

RESISTANCE AMONG PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS IN A
GRADUATE SOCIAL STUDIES COURSE

By

SHERYL MARIE HOWIE

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2008

© 2008 Sheryl Marie Howie

To my children, Jennifer, Amy, Aaron, and Matthew.
You are dear friends and trusted accomplices.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In 1987, Paulo Freire and Myles Horton had a conversation at Highlander in the mountains of Tennessee. It was later published as a book entitled *We Make the Road by Walking*. Their premise was that those of us who work for social justice do so through collective struggle, through walking the road to emancipation together. This dissertation is part of my walk on that road and I want to thank those who walked with me and those whose resistance to the ideals of social justice compelled me to continue.

Dr. Elizabeth Bondy brought me back to my roots of social justice. She introduced me to the teachings of Paulo Freire and the many other advocates for social justice, of whom I formed an allegiance. As my dissertation chair, she kept me focused on the task at hand while inspiring me to explore the depths of resistance and conscientization. Dr. Elizabeth Yeager not only encouraged me in my work in student resistance but gave me opportunities to grow as a scholar. The many hours we spent together on other projects were opportunities to tap her wisdom and intelligent guidance. Dr. Sevan Terzian brought me into the fold and provided me with endless opportunities to grow intellectually. His dedication to graduate students and their research is deeply appreciated. Dr. Sharon Austin showed me how to teach controversial issues and challenge hegemony while preventing resistance. I am still learning. I have the deepest gratitude and respect for these professors who treated me as a colleague and, at times, a conspirator.

I also must thank my fellow travelers who spent time with me at local watering holes—Michele, Cheryl, Bob, Patrick, and Lea. We still walk this road together, mixing high ideals with high comedy, but never giving up. I also want to thank Dr. Art Newman, who inspired critical inquiry and self-reflection along the road that was so very familiar to him. I must also thank my colleagues from Critical Pedagogy I and II. What a wonderful time we had challenging each other as we examined and experienced conscientization.

The participants in this study, unknowingly, walked with me in my struggle to understand resistance. Their willingness to explore places that must have felt very uncomfortable is deeply appreciated. They taught me a lot.

My father, also unknowingly, set me on this road through his discourse on issues of inequity, building within me a passion for social justice. My mother balanced the social justice fervor in our home by finding good in everyone and teaching me compassion for others. I am still learning the lessons from my walks with them.

Finally, I must thank my children. Jennifer, Amy, Aaron and Matthew encouraged me to pursue a dream, lifted me up during difficult times, and kept me from taking myself too seriously. Walking this road has been easier because they were beside me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	4
LIST OF TABLES	9
ABSTRACT	10
CHAPTER	
1 STUDENT RESISTANCE: FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE.....	12
Introduction.....	12
Purpose of Study.....	14
Significance of the Study.....	15
Definition of Terms	15
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	19
Critical Resistance	19
Cultural Resistance	26
Counter Resistance	35
Student Resistance: From Theory to Practice.....	37
3 METHODOLOGY	39
Theoretical Perspective.....	39
Methodology.....	41
Study Design.....	42
Context of the Study	42
Study Participants and Selection	45
Acts of Resistance in the Classroom	46
Data Collection	47
Observations	47
Interviews	47
Data Analysis.....	48
Thematic Analysis	48
Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)	48
Trustworthiness of the Study.....	51
Triangulation of data	51
Multiple methodological perspectives	52
Limitations of the Study	53
Subjectivity Statement.....	53
Sociohistorical context	53
Monitoring subjectivity.....	56

4	CONTEXTS OF RESISTANCE	58
	Preface	58
	The Context of the Classroom	58
	The Context of the Instructor.....	61
	The Context of the Researcher	64
	The Context of Participants	67
	William.....	67
	Kenneth.....	70
	Henry	72
	George	74
5	FINDINGS.....	77
	Preface	77
	Counter Resistance and the Role of the Teacher	79
	Teacher as Source of Important Knowledge	79
	Important Knowledge is Practical and Relevant.	86
	Teachers Control Decisions about Instruction and Management.....	96
	Teachers Encourage Students’ Ideas and Opinions.....	108
	Teachers Should Teach Assimilation to the Dominant Group.....	120
	Teacher Responsible for Success of all Students But... ..	124
	Good Female Teachers are Caring and Build Relationships with Students.....	127
	Cultural Resistance and the Role of the Teacher.....	132
	Teachers should not Micro–manage Classrooms	132
	Teachers should Maintain Trust in Student–Teacher Relationships	134
	Finale	139
6	CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS.....	140
	Explaining Resistance through Ideology	142
	Teacher is Source of Important Knowledge.....	145
	Important Knowledge is Practical and Relevant	146
	Teachers Control Decisions About Instruction and Management.....	147
	Teachers Encourage Students’ Ideas and Opinions.....	149
	Teachers Should Teach Assimilation to the Dominant Group.....	150
	Teacher is Responsible for Success of all Students But... ..	150
	Good Female Teachers are Caring and Build Relationships with Students.....	151
	Teachers should not Micro–manage Classrooms	152
	Teachers should Maintain Trust in Student–Teacher Relationships	153
	Escalating and Diminishing Resistance.....	154
	Extending the Literature	155
	Redefining Resistance	155
	Student Resistance in College Classrooms and Teacher Education.....	156
	Sociohistorical Context and Beliefs about Teaching.....	158

Implications	159
Implications for Teacher Educators.....	159
Implications for the Research Community.....	162
APPENDIX	
A INTERVIEW PROTOCOL.....	165
B SOCIAL STUDIES INTERNSHIP SEMINAR ASSIGNED READINGS	167
C HENRY’S CASE STUDY	169
REFERENCES	196
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	201

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>page</u>
4-1 Internship seminar class schedule, January 17, 2007	60
5-1 Categories of resistance: The role of the teacher	78
6-1 Counter resistant beliefs about the role of the teacher	145
6-2 Cultural resistance beliefs about the role of the teacher	152

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

RESISTANCE AMONG PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS IN A
GRADUATE SOCIAL STUDIES COURSE

By

Sheryl Marie Howie

August 2008

Chair: Elizabeth Bondy
Major: Foundations of Education

Teacher educators who use methods and content that support equity, cultural diversity, and an inclusive teaching philosophy are often met with resistance from prospective teachers. Prospective teachers may resist these unfamiliar methods and philosophies because their experiences in schools and beliefs about teachers support the White, Eurocentric, middle–upper class culture of the privileged group, a culture that is historically established in our schools. Due to the increased diversity of school populations and the fact that most teachers are White females who are members of the middle–upper class, it is imperative that teacher educators address the resistance engaged in by prospective teachers to inclusive teaching methods, which are proven highly effective in diverse school settings.

The purpose of this study was to better understand student resistance by White students in a secondary social studies internship seminar for prospective teachers. When content or teaching methods contradict the knowledge or beliefs of prospective teachers, they often choose to quietly dismiss or vociferously object. In order to understand the factors that shape resistance, this study seeks to address the following research questions:

- What explains resistant behavior among prospective teachers in an internship seminar?
- What factors shape resistance?
 - How is resistance escalated?
 - How is resistance diminished?

Resistance is grounded in critical theory so critical theory was used to frame the study of four prospective teachers in an internship seminar. The participants were selected based on observations of the internship seminar in which they engaged in what was perceived to be resistant behavior. Resistant behavior was determined by passive and/or active actions of students that disrupted the balance of power in the classroom and/or challenged the authority of the instructor. Data sources consisted of five observations, three prior to selection of participants, and three interviews with each participant. Interviews helped create a sociohistorical context for each participant and identify their beliefs about teaching. From the data, four cases were prepared to describe the participants' beliefs about the role of teachers. The case studies were then examined for shared and unique beliefs, which became the basis of the ideology for each participant.

Participants' ideology supported the White, Eurocentric, middle–upper class ideology of schools and the privileged group. This was evident in their sociohistorical contexts and their beliefs about teachers. The four participants resisted content taught in the internship seminar and teacher education program about culturally responsive teaching, democratic classrooms practices, and a no–excuses teaching philosophy. They also defined practical and relevant knowledge in ways that excluded effective teaching practices, such as culturally responsive pedagogy and democratic classroom practices. Participants' ideology supported the dominant White, Eurocentric, middle–upper class culture of schools in which teachers maintain and reproduce hegemony.

CHAPTER 1 STUDENT RESISTANCE: FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE

Introduction

For over twenty-five years, educators have been using the term *resistance* to describe the behavior of students in classrooms (Anyon, 1981; Devine, 1996; Giroux, 2001; McLaren, 1986; Shor, 1992; Willis, 1988). In these descriptions, student resistance can range from silence to physical violence, and culminate in a variety of outcomes. Most studies of student resistance in schools focus on the disconnect between the traditional culture of schools, which reflects the White, Eurocentric, middle-upper class ideals of the privileged class, and the cultures of oppressed groups—working-class or high poverty students and/or students of color (Anyon, 1981; Cochran-Smith, 2004; Dance, 2004; Devine, 1996; hooks 2002; McCadden, 1998; McLaren, 1986, 2003; Miron & Lauria, 1995; Willis, 1988). These studies of student resistance are relevant to teacher educators since prospective teachers are predominantly White, Eurocentric, middle-upper class females while the school population of culturally diverse students is increasing (Cochran-Smith, Davis & Fries, 2004; Gay, 1997). The reality of student resistance emphasizes the importance of preparing teachers to be more responsive to and inclusive of students whose identities and norms may be different from their own. A dilemma arises, however, when teacher educators shift the focus to equity and an inclusive teaching philosophy. When this happens, prospective teachers may resist these unfamiliar methods and philosophies in favor of the White, Eurocentric, middle/upper class ideals of the privileged group.

Acts of resistance are evident throughout human history but the term *resistance* became part of a theoretical perspective in the early 1900s. The original theory behind resistance is based on Marxist ideology and critical theory. Critical theory, as a discipline, had its beginnings in the

Institute for Social Research at the University of Frankfurt in Germany in the early 20th century. Under the leadership of Felix Weil, Friedrich Pollock, Max Horkheimer and other scholars who built on the ideas of Karl Marx, what is known as the Frankfurt School was established (Jay, 1973). Marx and scholars of the Frankfurt School viewed resistance as actions by the powerless to overcome hegemony and address economic and social injustices (Adorno, 1984; Althusser, 1971; Habermas, 1991; Horkheimer, 1972; Leclau & Mouffe, 2001; Lukács, 1972; Marcuse, 1991; Marx, 2005). Resistance was the result of the masses, or proletariat, becoming aware of how the privileged, the bourgeoisie, manipulated and exploited them to serve the desires of the wealthy privileged group. For many scholars at the Frankfurt School, education became the avenue to enlightenment and emancipation for the powerless masses and the beginning of a more socially just society. Critical pedagogy continued the theory of education for emancipation, applying ideas of resistance to student behavior in the classroom (Anyon, 1981; Delpit, 1996; Giroux, 2001; hooks, 1994; McLaren, 1986; Shor, 1992).

As noted earlier, studies of student resistance have centered on the cultural disconnect between the culturally diverse lives of students and the White, Eurocentric, middle–upper class ideals of classrooms and curriculum. More recently, however, studies on student resistance have focused on resistant acts by students who are members of the privileged group (Davis, 1992; Grant & Gillette, 2006; Haddad & Lieberman, 2002; Hunter & Nettles, 1999; MacFarland, 2001; McIntyre, 1997; Middleton, 2002). A study by Valerie Middleton (2002) found that many White prospective teachers agreed that multicultural teaching, or recognizing various cultures in the classroom, is necessary, but they did not understand “multicultural education, diversity, and the attitudes and skills needed for successful cross–cultural teaching” (p. 348). The fact that many White prospective teachers do not see themselves as having an ethnic or cultural identity

complicates matters when attempting to address the importance of cross-cultural teaching (Cochran-Smith, 1995; Gay, 2002; Irvine, 2003; Vallegas & Lucas, 2002).

According to Carl Grant and Maureen Gillette (2006), some prospective teachers are reluctant to change practices that they perceive were effective in their own schooling, have difficulty accepting criticism of their practices, or “hold attitudes and beliefs about certain students, parents, families, and communities that indicate an inability to work effectively with diverse constituencies” (p. 294). Often, the result is resistance by prospective teachers from the privileged class to an inclusive teaching philosophy. Prospective teachers who resist teaching methods based on equity and an inclusive teaching philosophy risk excluding students in their classrooms from the learning process.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to better understand student resistance by White students in a secondary social studies internship seminar for prospective teachers. Students bring knowledge and beliefs that impact how they view the content and teaching styles of instructors. When the content or teaching methods contradict their knowledge or beliefs they often choose to quietly dismiss or vociferously object. In order to understand the factors that shape resistance, this study seeks to address the following research questions:

- What explains resistant behavior among prospective teachers in an internship seminar?
- What factors shape resistance?
 - How is resistance escalated?
 - How is resistance diminished?

Through observations and interviews, this study critically examined and analyzed resistance by White prospective teachers in an internship seminar.

Significance of the Study

There are few studies that have focused on the resistance of White students to inclusive teaching philosophies and methods taught in a social studies teacher education course. Although student resistance traditionally has been viewed as a phenomenon experienced by students whose lives originate outside the White, Eurocentric, middle–upper class norm of schools, studies of White middle class students engaging in ethnic studies or diversity courses conclude that resistance is not limited to students of color (Davis, 1992; Haddad & Lieberman, 2002; Hunter & Nettles, 1999; McFarland, 2001; Middleton, 2002). In addition, the teaching methods used in many of these courses appear to fuel student resistance, creating a contentious environment that is not conducive to a free and healthy exchange of dialogue that would result in students challenging their preconceived biases about cultural differences. When an instructor advocates methods and content that reveal and work to eliminate White privilege, White students (from the privileged group) often engage in resistance to what is being taught because it does not reflect their beliefs (as the dominant group). This study will help teacher educators better understand what explains resistance, why it escalates, and ways it might be diminished, suggesting opportunities for positive change.

Definition of Terms

Many words are used in this study that could have multiple meanings, such as resistance, oppression, and White privilege. These terms are used throughout the study in specific ways outlined below.

Resistance. Resistance is defined differently by various schools of thought. In this study, *resistance* will be defined as passive and/or aggressive behavior in response to the content and/or methods used by the instructor with the purpose of changing the balance of power in the classroom and/or challenging the authority of the teacher as the professional educator. This

might include vocal protests to course assignments, actions that disrupt the class and challenge the teacher's authority, or disengagement during class activities.

Ideology. Ideology is defined in this study as a belief that works to maintain or disrupt hegemony in education or society. Ideology is formed by the interaction between individuals and society, what Marx calls the "historical life-process" (2005, p. 180). Marx (2005) considered ideology to be an inverted view of reality, but this is true when the ideology is based on beliefs that maintain hegemony. Ideology that maintains hegemony might be perceived as common sense (Fairclough, 1995) so the average person will accept it without question, but it is often a view of reality that hides the power structures that support the dominate group.

Culturally responsive pedagogy. Culturally responsive pedagogy is a framework or philosophical viewpoint for "making decisions that better serve the educational needs of culturally diverse student populations" (Gay, 2002, p. 32). Culturally responsive teachers recognize and value ethnic and cultural diversity in their classrooms and make educational choices based on student diversity (Irvine, 2003; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

Democratic classroom practices. Democratic classrooms create an atmosphere that recognizes the presence of numerous distinct ethnic, religious, or cultural groups within schools and society (Barton & Levstik, 2004). John Dewey's (1916) view of democracy as a way of living together is a simple yet widely shared definition of democracy among educators. He emphasized the need for a shared common interest and a change in social habits that resulted in "freer interaction between social groups" (Dewey, 1916, pp. 86–87). A democratic classroom creates a space where students from different cultural backgrounds can share their common interests and critically examine their differences with the purpose of

finding consensus. In democratic classrooms, students have a role in decisions about curriculum, instruction, and management.

A no-excuses teaching philosophy. A no-excuses teaching philosophy assumes that all students can succeed and it is the teacher's responsibility to create lessons and a classroom environment that support the learning of each student (Corbett, Wilson, & Williams, 2002). Teachers who do not adhere to a no-excuses teaching philosophy say that all students can learn, but make excuses when learning does not take place. They will say that all students can succeed but... and blame the student, the school environment, the family, or the community for the failure of students in their classrooms. All of these factors influence education, but teachers who cite them as possible reasons for failure are often relinquishing their own responsibility to help all students learn.

White privilege. White privilege is defined as the invisible benefits White people receive because they are White (Jensen, 2005; McIntosh, 1988). Most White people are unaware of these privileges they receive or how Whiteness is the center of U.S. society (Jensen, 2005; Lucal, 1996; McIntosh, 1988). For example, most schools in the United States teach national history from the perspective of White people, mainly men, and students "will be given curricular materials that testify to the existence of [the White] race" (McIntosh, 1988, p. 8). Curriculum on American Indian, African American, or Latino history in the United States is often viewed as ancillary to the main White curriculum. Most schools in the United States base curriculum, methods and standards on a White, Eurocentric, middle-upper class culture (Delpit, 1996; hooks, 2002; Loewen, 1995). This dominant White privilege, reinforced in most K-12 classrooms, prevents people from "other" ethnic and cultural groups from fully engaging in American culture. Lisa Delpit (1996) believes the tension between the power of White privilege

and the powerlessness of members of other ethnic groups is why schools are unable to educate children of color at the same level as White children.

White, Eurocentric, middle–upper class culture. This phrase is used to denote the historical positioning of schools and education in the United States. Historically, education was available to those with the financial means and time to pursue it, which meant the wealthy. Some early settlers in America believed education should be available to everyone, but this view was not shared by all colonists. In the early 19th century, the need for public education became an issue and public schools were established in some states but education beyond reading, writing and arithmetic was often limited to the wealthy. Schools in the United States were established by wealthy citizens in positions of power, who were mainly White and descended from Eastern European countries. Because of this, the White, Eurocentric, middle–upper class culture of schools was established early in our history, in both the content taught and methods used, and remains the dominant culture of schools. This term is in no way derogatory, but simply a part of our history that must be recognized when discussing the increased diversity in our schools today.

Prospective teachers. Prospective teachers are students in a teacher education program. I use this term in place of preservice teachers to help eliminate any confusion by readers outside the field of teacher education.

In this chapter, an overview of the study was provided. In chapter two, literature important to the study will be cited and reviewed. Chapter three explains the methodology for the study, including issues of trustworthiness and limitations of the study. The context of the study, including the classroom, instructor, researcher, and participants, is described in chapter four. Findings of the study are detailed in chapter five, and chapter five offers conclusions and implications.

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

When educators discuss student resistance in the classroom, they are usually referring to disruptive student behavior. Teacher response to this behavior may include ignoring it, analyzing it, or terminating it through disciplinary action. The definition of student resistance also varies and is dependent upon the perspective of the person or group doing the defining. An examination of the literature, from Marxist and critical theorist ideology to current qualitative studies of student resistance, reveals differences in conceptualizations of resistance among critical theorists, critical pedagogues, and educators. Most critical theorists view acts of resistance as organized by groups or individuals with the goal of changing political, economic and social power structures through critical examination of hegemony and emancipatory change. Critical pedagogues reflect the beliefs of critical theorists but focus on acts of resistance by students, either as individuals or groups. Critical pedagogues view resistance as challenging social, economic, and political structures that maintain hegemony. Through critical inquiry and self-reflection, educators and students take action to change the power structure within and outside of schools and the education system. Some educators label as resistance the acts of students from the dominant group (White, Eurocentric, middle-upper class) who oppose content and curriculum based on cultural diversity. While all are based on critical theory and involve a struggle against established hegemony, the variations in the literature suggest a three-part conceptual framework: critical resistance, cultural resistance, and counter resistance.

Critical Resistance

Of the three categories of resistance found in the literature, critical resistance aligns most closely with critical theory. Most critical theorists view resistance as organized group action with the goal of changing political, economic and social power structures. A critical examination of

hegemony—how it is created and maintained—and reflection on how to overcome it and bring about collective action for social change are necessary elements of resistance for critical theorists. Their goal is nothing less than long-term, far-reaching political change that will bring about emancipation of oppressed populations. This is *critical resistance*: it is motivated by social injustice, can be actions of individuals or groups, includes critical inquiry and self-reflection about hegemony, and focuses on the need for broad political change that would protect and benefit oppressed groups.

As introduced in Chapter 1, resistance theory originated with Marxist ideology and critical theory. Marx (2005) believed resistance, or revolution, would arise naturally. Marx's (2005) theory of "historical materialism" determined that a succession of economic systems are created to satisfy human needs, but at the same time these systems create class antagonism that results in societal divisions. The bourgeoisie (oppressors) owns the means of production and benefits from the profits, while the proletariat (oppressed) consists of wage-earners dependent on the bourgeoisie for employment. Marx believed that rising conflict between these two classes of people would result in resistance and revolution, which he considered a naturally occurring phenomenon carried out by the proletariat that would conclude with the introduction of a socialist government and the foundation for an equitable society.

Critical theorists from the Frankfurt School challenged and/or extended this idea of resistance. Max Horkheimer's early ideas reflected the thoughts of the Marxist revolution, but he later parted ways with Marxist theory and believed education, not class antagonism, would be the initiator of resistance and the revolution. According to Horkheimer (1972), the current education system is controlled by the ideology of traditional theory, which depends on empirical facts to determine outcomes. Empirical theory is prevalent in society through the promotion of

production and technology, which Horkheimer called an all-powerful “unitary system of science” (1972, p. 198). He asserted that education can emancipate and transform only if it examines the unitary system of science and expands knowledge using a critical theory lens and identifying hegemonic controls. The teaching of content that represents the reality of a socially unjust society and knowledge about how to make changes are necessary for social responsibility and emancipatory political activism (resistance to hegemonic forces from the ruling class) (Horkheimer & Adorno, 1972). Horkheimer’s resistance was an intellectual endeavor that led to emancipation from hegemony and resulted in a critically educated population rising up against a socially unjust government and economic system.

Jürgen Habermas (1991), considered one of the most influential members of the Frankfurt School, viewed the media as creating culture and selling it to the masses, molding their ideas to help maintain the status quo of the ruling class. To overcome this hegemony, Habermas argued that we need to bring small public spheres together to critically examine and reflect on social, economic, and political ideologies. Habermas (1998) favored a form of critical communication in which individuals come together and critically examine the perspective of each person in order to reach an understanding in which all participate. This form of resistance appears to have two expressions: the first when individuals come together to resist the hegemonic forces of the ruling class through critical dialogue, and the second when the collective understanding is established, which leads to resistant action in the political realm. For Habermas, resistance was a collective act. Like Horkheimer, resistance as defined by Habermas required self-reflection and critique, involved groups of people, and had as its goal changing government action to address injustices.

Theodor Adorno's (1984) view of oppression departed from other critical theorists in that he viewed it as an individual experience and was unable to formulate an idea or theory for collective struggle and resistance. Adorno (1984), a German philosopher and graduate of Johann Wolfgang Goethe University in Frankfurt, argued that people are socially constructed by the culture industry (media), which reinforces hegemonic patterns in society. This led him to assert that oppression is experienced individually, not collectively, and resulted in "the necessity inherent in the system not to leave the customer alone, not for a moment to allow him any suspicion that resistance is possible" (Horkheimer & Adorno, 1972, p. 12). For Adorno, resistance was an individual act that led to the emancipation of the individual from hegemony. This idea fits well in the classroom since resistant behavior is often committed by individuals. The traditional structure of classrooms in the United States, in which students are trained to succeed as individuals and not as part of a group, might prevent students who are experiencing similar oppressive acts from teachers and administrators from uniting in their resistance (McLaren, 1986). What placed Adorno's resistance as critical was the need for self-reflection and critique that can lead to emancipation of the individual.

Georg Lukács (1989), a Marxist philosopher, stated that the ultimate objective for resistance is to create a society in which oppressor and oppressed no longer exist. According to Lukács (1972), the "only valid yardstick is whether the *manner* of the action in a given case serves to realize this goal" (p. 4). Acts of resistance would have to be for the purpose of creating a more just society: "The class struggle of the proletariat is not merely a class struggle... but a means whereby humanity liberates itself, a means to the true beginning of *human* history" (Lukács, 1972, p. 5). Lukács did not view resistance as an individual act but, like Habermas, defined it as a collective act with political change and social justice as the goal.

Herbert Marcuse taught at the Frankfurt School for one year and left when Hitler came into power, traveling to the United States to teach at Columbia University and then at the University of California in San Diego. Marcuse (1991) argued that language is used to control the masses. He referred to Orwellian language—the “newspeak” George Orwell used in his book *1984*—as a one dimensional language used by government, capitalists, and media to misrepresent and suppress social contradictions and problems. In doing this, public thought and discourse are restricted to the terminology and discourse put forth by the ruling class (Marcuse, 1991). This creates a “one-dimensional” mode of thinking and acting in which critical thought and resistance to the status quo are unimportant. Marcuse (1991) believed radical thinking and oppositional behavior (resistance) could resurface among populations outside of the ruling class, like minority groups and radical academics, but there was a level of education that needed to take place. For Marcuse, resistance did not occur until the oppressed were educated regarding the hegemonic controls placed on them by those in power. Resistance was a deliberate and conscious act with the intention of emancipation and a change in the political, economic, and social power structures.

Italian political philosopher Antonio Gramsci (1971) believed a “war of position” needed to take place before a “war of movement” would be successful (pp. 238–239). A war of position entailed providing a moral and intellectual direction for the working class that would undermine the false consciousness created through hegemony (Gramsci, 1971). Gramsci’s (1971) *philosophy of praxis* would expose and reject the deceptions that maintain the hegemonic controls of the ruling class through a critique of the contradictions in history. For Gramsci, the goal of resistance was to gain political power for the purpose of political change, which is done

not by individuals but through organized groups of marginalized people and requires critical inquiry and self-reflection.

Paulo Freire was an internationally known critical theorist and educator who believed education should be a liberating force for overcoming hegemony (Freire, 1998). Like Habermas, Freire (1993) believed self-reflection and dialogue are necessary to examine power structures in society and uncover assumptions taught by the dominant culture for the purpose of maintaining hegemony. Freire's (1993) *conscientização* (conscientization) is the act of discovering why power structures are the way they are and taking transforming action to change them. Through conscientization, we not only question our assumptions but we liberate ourselves from hegemonic influences. Critical dialogue was the first step to enlightenment, liberation and resistance to the hegemonic structure (Freire, 1993). Freire (1998) believed resistance was indispensable to the process of humanization. His *pedagogy of indignation* is defined as when educators and the oppressed become indignant due to historical circumstances and resist the power structure that the dominant class has imposed (Freire, 2004). For Freire, resistance combined a critical examination of hegemony through dialogue with action that empowers the oppressed. This is not accomplished by individuals, as Adorno believed, but by groups coming together to work for social justice. Freire's goal was to teach poverty stricken adults in Brazil how to read so they could become politically active and resist the powerful wealthy elite who controlled government.

Henry Giroux is considered one of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy, which is based on critical theory. Like Horkheimer, critical pedagogues view critical education as necessary for the emancipation of the oppressed and to bring about social justice. Giroux (2001) defined resistance as "moral and political indignation" that occurred when a student's lived experience conflicts with the structures of domination and constraint found in the classroom (p.

107). A student's lived experience would include cultural elements, such as race/ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, religion, and age. Giroux's definition rejected traditional explanations of school failure—deviant behavior, individual inadequacy, learned helplessness, and genetic causes—and instead examined the power issues in education. According to Giroux (2001), emancipation became a guiding interest in acts of resistance. Like the critical theorists, he stated that oppositional behavior must include a critique of power structures and an element of self-reflection; actions that appear to challenge authority may not be acts of resistance due to the lack of an analysis of the power structure or purpose of emancipation. Giroux (2001) said true acts of resistance create “an interest in radical consciousness-raising and collective critical action” (p. 110). For Giroux, resistance was more than an act against hegemonic power structures; it was also an act toward self-reflection and freedom from hegemony. Resistance for Giroux required collective action directed at the power structure of traditional education, including both the social and political structures. His goal was to disrupt the hegemony prevalent in education and society.

Studies of critical resistance in schools and classrooms are scarce, but examples can be found. In March, 2006, students across the U.S. walked out of classrooms to protest an immigration bill that was under debate in Congress. The walk-outs and protest marches were organized quickly through the use of cell phones and the Internet and some middle and high school students risked punishment from school administrators. The majority of the student protestors were students whose families were recent immigrants and wanted their voices to be heard.

Christian Dorn, 16, a Salvadoran and a junior at Potomac High School in Dumfries, said the demonstrations had proved something. “It got the word out that we’re not going to be quiet,” she said. “It’s similar to what the African Americans did in the 1960s. . . . We shouldn’t be treated like criminals.” (Bahrapour & Glod, 2006)

Oddly enough, on the same day students took to the streets in the U.S., students in France were participating in their sixth day of protest against the *contrat de première embauche* (CPE), a labor law that allowed employers to fire employees age 26 and younger in their first two years of employment without giving a reason. Due to the tradition of protest in France, this was a more organized act of resistance. Labor unions, civil workers, and the Socialist party supported the student protests and said the new law discriminated against youth.

Vincent Camroux, a young student leader helping to organize the demonstrations... bewails what he calls “the immobilism” of French society, where business, politics, and the unions are full of people over 50, unwilling to make way for younger generations. “I am ambitious,” he says. “I want jobs from which I will learn, that will be fulfilling.” Most of the people he knows who will graduate this summer, though, face an endless series of unpaid internships or short-term contracts that don't lead anywhere. (Ford, 2006)

These protests, and others like them, are examples of critical resistance due to the focus on social justice, the knowledge expressed (by some students) that indicates the use of critical inquiry and self-reflection, and the goal of emancipating oppressed groups.

Cultural Resistance

The White, Eurocentric, middle-upper class culture reflected in most U.S. schools often conflicts with the cultural lives of students who are not members of this group. Critical pedagogues view student actions that work against the culture of schools as resistant behavior. Kindergartners who “act out” due to their discomfort with an environment unlike their home environment and high school students who inflict acts of violence against teachers for the same reason are both labeled resistant by researchers. These students are members of oppressed groups, usually specific ethnic groups, but they do not always practice the critical inquiry or self-reflection necessary to understand the hegemony that maintains an unjust power structure and prevents social justice and emancipation. The lack of critique by students does not lessen the importance of their actions but might indicate their sense of unfairness or injustice in the current

education system. This is *cultural resistance*: it is motivated by cultural hegemony, can be actions of individuals or groups, may or may not include critical inquiry and self-reflection, and focuses on the need for social change in a specific environment, but not broad political changes.

Peter McLaren's (1986) definition of resistance in the classroom was consistent with cultural resistance: "oppositional student behavior that has symbolic, historical and lived meaning and which contests the legitimacy, power and significance of school culture in general, and instruction in particular" (p. 142). The purpose of resistance, according to McLaren (1986), was to erode the authority of the teacher—breaking rules was a logical response to oppression and usually occurred when the "authoritarianism of the teacher became too much to bear" (p. 144). McLaren studied both Italian and Portuguese working-class students in Canada and African American students in the U.S. These students resisted the hegemonic controls of the school because the "formal dominant culture of the classroom" did not reflect the "lived informal culture of the streets" (McLaren, 1986, p. 143).

Due to the overwhelming evidence that most African Americans do not succeed economically through the traditional White, Eurocentric, middle-upper class education system, African American youth must find other ways to succeed (Delpit, 1996; hooks, 2002; Loewen, 1995). Their cultural identity system is not only "different from but in opposition to the social identity of their White dominators" (McLaren, 2003, p. 228). For McLaren, this resistance can have a negative effect by reinforcing the reproduction of the dominant social group because students who choose to resist maintain their cultural identity but forfeit the educational options that could change the power structure. When oppositional students decided to conform, however, McLaren found they became less politically aware, less assertive, and assimilated to White middle class expectations. McLaren does not appear to distinguish between resistance as

an individual act versus a group act; however, it is evident that he viewed social justice and emancipation from hegemony as goals for student resistance. The critical inquiry and self-reflection necessary for critical resistance were apparently lacking in McLaren's oppositional youth and in those who conformed.

Jean Anyon's (1981) definition of resistance reflected the cultural attitudes prevalent among working-class students, but like McLaren, did not appear to include critical inquiry or self-reflection as necessary for resistant acts to take place. She found resistance to be a dominant theme in working-class schools and observed resistance as both passive and active behaviors, from children not responding to questions or not completing homework to children falling out of chairs or stealing from each other. According to Anyon (1981), working class students were given a basic education and taught to follow directions, which are prerequisites for the low-paying jobs most of the students would fill after graduation, an example of how hegemony prevents certain groups from moving out of poor economic circumstances. The goal of students who resisted, according to Anyon, was to challenge a school environment that was culturally uncomfortable, not to deliberately and consciously come together in a collective force to gain emancipation or social justice. The resistance Anyon witnessed had similar negative results as that observed by McLaren. In a similar study, Paul Willis (1988) observed male students in a working-class school in England and found they harbored a strong resistance to the school environment. According to Willis (1988), resistance was evident in their pension for flagrantly breaking the rules or behaving in ways that reflected their home culture where practical knowledge, not theoretical knowledge, was valued. Like McLaren, Willis believed these acts of resistance engaged in by students did not include critical inquiry or self-reflection, but instead helped maintain the power of the dominant social group.

As noted earlier, the absence of critical inquiry and self-reflection does not diminish the actions of the students in any of the studies cited in this chapter. One must question if children and youth engaging in what are defined as resistant acts, but who are unfamiliar with the concepts of self-reflection and critical inquiry into hegemony, might not be acting upon a subconscious need for fairness, which might also be interpreted as social justice. In a study of kindergarten students, Brian McCadden (1998) observed that those whose cultures were most different from the teacher's resisted the classroom structure more than other students. The oppositional children had difficulty in an environment that was unlike their home environment, creating discomfort that led to acts of resistance. Like McLaren, McCadden found these students struggling with identity in an unfamiliar social and cultural structure. Similarly, Louis Miron and Mickey Lauria (1995) defined student resistance as "a struggle for identity (self-identification)" (p. 30). In their study of urban youth, they conclude that students were resisting school culture in an attempt to retain their ethnic identity and not conform to the uniformity imposed on them by schools. Again, this type of resistance did not produce self-reflection or freedom from hegemonic social structures for the resisters, but instead aligns with McLaren's idea that students in the oppressed or minority groups often resist the unfamiliar and uncomfortable culture of the classroom.

Janelle Dance (2004) provided another examination of student resistance in her ethnographic study of inner-city African American males. Dance (2004) observed that the cultural norms of life outside of schools often conflict with the cultural norms inside of schools, which dictate a "unique set of cultural norms and expectations upon students" (p. 39). Dance (2004) found that most urban youth are not involved in the hardcore criminal activities of the inner city, but will take on the dress, mannerisms, language, and dispositions of the "gangster"

(p. 6). This “tough front” is used partly as a way to protect themselves within their street culture environment, but can also become an act of “rebellion and resistance” (Dance, 2004, p. 6). She found that some teachers do not understand the environment the students come from and the survival skills necessary for that environment and instead label African American students as incompetent, unintelligent, or learning disabled. She observed that student opposition was more frequent when it involved teachers and/or administrators who did not understand the situation outside of school. Dance (2004) found students became oppositional due to “ethnic/cultural devaluation, low educational expectations, race– and class–based discrimination, residential segregation, urban poverty and deterioration, and pessimistic forecasts about [future] legal means of employment” (p. 56). According to Dance (2004), Black youths from low income urban areas start out with the same dreams as mainstream youth, but they are often rejected and labeled as problems by police, schools, welfare agencies, and other institutions (including the media). Dance (2004) concluded that this “constant mainstream rejection begins to weaken their resolve” to hold onto mainstream dreams and goals and “deflates and levels aspirations” for most black urban youth in their late teens and early twenties (p. 5).

This becomes the point of opposition—what they dream of is opposed by the mainstream culture creating a situation in which they have to choose to overcome mainstream culture or create an identity that will give them some sense of self–respect, even if that identity is oppositional to mainstream culture. By creating an oppositional identity, resistance becomes part of that identity. Dance’s (2004) definition of resistance aligns with cultural resistance—acts against a hegemonic education system that ignores cultural differences, but without critical inquiry or self–reflection by students.

Dance's (2004) study is important to consider when examining the ten-year study by John Devine. Devine (1996) found that many students in inner-city schools view violent acts, disruptions, crude comments, and violent behavior as the norm. According to Devine, students did not expect orderly classrooms with teachers who are engaging because that was not the pattern of education they experienced in the past. What students expected were metal detectors and body scans at the school entrance that would alert authorities to concealed weapons. According to Devine (1996), "This power-police intrusion is happening within school space, which was previously conceived as a sanctuary" (p. 27). What is most evident to Devine, and possibly to students, is that their bodies were no longer their own. "These unrecognized rites of passage, buried in the everyday routines of school life, are the means by which students are socialized into a world in which violence is considered part of the normal order of things" (Devine, 1996, p. 37).

Devine noted that Willis (1988) studied an organized, traditional school that gave students something concrete to resist. The inner city schools Devine worked in were not traditional or organized and bore little resemblance to the established structure of Willis's school. According to Devine (1996), the schools were an "intimidating space beyond the control of teachers, 'secured' by guards, and reinforced by armed police who routinely handcuff students," giving students no structure to resist (pp. 136-137). The school was fragmented by the violent environment outside and the perceived need by administrators to create a security system patterned after maximum security prisons—a framework that expected violent behavior by students. Devine believed students needed and sought a traditionally structured framework within the school to help develop their identities. Finding only a framework of violence, they were compelled to find their identity in some way within a broken, shattered system controlled as

a police state. Devine's claim that these schools did not have a structure to resist against might be misleading. The schools he studied did not have the traditional structure of schools but they did have a structure—one based on the hegemonic structure of prisons. Students may have been resisting this structure and further research might reveal a new aspect of student resistance.

Like McLaren, Devine (1996) was quick to emphasize the role of students in producing the resistance or violence themselves. Devine concluded that the traditional moral and virtuous teachings Giroux (2001) dismisses as hegemonic are what is necessary in the schools he studied. Devine pointed out that the topic of real violence in schools is not mentioned in Giroux's work, as if it did not exist, and more specifically the fact that students often commit these violent acts.

The premises of social reproduction theory lead to a logical conclusion its authors fail to appreciate: street culture in the school, rooted in the injustices of hegemony, possesses its own (de)formative power that is capable of transforming the student into an instrument of its own making, an instrument of violence. (Devine, 1996, p. 135)

It appeared that Devine viewed resistance as a conscious act by students in reaction to their environment—they were trained to engage in acts of violence through constant exposure to street violence and the police state that inhabited the school. He identified multiple social, economic, and political reasons for these conditions, but, like McLaren, refused to view students as innocent partakers in acts of resistance. As established previously, for oppositional acts to be considered resistance they must be based on the tension between an oppressed group and a dominant group exerting its power. In Devine's study, the students were still the oppressed group. The use of police tactics in the school sent a message to students: poor people of color are violent and unable to discipline their own behavior so they must be controlled by the state. The "state" becomes the dominant group that students resist, but they still find no support in schools that are not equipped to address larger economic (i.e., joblessness, homelessness) and social issues of the community. Students resisted the culture of the police state that invaded the school.

Another study that requires examination comes from Daniel McFarland. McFarland (2001) studied 36 classrooms in two schools and concluded that social networks and status among students was a strong factor in the level of resistance engaged in by students. McFarland (2001) defined resistance as “when the pupil initiates a vocalization or gesture that is meant as a negative expression of discontent, challenge, or refusal, and it is aimed at undermining either the task or the teacher” (pp. 632–633). Teachers and students recognize the acts as “profane communication” and there is either a verbal or nonverbal response by teachers and/or students (McFarland, 2001, p. 633). McFarland called these “active forms of everyday resistance” that are transformative:

Thus, acts of resistance are observed as intentional, publicly displayed forms of student-initiated profanations of classroom academic affairs—whether in the form of refusal, challenge, insult, personal ridicule, or loud complaint—all are recognized by the class as a breach, and most are redressed by the teacher or some other academically oriented participant of the class. (2001, pp. 633–634)

McFarland (2001) claimed that previous studies of student resistance neglected the social and academic structure of the classroom that might help explain resistant behavior that was not a result of cultural background. He concluded that social networks within classrooms gave students the support for acts of resistance and encouraged them to continue. While he admitted that students bring “a wide array of cultural tools and dispositions defined by their backgrounds,” he observed acts of resistance initiated more by the tasks and social arrangements of the classroom than by a student’s cultural background (McFarland, 2001, p. 616).

McFarland’s (2001) statement that youth are a “disaffected class or subculture in relation to adults” appears to explain the hegemony in the classroom that initiated resistance, and peer support helped escalate these resistant acts (p. 616). The powerlessness of students is part of the hegemony of schools, where teachers and administrators control the lives of students, from what they learn to when they visit the bathrooms. In one high school classroom, McFarland observed

both Black and White students resisting the teacher's academic structure of the classroom due to their frustration with the inability of the teacher to teach the subject matter in a way that students could understand. The resistance was first observed as individual acts, but as the year continued students were more supportive of their fellow-students' acts of resistance, and some of the students became more openly defiant. There appeared to be a sense of injustice among students in that they were not being taught the content as they believed they should be—they were not receiving the knowledge they believed they were entitled to—and they united, although loosely, in their resistance to the classroom teacher. McFarland's (2001) study reflected cultural resistance because he concluded that students were responding to their powerlessness as members of an oppressed group in schools—as students they were viewed as immature and unable to make intelligent decisions about classroom instruction.

It could be argued that the classification of students as resisting when they are unaware of the critical inquiry and self-reflection that is so much a part of resistant ideology contradicts resistance theory. What is important to consider is the location of power. Students from oppressed groups who engage in acts of resistance, even without the experience of critical inquiry or self-reflection, are trying to disrupt hegemony and gain power in the classroom for their own group. They may sense the unfairness created in the classroom toward members of their oppressed group but are unfamiliar with the practices of critical inquiry and self-reflection. The students' lack of critical inquiry and self-reflection is a direct result of hegemony in the education system. The students are engaging in resistant behavior in an attempt to bring the "other" (i.e., themselves) into the center of the curriculum and classroom while the teacher or school is trying to maintain the hegemony of the education system. The power rests with the teacher or school.

Counter Resistance

Recent studies examine the resistance of students from the White, Eurocentric, middle–upper class. In classrooms where teachers remove Whiteness from the center of the curriculum and teach a culturally diverse content, students who are members of the dominant group can become uncomfortable and engage in acts of resistance. The difference between cultural resistance and this form of resistance is the goal. As noted earlier, most classrooms and schools in the U.S. reflect the White, Eurocentric, middle–upper class culture. Teachers who decenter cultural norms and teach a culturally diverse curriculum are countering hegemony by resisting the traditional school environment and curriculum. Students who resist the critical examination and reflection used by teachers to uncover hegemony and introduce social justice are working against the resistant actions of the teacher. They are countering the teacher’s resistance with an attempt to maintain hegemony. This is *counter resistance*: it is motivated by a desire to maintain hegemony, can be actions of individuals or groups, and works against critical inquiry and self–reflection.

Studies indicate that counter resistance is exhibited by students in college classrooms. Angela Haddad and Leonard Lieberman (2002) taught an introductory honors sociology course for undergraduates in which all of the students self–identified as White, rural, middle class. Haddad and Lieberman (2002) concluded that due to the students’ lack of experience with domination (because they are member of the dominating group), teaching about oppression and domination of other groups resulted in student resistance to scientific and theoretical information. According to Haddad and Lieberman (2002), “Discussions about the flaws of standardized tests, the social advantages of dominant groups, and the social myth of meritocracy and individualism most likely created discomfort and cognitive dissonance” (p. 332). They

found that students reduced social issues to moral choices, believing their “norm” was the legitimate and natural interpretation of the issues.

Nancy Davis (1992) observed acts of resistance among her White middle class college students when they denied the existence of race, class, and gender inequalities. She found that students believed individual choices were responsible for poverty and unemployment, not hegemonic societal structures. She noted that her students’ lives at home, which often reflected stereotypical gender and social class roles, were at odds with what they were learning in the classroom, and they resisted any interpretations of gender, race or ethnicity that required self-reflection (Davis, 1992). Margaret Hunter and Kimberly Nettles (1999) taught a women’s studies course from the perspective of women of color and found that the majority of their students, nearly all female, maintained “whiteness as the center of their analysis” (p. 386). Hunter and Nettles (1999) concluded that the “displacement of whiteness from the center of the course obviously made many students uncomfortable” (p. 388). Students claimed they were being victimized due to the fact that they were White and conservative. They also observed women of color resisting the course content and taking a standpoint of Whiteness, viewing themselves through a White lens.

Teacher educators also witnessed resistance among prospective teachers from the dominant group. Middleton (2002) found that White prospective teachers agreed that multicultural education was important but could not comprehend what attitudes and skills were necessary for effective teaching in culturally diverse classrooms. Grant and Gillette (2006) found some prospective teachers were resistant to changing their teaching practices because they were ones that worked well for them as students. Prospective teachers also had difficulty accepting criticism and held biased and stereotypical beliefs about students from oppressed groups.

The student resistance in these college classrooms is similar to McLaren's (1983) definition due to the contradiction between the students' lived cultural experiences of domination both inside and outside the classroom, and the more critical nature of these particular college classrooms. It does not, however, include the elements of emancipation or social justice on the part of students. Those who are resisting are not resisting for the purpose of disrupting hegemony and changing the balance of power to empower the oppressed. As part of the dominant group, the students in these college classrooms resisted ideas and content that challenged the hegemony that maintained their position as the dominant group. Applying the term *resistance* to the actions of students who are members of the dominant group and who are not engaged in critical inquiry and self-reflection seems to contradict the theoretical foundations of resistance. Once again, the location of power must be examined. Students from the dominant group who engage in acts of resistance to curriculum or teaching methods that challenge hegemony are trying to regain the power they once had as the center of the curriculum and the dominant group. The power is situated with students in the dominant group and the instructor, regardless of his or her group membership, is challenging that hegemonic power structure. In this case, the person engaging in resistant behavior is the instructor and the students are working to counter that resistance and maintain hegemony.

Student Resistance: From Theory to Practice

This study will examine the various factors that explain student resistance in an internship seminar at a large state university and how these factors may escalate and/or diminish resistance. The purpose of examining resistance in classrooms is to better understand the power relationships that initiate resistant acts and the implications this has for teacher education. The review of literature is important to this study in that it provides a three-part conceptual framework that may improve our understanding of resistance. For educators who work for social

justice, studies of resistance may reveal how to assist students in acquiring the critical inquiry and self-reflection necessary for emancipation and the dismantling of hegemony in schools and society, which is often lacking in current studies of students engaging in resistant behavior.

Studies of counter resistance may provide educators with a better understanding of why students resist curriculum and methods that oppose hegemony, and how this type of resistance might be addressed.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

Theoretical Perspective

The purpose of this study was to better understand student resistance by White students in a secondary social studies internship seminar for prospective teachers by examining what might explain resistant behavior and what causes it to escalate and/or diminish in the classroom. Student resistance is a concept defined by critical pedagogues based on the writings of critical theorists; therefore, this study will be conducted using a critical theory lens. The concept of critical theory was first introduced by scholars at the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt, Germany, also known as the Frankfurt School (Giroux, 2001; Jay, 1973). Critical theory contends that all relationships are based on a power structure between dominant and oppressed groups, and these power structures are influenced or created by economic, political and social forces in society (Habermas, 1998; Horkheimer & Adorno, 1972; Laclau & Mouffe, 2001; Marcuse, 1991).

Gramsci's (1971) ideas about hegemony are based on these complex power structures. Hegemony describes the relationship between a historically dominant class, based on its "position and function in the world of production," and the "great masses of the population," the oppressed, who consent to the authority of the dominant class (p. 12). According to Gramsci (1971), the dominant class maintains control over the masses through the exploitation of education, religion, and popular culture. For critical theorists, the exploitation of the masses begins in the education system where students are taught the ideology of the dominant class, resulting in an education based on class status and not according to abilities of students or on an equitable system of education (Althusser, 1971; Habermas, 1998; Horkheimer & Adorno, 1972).

Critical theory provided education with a method for critically examining accepted knowledge and considering contradictory knowledge (Giroux, 2001).

Freire (1993) was one of the first educators to move critical theory into educational practice, creating critical pedagogy. Freire and others borrowed ideas from the Frankfurt School to develop emancipatory education, which challenges hegemony in the education system and in society while moving toward action for social justice (Darling–Hammond, French & Garcia–Lopez, 2002; Cochran–Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2004; Giroux, 2001; hooks, 1994; Howard, 2003; McLaren, 2003; Shor, 1992). Freire (1993) defined the term *conscientização* (conscientization) to mean “learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality” (p. 35). He advocated the use of reflection and dialogue to explore, identify, and overcome oppressive ideology. According to Freire (1998), we are constructed, deconstructed, and reconstructed through dialogue—through what happens when people meet to exchange ideas and alter the oppressive effects of those ideas. Dialogue should not exclude conflict but embrace it and work to overcome it, resulting in an open form of education that critically examines all ideas and beliefs.

Giroux (2001), influenced by the writings of Freire, advocated an education system for social justice and “political intervention” (p. xxvii). According to Giroux, schools use the hidden curriculum to teach ideas that perpetuate the power of the dominant class and maintain hegemonic relationships. Giroux (2001) and other critical theorists believe educators should critique the hegemony within schools (Freire, 1993; Horkheimer & Adorno, 1972; McLaren, 2003; Shor, 1992). Giroux maintained that schools are responsible for preparing students to not only develop a critical self–reflective stance, but also to teach students how to live in a democracy. Giroux called this a “radical pedagogy” that engages students in a critical discourse

of social class structure, examining who benefits and who is harmed by current power structures (2001, p. 115).

Research based on critical theory questions the power structures that exist in society and initiates action that will bring about social justice (Crotty, 1998). The issues of power and oppression guide the researcher in her quest to uncover injustice and hegemonic relationships. According to Michael Crotty (1998), critical inquiry is a type of praxis that searches for knowledge that emancipates the learner from participating in hegemony. The use of reflective thinking, dialogue, and action for change guide the methods of critical inquiry.

Methodology

In the first stage of this study, data were collected through classroom observations to identify acts of resistance by students within the internship seminar. Students often resist in ways that defy teacher and administrative authority because they are assigned positions of powerlessness in the classroom (Cochran–Smith, 2004; Freire, 1993; McCotter, 1999; Shor and Freire, 2003). However, other acts of resistance can be due to social class, ethnic, gender or other biases students bring with them to the classroom (Haddad & Lieberman, 2002; Michalove, 1999; Shor, 1992). For the purpose of this study, resistant behavior is defined as passive and/or aggressive behavior in response to the content and/or methods used by the instructor with the purpose of changing the balance of power in the classroom and/or challenging the authority of the teacher as the professional educator. Resistant behaviors could include, but are not limited to, vocal protests to course assignments, actions that disrupt the class and challenge the teacher's authority, or disengagement during class activities. Through the observations, four students were identified as engaging in resistant behavior and agreed to participate in the study.

In the second stage of the study, data were collected through observations of and interviews with student participants and the course instructor. Observations of the participants' interactions with

the instructor and with each other offered data regarding what might explain resistance in this internship seminar. Interviews provided data for analysis and an opportunity to engage participants in reflective dialogue about their behavior in the social studies internship seminar. Through critical analysis, self-reflection, problem-posing, and dialogue educators can better understand what motivates resistance among prospective teachers and can address these issues with prospective teachers (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Freire, 1993; McLaren, 2003; Shor, 1992).

Study Design

The purpose of this study is to explain the phenomenon of prospective teachers' resistance in a secondary social studies internship seminar. With this in mind, the study was designed so the social context of the study and the participants' beliefs and perceptions could be considered together. The types of data collected and the analysis methods used allowed the researcher to consider how the classroom environment and the expectations of the teacher education program combined with the perceptions of participants as described in interviews.

Context of the Study

The study took place at a college of education in a large southeastern university. The university is located in a city with a population of about 95,000 people (United States Census Bureau, 2000). Of the 98% of the total city population that classified themselves as being from one race, about 68% were White, 23% were Black, 5% were Asian, 2% were Other, and less than 1% were American Indian/Alaskan Native. About 6% of the total population classified themselves as Hispanic/Latino or mixed ethnicity with Hispanic/Latino. In 2000, the median household income was about \$28,000 and the median family income was about \$44,000. The school populations are a more revealing aspect of the community. When the public elementary schools that serve the city's students are located on a map, the percentage of White students in the schools decreases the further east the school is located and the percentage of Black students

increases.¹ A similar pattern occurs with the percentage of students qualifying for free and reduced lunch—the further east the school is located the higher the percentage of students who qualify for free and reduced lunch, which means schools on the east side of the city serve families in the lower economic groups. The city where the university is located is divided between east and west, with a higher population of White, economically wealthier students living in the west and a higher population of Black, economically poorer students living in the east. This racially and economically divided environment is where students in the social studies internship seminar lived and completed their internships in schools.

The university and College of Education populations do not reflect that of the city. In 2000, the same year as the census and school data, the university had a population of about 46,000.² Of those students, 69% were White, 7% were Black, 10 % Hispanic/Latino, 6% were Asian, less than 1% were American Indian, and 5% were non-resident aliens, probably foreign-born students. About 1% of all students entering the university did not report their ethnicity. In the college of education, 81% of the 1,885 students enrolled in 2000 were White, 7% were Black, 7% were Hispanic/Latino, and 6% classified themselves as other. The population of the city was more diverse than the university and college population.

The secondary social studies internship seminar, where observations took place, was designed to help support prospective teachers who are completing their internships in the area schools. The course is required for graduation from a master's program in the College of Education's secondary social studies teaching program. The social studies teacher education program is a one year master's program in which students complete four semesters of

¹ All school information on ethnic populations and free/reduced lunch percentages was obtained from the Public School Accountability Reports, 2000–2001, through the county school board.

² All university and college information on ethnic populations was obtained from the Office of Institutional Planning and Research at the university.

coursework (36 credits) in fifteen months. Students entering the program have already earned a degree in a social studies field and have completed a required number of credits in specific courses, including history, political science, economics, geography, sociology, psychology and anthropology. Prior to teacher certification, students are required to successfully complete two three-credit undergraduate courses—"The Adolescent" and one ESOL course, "ESOL Strategies for Content Areas" or "Secondary ESOL Teaching Strategies." Graduate coursework in the program included courses on classroom management, teaching methods, technology in the classroom, reading in the content area, and two experiences in public school classrooms—a part-time practicum and a full-time teaching internship. The internship was completed while taking the social studies internship seminar that was observed in the spring.

The instructor of the internship seminar was a doctoral student who had taught undergraduate and graduate level methods courses for three years. She divided the course into three units: (1) The Importance of Classroom Teachers, (2) Fostering Success in the Student Teacher Experience, and (3) Preparing to Become a Professional Educator. Throughout the first two units, prospective teachers were expected to reflect on their experiences as interns, in particular possible reasons for successes and failures in their teaching. The first unit of the course, The Importance of Classroom Teachers, focused on stories of successful teachers, most in diverse schools located in high-poverty communities, and supported teaching for social justice. Multicultural classrooms, culturally responsive teaching, critical friends, equity and excellence, a no-excuses teaching philosophy, and democratic classrooms were topics for readings and discussion (see Appendix B for reading list). The second unit of the course, Fostering Success in the Student Teacher Experience, focused on state requirements for teachers and the internship experience. The third unit of the course, Preparing to Become a Professional

Educator, provided instruction on preparing resumes and portfolios, interviewing skills, and balancing one's professional and personal life.

Study Participants and Selection

The class was a cohort of 29 students, 20 male and 9 female. As stated earlier, 26 students were self-classified as White/Caucasian, two as Hispanic, and one as Persian. They were in the second semester of a 15-month master's program for secondary social studies education. This particular cohort of prospective teachers was chosen for the study based on observations by two instructors who taught the students in the first semester of the program. The instructors expressed concern because they perceived that some of the students exhibited "resistance" to course content and the instructors' authority. As mentioned earlier, the process of participant selection began with classroom observations; four students were observed by the researcher as engaging in passive and/or active actions that disrupted the balance of power in the classroom and/or challenged the authority of the instructor. These oppositional acts included, but were not limited to, refusing to complete assignments, making comments that disrupted the class or assigned group task, appearing frustrated or bored, challenging the program's curriculum or objectives, challenging the authority of the instructor, and disengagement with classroom instruction or activities. Resistance was also determined not by the intensity of the oppositional behavior, but by repetition of the behavior over time. The four students were invited to participate in the study and told that their participation was completely voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time.

The four participants were White males ranging in age from 24 to 38 and originally from the midwestern United States. One had just completed his undergraduate degree when he was accepted in the teacher education program, one worked as a substitute teacher for a year before

applying to the teacher education program, and two were returning to college after working in other fields.

Acts of Resistance in the Classroom

Each of the four participants displayed similar acts of resistance in the internship seminar, including facial expressions that showed disgust, discontent, frustration and boredom. William's acts of resistance in the classroom also consisted of vocal disagreements with the content taught, sarcastic comments that disrupted the class, and body language that appeared to disconnect him from the class (his back turned to the instructor while she was talking or slumping in his chair and attending to something other than the instructor). Kenneth's resistance also included vocalized opposition. He consistently helped pull his small group off task and voiced his opposition to methods used by the instructor and to the readings about a no-excuses teaching philosophy and democratic classroom practices. Henry's acts of resistance were made apparent through facial expressions—he rolled his eyes or used an expression that appeared to imply that the work was not worth his time. Like Kenneth, he expressed vocal displeasure with some of the activities and when entering the classroom on one occasion and finding the desks in rows said, "Thank you! Desks in rows—a real classroom." George's acts of resistance in the methods course were made apparent through his body language—he often shook his head as if in disbelief when engaging in some of the work, he put his head down on the desk or held his head in his hands and looked down at the desk, appeared to check out mentally from the class, and he often sat with his desk facing away from the overhead when the instructor was giving information to the class. When the instructor asked students to open their notebooks, he would consistently delay in doing this. In small groups, all four students expressed discontent and disagreement with the methods and content used in the class and in the teacher education program. Their resistance

in the internship seminar was apparent, however, in both their vociferous complaints and in the deafening silence of body language and facial expressions.

Data Collection

Two kinds of data were collected to address the research questions. Interviews, the primary source of data, were conducted with the four participants. Observations of students during the internship seminar were also conducted.

Observations

Observations of the secondary social studies internship seminar took place during the first five weeks of the semester for three hours each week. These observations were detailed field notes recorded in a notebook and included bracketed thoughts and questions from the researcher. Observations were used to identify prospective teachers who would make suitable participants for the study. Participants were selected in the third week of observations and then observations focused specifically on interactions between the participants and the instructor. Observation data were helpful when determining the triggers for resistance and what escalated or diminished it. Observations also provided a context for much of the interview data and helped with interpretation.

Interviews

Each participant was interviewed three times. The first interview provided a brief history of each student, specifically their cultural background and experiences in schools. Student resistance is often grounded in a student's culture and history ((Haddad & Lieberman, 2002; McLaren, 2003; Michalove, 1999; Shor, 1992) so it was important to understand each participant's sociohistorical context. The second and third interviews provided insight into the acts of resistance observed in the classroom and into the beliefs that participants expressed in previous interviews. All student interviews were semi-structured and open-ended in order to

enable the researcher to (1) understand the nature and dynamics of student resistance and (2) stimulate participants' reflection on their resistance (Please see Appendix A for interview protocol).

Data Analysis

Thematic Analysis

Observations were first analyzed thematically using J. Amos Hatch's (2002) inductive analysis method, allowing the data to shape emerging themes. Similar to a puzzle, inductive analysis identifies particular pieces and connects them with other pieces until a picture (theme) emerges. Observation data were examined for passive and/or aggressive oppositional behavior of students, such as refusing to complete assignments or voicing dissatisfaction with course curriculum, which helped the researcher identify students who engaged in resistant acts. The emerging themes also provided additional support for Discourses found in interviews since Discourse includes not only language but also "action, interaction, values, beliefs" (Gee, 1999, p. 18).

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Discourse, according to James Gee (1999), is both spoken and written language and the "other stuff" that creates who we are with a certain group of people or within a certain community (p.7). Language creates rules that are followed for the purpose of communication within certain social locations, like families and classrooms, but language is also political in nature—it is used to reinforce the power and status of one group of people over another (Gee, 1999). This is the difference between what Gee calls "d"iscourse, conversations and stories, and "D"iscourse, "clothes, gestures, actions, interactions, ways with things, symbols, tools, technologies..., and values, attitudes, beliefs, and emotions..., and... places and time" (1999, p. 7). Discourse, with a capital "D," helps people identify with a social group or social network.

Discourse analysis (capital “D”) examines a way of living and the words spoken are only part of the data. For this reason, careful notes on elements such as location of interviews, participant dress and mannerisms, gestures, and emotions were recorded in this study and included in the analysis.

Discourse analysis considers five aspects of social interactions:

- Semiotic (“...language, gestures, images, or other symbolic systems”)
- Activity (“...specific social activity... in which participants are engaging...”)
- Material (“...place, time, bodies and objects...”)
- Political (“...distribution of ‘social goods’...”)
- Sociocultural (“...personal, social, and cultural knowledge, feelings, values, identities, and relationships...”) (Gee, 1999, pp. 82–83)

Gee found these five aspects to be intertwined; however, discourse analysis from a critical theory perspective uses a lens of power and naturally starts with the political aspect and the distribution of power in the discourse.

According to Teun Van Dijk (2001), Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) “studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context” (p. 352). CDA attempts to explain the structure of discourse in terms of social interactions and how discourse can “enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce, or challenge relations of power and dominance in society” (Van Dijk, 2001, p. 353). For the purpose of this study, Fairclough’s (1995) method of identifying ideology in language is used. According to Fairclough, CDA “focuses on the effects of ideologies rather than questions of truth” (1995, p. 25). The structure of ideology places it within “social conventions, norms, histories” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 71). For example, the belief that students need to be controlled is based on the ideology that humans of a certain age are naturally immature, impulsive, and disobedient. This ideology helps sustain the power relations in schools in which administrators

and teachers have power over students, who are then rendered powerless. Ideology is found in Discourse about past events but also in current events and in “the event itself” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 72). Ideologies try to disguise themselves as common sense but are identified when they “sustain or undermine power relations” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 82).

Fairclough’s (1995) method of CDA was used to analyze interview and observation data, identifying the codes of Discourse that might explain the ideology of student resisters in the internship seminar. Codes of Discourse are the rules people follow that identify them as belonging to a certain social group or network. In this study, the rules of language, values, beliefs, mannerisms, interactions, gestures, symbols, tools, dress, and location were evident in the observations and interviews. In the analysis process, interview data were divided into lines, each line representing a separate thought. Within each line, or thought, the word that had the strongest intonation was italicized indicating the emphasis the speaker made in this thought. For example, one participant said,

I did something extremely stupid a month or so ago
where *I* was so tired
and *I* did something disrespectful (W3)

The emphasis was placed three times on the word ‘*I*’ indicating the participant took responsibility for his actions. If the emphasis had been placed on ‘month,’ ‘tired,’ and ‘did,’ it would require a different interpretation. The ‘month’ might emphasize a past time that maybe should be forgotten along with the disrespectful act. His condition (‘tired’) might be an excuse and an avoidance of responsibility. The act itself (‘did’) focuses on what was done and not the person who did it, also a possible avoidance of blame. The word with the strongest intonation, therefore, helps explain the meaning behind the discourse. Throughout this study, words in italics indicate the strongest intonation and the emphasis of the participant. In addition, excerpts from interviews that are in block quotes used punctuation as follows:

comma (,): a short pause, two seconds or less
ellipses (...): a long pause, three seconds or more
long (em) dash (—): an abrupt interruption of the flow of words

The only other punctuation used are capitalizations of proper nouns and question marks to indicate a question, usually posed by the researcher.

The first student interviews were used to gain knowledge of the participants' cultural and educational history. The second and third interviews focused on the resistant behavior engaged in by participants and were analyzed using CDA. The interviews were listened to and read using a critical lens, allowing the analysis to focus only on those parts reflecting hegemony.

According to Gee:

Besides seeing that methods change with theories, it is also important to see that research, whether in physics, literary criticism, or in discourse analysis, is not an algorithmic procedure, a set of "rules" that can be followed step-by-linear-step to get guaranteed "results." ...Rather, research adopts and adapts specific tools of inquiry and strategies for implementing them. These tools and strategies ultimately reside in a "community of practice" formed by those engaged in such research. Such tools and strategies are continually and flexibly adapted to specific issues, problems, and contexts of study. They are continually transformed as they are applied in practice. (Gee, 1999, p.6)

This study was true to the principles of CDA as discussed by Fairclough (1995) but the process of data collection and analysis were "transformed as they applied" to this study. This is explained more fully in the next section and the use of multiple methodologies during analysis.

Trustworthiness of the Study

Various techniques were used to insure the trustworthiness of this study. Triangulation of data sources occurred through the use of observations, interviews, and peer review. The use of multiple methodological perspectives provided different lenses for interpreting data.

Triangulation of data

As noted earlier, there were five *observations* of the social studies internship seminar. Observations are important in understanding the context of the Discourse on resistance

(Fairclough, 1995; Gee, 1999). Observations were first analyzed using Hatch's thematic analysis in which the data revealed themes of resistance behavior. Once participants were identified, new observation data were analyzed using critical discourse analysis. *Interviews* provided opportunities for participants to explain the behavior observed in the internship seminar. These clarifications were important for understanding their beliefs about teaching, which helped identify their ideologies. The use of *peer reviewers* can help prevent researcher bias. Data from this study were presented multiple times to a small group of qualitative research methodologists who met regularly to share research and discuss analysis methods and findings. The members of the peer review group were doctoral students and professors from different departments across the university. The dissertation committee chair was another peer reviewer, and we met regularly throughout the data collection and analysis process.

Multiple methodological perspectives

Fairclough (1995) stated that his method of discourse analysis can be used in conjunction with other qualitative methods, thereby increasing the trustworthiness of a study. The use of multiple methods for analyzing data can increase trustworthiness when findings are similar when using various methods of analysis. This increases the credibility of the data and the analysis. As noted earlier, thematic analysis was used to analyze observation data prior to participant selection. Findings from this analysis were based on critical theory and the definition of resistance used in this study. Case study analysis was also used and cases were written for each participant. This provided a rich examination of the data since each case was analyzed thoroughly prior to identifying common and unique Discourses (see Appendix C for a sample case study). Critical discourse analysis was the predominant method used to analyze data and provided a third methodological approach. Trustworthiness was enhanced by using multiple

methodological perspectives and methods, including thematic analysis, critical discourse analysis, and a rich analysis of individual participant data (case studies).

Limitations of the Study

There were many possible limitations to this study. First, all four participants were White males from middle and middle–upper class families, which could limit transferability of the findings. Second, the study was in one internship seminar at a college of education in a university in the southeastern United States. Readers will need to determine if this study is transferable to other disciplines and geographic areas. Finally, studies based on critical theory are intended to look for power structures, which are defined by the researcher. Other researchers, including critical theorists, may view the data differently and find valid interpretations different from the ones presented here.

Subjectivity Statement

Subjectivity, or lack of objectivity, is apparent in all research, but especially qualitative studies (Glesne, 1999). According to Corrine Glesne (1999), subjectivity should be monitored to understand how it influences the study and to assure trustworthiness. By recognizing the various lenses used to view the world, researchers can recognize and avoid bias. In this study, my own personal lenses contributed strongly to my chosen research topic and theoretical perspective.

Sociohistorical context

My most vivid childhood memories involve events of social justice. As a child, I listened to my working–class father argue against government and corporate actions that harmed those of his own socioeconomic class. My father spent most dinners behind a newspaper, responding to the articles that infuriated his views of social justice. I never participated in these monologues, neither did my mother or three sisters, but his passion and logic somehow penetrated my childlike thinking. At the age of six, I was already responding vociferously to acts of injustice. In

Sunday school, a fellow student claimed a molded plaster picture I had done the Sunday before was hers. Her picture had been poorly molded and she wanted mine because it had fewer imperfections. When I claimed the picture was mine, the teacher hushed me and gave it to the girl. This girl was the minister's daughter and her word was taken over mine. Her initials were on her plaster picture, but the teacher would not challenge the words of the minister's daughter even with evidence. At the age of six, I expressed my outrage in knowing this girl was able to get away with lying because her father was the minister.

In the first grade, I had a classmate who had what I believe now to be hydrocephalus. Hydrocephalus is an accumulation of fluid in the brain and in an infant can result in an enlargement of the head. The boy in my class who had this disease was teased incessantly by some of our classmates because his head was abnormally large and oddly shaped. I remember one day becoming angry and yelling at two boys who were teasing this student, and the teacher had to intervene to calm me down. I doubt if I understood at the time why I did this. I only knew it was unfair to treat another human being in this way. The boy and I soon became good friends, and I have never forgotten him, although we lost touch when my family moved.

In the sixth grade, another more appalling example of injustice was made evident. My sixth grade teacher was racist to an extent I did not realize at the time. Thinking back, I now see how he placed all the blue-eyed blonde children in the center of the classroom, towards the front, and the rest of us took places outside this exclusive circle. I attended a rural high-poverty school, mostly White, and this class had only two students who were not White—an African American boy and a Hispanic boy. The African American boy had learned to be silent to avoid punishment but the Hispanic boy, new to the area, was often defiant and challenged the teacher.

Unfortunately, like Peter McLaren's (1986) oppositional students, this brought him more trouble and he was often sent to the principal's office for punishment.

One day, as the class walked back to our classroom from the library, we passed the principal's office. His door to the hallway was open, which was unusual, and I looked in. Sitting in a chair in front of his desk was the principal with an expression of agitated disgust. Standing to one side was my sixth grade teacher, a smile on his face and a paddle in his hand. Standing at the desk with his back to the door, head bowed, and both hands holding the edge of the desk, was the Hispanic student. The door was quickly closed by the principal, but the shock that reverberated through me at that moment I still experience today when I visualize that scene. I do not remember the walk back to the classroom or what happened for the remainder of the day, but I told no one about what I saw. Later that year, this same teacher punished the entire class by taking away recess for some trivial act, which was one of his consistent forms of discipline. Having been reared by my father and the nightly news casts on Civil Rights and Vietnam War protests, I whispered to the girls in front of me that we should have a sit-in. I had no idea that those words would spark a movement, but nearly the entire class agreed and a time was set. When the time came, almost the entire class moved out of their chairs and sat on the floor. The teacher was shocked and proceeded to scream at us until his face was red. Some students succumbed to his threats and returned to their chairs, but some of us remained on the floor, resistant. He stormed out of the room and our appointed classroom lookout crept quietly to the door to watch. When it was reported that he was returning with the principal, the entire class returned quickly to their chairs and appeared to be completely immersed in the assigned work. The teacher and principal entered the room. The principal looked around, looked at the teacher,

looked once more at the students, and left saying nothing. At the end of the school year, that sixth grade teacher was transferred to another school.

Events like this one continued to shape my perspectives as I grew and now strongly influence my research. The lens of gender and the lens of the working-class are also important to how I perceive the world and this study, but they are both closely intertwined with the lens of social justice. I consider my gender and my working-class roots significant because of my social justice stance—they simply present hegemony of another kind. These perceptions will greatly influence my research, so monitoring them is essential.

Monitoring subjectivity

Critical theory requires constant reflection, or what Freire (2004) calls conscientization. The critical theorist must examine her own beliefs for possible oppressive elements and take action to change oppressive beliefs (Freire, 2004). Journal writing is one strategy for monitoring subjectivity (Glesne, 1999) and exposing beliefs that support hegemony. Through self-critique and self-reflection, researchers are better able to define the areas of research that may reflect their own biases. Glesne (1999) suggests paying close attention to emotions since they are an indicator as to when we engage in our subjectivity.

Throughout this study, I maintained a journal to document possible subjective attitudes and perceptions, the most dominant being my self-proclaimed title of a critical resister. It was during data analysis that my social justice nature was stirred, and I became emotionally upset with the statements of some of the participants. Their obvious bias against minority groups and the attitude that students were less than human and not capable of participating in the workings of classrooms and schools violated my own deeply held beliefs. I was both angry and discouraged by these insistent claims from participants. In another instance, however, I was encouraged to see some reflection and possible change in beliefs when one participant was faced with a difficult

internship experience. My desire was to highlight his experiences because he was being self-reflective and engaging in critical inquiry. However, the changes were not taking place in the internship seminar and his resistance was not disrupted, so I wondered if I placed too much emphasis on these events because they appeared to be one small light in the darkness of hegemony. To counter my emotions and desire to find some positive change among participants, I focused even more closely on my research questions and repeated to myself, “What does this have to do with resistance in this classroom?” By keeping that thought foremost in my mind, I was able to move past my emotions and prejudices and focus on the data in a way that helped answer my research question.

The real struggle for a critical theorist and self-proclaimed resister is to maintain some objectivity in the midst of offensive subjectivity and open bias. The desire to intercede for the students I knew these future teachers would be responsible for, and the desire to help a fellow struggler toward an emancipatory stance, was very strong. However, to collect data that are as objective as humanly possible is also necessary and my desires and objectives were, at times, incompatible. I did ask questions that forced participants to reflect on their hegemonic beliefs about the roles of teachers. Most of these questions were necessary to better understand their beliefs, but some were intended to nudge participants toward critical inquiry and self-reflection that might lead to a disruption of hegemony. I do not regret, however, having pushed the edges of research and data collection toward an emancipatory stance even if data were sacrificed for this purpose.

CHAPTER 4 CONTEXTS OF RESISTANCE

Preface

Resistance does not happen in a vacuum and the context in which it occurs can influence escalating and diminishing factors (Fairclough, 1995; Gee, 1999). In this study, resistance acts took place in an internship seminar at a large university. The context of the classroom, actions by the teacher and researcher, and the sociohistorical context of the participants all influenced the resistance engaged in by students.

The Context of the Classroom

The classroom used for the internship seminar was one of those nondescript classrooms that are found in many schools and colleges. The carpet was brown and worn, the walls were dreary beige, and the fluorescent lighting too dim to reach the front of the room, making it difficult to read what was on the chalkboard. The room had six rows of desks and was meant to seat about 50 students, which left little space in between desks for student movement. The desks were the type in which the desk top is connected to the chair by a metal arm on one side, with enough space between the desk top and chair for bodies of a certain size. When facing the front of the room, there were large windows along the left wall with brown Venetian blinds that were rarely open, and brown wooden cabinets below. The same inevitable brown cabinets were along the right wall of the room with bulletin boards permanently mounted above the cabinets. The doors from the outer hallway were on the wall to the right, one in the front and one in the back of the room. The back wall was bare and the front wall had a bulletin board and chalkboard permanently affixed. There was a long table centered in the front of the room and a podium to the left that opened to reveal a computer. A digital projector hung from the ceiling and projected onto a screen on the front wall that could be lowered electronically. For the first class meeting,

there was a small table in the front of the room covered in a decorative cloth and holding a plate of cookies. Contemporary Hawaiian music played on a CD player. The cookies and music were provided by Rachel, the instructor.

Before class, Rachel arranged 29 of the desks into a large circle. This created a dilemma since the remaining desks had to be shoved into any space available and hindered access to the circle. Students were required to maneuver their way to a desk by squeezing into the circle or around the desks outside the circle. As students entered, Rachel greeted them and offered cookies, which they took with gratitude. The class convened from 5:00 pm to 8:00 pm. On the first day of class, Rachel began instruction at 5:06 pm by distributing a sheet of colored paper to each student in the circle and asking them to write their name on the paper. She then instructed them to pass the paper to the person on their right and each student will write one positive thing the student named on the paper brings to the classroom. The papers were then passed around the circle, with each student writing a positive comment on every other student's paper, until the papers arrived to their owners. Some students snickered mockingly at the activity, but they were cooperative, and as the papers were passed laughter was heard as students read what other wrote. Rachel moved around the classroom, monitoring the movement of the paper and reading what students wrote. She told students to "look forward when you're finished reading," but not all students complied. When it appeared students were done reading, she asked them how this activity made them feel and told them to answer that question "inside your head." She then asked if this activity would be helpful to teachers and if they felt they could do this in their own classrooms. Responses ranged from never using it to using it in certain classrooms to viewing it as a powerful tool for positive feedback to students. Rachel then introduced interactive notebooks and told students this would be the cover page for their notebooks. This was the first

meeting of the internship seminar and the activity took exactly 15 minutes, a testimony to Rachel’s highly organized and timed activities that would become a familiar pattern.

Rachel organized the internship seminar in three units: (1) The Importance of Classroom Teachers, (2) Fostering Success in the Student Teacher Experience, and (3) Preparing to Become a Professional Educator. The classes I observed during the first unit were a combination of group activities and direct instruction, or lecture. Rachel timed each activity so there would be adequate time to cover everything on her agenda for that day. Table 4–1 displays a schedule for one of the classes I observed.

Table 4–1. Internship seminar class schedule, January 17, 2007

Time	Activity
5:07 pm	Class began: daily assignment and sign-in sheet on table at front of room; interactive notebook table of contents on overhead; students were to glue page 10 in their notebook; desks were grouped for small group discussion
5:09 pm	Review: Rachel reviewed assignment and notebook pages; question-answer time about the notebook assignment
5:19 pm	Announcements: Rachel explained changes to the syllabus and course expectations
5:22 pm	Introduction of lesson: Rachel discussed how different teaching methods and effective teaching was hard work and would be learned over time
5:25 pm	Writing assignment 1: in notebooks “describe briefly your K–12 and college social studies learning experience”
5:30 pm	Writing assignment 2: in notebooks answer the question “What is a good social studies teacher?” and highlight important words
5:35 pm	Writing assignment 3: in notebooks answer the questions “How should social studies be taught?”
5:40 pm	Small groups: share responses to the three writing assignments
5:46 pm	Whole class: discuss responses to the three writing assignments
5:54 pm	Jigsaw: expert groups meet (students who have read the same assignment)
6:15 pm	Jigsaw: jigsaw groups meet to share their readings and what they learned from expert groups; Rachel directed them to draw a diagram in their notebooks and organize the information from the jigsaw using this diagram (four circles intersecting)
6:38 pm	Break
6:58 pm	Speakers: a teacher and administrator from local schools; speakers talked about their work and what they believed about teaching; students asked questions; Rachel had students write the speakers’ beliefs about teaching
8:00 pm	Class ended

Table 4–1 is representative of Rachel’s classroom structure during the first unit of the course when observations were completed. She was highly organized and this was reflected in her classroom. She followed a schedule that allowed her to cover all the material planned for that day.

The Context of the Instructor

In interviews, Rachel said she deliberately planned the internship seminar based on events from the fall semester. She said students in her technology class were not interested in the theory underlying effective teaching; they wanted only the practices necessary for teaching, so she taught the practices and then connected the theory through written reflections on why the practice was effective. She also said her observations of the prospective teachers in a graduate teacher education course taught by another instructor convinced her that they did better in a class that was “more businesslike” (R4). Rachel deliberately structured the class so the dominant voices she witnessed in the fall would not have opportunities to dominate, but said this resulted in her “being perceived as more authoritarian, which was not intended” (R4).

Rachel said the goal of the internship seminar was to prepare students as social studies educators, “which means understanding democracy, understanding equity versus equality. This is a class with content, not a support of [their] nine week internship” (R3). She said many students resisted the course content and methods because they did not view it as relevant to their internship. She chose the content based on discussions with instructors in the program who indicated students had not yet grasped important themes and concepts of effective teaching and needed more time with them. Rachel said she chose the methods so students could experience them and learn how to use them in their own classrooms. She also hoped the methods would model giving all students a voice.

Rachel grouped students so all the ones she identified as resisters, about eight students, were in the same small groups. She then divided the remaining students based on personality, the ability to understand difficult concepts, and their effective implementation of best teaching practices based on their lesson plans from the technology course. She said a veteran professor in the college suggested this type of grouping to avoid having the most vocal students dominate discussions with students who were less vocal.

I did not want to spread those resisters out. I wanted their voice to be encapsulated amongst their group to give the other people a chance to have their voices heard and to have their ideas talked about. I hate to say this, but I almost wanted to silence their voice. They dominated too long and I would love to see them change. I'm not sure it's the best approach. (R1)

Rachel said the methods used in the internship seminar were meant to give voice to students who were not as assertive in the classroom. Jigsaws were used in two other classes in the education program but Rachel said prospective teachers did not make the connection between doing the jigsaw and how they might employ the same method in their own classroom. Chalk talks were used to help “give more of an even voice and orally silence some voices” (R3). Later, Rachel said putting the resisters in the same groups gave them more power and was not beneficial. A small group of students continued to dominate classroom discussion and, after complaints from other students, she chose to “become more proactive” (R3). She restructured the groups, putting the four participants in this study in one group so I could work with them and distributing the remaining dominant voices among students she knew would not allow them to be the dominant voice. She also started calling on students and deliberately directed the discussion to give all students an opportunity to participate. She said she was accused of “micro-managing students” and “telling them when to talk and how to talk” (R2).

In essence, it was the methods that were telling them this and the ones who didn't like the methods were the ones who were criticizing. A minority of students objected to anything that decentered the mainstream. It comes down to a respect issue. Some of the students don't have respect for themselves, for their peers, or for me. (R3)

Rachel found the interactive notebook method was another major source of resistance. She used the interactive notebook in her methods courses to help prospective teachers understand how to teach organizational skills. The method is normally taught in the social studies methods course but the instructor of that course, taught in the fall, asked Rachel to teach the method in the spring due to the amount of material she had to cover. Rachel believed most students in the internship seminar benefited from the notebook but those who resisted the method created such a disturbance that she said, in retrospect, she should not have used the method with these students.

In my observations, Rachel did not take class time to discuss with prospective teachers why she chose to use certain methods and how students might implement them in their own classrooms. She said this discussion would take place in a methods course, but this was not a methods course. In a later interview, however, she said her focus on the steps used in the methods and not the reasons behind them was a mistake. Rachel said when she realized students did not understand the methods she should have stopped and discussed the theory behind the methods. Previous experience, however, led her to closely follow her agenda.

There might have been some fear in deviating from the plan because of the dynamics of the class. My natural reaction was to pull in the reins versus letting the reins go. When I let the reins go, it often got messy, and I can't say it was productive messy. (R4)

Rachel's decision to consciously direct voices in the classroom was an attempt to limit the dominate voices, which were mainly students identified as resisters. Teachers who take advantage of their position of power in the classroom to control the behavior of students often create a classroom environment in which resistance does not stop, but moves under the radar.

Resisters will comply with teacher expectations but their reasons for resisting, the underlying ideology that supports the oppositional behavior, remains unchanged.

The Context of the Researcher

In my observations, I was puzzled by Rachel's practice of closely following her agenda and abruptly ending discussions in which students were fully engaged. She was a colleague and friend who shared my ideals of social justice, so her need to time classroom activities and limit what I considered engaging discussions among students appeared to conflict with her belief in democratic classroom practices. When observing the internship seminar, my own desire to resist what I considered micro-management of students and instruction was very strong. I consciously chose to accept her management of the internship seminar until there was evidence as to why she conducted class in a way that I thought resulted in an escalation of resistance. After all, I was a guest in her classroom. My observation notes, however, are filled with bracketed comments about the instruction and what I considered hidden curriculum:

- Possible disconnect between this classroom organization method that would work in K–12 but not necessary in college [interactive notebooks]
- Rachel does not explain why she uses this method
- Students brought their own lens to their interpretations, needs to be questioned
- Explaining the methods is an important element missing in this class
- None of the speakers [current secondary level teachers] discussed why they were not successful with a student; do they really know why and had they reflected on this
- Near the end of the activity Rachel makes her way around the classroom to listen to discussions; the noise level drops; is this due to her presence?
- Her behavior reminds me of an elementary or middle school classroom; it's condescending
- This was a surprise notebook check, which is questionable since it places the teacher in the position of power; students are at the teacher's mercy

By the fourth observation, I had chosen the four participants and joined their small group, which is when my acts of resistance surfaced. During small groups, when students were participating in chalk talks, there was supposed to be complete silence. When my group was finished writing their comments, however, we began a whispered discussion of what they had

written. Rachel gave our group a look of reprimand and shushed us. Later, she asked if it would be better if I worked with the participants in another room. Since the study focused on resistance in the internship seminar, I thought it best to remain in the classroom but asked if we could bend the rules a little regarding discussion. Rachel hesitated and then suggested we move to another area of the classroom where we would be less of a distraction.

Prior to the study, Rachel and I agreed that I would join a small group to gather data and hopefully provide participants opportunities for critical inquiry and self-reflection. This was not possible due to the priority Rachel placed on following her agenda, which often meant ending discussions when students were struggling with their beliefs about teaching. My own resistance to the classroom schedule was immediately apparent to me, but I chose to continue the resistant behavior when I believed it was necessary for the study. I passed notes to participants asking for responses to comments they made in class and engaging them in a brief discussion on paper. This was done when Rachel was lecturing or during whole class discussion. In conversations with participants I was sympathetic to their complaints about Rachel's micro-management of instruction but told them it was unusual for her to teach in this manner. Interviews with Rachel helped explain her decision to closely follow her agenda, but her micro-management of instruction appeared to escalate resistance in the internship seminar.

It was evident during observations and interviews that I needed to win the trust of the four participants before they would elaborate on their oppositional behavior in the classroom. In the first interviews, all four participants gave very brief responses to questions. Henry and William would not elaborate on their answers without insistent prompting. George and Kenneth were more detailed in their responses to questions, but appeared to be suspicious of my motives. They appeared to not trust me so I had to work to gain that trust.

The first interviews focused on the participants' sociohistorical context, which gave them opportunities to share their childhood and school experiences. I asked questions and responded in ways that I hoped would indicate I was interested in their experiences and perceptions of teachers and schools. By the end of the first interviews, I felt I had established enough mutual trust with each participant that I could explore more controversial topics. This was not always easy, as my field notes indicated.

These students have been empowered by their place in society. They are part of the privileged class so they have never, or rarely, been silenced. When they resist they do so with a loud voice, unlike the oppressed groups who are used to being silenced and will resist in other ways. How do I work with a group taught to be the dominant group, but in a classroom where their ideas are not finding center stage? They try to make their ideas center stage by finding the negative in every method taught, but there's always a credible response from instructors to their objections. They're out to win and be proven right, not to become excellent teachers. (Field notes, February, 7, 2007)

My own frustrations with the ideologies held by the participants were evident, and in the second interviews I started asking questions that would challenge their beliefs about teaching. By the third interview, the participants appeared more relaxed and found the interview a place where they could talk freely about their objections to the internship seminar and how they were being taught to be teachers. I listened, asked questions that would further clarify their ideas, but also asked questions that challenged their thinking. My role as interviewer became both data collector and critical questioner. I realized there would be some data I would have to ignore because my social justice stance was obvious in the questions, but I also found the participants were open to the challenges I posed.

It was during data analysis when the ideology of the participants had the greatest impact on me. Their obvious bias against minority groups and the attitude that students were less than human and not capable of participating in the workings of classrooms and schools violated my own deeply held beliefs. I was both angry and discouraged by these insistent claims from

participants. By focusing on the research question, “What explains resistance,” I was able to set me own emotions aside and approach the data analysis with a more objective stance. The ideologies of the participants were not surprising, but the extent to which they resisted any opposing view was discouraging.

Participants in this study were selected specifically for their acts of resistance, so opposition to beliefs different from their own should not come as a surprise. When I described how I viewed the participants to Rachel, who had the students for two semesters, she said I portrayed their behavior exactly. We were in agreement that these four students resisted both content and methods.

The Context of Participants

The four participants were White males ranging in age from 24 to 38 and originally from the midwestern United States. One had just completed his undergraduate degree when he was accepted in the teacher education program, one worked as a substitute teacher for a year before applying to the teacher education program, and two were returning to college after working in other fields. In the following pages, the four participants are introduced with special attention to their family structure, socioeconomic status, home communities, and the K–12 schools they attended. Citations of participant interviews use the first letter of the participant’s pseudonym and the number of the interview. For example, W1 cites William’s first interview, W2 his second interview, and W3 his third interview.

William

William spent the first twelve years of his life in a rural midwestern, “working class, blue collar” town (W1). His father did not graduate from high school but earned a GED. He was a foreman in the construction industry and a union member, which William believed was partly responsible for his father being “paid pretty well” and maintaining a middle class income (W1).

He explained, “We never had any problems as far as money issues and a house with enough rooms for all of us to have our own room and that sort of thing” (W1). William’s mother had one year of college and worked at home until the younger of his two sisters started school. Then she found a job as an accountant and later a secretary.

When asked to provide information about his childhood and school experience, William described the socioeconomic and ethnic make-up of the schools he attended and communities where he lived, indicating the importance of this element of his life. He said the area where he grew up was “night and day from down here. It’s almost entirely White, for one thing, so it wasn’t really racially mixed at all” (W1). William’s elementary school years were spent in a working class neighborhood school, which William said was old but well cared for. He said they had a library, where he was free to read as much as he wanted, and a very large playground. According to William, the teachers were approaching retirement and most had grown children. In the sixth grade, his family moved to a middle-upper class suburban town that was an hour from a large, midwestern city. The move was due to his father’s job and resulted in a higher standard of living.

The schools in the suburban area they moved to were newer and better equipped than his elementary school. The high school, which housed grades seven through twelve when he was first enrolled, had a theater, Olympic-sized pool, large resource center for students, and a modern gym that students could use at any time. This school was located in a middle-upper class community. William described the teachers as younger, one “fresh out of college,” which he said made a “big difference” from the older teachers in his elementary school (W1). According to William, the young teachers were more enthusiastic about learning and made the content more interesting. He remembered only a few African-American students in his high school graduation

class and a larger, although still “proportionately small,” population of Hmong students whose families were originally from Vietnam and Laos (W1). He also said his teachers were all White and said he did not have a non-White teacher until college.

William’s high school used a modular schedule, which meant there were blocks of time when students were left to themselves and William, a self-proclaimed procrastinator, said he did not always use that time wisely. “Having all that free time to hang out with my friends was great, and I wasn’t really causing problems for anybody, not that I remember, but I could have used that time for school work and I know I didn’t. And my grades reflected that” (W1). He took responsibility for his lack of commitment to his academic work but admitted that his parents did not motivate him as much as he now wishes they had, and they were unable to help him with his advanced studies courses. He gave his mother credit for making sure he took the ACT college exam so he could attend college, and when he was accepted at a local community college she was proud of this achievement. Ultimately, however, he said his C-average grades in middle and high school and failing out of college after one year were due to his lack of self-discipline. William joined the military and when his tour of duty was over he left the Army and worked in construction with his father while he finished an Associates degree in computer science. He had difficulty finding a job in his hometown so he moved to the southeastern United States, married, and eventually returned to college, successfully completing a Bachelor’s degree in history and entering a Master’s of Education program in social studies education.

William did not have the advantage of college educated parents but did complete advanced placement classes in high school. He believed his success in college, however, was due to his time spent in the military, which helped him overcome his lack of self-discipline in high school.

Kenneth

When describing the community where he grew up, Kenneth said, “there are some very wealthy areas but there’s not really like any low income areas” (K1). He also said the schools he came from had few discipline problems “because where I come from is like working class America,” which meant there was a “high work ethic” that he felt contributed to his academic success (K1). According to Kenneth, he grew up in a middle–upper class midwestern town that was part of a small city complex of about 300,000 residents. His reported family income of over \$100,000 annually placed his parents in the upper income bracket for the 1990s, when he was in public school. His mother had a bachelor’s degree and two master’s degrees, and she worked as a special education teacher and later a school counselor. His father earned a business degree from a business college and was co–founder of a computer company that wrote programs for IBM computers. According to Kenneth, his father “had a chance to make a lot of money but he was working like 70 hours a week and he never saw me and so he quit the profession” (K1). He said his father was later employed as a real estate agent, owned a carpet cleaning business, and worked as a medical technician setting up medical equipment. Kenneth said, “I had a somewhat easy upbringing, I had two good parents. We didn’t really have to worry about money. I didn’t live in a bad place or anything like that” (K1).

The schools Kenneth attended catered to nearly all middle and upper class families and were majority White. He considered his elementary school “progressive” because it “had art and music regularly” and used a team teaching approach that followed a thematic curriculum (K1). The school had a “decent library” and a computer lab with Apple IIGA computers where his class went weekly (K1). He was in the gifted and talented leadership program because “they identified leadership qualities in me” but said he was average academically (K1). Kenneth’s middle school was older but well kept and catered to the same demographic of students. He

could not remember any good teachers in his middle school and said, “A lot of them seemed bitter and didn’t want to be there, it was just a job” (K1). He said he did not feel safe in middle school and blamed the teachers for not creating a sense of community or a comfortable climate in the school.

Unlike middle school, Kenneth enjoyed high school where his talent for soccer gained him respect and stature. As a freshman, he was chosen for the varsity team, made the all–conference team in grades nine through twelve, and the all–state team in grades eleven and twelve. The inclusion of a large population of Hmong students, mainly from Laos, Vietnam and Cambodia, introduced him to a culture very different from his own. As a high school counselor, his mother worked with Hmong students and their families. The stories she brought home, combined with his observations, led Kenneth to believe most Hmongs were very “isolationist” and were determined to maintain their cultural beliefs (K1). He cited the Hmong traditions of arranged marriages for females as young as 13 and 14, multiple families living in a one–family house, and keeping chickens in their backyard for food as cultural identifiers of the Hmong people. He also said the gangs in the area were mainly from the Hmong community. Kenneth never developed any friendships with Hmong students and appeared to view them as living outside the norm of his community.

Kenneth’s mother “put a lot of pressure on him to go to college,” but his father thought other career paths, like the military, were just as valuable (K1). Kenneth said it was an athletic scholarship to play soccer at a large midwestern university that helped him make his decision for higher education. Kenneth graduated with a Bachelor’s degree in liberal arts with a double major in history and political science. He applied to law school but after working with prospective college athletes and coaching a high school soccer team, he decided his commitment to

education was more important than his commitment to law. Kenneth found a job as a long-term substitute teacher and applied to the education program at a large southeastern university.

Kenneth had the advantages of socioeconomic status and parents who were college graduates but believed his success in school was due to a working-class work ethic. The schools he attended prepared him for a privileged education through the gifted program in elementary school and advanced placement courses in high school, and his talent for soccer provided him with funding for college. He did not view these as advantages but simply a series of events in his life. His experiences in college classrooms further solidified his beliefs about teaching and contributed to his resistance in the social studies internship seminar.

Henry

Henry spent the first ten years of his life in the suburbs of a large midwestern urban area. His father had a master's degree and was an editor for a building magazine. His mother was a high school graduate and worked as a realtor. Henry considered his family middle class and said the neighborhood where he lived was "one hundred percent White" (H1). His limited memories of his elementary school were that the school and teachers were nice, the music teacher was very boisterous, the predominant teaching method was direct instruction, and he had art, music and physical education. His most memorable events at his elementary school were the fights on the playground. He said, "Our play area was huge and we basically ran around there fighting. I got in a few fights, but it was what you did on the playground back [there]" (H1).

Henry's family moved to a smaller city in the southeastern United States that was predominantly White with a small percentage of Black and Hispanic residents, and more upper class than middle class. Henry was disappointed by the response to student fights at his elementary school: "I remember seeing fights and students were immediately suspended so they had much less freedom" (H1). His middle school was team oriented and used cooperative

learning and Henry said he “wasn’t a huge fan... [because] they weren’t really well organized but I had a pretty good middle school education” (H1).

The high school Henry attended was not the one he was zoned for; he was enrolled in a health sciences magnet program in a large high school outside his district. He planned on becoming a doctor but said the magnet program “completely altered my perspective” due to the intensity of the program and his concern about “burn out” in the highly stressful medical intern programs (H1). In addition to the academic demands of the advanced placement classes in the magnet program, Henry was on the football and weightlifting teams, in the band, and active in drama. His decision to go to college was based on his belief that education is important and because he was “very self-motivated... academics always came pretty easy to me” (H1). His parents did put some pressure on him to attend college but allowed him to make the final decision. Henry graduated in the top ten percent of his class, which earned him a state sponsored four-year college scholarship. He was accepted at a large southeastern university and earned a Bachelor’s degree in history. He then applied to and was accepted in the social studies secondary education master’s program at the same university.

Henry had the advantages of socioeconomic status and one parent who graduated from college and both parents who encouraged him to go to college. He believed his success in school, however, was due more to self-motivation than the influence of his parents or his teachers. His elementary years appeared to reflect the education of the middle class but his secondary years prepared him for a more privileged education, specifically his enrollment in the magnet program and advanced placement courses and his extracurricular activities. He did not appear to view these as advantages but simply a series of events in his life. Henry attended schools that reflected the White, Eurocentric, middle-upper class culture of the privileged.

George

George grew up in a large midwestern urban city. His father had a Ph.D. and was employed by the school district, first as a teacher and athletic director, then as a school administrator, and later as superintendent. His father was a strong proponent of public schools and when George was offered an athletic scholarship to a private school his father turned it down. His mother had a Bachelor's degree and worked as a homemaker. George said his "parents were always very active" in his education and "teachers knew that they had their support" (G1). His parents placed a high priority on education and regulated the time allowed for watching television and playing video games.

George said his family would be classified as middle class economically, which reflected the area where he grew up. He described his elementary school as "all White middle class" and his middle and high schools as an "all White... mix of working class and upper middle class" (G1). According to George, the school buildings were old but well-maintained and teachers had all the resources they needed. He classified his elementary school teachers in two categories: "disciplinarians" and "creative" (G1). He said the disciplinarians were mainly concerned with classroom management and reducing negative behavior but not encouraging positive behavior, while the creative teachers encouraged learning through positive reinforcement.

George said he enjoyed middle school because "I was the top clique group... I was the top of the heap" (G1). His middle school used tracking and placed students in learning groups based on their academic abilities, which provided him with a good academic program since he was in the highest academic level. According to George, the state ended tracking when he entered the eighth grade and students were mixed academically. He said students from the highest academic level were made group leaders in peer-led instruction and this was harmful to his education because it was "very boring and we didn't learn anything the whole year" (G1).

As a high school freshman, George had to overcome poor study habits from his eighth grade academic experience, which affected his performance in ninth grade, but his sophomore year was better. He also had to contend with the academic and political reputation of an older brother who he said was a “genius” and “very conservative” politically (G1). According to George, teachers expected him to perform academically on the same level as his brother and to have his brother’s political perceptions, which he said could be detrimental when he had teachers with liberal leanings. Regardless of the pressures he experienced, he did well enough in high school to complete advanced placement courses and earn athletic scholarships to a midwestern university. In high school, he was on the wrestling, football and baseball teams and was named all–state in baseball.

College was George’s first experience sharing classes with non–White students. His K–12 experience was in all White schools and he remembered only two non–White teachers in high school. He said families in his school district could choose which school their children attended: “Black teachers didn’t want to teach the White kids... they wanted to be in the Black high school. That’s just the way it is there” (G1). He attended a large midwestern university but finished his education in a southeastern university, earning a Bachelor’s degree in history. George worked in business management for 15 years before entering the Master’s of Education program in social studies education.

George had the advantages of two well educated parents who expected him to go to college and a father in the education system. His elementary and secondary years reflected the education of the White, middle class but also prepared him for a more privileged education, specifically his enrollment in advanced placement courses and his talent for athletics in high school, which led to college scholarships. He believed his success in school, however, was intrinsic and due more to

self-motivation than the influence of his parents or his older brother. His and the other participants' acts of resistance in the classroom were due in part to their cultural beliefs and beliefs about good teaching and the purpose of schools.

The four participants grew up in predominantly White communities and schools. They all had the advantages of a middle or middle-upper class school environment and advanced placement courses. Three of them had at least one parent with a college degree and one had a parent who encouraged him to attend college. The sociohistorical context of their lives combined with the classroom environment and the actions of the teacher and researcher influenced their acts of resistance in the internship seminar.

CHAPTER 5 FINDINGS

Preface

Resistance often occurs because a student's lived experience is not represented in schools or classrooms (Giroux, 2001; McLaren, 1986). Students' sociohistorical contexts, the combined social and historical factors in their lives, influence the beliefs they have about teachers, schools and education. The study of student resistance using critical discourse analysis must consider the context of family, community and school because discourse does not happen in a vacuum. It is influenced by individual and group history and by the context of the event where the discourse takes place (Fairclough, 1995; Gee, 1999). To better understand the resistance engaged in by the four participants, it is necessary to consider the sociohistorical context of their lives, specifically their lives in schools. For this reason, interviews focused on participants' school experiences, what they liked and disliked, and how this influenced their beliefs about teaching and education and their acts of resistance in the internship seminar.

Some of the beliefs about teaching held by participants in this study were shared and others were unique. The shared beliefs were held by two or more participants and defined the role of the teacher: who had the important knowledge in classrooms, how participants' defined important knowledge, who made decisions in classrooms regarding instruction and management, and the strict micro-management of classrooms. The unique beliefs also defined the role of the teacher: teach to assimilate to the dominant group, who is responsible for the success of students, female teachers are nurturing and build relationships with students, and the importance of trust in student-teacher relationships. The shared and unique beliefs appeared to lead to either counter resistance or cultural resistance. Counter resistance is when students resist the methods and content of an instructor teaches from a culturally conscious or social justice stance. The

instructor is resisting the traditional White, Eurocentric, middle–upper class culture of schools and attempting to disrupt hegemonic ideology, and students are countering her resistance through behavior that is meant to maintain hegemony. Cultural resistance occurs when students engage in behavior that resists the hegemony of schools and classrooms. Classrooms in which the instructor uses methods and content that maintain the perspective of the dominant White, Eurocentric, middle–upper class culture of schools can marginalize students who are members of other cultures and belief systems. These students might act in ways to disrupt the hegemony of the classroom.

Participants engaged in both counter and cultural resistance. The table below summarizes the categories of resistance for shared and unique beliefs about the role of the teacher.

Table 5–1. Categories of resistance: The role of the teacher

Counter Resistance
<i>Shared Beliefs</i>
Teacher is the source of important knowledge
Important knowledge is practical and relevant
Teachers control decisions about instruction and management
Teachers encourage students’ ideas and opinions
<i>Unique Beliefs</i>
Teachers should teach assimilation to the dominant group
Teacher responsible for success of all students but...
Good female teachers are caring and build relationships with students
Cultural Resistance
<i>Shared Belief</i>
Teachers should not micro–manage classrooms
<i>Unique Belief</i>
Teachers should maintain trust in student–teacher relationships

The resistant behavior engaged in by participants was due to the dissonance created when their beliefs about the role of teachers and schools conflicted with the content and pedagogy in the internship seminar. These future teachers were not always “willing to be disturbed” and resisted methods and content that disrupted their own beliefs about good teaching (Wheatley, 2002). The

methods instructor also acted in ways that reinforced hegemony, specifically the power held by teachers, and some participants resisted this culture of power.

Counter Resistance and the Role of the Teacher

If teachers who decenter cultural norms and teach a culturally diverse curriculum are countering hegemony and resisting the dominant school environment and curriculum, then students who object to this decentering are working against the resistant actions of the teacher. They are countering the teacher's resistance and attempting to maintain hegemony. Students who engage in counter resistance are motivated by a desire—typically unconscious—to maintain hegemony and they usually object to the cultural consciousness raising and self-reflection engaged in by those who teach for social justice. In this study, all four participants engaged in counter resistance and their resistance is best explained through their beliefs about the role of the teacher in schools.

The participants in this study had very definite beliefs about the roles of teachers. Some believed the teacher made all important decisions about knowledge, instruction and management, while others believed student knowledge should also be welcomed in the classroom. All believed teachers should teach content that is practical and relevant, but they had slightly different definitions of these terms. Through their discussion about classes they liked and disliked, their beliefs about teachers, schools and resistance were made evident. Two of the participants thought the teacher was the source of knowledge.

Teacher as Source of Important Knowledge

The two participants who viewed teachers as the source of the important knowledge in classrooms believed good teachers knew their content well and imparted that knowledge to students. An instructor William admired taught political science and was knowledgeable of her subject but used both lecture and discussion, which he found problematic.

she *just* had her own style of teaching,
again, it was a lot of *lecture*
but, um, she had so much *fun* teaching
and she, she would *get* off topic occasionally
which was kind of a, kind of a *downer*
she would *bring* up a topic
and it would be a *lot* of discussion
and she would ask *questions* and um
she would *always* open it up to the floor
and it *tended* to I think stop the flow of the class a little bit
because some people would just *ramble* on and on
and that's where we'd get off *topic* (W2)

William noted the '*lecture*' focus of this class and emphasized the '*fun*' this instructor had teaching, but he complained about how class discussion would '*get* off topic' (emphasized twice) when she opened discussion 'to the floor.' The instructor would '*bring*' knowledge that led to a '*lot* of discussion,' and then the instructor would '*ask questions*' and '*always*' bring students' ideas into the discussion. William said this '*tended* to... stop the flow of the class' and this was a '*downer*.' In this class, the teacher used a lecture format that she controlled but also included a class discussion format where knowledge and power were shared. For William, allowing students to contribute their knowledge to discussion was detrimental to the 'flow of the class,' indicating his belief that the teacher's knowledge was most important and was best given to students through lecture.

In one of the classes William did not like, the instructor used methods that conflicted with his beliefs about who should be in possession of important information and how that information should be imparted to students. The Reading in the Content Area class was a required course in the teacher education program and, according to William, the instructor was not qualified to teach the course.

she'd say stuff like,
"well Dr. *Quinn's* really the expert on this and stuff and, etcetera etcetera"
and I guess that kind of keys you... to what to expect

um, it *essentially*, it seemed like she was teaching Dr. Quinn's class,
in fact I think that's probably what she was *supposed* to be doing
we were using *his* readings
and um... and then you know trying to get, to get *through* 'em (W2)

William emphasized the instructor's comment, 'Dr. *Quinn's* really the expert,' and said she was
'using *his* readings,' which indicated to him the lack of knowledge the instructor had of the
content she was required to teach. According to William, the instructor was expected
(*'supposed'*) to teach another instructor's syllabus, but this conflicted with William's definition
of good teachers as those whose performance in the classroom demonstrated knowledge of their
content area. William also discussed the structure of the class.

we *could* have just done more—more activities
other than *stuff* along the lines of—
there's a *sheet* of paper on the wall back here
go and *write* five ideas
or *something* like that...
that's just I guess not my preferred way of learning
and I know a lot of people in the class didn't really take that *seriously* necessarily
they'd just take it as time to, *talk*
it *always* felt like you know
just making sure you *read* the paper or article

(I: *When she used a particular method people didn't take seriously was there any
connection made between the method and how you could use that in your own classroom?*)

well, I guess that was the *purpose* of it um
I mean what it turns—*usually* what it would be we'd take something from the reading
and *write* out the main idea of it
which, you don't *automatically* correlate it, I mean,
you have to put some *effort* into thinking how you do that
so, um, maybe in an indirect way that was the *reasoning* behind it (W2)

William admitted that the structure of the class was not his 'preferred way of learning.' He said
she '*could*' have taught the class differently instead of having students '*write*' ideas from the
readings on a '*sheet* of paper.' For William, this '*always* felt like' the instructor wanted to know
if 'you *read* the paper or article'—a form of busy work since, according to William, there was no
explanation as to why they were doing the activities. He said learning the methods was probably

the ‘*purpose*’ of the activity but what they ‘*usually*’ did would not ‘*automatically* correlate’ with ‘the *reasoning* behind it’ since no ‘*effort*’ was made to connect the method with what teachers did in classrooms. For William, the structure of the class included a lot of busy work that he felt was not connected with what he would do as a teacher. While he was open to more activities, the method of writing comments on a sheet of paper is a form of chalk talk in which all students are given a voice and student knowledge is valued. This technique provided space for the knowledge of students; however, William believed that the teacher owned the important knowledge, which conflicted with this instructor’s belief that students bring knowledge to the classroom that should be shared and discussed.

Henry also believed teachers owned the important knowledge, and this was reflected in a history class that he liked. He mimicked a classroom scenario in which the questions asked by the professor did not appear to be for the purpose of hearing different perspectives but to dismiss the ones that did not agree with his line of thinking.

all right so *let’s* give an example
it would be like
“*why* do you think that,
why do you think that,
well *what* do you think caused the Spanish–American war of 1898?
what do you think caused this?”
and he’d be like “*what* are the possible causes?”
and *we’d* like possibly give causes
and *he’d* be like “no well that’s not correct”
and *then* like we’d like have a discussion on what possible causes
like “well *here* they are,
here’s the *four* causes you need to know”
and he’d *give* ‘em to us,
that’s like an audible and like “you’d better write this *down*
‘cause it’s gonna’ be on the *test*”

(*I: was there any discussion as to why they were wrong?*)

yeah he’d *tell* you like
“that’s not really *relevant* to the situation because”
then he’d *give* you a situation...

and then when we'd *finished* the discussion
"here's the four main causes"

(I: the basic idea in his teaching was that he had all the knowledge)

yep

(I: and he was going to give it to students)

yep, yep

(I: and students didn't have any knowledge so you needed to make sure that they had it)

it's *college*...

that's what it's *supposed* to be in college

it's a university 4000 level *course*

there's no uh *student* input

there's *research*

and there's, *understanding* (H2)

In this excerpt, Henry portrays the professor as being in control of important knowledge. Henry emphasized how the professor would ask 'what' and 'why' and student responses ('we'd') were met with the professor ('he'd') correcting their thinking. 'Then' the professor would 'give' students the answers he wanted them to remember ('four causes you need to know') and students would 'write' them 'down' in preparation for the 'test.' The discussion did not appear to be a sharing of ideas but more an opportunity for the professor to 'tell' and 'give' his ideas and knowledge. If there were other possibly correct responses to his questions that he did not feel were 'relevant,' he would dismiss them. Henry affirmed that the professor's objective was to establish himself as the one who had all the knowledge and Henry thought that was appropriate in a 'college' classroom. He said that was what 'college' was 'supposed' to be—students doing 'research' and gaining 'understanding' but not having any 'input' in their own education.

In a later interview, Henry described in more detail his belief that the teacher has the important knowledge.

the *professor's* the chief
and *has* the basic knowledge
discussion is, takes *place* in class
but *ultimately* it comes back to
the *professor's* responsible for what's being taught in that course

if *any* incorrect information is, is learned by my students,
the *buck* stops with me (*I: yeah*)
that's why the *professor* is ultimately in charge
and responsible for *all* learning that takes place
so in the discussion *he* is the moderator
he is the director
he is the one who's leading it in the direction he needs to go
if *students* have prior knowledge
if *students* have questions
you *use* that discussion to advance your own lecture
that's the way—you're advancing the point
directing this point delivered to the student
because you *know* what you're delivering,
if you allow random ad hoc *comments* well,
and uh you don't know where that train's going
if you don't know where the train's going
it could lead *right* off the cliff into the ocean (H3)

Henry described the professor as a 'chief,' 'moderator,' 'director,' leader, and conductor, which are all terms that hold control and power. The professor '*has* (or owns) the basic knowledge' and is '*ultimately*' responsible for what is taught. Henry applied this description of the professor to his own classroom when he said, 'the *buck* stops with me.' He based his own teaching on how he believed college professors teach and on how his two favorite professors taught. According to Henry, the '*professor*' is in charge of '*all*' learning and '*he*' (emphasized three times) '*use[s]*' the knowledge and questions from '*students*' to 'advance' the teacher's knowledge. For Henry, discussion was important for '*directing*' the learning toward the professor's 'point.' Henry said there is no place in the classroom for 'random ad hoc *comments*' since they might lead to a destination, or to knowledge, that the professor is not familiar with or that does not support his own knowledge ('destination'). He emphasized that 'random ad hoc *comments*' could be

disastrous since ‘*you*’ (the teacher) would not know where the learning (‘train’) is headed, which clearly revealed his belief that the teacher is in control of all knowledge taught in the classroom.

Henry’s belief in the teacher owning the important knowledge was explained further in the social studies internship seminar when democratic classrooms were under discussion.

having classes set up as *purely* discussion
and around *circle* conversation,
I *question* whether they actually retain anything
or whether you’ll have... a *tale* told by an idiot
full of sound and *fury* but signifying nothing
like *nothing* really going on
lots of talk
and lots of good sounding like *stuff* taking place
but nothing really *concrete* being formed (H1)

He said classes that were ‘*purely* discussion’ or that used ‘*circle* conversation’ could result in the appearance of learning (‘sound and *fury*,’ ‘lots of *talk*,’ ‘lots of... *stuff* taking place’) but nothing ‘*concrete*’ being learned. His comment that this would result in ‘a *tale* told by an idiot’ implied that students were not capable of having or creating ‘*concrete*’ knowledge, which supported his belief that teachers have the important knowledge in the classroom.

William and Henry believed the teacher owned the important knowledge in the classroom and imparted that knowledge to students, but the teacher should not include student knowledge in the classroom. When discussion did take place, as in Henry’s classes, it was for the purpose of guiding students to what the professor considered the important knowledge and all discussion was controlled by the teacher. William, however, believed discussion took the class away from the important knowledge, which belonged to the teacher. Henry and William believed good teachers owned the important knowledge, but the dilemma arises as to how they define important knowledge. All four participants were clear as to how they defined this concept.

Important Knowledge is Practical and Relevant.

Participants believed that important knowledge was practical and relevant. In the case of education courses, they defined practical and relevant as the tools and skills necessary for teachers and teaching. They resisted the social studies internship seminar, and other college courses, because they believed much of the methods and content were not practical or relevant.

Henry said his least favorite classes were those that were irrelevant to him and described one of them.

*I didn't really like "Age of the Dinosaurs" too much,
and, I didn't really want to be there
lots of long scientific names
lots of memorization of topics
that I wasn't interested in at all
those history classes were all about critical thinking
and comprehending very, major and very large historical concepts
but this is like rote memorization of, annoying long genus and species
and all that stuff
it's like, it wasn't relevant to me at all
especially a history major (I: Right)
I don't care what the, what this bone of this dinosaur is
it was all memorization of, stupid facts (H2)*

Henry emphasized that the course 'wasn't relevant' to him as a 'history major.' While he did not enjoy the 'memorization' (mentioned three times), it was the content of the class that appeared to be the problem. In addition to being irrelevant, Henry said 'I wasn't interested in it' and 'I don't care,' which could imply that if he was memorizing facts from human history it might mean more to him. He emphasized that 'history' studied 'major' events while 'this' class studied 'boring' fossils with 'long scientific names.' Henry believed good teaching included teaching relevant, important content and he defined this to mean content that was interesting and useful to him as a social studies teacher.

Another class Henry perceived as irrelevant was an undergraduate education course in educational technology.

the *undergraduate* education classes were just not relevant at all,
and the *teachers* seemed, unqualified
educational technology, it was *ridiculously* stupid (*I: mhmm*)
she was unprepared for *class*
we didn't learn anything important,
she *taught* us things that didn't really matter,
it was like completely *irrelevant*

(*I: what kind of teaching style did she have?*)

it was like stupid *group* work
that was completely *irrelevant*
we just sat around and talked about how stupid the *class* was
we had a *separate* lab class on Wednesday
and *that* class was pretty, annoying too
because, we would *learn* something
we'd turn in the *assignment*
and then we would *immediately* forget how to use what we just did,
she's like "try to use like *constructivist* to like write education forms"...
I didn't learn *anything* in there
there was no there was *no* rigor
there was no *relevance* (H2)

Similar to the dinosaur class, Henry said the content taught in the educational technology class was not relevant ('not relevant,' 'completely *irrelevant*,' 'completely *irrelevant*,' 'no *relevance*'). He said the instructor 'was unprepared for *class*' and '*taught*... things that didn't matter.' According to Henry, the 'stupid *group* work' was '*irrelevant*' and the '*assignment*' completed for the '*separate* lab class' was '*immediately*' forgotten. He did not learn anything in this class that he considered relevant to him as a future social studies teacher, which differed from another undergraduate educational technology class that he took.

it was *better* in another class
that was strictly *technical* stuff
but at least it was *practical*
at least I learned how to *scan* stuff
and like had the *basic* formation of making a web page using Netscape
and *that* was strictly a technical portion of the lab
we *turned* in projects
and *that* kind of stuff
that was all right
you're just *learning* how to use the technology (H2)

Henry said the ‘*practical*’ use of technology (‘*scan* stuff’ and ‘*basic* formation of a web page’) was ‘*technical*’ knowledge that was useful. Instead of applying ‘*constructivist*’ theory to ‘education forms,’ he was ‘*learning* how to use the technology,’ which Henry may have found more relevant to his future career as a teacher.

In a graduate level educational technology class, Henry said he gained practical knowledge that was especially useful to him as a teacher, even though it was not one of his favorite classes. The class was taught by the same instructor (Rachel) who taught the social studies internship seminar.

we *learned* how to write a lesson plan
if we had to jump through *hoops* we learned how to jump through ‘em
it was we *hated* it at the time but...

(I: are you saying while you didn’t like doing the lesson plans you felt they were helpful later?)

no I find I’m glad we did all that work *now*
because now when I’m *talking* about it I can talk like Rachel
I can talk the *language*
she taught me how to speak uh, educational technology *buzz* words
and those... and now I’m *fluent* in it

(I: and how does that help you?)

in *interviews*
I can *talk* about educational technology
and its *relevance*
and like how you *use* technology effectively in a classroom,
it’s *nice* to be able to do that

(I: so it was *practical* in a sense in that it prepared you for your teaching?)

for *interviews*
and I guess *using* technology too,
like we did a we did a imovie project
it’s nice to *learn* how you use imovie
it all like seemed so *stupid* at the time
but... administrators love to *hear* that stuff (H2)

Henry emphasized how he '*hated*' to 'jump through *hoops*' but said he was '*learning*.' For him, the technology class made him '*fluent*' in 'the *language*' and 'educational technology *buzz* words' so he could '*talk*' about using technology in the classroom when on job '*interviews*.' Twice he emphasized how the course prepared him for '*interviews*' but he could only 'guess' that the course prepared him for '*using* technology' in the classroom. He said it was 'nice to *learn*' how to use the technology ('*imovie*'), but his emphasis was on how school administrators like to '*hear*' the correct words used in an interview. Henry appeared to appreciate how he could put to practical use what he learned in the educational technology course by using the language in interviews, but he did not view the technology as relevant.

she *made* us do like all these activities
of like *using* the technology
which was *not* as relevant
those hoops were *helpful* in this field I'm in (*I: okay*) (H2)

Henry said 'she *made* us' use the technology but the activities were '*not* as relevant.' The graduate level technology class supported Henry's belief that good teachers teach content that is practical or '*helpful*.' In this case, the content was useful in his job interviews even if it was not relevant in the classroom.

Henry also found some of the content from the social studies internship seminar practical, in the same way that he found the educational technology class practical.

she *taught* us how to speak some of the language
about professional *development*
and uh... continuous *education*
continuous *improvement*
reflection she really stressed reflection
and... the fact—when she was teaching us how to make the resume *portfolio*
and *interviewing* strategies
those were those were good (*I: okay*)
like the *finding* a job aspect is what I got the most out of it (*I: okay*)
but a *lot* of stuff was just...
seemed to be a *waste* of time (H2)

In the internship seminar, Henry thought being ‘*taught*’ the ‘language’ of the profession (‘*professional development*,’ ‘*continuous education*’ and ‘*reflection*’) was practical since it would be used in job interviews, in the same way the language from educational technology would be used. Other aspects of the class Henry thought were ‘good’ were the ‘*resume portfolio*,’ ‘*interviewing strategies*,’ and any instruction on ‘*finding a job*.’ This ‘*practical*’ knowledge was not a ‘*waste*’ of time since it was relevant to his future career goals, but he did not find the methods or content practical or relevant in any other way. He said,

it wasn’t *relevant*
the *readings* weren’t relevant
so I didn’t *read* ‘em (*I: okay*)
and I didn’t *have* to read ‘em
‘cause you could get *by*
and make something *up*
and not *read* ‘em (*I: yeah*)
it *seemed* like stressing the same points over and over again
that we had already *heard* a million times
plus it’s pretty much common *sense*
like you know what... treat your kids *equitably*,
be culturally *conscious*
you know... don’t like don’t marginalize your *kids*,
make a safe classroom *environment*
this is very uh, the *fact* that she was acting like we didn’t already know this stuff
was a *reason* so many of us felt patronized (H2)

Henry emphasized in this excerpt that the ‘*materials*’ used in the social studies internship seminar did not make ‘*sense*’ since he could not ‘*apply*’ them in the classroom. He said the ‘*readings*’ were not ‘*relevant*’ so he did not bother reading them. According to Henry, the readings ‘*seemed*’ to stress the same content they ‘*heard*’ before and it was really ‘*common sense*’—treating students ‘*equitably*,’ ‘*culturally conscious*’ classrooms, and a ‘*safe classroom environment*.’ He said students ‘*felt patronized*’ because the instructor believed (‘*fact*’) that they did not know the material. The instructor was familiar with the content and readings used by other instructors in the teacher education program but chose to focus on similar content. Her

decision to teach content that had already been covered gave Henry the perception that the instructor believed students had not mastered the content, which he thought was condescending ('felt patronized'). He believed the readings were not relevant because they had already covered the same material in previous classes and he resisted by not reading the assignments, however, he found the class practical and relevant because he learned the language he needed to find a teaching job.

Like Henry, George also believed the content taught in some of the teacher education courses was not practical or relevant. He was critical of the Reading in the Content Area class, which was one of his least favorite college classes.

(I: what about the content in the reading class?)

it wasn't *relevant*
it wasn't *practical*
she didn't even *attempt* to make it practical

(I: now when you say practical, practical for what?)

practical for *use*
you know *synthesizing*
and using in a *classroom* *(I: okay)*
most of the readings were completed by... Dr. *Quinn*
and they were extremely *dry*
and *boring*
and had *nothing* really to do with social studies... *(I: okay)* (G2)

George emphasized that the class was not '*relative*' or '*practical*' for use by teachers in a '*classroom*' and the instructor did not '*attempt*' to make it so. He said the readings were '*dry*' and '*boring*' and had '*nothing... to do with social studies.*' The course was not helpful to him as a social studies teacher so it was not practical or relevant.

George said the social studies internship seminar was also one of his college classes that he disliked. When asked what he liked about the class his response mirrored those of the other three participants.

(I: was there anything about the class that you liked?)

...I liked the *people* she brought in
the *speakers*
because I mean *that's* when I got
the *most* I got out of the program was in my internships
and my *practicums*
and that was talking to people in the *field*
it just seems like, people that are in—in *here*
for whatever *reason*
don't *get* it you know,
they're *idealistic*,
they have these visions of the way they *want* things to be
but somehow it *morphs* in their mind
and that's the way it really *is*
and that's not the way things really *are*, you know...
uh, whereas, it's a very hammer on the head type of *philosophy* that you get out in the field
because you're *dealing* with those kids everyday
and you're dealing with those everyday *problems*

(I: so then the speakers gave you practical information?)

yeah *realistic*
a *realist* perspective (G2)

George created a dichotomy between the '*philosophy*' of the '*field*' and that of the teacher education program ('*here*'). He said he gained the '*most*' from the teacher education program through the practicum and internship experiences, where he could talk to 'people in the *field*.' This is also why he enjoyed the '*speakers*' ('*people she brought in*')—they were '*realistic*' and gave him the 'hammer on the head type of *philosophy*' from the '*field*.' According to George, instructors in the program ('*here*') were '*idealistic*' and did not understand ('don't *get* it') what schools were really like. He said the instructors in the program '*want*' schools to be a certain way so badly that they believed it to be so—it '*morphs* in their mind' and 'that's the way it really *is*.' For George, the practical and relevant information came not from program instructors but from people in the public schools because their ideas were realistic.

As a future teacher, George did not want idealistic goals but methods that would work in the classroom, where teachers are ‘*dealing*’ with students and ‘*everyday problems.*’ He wanted the tools to be a good teacher.

*I want your help,
to uh mold me into a better teacher
to make it more comprehensible,
I mean this is the knowledge I have
and my knowledge is up here, (indicates above head) you know
part of what I wanted to get out of this program
is to be able to make that knowledge, comprehensible, down here
I wouldn't have entered
I mean I could have done alternative certification
I wouldn't have entered the master's degree program
if I didn't want to become a better teacher
and be able to communicate those ideas better
I felt like I needed to find strategies
and ways to be able to communicate those ideas
and you know it's highly intellectual stuff,
I'm asking you okay show me ways to make this more comprehensible (G2)*

What George (*I*) wanted out of a teacher education program were ‘strategies’ that would ‘*make*’ his ‘*knowledge*’ more ‘*comprehensible*’ to students. He considered his knowledge more advanced (‘*up here,*’ ‘*highly intellectual stuff*’) than that of his students (‘*down here*’), and he had difficulty communicating that knowledge. He thought he would be a ‘*better teacher*’ if he could ‘*communicate*’ his ‘*ideas better*’ in the classroom. He used the word ‘*communicate*’ twice, emphasizing it once, and the word ‘*comprehensible*’ three times, emphasizing it once, which indicated the necessity of getting his ideas across to his students. George thought it was important that the teacher’s knowledge be given clearly to students and the master’s degree program should give him the skills to do that. He resisted much of the methods and content of the teacher education courses in part because they did not provide him with what he considered practical and relevant content for social studies teachers.

Kenneth also believed that social studies teachers should be taught practical content but through a goal-oriented classroom. He described one class that he liked as project based in which the instructor used the first few weeks of the course to explain the projects, but students were responsible for completing them.

The *professor*
who was the *head* instructor,
um, *he* you know was just like the macro management
you now, like *he* had, all the doc students were working under him
and then *we* were working under the doc students
It was like a big *pyramid*
so, and, uh, so I mean and *that* was—it was an awesome experience

To be quite *honest*,
I probably *learned*...
that's one of the classes in undergrad that had *nothing* to do with my major
that I learned the most practical, *useful* stuff from

(*I: You were actually doing it instead of hearing about it.*)

And I'm *sure* you're making the connection right now
what I talked about *before* is that,
I'm all relevance...
like you know I don't feel *comfortable* teaching my kids in class
about... stuff that they're not gonna' *use* (K2)

In the excerpt above, the emphasis Kenneth placed on certain words indicated that he found the structure of the class important. He identified the structure of the classroom as a '*pyramid*' and emphasized the role of the '*professor*' ('*head*,' '*he*,' '*he*') as manager and the descending roles of doctoral students and students. For Kenneth, the content was '*useful*,' which he said reflected his belief ('*I'm* all relevance') that content taught in schools should be what students can '*use*.' Kenneth believed it was important to structure a class so the goal would include useful content.

Like Henry and George, Kenneth also found some of the content in the social studies internship seminar practical.

okay, *things* that she did well, uh
a *lot* of practical stuff... in there, uh you know

about getting the *jobs* and stuff,
the *resume* and cover letter,
and *talking* about people who have been through the process,
having other *people* come in,
the guest *speakers* come in...
that was awesome (K2)

Kenneth emphasized ‘*talking*’ to different ‘*people*’ and ‘*speakers*’ who gave them different ‘*perspectives*’ on teaching as a profession. He also emphasized the ‘practical’ implications of the class—the ‘*resume*’ and information for ‘*jobs*’—which lean toward a goal oriented structure, the goal being employment. Kenneth believed practical and relevant content was useful to him in understanding what it was like in the field of teaching and the job process.

William also found something practical and relevant in one of the teacher education courses. Like George, William did not like the social studies methods class but thought writing lesson plans was helpful to him as a teacher.

everybody knew that the unit plans *weren’t* the sort of thing that we were gonna’ write when we got to our *teaching* because they’re *so* much more in detail um, but I think the general *consensus* and something that we actually *talked* about was that... if you *just* made the class um lesson plans 101 then a *lot* of us would have been happy knowing how to do it what to *expect* um it was *really* time consuming to do but it was, it made you *analyze* how you’re going to approach it which I mean I’m not the most um *organized* person in the world so it did *help* me (W2)

According to William, students ‘*talked*’ about the lesson plans and there was a ‘general *consensus*’ that the class should focus on writing lesson plans even though they ‘*weren’t*’ going to need ‘*so* much... detail’ when they became teachers. The lesson plans were ‘*really* time consuming’ but they helped William ‘*analyze*’ his ‘approach’ to teaching a lesson and helped keep him ‘*organized*.’ The lesson plans were also an opportunity for him to focus on the

knowledge he, as the teacher, would give to students when he had his own classroom. Creating lesson plans placed him in the role of teacher and he found that practical and relevant.

The four participants believed practical and relevant content important. William, Kenneth and George defined practical content as the tools, skills and knowledge they would need as teachers. Henry defined it as content useful to him as a social studies teacher and the language he needed to get a job. Their resistance in the social studies internship seminar was due in part to their belief that most of the methods and content used in the class were not practical or relevant to them as teachers. The connection between the methods and content from the social studies internship seminar and the decisions they would make as teachers was not apparent to them.

Teachers Control Decisions about Instruction and Management

All four participants believed that decisions about instruction and management should be controlled by the teacher. The social studies internship seminar was organized around the themes of culturally responsive pedagogy and democratic classroom practices. All four participants experienced dissonance in the internship seminar related to democratic classroom practices and the importance of valuing student knowledge in the structuring of classrooms and schools.

George believed that democratic classrooms were not possible because schools were not situated in a society in which everyone was equal. He thought the theory of democratic classroom practices was in reality egalitarianism, which he defined as everybody being equal, but he did not define democracy in the same way.

*Rachel's never been one to... be a democratic classroom manager
she has this vision of egalitarianism that isn't, part of the human condition*

*(I: you said something about that during her democracy lesson and I wanted to know what
you meant by egalitarianism)*

*egalitarianism is egalitarianism,
it's where everybody's equal*

(I: okay and how is egalitarianism different from democracy?)

well everybody's *not* equal in democracy
everybody gets a *vote*
everybody's *politically* equal supposedly
but there are haves and have-nots in society
where in egalitarianism there *isn't*
everybody's on the same *level*
that's what *communism's* based on
it's the *classless* society
which *isn't*...
you can't *have* it
it's actually, almost the *antithesis* of democracy (I: okay)
well I *can't* say that
it's the *antithesis* to capitalism
which *our* democracy is tied to (G3)

When asked to define what he meant by egalitarianism, George said it meant 'everybody's *equal*,' which is not how he defined democracy. His definition of democracy was a capitalist democracy, where everyone appeared to be '*politically* equal' because everyone could '*vote*,' but people were not economically equal. He emphasized that egalitarianism was a '*classless* society,' similar to '*communism*,' and democracy was not classless because that was not possible ('you can't *have* it'). According to George, egalitarianism was the '*antithesis* to capitalism' and he defined democracy in the United States as being 'tied to' capitalism and inequality—of which the existence of the 'haves and have-nots' was proof. The 'human condition' he referred to was the existence of socioeconomic classes, and he accepted this as a natural part of democracy. To establish a democratic classroom, where all students were equal, was not possible for George because the human condition naturally created a class-based society where some students would have more than others.

George's belief that education was influenced by a society with an unequal distribution of goods was clarified in his support of academic tracking in schools.

I keep hearing relevance and *rigor*
relevance and *rigor*

well they're just *words*
 what's rigor and relevance to *one* kid
 is not gonna' be rigor and relevance to *another* kid
 or it could be, to a point where it's *too* rigorous
 and you know, to where *they're* disconnecting
 whereas it could be *too* rigorous for somebody who disconnects
 and not rigorous *enough* for somebody else who disconnects
 that's the problem I have with you know heterogeneous *classrooms* you know
 it puts it all you know too much on the *teacher*
 to me it's *cheating* the kids to... put them in heterogeneous classrooms
 cause you know it's not *tracking*
 you can call it *tracking*
 or *what* not,
 its just that... I mean it's *hard* enough you know, in a regular US history class
 because you have such a *varying* degree of knowledge
 and *interest*
 and this and *that* (*I: yeah*)
 and then when you throw *everybody* in
 then all of a sudden now you're *here* (indicates with hand a low level)
 and *I* just think you're gonna' be a much more effective teacher here (indicates with hand a
 high level)
 and scaffold 'em *up*
 because you're gonna' *lose* the fringes
 and you're gonna—that's why everybody teaches to the *middle*
 and you lose the *top*
 and you lose the *bottom*
 when you teach you know to the *middle* (G3)

George emphasized the need to view 'relevance and *rigor*' based on the abilities of individual students (compare '*one* kid' to '*another* kid'). Content that is '*too* rigorous' or 'not rigorous *enough*' could cause students to 'disconnect,' which he considered the student's problem ('*they're* disconnecting') and not the teacher's ('puts it all too much on the *teacher*'). According to George, 'heterogeneous *classrooms*,' where students are mixed academically, are '*cheating* kids' since teachers are forced to teach to the '*middle*.' Interestingly, he refused to use the term '*tracking*' to identify the separation of students by academic ability even though that is an accepted term. He said students' '*varying* degree of knowledge and *interest*' should guide student grouping, however, the knowledge and interest students have for a subject is greatly influenced by the teacher. His reference to other reasons for grouping ('this and *that*') might

refer to the academic ability of students since he later indicated, through placing his hand in a low position or in a high position, the level that teachers would teach for different groupings of students. According to George, when schools ‘throw *everybody* in’ the same classroom regardless of knowledge, interest or ability, the teaching will teach at a lower academic level (*‘here’*). He (*‘I’*) believed teachers were ‘more effective’ when their teaching was at a higher academic level and they would ‘scaffold *up*’ students to that level. He did not believe, however, that this could happen in ‘heterogeneous *classrooms*.’ George believed that schools and teachers should control instruction so students were grouped based on academic ability or intellectual capability (the *‘top,’ ‘bottom’* and *‘middle’*). He resisted democratic classroom practices because he thought it would mean treating all students as academically equal and he did not believe this was possible or practical.

Kenneth also resisted democratic classroom practices. His resistance was due to his belief that students should not be a part of the important decisions made in schools.

(I: You said you weren’t sure if active democracy could be taught in schools, and I was wondering if you would expand a little bit on that.)

I think my, that comment comes from the *fact* that *you’re* still gonna’ have the final say, in your classroom, (*I: Oh, okay*) so I guess, you can teach it like a United States *Republic* and *be* like “I’m George W. Bush and I can veto what you guys *want* at any point,” but you know, *you’re* still gonna’ have the final say and *you’re* still in control... you know, um... so, *total* ownership is not with the students and so when I say *active* democracy that’s what I mean, whereas, like if you have something that is *totally* student run, and *you* just kind of like layoff, you know that would be like teaching about *active* democracy and *stuff* like that so I think, like I think the *fact* that schools are set up in this structure where there’s where there’s *rules* that students weren’t part of the making, you know, and I mean, the students are so far *removed* from that, and they’re *never* gonna’ view it as you know “oh *my* people had ownership in the creation of this institution,” you know (K3)

For Kenneth, there were two ‘*facts*’ that he claimed prevented ‘*active* democracy’ in schools: ‘*you’re* (the teacher) still gonna’ have the final say, in your classroom’ and the structure of schools is such that there are ‘*rules* that students weren’t part of making.’ He then said if students had ‘something that is *totally* student run, and *you* just kind of like layoff... that would be... teaching about *active* democracy.’ His emphasis on the phrases ‘*total* ownership’ and ‘*totally* student run’ to describe what active democracy should look like excludes the context of democracy. He defined democracy as “rule by the people” (K3) so active democracy would mean shared ownership and shared governance with everyone in a classroom and/or school. Kenneth, however, believed students needed a separate space to experience active democracy, which limited their voice to a place outside the power of schools. He did not recognize students as part of the education system but as a group that was controlled by the system (‘*rules* that students weren’t part of the making’ and ‘students are so far *removed* from that’). The phrase ‘*my* people’ in his final statement emphasized his view of students as a separate ‘people’ or group outside the governance of schools. For Kenneth, schools and the education system were not created to include students in the structure and governance of the institution. He believed in the status quo, whether it was the ‘United States *Republic*’ where the teacher has the final authority or the schools where students are excluded from governance, which is why he vocally resisted the readings on democracy and democratic classroom practices. He believed students should be controlled by schools and not have any role in school administration and rule-making.

Henry also believed teachers controlled decisions about instruction and management in the classroom. His resistance to the methods used in the social studies internship seminar was notable when discussing democratic classrooms.

(I: when I observed you in the classroom you did resist a lot of the stuff that was being said like culturally responsive teaching and democratic classrooms)

I *don't* agree with having students make their rules,
chaos will ensue,
you—there *has* to be some sense of order,
the *teacher's* in charge (H1)

Henry believed good teachers are in control of the classroom and make the rules. He emphasized the '*teacher's*' role as the sole authority for the purpose of avoiding '*chaos*,' which supported his belief that teachers must control the instruction in the classroom.

Henry resisted the idea that students could be involved in the decisions teachers made about instruction and the management of classrooms. Twice during a classroom observation Henry referred to the teacher as "king" (Observation, February 28, 2007). When questioned about this idea of the teacher/king, he said it was his classroom management style.

in order to have an effective classroom *management*
you *have* to have student participation
they have to *buy* into what you're doing
they have to uh, they have to have a *say* in what you're doing
at the same time though the teacher *is* in control
so that's why I have *my* image
which coincides with Dr. *Joseph's*
and uh, which is that of a *benevolent* king...
or benevolent *dictatorship*
in the fact that *students* have a voice in their affairs (*I: okay*)
but ultimately the *teacher's* in charge

it goes back to the basic philosophy of a teacher *education* program
you gotta help teachers *grow*
and find their *strengths*
and then use those *use* those strengths
if a teacher is, that's their... if *that* is effective with that particular teacher than fine
I am most effective doing what I do best
and that's more on the lines of Dr. *Joseph*
or, the benevolent *dictator* (H3)

Henry emphasized that his 'classroom *management*' style was that of the '*benevolent* king' or '*benevolent dictator*.' As the '*benevolent dictator*,' he would '*have* to have student participation' and give students a '*say*' in his teaching, but for the purpose of having students '*buy* into' what he was doing in the classroom. According to Henry, the '*students* have a voice' but the

'teacher's in charge' ('teacher *is* in control'). He believed this classroom management style was one of his 'strengths,' and he validated it twice by citing a respected instructor in the social studies education program whom he believed used this method ('Dr. *Joseph*'). Henry explained what methods he used as the benevolent dictator or king.

the image of a benevolent *king*
is still the *king* no matter what
but *also* gets feedback from the students as,
that's just my classroom *management*
and classroom *philosophy*

I did uh *weekly* surveys (*I: okay*)
it was—I had an *index* card system
and they uh, every Friday I had *question* time
meaning students *bring* their index cards
they could write *anonymous* comments
put 'em in a box
they could write a *question*
and put their *name* on it
and I'd answer *back* on the card
to ensure that it just stays between *us*
or they can ask a question and put *no* name on it
and I'll *answer* that question in class
I was *getting* feedback
and the *students* were writing
they are *very* aware of their own education
and that's why I uh getting *feedback* from them is very important
it's like the *king* sitting under the oak tree
having the students come to him *directly* with their individual complaints (H3)

Henry emphasized that his 'classroom *management*' style maintained his role as '*king*' but '*also*' solicited 'feedback' from students. He explained that he provided '*weekly*' opportunities for students to write a '*question*' or 'comment,' signed or '*anonymous*,' on an '*index* card' and '*put*' it in a box. It should be noted that students had to '*bring*' their own index cards and these were not supplied by the '*king*.' Henry would read the cards and '*answer*' either on the back of the card (for signed cards) or in class (for unsigned cards). He emphasized twice that he was '*getting* feedback' from '*students*' because they were '*very* aware' of their educational needs. This

classroom management method was modeled after a story he heard about a French king from the Middle Ages who, every Sunday, sat by an oak tree and citizens brought concerns to him (Observation, February 28, 2007). Henry visualized himself as the '*king*' whose students came '*directly*' to him with concerns.

The dilemma that arises with this model is that the '*king*' or '*benevolent dictator*' is, as Henry said, 'still the *king* no matter what.' A king or dictator, no matter how benevolent, still has the power to ignore questions and comments that contradict his philosophy and goals, just as a teacher who models classroom management after a benevolent dictator has the power to ignore student questions and comments that conflict with his teaching philosophy and classroom goals. Henry resisted democratic classroom practices because they did not support his belief that good teachers maintained all control in the classroom.

Henry believed good teachers were dynamic lecturers and used lecture as the preferred instructional method. His favorite college classes were in his major program, history, and he said he liked the courses for their rigor and the instructional style of the professors. According to Henry, both professors were British and used lecture exclusively and his description of the two courses often overlapped.

they made the, the *lectures* were fun to go to
for one they were *interesting* (I: *mhmm*)
because they're *dynamic* lecturers

[the Caribbean history course] was a very *intense* course
all *lecture* based
and, he was a very *dynamic* professor
he was *extremely* academic
and *extremely* elite... (H2)

Henry enjoyed both professors for the same reasons and emphasized their '*dynamic*' and '*interesting*' '*lectures*.' He described the Caribbean history course as '*intense*' and the professor as '*extremely* academic' and '*extremely* elite.' Henry believed good teachers were dynamic

lecturers and used lecture almost exclusively as an instructional method. When asked later to elaborate on teachers as dynamic lecturers, he said,

*I see teaching as an art
it's a—you are on stage
it's a performance
it's a—it's a glorious art (H3)*

Henry emphasized his ('*I*') belief that the teacher ('*you*') engages in a '*performance*' that is '*glorious*.' The classroom becomes the 'stage' where teachers perform, which would mean students are the audience, they view the performance but do not actively partake in their own learning—their role is to receive the teacher's performance. This type of instructor could be described as a passionate performer. Henry extended the idea of performance to the interview by using a British accent with dramatic flair when quoting the British professors. The interview took place in a moderately crowded coffee shop, which did not appear to affect his behavior and he was either unaware of inquisitive looks from neighboring customers or did not mind them. This Discourse (i.e., language, gestures, dialect) is important to understanding how Henry perceived the role of the teacher. His Discourse indicated that he believed teachers control the decisions about management through the role of the benevolent dictator, and the decisions about instruction through the role of the passionate performer, where directed lecture is the only method used.

William also admired instructors whose instructional style was passionate and was exclusively lecture-based. He described a college professor of American history whom he greatly admired as a teacher.

*the one thing I remember the most about it is the...
the passion that the teacher had,
and he, uh, he was so animated
and it was, all he did was lecture, that's it,
and we had some, some books that we read um,
but, all he did was lecture*

and you'd take *notes*
but I'd—I'd find myself *listening* to him so much
that I wouldn't even take *notes*
because I would get so engrossed in what he was *saying* (I: *mhmm*)

it was *storytelling*
but it was, it was so much more *analytical*
I think it was maybe the first time I really connected the *past* with the present,
and it *fascinated* me (I: *Hmmm. Okay...*)
and *yes*, he was a great storyteller
again, that *animated*,
he always, *pounded* on the desk for emphasis (W2)

William emphasized the 'lecture' format of the class where students were passively 'listening' and taking 'notes' as the professor was actively 'animated' and 'pounded on the desk for emphasis.' The 'lecture' was 'analytical' but delivered with 'passion,' making the instructor a passionate performer. It was the combination of this instructor's passionate 'storytelling' and how he 'connected the *past* with the present' that 'fascinated' William.

Passionate performers must rely heavily on lecture as the instructional method for delivering knowledge to students. Lecture provides them with both the stage where they can perform what Henry calls their 'glorious art,' and the audience (students) who passively watch their performance. This method of instruction gives the teacher control in the classroom and William believed that good teachers control decisions about instruction and management.

I *lean* a lot toward traditional methods
with *lecture*, um and stuff like that
but um, I mean as far as like having just *rows* straight rows
and *columns* across um I can't
it's hard for me to fathom doing it in a *different* way you know
and, I hear my *classmates* talk about it all the time
and it just doesn't seem *right*, um
I guess I'm more *comfortable* in a traditional setting (W3)

William is aware of his preference for traditional teaching methods ('lean a lot toward' and 'I'm more comfortable'), including 'lecture.' According to William, the arrangement of the room, desks in 'rows' and 'columns,' was so ingrained that he could not 'fathom doing it a *different*

way' because it 'doesn't seem *right*.' His belief in traditional methods for teaching and structuring his classroom were reflections of how he was taught and the kind of teaching he believed to be best. His favorite teachers were passionate performers and used lecture almost exclusively, which required the traditional classroom arrangement that placed the teacher as the center. This results in the teacher being in control of decisions about instruction and management and this was reflected in his own teaching.

William's belief that teachers control methods of classroom instruction and management was made more apparent in an incident he shared from his internship experience in a sixth grade classroom. The Black girls in his classroom accused him of being racist because of his higher discipline rate for Black students.

*I talked to Mr. Smith [cooperating teacher] about this all the time that, um, one of the biggest problems that I had was, not *misbehavior* in class but that, the people who acted *out* happened just to be Black the ones that acted out the *most* I should say and um, I flat out *told* him, I'm like, you know, sometimes I feel almost relieved when I have to give lunch detention to a *White* kid so that it *appears* to be equal um and *that* was I think the basis of them thinking I was racist*

(I: so then the behavior of the Black students in your class, was that disrupting the learning of other students?)

*yeah that's when it became a *problem*, definitely I and... yeah and *that's* not limited to Black students at all um, it just *seemed* that the kids that were, problem kids tended more often than not to be Black and *that's* unfortunate (W3)*

According to William, the basis for the racist accusation was his disciplinary policy (decisions about management). He said, 'the people who acted *out* happened just to be Black' and 'it just *seemed* that the... problem kids tended more often than not to be Black and *that's* unfortunate.' He said he was 'almost relieved when' he had to punish 'a *White* kid' because it '*appears* to be equal.' In this excerpt, William did not reflect on his reaction to the behavior of students in his

class based on their cultural beliefs and practices; he blamed the high rate of punishments for Black students on *their* behavior, saying it was an ‘unfortunate’ coincidence (‘happened just to be Black’). William’s decision to use traditional methods of instruction and classroom management, which are based on the White, Eurocentric, middle–class culture, resulted in expectations of students that were not culturally responsive. His belief that the teacher controls instruction and management prevented him from reflecting on how his sociohistorical context (the White, Eurocentric, middle class culture of schools and community he identified with) might influence his actions in the classroom such that he might marginalize students of color and reinforce the hegemony of schools.

George, Kenneth, Henry and William believed good teachers controlled the instruction and management of classrooms. George applied society’s unequal distribution of goods to the classroom and thought academic tracking, where teachers and schools controlled the decisions about instruction and management (means of production), was effective since he believed it served the unequal distribution of knowledge, interest, and intellectual ability of students. Kenneth wanted to create a place for students outside of schools and classrooms where they could practice democracy because they should not be permitted to participate in the important decisions that directly or indirectly influenced their lives in schools. Henry’s self–image of the benevolent dictator gave the appearance of student involvement, but the teacher was still the dictator and the one who made the ultimate decisions about instruction and classroom management. William felt more comfortable in a traditionally structured classroom, with desks in rows, and said he used this type of classroom in his internship since it was most effective for lecture–based instruction. All four participants believed in traditional classroom instruction and

management and resisted the content of the social studies internship seminar that taught otherwise.

Teachers Encourage Students' Ideas and Opinions

Kenneth and George believed there was a place in the classroom for the ideas and opinions of students, which appeared to contradict their belief that teachers should control decisions about instruction and management. Their definition of whose ideas and opinions should be given greater consideration helped clarify this contradiction. They described instructors of courses they liked who made discussion an important part of the classroom; however, they both believed the most important ideas and opinions expressed in the classroom were their own.

One of the classes Kenneth enjoyed most was an honors history seminar that examined modern Middle Eastern history.

we had, you know, class was *fourteen* weeks,
we had *fourteen* books to read
and you know you *went* in there
and you talked about the *book*
what did you *think*
it was *bullshit*
or do you think it was for *real*

you know, it was just very *interesting*
and the *discussion* component was awesome
because, the way the professor *worked* is like, you
it wasn't him *talking* at you,
it wasn't *five* hundred people
in a *lecture* hall
and him *talking*
and you *writing* down,
it was like, "man, you just read a *book*,
what did you *think*" (K2)

For Kenneth, this class was '*interesting*' because it was not the professor '*talking*' and students '*writing*' what the professor thought was important—it was a small group of students ('wasn't *five* hundred people') discussing what they '*think*' about a '*book*' (was it '*bullshit*' or '*real*') and

that was how the professor ‘*worked.*’ He appeared to find the sharing of students’ ideas and opinions an important element of this class.

Kenneth’s ideas about valuing student voice were made clearer when describing a Scandinavian literature class. He was the only non–English major in the class.

[the instructor] was *so* cool
'cause she *welcomed* me in
and said, “You know what, I love a fresh *perspective*,
I love what you have to *say*,
I think it’s really *valuable*
because everybody *here* has their heads buried in plays
and *stuff* like that,
and *I* want to hear what somebody who’s not in that has to say.”

so you know *we’re* talking
“well... well *what* do you think” you know
and “*apart* from the saga,
what do you *think* that he meant when you know,
he you know murdered you know, his *son*”
or *something* like that...
“I just think he was pissed at his *son*...” you know
“*you* don’t think there’s any underlying thing there?...”
“*no*, I think honor was a big deal
and... he wasn’t honorable so his dad *offed* him,” you know...
“that’s *interesting*” you know
some *other* people are raising their hands,
“well *I* think you know I think it had to do with
maybe his *dad* was insecure about you know, his masculinity”
or something like *that*
and I’m like... “*no*” you know
and *I* was always like the frank
like “I *think* I think they meant what they wrote” kind of thing

she really *valued* what I had to say
because I was from a *different* perspective
and *that* was one of the things that really enlightened me to, you know,
valuing other perspectives
I had a *great* time
she thought I had a lot of good things to say
and I... like, *participated* like crazy
'cause that’s what I *do*
and so um, she said she *really* liked having me in class (K2)

In the above excerpt, Kenneth used a derivative of the word ‘value’ three times to emphasize the value his teacher placed on his contributions to class discussion. According to Kenneth, it was the teacher who valued his participation and ideas but there is no indication that other students found his insights valuable. In the first and third excerpts, Kenneth focused on his relationship with the instructor and how she ‘welcomed’ him, thought what he had to ‘say’ was ‘valuable,’ ‘valued’ his ‘different’ perspective, ‘she’ thought his contributions were important and ‘really’ liked having him in the class. In his mind, the teacher validated Kenneth’s knowledge, making it valuable. In the third excerpt, Kenneth said the class ‘enlightened’ him to ‘valuing other perspectives,’ but the second excerpt contradicts this assertion. He mimicked what might be considered a class discussion in which Kenneth’s perspective was challenged and twice his response was ‘no,’ meaning he would not consider ideas that differed from his. He appeared to enjoy this class because *his* ideas were solicited and valued by the instructor, not because there was a culture of valuing all students, although this might have been the case. Kenneth’s description of the class indicates the importance he placed on being valued as a student, but perhaps not necessarily on the value of all students. He said he liked this class because students were able to share their knowledge and ideas. Based on the excerpt, however, he appeared to believe that *his* knowledge and ideas were the correct ones, which challenged the value he placed on student voices that were in opposition to his ideas and opinions. He may not value other student input as much as the opportunity to voice his views.

Kenneth described two classes he did not like where he believed students were not allowed to participate, one a course on medieval history and the other the social studies internship seminar where observations took place for this study. Regarding the instructor of the medieval history course, he said,

he was *talking* at you, for one,
he was *disrespectful*,
you were *nothing*, you know
there was *no* value,
you were of *no* value to him

he *didn't* take attendance
and it was just, "You shut *up*
and it better be *quiet* now
I'm *talking*
and you're *listening*." (*I: all lecture?*)
yep, *all* lecture, no questions (K2)

Kenneth described this instructor as '*talking* at you,' which implied the instructor had the active role and students were passive. He emphasized that the instructor was '*disrespectful*' and students were '*nothing*' ('*no* value' emphasized twice), making them nearly invisible. According to Kenneth, the instructor's role was to talk ('I'm *talking*') and the students' role to listen ('you're *listening*'), so students were to 'shut *up*' and 'be *quiet*.' In this classroom, knowledge was the sole possession of the teacher and it was the student's responsibility to acquire that knowledge. This contradicted Kenneth's belief that good teachers make room for ideas and opinions from students.

Much of what he did not like about the social studies internship seminar appeared to be how the structure of the class created an environment in which students could not share their ideas and opinions out loud.

the way Rachel ran class, nobody wanted to *mess* with her
so, it'd *feel* like, okay, it's not appropriate for me to talk to somebody else right here,
because if you *notice* it's like, before class, everybody's talking,
"hey, how's it going, what's going on" you know
we were in our *internship*
so we didn't *see* each other
we *missed* each other
and everything like *that*,
it was *cool*
and all of a *sudden*
"No talking, time for chalk talk," you know and it was like
and so *nobody* wanted,

everybody just kind of wanted to go through the *motions*
and get through *class*
and not ruffle *feathers*

there were so *many* components where it was,
where she seemed like she was so focused on, *it* going the way she wanted
in terms of the *structure* of the class
rather than what we were getting out of it
and that's like, *chalk* talks, "nobody talking right now," you know, (*I: Right*)
and that, and I'll be *honest*,
those turned into a *joke*,
nobody cared, you know
they *wrote* them in there
because they needed to get the *grade*
and *that* was it
if we had,
if we had *talked* to do that
would have been *totally* different
and very, very, *very* beneficial, I think (K2)

Based on Kenneth's description and his emphasized words, he perceived that student voice was not valued in the internship seminar. As the excerpt indicates, students did not '*feel*' like they could talk or socialize, and '*it*' (the class) had to follow the instructor's plan '*rather*' then meet the needs of students. Kenneth described two altercations with the instructor which he perceived as silencing students ('*No* talking, time for chalk talk,' and 'nobody talking right now'). He asserted that if students had '*talked*' instead of using chalk talks it would have been '*totally* different' and '*very* beneficial.'

Chalk talks are a teaching strategy that uses no verbal interaction—all comments are written. One purpose for chalk talks is to provide an opportunity to participate for students who would not normally participate in an oral class discussion. In a chalk talk, all students have a voice and are equally recognized through what they have written. When Kenneth discussed his Scandinavian literature class, he emphasized the value the instructor placed on *his* contributions to discussion but did not emphasize how all contributions were valued. In fact, he considered his ideas the correct ones over all others. His dislike for chalk talks might be based on their

equalizing power—all ideas are treated equally and given equal voice. His resistance to this method might have been due to his desire to have his ideas considered the most valuable and correct and not equal to all other ideas, which is contrary to the goal of chalk talks. Kenneth resisted the methods used in the social studies internship seminar because he could not assert his views through a traditional method of discussion.

George also believed good teachers used discussion and, like Kenneth, felt the important knowledge he brought with him to the internship seminar was silenced. George's favorite college classes allowed students to share their opinions and ideas. One was a political science class that was discussion based and George said used a Socratic method of questioning to study political philosophers.

[the instructor] has very uh, radical *social* ideas
but he had this *course* in political philosophy
that *he* allowed everyone to be able to voice their opinions you know
so it was a *true* democratic classroom (*I: mmmm*)
and he was *not* judgmental

and uh *considering* he was the most directly polar opposite ideologically from me
he uh... *he* was a talker you know
so he *lectured* a lot
but he was also *Socratic*
and he would lecture for twenty minute *spurts*
and then go into these deep *discussions*
and he would really try to get *passions* involved
passions of the students involved

his ideas were that people understand the basic political *philosophies*
you know *all* ranges
from *everywhere*
if people understood what that *perspective* was
yet could *formulate* critically in their own minds
uh, how to *process* all that
so that's why I enjoyed *that* so much (G2)

What appeared to interest George in this class was first, the instructor's 'radical *social* ideas' that were 'polar opposite ideologically' to his, and second, the '*discussions*' that were '*not*

judgmental,' which he perceived as a 'true democratic classroom.' According to George, the instructor ('he') was a 'talker' but 'he' also gave students the opportunity to 'voice their opinions.' The instructor 'lectured' in 'spurts' and then used 'Socratic' questioning in 'discussions' with students. Socratic questioning is a teaching method that uses a series of questions to determine if a particular line of thinking or belief is supported. The method may be used in different ways, depending on the person doing the questioning, but it usually includes six types of questions that: (1) clarify ideas; (2) probe assumptions; (3) analyze reasons and evidence; (4) explore alternative views and perspectives; (5) explore implications and consequences and; (6) consider why certain questions were asked. It is not meant to be debate but an opportunity to reflect on beliefs and knowledge and to consider other perspectives. Depending on who is leading the questioning, Socratic method can be used to help students analyze their own assumptions and ideas, or it can be used to lead students to certain conclusions that agree with the questioner's assumptions and ideas. According to George, the goal of the political science instructor was to initiate 'passions' about the beliefs of many different philosophers ('all ranges,' 'from everywhere'). Ultimately, however, the professor wanted students to 'understand the basic political philosophies' so they could 'formulate' and 'process' each 'perspective.' Based on George's description, the professor wanted students to know the different philosophical perspectives and think critically about the philosophers' beliefs, but it appeared students could leave the classroom with their own perceptions unchanged. This might indicate that probing assumptions and exploring implications and consequences (two steps in Socratic method) were not a major focus in this classroom, but these can lead to the critical inquiry and self-reflection necessary to disrupt hegemony.

Another class George enjoyed was a history class entitled “Cultural Wars,” which he said was similar to the political science class.

he was a very *conservative* professor
far more conservative than *I* am
it was a lot of *talk*
I mean *that* particular class
it was just the *subject* material
and as well as just a wonderful *teacher*

that was also a three hour class
so it’s impossible to lecture for *three* hours (*I: yeah*)
so he—*he* would usually lecture the first half
and then he’d... use *Socratic* method
or *questioning* um
discussion *off* of people’s comments
the second *half* (G2)

It was the ‘*subject*’ and ‘*teacher*’ that made this class one of George’s favorites. To indicate the political positioning of the class, he emphasized that he (*I*) was conservative but this professor was ‘far more *conservative*.’ He also emphasized the focus on ‘*talk*,’ ‘*Socratic* method,’ ‘*questioning*,’ and ‘*discussion*’ during the second half of class, which appeared to be a method he enjoyed. George described another of his favorite classes that gave students the opportunity to voice their ideas and opinions without judging those ideas or opinions.

a young idealistic *professor*
with very concrete *views* of the literature that we read
opinions you know
and yet *still* he allowed you to be able to express your own
it was all *reflection*
and critical *thinking* (*I: okay*)
he would profess *his* ideas
and then he’d ask what you thought of *that*
then *he* would defend his ideas
and you would try to strengthen *your* argument
or *your* ideas
through excerpts from the *text* (G2)

In this literature class, the ‘*professor*’ had ‘concrete *views*’ and ‘*opinions*’ of the literature but ‘*still* allowed’ students to express their ideas. According to George, once the instructor explained

'his idea' he would ask students what they thought of 'that,' which would result in everyone taking and defending positions. It was 'he' against 'your' and the support for all 'views' and 'opinions' came from the 'text.' George emphasized the 'reflection' and 'critical thinking' that was a major part of the class but also the debate between what the instructor believed was a correct 'view' and what the student believed was a correct 'view.' Whether the reflection and critical thinking led to any constructive changes in views and opinions on either side is unknown.

George said it was not a coincidence that two of the classes he really enjoyed were philosophically based. The instructor of the political philosophy class wanted to inspire the passions of students with lecture and Socratic questioning on different philosophers throughout history. His goal was to help students understand and think critically about the perspectives and ideas of the philosophers. George liked this class because it allowed him to voice his opinions and was 'not judgmental,' which could mean it did not challenge students to critically evaluate their own beliefs. The literature class was a favorite for similar reasons—the instructor allowed students to express their own opinions. This class leaned more toward debate, with the instructor and students defending their positions. He enjoyed the history class due to the subject matter (culture wars) and the conservative teacher. George described instructors for the political science and literature classes as liberal in their thinking, and it was their willingness to allow student ideas and opinions that made the classes two of his favorites. Whether he enjoyed Socratic questioning that included the fifth step (explore implications and consequences of ideas and beliefs), which could lead to change, or simply enjoyed the debate that occurred during the questioning is difficult to assess. He did enjoy classes that allowed him to state and defend his position on what was being taught. The classes he disliked provided further insight into his beliefs about the role of the teacher in the classroom.

As noted earlier, the class that George said he disliked the most was Reading in the Content Area, a graduate level course in his teacher education program.

(I: *what kind of teaching methods did she use?*)

some... very *unstructured* group work
nobody wanted to *do* the group work
nobody took it *seriously*
so even if you *wanted* to do it seriously
the other three people in your group *didn't* want to do it seriously
so, um, and then she just let it *go*,
and she had other things going on in her life

(I: *did she do class discussions?*)

yeah... *they* were just,
they were *not* productive
there was just no *opinions* being brought
by *anybody* so
and I *did* bring out opinions
and I wrote *long*
we had this *Google* group
and I wrote long *opinions* on it
and nobody *cared*
so I just said "*hell* with it" (G2)

George emphasized that the '*unstructured* group work' was not taken '*seriously*' and students did not want to '*do*' the work. Class discussions, which was a method George enjoyed, were '*not* productive' because there were '*no opinions*' expressed by '*anybody*' (except George) because '*nobody cared.*' While he '*wrote long*' '*opinions*' in the online discussion, no one wrote back. Unlike his favorite classes, this class did not provide him with opportunities for debate since students did not share their ideas and opinions.

George's resistance in the social studies methods course was due in part to what he perceived as the lack of '*deep*' discussion in the course.

Rachel's not the type of teacher that goes deep in anything
I mean, she talks like she *wants* to
but never *does* (I: *right*)
I think she *understands* it

and *wants* to talk about it
but then, uh for whatever *reason*
she has all these things *planned* for that day
and she's gotta *get* to 'em, you know
discussion is uh sometimes you've just gotta write the rest of your class *off*
if you're having a good *discussion*
but she'll cut it *off*
and *end* it just as it's beginning to blossom
because something else was on her *agenda* (G2)

George emphasized twice that Rachel '*wants*' to have meaningful discussions and '*understands*' the importance of them, 'but never *does*' engage in discussions. According to George, the '*reason*' she did not attempt them in the social studies methods course was because she had to '*get*' to what she '*planned*' and a 'good *discussion*' might require her to change her plan ('write the rest of your class *off*'). He said she would '*end*' ('cut it *off*') a discussion because it was not 'on her *agenda*.' Observations of the social studies internship seminar confirmed George's reasoning—Rachel appeared to end discussions when students were fully engaged in them because she needed to move to the next item on her agenda. Discussions, including chalk talks and jigsaws, were often timed and students were required to stop when the time expired. This was frustrating for George because it prevented him from engaging in debate and sharing his ideas and opinions.

What appeared to be the underlying problem for George, however, was that his ideas and opinions were not respected in any of the courses in the teacher education program, and when he did respond with viewpoints that opposed the instructor's he said he felt marginalized.

the thing that really bugged *me* about everything
was that... my *knowledge* base was never,
my *experiential* base was never tapped into (*I: okay*)
you know um the things that I've *done*
and the *jobs* that I've had
I don't like to *talk* about 'em
and, I'm *not* the type of guy that's going to take people aside
and be some sort of *mentor* you know,

but there were *certain* things that I could have certainly added to, you know...
definitely the global studies class

(*I: was it in the global studies class that you said you felt the most marginalized?*)

definitely

she would comment on something I'd say
and then *not* let me rebut... (*I: okay*) (G1)

George emphasized that what bothered him (*'me'*) was that his *'knowledge'* and *'experiential base'* was not taken advantage of through class discussion. He was an older student returning to complete a master's program after working fifteen years in the business world and felt what he had *'done'* prior to entering the program, the *'jobs'* he held, provided him with *'certain'* knowledge and experience that would have *'definitely'* added an additional dimension to the global studies class. George did not like to *'talk'* about his experiences, and said he was *'not'* a *'mentor'* to others less knowledgeable, but was willing to share his knowledge and experience as it pertained to coursework. He felt his *'knowledge'* was marginalized in the global studies class when the instructor (*'she'*) would *'not'* let him *'rebut'* her response to his comments.

George believed good teachers allowed students to voice their ideas and opinions without judgment. This could present problems in a classroom where critical inquiry and self-reflection were important and challenging ideas and opinions is part of the learning process. George had a preference for discussion and what he referred to as Socratic questioning but what also resembled debate in which establishing ones own ideas and opinions was more important than critical examination or understanding the ideas and opinions of others. The classes he enjoyed had some structure in which the instructor lectured and then led discussion but George considered them all discussion based classes. In the classes he did not enjoy, discussions were unproductive because he was the only one sharing any opinions, there was no debate, the discussions were ended too quickly, or his ideas and opinions were not given prominence (they

were marginalized). Kenneth also believed good teachers allow students to voice their ideas and opinions, but he found the discussion method (chalk talks) used by the social studies methods instructor too restrictive because he believed his ideas needed to be heard above the ideas of others. As a student who valued voicing his ideas and perceptions and viewing them as correct, Kenneth resisted the idea that all student voices are equal. George and Kenneth believed good teachers allow room for the ideas and opinions of students, but in the internship seminar, they wanted to assert their own ideas and opinions as the correct ones or ones that deserved a place of prominence. Democratic classroom practices, however, does not allow one voice to dominate the class, which helps explain the contradiction between their belief that teachers should control decisions about instruction and management and their belief that students' ideas and opinions should be shared.

Teachers Should Teach Assimilation to the Dominant Group

One of the unique Discourses about the role of teachers was that teachers should teach assimilation to the dominant group. George resisted the teachings and content in the social studies internship seminar that supported culturally responsive pedagogy due to his belief that teaching should help students assimilate to the dominant culture. He thought teachings on diversity and multicultural education divided people instead of bringing them together.

there is *no* melting pot, you know
people *always* wanna' accentuate differences
in fact, *I've* always contested that diversity
and multicultural *training*
has always accentuated *differences*
rather than making *connections*

(I: okay so how do we teach the fact that we do have so many cultures)

I would teach through *geography*
where do these people *come* from,
where do *we* come from
nobody's from here *(I: right)*

not even Native Americans are *from* here, you know
and you start *there*
but then accentuate *similarities*
not the *differences*
because you know uh... there's *no* melting pot
but there's something to be said for, *something* of a melting pot

there are *essential* parts of Italian
and African *American*
and *Irish*
and, different parts of *culture* that are now part of the American culture (*I: right*)
that happened *naturally* you know
and it has *nothing* to do with assimilation
but it *has* to do with being an American
and there is an *American* culture
and for a *culture*
for a *country*
for a *nation* to go forward
there has to be a feeling of *oneness* you know
and we've gotten *away* from that
and I think that's the weakness of multicultural *education* (G3)

George believed the 'weakness of multicultural *education*' was due to the emphasis on 'differences' instead of 'connections' and this hindered the formation of a unified ('oneness') 'American culture' that could move 'forward.' He said he would teach multicultural education from the perspective of many different cultures coming together ('through *geography* where do these people *come* from, where do *we* come from *nobody's* from here'). He would then 'accentuate *similarities*... not *differences*.' The only differences he would teach would be the geographical homelands of the various cultures; all other teaching would be about things various cultures had in common. He believed the blending of 'different parts of *culture*' to create the 'American culture' happened naturally, and is not '*assimilation*' but has to do with being an American. However, the culture of any nation is dominated by the most powerful and, historically, the most powerful in the United States have been White, Eurocentric male, middle-upper class citizens. The elements of non-dominant cultures that have been absorbed into what

George calls 'American culture' were accepted because the dominant group, those in power, thought it beneficial to accept them.

According to George, his opinions about diversity and multiculturalism were not always well received in the teacher education program.

I came in here wanting to talk about all *kinds* of things
and uh... just would either A not *get*, to the aspects that I want to talk about
or B when I *was* caught up in the
and a lot of this program *is* caught up in multiculturalism
and *diversity*
and uh, *equity*
and all *that*
uh that when I gave a, uh, differing *opinion* it was, ignored (G2)

George felt the '*kinds* of things' he wanted to discuss were not addressed ('not *get* to') or when they were addressed and he gave a 'differing *opinion*,' he 'was ignored.' He also felt the program was 'caught up in multiculturalism... *diversity*... *equity* and all *that*,' meaning issues that supported ideals that he did not agree with. Statements George made during the interview were often biased against lower socioeconomic groups, women, certain ethnic groups, and certain religions. When these statements were challenged he would respond by directing the interview away from the topic. For example, George felt it was important that schools represent the majority population within the community where they are located but refused to consider how the minority population might be affected.

schools are meant to be a reflection of their communities,
and we've made them a reflection of the *national* um multicultural values rather than...
if you live in a town where church is the *center* of the town
it only makes *sense* to have that as part of the curriculum you know...
and—I can't say part of the curriculum
but... *as* part of... discourse you know
cause it's *something* that's very real in people's eyes

(*I: what's the difference between having it part of a discourse and having it part of the curriculum?*)

I understand

what you're saying is protecting *minority* rights

I think we're intelligent enough as a *society*

to be able to tell the difference between, um, putting a *Christmas* tree in a classroom and *somebody* uh... teaching that you're gonna' go to hell if you don't believe in god now people are afraid to even say the word *in* school...

I think that *hurts* society

(I: you have maybe Jewish children along with children who come from homes who don't believe and possibly even coming from Muslim homes and how do you come together in a classroom with all these kids with the idea of a Christmas tree? as a teacher you're setting up this piece which is connected more closely with a specific religion. is that okay when you have students who might not necessarily be offended but almost left out—)

—exclusion—

(I: —because it's not part of their beliefs in the same way that you as a conservative in the classroom often felt left out and pushed aside because your ideas didn't coincide with the teacher's and the main thinking?)

I think it's a *travesty* that religion's not taught

and... if you have *Muslim* people

and you have *Jewish* people living in the society

they should *know* where the majority's coming from...

but *again* I want to get back to indoctrination (G3)

The two main points of this discourse are first, the emphasis George placed on the role of Christianity in schools, which he considered the majority religion, and second, his refusal to address the issue of ignoring the beliefs of students when they do not coincide with the beliefs of teachers or the community. He argued that if the 'church' is the '*center*' of a community, it should be included in the 'discourse' of the school ('makes *sense*'). He does not identify which religion the church represented but his later reference to a Christmas tree made it clear that he was referring to a church that followed the Christian religion. When questioned as to the difference between curriculum and discourse, George responded with the difference between a '*Christmas* tree' (an inanimate object) and '*somebody* teaching that you're gonna' go to hell if you don't believe in god.' He did not appear to make a connection between a teacher's actions and the message those actions send to students. In his mind, a Christmas tree was not offensive

because it was not teaching anything in the way a teacher ('*somebody*') would. When questioned what a Christmas tree represented and the effects that might have on students whose beliefs did not support that particular religion, George used the word 'exclusion' but then changed the subject. He said it was a '*travesty*' that religion was not taught in schools but '*again*' wanted to return to a discussion on indoctrination. Ironically, the discussion on indoctrination, which occurred much earlier in the interview, involved his belief that teacher education programs were liberal and indoctrinated students to believe the same way, which offended him as a student with conservative beliefs.

George believed fear prevented people from including 'god *in school*' and 'that *hurts* society,' but the god he referred to was the Christian god. He said he understood ('*understand*') the issue of 'protecting *minority* rights,' but also said minorities ('*Muslims*' and '*Jewish* people') should '*know*' the beliefs of the majority. He never suggested or implied that the majority should know the beliefs of minorities. This reflected George's ideology, or political beliefs, about education. He did not believe culturally responsive teaching (multiculturalism) was advantageous because it was divisive and not unifying. He also believed schools should reflect the dominant culture within the community regardless of how that might affect minority groups. His unique '*something* of a melting pot,' or assimilation, theory about multicultural education appeared to give precedence to the dominant group and marginalize non-dominant groups.

Teacher Responsible for Success of all Students But...

Another of the unique teacher beliefs was Kenneth's resistance to course content based on a no-excuses teaching philosophy. He was required to read a chapter in *Leadership for Equity and Excellence* by James Joseph Scheurich and Linda Skrla and responded to the reading in a small group by stating that society is capitalist so some students will fail, or be at the bottom, and it is not the teacher's fault. He was asked during an interview to elaborate on this response.

(I: What do you see, or can you explain the relationship between capitalism and what goes on in classrooms?)

schools never end up being *funded* equally
and then you give *grades*, and grades,
there's a top and a *bottom*,
just like *capitalism*,
there's *rich* and poor
and a *lot* of people in the middle
and yeah I mean *that's* kind of the way it the way it ends up
and you know... the student doesn't have to necessarily get the *F* you know
or the *failing* grade,
but if they get the *D*
or a *C*
because of their *ability* level, I mean,
what do you, you know, there's nothing that you can *do* about that
you can *help* 'em
and *help* 'em
and *help* 'em
and *try* your best, you know,
but, if *they* don't produce those kind of, you know
if *they* don't produce any results,
if *they're* not moving,
getting any better quality wise then they *were*, you know,
there's *not* a ton you can do about that
and then there are *certain*,
I think there are *certain* things that are outside of your control
that you *can't* help
if *they* have a bad home life,
you can *certainly* do your best to try to, control the damage that is done by that
but there's *nothing* that you, are going to be able to do that's gonna' be, you know,
probably not, there's *probably* not much that you can do
that's gonna' be *more* powerful than what mom or dad says at home, you know (K3)

Kenneth does not believe in a no-excuses teaching philosophy, which takes into consideration the factors that contribute to student failure but does not place blame. In this excerpt, Kenneth first placed blame for failure on a student's '*ability* level,' saying 'if *they* don't produce,' 'if *they're* not moving,' 'there's *not* a ton' a teacher can do to help the student. He also blamed a student's home life—'if *they* have a bad home life' there is '*nothing*' a teacher can do, or there is '*probably* not much that you can do,' that will 'be more *powerful*' than the parents. The emphasis on '*they*' and '*they're*' places the responsibility for learning and the blame for failure

on the student. What is most telling about this excerpt, however, is Kenneth's application of capitalism to the classroom, teaching, and the education system. He views capitalism as a natural sorting system in which some succeed and some do not depending on their own abilities or other factors, and the teacher is powerless to change this sorting system. Kenneth's belief that capitalism creates schools as natural sorting machines, where some are going to be 'on the *bottom*,' prevented him from accepting a no-excuses teaching philosophy and believing it was his responsibility to help students overcome some of the obstacles to their own education. Kenneth established a belief about teaching that allowed him to blame students or circumstances for failure in the classroom, which was evident in his resistance to a no-excuses teaching philosophy.

I know that *specifically*,
with kind of an idealistic *fervor* in the class
where there was a *whole* lot of talk
and a *whole* lot of readings
about, you've *gotta* reach every kid you know
and *that* I perceived as a big problem
it was *never* explained to anybody that, you know what,
as long as you *try* hard it's gonna' be cool, you know
that was never made explicit
it was, oh, you're not *reaching* a kid, there's something wrong, you know
and it *needs* to be explained more than that
okay, *there's* something wrong
and how can we *rework* this
and put our *efforts* to try get that kid back on track,
it was just like *you're* doing something wrong

it's *your* fault
it's *always* the teacher's responsibility
you probably *noticed* this but,
I'm sure the reason that *I* was identified [as resisting]
is because from the fall *on*
I was the one who always objected to that [idea] (K2)

In his discussion of what caused him to resist in class, Kenneth cited the 'ideological *fervor*' of the class and the no-excuses teaching philosophy supported through a '*whole* lot of talk' and a

‘*whole* lot of readings.’ He believed he was identified as being resistant because of his objections to a no–excuses teaching philosophy. He understood this philosophy to mean ‘you’ve *gotta* reach every kid’ and if not then ‘*you’re* doing something wrong.’ He agreed that teachers must ‘*try* hard,’ ‘*rework*’ the lesson, and focus their ‘*efforts* to try to get that kid back on track,’ but he also wanted someone or something to blame (other than the teacher) when a student did not succeed.

The readings for the social studies internship seminar (see Appendix B) were based on research from well known educators and explained a no–excuses teaching philosophy. The instructor of the social studies methods course was never observed saying teachers were to be blamed for student failure. During an observation, Kenneth said the readings were too idealistic and reflected the curriculum of the teacher education course, which he said was inappropriate since it taught teachers to think everything was their fault and it expected schools to fix everything. Kenneth’s oppositional statements and resistance to the readings were due to his belief that classrooms are natural sorting machines, just as capitalism is a natural sorting machine, and there will always be students who fail or do not do well in the classroom regardless of the quality or efforts of the teacher. Kenneth was the only participant who explicitly resisted the content on a no–excuses teaching philosophy, and William was the only participant to give strong evidence of biased beliefs about gender and teachers.

Good Female Teachers are Caring and Build Relationships with Students

William believed good teachers had a deep knowledge of content and were good storytellers, however, he also described the female teachers he liked as nurturing. None of the male teachers he liked were described as caring or nurturing. A memory from his fifth grade class helps clarify his beliefs about good female teachers.

(I: is there anything in particular that you can remember about your elementary years? especially something that might influence you now when you think about teaching?)

well, yeah, I mean, I had some teachers that I really enjoyed *being* with
my *fifth* grade teacher
she took us on a field trip, um
just *our* fifth grade
there were, I think, *three* fifth grade classes
and, *ours* was the one that went on the 3-day field trip
where *we* got to like stay overnight
it was like at a *ski* resort
cross-country skiing
and, I just remember her classroom for *doing* stuff like that all the time
we put on a *play* once
and some stuff that the *other* classes never did
and, I mean it *really* stood out in my mind
because, she *liked* doing it
and you could really tell she *cared* about us
I remember being in *4th* grade
and *seeing* her yelling at a student once out in the hallway
and thinking *I* never want to have that lady as a teacher
and *then* when I got her
I absolutely *loved* her...
I was *so* glad that I ended up with her (W1)

William remembered this teacher because she was ‘*doing* stuff’ that showed ‘she *cared*.’ His emphasis that ‘*she* took us,’ ‘just *our*,’ ‘*ours* was the one,’ and ‘*we* got to’ indicated the importance he placed on the caring relationship between the teacher (‘*she*’) and the students (‘*we*’). William said this teacher ‘*really* stood out’ because she ‘*liked* doing it’ and it was obvious to him that ‘she *cared* about us.’ According to William, a good teacher is caring and incorporates activities and events to show students they are special.

Another female instructor William admired taught political science and was passionate about her subject but also built relationships with students.

she *just* had her own style of teaching,
again, it was a lot of *lecture*
but, um, she had so much *fun* teaching
and you could tell *just* from her interaction with students...
I really *like* that and, uh
she’s the *first* college professor I’ve ever had that I, I’ve had a relationship with
like that that I would go *talk* to (I: *Mhmm*)

she, she would just voice her *opinion* no matter what
she *loved* talking to people that were conservative
and stuff like *that*
and would never *belittle* their view
or anything like *that*
but um would let them voice their *opinion*,
and um... lay out *her* side
and then let everyone else choose what they, what *they*, felt they should do
and *that's* why I had her for one class,
like state *politics*,
and then I took her *again* for a broader political class, um...
but um *she* would cultivate personal relationships with the s—with the people in her class,
she always knew us by she called us by our last name,
she... *same* thing she just loved what she was doing,
she *loved* talking about it
and um *encouraged* people to get active in politics (W2)

William noted the '*lecture*' focus of this class but emphasized the '*fun*' this instructor had teaching and how this was evident through 'her interaction with students.' He said she '*loved*' hearing differing opinions and 'would never *belittle*' another point of view. This respect for students was also evident in the way '*she* would cultivate personal relationships' and '*she* always knew us by... out last name.' As with his fifth grade teacher, William emphasized the actions of the teacher ('*she*') that indicated a nurturing attitude. He said this instructor was not only passionate about her subject area ('*same* thing she just loved what she was doing' and '*she loved* talking about it') but she also made an effort to show students she cared by making herself available outside the classroom ('I would go *talk* to her'). William said this was the '*first* college professor' he had a relationship with and in a later interview called her a mentor.

William's fifth grade teacher and his political science teacher, both females, made learning fun and acted in ways that built caring relationships with students. However, he did not perceive the social studies methods instructor, also a female, in this way. Interestingly, he said Rachel was not like this in the fall when she taught an educational technology class.

when we *had* her in the fall um
it started out, she was um, that she was *dynamic*

I mean she'd come *in*
 and some things would make you feel a *little* uncomfortable
 she'd you know come in dressed in a *wig*
 and *stuff* like that
 it's a little weird *but* you know,
 it—it *switched* things up
 but um *somewhere* along the line um
I don't know
 it went from being, um she's the *fun* teacher to being
 she um, it's *her way* or the highway
 and *I don't know*
 for *whatever* reason a lot of people rebelled against that (W2)

William emphasized that Rachel was '*fun*' and '*dynamic*' in the fall, like the female teachers he enjoyed. He said she made him 'feel a *little* uncomfortable' but she '*switched* things up,' making class more interesting—building a relationship with students through what she did in the classroom. That changed, however, and it became '*her way* or the highway.' He described his confusion over this by twice stating '*I don't know*' and then said students, for '*whatever* reason,' rebelled against her. The change in the instructor's classroom management style did not support William's belief that good female teachers are caring and build relationships with students. This was further illustrated in an incident in the spring internship seminar.

Wednesday I was taking notes on my laptop
 and she stopped *class*
 "William, um can you put that *away*
 I can't think of any reason why you might be *using* it,"
 and then just kept going before I could even *respond*
 well, *I* just kept typing away
 and *eventually* when we came to a short break she came up behind me
 and looked at what I was *typing*
 she like, "You could have just said you were taking *notes*,"
 "Well you didn't give me the *chance* to, Rachel"
 so, um, her classroom management seems to me to *change*
 to *evolve* to a point
 where it's *assumed* that people are doing something wrong and disruptive
 and deal with it, *sometimes* um confrontationally (W2)

According to William, the instructor '*assumed*' he was taking class time to do something other than class work. When Rachel did not give him the '*chance*' to '*respond*' to her request, he

continued the behavior but took responsibility for his actions ('I just kept typing'). His response to continue the behavior can be considered an act of resistance since he deliberately challenged the authority of the teacher and admitted that was what he was doing. During the break, the instructor 'came up behind' William, possibly to see what he was doing on the laptop, and found he was 'taking notes.' According to William, the instructor did not apologize but instead blamed him for not telling her that he was 'taking notes.' He said her 'classroom management' style seemed 'to *evolve*' from a more constructive and positive style to a more authoritative style ('*assumed* that people are doing something wrong'), and William found this strict disciplinarian classroom management style '*sometimes* confrontational.'

In the descriptions of the two female teachers William admired, he emphasized their caring natures and how they worked to build relationships with students. He did not do this with any of the male teachers whom he appeared to admire almost exclusively for their lecture performance and passion for the subject they taught. His fifth grade teacher, a female, was admired and remembered for the special activities she created for students outside of the classroom. And the political science professor, also female, was admired not only for her passion for her subject area but also for building personal relationships with students by remembering their names and making herself available to them outside the classroom. William's emphasis on the caring aspect of the two female teachers he admired might indicate he believes good female teachers are nurturing in addition to knowing their content area and loving what they do. He did not view the instructor of the social studies internship seminar as nurturing or fun, although she was when he had her in the fall technology class. The change in her way of teaching, from the 'fun' teacher to the strict teacher, and his belief that good female teachers are nurturing and build student relationships, may have helped escalate the resistance to the methods and content of the class.

His acts of resistance during the laptop incident might be considered cultural resistance, not counter resistance, because he was resisting a power structure established by the instructor. His reasons for resistance, however, appeared to be for the purpose of maintaining his belief that female teachers are nurturing and build relationships with students. This contradiction will be discussed further in the next section.

Cultural Resistance and the Role of the Teacher

The participants engaged in what is called in this study counter-resistance when they resisted methods or content meant to create dissonance and disrupt hegemony in teaching and schools. Participants also, however, engaged in what can be called cultural resistance due to the instructor of the social studies internship seminar using rigid classroom management and due to the handling of the student-teacher relationship throughout the program. Cultural resistance is when oppositional behavior by students works to disrupt the White, Eurocentric, middle-upper class culture reflected in most U.S. schools. The students' cultural beliefs conflict with the cultural beliefs of schools and classrooms, and students might express their discontent through resistant behavior, as appeared to be true of William and Kenneth.

Teachers should not Micro-manage Classrooms

When William complained of the change in the way Rachel taught class between the fall and spring semesters, he indicated the strictness that was used in the spring class that was not evident in the fall.

(I: what was it about that class that you did not like?)

I *don't* know

I guess the *strictness* of it...

there was, it seemed like there was an *expectation*

to be um, *creatively* thinking a lot of the time

but at the same *time*

we were expected to do—to toe the *line*

on *everything* up to and including the way we presented ourselves in class

um it was... and I *think* I said this to you last time
a *lot* of the class was kind of a rebellion against Rachel
more than the *content* of the class

According to William, the ‘*expectation*’ of the class, to be ‘*creatively* thinking,’ conflicted with the demand that students ‘toe the *line* on *everything*.’ He perceived that the demand on students to adhere strictly to classroom expectations prevented the critical thinking expected of students. He believed this ‘*strictness*’ resulted in resistance (‘rebellion’) to the instructor more than the ‘*content*.’ Kenneth also complained about the strictness of the class.

the other *thing* I disliked about the [methods] class
obviously the structure was so *rigid* at times that... you just, you know it was like
you didn’t feel like you could, ask *questions* or do anything—I mean
I got *snapped* at several times
you were you saw me get *snapped* at
and I’m like, I’m not an unruly type of *person* or anything
um you know, like when I was outside the *circle*
and I was, “oh, cool, I can *see*.”
“*nope*, in the circle.”
whoa! whoa, you know

there were so *many* components where it was,
where she seemed like she was so focused on, *it* going the way she wanted
in terms of the *structure* of the class
rather than what we were getting out of it

Kenneth emphasized the ‘*rigid*’ structure of the internship seminar and how he felt uncomfortable asking ‘*questions*.’ He said he was ‘*snapped*’ at for sitting outside the ‘*circle*’ during a class activity and the observation that day confirmed his description. The circle of 29 students was large and Kenneth chose to sit behind another student but the instructor did not like that arrangement and demanded the desks be moved so he could sit in the circle. Kenneth felt the instructor was more concerned that the ‘*many* components’ of the class follow her ‘*structure*’ (‘focused on *it* going the way she wanted’) ‘*rather* than’ what would be best for student learning.

Both William and Kenneth believed good teachers control the instruction and management of classrooms, but resisted when the instructor of the internship seminar did this in her

classroom. For William, this may have been due partly to his belief that good female teachers are nurturing and build good relationships with students, and he did not define the methods instructor as a good female teacher. Kenneth may have felt the control excluded any student input, even in the smallest ways like where a student sat, and he believed his ideas and opinions should be asserted in the classroom. The strictness of the class may have escalated their acts of resistance. Based on the methods and content of the class, it appeared the instructor was intent on disrupting hegemony; however, observations indicate that her reliance on rigidly timed activities created an environment that was so strict participants felt uncomfortable asking questions or feared retribution for the way they behaved in class. An instructor who reinforces her agenda through rigidly timed activities is maintaining the current culture of schools in which the teacher holds power over student learning and movement. William's and Kenneth's resistance to the strictness of the class appeared to be cultural resistance because it worked against the traditional culture of classrooms. William also believed the resistance in the class was due to a classroom culture that lacked trust between students and teacher.

Teachers should Maintain Trust in Student–Teacher Relationships

Trust in student–teacher relationships was important to William and he expressed deep disappointment in how that trust was violated by the instructor of the social studies internship seminar. According to William, the instructor consistently referred what she perceived as misbehaving students to college administrators without investigating the incidents or speaking with the students. This element of classroom management can reinforce the hegemonic hierarchy of schools and the powerlessness of students. William said his resistance in the internship seminar was due mainly to the lack of trust between students and teacher and that resulted from events during the fall semester.

in the *fall* she overheard a conversation
between me and another *student*
we were in class
and um *getting* ready to leave
I don't remember exactly what had *happened* with him that prompted the whole thing
but *he* was pretty upset about it
I mean, it was about another *instructor* actually,
the um... the other student I was *talking* to had a particular complaint
and um, he was just *venting* to me
and I was *listening*
and I was, "yeah, you know I *agree*, you might be right"
and just along *those* lines
and, I was just *there*
and the *next* thing I knew
I was called into Dr. *Boyson's* office
and *that* to me was just unacceptable

you *had* to be careful
because it *wasn't* worth the
it wasn't worth the pain in the *butt* to uh
to um say something that *might*
that's just gonna' cause you *problems* later on

(*I: was there any time during the conversation, or after it, or prior to getting the email, when you might have thought this conversation was inappropriate?*)

um I... *looked* over
and I *saw* Rachel there
and I thought, *maybe* this isn't the best place to talk about this, (*I: okay*)
um but, she seemed *absorbed* in what she was doing
and I *really* didn't pay much attention to her
inappropriate? at the *place*? yeah probably,
I mean it's the *sort* of thing that you should talk about outside of class
class was over, by the way (W2)

The conversation between William and the other student took place in 'class' when they were 'getting ready to leave.' The other student was 'talking' and 'venting' but William perceived his role as more passive—he was 'just there,' 'listening,' and verbally agreeing with the student's statements ('I agree, you might be right'). During the conversation with the other student, he questioned the appropriateness of the place for this discussion (he deliberately 'looked' at Rachel 'but she seemed absorbed') and said 'maybe' it was not the best place. His indecision was not

with the topic of the conversation ('another *instructor*') but with the '*place*' (the classroom) where the conversation was being held and the possibility of being overheard. The thought that they would be reported to the associate director of the department ('Dr. *Boyson*') probably did not enter his mind since he viewed it ('*that*') as 'unacceptable' to do so. Ultimately, William believed this incident, and others like it, disrupted the trust between students and teacher, and students in the internship seminar '*had* to be careful' they did not say anything that '*might*' cause problems later.

He recalled other incidents reported to administrators that he felt undermined the student–teacher relationship but also admitted that his own behavior often disrupted class.

*I did something extremely stupid a month or so ago
where I was so tired
and, and I did something disrespectful
and because I did it
the way I did it
I called Karen's cell phone and
to get it to ring and anyway—*

(I: —you did it during class?)

*I did it during class
but the thing was
I know this sounds dumb
but Rachel wasn't in my thoughts when I did it at all
I was tired
I was trying to make Karen laugh
and the fact that I didn't think about Rachel is disrespectful in itself but um
and I just pushed it a little too far
not to mention I mean I make sarcastic comments
and I'm trying to keep things light for people in there the best I can
and I go overboard sometimes
I know it um
I've on occasion
I've apologized for it
and I've stopped doing that all together but...*

(I: did you apologize for the cell phone thing?)

um no she *sent* me an email
saying it wasn't *appropriate* and uh
but I mean I *knew* that so...
the *fact* that it was copied to Dr. Hunter kind of irked me a little bit
so no I *didn't* apologize
although uh, maybe in retrospect
I mean *that* was probably the worst thing I did in any of the classes
so maybe I *should* have but...

Dr. Hunter didn't say anything to me about *that*
but with *other* people,
yeah I hear that *they'll* get called in
you know "you did *this*"
and like "well Rachel didn't *say* anything to me about it
I just I didn't realize anything was *wrong*
until I get called by the higher *ups*"
and *that's* just, a method of instruction that I don't agree with at all (W3)

When describing an incident where he was at fault, William emphasized '*I*' three times, which placed responsibility for the action on himself. Later, he emphasized '*I*' four times when discussing some of his behavior that went too far. His willingness to take responsibility for behavior that might he considered disrespectful or that could have '*pushed* it a little too far' indicated his ability to see the role he played in the development of the student–teacher relationship. When explaining why he behaved in this way, he admitted to the 'dumb' nature of his actions and the reasons behind them ('*Rachel* wasn't in my thoughts,' 'I was *tired*,' '*trying* to make Karen laugh'). He considered the cell phone incident his most disrespectful act toward a teacher but he admitted he did not apologize for disrupting class, '*although*... in retrospect maybe I *should* have.' Looking back on the incident, he said the '*fact*' that he did not think about the instructor before the incident was disrespectful, but the '*fact*' that the program chair was copied on the disciplinary email 'irked' him. It appears that William believed teachers should be respected, but they are also responsible for building a student–teacher relationship that includes trust. The consistent reporting of student behavior problems to the 'higher *ups*' was a 'method of

instruction' that William strongly disagreed with and eroded the trust William believed teachers should have with students.

According to William, the lack of trust between students and instructor also inhibited classroom learning.

it got *uncomfortable*
when we'd *sit* in our small groups
and, you *always* felt like you could be open and honest
with the people that you're *with*
because you're *friends* with them
but *then* when Rachel would come over
and *sit* next to you
to find out you know what's going *on*
then you had to, go back to all right, *by* the book
and *everything* along those lines so,
and *that* was tangible
I mean you could you could *see* it (W2)

In observations, changes in group dynamics were noted during small group discussions when Rachel was present. Even when discussions were on task, students often became silent or the discussion faltered when the instructor joined the group. William felt the instructor's presence during small group discussions was '*uncomfortable*' and prevented an '*open and honest*' discussion. He emphasized that students were comfortable '*with*' each other because they were '*friends*,' but when the instructor joined them they felt compelled to go '*by the book*.' According to William, his acts of resistance in the social studies internship seminar were due mainly to the erosion of trust between the students and teacher, something he valued in the student-teacher relationship. He believed Rachel created an authoritarian culture in the classroom and used management techniques that disrupted the trust with students. By doing this, she reinforced the hegemonic hierarchy of schools and the powerlessness of students, which appeared to be why William engaged in acts of resistance in the social studies internship seminar.

Finale

Participants engaged in two types of resistance, counter and cultural. They engaged in counter resistance when they resisted content and methods that conflicted with their beliefs about the role of the teacher—teacher is the source of important knowledge, important knowledge is practical and relevant, teachers control decisions about instruction and management, teachers encourage students' ideas and opinions, teacher should teach assimilation to the dominant group, teacher is responsible for the success of all students but..., and good female teachers are caring and build relationships with students. These beliefs about the role of teachers maintain hegemony. They engaged in cultural resistance when they opposed actions by the teacher that appeared to maintain hegemony—teachers should not micro-manage classrooms and teachers should maintain trust in student-teacher relationships. Resistance can be better understood by insights into participants' ideology about education, which is explained through the connection between sociohistorical contexts and beliefs about the role of teachers. Participant ideologies are examined in chapter five.

CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to better understand student resistance by White students in a secondary social studies internship seminar for prospective teachers. Student resistance has been described as oppositional behavior by students whose cultures are not represented in classrooms and schools (Anyon, 1981; Cochran–Smith, 2004; Dance, 2004; Devine, 1996; hooks 2002; McCadden, 1998; McLaren, 1986, 2003; Miron & Lauria, 1995; Willis, 1988). More recently, however, instructors who teach classes on diversity and ethnic studies witnessed White students from the privileged group resisting the content presented in the classroom (Davis, 1992; Haddad & Lieberman, 2002; Hunter & Nettles, 1999; McFarland, 2001; Middleton, 2002). This presents a unique problem for teacher educators since the student population in many schools is becoming more diverse but the pool of prospective teachers is still predominantly from the privileged group—White, Eurocentric, female, and middle–upper class (Cochran–Smith, Davis & Fries, 2004; Gay, 1997). Resistance by prospective teachers to methods and content many teacher educators believe to be essential for effective teaching in schools, and more specifically culturally diverse schools, could result in poor teaching of culturally diverse learners and the reinforcement of hegemony in schools.

There is little research on resistance by White prospective teachers in teacher education programs, but what does exist indicates reluctance by White prospective teachers from the privileged group to change practices that they believe were effective in their own schooling (Grant & Gillette, 2006). They also have difficulty accepting criticism of their practices and hold certain biases and stereotypes about students who are members of minority groups (Grant & Gillette, 2006). Even among prospective teachers who agree that multicultural teaching is necessary, there is little understanding as to what that means or how to go about doing it (Middleton, 2002). When

classrooms teachers attempted to decenter cultural norms and teach a culturally diverse curriculum, they found this created discomfort and cognitive dissonance among students (Davis, 1992; Haddad & Lieberman, 2002; Hunter & Nettles, 1999). Their findings are confirmed in this study of student resistance engaged in by White prospective teachers.

Critical theory was used to understand what explains resistance among prospective teachers. A critical theory framework was chosen because student resistance is a concept grounded in that theory. Four participants were selected based on observations of what appeared to be resistant behavior in the social studies internship seminar. There were three observations of the class prior to selecting participants and two observations following the selection. The first three observations focused on identifying acts of resistance by students; the remaining observations focused on the four participants' interactions with the instructor, with each other, and with their peers. There were also three interviews with each participant. Interviews focused on participants' sociohistorical context, their beliefs about teachers, and explanations of their reactions to and behavior in the internship seminar. The data were presented on multiple occasions to a small group of qualitative methodology researchers (professors and doctoral students) for peer review.

Analysis began with the observation data, and Hatch's (2002) inductive analysis method was used to identify patterns of resistant behavior for the purpose of selecting participants. Once participants were selected, Fairclough's (1995) critical discourse analysis method was used to analyze interviews and observations, in order to identify the codes of Discourse that might explain the ideology of student resisters and their reasons for resisting. Codes of Discourse are the rules people follow that help them to identify with certain social groups or networks (i.e., rules of language, values, beliefs, mannerisms, interactions, gestures, symbols, tools, dress, and location). Participant interviews were analyzed individually and then compared for similar and unique codes

of Discourse, (i.e., teachers have the important knowledge, teachers control decisions about instruction and management, teachers are responsible for the success of students but...). From these codes of Discourse and the sociohistorical context of participants, the ideology of the participants emerged. The codes of Discourse were first identified as either counter or cultural resistance, and then identified as shared or unique. Of those identified as counter resistance, four were shared beliefs and three unique beliefs. All seven beliefs served to maintain and/or reproduce the hegemony of schools and classrooms. Of those identified as cultural resistance, one was a shared belief and one a unique belief, and both attempted to disrupt the hegemony of the classroom. Explaining resistant behavior using Fairclough's (1995) method of analysis requires considering the social context and histories of participants and where the resistance took place.

Explaining Resistance through Ideology

This study was designed to answer the following questions:

- What explains resistant behavior among prospective teachers in an internship seminar?
- What factors shape resistance?
 - How is resistance escalated?
 - How is resistance diminished?

Explanations for resistant behavior can be understood through participants' ideology about education. Ideology is defined in this study as political, economic, or cultural beliefs that maintain or disrupt hegemony in education or society. Examining the sociohistorical context of the participants, as presented in chapter four, and the participants' beliefs about the role of the teacher helped explain their ideologies and reasons for resistance.

Based on their sociohistorical contexts, the four participants have some similarities. They all attended predominantly White schools and had predominantly White teachers until they reached college. The communities they lived in were also predominantly White and they all

enjoyed membership in the dominant group in their communities and schools. Their secondary schools were located in middle or middle–upper class communities and offered advanced placement courses, of which all four of them took advantage. They were also all involved in extracurricular activities, specifically athletics. The differences in their sociohistorical contexts are most evident in their family lives. Both Kenneth and George had two parents with college degrees, George’s father having a Ph.D. and being employed in the education system. Henry had one parent with a college degree, and William’s mother had one year of college. Studies indicate that students with parents who have a college degree are more likely to graduate from college (American Council on Education, 2002; Sewell & Shah, 1968). With this in mind, Kenneth and George had the greatest educational advantage. William had the least advantage and this may have contributed to why he did not do as well in school (C–average grades) and why he later dropped out of college. William was also the only participant whose elementary school was located in a rural area and working class community, which may have given him less advantage academically (Anyon, 1981). The other three participants attended elementary schools similar to their secondary schools. George and Kenneth described bias in their communities against people of color (African Americans and Hmong respectively), and they both appeared to accept these biases. None of the participants were aware of the advantages they had that led to a more privileged education.

William thought his success in college was due to the military, where he gained self–discipline, but he never viewed his secondary school, with its theater, Olympic–sized pool, large resource center for students, modern gym that students could use at any time, and advanced placement courses, as an advantage. Kenneth did not recognize the role his mother played in his education—she had two master’s degrees and worked in the school system. He was unaware of

the advantage he had in an elementary school that had a computer lab and gifted and talented programs. He had the advantage of advanced placement programs and an athletic scholarship, but said his success in college was due to his working-class work ethic. Henry believed his success in college was due to self-motivation, not the health sciences magnet school he attended where he took advanced placement courses or the numerous extracurricular activities he had to choose from. His father had a master's degree and his parents encouraged him to attend college, but a state-sponsored scholarship paid for his tuition. Both of George's parents had college degrees. His father had a Ph.D. and worked as superintendent of schools, but George did not view this as an advantage. He believed his success in college was intrinsic and due more to self-motivation than the advanced placement courses he took in high school or the constant attention his parents and older siblings gave to his education. None of the participants considered the fact that money was not an issue for their families as an advantage that students in other socioeconomic groups may not have, or that the education level or knowledge of their parents helped them gain entrance into higher education. They were blind to the advantages their middle-upper class school environments gave them that are often missing in schools located in high poverty and working class communities. These advantages were invisible to them, possibly accepted as the norm, and contributed to their ideas about people and schools different from what they experienced.

The sociohistorical context of each participant, and especially their experiences in schools, helped construct their ideology. According to Fairclough (1995), ideology is often disguised as common sense and can only be uncovered by identifying the power relations the ideology attempts to maintain or disrupt. Fairclough's (1995) method of critical discourse analysis helped identify the codes of Discourse for the purpose of explaining the educational ideology of student

resisters in the internship seminar. Ideologically, all four participants believed in maintaining the hegemony of the White, Eurocentric, middle–upper class culture of schools. This should not be surprising since they were all strongly grounded in that same school and community culture. Their ideology was best explained when they defined what they perceived to be the role of the teacher. Table 6–1 represents their beliefs about the role of the teacher that helps explain their counter resistance in the classroom.

Table 6–1. Counter resistant beliefs about the role of the teacher

	William	Kenneth	Henry	George
Shared Beliefs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher is source of important knowledge • Important knowledge practical and relevant • Teacher controls decisions about instruction and management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important knowledge practical and relevant • Teacher controls decisions about instruction and management • Teacher encourages students' ideas and opinions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher is source of important knowledge • Important knowledge practical and relevant • Teacher controls decisions about instruction and management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important knowledge practical and relevant • Teacher controls decisions about instruction and management • Teacher encourages students' ideas and opinions
Unique Beliefs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good female teachers are caring and build relationships with students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher is responsible for success of all students but... 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers should teach assimilation to the dominant group

Table 6–1 organizes the counter resistant beliefs of participants by each participant and whether it is a shared or unique belief. This representation is helpful in understanding the codes of Discourse that might explain the ideology of each participant and the reasons for resistance.

Teacher is Source of Important Knowledge

William and Henry believed that teachers were the source of important knowledge, which reinforces Freire's (1993) banking method of teaching where the instructor has possession of the

knowledge and deposits it through lecture into the minds of students. At some point, the instructor withdraws the knowledge through various assessments and determines if the student has the knowledge valued by the instructor. This ideology maintains the hegemony of schools as places where knowledge from those in power, the dominant class, is passed on to students who then accept it as fact, thereby reproducing the hegemonic ideology in their own lives. Henry believed ‘the *professor’s* the chief’ and should control all aspects of the classroom, and William thought student participation in the classroom interrupted instruction, or the delivery of important knowledge. The social studies methods instructor used instructional activities, like chalk talks, small group discussions, and jigsaws, which resulted in important knowledge being shared between the students and teacher. Democratic classroom practices also support giving students a voice in the classroom, which William and Henry resisted since that would allow student knowledge a place of importance. Henry’s and William’s resistance to the content and methods of the social studies internship seminar might be due to their belief that the teacher has the important knowledge and students should not be involved in the creation of knowledge. Their ideology maintained the hegemony of the dominant group and the White, Eurocentric, middle–upper class culture of schools.

Important Knowledge is Practical and Relevant

All four participants believed the teacher education program should teach practical and relevant content, which they defined as the knowledge and skills they would need as social studies teachers. William found the lesson plans helpful because they prepared him to think like a teacher and to determine the important knowledge he would teach in the classroom. Henry thought practical and relevant content should give him knowledge to teach social studies and the language to navigate job interviews. George defined practical and relevant knowledge as the tools he needed to communicate his knowledge and ideas to students so they could comprehend

them. Kenneth believed practical and relevant knowledge was goal-oriented, and that goal was employment. The definition of important knowledge as practical and relevant—the knowledge and tools needed to gain employment as a teacher and to teach social studies—relegated content that did not meet that definition as unimportant to teaching. In the internship seminar this included content related to culturally responsive classrooms, democratic classroom practices, and a no-excuses teaching philosophy. The only participant who found this content relevant was Henry and that was because it equipped him with the educational ‘buzz words’ he needed for job interviews. Participants resisted much of the content taught in the social studies internship seminar because they perceived it as impractical, irrelevant and in opposition to their own ideology about education.

Teachers Control Decisions About Instruction and Management

The four participants also believed that teachers control decisions about instruction and management, but for different reasons. George believed teachers needed to control instruction because students have different levels of knowledge, interest, and academic ability. Because of this belief, he supported tracking in which students are placed with those of their own ability level. This not only maintains but reproduces a class culture in which those with less usually receive less. Students whose families can afford reading materials, computers, and regular vacations usually perform better academically than those who do not. George may have resisted teachings on democratic classroom practices because they opposed his fundamental belief that students are not equal. He defined democracy as a way of governance that was controlled by capitalism, in which there would naturally be an unequal distribution of wealth. George viewed knowledge and intellectual ability as naturally unequal among students but never identified what factors might contribute to this inequality. His access to schools that provided him with certain privileges, like advanced placement courses, and the fact that his father was school

superintendent did not appear to him as an advantage or privilege that influenced his own education.

Kenneth believed students should not be a part of the important decision making that occurs in classrooms and schools. He recommended a space outside of the governance of schools for students to practice active democracy. These spaces are rare, however, since even student-run newspapers and student-organized events are monitored by school administrators or teachers. Kenneth said schools were not created to include students in the decision-making, so finding a separate space within this exclusionary structure would be difficult. Like George, Kenneth may have resisted democratic classroom practices because they would give students a voice and power in the decisions about instruction and management of classrooms and schools, and he believed that violated the role of the teacher.

Henry said chaos would result if students were included in decisions about instruction or management. He believed the '*teacher's* in charge' and viewed himself as a 'benevolent dictator,' which he thought an appropriate approach to classroom management. Any dictator, benevolent or tyrannical, is still a dictator and works to maintain his own power and the hegemony that reproduces that power. Henry admitted that he did not read the material for the social studies internship seminar, but his belief in the teacher as the benevolent dictator would contradict democratic classroom practices and may have resulted in resistant behavior. Henry equated democracy with chaos, or anarchy, which is why he believed classrooms needed to be dictatorships, where teachers ruled as dictators. He did not view students as having the compassion or intelligence to engage in the governance of classrooms. Based on his view of democratic classroom practices, he defined students as lawless, unruly creatures who would take any opportunity to participate in the governance of classrooms as an opportunity for inflicting

damage and creating chaos. His belief that democracy was equivalent to chaos defined his belief about the role of teachers as dictators.

William was uncomfortable in any classroom setting that was not the traditional lecture format with rows of desks where students absorbed the important knowledge of the teacher. His belief in teaching as a passionate performance reinforced his need for instructional methods and classroom management that controlled the instruction and the movement of students. William resisted democratic classroom practices and methods used in the social studies internship seminar because they opposed his belief that teachers control decisions about instruction and management. The belief that teachers control decisions about instruction and management in classrooms maintains the hegemony of schools as places where the movement and activities of students are controlled because students are considered too immature and irrational to understand how schools function or to participate in the administration of classrooms.

Teachers Encourage Students' Ideas and Opinions

George and Kenneth believed teachers should encourage students' ideas and opinions in the classroom, which appears to contradict their belief that teachers control decisions about instruction and management. The value they placed on students' ideas and opinions, however, was directly connected with the belief that *their* ideas and opinions should be asserted in the classroom. Kenneth valued his own voice in the classroom as the most important but did not value the perspectives of others even though he believed they should be shared. His resistance in the internship seminar might be explained by the methods used for discussion (like chalk talks) that prevented any one voice from being asserted as dominant. George valued his own ideas and opinions and thought they should be welcomed in the classroom, but did not want them challenged. He enjoyed debate but was not open to critical reflection. His resistance might be due to his perception that productive discussion (debate) did not take place in the classroom and

when it did, his ideas were marginalized. This belief that teachers should encourage students' ideas and opinions in the classroom maintained hegemony because Kenneth and George believed some ideas were more valuable than others and should be asserted more prominently. The absence of critical reflection and valuing of other perspectives also helps maintain hegemony. This Discourse reflected an ideology that gave power to some voices and not to others.

Teachers Should Teach Assimilation to the Dominant Group

The three unique Discourses served to maintain the hegemony of the privileged class in very specific ways. George believed teachers should teach assimilation to the dominant group and not follow the teachings of culturally responsive classrooms or multicultural education, which may have explained his resistance in the social studies internship seminar where these ideas were taught. He believed teachers should teach similarities between different cultures and not focus on differences; however, he also believed schools should reflect the culture of the community. If the dominant religion in a community was Christian, George believed Christianity should be reflected in the school whether or not there were students and families whose religious beliefs differed from the dominant religion. He claimed he wanted teachers to teach similarities between cultures but supported teaching assimilation to the dominant culture. This ideology reinforces the hegemony of the White, Eurocentric, middle–upper class culture of schools and could be detrimental to students whose cultures differ.

Teacher is Responsible for Success of all Students But...

Kenneth resisted the content in the social studies internship seminar that focused on a no–excuses teaching philosophy. He believed teachers could not expect all students to succeed because there were circumstances outside of their control, like an unsupportive home life or a lack of academic ability on the part of the student. While he said teachers should always make an effort, he also believed others could be blamed for the failure of students and expected some of

his students to perform poorly. This belief was based on his definition of schools as capitalist societies where some students will naturally have more advantages and intellectual ability than others. He did not take into consideration the political, economic and social factors in place that produce an unequal and inequitable education system, like the level of unemployment or underemployment in a community and how that directly affects the funding of schools. His ideology maintains a power structure in which students from a higher socioeconomic group are likely to excel because they have the supports in place to help ensure their success, whereas less economically advantaged students may not have those supports, but the socioeconomic factors are invisible to him. Furthermore, his ideology encourages teachers to reproduce that power structure by providing them with excuses for students who fail.

Good Female Teachers are Caring and Build Relationships with Students

What appeared to be the only obvious Discourse on gender bias was William's belief that good female teachers are caring and build relationships with students. He applied these attributes to two female teachers that he liked but not to the instructor of the social studies internship seminar. He also did not apply this to any of the male teachers who taught the classes he liked. His resistance in the social studies internship seminar may have been due in part to the instructor not fulfilling his belief that good female teachers are caring and build relationships with students.

The counter resistance codes of Discourse indicate that all four participants followed an ideology based on the culture of the White, Eurocentric, middle–upper class, which is also their own culture. William added the element of 'male' to that ideology based on his belief that female teachers are caring and build relationships with students. Their resistance in the social studies internship seminar might be explained by the instructor's content (i.e., culturally responsive pedagogy, democratic classroom practices, a no–excuses teaching philosophy) and methods (i.e., small group discussions, chalk talks, and jigsaws) that decentered the White, Eurocentric,

middle–upper classroom culture, with which they identified. Their resistance might also be explained by their belief that knowledge should be practical and relevant, and by that they meant a teacher–education program should teach the knowledge and tools necessary for teaching social studies and finding employment.

The codes of Discourse related to cultural resistance were not as numerous, yet they were important for explaining why resistance escalated. Cultural resistance in the classroom occurs when the instructor attempts to maintain hegemony in the classroom and participants resist her actions. The cultural resistant codes of Discourse are shown in Table 6–2.

Table 6–2. Cultural resistance beliefs about the role of the teacher

	William	Kenneth
Shared Beliefs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers should not micro–manage classrooms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers should not micro–manage classrooms
Unique Beliefs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers should maintain trust in student–teacher relationships 	

Table 6–2 organizes the cultural resistance beliefs of two participants and whether they were shared or unique beliefs. This representation is helpful in understanding the ideology of each participant and possible explanations for their resistance. These beliefs are considered cultural resistance because the teacher is maintaining hegemony through her position of power and students are acting in ways to disrupt hegemony.

Teachers should not Micro–manage Classrooms

William and Kenneth believed the social studies internship seminar was too strict and rigid in its structure. They both agreed that the instructor micro–managed the class and was more intent on following her agenda than taking time to consider the needs of her students. Observations confirmed that the instructor did follow a strict time schedule for classroom activities and often ended them when students were fully engaged. Rachel also recognized her role in directing discussion so the less dominant students would have an opportunity to share

their ideas and knowledge. Participants did not object to the way she led discussions, but more to the way she restricted discussion by putting a time limit on it. They also said she taught the class as if they were middle school students, and Kenneth cited the notebooks as a way of organization that might be used in middle school but was inappropriate for graduate students. Rachel said she had been accused of micro-managing students and changed her expectations for the notebook to help alleviate that problem.

Participants' beliefs about the role of the teacher may have influenced their belief that they were being micro-managed. William's belief that good female teachers are caring and build relationships with students may have contributed to his resistance since he would probably not define a female teacher who micro-managed instruction as caring. Kenneth's belief that students should be encouraged to share ideas and opinions may also have contributed to the resistance since the instructor's focus on completing her agenda often ended activities involving student discussion. The instructor's use of instructional management that strictly followed her agenda and did not consider the immediate needs of students in the classroom created an imbalance of power. This did not appear to be her intention, but it emphasizes the contradictions teachers might experience between what they believe is effective teaching and what they actually do in the classroom. Although Rachel voiced a commitment to democratic classroom practices, she sometimes acted in ways that violated them, which helped to maintain hegemony in the classroom. The instructor's actions may have served to escalate resistance in the social studies internship seminar.

Teachers should Maintain Trust in Student-Teacher Relationships

William also believed the instructor acted in ways to erode the trust that he believed teachers should maintain in the student-teacher relationship. William had a class in the fall with the social studies methods instructor, and he said she would report to college administrators what

she perceived as misbehavior by students. This was usually done through a disciplinary email in which she would copy the program chair or the associate director of the department. The use of emails for this purpose was confirmed by all four participants and through conversations with instructors in the program. William may have resisted this disciplinary method because he believed female teachers are caring and build relationships with students, and this method of discipline would hinder building good relationships. The instructor's actions, however, attempted to maintain her authority as teacher and the hegemony of the classroom. William believed trust between teachers and students should be part of the culture of the classroom, but the instructor acted in ways that violated his cultural belief. He said this was the main reason he engaged in oppositional behavior in the social studies internship seminar.

Escalating and Diminishing Resistance

There is some evidence that resistance was escalated due to the actions of the instructor. Whether different actions by the instructor would have diminished resistance is not evident from this study mainly because there was no evidence that resistance had diminished. Throughout the observations and the interviews, the resistance by participants to the content and methods used in the internship seminar was consistent and ongoing. It appeared that challenges to participants' ideologies led to their resistance.

Louis Althusser said, "the school... teaches 'know-how', but in forms which ensure *subjection to the ruling ideology* or the mastery of its 'practice'." (1971, p. 133). Schools teach academic and social knowledge that reinforce the ideology of the dominant group. This is evident in William's and Henry's belief in Freire's (1993) banking system of education in which teachers decide what knowledge is important and students passively accept that knowledge. It is also evident in the participants' belief that teachers control decisions about instruction and management, which reinforces the ideology that children are immature and undisciplined and,

therefore, unable to be part of important decision-making. Participants' sociohistorical context, especially their experiences in schools, contributed to their mastering the ideology of the dominant group. As classroom teachers, they are equipped to ensure the subjection of their own students to the "ruling ideology" (Althusser, 1971, p. 133). Disrupting the reproduction of hegemonic ideology might require teacher educators to reconceptualize student resistance and reconsider how they address resistance in the classroom.

Extending the Literature

Findings in this study extend the literature base regarding how resistance is defined, student resistance in college classrooms and teacher education, and the connection between sociohistorical context and beliefs about teaching. These ideas will be discussed and then implications for teacher educators and the research community presented.

Redefining Resistance

Critical theorists frame resistance as actions intended to bring about long-term, far-reaching political change resulting in the emancipation of oppressed populations (Adorno, 1984; Gramsci, 1971; Habermas, 1991; Horkheimer, 1972; Lukács, 1989; Marcuse, 1991; Marx, 2005). Critical resistance is motivated by social injustice and requires what Freire (1993) calls conscientization. Conscientization requires critical inquiry and self-reflection to determine the reasons for hegemony and then transformative action to liberate the oppressed from hegemony. Cultural resistance is also motivated by social injustice but occurs in schools and classrooms where the White, Eurocentric, middle-upper class culture of schools conflicts with the cultural lives of students who are not members of this group (Anyon, 1981; Dance, 2004; Delpit, 1996; hooks, 2002; McCadden, 1998; McLaren, 1986; Willis, 1988). Cultural resisters do not always practice the critical inquiry or self-reflection necessary for conscientization, but that does not lessen the importance of their actions. Students who engage in cultural resistance are expressing

their sense of inequity or injustice in the classroom or school. The overall purpose of cultural resistance may not be broad, long-term change but liberation from hegemony in classrooms and schools.

Counter resistance is a term I created based on studies of resistance engaged in by students in the dominant group, including participants in this study. Counter resistance is motivated by a desire to maintain hegemony and works against critical examination and reflection. Researchers concluded that students from the dominant group experienced cognitive dissonance when their beliefs were contradicted by culturally responsive content (Grant & Gillette, 2006; Haddad & Lieberman, 2002). When Whiteness was decentered by the instructor, White students often worked to recenter it in the classroom, and thereby reinforce their own beliefs and maintain hegemony (Davis, 1992; Hunter & Nettles, 1999; Middleton, 2002). Critical theorists define hegemony as control by the dominant group over oppressed groups through the control of politics, economics, culture and education (Gramsci, 1971). White students who act in ways to maintain hegemony cannot be engaging in resistance since resistance has the goal of disrupting hegemony. There are, admittedly, contradictions and overlaps in the three categories of resistance described in this study. However, the use of counter resistance to describe students from the dominant group who oppose teachers who attempt to disrupt hegemony extends the literature base by presenting a new way of viewing resistance by members of the privileged group.

Student Resistance in College Classrooms and Teacher Education

As noted previously, teachers who decenter cultural norms and teach a culturally diverse curriculum found that students from the dominant group resisted the content taught and the critical examination and self-reflection used to uncover hegemony (Davis, 1992; Grant & Gillette, 2006; Haddad & Lieberman, 2002; Hunter & Nettles, 1999; Middleton, 2002). Davis

(1992) found that her students engaged in counter resistance because their lives at home contradicted what was being taught in her classroom. This study confirmed her findings but increased the importance of school experiences as factors that influence the cultural beliefs of college students. This study also confirms Hunter's and Nettles' (1999) finding that students thought they were being victimized because they were White and conservative. George claimed he was being marginalized because his conservative beliefs conflicted with the beliefs taught in the education program. Middleton (2002) found students in her study agreed that multicultural education was important but were unable to comprehend what attitudes and skills were necessary for effective teaching in culturally diverse classrooms. Interviews with participants in this study revealed they were also unable to understand the attitudes and skills needed. Henry said it was common sense not to marginalize students but was unable to see how his own beliefs about teaching (the teacher has the important knowledge and controls decisions about instruction and management) could prevent culturally responsive teaching. Students from non-dominant groups might feel uncomfortable and marginalized in a classroom where they can not share their knowledge or are restricted to teacher-centered instruction and management. William held the same beliefs as Henry and said he established his sixth-grade classroom to support lecture-based instruction and management, which would exclude students from cultures that value social learning. He did not appear to understand the connection between his beliefs about teaching and the need for culturally diverse classrooms.

Most studies of counter resistance are self-studies in which the researchers were also instructors of the courses they studied. Self-studies provide valuable information but might be hindered by the fact that the instructor/researcher is also in the position of assigning students' grades. In my study, I was not an instructor in the course or the program, and only one of the

students in the course took a class I taught two years earlier. He was not one of the participants in this study. None of the studies on counter resistance cited here included interviews with students. Interviews can provide rich data that would be difficult to collect through classroom observations, group discussions, and assignments. This study contributes to the literature a richer, deeper analysis of the phenomenon of resistance in an internship seminar.

Sociohistorical Context and Beliefs about Teaching

Sociohistorical context has always been important to how resistance is defined (Anyon, 1981; Dance, 2004; Delpit, 1996; hooks, 2002; McLaren, 2003; Miron & Lauria, 1995). However, this definition is nearly always applied to students from cultures that are not the privileged culture. Davis (1992) included students' home lives as influencing their resistant acts in the classroom, but there are no other studies of student resistance among prospective teachers that take sociohistorical context into account. There are no studies of prospective teachers in social studies teacher education programs that consider the link between sociohistorical context and teacher beliefs. All four participants' beliefs about teaching were influenced by their families, the schools they attended, and their communities. However, the schools they attended probably influenced their beliefs about teaching more than family or community since their beliefs about the role of teachers is based on their experiences in schools. This insight highlights the role of K–12 schools and undergraduate college courses in training future teachers. The participants in this study established their beliefs about teachers and teaching throughout their experiences as students in schools. The teachers in their K–12 and undergraduate college experience that were most influential provided them with role models for teaching that were internalized. Henry's and William's belief that lecture was the best instruction method was based on their experience in classrooms with lecturers they admired as teachers. This study extends Lortie's (1975) concept of the apprenticeship of observation.

This study extends the literature through redefining resistance when oppositional behavior is engaged in by members of the dominant group, and through a deeper, richer analysis of why resistance occurs in teacher education classrooms. It also creates new avenues for research through the connections between sociohistorical context and teacher beliefs.

Implications

The findings of this study can not be used to generalize to the population of White, Eurocentric, middle–upper class prospective teachers. Participants in this study were selected specifically because of the oppositional behavior they engaged in during an internship seminar. Despite these limitations, the findings do have implications for teacher educators and the research community.

Implications for Teacher Educators

Understanding the explanations for participants' counter resistance in an internship seminar is helpful to teacher educators as they plan teacher education programs and courses that incorporate methods and content that decenter the ideology of the dominant group. As indicated in the conclusions, participants had similar sociohistorical contexts, which helped explain the beliefs they had about the role of teachers. Knowing the sociohistorical contexts of prospective teachers might better prepare teacher educators for challenges to methods and content that could conflict with prospective teacher beliefs.

Giving prospective teachers the opportunity to explore their beliefs by examining controversial issues in education (i.e., ethnicity/race, multicultural education, socioeconomic status, poverty, gender, sexual identity, age, and religion) in a non–threatening environment could help them learn the importance of critical consciousness and self–reflection in their future work as teachers. Teacher educators can accomplish this by using democratic classroom practices to create a safe, reflective environment in which students can safely voice their beliefs.

These conditions foster a dialogue in which teacher educators help students reflect on their beliefs through the use of content that presents differing perspectives through personal stories of dominance and the use of relevant data. Personal stories of dominance are the stories of oppressed people that help those from the privileged group better understand hegemony in society (e.g., *Hear Us Out: Commentary by Youth on School and Society* from What Kids Can Do or “Finding Words to Talk About Race” by Maria Luisa Tucker posted at <http://www.alternet.org/story/30755/>). Combined with data that support the experiences of the storyteller, the teacher educator has a very powerful tool in helping students from the privileged group understand their own privileged positions, which might lead to disrupting hegemony.

Disturbing beliefs is not an easy task but is essential before some prospective teachers will accept and master the methods and content that result in highly effective instruction. Teacher educators need to pay closer attention to the vociferous complaints and deafening silences in which prospective teachers engage when their beliefs conflict with the beliefs necessary for effective teaching. Their unwillingness to be disturbed must be addressed in ways that will promote dialogue and collegiality and reduce resistance. Before this can happen, however, teacher educators need to have their own beliefs disturbed. They need to enter into dialogue with colleagues for the purpose of reflecting on their own biases and hegemonic beliefs. They need to experience Freire’s (1993) conscientization to be fully prepared to help their students do the same. The move toward full emancipation from hegemonic influences requires constant critical inquiry and self–reflection—it is a process that happens over time and we must expect the same of ourselves and our students.

Teacher educators need to make better connections between effective teaching practices and what they might look like in the classroom. Participants in this study considered as irrelevant

those courses in the social studies program that included effective teaching practices. Participants thought courses were practical and relevant when they taught knowledge and tools they would need as social studies teachers. They apparently did not make the connection between what was taught in the education courses and the decisions they would make as teachers. According to Middleton (2002), prospective teachers who agreed that multicultural education was important still had difficulty understanding what attitudes and skills were necessary for effective teaching in culturally diverse classrooms. It is imperative that teacher educators examine this discrepancy so they can structure courses that will clarify the connection between effective teaching practices and what those practices might look like in the classroom. Engaging prospective teachers in methods like interactive notebooks or chalk talks is important but needs to be followed by questions about why and when the methods would be used. For example, which students would benefit most from chalk talks? How might the workload of grading assignments be reduced by using interactive notebooks? What are other ways to help students organize their work and think critically about what they are learning? Which students would benefit most from the interactive notebook? These types of questions might help prospective teachers better understand the method as an effective teaching practice for diverse learners.

The obvious, yet impossible, solution to counter resistance is to recruit students into teacher education programs who already have the dispositions necessary to implement effective teaching in diverse classrooms. Teacher educators, however, are often pressured by administrators and state and local education agencies to provide teachers regardless of their dispositions on teaching (Grant & Gillette, 2006). Regardless, it would be advantageous to teacher educators and colleges of education to create networks with instructors who teach to disrupt hegemony for the purpose of recruiting prospective teachers. Educational foundations

courses might be a place where potential teacher candidates could be identified. In my experience teaching a social foundations of education course in which the ideology of the dominant group was decentered, I had a number of students who chose a career in teaching. Two of them had test scores and GPAs that might have prevented them from entering the master's program in teacher education. Their dialogue and written work in my course, however, convinced me they had the dispositions to teach in diverse communities and only needed further teacher education to prepare them for a career in teaching. I wrote strong letters of recommendation, and they were both accepted and completed the program successfully.

Implications for the Research Community

This study also has implications for the research community in terms of identifying what aspects of the study might warrant further investigation. Participants' perspectives are represented in this study; however, the role of the instructor in resistance is also important and warrants further research. William conveyed how the social studies methods instructor acted in ways that violated the trust he believed necessary in student–teacher relationships. This resulted in his engagement in acts of resistance. He and Kenneth also said the micro–management of the class by the instructor created an environment in which learning was interrupted. It would be helpful for teachers who teach to disrupt hegemony to better understand how their actions might escalate or diminish resistance in the classroom. Observations of and interviews with the instructor in addition to the students might provide important data for furthering the study of counter resistance. A study of pedagogy that is more sensitive to the points of resistance might help teacher educators refine their instruction so as to promote critical inquiry and self–reflection.

This study used critical theory as the framework and thematic and critical discourse analyses as the methods for analyzing data. Using a different methodology might result in a

better understanding of counter resistance. Cynthia Tyson's (2006) emancipatory research methodology would allow researchers to not only collect data to better understand counter resistance but also engage prospective teachers in dialogue to promote critical inquiry and self-reflection about hegemony in classrooms and schools. Emancipatory research methodology echoes the medical directive of "do no harm" in that patients (participants) are not left to their (social) illnesses (i.e., biases based on race, gender, social class, age, sexual identity) when relief (a solution) is possible. Tyson (2006) applies this methodology specifically to critical race theory and studies of race, but identifies two actions necessary for emancipatory research work.

First, we must systematically and consciously resist the injustices of racism. Second, we must work constructively to improve the ways in which racism surfaces in the vocalized assumptions of those in power. In essence, we simultaneously attack the causes and heal the effects. (Tyson, 2006, p. 44)

Critical theory not only requires that we understand the impact of hegemony—who benefits and who is harmed—but also that we take action to help change those structures (Crotty, 1998; Freire, 1993; Tyson, 2006). Further research using emancipatory research methodology would allow researchers engaged in critical theory to take steps with their participants that might result in the disruption of hegemony. A study of this type would allow the researcher and participants take actions that might protect and benefit oppressed groups in their classrooms and schools. According to Tyson (2006), "if we are to engage in emancipatory research, we must stop trying to benefit ourselves and engage in the process of researching for the greater good of our communities" (p. 46). Further research on counter resistance using emancipatory research methodology might help educators to not only better understand the explanations for resistance, but might also help explain what diminishes resistance.

Student resistance in college of education classrooms is becoming an important issue in education as more studies are being done to examine this phenomenon. The dominant culture of

schools, based on the White, Eurocentric, middle-class culture, is reproduced in schools by teachers whose actions in the classroom maintain hegemony. Teacher educators need to find ways to promote critical inquiry and self-reflection among prospective teachers for the purpose of helping them teach for social justice. Teachers whose actions disrupt hegemony work to promote social justice in their classrooms and schools. While this study can not be generalized to other students, classrooms, or schools, it can be considered a beginning in countering the reproductive mechanism that currently prevents schools and society from disrupting the hegemony that guides their practices. As teacher educators, our willingness to be disturbed is necessary before we can guide students down the same road.

APPENDIX A
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Student Interview One

For the first interview, participants' were asked to describe their experiences in elementary, middle and high school. They were also asked to describe their families and communities where they grew up.

Questions about schools:

- Did you attend a private or public school?
- If private, who paid for your school?
- Were you in any special programs at the elementary school?
- What was the building like?
- What kinds of resources were available to you? (library, materials available in the classroom, music, art, athletics, AP courses, magnet program, etc.)
- What were the teachers like?
- How did they influence you as a student?
- What were the students like?
- How did they influence your education?
- Who were some of your best friends?
- What were the demographics of the teacher and student population?

Questions about family:

- How would you classify your family/guardians—working class, middle class, upper class? Why do you classify them in this way?
- Did your parents/guardians attend college? Did they graduate?
- What career fields are they in?
- How did they influence you as a student?

Questions about community:

- What were the demographics of the community where you grew up?
- What was the approximate population?
- What ethnic groups comprised your community?
- Was it urban, suburban or rural?

Student Interviews Two and Three

The second and third interviews were based on responses from the first interviews and observations in the classroom.

- Tell me about teachers and/or classes you especially liked and disliked. What did you like about these classes? What content was taught? What teaching methods were used?
- What has the social studies internship seminar been studying?
- Tell me about something you've read recently for the class. What do you think of it?
- What does the class seem to be about? What are the themes you notice?
- What is it like for you to attend this class?
- Is this class important for people who intend to become teachers? If so, why? If not, why not?

There were also a series of "I noticed..." questions in which I stated something I noticed that happened in the classroom or that they said in the previous interview. I presented the event or statement and asked for the participant's assessment of and reaction to it. Examples of these questions are below.

- In class, you said you weren't sure if active democracy could be taught in schools. Can you expand on that?
- You walked into class and the desks were in rows instead of grouped. You said, "Thank you! Desks in rows—a real classroom!" Can you explain what you meant by that statement?
- In class, you often appeared frustrated and bored. You would often put your head down on your desk or hold your head in your hands and look down at the desk. You appeared to mentally check out of the class and, at one point, had your back to the instructor while she was lecturing. Can you tell me what you might have been thinking during these times?

APPENDIX B
SOCIAL STUDIES INTERNSHIP SEMINAR ASSIGNED READINGS

The following is a list of reading materials assigned in the social studies methods course.

The readings were assigned so students did not read every reading but shared what they read with their group.

- Clark, R. (2004). *Excellent 11*. New York: Hyperion.
- Corwin, M. (2001). *And still we rise: The trials and triumphs of twelve gifted inner-city students*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Cushman, K. (2003). *Fires in the bathroom: Advice for teachers from high school students*. New York: The New Press.
- Johnston, M. (2003). *In the deep heart's core*. New York: Grove Atlantic.
- Ladson-Billings, G.L. (1997). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mitchie, G. (2004). *See you when we get there: Teaching for change in urban schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Corbett, H.D. (2003). *Effort and excellence in urban classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press. (Chapter 2, The Different Meanings of “All Children Can Succeed”)
- Villegas, A.M. & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach*. New York: SUNY Press. (Chapter 4, Modeling the Practice of Culturally Responsive Teaching)
- Scheruich, J.J. & Skrla, L. (2003). *Leadership for equity and excellence*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press. (Chapter 2, Learning to Believe the Dream is Possible, and chapter 4, Instruction and Classroom Climate)
- Parker, W. (2003). *Teaching democracy*. New York: Teachers College Press. (Chapter 2, Democracy and Difference)
- What Kids Can Do, Inc. (2004, October). *Students as allies in improving their schools: A report on work in progress*. New York: What Kids Can Do, Inc.
- What Kids Can Do, Inc. (2002, May). *Taking democracy in hand: Youth action for educational change in the San Francisco Bay area*. New York: What Kids Can Do, Inc.

- Marri, A.R. (2005). Building a framework for classroom-based multicultural democratic education: Learning from three skilled teachers. *Teachers College Record*, 107(5), 1036–1059.

APPENDIX C HENRY'S CASE STUDY

Resistance often occurs because a student's lived experience is not represented in schools or classrooms (Giroux, 2001; McLaren, 1986). A student's beliefs about schools and education are based on the sociohistorical context of schools. The study of student resistance using critical discourse analysis needs to consider the context of family, community and school; discourse does not happen in a vacuum, it is influenced by individual and group history and by the context of the event where the discourse takes place (Fairclough, 1995; Gee, 1999). To better understand the resistance engaged in by the four participants, it is necessary to consider the sociohistorical context of their lives, specifically their lives in schools. For this reason, interviews focused on participants' school experiences, what they liked and disliked, and how this influenced their beliefs about teaching and education and their acts of resistance in the classroom.

Sociohistorical Context of a Resister

Henry spent the first ten years of his life in the suburbs of a large Midwestern urban area. His father had a master's degree and was an editor for a building magazine. His mother was a high school graduate and worked as a realtor. Henry considered his family middle class and said the neighborhood where he lived was "one hundred percent White" (H1). His limited memories of his elementary school were that the school and teachers were nice, the music teacher was very boisterous, he had art, music and physical education, and the predominant teaching method was direct instruction. Henry said he was an auditory learner and remembered much of the lectures so direct instruction worked well for him. His most memorable events at his elementary school were the fights on the playground. He said, "Our play area was huge and we basically ran around there fighting. I got in a few fights, but it was what you did on the playground back [there]" (H1).

When his family moved to a smaller city in the southeastern United States, Henry was disappointed by the time allowed for recess compared to the school he came from: “We had an hour for recess, lunch recess, and that was a long recess, and when I got here it was only fifteen minutes, so it was pretty ridiculous” (H1). He was also disappointed by the response to student fights: “I remember seeing fights and students were immediately suspended so they had much less freedom. But I remember thinking that was interesting and how much recess sucked here compared to where I came from” (H1).

Henry’s new neighborhood was predominantly White with a small percentage of Black and Hispanic residents, and it was more upper class than middle class. The middle school was team oriented and used cooperative learning and Henry said he “wasn’t a huge fan... they weren’t really well organized, but I had a pretty good middle school education” (H1). He said he remembered all his teachers but none of them were “particularly mind–blowing... they’re all just decent teachers” (H1). When asked if there were any teachers who influenced him, Henry questioned the environment of middle school as a place where students can be strongly influenced by teachers. He said, “How can you really inspire a 12–year–old or 13–year–old because, me personally, I don’t see it, you’re too young, you’re evolving and changing into an adult and you don’t really remember a lot” (H1). For Henry, middle school students were not at an age to be influenced by their teachers.

The high school Henry attended was not the one he was zoned for; he was enrolled in a health sciences magnet program in a large high school outside his district. He planned on becoming a doctor but said the magnet program “completely altered my perspective” due to the intensity of the program and his concern about “burn out” in the highly stressful medical intern programs (H1). In addition to the academic demands of the advanced placement classes in the

magnet program, Henry was on the football and weightlifting teams, in the band, and active in drama. His decision to go to college was based on his belief that education is important and because he was “very self-motivated... academics always came pretty easy to me” (H1). His parents did put some pressure on him to attend college but allowed him to make the final decision. Henry graduated in the top ten percent of his class, which earned him a state sponsored four-year college scholarship. He was accepted at a large southeastern university and earned a Bachelor’s degree in history. He then applied to and was accepted in the Social Studies Secondary Education Master’s Program at the same university.

Henry had the advantages of socioeconomic status and at least one parent who graduated from college and both parents who encouraged him to go to college. He believed his success in school, however, was due more to self-motivation than the influence of his parents or his teachers. His elementary years appeared to reflect the education of the middle class but his secondary years prepared him for a more privileged education, specifically his enrollment in the magnet program and advanced placement courses and his extracurricular activities. He did not appear to view these as advantages but simply a series of events in his life. Henry grew up in a White, Eurocentric, middle class environment for his elementary years and a White, Eurocentric, upper class privileged environment for middle and high school. Examining more closely the college classes he liked and those he disliked might help clarify his beliefs about teaching and his acts of resistance.

Foundations of Resistance: Beliefs about Good Teaching

If resistant behavior occurs in classrooms where a student’s lived experience is not represented, then Henry’s resistance might be explained by the disconnect between what he believed was good teaching and what he experienced in the internship seminar. Henry’s beliefs about teaching and education are best understood through his descriptions of the courses and

instructors he liked best and least. He described three aspects of good teaching that he believed were important: the teacher was a passionate performer, the teacher controlled all knowledge in the classroom, and methods and content were relevant and practical.

Henry's favorite college classes were in his major program—history. He said he liked the courses, “Caribbean History” and “Twentieth Century German History,” for their rigor and the instructional style of the professors. According to Henry, both professors were British and used lecture exclusively.

they made the, the *lectures* were fun to go to
for one they were *interesting* (I: *mhmm*)
because they're *dynamic* lecturers

[the Caribbean history course] was a very *intense* course
all *lecture* based
and, he was a very *dynamic* professor
he didn't take any crap
so, like *half* the kids dropped his class
he was *extremely* academic
and *extremely* elite... (H2)

Henry's description of the two courses often overlapped. He enjoyed both professors for the same reasons and emphasized (in italics) their '*dynamic*' and '*interesting*' '*lectures*.' He described the Caribbean history course as '*intense*' and the professor as one who would not '*take any crap*' off students so '*half*' of the students dropped the class. He also described the professor as '*extremely* academic' and '*extremely* elite.' According to Henry, one student who dropped the course returned to reprimand the professor for not teaching anything of value. Henry said this student would sit in the back of the class and make '*ridiculous comments*' (H1).

(I: *did anybody in the class make intelligent comments?*)

yeah there was uh *intelligent* questions [from students]
and *discussions*
and *naturally* he asked questions
and like to make sure you know, you were following *along* with him
but, there were *no* slides

no PowerPoints
no visuals
just *one* hundred percent write down what he said

(I: *but you said that he did ask questions, right?*)

he would like ask us what we *thought* the issue might be
and then he'd actually *tell* us what it would be (H2)

Henry said students asked '*intelligent* questions' and that there were '*discussions*.' The professor's questions, however, were a natural ('*naturally*') part of the class to 'make sure' students were 'following *along*' with the professor's thinking. The fact that there was '*no*' visual support for the lectures made the professor's words more important ('*one* hundred percent')—the professor was the focus of learning. The questions asked by the professor did not appear to be for the purpose of hearing different perspectives but to dismiss the ones that did not agree with the professor's line of thinking. After asking their '*thought[s]*' he would '*tell*' them the correct answer. This was emphasized even more strongly when Henry mimicked a classroom scenario.

all right so *let's* give an example
it would be like
"why do you think that,
why do you think that,
well *what* do you think caused the Spanish–American war of 1898?
what do you think caused this?"
and he'd be like "*what* are the possible causes?"
and *we'd* like possibly give causes
and *he'd* be like "no well that's not correct"
and *then* like *we'd* like have a discussion on what possible causes
like "well *here* they are,
here's the *four* causes you need to know"
and he'd *give* 'em to us,
that's like an audible and like "you'd better write this *down*
'cause it's gonna' be on the *test*"

(I: *was there any discussion as to why they were wrong?*)

yeah he'd *tell* you like
"that's not really *relevant* to the situation because"
then he'd *give* you a situation...

and then when we'd *finished* the discussion
"here's the four main causes"

(I: *the basic idea in his teaching was that he had all the knowledge*)

yep

(I: *and he was going to give it to students*)

yep, yep

(I: *and students didn't have any knowledge so you needed to make sure that they had it*)

it's *college*...

that's what it's *supposed* to be in college

it's a university 4000 level *course*

there's no uh *student* input

there's *research*

and there's, *understanding* (H2)

In this excerpt, the professor is in control of important knowledge. Henry emphasized how the professor would ask 'what' and 'why' and student ('we'd') responses were met with the professor ('he'd') correcting their thinking. 'Then' the professor would 'give' students the answers he wanted them to remember ('four causes you need to know') and students would 'write' them 'down' in preparation for the 'test.' The discussion did not appear to be a sharing of ideas but more an opportunity for the professor to 'tell' and 'give' his ideas and knowledge. If there were other possibly correct responses to his questions that he did not feel were 'relevant,' he would dismiss them. Henry affirmed that the professor's objective was to establish himself as the one who had all the knowledge and Henry thought that was appropriate in a 'college' classroom. He emphasized (italics) that is what 'college' was 'supposed' to be—students doing 'research' and gaining 'understanding' but not having any 'input' in their own education.

Based on his statements, Henry believed good teachers were dynamic lecturers and controlled the knowledge in the classroom. When asked later to elaborate on teachers as dynamic lecturers, he said,

*I see teaching as an art
it's a—you are on stage
it's a performance
it's a it's a glorious art (H3)*

Henry emphasized his ('*I*') belief that the teacher ('*you*') engages in a '*performance*' that is '*glorious*.' The classroom becomes the 'stage' where teachers perform, which would mean students are the audience, they view the performance but do not actively partake in their own learning—their role is to receive the teacher's performance. This is similar to William's belief that teachers are passionate performers. Henry extended the idea of performance to the interview by using a British accent with dramatic flair when quoting the British professors. The interview took place in a moderately crowded coffee shop, which did not appear to affect his behavior and he was either unaware of inquisitive looks from neighboring customers or did not mind them. He was observed to use a dramatic flair in most of his communications during interviews and in the internship seminar.

Henry's belief that teachers perform and students are the audience supported the second of his beliefs about teaching—that the teacher holds all the knowledge.

*the professor's the chief
and has the basic knowledge
discussion is, takes place in class
but ultimately it comes back to
the professor's responsible for what's being taught in that course*

*if any incorrect information is, is learned by my students,
the buck stops with me (I: yeah)
that's why the professor is ultimately in charge
and responsible for all learning that takes place
so in the discussion he is the moderator
he is the director
he is the one who's leading it in the direction he needs to go
if students have prior knowledge
if students have questions
you use that discussion to advance your own lecture
that's the way—you're advancing the point
directing this point delivered to the student*

because you *know* what you're delivering,
if you allow random ad hoc *comments* well,
and uh *you* don't know where that train's going
if *you* don't know where the train's going
it could lead *right* off the cliff into the ocean
it woul—with uh *discussion*
and *input*
and *student* uh input
and *student* uh prior knowledge
that merely speeds up the train
cause *you* know the destination (H3)

Henry described the professor as a 'chief,' 'moderator,' 'director,' leader, and conductor, which are all terms that hold control and power. The professor '*has* (or owns) the basic knowledge' and is '*ultimately*' responsible for what is taught. Henry applied this description of the professor to his own classroom when he said, 'the *buck* stops with me.' He based his own teaching on how he believed college professors teach and on how his two favorite professors taught. According to Henry, the '*professor*' is in charge of '*all*' learning and '*he*' (emphasized three times) '*use[s]*' the knowledge and questions from '*students*' to 'advance' what he believes is the most important knowledge. He emphasized this idea a second time at the end of the excerpt when he said '*discussion,*' '*input,*' and 'prior knowledge' from a '*student*' can speed up the process of learning ('train') what the professor ('*you*') has decided is the most important knowledge ('destination'). For Henry, the '*place*' in the classroom for discussion was in '*directing*' the learning toward the professor's 'point.' Henry said there is no place in the classroom for '*random ad hoc comments*' since they might lead to a destination, or to knowledge, that the professor is not familiar with or that does not support his own knowledge ('destination'). He emphasized twice the idea that '*random ad hoc comments*' could be disastrous since '*you*' (the teacher) would not know where the learning ('train') is headed, which reinforces his belief that the teacher is responsible for all knowledge taught in the classroom.

Henry's beliefs that good teachers are passionate performers, have the important knowledge, and use what goes on in classrooms to direct learning toward what they deem important was not always reflected in the classes he did not like. One course, "Age of the Dinosaurs," fulfilled a biology credit requirement and the other course was one of his undergraduate educational technology courses. When asked to describe his least favorite classes in college were, he said,

that'd be ones like really uh... not *relevant* for me
I was just in because I *had* to be there...
I *didn't* really like "Age of the Dinosaurs" too much,
and, I didn't really want to be there

she made it a lot more *serious* than I thought it would be
we got into *dinosaurs*
and very *technical* and scientific
and *that* ain't really my thing

(I: *okay so it was the content more?*)

yeah it was it was *dry*
it was *dry*
and *boring* as the fossils that we were learning about
lots of *long* scientific names
lots of *memorization* of topics
that I wasn't interested in at all
those *history* classes were all about critical thinking
and comprehending very, *major* and very large historical concepts
but *this* is like rote memorization of, annoying long genus and species
and all *that* stuff
it's like, it *wasn't* relevant to me at all
especially a *history* major (I: Right)
I don't care what the, what this bone of this dinosaur is
it was *all* memorization of, stupid facts (H2)

According to Henry, a 'serious' study of dinosaurs was not what he expected. He emphasized twice that the course was not relevant to him as a 'history major' ('not *relevant* for me' and 'it *wasn't* relevant to me'). While he did not enjoy the '*memorization*' (mentioned three times), it was the content of the class that appeared to be the problem. In addition to being irrelevant,

Henry said ‘*I wasn’t interested in it*’ and ‘*I don’t care,*’ which could mean if he was memorizing facts from human history it might mean more to him. He emphasized that ‘*history*’ studied ‘*major*’ events while ‘*this*’ class studied ‘*boring*’ fossils with ‘*long scientific names.*’ Henry’s beliefs about good teaching appear to include teaching relevant, important knowledge and he defined this to mean knowledge that was interesting to him.

Another class he did not enjoy was an undergraduate educational technology class.

the *undergraduate* education classes were just not relevant at all,
and the *teachers* seemed, unqualified
educational technology, it was *ridiculously* stupid (*I: mmmm*)
she was unprepared for *class*
we didn’t learn anything important,
she *taught* us things that didn’t really matter,
it was like completely *irrelevant*

(*I: like what?*)

can’t *think* of any it’s like
cause I didn’t *learn* anything in that class whatsoever
just *blanked* that completely out of my mind
'cause it’s like, *completely* irrelevant
she said “*I don’t know anything about technology*”

(*I: what kind of teaching style did she have?*)

it was like stupid *group* work
that was completely *irrelevant*
we just sat around and talked about how stupid the *class* was
we had a *separate* lab class on Wednesday
and *that* class was pretty, annoying too
because, we would *learn* something
we’d turn in the *assignment*
and then we would *immediately* forget how to use what we just did,
she’s like “try to use like *constructivist* to like write education forms”...
I didn’t learn *anything* in there
there was no there was *no* rigor
there was no *relevance* (H2)

Similar to the dinosaur class, Henry emphasized five times that the content taught in the educational technology class was ‘not relevant.’ He said he ‘didn’t *learn* anything,’ the instructor

‘*taught*... things that didn’t matter,’ and emphasized how the class had ‘*no rigor*.’ This supported his belief that good teachers taught relevant content. He also said the instructor was ‘unprepared for *class*’ and admitted she was not knowledgeable of the subject area (‘*I don’t know anything about technology*’). For Henry, the instructor was not fulfilling his belief about good teaching—that the teacher has the important knowledge and directs the class toward acquiring that knowledge. His description of the instructor’s teaching method as ‘stupid *group work*’ might be viewed as supporting his belief that teachers are passionate performers and use dynamic lecture to direct student learning. Henry said they would ‘immediately forget’ what they learned in the lab, which differed from another undergraduate educational technology class that he took.

it was *better* in another class
that was strictly *technical* stuff
but at least it was *practical*
at least I learned how to *scan* stuff
and like had the *basic* formation of making a web page using Netscape
and *that* was a strictly a technical portion of the lab
we *turned* in projects
and *that* kind of stuff
that was all right
you’re just *learning* how to use the technology (H2)

Henry said the ‘*practical*’ use of technology (‘*scan* stuff’ and ‘*basic* formation of a web page’) was ‘*technical*’ knowledge that was useful. Instead of applying ‘*constructivist*’ theory to ‘education forms,’ he was ‘*learning* how to use the technology,’ which Henry may have found more relevant to his future career as a teacher.

Another class he did not like while he was taking it was a graduate level educational technology class.

it was jumping through *hoops*
we had to make it *precisely* the way she wanted it
and it was—and she *wanted* every single little detail like you could possibly imagine
my lesson plans were nine pages *long* for a single lesson
one day lesson *nine* pages...
and then *questions* afterwards

about *how* it was used in technology
how is it applicable here
show like how technology was uh, effective use of technology in the class in this lesson
like we had to like *answer* all these like complicated questions
it was so, it was mind numbingly *tedious*
but it *taught* us
in a *way* that's like the same reason that—
I didn't like the *subject* as much as I liked Caribbean or German history
but in the same *way* it was a lot like—
a lot like the *rigor* in that course was similar to those history courses that I liked so much
(H2)

Henry did not like the graduate level technology course because he had to jump through '*hoops*' and complete assignments in '*precisely*' the way the instructor '*wanted*.' What the instructor '*wanted*' were detailed lesson plans (Henry's were '*nine pages*' '*long*') that included responses to '*questions*' on '*how*' technology was applied and would '*show*' the effective use of technology, which he found '*mind numbingly tedious*.' He said the '*rigor*' in this course was similar to the history classes he enjoyed and, even though he did not like the '*subject*,' he admitted the work '*taught* us.'

Henry gained practical knowledge in the graduate level educational technology class that he said was especially useful to him as a teacher.

we *learned* how to write a lesson plan
if we had to jump through *hoops* we learned how to jump through 'em
it was we *hated* it at the time but...

(*I: are you saying while you didn't like doing the lesson plans you felt they were helpful later?*)

no I find I'm glad we did all that work *now*
because now when I'm *talking* about it I can talk like Rachel
I can talk the *language*
she taught me how to speak uh, educational technology *buzz* words
and those... and now I'm *fluent* in it

(*I: and how does that help you?*)

in *interviews*
I can *talk* about educational technology

and its *relevance*
and like how you *use* technology effectively in a classroom,
it's *nice* to be able to do that

(I: so it was *practical* in a sense in that it prepared you for your teaching?)

for *interviews*
and I guess *using* technology too,
like *we* did a we did a imovie project
it's nice to *learn* how you use imovie
it all like seemed so *stupid* at the time
but... administrators love to *hear* that stuff (H2)

Henry emphasized again how he '*hated*' to 'jump through *hoops*' but said he was '*learning*.' For him, the technology class made him '*fluent*' in 'the *language*' and 'educational technology *buzz* words' so he could '*talk*' about using technology in the classroom when on job '*interviews*.' Twice he emphasized how the course prepared him for '*interviews*' but he could only 'guess' that the course prepared him for '*using* technology' in the classroom. He said it was 'nice to *learn*' how to use the technology (imovie), but his emphasis was on how school administrators like to '*hear*' the correct words used in an interview. Henry appeared to appreciate how he could put to practical use what he learned in the educational technology course by using the language in interviews, but he did not view the technology as relevant.

she *made* us do all like she made us do all these activities
of like *using* the technology
which was *not* as relevant
and then like... *all* this stuff we had to write for it
and she worked us to the *bell* every single day

(I: *intellectually* there was some challenge)

well, it didn't *feel* like it at the time
it felt like just jumping through *hoops*
but those hoops were *helpful* in this field I'm in (I: *okay*)
see *dinosaur* bones aren't helpful to me now (H2)

Henry said 'she *made* us' use the technology but the activities were '*not* as relevant.' He emphasized 'all' the writing they had to do and how the instructor 'worked us to the *bell*,'

indicating there was no down time in the classroom. Again, he emphasized how ‘jumping through hoops’ was ‘helpful’ and ‘dinosaur bones’ were not. The graduate level technology class supported Henry’s belief that good teachers are rigorous and teach content that is practical or ‘helpful.’ In this case, the content was useful in his job interviews even if he did not use it in the classroom.

Henry believed good teachers were passionate performers, had command of the important knowledge and controlled the direction of learning in the classroom, and taught relevant or practical content. He preferred lecture or direct instruction, the methods of a passionate performer. In the classes he did not enjoy, one was rigorous but did not teach what he considered practical content, and another used group work (no passionate performance), the instructor was not knowledgeable of the content, and she did not teach what he considered practical content.

Acts of Resistance: Challenging Beliefs about Good Teaching

Henry thought inappropriate teaching methods and classroom structure, and content that was not relevant or practical, were problems in the social studies methods course he took in the spring. The methods and activities used by the instructor did not support his belief that good teachers were passionate performers and controlled the learning in classrooms. Like the other participants, Henry’s acts of resistance were made apparent through facial expressions—he rolled his eyes or used an expression that appeared to imply that the work was not worth his time. He also expressed vocal displeasure with some of the activities and when entering the classroom on one occasion and finding the desks in rows said, “Thank you! Desks in rows—a real classroom.” For Henry, the point where his beliefs about good teaching were challenged by oppositional ideas (where “contradictory positions overlap”) was in the internship seminar, and this is where resistance occurred.

Practical and Relevant Content

Henry resisted most of the methods and content in the social studies internship seminar because he thought they were not practical or relevant. Like William, he thought the instructor of the social studies internship seminar did a better job teaching the educational technology course in the fall.

Rachel's technology course is *much* stronger than her internship course 'cause it was *practical* stuff that we could use her *internship* class had a problem because it's not *practical* some of the same things, she *taught* us how to speak some of the language about professional *development* and uh... continuous *education* continuous improvement *reflection* she really stressed reflection and... the fact—when she was teaching us how to make the resume *portfolio* and *interviewing* strategies *those* were those were good (*I: okay*) like the *finding* a job aspect is what I got the most out of it (*I: okay*) but a *lot* of stuff was just... seemed to be a *waste* of time (H2)

It was important for Henry to gain something '*practical*' from his education courses, which is why he perceived the educational technology class as '*much* stronger' than the internship seminar. In the internship seminar, learning the 'language' of the profession ('professional *development*,' 'continuous *education*' and '*reflection*') was practical for him since it would be used in job interviews, in the same way the language from educational technology would be used. Other aspects of the class Henry thought were 'good' were the 'resume *portfolio*,' '*interviewing* strategies,' and any instruction on '*finding* a job.' This '*practical*' knowledge was not a '*waste*' of time since it was relevant to his future career goals, but he did not find the methods used and the content taught in the internship seminar practical or relevant.

there really *wasn't*
like some of the *material* like we learned about

you couldn't *apply* it to our classrooms at all...
and it really made no *sense* for us to be doing that
yet she, *forced* it on us
I don't know
she *lost* the class
in the class people lost *respect* for her

(*I: now why do you think that was so?*)

she... the *interactive* notebooks
and like the stuff we like *had* to do for the class
she really didn't give *reasons* for it
just like she said like "I'm *doing* this for you so you'll do this for your classes
and know like actually have *experience*,"
we *hated* those damned things
and I'll *never* make my kids—
in *high* school do an interactive notebook?
are *you* kidding me?
just *glue* some stuff in there it's like...
the way like, *some* of her assignments
it's the *way* she conducted class she just...
I don't know
she *lost* people that semester (H2)

Henry emphasized (in italics) in this excerpt that the '*materials*' used in the social studies internship seminar did not make '*sense*' since he could not '*apply*' them in the classroom. Like Kenneth, the '*interactive* notebooks' were a point of contention for Henry and he emphasized how students were '*forced*' or '*had*' to do them along with other assignments. During class, Henry and other students were observed asking the instructor the purpose of the interactive notebooks. According to Henry, she said she was '*doing*' the notebook to give them '*experience*' so they could use it in their own classrooms, but he viewed this as insufficient ('she really didn't give *reasons*'). He '*hated*' the notebook and said he would '*never*' use it with '*high* school' students. He stated twice that he was not sure why ('*I don't know*') the instructor chose the methods and assignments, but also emphasized twice that she '*lost* people' in the class and '*lost respect*' from students, possibly because of the '*way*' she conducted class. Henry resisted the methods used by the instructor, specifically the interactive notebook, because he considered it

not practical or useful and he would not apply it to his classroom. He resisted the content taught in the class for similar reasons.

(I: so like the readings she gave you?)

it wasn't *relevant*

the *readings* weren't relevant

so I didn't *read* 'em (*I: okay*)

and I didn't *have* to read 'em

'cause you could get *by*

and make something *up*

and not *read* 'em (*I: yeah*)

it *seemed* like stressing the same points over and over again

that we had already *heard* a million times

plus it's pretty much common *sense*

like you know what... treat your kids *equitably*,

be culturally *conscious*

you know... don't like don't marginalize your *kids*,

make a safe classroom *environment*

this is very uh, the *fact* that she was acting like we didn't already know this stuff

was a *reason* so many of us felt patronized (H2)

For Henry, the '*readings*' were not '*relevant*' so he did not bother reading them. He said the readings '*seemed*' to stress the same content they '*heard*' before and it was really 'common *sense*'—treating students '*equitably*,' 'culturally *conscious*' classrooms, and a 'safe classroom *environment*.' It appeared Henry agreed with the content of the readings but thought they were not relevant in this classroom since they had already read similar material in another class. He said students 'felt patronized' because the instructor believed ('*fact*') that they did not know the material. The instructor was familiar with the content and readings used by other instructors in the teacher education program but chose to focus on similar content. Her decision to teach content that had already been covered gave Henry the perception that the instructor believed students had not mastered the content, which he thought was condescending ('felt patronized'). This resulted in him resisting the readings by not reading them.

Henry appeared to connect the methods used by the instructor to the way she perceived students in the classroom.

Rachel's class she was *patronizing*
'cause it kind of felt like we were in eighth grade (*I: okay*)
that's where I get *angry*
she was trying to model the class as a
as a *eighth* grade class might be taught
Rachel tried to treat us like we're eighth graders
by doing that she *failed* everybody,
'cause she didn't match up the *curriculum* with the age level
that's one of the first things you should *learn* as a teacher
make sure it *matches*
are you treating us like *college* kids
or are you treating us like *eighth* graders
she treated us like *eighth* graders
we're beyond that as master's students
you don't have to treat us
we don't have to do eighth grade activities
to *know* how to do eighth grade activities (H3)

Henry emphasized (in italics) four times that the structure of the classroom followed what teachers would use with 'eighth graders.' This made him '*angry*' because it felt '*patronizing*.' He emphasized how the instructor '*failed*' students because the '*curriculum*' did not reflect ('*matches*') what was appropriate for '*college* kids.' Henry resisted the interactive notebook and other activities because he believed they were not the way 'master's students' should be taught. He thought students could learn the activities by being taught about them instead of doing them.

Henry resisted the methods used and content taught in the social studies internship seminar because he perceived the instructor as condescending when she ignored what they had learned in earlier classes and structured the class on a middle school level. He also perceived the methods, like the interactive notebook, as inappropriate for high school and college students, so they were not practical. The readings were similar to ones they had in previous classes so were not relevant in this class. He believed good teaching included relevant and practical content and resisted the

social studies methods course because he perceived it had neither. He also resisted the class due to the lack of passion displayed by the instructor.

Passionate Performer

In earlier excerpts, Henry emphasized that good teaching was a ‘*performance*’ and a ‘*glorious art*.’ He described the instructors he liked as ‘*dynamic*’ lecturers. This was a point of resistance in the social studies internship seminar.

Rachel saw teaching as a science
it’s very *technical*
like there were the—you can *use* these techniques
and they will *work*
you *model* this correctly
and it will *work*
her experiment failed,
because *she* did not bring enough of the art
she did not bring the *art*
and the *feeling*
and the *emotion*, into that (*I: okay*)
she brought this—it says in my *science* book
these studied scientific methods will *work* in this teaching environment...
but *surprise*... this ain’t chemistry,
sometimes you get unforeseen *reactants* involved (H3)

Henry emphasized what he perceived as the instructor’s belief that the ‘*technical*’ or scientific aspect of teaching was more important than the ‘art... feeling... emotion’ of teaching. He said the instructor believed if teachers ‘*use*’ and ‘*model*’ certain teaching methods correctly they will ‘*work*’ in the classroom. He emphasized (in italics) that the instructor (‘*her*,’ ‘*she*’) failed in the classroom because she relied too much on science and not enough on ‘art’ and could not handle the ‘*reactants*.’ For Henry, the art of teaching was more important than the science and he related this directly to how he taught in the classroom.

lecture slash direct instruction is a very, it’s a performance
I’m *walking* around the class
and *conducting* the material as a performance
using *repetition*
theater

visuals
and *such* as means of instruction (*I: okay*)
now students *have* to be involved in the lecture
'cause if you're just standing up there *talking*
then *they're* going to go to sleep
you keep *after* 'em
questioning,
rapid fire *questions* to make sure everybody's
keeping everybody on task
and *telling* lecture in a narrative structure
like a *story*
you put on a *show*
I'm an *actor*
teaching is not a science
it's an *art* (H1)

Henry emphasized his active role ('*walking*,' '*conducting*,' '*questioning*,' '*keeping*,' '*telling*') as teacher, which implied the role of students was more passive by responding to questions from the teacher and observing the performance. The use of '*repetition... theater... visuals*' and '*story*' were meant to help keep students watching the '*actor*' in the '*show*.' Henry appeared to view teaching social studies as an opportunity for him to perform since that is what he described as the most effective way for him to teach. He believed teacher education programs should help teachers find their most effective way of teaching, and for him that was lecture.

teachers have to find their strengths
and lecture's a strength of *mine*
if I'm extremely effective doing *that* then why do something I'm not so effective at
and different *subjects* require different, different means of teaching
a *lecture* is a very effective means of teaching social studies for me,
because I'm very *good* at it (H3)

Henry said that '*teachers*' have 'strengths' and his ('*mine*') was '*lecture*' so why should he use other methods that were not as 'effective' for him. He said that 'different *subjects* require different... means of teaching' and that '*lecture*' worked best when teaching social studies. His resistance to the social studies methods course was partly due to the emphasis the instructor placed on teaching methods other than lecture (group work and cooperative learning).

His resistance to the class and to the teacher education program was also due to his belief that the program did not meet the needs of future teachers.

we were resisting because there are there are problems in this program that need to be addressed,
and we're not being uh *trained*
and *receiving* the training necessary to make us effective teachers
we need a prog—a *teacher* education program should be designed to help individual teachers meet their unique needs
because *every* teacher is unique
everybody has their own unique strengths
so *teacher* education programs should meet the needs of its students
and *prepare* those teachers to meet their niches
find their niches
and be the *best* teachers that they can be (H3)

Henry included the cohort (*'we'*) when he explained the reason for his resistance. According to Henry, the *'teacher'* should be *'trained'* to be *'effective'* by preparing them to *'find* their niches,' and this was applicable to *'every'* teacher and *'everybody.'* He viewed the goal of teacher education programs as meeting the *'unique needs'* of *'individual teachers'* and believed this would create the *'best'* teachers. He considered his *'niche,'* or his strength, the role of the passionate performer.

While Henry believed good teachers used effective teaching methods based on the subject taught, his belief that good social studies teachers used lecture almost exclusively and that lecture, or a passionate performance, was his strength contradicted what was taught in the social studies internship seminar and in the teacher education program. The use of culturally responsive pedagogy and the creation of democratic classrooms made room for methods other than lecture (chalk talks, democratic dialogue, circle conversations, jigsaws, reading groups, etc.) and the methods modeled by the instructor of the social studies methods course were not lecture based. Henry resisted these methods. He thought a teacher education program should help future teachers develop the teaching style at which they excelled (which for him was the passionate

performance) instead of teaching them how to use various methods of instruction to meet the learning needs of all students.

Control of Knowledge and the Benevolent Dictator

Henry's favorite instructors were passionate performers and controlled the knowledge in the classroom, which he believed was the sign of a good teacher. His resistance to the methods used in the social studies internship seminar was most notable when discussing democratic classrooms.

(I: when I observed you in the classroom you did resist a lot of the stuff that was being said like culturally responsive teaching and democratic classrooms)

I *don't* agree with having students make their rules,
chaos will ensue,
you—there *has* to be some sense of order,
the *teacher's* in charge,
like having classes set up as *purely* discussion
and around *circle* conversation,
I *question* whether they actually retain anything
or whether you'll have... a *tale* told by an idiot
full of sound and *fury* but signifying nothing
like *nothing* really going on
lots of talk
and lots of good sounding like *stuff* taking place
but nothing really *concrete* being formed (H1)

Henry's belief that good teachers are in control is extended to classroom management and who makes the rules in classrooms. He emphasized (in italics) the '*teacher's*' role as the sole authority for the purpose of avoiding '*chaos*.' He said classes that were '*purely* discussion' or that used '*circle* conversation' could result in the appearance of learning ('sound and *fury*,' '*lots* of *talk*,' '*lots* of... *stuff* taking place') but nothing '*concrete*' being learned. His comment that this would result in 'a *tale* told by an idiot' implied that students were not capable of creating '*concrete*' knowledge, which supported his belief that teachers must control the knowledge in the classroom.

Henry resisted the ideas that students could be involved in both creating knowledge and in the management of classrooms and these were core ideas supported in the internship seminar. Twice during a classroom observation Henry referred to the teacher as “king” (Observation, February 28, 2007). When questioned about this idea of the teacher/king, he said it was his classroom management style.

in order to have an effective classroom communi—classroom *management*
you have to you *have* to have student participation
they have to *buy* into what you’re doing
they have to uh, they have to have a *say* in what you’re doing
at the same time though the teacher *is* in control
so that’s why I have *my* image
which coincides with Dr. *Joseph’s*
and uh, which is that of a *benevolent* king...
or benevolent *dictatorship*
in the fact that *students* have a voice in their affairs (*I: okay*)
but ultimately the *teacher’s* in charge

it goes back to the basic philosophy of a teacher *education* program
you gotta help teachers *grow*
and find their *strengths*
and then use those *use* those strengths
if a teacher is, that’s their... if *that* is effective with that particular teacher than fine
I am most effective doing what I do best
and that’s more on the lines of Dr. *Joseph*
or, the benevolent *dictator* (H3)

Henry emphasized that his ‘classroom *management*’ style was that of the ‘*benevolent* king’ or benevolent *dictator*.’ As the ‘benevolent *dictator*,’ he would ‘*have* to have student participation’ and give students a ‘*say*’ in his teaching, but for the purpose of having students ‘*buy* into’ what he was doing in the classroom. According to Henry, the ‘*students* have a voice’ but the ‘*teacher’s* in charge’ (‘teacher *is* in control’). He believed this classroom management style was one of his ‘strengths,’ just as he believed a passionate performance was his strength, and he validated it twice by citing a respected instructor in the social studies education program whom

he believed used this method ('Dr. *Joseph*'). Henry explained what methods he used as the benevolent dictator or king.

the image of a benevolent *king*
is still the *king* no matter what
but *also* gets feedback from the students as,
that's just my classroom *management*
and classroom *philosophy*

I did uh *weekly* surveys (*I: okay*)
it was—I had an *index* card system
and they uh, every Friday I had *question* time
meaning students *bring* their index cards
they could write *anonymous* comments
put 'em in a box
they could write a *question*
and put their *name* on it
and I'd answer *back* on the card
to ensure that it just stays between *us*
or they can ask a question and put *no* name on it
and I'll *answer* that question in class
I was *getting* feedback
and the *students* were writing
they are *very* aware of their own education
and that's why I uh getting *feedback* from them is very important
it's like the *king* sitting under the oak tree
having the students come to him *directly* with their individual complaints (H3)

Henry emphasized that his 'classroom *management*' style maintained his role as '*king*' but '*also*' solicited 'feedback' from students. He explained that he provided '*weekly*' opportunities for students to write a '*question*' or 'comment,' signed or '*anonymous*,' on an '*index* card' and '*put*' it in a box. It should be noted that students had to '*bring*' their own index cards and these were not supplied by the '*king*.' Henry would read the cards and '*answer*' either on the back of the card (for signed cards) or in class (for unsigned cards). He emphasized twice that he was '*getting* feedback' ('getting *feedback*') from '*students*' because they were '*very* aware' of their educational needs. This classroom management method was modeled after a story he heard about a French king from the Middle Ages who, every Sunday, sat by an oak tree and citizens brought

concerns to him (Observation, February 28, 2007). Henry visualized himself as the '*king*' whose students came '*directly*' to him with concerns.

The dilemma that arises with this model is that the '*king*' or '*benevolent dictator*' is, as Henry said, 'still the *king* no matter what.' A king or dictator, no matter how benevolent, still has the power to ignore questions and comments that contradict his philosophy and goals, just as a teacher who models classroom management after a benevolent dictator has the power to ignore student questions and comments that conflict with his teaching philosophy and classroom goals. Henry resisted democratic classroom practices because they did not support his belief that good teachers maintained all control in the classroom. His belief that good teachers are passionate performers was related to his commitment to control because as a passionate performer, the teacher controls the knowledge in the classroom. He resisted methods used and content taught in the social studies internship seminar because they conflicted with his belief that good teachers control the behavior of students and the important knowledge in classrooms. He also perceived much of the class as impractical or irrelevant to his future career as a teacher. His beliefs about teaching were the basis for his educational ideology.

Ideology of a Resister

Educational ideologies are political beliefs about teaching, schools and education that maintain or disrupt the hegemony of schools. In the United States, the culture of most schools is grounded in White, Eurocentric, middle–upper class cultural beliefs. Henry's sociohistorical context placed him in a White, Eurocentric, middle and middle–upper class environment similar to how schools are structured in the United States. He attended predominantly White schools that catered to mainly middle and upper class families. According to Henry, his elementary school was all White and his secondary schools were predominantly White. He attended a health sciences magnet program in high school that he said was academically rigorous.

Henry's father had a master's degree and his mother had a high school diploma and they both encouraged him to go to college. He believed his success in high school and college was due to his self-motivation, not to his father's education level, parents' socioeconomic status, a rigorous magnet program, or a four-year scholarship. Due to his family background, he fit well in the White, Eurocentric, middle-upper class culture that dominates schools in the United States.

Henry believed good teachers taught practical and relevant content. The two classes he enjoyed most were both in his major field—history—and the instructors were demanding. For Henry, the content was relevant as well as interesting to him as a future social studies teacher. He did not like two graduate level courses in his social studies education program but said they taught what he considered practical content. The educational technology class and the social studies internship seminar taught him how to speak the language that school administrators wanted to hear. That was not the expressed purpose of either class, although the internship seminar did help future teachers create a portfolio of their work. The social studies internship seminar explored issues in classroom teaching, like culturally responsive pedagogy, democratic classrooms, and a no-excuses teaching philosophy. He resisted the material related to these issues. Henry, however, found the class practical and useful because it helped him learn the 'buzz words' that could help him get a job.

Henry also believed that good teachers are passionate performers and control the most important knowledge in the classroom. As discussed in William's chapter, a passionate performer is a lecturer with a flair for drama and a good memory for stories. Henry confirmed this idea when he said teaching was an art and he was a performer. This approach is similar to Freire's (1993) banking method of teaching where the instructor has possession of the

knowledge and deposits it through lecture into the minds of students. At some point, the instructor withdraws the knowledge through various assessments and determines if the student has memorized what the instructor values as knowledge. Henry's ideology supports the hegemony of schools in which the teacher owns and controls all the knowledge.

His belief that good teachers are benevolent dictators reinforces the ideology that teachers must control student behavior and students are powerless. His use of index cards as a way for students to participate in the way the classroom is run is an illusion of shared power since, as Henry said, the teacher is still the king. He resisted democratic classrooms or sharing power with students in the management of the classroom because he felt this would lead to chaos. In the United States, schools are expected to maintain the power of the administrators, faculty and staff over students. Henry supports this order, which maintains the hegemony of schools.

Henry's resistance to the methods used and content taught in the social studies internship seminar and the teacher education program was based on his ideology that schools and teachers control the behavior and knowledge of students. The instructor of the internship seminar attempted to disrupt this by using methods and content that challenged this ideology. Henry's resistance was counter-resistance since he was resisting ideas that could potentially disrupt hegemony in schools.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. (1984). *Aesthetic theory*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatus (notes toward an investigation). In B. Brewster (Trans.), *Lenin and philosophy and other essays* (127–193). New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.
- American Council on Education. (2002). *Access and persistence: Findings from 10 years of longitudinal research on students*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 11(1): 3–42.
- Bahrapour, T. & Glod, M. (2006, March 29). Students walk out in 2nd day of immigration rights protest. *The Washington Post*, p. B03.
- Barton, K. and Levstik, L. (2004). *Teaching history for the common good*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Cochran–Smith, M. (1995). Color blindness and basket making are not the answers: Confronting the dilemmas of race, culture, and language diversity in teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 493–522.
- _____ (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Cochran–Smith, M., Davis, D. & Fries, K. (2004). Multicultural teacher population: Research, practice and policy. In J.A. Banks and C.A.M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd edition, pp. 931–975). San Francisco, CA: Jossey–Bass Publishers.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dance, L.J. (2004). *Tough fronts: The impact of street culture on schooling*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Darling–Hammond, L., French, J. & Garcia–Lopez, S.P. (2002). *Learning to teach for social justice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Davis, N.J. (1992). Teaching about inequality: Student resistance, paralysis, and rage. *Teaching Sociology*, 20(3): 232–238.
- Delpit, L. (1996). *Other people’s children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Devine, J. (1996). *Maximum security: The culture of violence in inner–city schools*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Ford, P. (2006, March 28). Why French youths protest an age of insecurity. *Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved September 15, 2006, at <http://www.csmonitor.com/2006/0328/p01s03-woeu.html>.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum Publishing Co.
- _____ (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- _____ (2004). *Pedagogy of indignation*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Gay, G. (1997). Multicultural infusion in teacher education: Foundations and applications. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 72(1), 150–177.
- _____ (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 106–117.
- Gee, J.P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis theory and method*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Giroux, H.A. (2001). *Theory and resistance in education: Towards a pedagogy for the opposition*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.
- Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. New York, NY: International Publishers.
- Grant, C.A. & Gillette, M. (2006). A candid talk to teacher educators about effectively preparing teachers who can teach everyone's children. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(3), 292–299.
- Habermas, J. (1991). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- _____ (1998). *Communicative ethics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Haddad, A.T. & Lieberman, L. (2002). From student resistance to embracing the sociological imagination: Unmasking privilege, social conventions, and racism. *Teaching Sociology*, 30(3), 328–341.
- Hatch, J.A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis, Inc.

- _____ (2000). *Where we stand: Class matters*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Horkheimer, M. (1972). *Critical theory*. New York, NY: Seabury Press.
- Horkheimer, M. & Adorno, T. (1972). *Dialectic of enlightenment*. New York, NY: Seabury Press.
- Howard, T. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory into Practice*, 42(3), 195–202.
- Hunter, M.L. & Nettles, K.D. (1999). What about the white women? Racial politics in a women's studies classroom. *Teaching Sociology*, 27(4), 385–397.
- Irvine, J.J. (2003). *Educating teachers for diversity: Seeing with a cultural eye*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Jay, M. (1973). *The dialectical imagination: A history of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923–1950*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Jensen, R. (2005). *The heart of whiteness: Confronting race, racism, and white privilege*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books.
- Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. (2001). *Hegemony and socialist strategy*. London, UK: Verso.
- Loewen, J. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lukács, G. (1972). *Political Writings: 1919–1929* (R. Livingstone, Trans.). London: NLB. (Original work published 1919).
- _____ (1989). History and class consciousness. In R.S. Gottlieb (Ed.), *An anthology of western Marxism: From Lukács and Gramsci to socialist-feminism*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lucal, B. (1996). Oppression and privilege: Toward a relational conceptualization of race. *Teaching Sociology*, 24(3), 245–255.
- Marcuse, H. (1991). *One-dimensional man* (2nd edition). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Marx, K. (2005). The German ideology. In D. McLellan (Ed.), *Karl Marx: Selected writings* (2nd ed., 175–208). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- McCadden, B.M. (1998). *It's hard to be good*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- McCotter, S.S. (1999). Team meetings, integrated curriculum, and literature groups: Forums for democratic decision-making. In J. Allen (Ed.), *Class actions: Teaching for social justice in elementary and middle schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- McFarland, D.A. (2001). Student resistance: How the formal and informal organization of classrooms facilitate everyday forms of student defiance. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(3), 612–678.
- McIntyre, A. (1997). *Making meaning of whiteness: Exploring racial identity with white teachers*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- McLaren, P. (1986). *School as a ritual performance*. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- _____ (2003). Critical pedagogy: A look at the major concepts. In Darder, A., Baltodano, M., and Torres, R.D. (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Michalove, B. (1999). Circling in: Examining prejudice in history and in ourselves. In J. Allen (Ed.), *Class actions: Teaching for social justice in elementary and middle schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Middleton, V.A. (2002). Increasing prospective teachers' diversity beliefs and commitment. *The Urban Review*, 34(4), 343–361.
- Miron, L.F. & Lauria, M. (1995). Identity politics and student resistance to inner-city public schooling. *Youth & Society*, 27(1): 30–47.
- Sewell, W.H. & Shah, V.P. (1968). Parents' education and children's educational aspirations and achievements. *American Sociological Review*, 33(2), 191–209.
- Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Shor, I. & Freire, P. (2003). What are the fears and risks of transformation? In A. Darder, M. Baltodano & R.D. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Tyson, C. (2006). Research race and social education. In K. Barber (Ed.), *Research methods in social studies education: Contemporary issues and perspectives*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- United States Census Bureau. (2000). *Census 2000*. Retrieved online April 20, 2008 from <http://www.census.gov>.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, and H.E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Villegas, A.M. & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 20–33.
- Wheatley, M.J. (2002). *Turning to one another: Simple conversations to restore hope to the future*. San Francisco, CA: Barrett-Koshler Publishers, Inc.

Willis, P. (1988). *Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs*.
Hampshire, England: Gower Publishing Company Ltd.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Sheryl Marie Howie was born in Washington, D.C. and raised in central Maryland among cows and corn fields. In 1988, she earned an Associate of Arts degree from Windward Community College, Kaneohe, Hawaii and in 1994, earned a Bachelor of Arts in history and a secondary social studies teaching certification from Virginia Wesleyan College, Norfolk, Virginia. She worked as an editor for various publishing companies in Boston, Massachusetts, before applying to graduate school at the University of Florida. She earned a master's degree in education in 2004 and a doctorate in education in 2008 from the University of Florida, both in foundations of education.