. The personal development side of democracy, as Connie stated, “Democratic education is … the way that values everybody, gives voice, and requires people to be very reflective about what they are thinking and what they are doing” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003). On the other hand, the CARE instructors also affirmed Dewey’s democratic idea of education, that is, as Brian advocated in his class, “to develop the students’ capacities in ways that empower themselves to be active participants in the school community and the wider society” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004).

The CARE instructors advocated the idea of democratic education in their teaching by creating a learning community in which they engaged the CARE students to learn teaching knowledge as members of a democratic community. “The goal of creating a democratic learning community was to provide opportunities for every member of the group to create, question, and learn together as critical learners,” reported Connie (Connie personal communication, November 10, 2003).

In this learning community, teachers and students care about both private intellectual growth and the development of the larger society. The CARE instructors demonstrated in their teaching that the purpose of teaching democratic pedagogy is, as stated in their interviews, not only to “provide CARE students with teaching knowledge and critical thinking skills for democratic learning” (Mike, personal communication, March 01, 2004), but also to convey the message that “the learning itself is a democratic
activity” (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003) and that “teachers need to be active, to play an active role in the community, and to know that they can change the world” (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004).

From Critical Thinkers to Reflective Practitioners—the Social Context

For the four CARE instructors, teaching and learning was to set a broad exploration of how social context shaped the educational process and practice. Through readings and class activities, the four CARE instructors created a classroom environment in which the CARE students were engaged in understanding theoretical and practical aspects of teaching within the realistic social context in which education is embedded. For example, as stated in Connie’s and Mike’s class syllabus, the learning content was focused on the examination of the social context of schooling and the established beliefs about the purpose and experience of schooling for the nation’s children. Topics of such critical thinking included “How schooling is institutionalized in America,” “Goal(s) of critical literacy education,” “Learning as a function of race, culture, gender, and socio-economic status” (Connie, 2003, class syllabus; Mike, 2004, class syllabus). “By exploring different theories and perspectives, the [CARE] students examined the context of education [and] helped build their knowledge base for their teaching” (Mike, personal communication, March 01, 2004).

The critical examination of the social context brought with it cognitive dissonance and such conflicts provoked were used by CARE instructors to nurture critical thinkers (Giroux, 1985; Paul, 1990) and reflective practitioners (Schön, 1983, 1987). Being critical thinkers and reflective practitioners, for the CARE instructors, is to “think beyond
the text, beyond the course, and beyond the instructor. It is a means for [CARE students] to explore and expand their critical consciousness. … And all of these take a lot of thought and reflection on how to be a teacher” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003).

One challenge that the four CARE instructors faced was to picture struggles and difficulties that their students might face when they learned to develop critical thinking and reflection skills for teaching democratically. The four CARE instructors were veteran teachers with many years of practical experience working in the school settings. “[CARE] students were exposed to insiders’ views of the school systems, particularly those systems that would discourage democratic pedagogy,” said John in an interview (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003).

While the CARE students were gaining practical teaching knowledge from the field experience, a situation sometimes occurred that raised doubts about whether the idea of democratic education, which they had been practicing in the college classroom, was “only a utopian ideal that could not be achieved in classrooms as they are today” (John, personal communication, October 02, 2003). The CARE Juniors were skeptical about the practice of democratic education in their classrooms “when the school itself advocated a top-down authoritative teaching system,” said one junior in John’s class (John, personal communication, October 23, 2003).

One question often raised by the CARE juniors was to challenge John as to whether or not their learning of democratic teaching would help them to become more effective teachers. They raised questions such as “why learn the so-called democratic
approaches if the teaching system wouldn’t allow them to be applied” (John, personal communication, October 02, 2003).

John saw the CARE juniors’ struggles as “teachable moments” to guide them to “reflect on why they felt they were struggling, to reflect on the struggle feelings, and to examine their views of teaching and learning” (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003). As a teacher of long standing experience, he said in an interview, “I understand the struggles of the CARE students who recognize the tension between a school system designed for one purpose and a teacher who strived to work in the students’ best interests” (John, personal communication, October 02, 2003).

A teaching strategy that John used in this circumstance was to “encourage the CARE students to explore their personal values and attitudes in teaching” (John, personal communication, October 02, 2003). From his personal teaching experience, as John said:

I realized that the current educational system generally does not encourage teachers to use so-called progressive or democratic teaching approaches. I told [the CARE juniors] that teaching as a moral action requires teachers to reflect on what values and principles they hold in education and as human beings,” reported John in an interview. (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003)

He also urged his students “to develop the courage to challenge the existing assumptions embedded in the school systems” (John, personal communication, October 02, 2003). At the same time, he emphasized that “democratic teachers need to have the courage stick with what they value and practice it in their own teaching settings” (John, personal communication, October 02, 2003).
John and the other three CARE instructors’ teaching incorporated examination of the wider context of political, social, and cultural conditions of the school system. In this way, the four CARE instructors built a learning community in which CARE students conceptualized their pedagogy. Learning to be a teacher was a journey in which the CARE instructors helped CARE students to challenge the existing educational system while guiding them to reflect on their professional image in teaching. In the CARE classrooms, Connie, Mike, Brian, and John helped the CARE students realize the significance of the social and cultural conditions that impacted their students and their democratic approach to teaching.

Knowledge of Democratic Teacher Education

The CARE program as a pre-service teacher education program was the formal starting point for CARE students to learn about teaching and learning. The seeds for professionalism in teaching were nurtured during teacher preparation. Generally, instructors are responsible for nurturing the future teachers with foundations of professional knowledge and skills for the development of their teaching profession.

In addition to preparing the CARE students with the professional knowledge and skills for teaching, the CARE instructors emphasized the importance of the creation of a democratic learning community to model for the CARE students why and how learning was transformed and enriched in an intentional democratic social context. For example, as Connie said:

*I think it’s important to establish a learning community, a place where people learn to live together, to express different opinions, and to be accepted. ... as a*
group, we get to learn learning together, working together, living together, what things do we need to agree upon. (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003)

Research reports that democratic teacher educators refer to those who can call forth democratic possibilities in a wide variety of situations and model their values and principles in practices (Novak, 1994). In the CARE program, the four CARE instructors modeled democratic practices in their teaching for the CARE students’ novice pedagogy and set conditions for them to engage in such practices.

In doing so, the CARE classroom became a learning community where democratic values were reflected in course content and pedagogy. The study’s findings revealed that the four CARE instructors’ teaching practice aimed towards the Deweyan idea of education (Dewey, 1916/1966). In an ideal public school classroom, as Connie expected, “the student would learn what it means to live in a democracy and to be an active and responsible citizen in that democracy” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003). Three major functions in the CARE instructors’ knowledge of democratic teacher education emerged from their teaching:

- Becoming a reflective practitioner
- Building an learning community
- Investigating the social context of school

_Becoming a Reflective Practitioner_

Evidenced from the observations, through course readings, discussions, activities, lecturing, and field experiences, a major learning goal in these CARE courses was to
forge an understanding of the cultural, political, social, and institutional context in which the day-to-day realities of classrooms were shaped. This approach to teacher education aligned with Schön’s (1983, 1987) “reflective practitioner.” Schön (1983, 1987) argued the importance in raising the students’ awareness of the political, social, and institutional system where teachers work. This teaching pedagogy is also supported by studies regarding teacher education which have recommended that teacher educators in university programs should engage students in the learning inquiry process by using collaborative and reflective approaches (Goodlad, 1990a, 1990b; Holmes Group, 1986, 1990, 1995; National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, 1991). Connie agreed with this teaching approach and viewed democratic education “not as a subject matter to be studied, but as a learning process in which students were required to be reflective about what they were thinking and what they were learning” (Connie, personal communication, October 21, 2003).

The four CARE instructors emphasized in their modeling the significant role of reflection. As one of the student said, “we were constantly challenged to think critically … to voice our opinions” (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004). From Mike’s pedagogical perspective, in order to learn how to be a reflective practitioner, CARE students needed to “develop [their] sense of decision making capacity” (Mike, personal communication, March 01, 2004). CARE students were encouraged to investigate their own teaching behaviors, to think critically about their decision-making, and to follow closely with questions and problems found in their field work. For example, as Connie was making the connection between field work and classroom activities, she said that “gradually, … the cohort students will develop the
ability to reflect on how their values form a lens through which they make [their] observations” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003). One CARE sophomore reflected on the learning experience in Mike’s class and learned to make connections in her learning. She said:

The books and videos [Mike] selected for this course as well as the experience I had at middle school broaden my perspectives and keep me open minded to all issues. The issues and perspectives I learned and confronted ... now I know how [they] can be applied to education and the learning environment of my classroom.

(CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004)

For the four CARE instructors, democratic education was a teaching vision, and also a leaning content that cultivated professional development by developing different perspectives and knowledge for teaching. In doing so, the CARE students were guided to construct and develop their own pedagogy for their teaching profession. Learning how to teach was conceptualized as a reflection process in which CARE students examined different theoretical knowledge and practical skills to construct their own pedagogy. As one CARE sophomore reflected on her learning experience in Connie’s class:

Piaget’s stages of child development and my field experience have taught me more effective ways to deal with children. I feel I could be much calmer with them after observation in classroom. Also, understanding that five year olds are egocentric allows me to accept many of the actions from students. I am confident that I will be able to handle many situations much more effectively now. (CARE students, personal communication, October 8, 2003)
**Building a Learning Community**

In the CARE classrooms, the CARE instructors modeled discussion-leading and communication skills to demonstrate for the CARE students the importance of forging a learning community. Findings on the four CARE instructors’ PCKs revealed that various approaches such as small and large group discussion, hands-on projects and individual and group presentations were used to create an inclusive learning community while engaging CARE students to investigate the idea of democratic classroom.

For example, in order to build a trusting classroom atmosphere, Connie and Brian used small group discussions and activities to encourage students to talk with one another. “I found in my experience that the small group discussion is a useful strategy to engage students to open themselves to others [so] as to build a safe and comfortable class atmosphere” (Connie, personal communication, October 21, 2003). Regarding the CARE students’ exploring content designed to make democratic teaching visible in the lesson planning exercise, Brian stated that “this cooperative approach afforded students opportunities to become acquainted with their peers” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004). In Brian’s teaching method class, he engaged CARE sophomores “in a cohesive and participating learning environment,” as evaluated by one CARE sophomore (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004). Brian set the conditions under which a learning community was forged where the CARE students “learned how to build a classroom community by using different teaching approaches” (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004).

Mike’s educational learning course supported discussion-based instruction as an effective learning approach to encourage active, inclusive participation. “In the class
discussions, I want to make sure if all voices were heard. Class discussions provide students to have the opportunity to learn how to listen to each other, help each other, and ultimately grow together,” said Mike in an interview (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004).

On the other hand, John usually organized his teaching method class in cooperative groups to facilitate CARE juniors’ participation in reading studies or class project planning. Cooperative learning in John’s class also functioned as “a communication tool” through which the CARE students were more likely “to express ideas and views of how the class curriculum might be organized” to accomplish certain learning objectives (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003).

Connie found out that CARE sophomores “felt more comfortable to talk in class if they felt they were part of a class with an accepting and respecting atmosphere” (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003). In an inclusive learning community, CARE students learned how to negotiate with one another and compromise with difference and build a collective perspective based on different ideas. For example, as one CARE junior reflected on the CARE expeditionary project in John’s class, “The day we finalized our [expeditionary] project was a very good experience. We worked together, debated some different ideas and then chose something that everyone could agree on (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2004).

Here again we see Dewey’s (1916/1966) idea that a democratic learning community should encompass full and free interactions between community members to develop shared interests and understandings. The CARE instructors intentionally provided opportunities for the CARE students to engage them with teaching and learning
ideas through class discussions, group activities, reading reflections, self reflections, and field observations, among other activities.

For the CARE instructors, democratic principles required their classrooms to begin as a learning community in which active communication and reflection were encouraged. To qualify as engaged learning, there must be “dialogue in the classroom community,” said Brian (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004). CARE classes emphasized reflection on the nature of relationships in educational settings—the relationships between students and students, teacher and students, and teachers and teachers. In the CARE learning communities, the CARE instructors all reported their intentionality in creating a classroom community where students had the opportunity to learn how to direct and govern their learning. Examples are the midterm evaluation in Connie’s class, the direction of class discussions and activities in Mike’s class, and the conducting of the hands-on expeditionary project in John’s class, and the readjustment of the pre-set class syllabus in Brian’s class. One CARE sophomore recalled the best learning experience in Brian’s class was when she felt she was empowered to actively participate in her learning. She said:

During the first day of class Brian allowed us to go through the syllabus and make changes and compromises as we all felt necessary. This was really important because it showed me how wonderful it felt to have a major role in creating how our class would run. I realize the importance of flexibility in my own classroom. (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004)

The CARE learning communities were “marked by active participation and communication, where students initiate and take responsibility for [their] learning
through negotiation with [their] instructor,” evaluated one CARE sophomore (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2003). The findings in this study revealed that theories, knowledge, opinions, and experiences shared and discussed in the CARE classrooms illuminated CARE students “to discuss how CARE was effecting us and what we thought needed change” (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003) while helping them “not only … to voice out in class but to voice out in the community and to be activists” (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004).

Investigating the Social Context of School

In the CARE program, an essential content knowledge for the students was the social aspect of schooling (CARE Handbook, 2003). The content involved the study of foundational knowledge in psychological and sociological theories of child and adolescent development and the impact of social context on learners in school settings. The CARE instructors systematically led the cohort groups in exploring the nature of learners, from childhood to adolescence, in the context of social, cultural, political, and economic factors and how these factors impacted the learners’ school experience (Connie, 2003, class syllabus; Mike, 2004, class syllabus). In Connie and Mike’s educational learning classes, readings were coordinated to increase the CARE students’ understanding of the interrelationship between child development, theories of learning, and social contexts of school. For example, the learning content in the center of the Mike’s class was middle school age children. Mike selected and organized readings about middle schoolers’ social learning, behaviors and feelings, emotional issues, and multiple-
intelligence. For example, *Joey Pigza (2000)* describes a boy appears to have Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) and what his life is like; *School Girl (1995)* gives a look inside the life of a teenage girl and all the problems that she may face; *Raising Cain (1999)* deals with the emotional aspect of boys which helps CARE students understand adolescent boys’ life. Each reading offered important perspectives and ideas to reflect upon the life of middle school children and their relationship to the schools of education.

Schools function as socialization institutions that cultivate in learners the habits of mind that make active and responsible citizenship possible (Dewey, 1916/1966; McDonnell, 2000). Mike confirmed this educational perspective and emphasized in his class that “schools as learning institutions should play an essential role in the democratic socialization process of children” (Mike, personal communication, February 24, 2004). For the CARE instructors, the aim of teacher education, as Connie said, was to educate future teachers in these “habits of mind” so that they might instill in their students “the commitment and knowledge to be reflective and active” citizens in a democracy (Connie, personal communication, October 21, 2003). Curriculum in the CARE program aimed to promote CARE students’ understanding of learning in its context, and at the same time, cultivate the democratic habits of mind that Dewey argued as necessary in both classroom and democratic society (CARE Handbook, 2003).

For example, in their classes, by the use of class reflection writing, the CARE instructors helped the CARE students develop reflection skills to think constantly about their roles as teacher and the decisions they made as teachers. As one CARE sophomore reported, “By writing the reflections it has allowed me to evaluate my performance as a tutoring guide [in the field]. I was able to look back and think what I could have done or
said differently” (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004). In order to deepen the CARE students’ understanding of the relationship between school and society, social and cultural issues such as race, class, differences, equality, and social justice were part and parcel of the CARE curriculum. The CARE students were “guided to explore those concepts and issues, … constructing knowledge as foundation for their teaching,” reported Mike in an interview (Mike, personal communication, March 01, 2004).

**Knowledge of Content—Teaching about Teaching as the Content Knowledge for Teacher Educators**

Teacher educators’ core task “is to enable student [teachers] to become competent teachers,” said Mike in an interview (Mike, personal communication, March 01 2004). As teachers of teachers, the four CARE instructors recognized that their educational function in teacher preparation was to help their CARE students understand and develop pedagogical knowledge with subject or content knowledge as a significant component. In this study, findings showed that CARE instructors communicated their pedagogical thinking and reasoning on the knowledge of content with CARE students.

**Teaching How to Teach**

Teacher education is an interplay process between the CARE instructors’ teaching and the CARE students’ understanding of content and pedagogical reasoning for their teaching in the future. In this process, the CARE instructors taught CARE students how to teach by connecting teaching methods and learning content to formulate their knowledge of pedagogy.
**Bridging pedagogical theories and practice.** Evidenced from the class observations, the CARE instructors’ teaching became a bridge connecting the pedagogical theories CARE students study in the college classrooms to the actual teaching practice in school. Examining the four CARE instructors’ teaching practice in the CARE classrooms, the study findings revealed that despite the differences in course objectives and contents, the CARE instructors were commonly conscious about “teaching about teaching” (Loughran, 1997) while they organized the class structure and teaching and learning activities for CARE students. As Loughran (1997) indicated, teaching about teaching is the teacher educators’ content knowledge they utilize to guide student teachers into the professional realm of teaching. Teaching about teaching as also appeared, in this study, as the content that the CARE instructors master and by which they educate CARE students.

Teaching principles and skills the CARE instructors demonstrated or illustrated in their classes assisted the CARE students to become aware of “how teaching principles are implemented in different kinds of situations” (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004). For example, in sharing his teaching experience to explain how teachers respond when students have questions about the study content being taught, John used his school teaching cases as examples to demonstrate his CARE juniors when to use “direct teaching by telling skill” and when to use “question asking strategy” to enhance students’ understanding (John, personal communication, October 23, 2003).

On bridging pedagogical theories with practice, the CARE instructors reported that they and the field partner school teachers saw pedagogical and content knowledge
from different perspectives in terms of teacher preparation. As Brian reflected on the nature of his teaching in teacher education:

I do not work with students in the same way the partnership school teachers do.

When the students were in the field, the partnership cooperating teachers could have an immediate discussion on the teaching behaviors CARE students observed in their classrooms. (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004)

For the CARE instructors, class discussion was a challenge to connect the reflection of field experience with abstract theories. The exploration of how teaching actions were influenced by diverse classroom situations was an abstract, conceptual idea. For the CARE instructors, the challenge in class discussion was to model and think out loud how to reflect on teaching methods. This was intentional modeling to illustrate methodological skills for the CARE students. For example, the student-directed teaching approach was demonstrated in the midterm evaluation project in Connie’s class. Connie showed the CARE sophomores how students were invited to evaluate their own learning. In another case, the CARE expeditionary project in John’s class modeled how to form a learning project that interests students. The CARE instructors led the discussion focusing on the exploration of possible teaching situations to help CARE students connect theories with the reality of classroom life.

Transforming educational concepts. From the perspective of PCK, teaching about teaching is the knowledge that the CARE instructors possess to help CARE students acquire in order to transform their learning content into a meaningful and understandable teaching framework for their own teaching. Mike reported that he recognized his teaching
role involves adapting “different teaching approaches and learning knowledge to enable CARE students to understand how they might use or adjust what they have learned in their own classrooms” (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004). Over time, the CARE instructors helped develop the CARE students’ teaching abilities by transforming educational concepts into a functional and understandable framework. One example of how this transformation occurred can be seen from a CARE sophomore’s experience.

While recalling that she learned to make the connection between learning knowledge and teaching skills, she said:

> After reading ‘Raising Cain’ [(Kindlon & Thompson, 2000)], we discussed how important being aware of boys emotions. I now know, as a teacher, I need to be aware of the gender issue and use it as a tool in my classroom teaching. Once again, it opened my mind up to new ideas. (CARE students, personal communication, November 12, 2003)

In Brian’s teaching methods class, one of the class objectives was for CARE students to learn how to design a lesson plan. While teaching the CARE students in lesson planning, Brian used different teaching approaches such as cooperative group work, mini teaching, and class meeting to help CARE sophomores understand the process of teaching.

Lesson planning is a tool that teachers develop to guide their teaching in ways that help their students achieve the intended learning objectives. As Brian said in his class, “lesson planning refers to the design of a unit of teaching and learning that outlines what will be done in class. It is a teaching outline of what [is] to be taught and learned and how teaching contents are arranged and presented” (Brian, personal communication, January
15, 2004). He explained to his CARE students that it generally includes objectives, activities to carry out, points to be made, questions to be asked, references to related materials, assignments, and the evaluation methods or tools related to that.

For CARE students, developing their first lesson plans was “difficult and confusing” (Brian, personal communication, January 15, 2004). They felt that the notion of lesson plans were “abstract and difficult to generate.” Brian chose to consciously adjust the way of presenting the content to the CARE sophomores. By ‘translating’ the lesson plan from a conceptual definition into understandable units of meaning, Brian constructed a lesson plan framework (Table 4.4), combining different elements to help the CARE sophomores practice how to think holistically in order to develop a lesson plan. He shared how teachers used the lesson plan as the instrument to guide their own teaching and to facilitate their students’ learning.

According to Shulman (1987), the PCK is the teachers’ ability to translate the content being taught to a diverse group of students by using multiple strategies of instruction associated with related contextual and social boundaries within the learning environment. In Brian’s teaching, when the principles of translation (PCK) were applied in the learning exercise of designing lesson plans, Brian’s associated knowledge in the pedagogy of teaching about teaching was manifested. Brian demonstrated in his teaching that different kinds of knowledge such as lesson planning, class activities, instructional strategies, and the understanding of students need to be organized and presented in combination depending on the context of the classroom situation.
Making Connections

The university classroom environment is removed from the messiness and intensity of the K-12 classroom, and is, by intent, focused on theoretical and pedagogical knowledge rather than practical experiences of classroom teaching. While theory and practice are married in actuality, many teachers do not recognize or reflect on the iterative nature of praxis in their own teaching. In the CARE program, theoretical knowledge was closely linked to actual life in the classroom. For the CARE instructors, teaching involved exposure to diverse knowledge claims, theories, perspectives, and critiques. These competing concepts offered CARE students the opportunity to critically adapt and evaluate those views in different educational applications. For example, in connection with the students’ field experience, Connie helped the CARE sophomore reflect on the role of play in children’s development (in terms of the different educational and research-based knowledge and perspectives such as Lev Vygotsky’s theories and Dewey’s views on play). Connie reported from her students’ class reflections, “The CARE students were provoked to think critically about what they observed in schools, and able to confront practical experience from different points of view” (Connie, personal communication, October 8, 2003).

Making the tacit aspect of teaching explicit. Teaching was “an intellectual activity” in which “the theoretical and practical knowledge in teaching were blended” in the CARE instructors’ teaching actions (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004). The theoretical knowledge is research-based knowledge about teaching while practical knowledge is the knowledge held by teachers related to how they teach in a
given context. Practical knowledge is what Schön (1991) refers to as “practical in-action knowledge within teaching.” It is a dynamic personal knowledge in teaching action that teachers develop through experience of teaching. Connie reflected from her personal teaching experience and confirmed that this practical aspect of teaching knowledge “was learned over a period of time through teaching experience” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003).

Research indicated that teachers develop their personal practical teaching knowledge as part of their holistic act of teaching which is difficult to articulate into words (Zanting et al., 1998). Polanyi’s statement of “we can know more than we can tell” (Polanyi, 1967, p. 4) conveyed the notion that teachers have more know how than they can express. It becomes a kind of “tacit knowledge” (Polanyi, 1967) which teachers know but is not easy to describe. The tacit knowledge is complex in that it does not display in a propositional form or as rules of performance.

Research in teachers’ teaching knowledge has indicated that teaching is a constellation of knowledge in which values, principles, and attitude are integrated consciously or unconsciously in the teachers’ practice (Hansen, 1994; Smith, 2003; Zanting, et al., 1998). It is not easy for the CARE instructors to explicitly teach CARE students by analyzing teaching actions and merely demonstrating the concepts and their components in class. Mike emphasized how field work can help the effectiveness of learning how to teach. He stated, “It was helpful for the CARE students to have field experience where they were guided to focus on things that can be articulated in a systematic way” (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004).
In addition to field work, Mike also found that explaining his pedagogical reasoning was his personal way of articulating about teaching, which was tacit and could not be learned by simply giving a set of procedures or guidelines. One CARE sophomore found it is helpful to her understanding that teachers point out a reason and rationale of why they are teaching certain materials. She said:

_Educators have to EXPLAIN lessons, so that the students will understand HOW and WHY to apply their new knowledge. It’s been many times when I would wonder why we did certain assignments and activities, but it was never explained to me or the class._ (CARE students, January 29, 2004)

In one of his educational learning classes, after the class activity of a Bingo game, Mike immediately discussed with students how he had used this game in schools. Mike gave examples to CARE students on how this game could be used for icebreaking to warm up the class. He also explained the usefulness of this type of activities in enhancing class relationships, expression, and participation. From this activity, Mike explicitly demonstrated to CARE students how teaching skills could be used to engage student learning.

Brian also pointed out, “Sometimes you tell the CARE students by mouth, [but] they don’t get it” (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004). Brian reported in an interview that “practical classroom experience, when integrated into coursework, from the responses of the students’ exit slip, had a much more influential impact on learning how to teach in terms of blending theory and practice to develop their teaching methods” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004).
The teaching knowledge, as evidenced in Mike and Brian’s experience, has its tacit aspect which is not easily described with the use of direct instruction. The teaching of teaching, therefore, will be more meaningful to the future teachers if learned in integrated activities which blend theories and practice together in the way the CARE instructors have done.

Field experiences help make connections. To assist CARE students in making the connection between theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge about teaching and learning, field experience was emphasized and integrated into CARE teacher education courses. To learn how to teach, the CARE students were guided while working in the field to focus on the exploration of the contextual nature of teacher reasoning and skills, and the multiple ways that teaching knowledge and action interact. As John reported, in order to help CARE students develop the framework of teaching knowledge for their own teaching, “CARE students needed to have practical experience” (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003). The findings pointed at similarities in regards to how the CARE instructors emphasized the importance of the development of practical knowledge in teaching through guided reflection on the field experiences.

Field experience incorporated in curriculum was an important part of learning about teaching in the CARE program (CARE handbook, 2003). In the CARE classrooms, field work assignments were paralleled with weekly class activities in each CARE instructor’s class. As John found in his teaching, incorporating field work with college classroom activities was an effective strategy for the CARE students learning how to teach. “It helped the [CARE] students make connections between theory and practice by
identifying different ideas and knowledge discussed in the college classrooms that complemented or contrasted with their experiences in the field,” said John (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003). The impact of helping students make connection between theory and practice was the rationale for the extensive field work in each CARE course.

Field experience provided CARE students the content for reflecting on educational ideas and teaching principles as they were utilized in classroom situations. Mike reported that he found in CARE students’ class reflection journals and in class activities that “field experience facilitated their understandings of teaching at the practice level” (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004). As Connie assigned her CARE sophomore to identify “what things make a democratic education classroom and what things don’t” in the school classrooms they observed, it was also through the field reflection journals and class discussions that the Connie evaluated whether the CARE students “were genuinely reflecting on the different aspects of teaching or simply reiterating the educational theories and knowledge discussed in class” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003).

*Developing a personal pedagogical construct.* For the four CARE instructors, to work in school settings allowed the CARE students to have opportunities to experience the reality of schooling and to connect knowledge and ideas discussed in class in a way meaningful to their personal understanding and interpretation. The practical experience the CARE students learned from their field work, in this sense, was incorporated into
their overall personal teaching understanding and, as SooHoo and Wilson (1994) stated, can be one of the legitimate sources of educational knowledge for their own teaching.

This knowledge learning process involves not only craft knowledge to be gained and utilized, but more importantly the learning experience on teaching that CARE students were going to discover and construct. This learning process can be understood by the constructivist view that the understanding of a reality is socially constructed (DeLashmutt & Braund, 1996). Within the social context of college classroom and field experience, the individual CARE students’ subjectivist interpretation, the teaching reality can be deconstructed, reconstructed, and transformed.

Each CARE course provided students with opportunities to link theory with practical experience by combining class learning and field work experiences. In this way the teaching knowledge and skills were learned not only through the experience they got in the college classrooms but also from the experience they brought in from the real school settings. As Mike said, “Their learning is making more sense as they work with students in the school setting and later have the chance to deal with the experience by sharing it with their cohort peers and teachers in the university” (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004).

From the perspective of constructivist learning, the CARE students were afforded the opportunity to share their field experience and self learning reflections as they constructed and developed their own teaching repertoire. The practical teaching experience was connected directly to what they had learned from theories and research-based knowledge and, combining with their sharing in college classrooms, used in developing their own personal pedagogical knowledge.
Knowledge of Curriculum for Democracy

Curriculum consists of the planned and guided activities and experiences for learning (Tanner & Tanner, 1975; Kelly, 1999). Evidenced from the class observations, the curriculum designed and practiced in the CARE instructors’ classes had its emphasis on the interaction among teacher, students, and knowledge, which was in line with the Deweyen perspective of seeing education as a social learning process for democracy. In the four CARE instructors’ teaching, curriculum was designed to reflect the principle of “teach democratically” and “teaching for democracy.” Democratic education, for the four CARE instructors was the center theme in their curriculum.

In addition to “curriculum as the sum of experiences and activities” (CARE handbook, 2003), as Connie reflected in an interview, the design of her class curriculum also included “a process of practicing democratic education” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003). In democratic education, curriculum was conducted democratically. The CARE instructors encouraged the CARE students to actively participate in class activities; to cooperatively initiate, form, plan, make decisions, execute, and evaluate projects or tasks. The class learning goals, plans, and activities were not just initially brought in by the CARE instructors but also emerged from within the CARE students’ discussion process.

Experiencing the Democratic Way of Life

Schubert (1986, 1989) argues that the study and design of class learning activities should address the basic curriculum question of what aspects of knowledge and experience are worthwhile for students to acquire. In this study, the findings showed that
the four CARE instructors’ concern in their curriculum decisions in terms of what knowledge and experience the CARE students should have. Another concern they had in the curriculum organization was how the knowledge and experience was acquired by the CARE students in the educational process. For example, when Connie was evaluating the CARE sophomores’ learning, she focused not only on “what concepts that students had mastered”, but more importantly she emphasized how they demonstrate their mastery “through the activities of class discussion, reflection journal writing, project presentation, and making connections with their fieldwork” (Connie, personal communication, October 21, 2003).

Observations on the four CARE instructors’ teaching showed their curriculum for democracy was the class highlight which emphasized more how students were taught than what they were taught. In other words, process was as or more important than the product. Smith (1995) argued that the classroom can be the learning community only by living it. Connie confirmed this view and saw “education as a living and growing process” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003). She drew on Dewey’s (1916/1966) idea that “education should not be seen as the preparation for an ideal image of democratic life; it is democratic life itself,” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003). Brian also emphasized in an interview that the way he organized his class curriculum was guided by his teaching philosophy that “students experience democracy by learning through its democratic processes and not just learn about it” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004). In his teaching, John used his school expeditionary projects as examples to help the CARE juniors come to
acknowledge that “learning itself could be democratically constructed” (John, personal communication, October 23, 2003).

To create a learning community for every student was what guided the four CARE instructors, creating their ethical boundary with which compatible curriculum was organized and pedagogy was employed. No matter what content was learned or activity was conducted, as Connie indicated, it was an important experience for “the [CARE] students to feel as a member of a community where they were treated as valued participants with the right and ability to contribute themselves, (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2004). Democratic classrooms need to be supportive environments where students felt it is safe to express their ideas, so that they may have the opportunity to develop their own voice. As Thayer-Bacon and Bacon (1998) argue, an all-voices-are-welcome learning environment would encourage every member to learn and contribute to the constructing of knowledge while a sense of community is nurtured. Connie confirmed this idea and found in her teaching that the sense of being valued that CARE students had about themselves “encouraged more chances to learn how to master knowledge and how they can contribute further to their learning” (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003).

_Co-created Curriculum_

Democracy is recognized by the extent to which individuals have an intellectual and moral involvement in group interactions (Mill, 1976). Intellectual and moral involvement was embodied in the CARE educators’ curriculum decisions. From the class observation, the CARE students were encouraged to contribute their knowledge and ideas
to influence the educational decisions in their learning including curriculum planning and evaluation. A normal occurrence in CARE classrooms was that the CARE students actively participated in the curriculum planning process—to initiate, plan, conduct, and evaluate their own learning.

As in John’s class, when the CARE students chose the CARE program itself as their expeditionary learning project, “they figured ways to plan, conduct, and present it, said John (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003). The CARE students were, as John said, “designing the curriculum” for the class (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003). In the CARE classrooms, John mentioned in an interview that “teachers had to trust the class fully in the moral sense of the students” (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003). John modeled in his teaching that democratic teachers had to have the understanding in their minds that they were “obligated to empower students through class curriculum, … using projects to [help students] explore and research about the world around them” (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003).

The CARE instructors’ view on knowledge attainment was supported by the humanist view that knowledge acquisition is based on self-awareness and self-reflections of the individual (Rogers, 1969) and by the constructivist view that the learners build their own knowledge by refining or revising what is already known in order to cope with new situations (Brooks & Brooks, 1993). For the CARE instructors, knowledge was not a product that can be simply transferred from teacher to learner. The view of transferring knowledge is what Freire (1970) calls “banking education” where a teacher fills his
students’ heads full of ‘knowledge’ and then ‘withdraws’ it to test how much the students retained.

Examples of co-creation of curriculum in the CARE program can be seen in John’s class when the CARE juniors took the responsibility of their own learning and figured out how to conduct an expeditionary project and in Connie’s class when she engaged her CARE sophomores in evaluating their own learning performance with her. With the aim to facilitate the individual’s participation, the CARE instructors demonstrated that these curricula occurred in a “co-created environment where teacher and students participated in the learning process to create activities and build their knowledge together,” reflected one CARE junior (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003).

As the study’s findings revealed, for the CARE instructors, the ways and criteria to organize class activities and to evaluate learning performance were an open topic for class discussion. The CARE instructors practiced the constructivist approach in epistemology in their teaching that the purpose of learning is not to seek universal truth; instead, the individual has the rationale by which meaning and understanding are constructed subjectively. In her teaching, Connie emphasized that the “self-understanding and self-reflection expanded and changed as experience accumulated” (Connie, personal communication, October 21, 2003). Therefore, curriculum was necessarily open to change as students and classroom context shifted. As observed in classes, syllabus and curriculum that the CARE instructors created in the beginning of the class evolved gradually into a reference guideline instead of an imperative. When different concerns
emerged and developed, and as shared interests of the class evolved, the original syllabus or curriculum was adjusted accordingly.

*Moral Pedagogy as Curriculum*

A traditional teacher education program is organized in practical orientation of teaching knowledge and skills acquisition which normally leads the education courses to be judged by utilitarian, instrumental criteria (Goodlad, 1990a). However, as Burbules (1997) argued, a teacher preparation program that emphasizes technical conceptions of teacher effectiveness cannot be adequate in teaching the complex practices that teaching requires. For the CARE instructors, “teaching is not about transmitting information to the students,” said John (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003); instead, it involved a myriad of “educational decisions and judgments” that were not merely pedagogical reasoning issues, but also “values and attitudes that teachers employ in teaching” (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004). For the CARE instructors, teaching was as much a moral as an intellectual activity. As Connie advocated in her class, “teaching is to help people understand and to challenge what values and ideas were taken for granted in our lives” (Connie, personal communication, October 8, 2003).

As Chomsky (Macedo, 2000) argued, “miseducation” in schooling is when teachers see themselves as neutral agents and their job as delivering neutral knowledge to students. Similarly, one philosophy that the CARE program is based on is the viewpoint that “education is not a neutral endeavor” (CARE Handbook, 2003, p. 4). Values, views, and attitudes are attached to every action taking place and therefore force teachers to take stands. As Brian emphasized in an interview, it was “the social and cultural context that
shaped our experiences, values, and attitudes” (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004). John also stated that “teaching is a process to help individuals in recognizing who we are and what we like and don’t, to help individuals make sense of their relationship with the world” (John, personal communication, September 18, 2003). For the CARE instructors, democratic curriculum demanded the moral perspectives be part of the pedagogical constitution for students.

In their learning community, CARE instructors’ curriculum demonstrated that democratic education was to prepare CARE students to address the moral issues that life situations may throw at them and that may emerge daily in their classrooms. For example, in one of Brian’s class meetings, after watching the film “Bowling for Columbine” (Moore, 2002), Brian led a discussion on the issue of “having a gun at home” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004). Not until this class discussion had the students realized, as one CARE sophomore said, “having a gun is not as simple as a personal choice” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004). Through this activity, students understood that having a gun to safeguard personal security has more moral concerns than choosing a restaurant to dine in. As Brian reminded the CARE students, “Sometimes people fail to recognize the moral and ethical implications which were associated with so called personal right and choice” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004).

CARE instructors viewed moral pedagogy as part of their curriculum because, as demonstrated in their class activities and discussions, it provoked self-reflection and dialogues about the hidden and complex moral and ethical issues that situated in the daily life of everyone. Therefore, moral pedagogy in the CARE program served to guide the
curriculum in ethical and moral issues which would help them face moral choices they
would make as a teacher in the future.

*Insightful Knowledge Emerges from Dialogue—Process vs. Content*

The interactivity of discussion is the ground for the democratization of the
classroom (Miller, 2002). From the constructivist view, it is in the continuum of
dialogical interaction between members and the contextual environment around them that
the knowledge and wisdom emerged and constructed (DeLashmutt & Braund, 1996). One
CARE sophomore reflected how her understanding of middle childhood learners was
refined through the dialogical interaction in class discussion in Mike’s class:

*One of the best things I get out our large group discussions is that I always find
something that I should try and take a different view point on. For instance, when
talking about depression among boys, I never really related it to boy’s anger and
violence. What I mean is on a day to day basis and looking back at my school
days, I never would have thought the “bad” kid or one who is always so mad,
would possibly have a major issue of depression going on. I think as a teacher it is
something I need to be very aware of.* (CARE students, personal communication,
March 02, 2004)

In one of the Connie’s classes, she led the class discussion on the topic of
classroom management and student discipline (Connie, personal communication, October
22, 2003). When the discussion changed to the issue of “ADD (Attention Deficit
Disorder) students in school,” the CARE sophomores found this topic was quite
interesting because they had heard a lot about the term but did not know exactly what it
was and what teachers could do if they have ADD students in their class. In the beginning, the dialogue seemed messy and had no clear points. It was mostly the expression of personal feelings and talk about what to do with ADD students. By leading questions in a systematic manner, Connie gradually helped the CARE sophomores to understand the concept of ADD. Connie posted questions and dilemma situations to challenge students to think more critically about ADD and examine the relationship between student and school and issues beyond the classroom.

When one of the students shared the story of her diagnosed ADD younger brother in middle school as a case, different ideas and views about how to deal with an ADD student spontaneously arose during the discussion. When the student talked about her brother only taking medicine when he was in school, discussion was directed to the role of schooling in the development of a child. Then, another level of discussion about ADD emerged when another CARE student posted the question of “how to interpret the role school played in children’s learning and growth when they had to take medicine to be accepted by teachers and other students in school” (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003).

The idea of how schooling shaped the students’ learning experience was a point of consciousness raising which emerged from class discussion. In students’ experiences, prior knowledge came first in the knowledge constructing process, and then it became an abstract idea, and finally, a concept. In this class discussion, educational concepts such as ADD behavior and the role of schooling were inquired in the narrative way of experience sharing and listening. According to her teaching experience, Connie reported that
“educational concepts and ideas had better comprehension if they were being explored in a situational learning process” (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003).

For the CARE instructors, discussion based teaching was an effective approach by which the learning content was explored and built upon through the process of students’ experiences and idea sharing and reflection. As shown in the example of Connie’s class discussion above, in a student-directed learning community like the CARE classroom, the class learning content (such as child development, ADD behaviors, or the role of schooling) fell into place while the CARE instructor focused on facilitating the class discussion or activity process.

“In the class discussion,” said Mike in an interview, “I did not focus on how much reading content or class objectives were going to be accomplished. Instead, I cared more about what students were interested in and how much they wanted to know” (Mike, Personal communication, January 27, 2003).

For the CARE instructors, the student-oriented teaching approach underpinned their teaching decision not to urge the class discussion topics to what they thought are important as class curriculum to the CARE students. In the dialogical class discussion, as Connie said, “every student in the classroom was a knowledge initiator and contributor instead of merely a responder” (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003).

In the CARE classes, knowledge and wisdom mostly did not come from teacher’s direct telling; instead, they emerged and constructed from the group interaction in which every member added to a socially constructed idea, enriched by the instructor’s knowledge of the literature and their teaching experience.
Discussion as Democratic Action

Practice democratic ideas through dialogical discussion. Democracy is a way of life where members of a community learn how to have connected and associated living so that all individuals can have opportunities to develop their capacities and own the rights to govern their own quality of life. For democratic education, dialogical discussion is seen as the main classroom curriculum that engages students practicing a democratic way of living in the classroom (Parker, 1992). The CARE instructors led classroom talks which in turn generated interactive group dynamics among the class members. In class discussions, the teacher and students talked back and forth over the topic or issue being discussed at a high cognitive and reflective level while bringing in course readings as well as prior experiences. For the four CARE instructors, democratic education was best practiced through group discussion and participation as a way that made associated living possible.

For example, incorporated with the cooperative learning ethic, John used a class discussion to guide the CARE students to learn in an interdependent way to start a real life project they could work and complete cooperatively. For John, discussion was also a very helpful way “to get students motivated in class participation and building a trust relationship between one another” (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003). Connie expressed that, in discussion, knowledge and skills like “listening, analysis, critical thinking, and respect were given a chance to be nurtured and developed” (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003). Brian emphasized that through class discussion, “diverse thoughts, ideas, and opinions were considered” and it helped
construct “shared interests and values between class members” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004).

As observed in his class, Mike demonstrated that discussion as a way of learning was an open-ended dialogue (Mike, personal communication, February 24, 2004). For example, the discussion began with the topic of young boys’ emotional control but ended up in discussing standardized tests. The class discussion, as one CARE sophomore described, “…started with topics in assigned readings or in field experience that concerned our learning, … led by the atmosphere of free flow of ideas” (CARE students, personal communication, March 2, 2004).

For Mike, the open-ended discussion provided “free space for the CARE sophomores to explore ideas that matter to them” (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004). On the other hand, discussion as the way of learning helped the CARE students understand “what seemed like unrelated ideas about an issue might actually be impacting each other,” said one CARE sophomore (CARE students, personal communication, March 2, 2004).

CARE instructors used discussion to engage students in the classroom interaction and help them develop the ability of critical thinking. They helped CARE students by providing different perspectives and posing questions on their assumptions and thoughts. CARE students were asked to practice analytical thinking to explain the world around and within them—the “why” and “how” of what was happening in the classroom and the larger society.

Democratic teacher education, for the CARE instructors, emphasized the importance of the interaction of social and cultural norms, values, and expectations in
curriculum. The message conveyed in the critical thinking process was, as Brian stated, “to help students generate self-empowering consciousness and be active in what they stand for” (Brian, personal communication, November 10, 2004).

*Cultural workers for social change.* For the CARE instructors, the goal of democratic education was to help CARE students build the knowledge necessary to change what they could for a more just society. For the CARE instructors, democratic education is about taking action and making change. “It’s never enough for only voicing out. It’s important for you to [be] working out and taking actions,” said Brian (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004).

Freire (1998) argued that teachers should be aware of their roles as cultural workers because teachers are part of a community and they should be active and take actions toward social justice. It is from the perspective of critical pedagogy that teachers should be active in action and work for social transformation and change (Apple, 1993).

To be active in action is what Freire (1970) advocated as praxis, which empowered people to actively take actions in their self interest to improve their situations. Education, therefore, is not only a force for individual development but for social change as well. One CARE sophomore reflected on her willingness of being active for educational change. She said:

*My passion for change in education is far beyond deep. It’s gotten into my veins! I really do appreciate CARE courses, because, I can now develop characteristics where I can use them in the classroom. In a few short years I will be in front of*
the class and pour the knowledge that I have now into them. (CARE students, personal communication, January 29, 2004)

Social reconstructionism (Eisner, 1985) supports the goal of democratic education that schooling is an agency of social change by which education is expected to be relevant both to the students’ interests and to society’s needs.

Observed from the CARE classes, CARE instructors saw the goal of education was for students to build insights and encouraged them to challenge the current system from the wider context of social and cultural forces. “A democratic teacher is working for transformation and change,” said Brian in one of his classes (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004).

One CARE sophomore (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004) reflected on the idea of being active that Brian advocated in the class and stated:

*When Brian talked to us on numerous occasions about being active in life I felt very empowered. Brian got me excited about teaching and making a difference. With Brian, every class meeting is the best experience. I have never felt more motivated and encouraged by a teacher like this before.*

Engaging CARE students in a dialogical learning communities (Freire, 1998), the CARE instructors made the effort in their classes to develop pedagogy and curriculum compatible with democratic values such as participation, equality, and social justice and to engage students in a democratic way of life so they could make a better society for themselves.
Knowledge of Learners—Two-Fold Nature of Learners in Teacher Education

One of the components of the CARE instructors’ understanding of teaching that contributes to their PCK was an understanding of the characteristics of learners. “CARE students are the learners in the teacher education program,” said Mike (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004). The CARE instructors were responsible for helping their students learn how to understand and approach children and help children learn by developing related knowledge and skills. As this study’s findings revealed, the CARE instructors’ pedagogical thinking for teacher education was that the knowledge of children’s development and how they learn were considered part of the content knowledge which the CARE instructors incorporated into the class curriculum to help CARE students learn how to teach and understand children.

The Understanding of Learners Shapes Teaching Practice

Evidenced from the observation, active knowledge acquisition was one of the characteristics of learning in the CARE classrooms. The CARE instructors modeled in the class activities to show CARE students that knowledge was constructed in active learning processes. The CARE students’ teaching knowledge and strategies were constructed through discussion, cooperation, exemplary models, self reflection, and field work. The CARE instructors saw themselves as “facilitators” (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003) who guided and helped students “construct, interpret, and organize knowledge and skills” (Brian, February 26, 2004) to “solve real-life problems” (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003).
The CARE program was not only designed to help CARE students master the content area being studied, but also “to teach them how to teach democratically” (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004). It was evident in their teaching that CARE instructors used a constructivist approach in their teaching where students were entitled to ownership of their learning. For the CARE instructors, the focus of learning was not on the information regurgitation of students, but on how to learn through questioning, inquiry, and problem solving.

The CARE instructors constantly reminded the CARE students that educational reform of teaching skills and curriculum would not be effective if the change was not based on teachers’ realistic understanding of the students. For Mike, “the understanding of their students, including their developmental level, attitudes, motivation, and prior knowledge would help teachers shape their teaching approaches and activities to enhance students’ learning and understanding” (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004). A “student-oriented” instruction (Firestone, 1993) was practiced in the CARE instructors’ teaching in which “the communication to understand students’ learning and knowing” was central to the CARE instructors’ PCK (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003). As John reminded his CARE juniors in class, teachers had to understand that “teaching approaches and strategies changed according to who the students you were teaching were and what they already knew, including their misconceptions” (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003).
Transforming from Learning to Teaching

For the CARE students, teacher education is a process of learning how to teach democratically. By organizing different class activities, the CARE instructors modeled for the CARE students how to become effective and democratic teachers. They used different approaches to help CARE students understand what children are like, how to understand them, how to approach them, and what curriculum and instruction could be used in order to engage them in active learning. These, in the CARE classes, were not only explicitly taught but also modeled.

As reported in the interviews, the CARE instructors recognized that when CARE students learned how to be teachers those students were playing a two-fold role in the process of learning how to teach. According to Loughran (1997), teacher educators are preparing student teachers through a learning-and-teaching synchronous process. This point of view indicates that a teacher educator’s pedagogical reasoning is different from a K-12 school teacher’s. In the CARE classrooms, for example, as Brian explained, “teacher [educators] helped the student [teachers] reflect on their learning as learners in the college classroom. They also enabled student teachers to reflect on how the knowledge, skills, and actions of the teacher [educators] were displayed, adapted, and developed in [those educators’] teaching could be applied and adjusted in their own classrooms to help their students learn” (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004).

For example, in Mike’s class, by showing a film on human brain development, he helped CARE sophomores understand that children think and perceive differently from adults. In the following discussion, Mike taught the CARE sophomores that “teachers
should not expect children to react and behave the way adults do or be as rational or proper. … as shown in the film, … it is because the human brain is not fully-developed at the teenage stage to allow them to perceive things the same way adults do” (Mike, personal communication, February 24, 2004). Mike explained to the CARE students that “the knowledge of brain development should be incorporated into your curriculum design so that you can organize class activities and evaluate children’s learning” in accordance with the children’s physical and psychological development (Mike, personal communication, February 24, 2004).

For the CARE instructors, one of their goals was to teach CARE students how to transform the content knowledge into teaching knowledge. That is, the CARE instructors were facilitating the transformation from learning content knowledge into learning content knowledge specific for teaching.

To help CARE students reflect on their learning from the perspective of both a learner and a teacher was a challenge for the CARE instructors. The CARE instructors facilitated this transformation in their teaching in different ways such as self reflection, class discussion, case studies, mini teaching, and field reflection writing. They guided the CARE students to learn how to shift their role from being a student learning a subject, to a teacher transforming the subject matter for teaching. Russell (1997) described this learning-to-teaching transformation process as “the content turn.”

Knowledge of Democratic Pedagogy

The educational view of seeing learning as a process underpins the CARE instructors’ teaching. CARE instructors held that this process had a focus on the
interaction and communication among teacher, students, and the learning content. In this
democratic education process, the primary teaching principle embodied in the CARE
instructors’ pedagogy was a student-centered approach by which teaching was based on
student-governance, student-participation, and student-responsibility. This teaching
approach is different from the pedagogy designed for passive receivers in which the
teaching is authoritarian and inflexible, relegating relationship to top-down from teacher
the knower to student the learner (Friere, 1970).

Instead of authoritarian top-down structure, the CARE instructors confirmed that
the ideal relationship between teacher and students was developed in “participation” and
in their teaching that leadership emerged from participation. In the CARE classrooms, the
CARE instructors showed their paradigm of reciprocal relationships to encourage CARE
students to practice teaching by actively participating in organizing and leading the class
activities. Learning to teach for the CARE instructors meant nurturing CARE students to
experience the paradigm of democratic education where “teachers are expected to think
and act as participatory leaders rather than as authoritarian dictators,” reflected one
CARE sophomore (CARE students, personal communication, November 12, 2003).

Classroom as Democratic Community

For Dewey (1916/1966), two criteria highlighted in the structure of democratic
community are the contributions of various voices to discussion and the interaction
between and among the individuals and the groups. As Dewey (1916/1966) argued, the
two criteria to measure the constitution of a democratic community are “the extent in
which the interests of a group are shared by all its members, and the fullness and freedom with which it interacts with other groups.” (p. 99)

Valuing individual’s contribution. In her study of democratic education, Gutmann (1987) also emphasizes the value of everybody’s participation and contribution as the essential recognition of a democracy. Applying the idea in education, the CARE instructors confirmed that one common attribute seen in democratic classrooms is “to recognize the value of the individual’s contributions” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003). Gutmann (1987) argued that two principles, “non-repression” and “non-discrimination,” should be added to support a broader sense of democratic community. According to Gutman, the principle of non-repression assures “the freedom to deliberate rationally among a different way of life” (p. 44); and the principle of nondiscrimination assures that “all educable children must be educated” (p. 45). As shown in her teaching, Connie emphasized in her class that an important attitude for every teacher to have was “to value every class member’s voice and effort regardless of their race, class, gender, or ability” (Connie, personal communication, September 17, 2003). It is the “freedom of expression” which Mike saw as “a cornerstone of democracy that should be protected and promoted,” said Mike in an interview (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004).

Avoiding the misuse of freedom of expression. Mike confirmed that a group culture of giving everybody opportunities to speak was the essential principle to make the community run democratically. However, “the risk of misusing the freedom of
expression should be cautioned as it could develop or promote discriminatory thoughts or actions,” said Mike (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004). Reflecting upon his teaching experience, Mike explained that a democratic classroom like the CARE sophomores had could easily run the risk of “misuse of freedom of expression” where the development of a class community could be dominated by certain voices irrationally as shown in “Summerhill” (Neill, 1967). According to his teaching experience in the CARE program, Mike thought that “deep ego involvement of certain group members could cause dominance in the group. That kind of negative dynamic could actually suppress other voices and participation” (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004).

It was shown in the class observations that the CARE instructors carefully guided the class discussion in which different views were provided to help CARE students understand the controversies surrounding freedom of expression. As John pointed out to the CARE students, attitudes and strategies such as “respecting” and “listening to different opinions” could be developed while avoiding “the risk of promoting discriminatory thoughts and actions” (John, personal communication, September 18, 2003). For example, Brian spoke in his class about how important it was “that people learned to have an attitude of appreciating others in the group interaction” (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004). He emphasized that with the attitude of appreciating people and people’s contributions as a premise, “people will have the willingness to listen to other’s opinions” and learn how to respect the people’s right of expressing themselves (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004).
Responsibility associated with rights. As John confirmed the importance of freedom of expression as a fundamental right in a democratic society, he talked about the responsibility associated with freedom of choice. As he said, “I showed [the CARE juniors] not to have authoritarian control over the class, but I don’t mean let kids get wild, I think that’s wrong. [Students] need to learn how to take and share responsibility” (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003). “Freedom for me means responsibility,” said Connie (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003). With an attitude of taking responsibility, Connie further expressed she expected the CARE sophomores “would get together and learn learning together while understanding that it was equally important to learn how to listen to other people and how to show respect for other people when they disagree” (Connie, October 22, 2003). John also expected CARE juniors to understand the importance of learning how “to be responsible for what they said, what they did, and when they agreed or disagreed” (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003). By critically analyzing reading literature and examples, the CARE instructors helped students build an awareness that freedom came with responsibility. By reflecting on their thinking and behaviors in class, the CARE educators engaged CARE students in practicing how to be responsible to their speech and behaviors in group interaction.

Interacting with people within and outside the group. Dewey (1916/1966) talked about interaction as an important criterion for building a democratic community. He pointed out the importance of having group interaction both “within the group” and “with others outside the group.” Reflecting on the effect of cohort group learning, Connie explained the importance of having the willingness and ability to communicate with
people who are in a different group or community other than ours. In addition to preparing teachers to teach effectively, the CARE program focuses on the development of personal and social responsibility among students in a democracy.

In the CARE learning communities, unique vocabulary sets such as “engage,” “participation,” “respect,” and “democratic education,” among others, were used by the CARE group members. CARE instructors fostered a sense of community and interactive relationship through the development of shared interests and values and the engagement in cooperative learning activities. They talked about concepts of respect, participation, trust, and listening. They explored phrases such as freedom of expression, cultural difference, social justice, and critical literature. All the concepts and ideas were discussed in many contexts and constructed in the CARE cohort students’ learning as essential knowledge of a democratic teacher. For example, one sophomore and one junior CARE student described what democratic education is:

*I believe democratic is looking at the whole child-academically, socially, and cognitively. It’s taking a hands-on approach to learning, allowing students to learn by actively being involved in the class. It’s having the teacher help guide and foster the development of each child, without direct instructing.* (CARE students, personal communication, November 12, 2003).

*Democratic education is education that applied the democratic principles of tolerance, equality, activism, using what you learn choosing what you learn, forming learning communities, and realizes that different individuals come from different places, learn in different ways, and have different needs. Democratic education encompasses all of these things.* (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003)
In light of Dewey’s notion that a democratic community is less likely to be isolationist and exclusive if the group members have full and free interaction with others outside the group, Connie said in an interview, “It is important [for the CARE sophomores] to have constant self-reflection on the risk of taking the knowledge and skills they learned in the CARE classes as self-defense to arm against people who were different from themselves” (Connie, personal communication, November 13, 2003).

From her teaching experience in the CARE program, Connie found that:

*The CARE students could talk to each other about any ideas and thoughts freely because they were learning in a classroom community where they cared for each other, supported each other, and they supported and practiced the educational values grounded in democratic education.* (Connie, personal communication, November 13, 2003)

Connie reported she thought it is important to remind her CARE students by questioning them if they could have the interaction they did with their cohort peers towards other people. For example, as she questioned in an interview whether “they have the willingness and ability to communicate to those [student teachers] who were in the traditional teacher education program and have different educational values and views in teaching” (Connie, personal Communication, November 13, 2003).

For Connie it was important to create opportunities for students to interact with others who were different from themselves. Connie confirmed the spirit of democratic education was to develop a learning community where students were obligated to learn how to participate in group interaction by voicing themselves while learning how to communicate with people within the group and people outside the group. Such
interaction helped the democratic community to adapt and change continuously to meet the needs of its individual members.

For example, in Connie’s class, initiated by a student’s proposal, Connie invited the CARE students’ ideas to develop an EDCI 201A class agreement with class rules that every class member should follow (Connie, personal communication, September 17, 2003); CARE sophomores in Brian’s class decided to organize a campus rally to express their concerns about the increase of their tuition and how the money they paid for their learning was spent (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004). The above examples demonstrated that it was through communication that these shared interests and concerns were developed for the purpose of personal and group development in a democratic community.

Student Directed Learning—Shared Leadership as Democratic Practice

In the CARE learning communities, class discussion—small-group, large-group, and one-on-one—was the major pedagogical delivery approach. In the CARE program, the instructors led and facilitated the class, but CARE students were actually the main entity that governed their learning ownership by directing how the class discussion was conducted and where the discussions went.

Student-directed approach. Guided by the democratic principle, CARE instructors practiced the idea students should be given the opportunity to govern their own learning, including, as John put it, “what they wanted to do, how they wanted to do, and how they wanted to organize the class” (John, personal communication, January 27, 2003). For
example, John considered himself as a member among the class and supported the idea that “the students should learn to share the responsibility in the determination of their own learning content and process” (John, personal communication, January 27, 2003).

In a democratic classroom, the student-centered teaching approach (Harmon & Hirumi, 1996; Rogers, 1983; Rogers & Freiberg, 1994) is implemented when the teacher’s role makes the transmitter to facilitator of learning. Connie encouraged the CARE sophomores to access, organize, and transform information to find interpretations and answers to the teaching problems. The CARE sophomores presented their learning interests and outcome in the midterm projects. The midterm projects demonstrated how real teaching problems challenged their novice teaching confidence such as “how to communicate with a middle schooler?” and “what should I do when the partner school teacher treated me as one of her students?” Research based knowledge and class discussions provided CARE students with perspectives to make connections with the practical educational situations. As one sophomore student said, “The assigned readings and class discussions helped me to discover knowledge and needed information to cope with the situations” (CARE students, personal communication, November 12, 2003).

In the CARE learning communities, the CARE instructors showed CARE students a student-centered learning approach organized in groups or individually working to explore topics and problems while learning as active knowledge workers rather than passive knowledge recipients. The physical organization of the class served the learning, not the other way around. When students constructed their learning by actively seeking their own information to make sense of the world, not only did they
learn how to master the content area being studied, they also were taught how to learn through discovery, inquiry, and problem solving.

*Students and the ownership of learning.* It showed a level of trust in their students when the CARE instructors were able to step back and not try to control the curriculum but allowed the students to organize their work and have the ownership of their learning. For example, in Brian’s class, he adjusted the class syllabus and cut off some class assignments as he respected it as the class’s collective consensus.

The decision Brian made was based on his teaching philosophy that “[students] have capabilities of thinking, choosing, [and] making decisions for what is best for their learning” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004). “All the students were capable, valuable, and responsible individuals and they should be treated with trust in their learning,” said Brian in one class (Brian, personal communication, January 15, 2004).

However, trust in students on the teachers’ part could be a critical term which likely meant risk-taking. For the CARE instructors, a student governed classroom could develop a class in different directions. For example, it could be, as Connie appraised, “a good learning experience for every student to recognize the value of freedom and responsibility while engaging in learning” (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003).

In her class, the midterm and final evaluation projects initiated by the CARE sophomores provided them the opportunity to demonstrate their learning in their own way. As Connie recalled, “I think they have positive prospects about themselves as good
teachers by having the shared leadership in their learning” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003).

On the other hand, as Mike cautioned that “a student-centered class could be dominated by a majority group of irrational voices” (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004). “It could lead the class into total chaos where students lost the sense of community and left the class with anger and frustration,” said John (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003). But John also thought that “it was worth taking the risk” (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003). For John, that was what a teacher did: “trusted in your students, but guided and taught them, too” (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003). For many CARE students this may be their first exposure to democratic pedagogy, so the CARE instructors anticipated and guided the experiences.

John explained that having students “share in the determination of class curriculum” was an important learning activity itself for students while “they were given the space trying to figure out what they wanted to do together and how to get things done” (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003). One message revealed in the CARE instructor’s class was that no one is born with a democratic disposition; it must be learned over time and through practice. For the CARE instructors, students in class should experience shared leadership in their learning otherwise the democratic education could never happen.

*Communication for shared goals.* Miller (2002) talked about the democratic principle of student determination from the perspective of having more or less knowledge
between two parties like teacher and students in the classroom. He argued that the democratic spirit could not be practiced if the principle of student determination was neglected because students in the classroom are relatively less knowledgeable.

The CARE instructors supported the idea of a student-directed learning approach and practiced it in their teaching. But they also emphasized in their classes that democratic education did not mean everything goes with students’ wishes. “Democratic was not where a teacher sat back, did nothing, and allowed students to do whatever they wanted,” said John (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003).

As Mike reflected on how to be a democratic teacher, he emphasized that “there were educational goals and class objectives to be planned and accomplished for each class” and teachers should play “the moral role of engaging students in the discussion-based learning process” for the development of individuals (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004).

Research has indicated that because an unequal relationship between knowledge levels can lead to an authoritarian approach, teachers must be alert not to accept the myth of aristocrats who “fear and distrust the people, and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes.” (Chomsky, 1994, 11) To revitalize the democratic spirit, Dewey (1916/1966) provided a vision on how the role of communication should be highlighted for the development of community unity. For Dewey (1916/1966), “communication is the process of sharing experience till it becomes a social possession” (p. 9).

During the “case study project” in Mike’s class, a CARE sophomore asserted that Mike’s teaching was “not open enough to run the class democratically” when he did not
agree to cancel the case study project because students told him “the work load for the quarter’s class was too heavy and they did not think they would benefit much from doing it” (CARE personal communication, March 2, 2004). Examining Mike’s case study event from the perspective of the function of communication, the teacher and students relationship might have been different if a little more effort had been devoted to communicate the teacher’s pedagogical reasoning and students’ learning needs. Even though many CARE sophomores agreed that “our freedom of expression is the core characteristic in this class,” one CARE sophomore said, “I wish we had more of say in issues, such as the conducting of a case study project, in the class and that our comments were taken more seriously and definitely considered” (CARE student, personal communication, March 2, 2004).

In Mike’s pedagogical thinking, as he reported, the ultimate goal of his class was for the CARE sophomores “to learn to have a comprehensive understanding of adolescents in school” (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2003). The purpose of doing a case study project in Mike’s curriculum planning, as he added, was “to manifest detailed aspects of middle school students’ life since his course focused on middle childhood students” (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2003).

However, from the perspective of developing a shared vision on a learning activity, to what extent a case study project could be conducted in this class “should be an open issue to be discussed and communicated for everyone’s sake in the class,” said one CARE sophomore (CARE students, personal communication, March 2, 2004). As observed in the class, the issue that raised about the case study project, for the CARE sophomore, was not the rightness of doing it or not, but the way it was brought into the
class assignments. As one CARE sophomore said, “I believe this class is run
democratically. I just wish us students had more say in assignments and the workload”
(CARE students, personal communication, March 2, 2004).

Redefining leadership. Evidence from the study’s observations showed that, while
the CARE classes emphasized engagement, ownership, trust, caring, open expression,
critical thinking, and self reflection throughout the learning process, the notion of
leadership was redefined as student-oriented responsibility and collective consciousness,
which changed the traditional hierarchical relationship between teacher and students. In
the CARE classrooms, CARE instructors demonstrated in their pedagogical reasoning
and actions that they functioned as facilitators, organizers, and resource and information
providers who modeled in their teaching actions that guided students to discover,
question, and explore in their learning.

For example, in his teaching method class, by careful listening to students’
feelings and needs, John facilitated his CARE juniors to do the student-initiated hands-on
CARE expeditionary learning project and learned with them (John, personal
communication, October 2, 2003). In responding to students’ requests in the educational
learning class, Mike arranged for the CARE sophomores to watch films they desired and
the information provided in the films offered different angles through which adolescent
behaviors were discussed (Mike, personal communication, February 24, 2004). To
enhance their understanding of classroom management in an elementary classroom,
Connie provided her personal teaching experiences as examples to help clarify students’
concerns in coping with some teaching dilemmas (Connie, personal communication,
September 17, 2003). Brian adjusted his pre-determined syllabus from doing a bi-weekly reflection assignment to helping his students organize a tuition increase rally at the university (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004).

The CARE instructors manifested the notion of trust that teachers had in their students by stepping back a little and avoiding authoritarian control that most instructors exhibited without reflection. The purpose was to encourage students to initiate and direct their own work, and in the process, construct meaning and understanding. For example, as one CARE junior reflected on John’s teaching, she said,

> John is incredibly laid back and teaches us what we want to learn. He takes the time to listen to our questions and concerns, and then answers/helps us the very best way he can. He is always bringing in additional work that teaches us more or adds more insights or issues to discuss. John has been an incredible teacher this quarter and it has really helped me gain my confidence back in the CARE program. (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003).

Building Interdependent Class Relationship

This study found that the cohort structure of taking courses and learning together from their sophomore year to senior year afforded the CARE instructors and students the time and opportunities to develop interdependent student-student and student-teacher relationships. Having more time learning together gave the CARE instructors a sense of awareness of classroom events and individual student’s behavior that happened in the class. In other words, the CARE instructors were able to “read” their class and respond
thoughtfully. “I think that’s from the cohort. The cohort makes that possible,” stated Mike. He explained from his experience:

*In a cohort group like the CARE program, people get to know each other that well, and that enables them to communicate with one another. Then there is a lot of trust and students can really say things you want to say.* (Mike, personal communication, March 01, 2004)

As observed during this study, class relationship was a weighty factor that could increase or decrease the enthusiasm of students’ learning and class participation. Group dynamic changes take place when the individuals and class interact; and in these interactions with each other, all are affected (Thayer-Bacon & Bacon, 1998). Ignoring or misjudging of significant events or remarks could change the classroom atmosphere of interpersonal relationship, and it could halt further opportunity of interaction. Therefore, in a classroom like CARE, where learning activities were mostly conducted cooperatively in group forms, the development of an ethic of interdependence among class members becomes more important.

For example, Brian was sensitive about individual student learning and class relations with one another and with the group. He explained in an interview that he tried to “build an interdependent classroom environment where everybody felt they were equally important and had a willingness to get to know each other, listen to each other, and help each other” (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004). Brian’s class was in the second (winter) quarter of the CARE sophomore year. Before they took Brian’s class, the cohort group had been learning together in Connie’s class for one quarter. With Connie’s lead, as evaluated by CARE sophomores, this cohort class had
built positive feelings of “we-as-a-class,” and had “positive attitudes of working with [their] cohort peers together” and “learning from each other” (CARE students, personal communication, November 12, 2003). It was during this second quarter of the sophomore year in Brian’s class that a new member joined, Mary.

From the first week student exit slip reflection, Brian found that as a newcomer Mary was worried that she was “very far behind” and afraid she “could not meet everyone’s standards” (CARE students, personal communication, January 8, 2004). During the second week in class, Brian paid more attention to Mary by giving her more opportunities to express herself, giving her feedback as encouragement, and confirming if she had followed well. Then at the sixth week meeting, responding to Mary’s request, Brian arranged for Mary to teach a mini art lesson in the class to her cohort peers. Mary recalled this experience in Brian’s class. She said,

I really enjoyed when Brian gave me the chance to teach the class. I made a lesson plan, had Brian approve it and then I followed through with it. I had the cohort pair up and paint with their feet addressing communication and how anyone can create art. I really enjoyed this because it helped me to feel more confident about teaching my crazy, way-out-there lessons. (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004)

As evidenced from the students’ class reflection sheets, the class enjoyed Mary’s creative ideas in art teaching, and it gave Mary much more confidence in teaching and being accepted by the class (CARE student, personal communication, February 12, 2004). If it was not a cohort group, or the class had not been ten weeks long, Brian would not have had to make such effort to help the newcomer Mary and her peer classmates get
along with one another to enhance their interpersonal solidarity. As Brian explained, “It was likely that one member’s moving in and out would not affect the learning” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004).

The interdependent feature of class was also manifested in the learning activities in which the CARE instructors engaged the CARE students working cooperatively in class activities or projects. As in John’s CARE expeditionary learning project, the CARE juniors were organized into groups and each group had its own task to accomplish. It was the cooperative learning ethic and interdependence that the students realized that accomplished the shared learning goal. In their learning exploration, as one CARE juniors reflected, “They could reach their sub-group goals if other groups could also reach theirs” (CARE students, personal communication, November 13, 2003). In a learning community, students’ tasks and goals for learning are independent of others (Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 1992). In the process of exploring how students as active learners could organize learning activities together cooperatively, interdependence was not only a learning experience CARE students went through, but also an important subject for them to study in order to create learning communities in their teaching.

“The CARE expeditionary learning involved not only skills and knowledge for teaching, but also the values of a democratic way of life, which were demonstrated while doing the project,” said John (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003). The CARE expeditionary learning project, as evidenced from this study’s finding, started as a way to engage the CARE juniors in a learning activity and turned out to enhance the solidarity among the cohort students as a whole.
Classroom Communication—Voices and Interactions

In the discussion of relationship between individuals and communities, Dewey (1916/1966) emphasized the interactive and interrelationship process in which individuals make connections with each other and develop shared interests for the common good. For Dewey, the term democracy is used to describe a group with the characteristics of interaction, interrelationships, and interdependent qualities among individuals and others (Thayer-Bacon & Bacon, 1998). Research showed that to build good interpersonal relationship skills, people need to develop skills and attitudes including communication skills, mutual respect, and helping others feel valued (Burbules & Rice, 1991).

In line with the ideal of democratic education, the CARE instructors modeled participatory communication and shared decision making while they encouraged students to learn how to express themselves and solve realistic social and moral problems. As shown in the CARE instructors’ teaching, the role of communication was emphasized, and students’ participation was facilitated as a force to develop the shared understanding and agreement on their learning that marked a democratic classroom. It was also seen as the CARE instructors’ task to provide opportunities for students to practice the communications skills and the usage of the language needed in democracy.

For example, Connie emphasized this point as she practiced the idea that a democratic teacher “should create space for students so any topics and issues could be discussed openly in class while students are offering opportunities to practice their listening and speaking skills, and their ability to analyze is promoted” (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003). Connie expected the CARE sophomores to
understand that the purpose of education was to nurture students to have the ability “to create, question, and learn together as critical learners” and to take positions and actions as a result of the “honorable compromising” process (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003).

One thing that was emphasized in the four CARE instructors’ teaching as the practice of democratic ideal was to encourage every student to actively participate in class discussion and dialogue where opportunity was given to make sure everybody’s voice was heard. CARE classrooms all had dynamic interaction and the exchange of ideas free-flowing in the class. The CARE students were expected to develop their communication skills as well as their interpersonal relationship skills. As Mike emphasized in his class, “Each voice in the discussion was important and teachers must make sure that everyone had the opportunity to speak and talk” (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004). Connie encouraged the CARE sophomores to learn the art of “honorable compromising;” that “personal opinions could be voiced freely and the consensus of the learning goal could be reached” (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003). For Connie, the honorable compromising was an important collaborative attitude in democratic education when students learned how to listen and interact with others while “developing the ability to judge whether the reasons to support the argument were sound and right” (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003).

In order to increase the chances of interpersonal interaction, in the CARE learning communities, the class desks usually were arranged in a horseshoe shape or in a circle so that in the big group discussion all students could see each other’s faces. In this
classroom environment, space organization reflected the kinds of learning that took place within it.

The CARE instructors explained the physical arrangement of the classroom and its visual aspect influenced learning in profound ways. As Mike reported, according to his teaching experience, “A face to face interaction provided more opportunity to get to know each others’ reactions and contributed to the likelihood that all students would actively contribute to class activities” (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004).

However, as Brian pointed out “with different reasons, like having no motivation, having a bad day, or just feeling tired, students may not actively participate as teachers’ expect” (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004). CARE instructors used different skills, like getting students moving around, changing activities, arranging pair or group work, or giving a small speech to uphold the class energy and keep students active and motivated. From the observations in CARE classrooms, the effectiveness of class organization in getting students engaged in active learning was related to whether students were given intriguing questions or problems that they were interested in or dilemmas that they could face as teachers.

For example, it was in one of Brian’s classes that the CARE students decided to organize a rally on the campus to express their concerns about the tuition increases. They showed their eagerness to participate in the discussion regarding how the money they paid was spent by the university because it concerned their learning and their families’ financial burdens. This is what Freire (1970) calls “authentic thinking” when their thoughts are “concerned with reality” (p. 64). As one CARE sophomore said,
My favorite day was when Brian gave us his little speech about getting up and doing something rather than just talking [about] everything, such as our tuition increases. He really inspired me to be an activist and to find a solution to our problems and concerns. (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004)

Instructional Delivery—Context, Modeling, and Influential Figure

Contextualized pedagogical content knowledge. One teaching skill that the CARE instructors often used was to deconstruct a situational teaching concept together with CARE students in examining the contextual variables such as cultural, historical, and personal aspects that shaped what we knew and how we understood. Practical reasoning in teaching is inevitably influenced by the elements of context specifically where teachers adapt the strategies to fit changing circumstances (Polkinghorn, 1986).

In this sense, the structure of a teacher’s pedagogical content knowledge as a constituted unit is not a fixed one. As Connie reported in an interview, the skills and strategies that she used in her teaching composed “a changeable and adjustable unit which would apply differently as the teaching situations changed, as my teaching judgment informed me to do so, … and as my teaching experiences accumulated” (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003).

For example, in the post-class interview, Connie reflected on the reasons why, in the class activity of IDE conference experience sharing, she changed her mind to have a large group discussion instead of small group discussion as she had planned and stated in the pre-class interview. Connie said:
I felt this group of cohort is more comfortable to express themselves in public. They are comfortable to listen to different ideas and opinions that posted in class discussion. They showed their willingness to listen to their peers’ opinions, which I value very much. Also I felt that they are eager to hear from on another’s experience, everybody’s experience. So, I changed my mind to have a large group to best benefit their interests. (Connie, personal communication, October 22, 2003)

In their interviews, the CARE instructors stated that the spirit of democratic education offered an educational paradigm that guided their pedagogical reasoning to nurture active and reflective educators. For example, in a class discussion on assigned readings, Connie encouraged her students to investigate the social culture, moral attitude and existing knowledge that influenced what was possible for an author to say and to further define in the terms of meaning. In the discussion, Connie taught the CARE sophomores that the concept of how to teach, as she said, “was not simply the book-knowledge of knowing a certain subject matter” (Connie, personal communication, September 17, 2003). She then guided the CARE students to realize that the practice of teaching involved the understanding that knowledge should be utilized “from the viewpoint of what it meant to apply it in a contextualized environment” (Connie, personal communication, September 17, 2003). The CARE instructors tried to show the students that contextualized meaning-making provided a basic principle which set the goal of becoming a teacher as not just to accomplish theory-driven teaching skills acquisition, but as a journey of contextual examination and self-reflection.
Teaching through modeling. Learning to teach for the CARE instructors was not like collecting recipes as a set of directions of how to be a good teacher. They saw their teaching in the college classroom as somehow a modeling of teaching in which it offered the CARE students the opportunity to verify the pedagogical purpose, to participate in different learning models and activities, and to guide them to frame their own decisions about how they might incorporate different values and perspectives into their own teaching. The teacher educator is the living role model of ethical leadership (Lehr, 2003). Brian confirmed this idea from evaluating his own teaching and indicated that CARE students’ learning in college classrooms was a result of the teaching approaches that instructors conducted. As he said, “How the [CARE instructors] behaved and teach have an impact on CARE students’ professional view on teaching and teachers” (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004). For example, one CARE sophomore reflected her learning experience in Brian’s class:

Being in Brian’s class has made me feel that I can really make a difference. His passion has inspired my activism. When I think of democratic education, I want to be active. I felt I could make a difference and had an urge to do something myself. (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004)

Influential figure. In the CARE learning communities, the instructors expected the participants to have active educational experience under their lead. CARE instructors hoped to portray themselves as influential figures who had a positive impact on the students’ professional development of becoming democratic teachers.
Reflecting on his teaching experience in public school systems, John explained that it took courage to practice teaching democratically because as he said, “If teachers would try to adopt alternative approaches other than the school system required, they would not get a lot of support from their colleagues and administrators” (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003). Under the pressure of being isolated, he added, “An expectable consequence was that the teachers would adjust their teaching to the institutional routine and immerse themselves into the dominant school culture” (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003).

CARE instructors tried to present themselves as living role models and showed the CARE students that they can be democratic teachers too. The CARE instructors demonstrated this in their class organization and showed the CARE students how to create a democratic classroom in which students’ opinions, concerns and voices could be heard in order to build a learning community for the students to learn within. In addition, the CARE instructors presented themselves as realistic exemplars to uplift CARE students’ passion for teaching by showing the courage to challenge the status quo and make a difference in students’ lifes and the society at large. As one CARE sophomore reflected:

*I appreciated how [the instructor’s] assignments, texts, and methodology exposed the issues of our youth. I felt ... our discussions and assignments led us to how what we as educators can do to solve or at least begin to adapt our classrooms to the issues. ... recognizing the problems is the first step but there needs to be a second step, taking action and making a change.* (CARE students, personal communication, March 2, 2004)
Knowledge of Professional Self

Interviews with the CARE instructors’ showed that their view of teaching was closely related to how they envisioned themselves as teacher educators. When they talked about how they performed their teaching, they were also talking about their character and their reflections as democratic teacher educators.

This study found that the recognition of how they should act in class was linked to a professional teaching image that they intended to identify themselves with. The professional image or character that CARE instructors displayed in the teaching profession was their “professional self” (Bauer, 1999; Connelly & Clandinin, 1999; Kelchtermans, 1993). It is their in-class presence which they put forth as they interact with the CARE students within the paradigm of democratic education.

This study found that the four CARE instructors were constantly conscious of their pedagogical reasoning, which mediated their teaching actions. The analysis in this study showed that the knowledge of the CARE instructors’ professional self emerged from their professional awareness, practical experience, and self-reflection.

Reflecting on Professional Awareness

In the four CARE instructors’ teaching, the democratic ideal was identified as a philosophical view which provided a context in which curriculum and instruction were accordingly deliberated. For example, for Mike, to foster “informed citizens” who will be able to “engage in on-going discussion and dialogue” is the goal for democratic education. It is the not the practice of democratic education when “a democratic teacher uses
lecturing all the time as his teaching method.” There is a need to call on the “democratic urge to instruction,” said Mike. He explained, “So that the instruction reflecting the idea of freedom of expression, for example, would give our students an idea of how they should conduct their class” (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004)

Democratic teachers see themselves as both philosophers and practitioners (Dewey, 1916/1966). For the CARE instructors, the philosophical views and values that associated with the democratic education ideal provided them an underpinning foundation on which they developed the capacity to certify that their teaching practice was professional and meaningful.

Connie confirmed the idea that “to be a democratic teacher is to be a practitioner. Teachers must practice what they preach” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003). For example, she recognized and practiced the concept of self-reflection in her teaching, talked about how “self-reflection should be developed as a habit of mind to examine assumptions embedded in teaching actions” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003). Mike also thought that teachers should “constantly ask themselves in their teaching why this decision should be made rather than that one” (Mike, personal communication, January 27, 2004). In their interviews, CARE instructors expressed that the awareness of their teaching, thinking, and actions is an essential capacity for a teacher educator, because as Brian said, “Our teaching has the potential to influence the CARE students’ perceptions on teaching.” It is likely that “they [will do] the same thing exactly as they saw in the college classroom because people are practicing what they see” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004).
This self-reflection process is the capacity to “notice oneself noticing” (Valli, 1992, p. 99), which allows teachers to step back and see the ways they think and act within the context of their classroom practice. For the CARE instructors, it was self-reflection that facilitated their professional development leading them to become democratic teacher educators. Reflection on educational assumptions and teaching experiences led the CARE instructors to be consciously concerned with the teaching actions they took and the possible impacts or consequences of those actions. For example, for Mike, the essential elements of democratic pedagogy for him are “discussion-based teaching,” “critical thinking,” and “sense of decision-making.” As he said,

*These are the essential elements that I incorporated in my [teaching] methodology. That’s democratic practice got to do. If the teachers teach in a class and say they wouldn’t do those things. I would wonder if that is [going be] democratic education.* (Mike, personal communication, March 1, 2004)

The emphasis on self-reflection in teaching was related to the CARE instructors’ professional image that they would like to present as democratic teacher educators. Connie found that self-reflection on democratic education ideas and her personal teaching experience helped her to envision how her “learning community should be constructed to best benefit CARE students’ learning” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003). More importantly, as Brian reported in an interview, reflecting on his teaching practice helped him “articulate how his teaching should be performed,” and ensure that his “teaching [character] was compatible with the educational philosophy” he developed in his teaching career (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004).
The awareness of how they should act in class as democratic teacher educators, presented a professional image that the CARE instructors want to achieve. The professional image that the CARE instructors portrayed is the “professional self” (Bauer, 1999; Connelly & Clandinin, 1999; Kelchtermans, 1993) which they developed as a result of the self-reflection process in the teaching profession. The professional character that the teacher educators use to interact with the CARE students is different from the one they use as school teachers.

The concept of professional image was also embodied in the CARE instructors’ expectation of CARE students’ actions in college classrooms and in field settings. It was central to their teaching practice that the CARE instructors helped the students develop the habit of self-reflection to understand how they should act to be professional. For example, in their classes, by the use of class reflection writing, the CARE instructors helped the CARE students develop reflection skills to think constantly about their roles as teacher and the decisions they made as teachers. As one CARE sophomore reported, “By writing the reflections it has allowed me to evaluate my performance as a tutoring guide [in the field]. I was able to look back and think what I could have done or said differently” (CARE students, personal communication, March 11, 2004).

On Personal Assumptions and Practical Experiences

CARE instructors emphasized in their teaching that recognizing the differences and individuality of people was the premise that led to respecting the diverse opinions among people. And it was the attitude of respecting diverse voices that made the construction of an inclusive learning community possible. People have different religions,
cultural and personal backgrounds, and personalities. Teachers are human beings, too. They have their personal assumptions and values. They, no doubt, have their own attitudes towards a variety of issues such as same sex marriage and abortion. A teacher’s personal judgments or values might affect their relationship with students in a learning community and make some students feel excluded.

Democratic teacher’s role is to “foster critical thinking,” not to indoctrinate into “one way of thinking,” said John in an interview (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003). In democratic education, “students should be encouraged to come to their own decisions about what they want to do or to learn” (John, personal communication, October 2, 2003). The CARE instructors emphasized in their teaching and reminded the CARE students that as future teachers they should act professionally by being “responsible for their own ethical behaviors” (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003) and “the quality of field work” (Connie, personal communication, September 17, 2003) during their work in the field.

To become a teacher involves not only a process of becoming acquainted with a teaching knowledge base, but it is also a cognitive development process, a refining of one’s sense of self (Tusin, 1999). It leads to self-examination about what teachers consider the practices of teaching and learning and themselves as teachers (Bullough, 1997). For example, for Connie, a big part of reflecting on why she should create a learning environment a certain way was so that teachers can articulate the understandings of their teaching actions and the reasons underlying the class organization. The exploration of self in the teaching profession formed a sense of professional identity which provided a basis for teachers’ pedagogical reasoning and actions.
For the CARE instructors, the goal of exploring teachers’ personal assumptions and values started from “analyzing their own experiences,” as Brian said, so that they became aware of their own teaching philosophy and their practical reasoning. Between research-based knowledge and experiential knowledge lies a body of “personal understandings” which Brian thought “emerged from the interaction between the teaching experience and self-reflection” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004). The study’s findings revealed that the instructors thought their personal teaching experiences and assumptions about democratic education are grounded knowledge that they brought into their teaching and which is relevant to their professional development.

The interactive activities between teaching experience and self-reflection refer to Dewey’s (1916/1966, 1938/1977) notion that knowledge is constructed through reflection on experience. Clandinin and Connelly (1986, 1992) further described this experiential knowing process as “personal practical knowledge” which is carved out from a teachers’ past experience, present mind and body, and future plans and actions. They suggested that the personal knowledge constructing process is an important opportunity for teachers to explore the connection between personal and professional knowledge. The process of exploration facilitates the development of the professional self while teachers construct their knowledge base for teaching.

Connelly and Clandinin (1999) point out that all the experiences that the student teachers have in teacher education program have influence on their perception of their professional self. For the CARE instructors, reflecting on personal experiences and assumptions, values, and attitudes was important for professional growth. The CARE
instructors also helped the CARE students to reflect on their experiences to examine and expand their understanding of being a teacher.

Self-Reflection as a Professional Reasoning Mechanism

Analysis of data in this study revealed that the CARE instructors’ teaching actions were informed by the interaction between theoretical knowledge and practical teaching knowledge. Self-reflection, as a professional reasoning mechanism, mediated the interaction between the two. It is what Kelchtermans (1993) called “personal interpretive framework” (p. 147) which functions as a reasoning mechanism through which teachers’ views and values inform their teaching actions. The personal interpretive framework also functions to help the professional development of teachers’ cognition about teaching and being a teacher. All the assumptions, values, knowledge, and experiences that operated in this reflective process were directed to developing an image of professional self which helped the CARE instructors develop their action repertoire.

For the CARE instructors, self-understanding and self-reflection were highly relevant to the teaching profession. The CARE instructors not only practiced self-reflection as part of their pedagogical thinking, but also applied it in the CARE classes. For example, the CARE instructors all used reflection journals, including reading or field reflection journals and class reflection journals, in class to encourage students to communicate with them. The CARE instructors expected that through self-reflection, the CARE students would make their teaching philosophy and knowledge more explicit and thus develop a professional identity for democratic education. On the other hand, through the reflection journals, the CARE instructors also had the opportunity to understand what
CARE students thought about the class organization and their teaching. As Brian said, for example, “The exit slip provided information for evaluating and adjusting my teaching strategies. It says a lot about the class. And I think they send you a message” (Brian, personal communication, February 26, 2004). The CARE students’ reflections therefore were a vital resource for the CARE instructors’ self-analysis and reflection in constructing their professional roles in teacher education.

There are different principles and values in democratic education that the CARE instructors recognized as their teaching philosophy. Such as Democratic education is “not as a subject, but as a process” (Connie, personal communication, November 10, 2003); The principle of democratic education was “engaging students in active participation while having flexibility under the teacher’s leadership” (John, personal communication, November 13, 2003); The aim of democratic education was seen to be “taking actions for what you want to be” (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004). “Class discussion was an essential teaching and learning approach in practicing democratic education” (Mike, personal communication, March 2, 2004).

Based on the CARE instructors’ interviews and classroom observations, the above teaching philosophies in democratic education were the guiding principles that informed teacher educators’ teaching behaviors whereas and self-reflection was at the heart of their professional development.

In CARE learning communities, the CARE instructors modeled their professional roles in teaching to convey the message of, as Brian said, “do as we say and do as we do” (Brian, personal communication, February 19, 2004). It echoed the spirit of democratic
teaching that to practice the democratic education is not to teach the concept, but to live it (Miller, 2002).

Teaching has been regarded as a field of reflective moral action in which teachers are moral agents who can have a shaping effect on learning situations (Beyer, 1997; Craig, 1995). Because teaching itself involves influencing or changing human beings’ lives cognitively and behaviorally, ethical and moral concerns should be central in considering approaches to teaching and schooling (Goodlad, Soder, & Sirotnik, 1990; Noddings, 1984). For the CARE instructors, democratic education was an educational paradigm that informed their teaching as a force for personal development and social change. It was with ethical concern that the CARE instructors asked themselves constantly what their teaching meant in relation to teacher preparation as well as to the democratic community as a whole. To perform professionally and ethically, the CARE instructors showed in their teaching that they were willing and ready to adapt their curriculum and their teaching actions as they came to understand the influences and implications they had on the professional self development of future teachers.

Summary

The four CARE instructors’ PCK was a combination of different knowledge including knowledge of educational aim, knowledge of democratic teacher education, knowledge of content, knowledge of curriculum for democracy, knowledge of learners, knowledge of democratic pedagogy, and knowledge of professional self.

For the CARE instructors, democratic education was an educational philosophy. This ideal of democratic education as the philosophical underpinning guided their
teaching actions in the CARE teacher preparation program aiming for preparing future teachers in the democratic community where they would become members.

In this study, the CARE instructors demonstrated the efficacy in articulating their understanding of democratic education. With the educational aim of teaching for democracy as the foundation of their PCK, the CARE instructors, through class activities and self-reflection, facilitated the CARE students in developing their own knowledge in teaching and in democratic education.
CHAPTER SIX
Conclusions and Recommendations

The literature on pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) has added a good deal of understanding on teaching in K-12 settings (e.g. Gomez & Housner, 1992; Housner et al., 1993; Magnusson, Borko, & Krajcik, 1994; Tuan et al., 1995). However, research on the PCK of teacher educators at the college level is still limited.

The purpose of this study is to explore college teacher educators’ PCK and analyze how it is constructed. Using a qualitative case study method, four teacher educators and two cohort classes of 55 student teachers in a program of democratic education for teacher preparation (Creating Active and Reflective Educators for democratic education, CARE) participated in this research.

This study is guided by the following questions: (1) What are democratic values and principles? Included is the issue of how those values and principles influence the development of college teacher educators’ pedagogical content knowledge in a democratic teacher preparation program. (2) What is the structure of the pedagogical content knowledge of college teacher educators who teach in a democratic teacher preparation program? (3) How does pedagogical content knowledge inform college teacher educators’ teaching practice?

Conclusions

The findings of this qualitative case study lead to conclusions in three major sections addressing each of the three research questions. The first section reveals how the
Democratic Values and the Teacher Educators’ Pedagogical Content Knowledge

For the four CARE instructors, democratic education is the guiding ideal from which the educational values and attitudes are derived. These educational values and attitudes are then incorporated into their PCK. The four CARE instructors follow and practice Dewey’s (1916/1966) view of democratic education in their teaching. In democratic education, teachers have the responsibility to create a learning community where everybody is included and each member is engaged in their own learning. The spirit of democratic education also means valuing individual contributions and encouraging students to actively participate in their learning process.

In this learning community, everyone’s opinion becomes a valuable contribution and the common interest for their learning is then developed through negotiation of the individual voices. During the ongoing negotiation process, community members are respectful of each other, committed to listening, and open to others’ views. In the CARE learning communities, CARE instructors demonstrate their democratic values and incorporate their principles into their teaching activities. This shapes their PCK in conjunction with democratic education. Their democratic PCK makes explicit the ethical and moral concerns in their teaching practice. The democratic values and principles also guide the CARE instructors as they help students understand that learning is not about
accumulating knowledge and skills to be used for democratic way of learning, but that learning itself is a democratic activity.

The Structure of Teacher Educators’ Pedagogical Content Knowledge

The results of this study indicate a multi-faceted view of the structure of the CARE instructors’ PCK. CARE instructors commit to and share these elements of the PCK. The elements of this structure include knowledge of educational aims, knowledge of democratic teacher education, knowledge of content, knowledge of curriculum for democracy, knowledge of learners, knowledge of democratic pedagogy, and knowledge of professional self.

Knowledge of educational aim—teaching for democracy. The four CARE instructors follow Dewey’s (1916/1966) idea that the goal of democratic education is for students to experience a democratic way of learning and life in the classroom community. The goal of democratic education is not to prepare students to be ready for a democratic society. Instead, the CARE instructors demonstrate in their teaching that education itself is included in their democratic lives.

For the four CARE instructors, the goal of teacher education is to empower the CARE students with the commitment and knowledge they will need to put into practice the democratic education processes in their classrooms in the future. They help CARE students build related theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge that they can utilize to create a democratic classroom community in their future teaching career.
A learning community, for the CARE instructors, is a place where teacher and students are respectful of each other and open to one another’s ideas as they engage in learning content and teaching knowledge. The CARE instructors demonstrate this in different activities (such as classroom discussion, role play, writing reflections, field experience, and individual and group presentations) how to engage CARE students to be active in multiple ways, in order to help them to understand how theories and experience they learn in the college classrooms can be transformed into classroom teaching practice.

Knowledge of democratic teacher education. It is the basic principle in the four CARE instructors’ teaching philosophy that if school teachers are to be expected to teach democratically, teacher preparation ought to be a setting where students can experience democratic education for themselves. The CARE program aims to prepare teachers to become reflective practitioners. Through curriculum design, reading selection, class activity, and field experience, the four CARE instructors create conditions to help student teachers develop teaching knowledge, communication and critical thinking skills in order to develop engaging curriculum for children’s learning. Additionally, these CARE instructors voice their concerns that the challenges in school culture and climate can and do deter a teacher from being democratic.

Knowledge of content—teaching about teaching as the content knowledge. The CARE instructors help students learn to use teaching knowledge to transform content or concepts for students’ learning and understanding. It is the knowledge characterized by instructors as the knowledge of teaching people how to teach. In the CARE learning
communities, the class structure and activities that the CARE instructors organize can be conceptualized as content knowledge of teaching about teaching. In order to help CARE students learn how to transform content knowledge into an understandable framework so that students can apply it in their teaching, the CARE instructors place the students in partnership schools and help them make connections between craft knowledge and situated application. This is done by guiding students to use field experience as basis for critically examining theories of teaching and learning in order to help them construct their teaching knowledge of how students learn and how they should teach.

Knowledge of curriculum for democracy. Developing a class activity for the four CARE instructors is more than just following mandated requirements to write lesson plans. CARE instructors try to make students understand that the goal of developing course materials is not only to meet the state standards, but they also intentionally to develop students’ learning ability to construct their own knowledge for understanding. Lesson plans, therefore, are not a prescriptive exercise, but an opportunity to engage in ethical decision making about what and how to teach.

In the CARE classrooms, the four instructors model their teaching to CARE students in ways curriculum might be organized so that students can construct their knowledge by connecting what they know with new understanding. The CARE instructors help students understand that although school curriculum is mostly driven by mandated guidelines and requirements, teachers with professional awareness and self reflection capacity play an active role to incorporate these guidelines into content based flexible lesson plans and class curriculum that adapt to the students’ needs. In doing so,
the CARE instructors help students develop ways to teach democratically by adapting a
preset lesson plan or creating one that reflects democratic principles while fulfilling
mandated requirements.

Knowledge of learners—two-fold nature of learners. Student teachers are the
learners in the teacher education program. For the four CARE instructors, to understand
the role CARE students play as learners in teacher education is a critical element for them
to construct their PCK because CARE instructors see their role as helping students learn
how to understand children and to learn related knowledge in order to help children learn.
In the CARE classrooms, student teachers as learners are playing a two-fold role through
the learning/teaching transforming process. It is the mission for the CARE instructors to
guide student teachers to shift their role from being students and learning the knowledge
of content to being teachers and learning how to teach students in ways that engage their
learning.

Knowledge of democratic pedagogy. The four CARE instructors view education
as a process and pedagogy as the facilitation of learning subject matter and fostering
intellectual growth. In the CARE learning communities, the pedagogy to facilitate student
teachers’ understanding of how to teach is practiced with the teaching principles of
respecting students’ voices in what and how to learn, encouraging active participation in
the learning process, and taking responsibility for their decision making. The CARE
instructors demonstrate their teaching by showing the students how to develop a
reciprocal and respectful relationship in a learning community in which children can
actively participate in the learning process. To help CARE students understand that children have different learning styles and needs, the CARE instructors also demonstrate how to use different teaching approaches and strategies. Role play, drawing, writing, lecturing, small group and big group discussions allow students to experience different ways of learning and to understand as well as to construct knowledge.

Knowledge of professional self. Self-understanding and self-reflection are important tools in shaping the CARE instructors’ teaching performance. Data analysis reveals that the CARE instructors’ teaching actions are mainly guided by the interaction of research based knowledge and experiential knowledge while self reflection lies in between and mediates the two. This study’s findings show that the function of self reflection in teaching is related to the professional image that the CARE instructors envision of themselves as democratic teacher educators. When the CARE instructors talk about their teaching performance they are also talking about their teaching character as democratic teacher educators.

The understanding of how they should speak, act, and behave properly in class within the paradigm of democratic education allows them to visualize a professional image that the CARE instructors want to perform and achieve. The professional character that teachers portray is the “professional self,” which reveals itself through interactions with their students (Bauer, 1999; Connelly and Clandinin, 1999; Kelchtermans, 1993). The CARE instructors model their professional character in their own teaching as it also embodies the instructors’ expectation for student teachers’ performance in the college classroom and in the field setting. In their teaching, the CARE instructors assist the
CARE students in developing the capacity of self reflection by examining how they act, both pedagogically and in their professional relations with students and colleagues.

*How the Pedagogical Content Knowledge Informs Teacher Educators’ Teaching Practice*

The PCK indicates that teachers need to have understanding of the subject knowledge, but more importantly, teachers also need to know there is a difference between knowing the subject and knowing how to teach the subject (Shulman, 1986a, b, 1987). The four CARE instructors, recognizing their roles as facilitators and guiders, provide materials to examine theories of learning and teaching through readings, films, discussions and other activities in order to help student teachers master the content knowledge that they are going to teach. Furthermore, they demonstrate different teaching approaches such as group discussion, presentations, group projects, role play, and class meetings to help the CARE students learn different approaches for display and demonstration of understanding. The CARE instructors recognize that the structure of PCK supports the notion that a teacher’s teaching strategies cannot be fixed as teaching contexts change. Additionally, teachers themselves change over time as their teaching experience accumulates. They remind the CARE students it is important that their teaching practice is not a tacit theory/practice application. Instead, teaching practice is influenced by the categories of PCK structure where teachers consciously adapt the knowledge and skills to fit changing settings. How to apply certain kinds of pedagogical knowledge and skills to engage students to learn a concept involves an ethical sense of teachers’ professional awareness and understanding. For the CARE instructors, the
professional understanding emerges from teachers’ self reflection between theoretical knowledge and teaching experience knowledge.

Professional awareness and self reflection function as reasoning mechanisms to support the CARE instructors’ teaching actions, for example, when to use small group discussion or when to use project based learning for certain topics in certain situations. In their teaching, the CARE instructors use different approaches like writing reading reflections, writing class reflections, studying learning theories and teaching methods, and analyzing field experience to encourage the CARE students to develop the habit of reflection and an understanding of ways to teach a subject, to approach students, and to conduct class activity in diverse classroom settings.

Implications and Recommendations

The four CARE instructors demonstrate that they echo the values and principles of a democratic education through their disposition and pedagogy. Principles such as creating a learning community, valuing included members’ contribution, encouraging participation, and being reflective practitioners are evident as the educational philosophy which they use to set up a learning context in which teacher education takes place. Guided by the principles of democratic education, the CARE instructors’ PCK informs their teaching practice to prepare teachers as reflective practitioners. It is noteworthy that this study’s findings regarding the structure of the CARE instructors’ PCK are collected in the context of a democratic ideal. This study data analysis shows that the ideal of democratic education provides delineated values such as freedom of expression, listening, equality, participation, and social justice that informs the CARE instructors’ teaching
practice. Future studies into PCK of college teacher educators should focus on those who
teach in a regular teacher education program or in other programs that also use
democratic values as an aim in teacher education. More attention should also be focused
on the investigation of the contributing components that constitute teacher educators’
PCK in different teacher education programs. In future research, comparison studies
should be conducted to build a comprehensive understanding of the preparation of
teachers.

This study’s findings confirm that the function of PCK in teaching practice is a
personal way of articulation used to interpret and transform subject matter specific for
teaching. In this study, professional awareness and self reflection are identified as the
main reasoning mechanisms that helped represent PCK in teacher preparation. The
findings reveal that the dynamic nature of PCK delineates the reasoning and reflection
aspects of teaching performance. The combination of the different kinds of knowledge
that guides the CARE instructors’ teaching actions and decisions conceptualize as a result
of self reflection and a professional identification process. This study suggests that
research should further explore the interaction between the components of teacher
educators’ PCK in terms of how self reflection and professional awareness functions in
between. Future research into PCK of teacher educators should also explore the
development of the PCK of teacher educators and how it is constructed.

This study’s findings show that each CARE instructor has his or her own
repertoire of teaching experience to facilitate CARE students’ learning and understanding
in the process of learning how to teach. The repertoire is accumulated and refined into
practical teaching knowledge by each instructor during the time they engage in teaching.
This study finds that the nature of the CARE instructors’ practical teaching knowledge has its own tacit character which is embedded in the instructors’ teaching. Future research should address the investigation of teacher educators’ personal articulation of their pedagogical thinking and actions used to make the tacit knowledge explicit. This study suggests case studies into teacher educators’ practical knowledge of “teaching how to teach” in different subject areas and teaching methods would enrich understanding of teacher preparation and facilitate knowledge acquisition of both teacher educators and student teachers in their fields.

The review of CARE instructors’ PCK and their teaching for teacher preparation shows that, in the CARE classrooms, teaching decisions and actions are not purely pedagogical issues. Instead, values and principles inherent in the democratic spirit are among an instructor’s central concerns. The findings provide important implications for teacher education reform and encourage further research in the field to envision PCK beyond practical techniques and not to be limited to information collection of the “what” and “how” of teaching.

As addressed in Chapter One, research into the investigation of professional development of teacher educators is limited. Part of the reason for this is the fact that the research into the knowledge base for teacher education is limited. This study attempts to establish a structure of teacher educators’ PCK in an effort to explore the professional nature of teacher educators. For example, one feature evident in the four CARE instructors’ teaching practices was that they usually explain and try to make their pedagogical choices explicit and accessible to the CARE students. In other words, they reflect aloud about their own teaching. The intention and ability to make pedagogical
thinking and actions precise is addressed in this study as an important skill that professional teacher educators should develop. More attention should be given to the competence and professional development of teacher educators. This study suggests that further research should investigate professional competencies that teacher educators need to develop and the development plans and support they need in order to increase the professional level of their teaching practice.
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APPENDIX A

CARE Instructor Pedagogical Content Knowledge Interview Questions

Part 1 questions—deep story question

1. Can you tell me something about your background in education? What areas did you concentrate on? How much involvement did you have in K-12 school teaching and/or college teaching?

2. How did you become interested in democratic education? What were your reasons to become involved in the CARE? How do you view the realization of being a teacher educator in CARE program?

3. How do you define democratic education?

4. How do the values of democratic education influence your ideas about teaching and learning?

5. Share a highlight moment of your teaching in CARE. As you share your story, consider the following: What made it a great teaching experience? What subject or content were you teaching? What did you do to engage student teachers to explore the subject or content? What knowledge and teaching strategies did you use? Who was involved? What did the students do to make it a good experience? What other things contributed to making it a high point teaching CARE student teachers?

Part 2 questions—valuing people and program

1. Based on your experience so far, what do you value most about yourself as a teacher educator in a democratic teacher education program like CARE? What do
you value most about the people you work with (CARE students, colleagues)?

What do you value most about the CARE program?

2. Based on your personal and professional experience in CARE, what do you value most about your teaching?

Part 3 questions—life-giving question

1. What would you define as core characteristics of the CARE program (which make the program what it is)? Please be specific.

2. What characteristics or components of the CARE program affect you most in your classroom teaching? How do they affect your thinking and teaching about what and how you teach?

3. In CARE, how do you explain to CARE students that the concept of democratic education is important for them to learn?

4. If “teaching” is a subject matter that you are going to teach in a CARE class, what would you do to organize the concept in your teaching and do to engage student teachers to explore it? In doing so, what materials, knowledge, and strategies are you going to use? How would you decide which ones to use?

Part 4 questions—future questions

1. If there are pedagogical content knowledge bases a democratic teacher educator should map as essential for teaching, what do you think they are? Why?

2. If you could delineate three essential concepts that student teachers needed to build for democratic education, what would you wish them to have?
APPENDIX B
CARE Instructor Pre- and Post-Class Unit Interview Questions

Interview 1: pre-unit interview questions

1. What ideal class image are you expecting to see in this coming class unit? How are you going to organize the course, and for what reason? What other ways might you think about organizing it?

2. Tell me about your initial thoughts about teaching the CARE class. What general concerns did you have? How did the concerns affect you in selecting teaching materials and classroom activities?

3. What teaching materials and strategies are you going to use to enhance your students’ learning and understanding of the subject matter in this coming class unit?

4. How would you describe your knowledge of the content you are going to teach for this class unit? What are the most important components that would best engage student teachers’ understanding and inspire their pedagogy development?

5. Describe a situation in which a student challenged your argument? what values and beliefs affected your response to this situation?

6. In your class how and what did you do to help student teachers integrate subject matter, pedagogy, students, and learning environments in learning to teach? In doing so, what useful and essential knowledge do you think a teacher educator should build with?
Interview 2: post-unit interview question

1. Share the best teaching moment of this class. What made it a high point? What did the student teachers do to make it a good experience? What did you do to make it a good experience? What other components contributed?

2. What did you value most about this class unit organization? About the student teachers?

3. What is the best way to keep student teachers involved in learning to teach within a democratic community?

4. Why was the class unit organized in the way it was? How might it different if you were teaching a traditionally-oriented teacher education class?

5. If you were going to teach the same unit again to the same group, what would you hope to see in it?

6. If you have three essential goals to effectively integrate democratic ideas into your teaching practice, what do you want them to be?
APPENDIX C

List of Personal Communications and Documents

*Personal Communications*

*Class Observation Field Notes*


Interviews

John, EDCI 310: Pre-class interview. October 02, 2003.
Mike, EDCI 201B: PCK interview. March 01, 2004.

Students Class Reflection Sheets

CARE students, EDCI 201B: Class reflection sheet. February 17, 2004.
Student Questionnaire


CARE students, EDCI 201B: Student questionnaire. March 02, 2004.


Documents

CARE Program Handbook


Class Syllabus


Class Syllabus, Ohio University.


Dear CARE student,

The following questions regarding your class reflection are for my research on democratic teacher preparation. Your experience and insights are valuable for the understanding of what democratic teacher preparation program is and in which how teachers are fostered. Thank you very much for your time and assistance on my study.

Sincerely,

Yueh-hsia Chang

1. Please describe the best experience that the instructor has facilitated in your learning about becoming a teacher for democratic education. As you share your story, please retrieve the scenario of that moment. What was happening? What made it a good experience? What did the instructor do to make it a good moment? And what did you do to make it a good moment?

2. Based on your experience with this class so far, what would you identify as core characteristics of the instructor’s pedagogical plan with this class (in other words, without these, the class would not be what it is)? Please be specific.
3. Based on the experience you had in this class, in what ways did you see the concept (or components) of democratic education was practiced and/or embedded in this course organization? Please use example(s) to explain.

4. Based on your experience with this class so far, what do you value most about the instructor’s teaching? And how do those components affect your realization of being a teacher?

5. Envisioning an ideal CARE classroom, if you walked into any given CARE classroom, what would you hope to see? Describe (write) an affirmative statement that describes the idealized CARE future as if it were already happening.
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