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The study of dispositions has engaged researchers within both teacher education and education psychology fields, creating debates on terminology, research paradigms, and application within teacher education programs. Teacher preparation programs are charged with a myriad of responsibilities related to preparing the next generation of classroom teachers. Since the 1990s, teacher education programs across the United States have included dispositions into their evaluations of students’ readiness for the classroom (Freeman, 2007; Thorton, 2006). In order to ensure effective preparation, national accreditation organizations, such as the Council for the Accreditation of Education Preparation (CAEP), have mandated programs assess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of teacher candidates. Although skills and knowledge related to education are responsibly easy to define, develop, and document, dispositions have proven to be far more difficult resulting in various innovations of disposition development, implementation, and assessment (e.g., Diez, 2006; Dottin, 2006; Schussler, Bercaw, & Stooksberry, 2008; Sherman, 2006, Sockett, 2009; Wake & Bunn, 2016; Wilkerson, 2006).

This text provides a global perspective to the current issues related to teacher dispositions, their place in teacher education programs, and impact on education reform around the world. Drawing from researchers around the globe, the text provides a comprehensive examination of the theoretical aspects of dispositions in education, including discussions on the social-cognitive perspectives in dispositional development and the pedagogical practices used in conjunction with teacher dispositions. Practices for assessing teacher dispositions are included, focusing on methodologies for instrument development and the challenges of language and meaning when constructing items to assess dispositions. The text includes a discussion of the virtual/online classroom and how teacher dispositions are influencing teacher and student relationships. These topics are explored from a global perspective with special emphasis on how the awareness of teacher dispositions and their role in the classroom are making transformative changes to teacher education programs, educational practices, and student outcomes around the world.

In Part 1, Dispositional Development, Peterson begins our exploration of dispositions from the perspective of the professional decision maker. The chapter addresses the need for the disposition of critical reflection and transformative learning, as teachers are held to increasingly higher standards of accountability for student outcomes. Thomas, Huffman, and Flake focus specifically on the topic of pre-service elementary teacher dispositions within the field of mathematics. Using a multiple-case, mixed-methods design, they highlight the challenges faced by pre-service elementary teachers with regard to their dispositions about teaching
and learning mathematics. Part 1 concludes with Reardon’s study using the Myers-Goody/Webb DOK model to help pre-service teachers learn about the cognitive development in student oral responses and writing patterns, thereby training the teachers to project positive depositions through body language, word choice, and written response in feedback to their students.

Part 2, Regional Perspectives, take us across the globe, providing us with insight as to the impact of teaching dispositions within both teacher education programs and online educational environments. Our journey begins in Northern Africa where Idri describes the challenges educators face in this region due to a long period of colonization and the new challenges faced by independence and the post-colonial period. This study brings to light the many advances in the educational systems of the region, but also the many opportunities teachers and policy makers face, especially regarding teaching dispositions. Second language teachers in Japan are the focus of Amos, who describes the dispositions of Japanese second language teachers as they relate to high expectations, caring, and open-mindedness. Fah, Tek, Thoe, and Suki use structural equation modelling to examine the validity and reliability of the Malaysian Teacher Disposition Index, establishing the instrument as a valuable resource for use in teacher preparation courses. Kõiv explores teaching dispositions by focusing specifically on online teachers in Estonia who have been subjected to bullying, by using an instrument designed specifically to assess dispositions of online teachers. The next chapter takes us to the Nordic region where Forss, Kiukas, Rosengren and Silius-Ahonen provide insight into teacher dispositions within the context of Higher Education and the Nordic tradition. We end our journey in the Middle East where Welch, Areepattamannil, and Dickson have developed an instrument to assess teaching dispositions based specifically on the Abu Dhabi Educational Council professional teaching standards. Using data from the 2013 TALIS, Melkonian reports on the correlation between teacher dispositions and job satisfaction in the UAE.
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PART 1

DISPOSITIONAL DEVELOPMENT
1. THE DEVELOPMENT OF A DISPOSITION FOR REFLECTIVE PRACTICE

INTRODUCTION

The role of teacher preparation programs is to ensure that candidates are well prepared in the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to be effective in the classroom. While skills and knowledge in the field of education are fairly easy to define, cultivate, and assess, dispositions have consistently been difficult to define. In a research study on dispositions in teacher education conducted by Almerico, Johnson, Henriott, and Shapiro in 2011, it was identified that dispositions related to effective teaching have been defined in a number of ways over the years. For example, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (2001) provided the following explanation of dispositions: dispositions are the values, commitments, and professional ethics that influence behaviors toward students, families, colleagues, and communities that affect student learning, motivation, and development as well as the educator’s own professional growth. Dispositions, according to NCATE, are steered by attitudes and beliefs related to values like caring, honesty, fairness, empathy, respectfulness, responsibility, and thoughtfulness. The Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) (1992) uses the following descriptors to encompass the concept of dispositions: adopts, appreciates, believes, is committed, has enthusiasm, persists, realizes, recognizes, responds, seeks, is sensitive to, understands, and values. Schulte, Edick, Edwards, and Mackiel (2004) define disposition as a pattern of behavior exhibited frequently and in the absence of coercion, and constituting a habit of mind under some conscious and voluntary control, and that is intentional and oriented to broad goals. Dispositions related to effective teaching as proposed by NCATE, InTASC and Schulte, Edick, Edwards and Mackiel, refer to attitudes necessary for professional decision-making based on critical understandings of the context of teaching. Having a disposition for effective teaching requires mindfulness of the complexity of teaching. An effective teacher needs to have the temperament or disposition necessary to step back and analyze the effect of context on their practice in order to improve the quality of his or her practice. In this chapter, analysis of teaching will be referred to as reflective practice. Reflective practice and reflective thinking are integral dispositions necessary for today’s teaching professional.

Driving the urgency for establishing a culture of reflective practice is the need for teachers to be highly effective instructional decision makers. Helping teacher
candidates develop this disposition or temperament for reflection has been an ongoing responsibility in teacher preparation programs. This is especially important as teachers are held to higher levels of accountability for student outcomes. The emphasis on reflective thinking challenges teacher educators to create programs which provide constructive ways for teacher candidates to engage in the practice of reflection. This value is aptly demonstrated in state and national standards that have a component requiring reflective thinking. More than ever, teachers need the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to customize learning for students with a range of individual differences.

The focus of this chapter is reflective practice as a disposition for professional decision making. The nature and theory of reflection is discussed, as well as reflection as transformative learning. The chapter will conclude with a presentation of exemplar studies on reflection.

TEACHER QUALITY PRESIS

Demand for Teacher Quality

Much attention from the media, parents, and policy makers continues to be placed on the education of our children and whether we are adequately preparing them to successfully compete in a global market place. In the opening paragraph of Teacher Quality: Understanding the Effectiveness of Teacher Attributes, Jennifer King Rice (2003) states, “Teacher quality is the most important school-related factor influencing student achievement” (p. 1). The National Council of Teachers of English (2004) defines teacher quality as a vital factor in student learning. In addition, Long and Riegle (2002) define teacher quality as a complex phenomenon, and they state that there is little consensus on what it is or how to measure it. They emphasize that the two most common definitions focus on teacher qualifications and teacher practices. These reports and others that followed focused on perceptions of declining student achievement and affirmed the need to professionalize teaching.

Teacher Standards, Teacher Quality, and Reflection

During the past 30 years, many state and national initiatives have surfaced that address the need to improve the quality of teachers in American schools. Embedded in these reports is the drive to increase the professionalization of teaching. Teacher quality in the American educational system has been an issue of national concern since at least the early 1900s, but interest in educational quality seems to have intensified during the second half of the 20th century and continues in the 21st Century (Long & Riegle, 2002). The accountability reform movement in the United States, that started with learning standards for public school children and followed the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (1983), turned to consensus
about teacher quality with the 1996 report by the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF), *What Matters Most: Teaching for America’s Future*. In its 1996 report, NCTAF offered a blueprint for ensuring teacher quality through recruiting, preparing, and supporting excellent teachers in all of America’s schools and recommends three anchors of teacher quality: the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC), and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

In response to the call for highly qualified teachers and the need for a model of good teaching, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) developed a set of standards for teacher preparation programs in 2000 that promotes accountability for ensuring teachers are well prepared to meet the needs of all children (NCATE, 2000). While NCATE accredits schools, colleges, and departments of education that provide professional training for teachers, the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI), a constituent member organization of NCATE, is responsible for the program review process within NCATE for institutions seeking national accreditation in elementary education. The position ACEI takes in the preparation of elementary teachers is that qualified teachers must be recognized as professionals in their field by being graduates of an accredited teacher preparation program, or at least be certified through an accredited alternate program that requires a bachelor’s degree in addition to professional study. Woven through the NCATE/ACEI Standards is the idea that for teachers to be recognized as professionals, they need to engage in reflective practice.

In 1996, under the auspices of the Council of Chief State School Officers, a consortium of more than 30 states and professional organizations formed the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Standards for Beginning Teachers Licensing and Development. These standards were drafted by representatives of the teaching profession along with personnel from 17 state education agencies. The standards represent a common core of teaching knowledge and skills that should be acquired by all new teachers. The standards are performance based; that is, they describe what teachers should know and be able to do rather than listing courses that teachers should take in order to be awarded a license. The InTASC standards for teacher licensing were organized around ten principles that reflect the core knowledge, skills, and dispositions teachers should develop in order to teach in the ways that the new standards demand. The ability to reflect on, evaluate and improve teaching and learning is explicitly stated as one of the guiding principles.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and assessments help teachers reflect on and learn from their practice. NBPTS is an independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan organization governed by a board of directors, the majority of whom are classroom teachers. Other members include school administrators, school board leaders, governors and state legislators, higher education officials, teacher union leaders and business and community leaders. The National Board
for Professional Teaching Standards is rooted in the belief that the single most important action this country can take to improve schools and student learning is to strengthen teaching. The mission is to advance the quality of teaching and learning by maintaining high and rigorous standards for what accomplished teachers should know and be able to do. The NBPTS standards are based on five major propositions that teachers and researchers agree are essential to accomplished teaching:

1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning.
2. Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.
3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.
4. Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience.
5. Teachers are members of learning communities.

The aim of NBPTS in developing the core propositions as a foundation was to detail what constitutes accomplished teaching in every subject and for students at all stages of their development. Ultimately, the NBPTS standards provide a careerlong learning curriculum for accomplished teaching and set the standard to improve teaching and, thereby, improve student learning.

This continuum of standards (NCATE, InTASC and NBPTS) has been developed to guide teacher learning across the career path. Recognizing the importance of a quality education, NCTAF (1996) challenged the nation to provide every child with what should be his or her educational birthright: “competent, caring, qualified teachers in schools organized for success” (NCTAF, 1996, p. 3) by improving the quality of teaching professionals.

The issue of how to improve teacher quality has moved to the top of the reform agenda in a growing number of states. States have undertaken a wide range of initiatives affecting all aspects of teaching from preservice education and induction to evaluation, licensing, compensation, and ongoing training. But, particularly in the area of teacher education programs, a significant gap continues between what is known to be effective in improving teacher quality and what is practiced at the school and district levels. These changes to improve the quality of teaching are evidence of a deepening commitment to professionalism in teaching.

The call for teacher quality informs us that learning how to teach and improving the quality of teaching requires a proactive and reflective approach to teaching practice. The enormously popular work of Donald Schön in the 1980s introduced the concept of the reflective professional and challenged the dominant technical rationality in professional education. He argued for more attention to promoting artistry in teaching by encouraging reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action among teachers. The reflective approach is intended to facilitate the complex process of learning how to teach and enable the teacher to bridge theory and practice. Schön (1987) reminded us that practitioners in any field are problem solvers. However, he suggested that problems of real-world practice, especially teaching, do not present themselves to practitioners as well-formed structures. It is exactly the ill-defined nature of teaching that challenges teachers to find solid ground when reflecting on
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their practice. More than ever, it is imperative for teachers to develop a disposition of reflective teaching, which according to Tripp (1993) is essential to a professional approach to practice.

In the following section the nature of reflection will be discussed. Prominent theories of reflection that have influenced current understandings of reflective practice will be introduced.

THE NATURE AND THEORY OF REFLECTION

Nature of Reflection

In classrooms, teachers make hundreds of decisions daily on instances that require them to ponder or reflect. These instances require teachers to arrive at judgments about how to respond to a particular problem or dilemma. Teachers must consider all the factors, develop possible solutions, weigh the consequences, and make a determination during the course of teaching that resolves the problem or dilemma. These instances become critical because they are not easily solved and invite teachers to pause and consider appropriate action that will have an effect on their practice.

Reflective thinking and reflective practice have become common concepts in the teacher education literature as national and state policy makers and teacher educators have committed to preparing teachers who are reflective practitioners (Cochran-Smith & Villegas, 2015; Cochran-Smith, 2006; Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2006; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). The goal, according to Parsons and Brown (2002), is to develop teachers who are reflective thinkers “capable of effectively articulating their judgments about what constitutes best practice and who can apply their judgments in their classrooms, thus becoming reflective practitioners” (p. 1). In recent years, a substantial body of literature has emerged in teacher education journals stressing the importance of preparing more thoughtful, reflective practitioners who are more effective in the classroom (Zeichner & Liston, 2013). Also, reflection has become recognized as a crucial element in the professional growth of teachers. Schön (1987) suggested that the ability to reflect on one’s actions is characteristic of professional practice. He commented that reflection can take place throughout the teaching process and is an essential aspect of the process by which beginners in a discipline improve their practice to make it more consistent with that of successful, experienced practitioners. Tripp (1993) carried that argument further and made the case that being able to do something and knowing how one does it are two different aspects of being professional. He suggested that one kind of expertise is required to make a lesson happen and another very different kind of expertise and knowledge to diagnose what actually went on in it.

Barone, Berliner, Blanchard, Casanova, and McGowan (1996) proposed that teacher education programs should be built around the unifying image of the “strong professional” (p. 1111). One of the criteria of the strong professional is the ability to critically examine his or her actions (Ostorga, 2002–2003). The process
of critical analysis and evaluation has been defined in the literature as reflective thinking. Although many educators and theorists agree that reflection is an essential aspect of good teaching, different teacher educators and theorists have defined the concept of reflection in a number of ways.

_Teory of Reflection-John Dewey_

Thought about reflection and reflective practice has evolved over many decades. The collective literature on reflective thinking reveals numerous common themes. However, reflection is generally viewed as an active thought process aimed at understanding and subsequent improvement. Various philosophers, theorists, teacher educators, and researchers have contributed to this body of knowledge. John Dewey is often considered the first to promote reflection in teaching. Dewey wrote about the need for reflective thinking as early as 1903 and dealt with the role of reflection extensively in _How We Think_ (1910, revised 1933). For Dewey, logical analysis was basically the generalization (in a systematic form) of the reflective process in which all of us engage on occasion. Dewey recognized that we can reflect on a whole host of things in the sense of merely thinking about them; however, logical or analytic reflection can take place only when there is a real problem to be solved. He considered reflection to be “central to all learning experiences enabling individuals to act in a deliberate and intentional fashion…[to] convert action that is merely blind and impulsive into intelligent action” (Dewey, 1933, p. 212). Reflective thought, according to Dewey, looks back on assumptions and beliefs to be sure they are grounded in logic, evidence, or both, and it looks forward to the implications or consequences of a particular course of action. Dewey suggested that an individual who is reflective refuses to accept things at face value, but instead engages in the process of hunting, searching, or looking for information that will lead to more thoughtful consideration (Dewey, 1933, p. 76).

According to Dewey (1933), reflection begins with a “felt difficulty” (p. 102), which can range in intensity from mild uneasiness to intense shock. To address this sense of unease, Dewey suggested, individuals must proceed through three steps of reflection: (1) problem definition, (2) means/ends analysis, and (3) generalization. For Dewey, then, true reflective practice takes place only when the individual is faced with a real problem that he or she needs to resolve and seeks to resolve that problem in a rational manner. Dewey distinguished between action based on reflection and action that is impulsive or blind. His emphasis was on the need to develop certain dispositions of open-mindedness and skills of thinking and reasoning in order to reflect. For Dewey, a fundamental purpose of education is to help people acquire a disposition of reflection so they can engage in intelligent action. Developing a disposition of reflective thinking has become equated with the hallmark of effective professional practice supported by most teacher preparation programs and heralded by the standards for teacher quality. Dewey’s exploration of thinking and reflection – and the associated role of educators – has continued to be an inspiration.
Theory of Reflection—Donald Schōn

Fifty years after Dewey’s work on reflection, Donald Schōn (1983, 1987) began an exploration of professional knowledge. One of Schōn’s great contributions was to bring ‘reflection’ into the center of an understanding of what professionals do. His innovative thinking around notions such as ‘the learning society’, ‘double-loop learning’ and ‘reflection-in-action’ has become part of the language of education.

In 1983 Schōn introduced the concept of the reflective professional and challenged the dominant schema of technical rationality. In the mid 1800’s into the early 20th Century the prevailing view of professional knowledge was the application of scientific theory and technique to the instrumental problems of practice. According to Schōn (1983), technical rationality became established when the scientific movement, industrialism, and the Technological Program became dominant in Western society. The opening of The Reflective Practitioner (1983) is directed against ‘technical-rationality’ as the grounding of professional knowledge.

From the perspective of Technical Rationality, Schōn (1983) wrote “professional practice is a process of problem solving” (p. 39). Technical Rationality depends on agreement about ends. Schōn (1983) stated “When ends are fixed and clear, then the decision to act can present itself as an instrumental problem” (p. 41). He argued that for certain professions, education being one, problem solving in the practice of the profession involves complexity, uncertainty, instability, uniqueness, and value conflict—which do not fit the model of Technical Rationality. For most teachers, the complexity of problems faced each day, is related to classroom phenomena and the context of the situation. The complexity of classroom situations often defy resolution through an agreed upon means and relies upon a discrete body of knowledge and the ability to sort through a myriad of possible solutions.

Schōn recognized the complexity of problem solving in the context of teaching. The concept of reflection was a significant construct in defining professional practice in Schōn’s work, Educating the Reflective Practitioner (1987). Schōn noted that for the teaching professional reflection can take place throughout the teaching process and is a crucial aspect of the process by which beginners in a discipline improve their practice to make it more consistent with that of successful, experienced practitioners.

Schōn (1987) proposed that in preparing teaching professionals, teacher educators need most to “teach students how to make decisions under conditions of uncertainty” (p. 11). According to Schōn, the reflective approach is intended to facilitate the complex process of learning how to teach and enable the teacher candidate to bridge theory and practice. Schōn (1987) described three forms of reflection: reflection-on-action, reflection-in-action, and reflection-for-action, and drew a distinction between reflection-in-action and knowing-in-action. Schōn suggested that when someone has learned how to do something, he/she can make decisions and adjustments to their actions without having to think about them. He contended that most of the time our “spontaneous knowledge (knowing-in-action) gets us through the day”
(p. 26). However, there are times when a familiar routine produces a surprise or unexpected event and something fails to meet our expectations. At times such as these, Schön asserted, an individual may respond by brushing it aside, or he/she may respond by reflection. A person may reflect on action by thinking back on what was done in order to discover how their knowing-in-action might have contributed to the surprise. Reflection-on-action usually happens after the incident or can be a brief period of time when a person pauses in the midst of action to stop and think. In reflection-on-action, there is no direct connection to the present action. In contrast, a person may reflect-in-action without breaking the flow or interrupting the action. In education we might refer to reflection-in-action as being an in-flight decision. In this context, Schön contended, our thinking serves to reshape what we are doing while we are doing it and while we can still make a difference to the situation. Schön’s ideas initiated a new wave of research and learning about teacher reflection. Reflection-on-action is the basis of much of the literature pertaining to reflective teaching and reflective teacher education.

Both reflection-on-action and reflection-in-action are essentially reactive in nature, being distinguished primarily by when reflection takes place – with reflection-in-action referring to reflection in the midst of practice and reflection-on-practice referring to reflection that takes place after an event. Reflection-for-action, in contrast, as Schön argued, is the desired outcome of both previous types of reflection. It can be deduced that reflection is undertaken not so much to revisit the past or to become aware of the metacognitive process one is experiencing, but to guide future action. In other words, reflection-for-practice is proactive in nature. It is important to note that the relative significance of each of these three components of reflective practice may change during an individual teacher’s career; thus, for the novice teacher according to (Schön, 1987), reflection-for-practice and reflection-on-practice may be the most obvious ways in which his or her practice is distinguished, whereas for the expert or master teacher, reflectivity may be best seen in his or her reflection-in-practice. Further, the process of engaging in reflection-for-practice should be seen not as a linear one, but as an ongoing spiral in which each element of reflective practice is constantly involved in an interactive process of change and development (Schön, 1987).

Theory of Reflection-Max van Manen

The literature on reflection not only suggests that there are types of reflection, but that individuals will reflect at different levels of complexity. Prior to Donald Schön’s work on reflective practice van Manen (1977) conceived of reflection as a progression involving a hierarchy of three levels of reflectivity. His three levels of reflective teaching, describe different criteria for choosing among alternative courses of action (O’Donoghue & Brooker, 1996), and can be seen as paralleling the growth of the individual teacher from novice to expert or master teacher (Norlander-Case, Reagan, & Case, 1999). The first level, technical reflection, concerns the effective application
of skills and technical knowledge in the classroom setting. Here, reflection is confined to analyzing the effects of strategies used. In technical reflection, the teacher considers the best way to reach an unexamined goal. Level 1 is concerned with the technical aspects of teaching. The primary emphasis is on the application of knowledge for the purpose of reaching specific teaching objectives. The first level is characterized by the effective and appropriate application of skills, materials, technical knowledge, and instructional strategies in the classroom setting (Norlander-Case et al., 1999, p. 31). The second level, practical reflection, involves reflection about the assumptions underlying a specific classroom practice as well as the consequences of that practice on student learning. In practical reflection, the teacher examines the means and the end (goals) by asking questions such as, “What should we be learning?” This level of reflection implies that teachers are assessing the educational implications of their actions and beliefs. Level 2, according to van Manen, is that of practical reflection, which is concerned with deciding the relative worth of competing educational goals. Interest centers on the moral, ethical, and value considerations in education. Reflection at the second level involves reflection about the assumptions underlying specific classroom practices as well as about the consequences of particular strategies, curricula, materials, and so on. According to Norlander-Case et al. (1999), “At this second level of reflectivity, teachers begin to apply educational criteria to pedagogical practice in order to make independent, individual decisions about pedagogical matters” (p. 31). The third level, critical reflection, entails questioning the moral and ethical dimensions related, directly or indirectly, to the classroom situation. In critical reflection, the moral and ethical issues of social compassion and justice are considered along with the means and ends. At this level of reflection, teachers make connections between situations they encounter and the broader social, political and economic forces that influence those events. Level 3 is the level of critical reflection, where the focus is on the social and political context of schooling. Teachers assess their actions for their ability to contribute toward greater equity, social justice, and humane conditions in schooling and society. The critical element at this level is concerned with “the moral and ethical aspects of social compassion and justice” (Sparks-Langer, Simmons, Pasch, Colton, & Starko, 1990, p. 39).

Theory of Reflection—Linda Valli

Linda Valli (1993) referred to reflective teaching as promoting a thoughtful examination of practice. She contrasted reflective teachers and non-reflective teachers stating that reflective teachers have the ability to think about their teaching behaviors and make judgments about them. Teachers who are unreflective are limited in this way and remain as skilled technicians who have not developed the intellectual and moral capacities (disposition) to make wise decisions or to consider the consequences of their actions (Valli, 1993). After a review of the literature on different teacher education programs that emphasize reflective teaching, Valli (1993) concluded that there are at least five different types of reflection. She calls
these orientations technical reflection, reflection-in- and -on-action, deliberative reflection, personalistic reflection, and critical reflection.

Valli (1993) described a technical orientation to teaching as being “on performance, often measurable performance, with the teacher’s role limited to ‘piloting’ students through a learning process conceived and designed by others” (p. 36). Valli added that technical teachers would have little basis upon which to make strategic decisions or to consider consequences or alternative courses of action. “They would simply have a repertoire of behaviors which are used in a relatively unvarying manner” (p. 36). Valli (1993) described technical reflection as having two related meanings. The first relates to the content of reflection: focus on the narrow domain of teaching techniques or skills. The second relates to the quality of reflection: directing one’s actions through a straightforward application of research on teaching. Valli suggests that teachers who utilize technical reflection are externally motivated and judge their performance through definitions of good teaching by an outside expert. “In this type of reflection, the outside expert researcher’s voice is dominant” (p. 76).

Valli (1993) borrowed the terms “reflection-in-action” and “reflection-on-action” from Donald Schön (1983, 1987). Reflection-on-action refers to the retrospective thinking teachers do after a lesson has been taught. Reflection-in-action refers to the spontaneous, intuitive decisions made during the act of teaching. Unlike technical reflection, in reflection-in- and -on-action, the teacher’s voice is regarded as expert and the content for reflection comes from the teacher’s own unique situation. “Each teacher’s values, beliefs, classroom context, and students provide the source of knowledge for reflective action” (p. 76). Valli suggested that in a teacher education program, the unique case, rather than the generalized rule, is the important teaching tool.

A third type of reflection proposed by Valli is deliberative reflection. Valli (1997) views deliberative reflection as emphasizing decision making based on a variety of sources: research, experience, the advice of other teachers, and personal beliefs and values. According to Valli, no one voice dominates. Multiple voices and perspectives are sought and heard. “Teachers must then make the best decision possible even though conflicting advice might be offered” (p. 77).

Personalistic reflection focuses on personal growth and relationships. In this mode of reflection, teachers would consciously link their personal and professional lives. They also would think about their students’ lives. Valli (1997) stated that teachers who reflect in a personalistic way would be caretakers, not just information dispensers. These teachers would reflect to understand the reality of their students in order to give them the best care possible. “The quality of their reflection would be determined by the ability to empathize” (p. 78).

The final type of reflection Valli (1997) suggested is critical reflection. The aim of critical reflection, according to Valli, is not just understanding, but improving the quality of life of disadvantaged groups. This mode of reflection is derived from political philosophers and is the only form of reflection that explicitly views the school and school knowledge as political constructions. Therefore, the content
for reflection would be ways in which “schools and teachers contribute to social
injustices and inequality and ways in which they can help overcome these inequities”
(p. 79). Teachers engaged in critical reflection would attend to the voices of those
who are among societies least powerful and privileged.

Valli’s conception of reflection incorporates many aspects of Schön’s (1987)
and van Manen’s (1977) frameworks. To organize her framework for ease of use, a
table depicting her framework is provided in Table 1. How Valli’s types and levels
of reflection are incorporated in teacher preparation programs is addressed in the
next section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflection Orientation</th>
<th>Content for Reflection</th>
<th>Quality of Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Reflection</td>
<td>General instruction and management behaviors that are based on research on teaching</td>
<td>Matching one’s own performance to external guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voice of outside authority is prominent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prescriptive way to learn how to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection-in/on-Action</td>
<td>One’s own personal teaching performance</td>
<td>Basing decisions on one’s own unique situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher’s inner voice dominates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unique cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberative Reflection</td>
<td>A whole range of teaching concerns, including students, curriculum, instructional strategies, rules, and organization of the classroom</td>
<td>Weighing competing viewpoints and research findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No one voice dominates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalistic Reflection</td>
<td>One’s own personal growth and relationships with students</td>
<td>Listening to and trusting one’s own inner voice and the voices of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher’s inner voice and voices of students are listened to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transformative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reflection</td>
<td>The social, moral and political dimensions of schooling</td>
<td>Judging the goals and purposes of schooling in light of ethical criteria such as social justice and equality of opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voices of disadvantaged are heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political constructions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REFLECTION IN TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

The phrase “reflective practice” has become a common phrase in the literature of teacher education as a growing number of teacher preparation programs have explicitly committed themselves to preparing teachers who will be reflective practitioners. Although not all teacher preparation programs have an articulated commitment to reflective practice (Christensen, 1996), it would be unusual to find a teacher preparation program anywhere in the United States that was on record as rejecting the goal of reflective practice for classroom teachers and preservice teachers (Norlander-Case et al., 1999). Reflective practice as a goal of teacher preparation programs has become very much like “loving children” for many teacher education students and faculty—a slogan with a very high positive connotation and relatively little commonly agreed-on descriptive meaning (Norlander-Case et al., 1999). Valli (1992, 1993) provided a usable framework for untangling the meaning of reflective practice in teacher preparation programs. She argued that reflection could be conceptualized as two independently varying dimensions of teaching: non-reflective to reflective and technical to ethical/critical.

Figure 1 provides a visual representation of Valli’s dimensions of teaching and reflection as they intersect with four approaches to teacher preparation.

![Figure 1. Four images of teacher preparation (Valli, 1993)](image-url)
THE DEVELOPMENT OF A DISPOSITION FOR REFLECTIVE PRACTICE

The first quadrant combines a non-reflective approach to technical preparation and generates an image of teaching or teacher education as skill development. In the second quadrant, the focus is still on technical preparation, but this occurs in a reflective context. The result is an emphasis on practical decision-making. The third quadrant captures approaches that depart from the traditional emphasis on technical preparation. Instead, these would focus on moral, ethical, and social aspects of teaching, but in a non-reflective manner. For that reason, the approach would have to be labeled inculcation or indoctrination. The fourth quadrant again emphasizes the social and moral aspects of teaching, but this time reflectively. The metaphor for teaching in this approach would be critical or moral reflection. Valli (1993) suggested that this last approach is the most justifiable and holds the greatest promise as a viable image of teaching, but, she stresses, it must be integrated with others to provide comprehensive preparation for teachers.

Skill Development

Often referred to as competency- or performance-based models, programs that foster skill development are based on positivistic epistemology and behavioral psychology and emphasize the development of specific and observable teaching skills that are assumed to be related to pupil learning. The goals of such programs, according to Zeichner (1996), are to transmit those principles and procedures that form a scientific basis for teaching and to help prospective teachers master knowledge and skills so that they are proficient in basic teaching tasks (Feiman-Nemser, 1990). Barnes (1987) cautions that graduates of skill-oriented programs are likely to develop and maintain a restricted view of themselves as teachers and might later resist more critical forms of thinking.

Practical Decision Making

In the next quadrant, teachers are reflective decision makers. They analyze their own activity and the consequences of those actions, but only within the bounds of pre-established goals. The assumption is that reflection on experience provides useful insights for the improvement of teaching. Reflection is implicitly defined as the retrospective comparison of the effectiveness of different teaching strategies.

Programs that emphasize practical decision-making fall into what has been called the small arena of the problematic (Tom, 1996). Decisions made within that relatively narrow scope of inquiry include matters of instruction, instructional design, individual differences, group processes and dynamics, student motivation, discipline, and classroom organization. Besides a practical decision maker, this type of teacher could be called self-analytic, problem solver, hypothesis maker, self-monitoring, or adaptive (Tom, 1996). These teachers attempt to make sense out of phenomena they find puzzling or perplexing. They question classroom phenomena
which technical teachers would take for granted, choose among alternative ways of framing problems and dilemmas, and assume responsibility for those choices (Ross, 1989; Schön, 1983). These teachers are not merely skilled in routines. They do not simply follow habit, example, or tradition. Rather, in Dewey’s words, they are thoughtful about theories and principles of education (Dewey, 1933).

Valli (1993) argued that the limitation of this approach to reflection and the reason it does not function as a comprehensive image of teaching is that it leaves the goals, social context, and often even the curriculum content of education unexamined. In this approach, reflection is viewed as an end in itself rather than a means toward the development of ethical judgments, strategic actions, and the realization of ethically important ends (Zeichner & Liston, 2013). In its most extreme version, this approach communicates that the role of the teacher is to accept educational goals and social structures, as they exist, that a teacher’s sole function is to manage instructional resources in the most effective way possible to meet taken-for-granted goals. But by taking goals for granted, teachers become mere instruments of preserving current social arrangements.

*Indoctrination*

A third possible orientation to teacher education is that of indoctrination, strongly, but not reflectively, promoting a belief system about teaching. In the late 1960s, C. Wright Mills argued that there are three types of believers: vulgar, sophisticated, and critical. Vulgar believers operate only with stereotypes and slogans. They have no interest in listening to opposing arguments or even in analyzing their own beliefs. Sophisticated believers are interested in knowing opposing points of view, but only for the purpose of refuting them. They are still not open to the possibility that their own belief system might be flawed, based on inadequate evidence or illogical arguments. Their concern is only in furthering their own point of view.

Teachers and teacher educators who are vulgar or sophisticated believers would hold fast to certain positions. These positions could range from things like promoting direct instruction, assertive discipline, or creationist science to denouncing all tracking systems. These believers can range from ultra-right to ultraleft to mainstream in political views. What they have in common is a lack of openness to modifying a position and considering alternatives or sources of evidence. They have closed world-views, which they attempt to impose on others.

Indoctrination, according to Valli (1993), is so contrary to ideals about liberal education in a democratic society that it is difficult to imagine teacher education promoting it.

*Moral Reflection*

In contrast to vulgar and sophisticated believers, Valli (1993) described critical believers. These believers are willing to enter sympathetically into opposing points
of view because they can recognize weaknesses in their own. They learn from criticism and understand that a belief system needs to be refined by a fuller and richer consideration of available evidence and reasoning. Approaches to teaching that embody this vision are called moral reflection. Three variations of moral reflection are the deliberative, the relational, and the critical (Valli, 1990). Each is concerned with helping prospective teachers reflect on the moral aspects of teaching and assumes that educational decisions are inevitably based on beliefs, however tacit, about what is good or desirable.

The deliberative approach encourages thoughtful consideration of educational issues. Prospective teachers are made aware of and reflect upon the ethical decisions implicit in ordinary classroom instruction and analyze the purposes of schooling and the political and moral choices implicit in routine teaching decisions (Valli, 1993). In Noddings’s view (1984), the teacher is a caretaker whose job it is to reflectively apprehend the reality of the student, the cared for. This type of moral reflection, according to Valli (1993), in which the focus is on the whole student, stands in stark contrast to reflecting on teacher effectiveness research, where the focus is on discrete teacher behaviors within predetermined ends.

DISPOSITIONS FOR REFLECTIVE PRACTICE

Schön (1983) stressed that reflective practice is grounded in the practitioner’s appreciation system (i.e., repertoire of values, knowledge, theories, and practices). The appreciation system of the teacher influences the types of dilemmas that will be recognized, the way teachers frame and reframe dilemmas, and the judgments teachers make about the desirability of solutions. For example, Valli (1990) and Tabachnick and Zeichner (2002) note that teachers must use moral as well as educational criteria in examining the consequences of implemented solutions. Consequently, preparation of reflective practitioners requires teaching not only the elements of the reflective process but also increasing the range and depth of knowledge in each student’s appreciation system.

The development of reflection also requires the development of several attitudes and abilities, such as introspection, open-mindedness, and willingness to accept responsibility for decisions and actions (Dewey, 1933). The introspective teacher engages in thoughtful reconsideration of all that happens in a classroom with an eye toward improvement. The open-minded teacher is willing to consider new evidence (such as unexpected occurrences in a classroom or new theoretical knowledge) and is willing to admit the possibility of error.

The characteristics of mature reflective judgment indicate that teachers must also develop the ability to view situations from multiple perspectives, the ability to search for alternative explanations of classroom events, and the ability to use evidence in supporting or evaluating a decision or position. This definition of reflection provides a framework for helping teachers become more reflective and for evaluating their progress toward that goal (Ross, 1989). In response to Schön’s
theories of reflection, Tripp (1993) suggested that reflecting on what we do is essential to the development of professional judgment, but unless our reflection involves some form of challenge to and critique of ourselves, and our professional values, we tend to simply reinforce existing patterns and tendencies.

An important distinction about reflective practice made by Schön (1987) is that through reflective practice the practitioner becomes the researcher. Schön indicated that when someone reflects-in-action, he or she becomes a researcher in the practice context. He or she is not dependent on the categories of established theory and technique, but constructs a new theory of the unique case. Inquiry is not limited to a deliberation about means, which depends on a prior agreement about ends. The individual does not keep means and ends separate, but defines them interactively as he or she frames a problematic situation. Schön suggested that a reflective practitioner does not separate thinking from doing, instead reasons his or her way to a decision, which must later convert to action. Because this experimenting is a kind of action, implementation is built into the inquiry.

**Critical Reflection and Transformative Learning**

Jack Mezirow (1990) examined the process of reflection in relation to the adult learner. In *Fostering Critical Reflection in Adulthood: A guide to Transformative and Emancipatory Learning* (1990), Mezirow posed that learning in adulthood is often confined to preserving traditional ways of knowing and perpetuating them by socializing the young. He contended that traditional sources of authority are often unchallenged and become sources of “solace and security” (p. xiii). This is especially true for teachers. The literature in teacher preparation often refers to cultural myths (Britzman, 1991) that teachers bring with them into the classroom. These “cultural myths” frequently act as barriers to acquiring new knowledge and developing fresh perspectives about teaching and learning, especially for new and beginning teachers. These experiences have informed the prospective teacher about notions of good teaching that are extremely resistant to change (Britzman, 1991).

Critical reflection, according to Mezirow (1990), involves a critique of the presuppositions on which our beliefs have been built. Mezirow defines learning as the process of making a new or revised interpretation of the meaning of an experience. The newly acquired meaning, he asserted, then guides subsequent understanding, appreciation, and action. Mezirow suggested that what we perceive and fail to perceive, what we think and fail to think, are powerfully influenced by habits of expectation that constitute our frame of reference, that is, “a set of assumptions that structure the way we interpret our experiences” (p. 1).

Mezirow (1990) proposed that perspective transformation occurs in response to an externally imposed disorienting dilemma. He suggested that anomalies and dilemmas of which old ways of knowing cannot make sense become catalysts or trigger events that precipitate critical reflection and transformations. Teachers, and especially teacher candidates, are faced with hundreds of decisions daily.
that need a response. Many of these decisions do not have clear-cut answers. Resolution is determined by the way in which the teacher or candidate perceives the dilemma inherent in the incident. Mezirow defined perspectives as being made up of higher order schemata and beliefs. Meaning perspectives, he contended, refer to the structure of assumptions within which new experience is assimilated and transformed by one’s past experience during the process of interpretation. He emphasized that perspectives involve the application of habits of expectation to objects or events to form an interpretation or ascribe meaning. Habits of expectation are linked to prior experiences and, depending on the intensity of the experiences, the habits will be more or less embedded and resistant to change. Mezirow referred to personal critical reflection as the process necessary to mediate the tension derived when expectation is not fulfilled in the experience. Becoming critically aware involves challenging established and habitual patterns of expectation. Mezirow referred to this type of critical reflection on presuppositions as transformative learning that may involve correcting distorted assumptions from prior learning. Britzman (1991), Dewey (1933), Schön (1987), Valli (1993, 1997), van Manen (1977), and others who examine the nature of learning to teach also contend that implicit beliefs about teaching stem from lived experiences in classrooms and support the notion that reflection is a vehicle for change.

EXEMPLAR STUDIES ON REFLECTION

Ultimately, the value of reflection lies in its effect on practice. Empirical and theoretical perspectives inform the literature surrounding the value of reflection. Crowe (2003) conducted a study that highlighted the thinking of prospective teachers as they learned about teaching during their first experiences in a classroom. The results of her study indicated that the use of reflective thinking in confronting, identifying, and solving ill-structured problems was at the heart of learning how to teach. Crowe employed a qualitative study involving cases of three students enrolled in a master’s-degree-level internship program and who had no formal classroom teaching experience. Crowe referred to the catalyst that triggered reflective thinking in her students. For two students, the catalyst was the dissonance caused between expectation and lived experience. For the other student, the catalyst appeared to be her own metacognitive abilities and value for explicit reflection that seemed to continue to drive her reflective thinking. This study revealed that the relationship between reflective thinking and learning to teach could be described as a dynamic, problem-centered intellectual experience of learning from experience. Crowe discovered that when problem solving, her students drew from their attitudes, knowledge (including beliefs), and previous experiences to identify and attempt to solve the problem. Their reflective thinking involved both implicit and explicit reflection that helped them learn from experience. The reflective thinking processes reported by Crowe appeared to parallel the complex thinking processes
and learning from experience that Dewey (1933), van Manen (1977), and Schön (1983) described when they wrote about reflective thinking. The thinking exhibited by the prospective teachers was consistent with that reported in more recent works on the connection between reflective thinking and learning to teach (e.g., LaBoskey, 1994; Loughran, 2002; Korthagen, 2011).

In this study, Crowe demonstrated that student teachers followed somewhat similar patterns in their reflective thinking about their teaching. In particular, the stories provided examples of how the prospective teachers (1) were often surprised by the problem (resulting in frustration at times), (2) tried to understand the problem or problems (sometimes the problem was the surprise itself), (3) devised possible solutions to the problem or problems, (4) tried these solutions, (5) made judgments about the effectiveness of the solutions, and (6) recycled through these steps as needed. Crowe concluded that as the student teachers proceeded through this process of reflection, they learned about teaching from their practice of teaching and their reflective thinking.

The results of a study by LaBoskey (1994) on the development of practice of preservice teachers supported the position that initial reflectivity is resistant to change. LaBoskey found that students fell into two categories, alert novices and commonsense thinkers. The alert novices were more likely than the commonsense thinkers to be guided by a strong belief, e.g., the need for active learning and personal interpretation on the part of students, which often served as a powerful impetus for reflection. The two groups could also be differentiated by the nature of the questions they asked. Alert novices tended to ask “why” questions – “Why am I doing what I am doing?” whereas the commonsense thinkers tended to ask “how to” or “what works” questions. In addition, results seemed to indicate that half of the commonsense thinkers were unreflective because of a cognitive inability and the other half because of an emotional interference. Thus, both ability and attitude appear to be necessary for reflective thinking.

The results of LaBoskey’s study further suggest that reflectivity does not only entail an intelligent processing ability, it also includes a predisposition for engaging in these reasoning activities. The evidence supports Dewey’s proposal (1933) that the attitudes of open-mindedness, responsibility and wholeheartedness are integral to reflective action. The alert novice seems to be driven by a will to know. According to LaBoskey, “They are always on the lookout for something ‘better’” (p. 32). LaBoskey suggested that the beliefs and attitudes of the commonsense thinkers may be due to an absence of passionate creeds or to the asking of what works rather than why questions. Other evidence suggested that interfering attitudes and emotions may also be operating. It was revealed that the reflective process is a complex one in which both feelings and cognition are closely interrelated and interactive. The source of reflection LaBoskey discovered was often the occurrence of an external environmental event the person could not control or did not understand. The purpose of the reflection was then to regain control of the situation or to better comprehend an issue.
Calderhead and Gates (1993) edited a selection of papers that examined the nature of reflection in teachers’ professional development to consider the contribution of the papers to the ongoing development of teachers. A summary of the articles identified the distinctive and complex nature of the reflection involved in learning to teach. Calderhead and Gates contend that reflection in teacher education involves values, attitudes, and beliefs, as well as cognitive skills. They assert that the processes of learning to teach, focused as they are on the analysis and development of experience, may be in marked contrast to the academic learning to which prospective teachers may have been more accustomed.

A second feature emerging from the Calderhead and Gates study is that there appears to be a developmental process in becoming reflective. A third feature emphasized that teacher educators may frequently have overly high expectations for the achievements of student teachers. Changes in student teachers’ and even experienced teachers’ levels of reflection appear to occur only over fairly lengthy periods of time.

A danger raised by some of the papers is that of making reflection too process oriented. Reflection for its own sake may be unconstructive and even debilitating. Finally, the studies reported repeatedly emphasized the role of the mentor, teacher educator, or change agent to facilitate reflection.

Collectively, these papers point toward a view of professional growth which recognizes teaching as a complex activity that is highly demanding both cognitively and affectively and is a process of continuous development in which teachers themselves have a high personal, as well as professional, investment, working as they do in a context of powerful ideological and physical constraints.

Calderhead and Gates (1993) suggested the current enthusiasm for reflective teaching may be partly explained in terms of an attempt to understand more fully what is distinctive about teachers’ professional development and to come to terms with its complexity. They contend that teacher education programs based on notions of reflective practice frequently espouse one or more of the following aims:

• To enable teachers to analyze, discuss, evaluate, and change their own practice, adopting an analytical approach towards teaching;
• To foster teachers’ appreciation of the social and political contexts in which they work, helping teachers to recognize that teaching is socially and politically situated, and that the teacher’s task involves an appreciation and analysis of that context;
• To enable teachers to appraise the moral and ethical issues implicit in classroom practices, including the critical examination of their own beliefs about good teaching;
• To encourage teachers to take greater responsibility for their own professional growth and to acquire some degree of professional autonomy;
• To facilitate teachers’ development of their own theories of educational practice, understanding and developing a principled basis for their own classroom work;
• To empower teachers so that they may better influence future directions in education and take a more active role in educational decision making. (Calderhead & Gates, 1993, p. 2).

From the diverse conceptualizations of reflective teacher education, Calderhead and Gates (1993) discussed the agreement among teacher educators of the difficulty of putting ideas about reflective teaching into practice. They articulate nine provocative dilemmas for teacher educators and cite the many issues they believe are required to be addressed in examining the role of and potential of reflective teaching. The dilemmas are listed below:

1. What is the process of growth in developing reflection? Do student teachers go through a phase of developing taken-for-granted routines before they are in a position to analyze and critically evaluate them? What do we do to prepare students for reflection?

2. What is the relationship between personal knowledge and public knowledge? In what ways can we attempt to integrate the knowledge that grows from reflection on practice with other knowledge, such as theoretical knowledge and empirical research evidence that we deem to be of value in teacher education?

3. How do we accommodate professional growth and emancipation? How does one reconcile the aim of developing particular areas of knowledge, skill, and attitudes with the aim of encouraging autonomy and professional responsibility?

4. How do we accommodate reflective practice in schools?

5. How do we reconcile concerns with assessment with concerns for reflection? If student teachers know they are to be assessed by their tutors or supervising teachers, they may be much more reluctant to confide in them and discuss their concerns and difficulties openly.

6. How do we cater to individual differences in learning to teach? How do we take into account these differences in a reflective teacher education program?

7. What can be reasonably expected of student teachers during the course of a preservice program and what is only feasible in the much longer term, after considerable experience in the classroom and further inservice support?

8. What consideration do we have to give to the teaching context?

9. To what extent is reflection an individual or collective pursuit? Are reflective teaching programs more appropriately directed to groups of inservice teachers in schools where sustained professional support is more feasible?

The questions posed by Calderhead and Gates (1993) clearly reflect similar questions posed by other researchers in regard to reflection and teacher education. These questions draw attention to the complex nature of reflective practice.

Finally, an empirical study conducted by Deborah Britzman (1991) highlighted the lived experiences of two student teachers and offers a compelling view of teacher education, particularly from the point of view of student teachers. Britzman studied the phenomenon of student teaching through a psychological lens that critically
examined the process of learning how to teach. Her analysis revealed some of the
tensions, contradictions, and dilemmas that make the world of student teaching so
problematic. Britzman posed the question, “What does learning to teach do and
mean to student teachers and those involved in the practice of teaching?” (p. 2).
In an attempt to answer this question, Britzman explored how teacher identity is
constructed in the context of learning to teach. By pursuing an understanding of
the construction of teacher identity, Britzman exposed the need to develop what
she terms a double consciousness of persons and of places, relating those involved
in the practice of teaching to the history, mythology, and culture of the institutions
framing their work. Britzman argued that the story of learning to teach begins much
earlier than the time one first decides to become a teacher. She suggested that the
mass experience of public education has made teaching one of the most familiar
professions. This familiarity, Britzman asserted, is laden with stereotypical images
of teachers and superficial images of teaching. This familiarity becomes the material,
then, for cultural myths about teaching.

Cultural myths, according to Britzman, may bear upon the expectations, desires,
and investments one brings to and constructs during the process of becoming a
teacher. She suggested that student teachers are summoned by cultural myths – a
language for describing who they might become and what they should desire –
and through these myths, they recognize themselves as a teacher or feel as if they
do not possess what it takes to become one. Britzman identified three cultural
myths that inform the notion of the good teacher. The first, “Everything Depends
on the Teacher,” implies a power struggle that is predicated upon the institutional
expectation that teachers individually control their classes. This myth presumes that
learning is synonymous with control. Additionally, according to Britzman, outside
aid in controlling the class is perceived as a sign of professional incompetency. She
suggested that teachers tend to judge themselves, and others tend to judge them, on
the basis of their success with classroom control. The pressure of having student
learning as a product of social control is especially problematic for the student
teacher, who is engaged in her or his own process of learning while coming to terms
with the contradictory effects of social control.

The second cultural myth presented by Britzman is “The Teacher as Expert.”
This myth has the potential to cause even more stress for the student of teaching
as two fears are collapsed into one: knowing how to teach and knowing everything
there is to know about the material. Britzman suggested that the fear and anxiety
rooted in not knowing what to do force the student teacher to look to teaching
methods as the source rather than the effect of pedagogy. She emphasized that this
socialized expectation, that methods can be applied like recipes, cannot accommodate
the fact that methodology always means more than mere application. The second
fear, never knowing enough to teach, expresses the larger cultural expectation that
teachers are certain in their knowledge and that knowledge expresses certainty.
Britzman highlighted this myth as problematic because student teachers dwell in
two uncertain worlds: they are being educated as a student while educating others as
a teacher. The student teachers in Britzman's study felt the pressure to know and the corresponding guilt in not knowing. She suggested that they were prevented from attending to the deeper epistemological issues—about the construction of knowledge and the values and interests that inhere in knowledge.

The construct of the teacher as expert also tended to produce the image of the teacher as an autonomous individual and as the source of knowledge. Knowledge as possession, then, is knowledge that is not constructed through values, interests, and ideology. Becoming an expert, Britzman asserted, becomes the key to controlling knowledge and imposing it on students as a means of control.

The third cultural myth proposed by Britzman, “Teachers are Self-Made,” supports the view that teachers form themselves and are born into the profession. According to Britzman, this natural teacher somehow possesses talent, intuition, and common sense, all essential features of the good teacher. The underlying assumption of this myth “diminishes reflection on how we come to know and on what it is we draw upon and shut out in the practice of pedagogy” (Britzman, 1991, p. 230). In the supposedly self-made world of the teacher, Britzman offered a compelling argument that pedagogy is then positioned as a product of one’s personality and therefore is replaced by teaching style. This teaching style, viewed as an extension of one’s personality, functions to distinguish one teacher from the next and is valued as an important source of one’s individuality. Britzman cautioned that the concept of teaching style, even promoted by teacher education programs, engenders the assumption that teaching style metamorphoses into knowledge. Teaching style becomes like something you try on until the right one is found. However, valuing teaching style over pedagogy ignores both the social basis of pedagogy and the institutional pressure for teachers to exert social control. In conclusion, Britzman asserted that the myth that teachers are self-made serves to cloak the social relationships and the context of school structure by exaggerating personal autonomy.

Britzman raised questions important for teacher education and challenged teacher educators to explore the dynamics of power and desire in learning to teach and how biography influences experience.

SUMMARY

Dispositions, reflective thinking, and reflective practice have become an important part of the conversation about effective teaching. In this chapter the concept of reflective thinking is discussed as an essential disposition for professional practice. According to John Dewey (1933), thinking, particularly reflective thinking or inquiry, is essential to both teachers’ and students’ learning. In the past 30 years numerous commissions, boards, and foundations as well as state and local education agencies have identified reflection/inquiry as a standard toward which all teachers and students must strive. Although the cry for reflective thinking is clear, it is difficult to depict what reflective thinking is. For many, reflection has been a
taken-for-granted assumption. It is often assumed that reflection happens automatically when an individual encounters a dilemma or problem. However, everyone does not solve problems and resolve dilemmas in the same way or with the same results. A classroom teacher’s day is filled with hundreds of problems and dilemmas that require action. Effectively responding to classroom challenges requires reflective thought. A disposition of reflection will allow a teacher to step back from the situation and examine it in new light. A disposition of reflection thus implies a dynamic way of being both inside and outside the classroom. The purpose of this chapter was to examine the disposition of reflective thinking and provide some clarity to how reflective thinking is characterized in the literature on learning to teach. Four theories of reflective practice were examined. Reflective practice is defined in many ways, but the effects of reflective thinking on learning were first examined by John Dewey in 1933. Dewey established the premise that “reflection is central to all learning experiences enabling individuals to act in a deliberate and intentional fashion…to convert action that is merely blind and impulsive into intelligent action” (Dewey, 1933, p. 212). Fifty years after Dewey’s work on reflection, Donald Schön began an exploration of professional knowledge and brought ‘reflection’ to the center of understanding of what professionals do. According to Schön, reflective practice is the capacity to reflect on action so as to engage in a process of continuous learning (Schön, 1983). According to one definition reflection involves “paying critical attention to the practical values and theories which inform everyday actions, by examining practice reflectively and reflexively. This leads to “developmental insight” (Bolton, 2010, p. 25). A key rationale for reflective practice is that experience alone does not necessarily lead to learning; deliberate reflection on experience is essential (Loughran, 2002; Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2006). Schön (1983) emphasized that reflective practice is an important tool in practice-based professional learning settings where people learn from their own professional experiences, rather than from formal learning or knowledge transfer. According to Schön (1983, 1987), reflection may be the most important source of professional development and improvement. It is also an important way to bring together theory and practice; through reflection a person is able to see and label forms of thought and theory within the context of his or her work. A person who reflects throughout his or her practice is not just looking back on past actions and events, but is taking a conscious look at emotions, experiences, actions, and responses, and using that information to add to his or her existing knowledge base and reach a higher level of understanding.

Van Manen (1977) and Vali (1993, 1997) posit that critical reflection is the distinguishing attribute of reflective practitioners. The term critical reflection as developed here merges critical inquiry, the conscious consideration of the ethical implications and consequences of teaching practice, with self-reflection, deep examination of personal beliefs, and assumptions about human potential and learning. Britzman (1991) suggests teacher beliefs are self-generating, and often
unchallenged. Unless teachers develop the practice of critical reflection, they stay trapped in unexamined judgments, interpretations, assumptions, and expectations. Approaching teaching as a reflective practitioner involves infusing personal beliefs and values into a professional identity, resulting in, as Dewey (1933) claims, intelligent decision-making.

CONCLUSION

More than ever teachers are entering a profession profoundly different than what they experienced as children in school. Today, teaching in the United States happens in a political arena that is filled with high expectations and high accountability. State and national initiatives have strengthened teaching standards to ensure teachers are prepared to teach learners with varied backgrounds. The school milieu itself is facing unprecedented change, including the breakdown of family and community structures, and increasing levels of violent behavior among young people, the rapid creation of new knowledge, and the advances in technology that can literally transform traditional teaching and learning processes. Establishing a culture of teaching professionals who are pro-actively engaged in intelligent decision-making through critical reflective practice is necessary to ensure children of today are actively engaged in the learning process and will be ready to enter college or the workforce upon graduation from high school. Teachers today need more than a technical orientation to teaching. Teachers today need a disposition that allows them to weigh competing viewpoints, examine multiple perspectives, listen to the voices of students, and make decisions that promote equity and justice. One of the most important challenges facing teacher preparation programs today is to ensure that teacher candidates are prepared to meet the academic needs of all students. The current demand in many states is for teachers to be ready to teach, with the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to support student learning, from the first day they enter the classroom. In addition, much attention from the media, parents and policy makers continues to be placed on the education of our children and whether they are adequately being prepared to compete in a global market place. The changing landscape of schools and the demand for increased teacher accountability required a transformation of teacher preparation. No longer is it acceptable for candidates to enter the profession from a program that merely promotes skill development and a non-reflective approach to teaching. The teaching professional today needs the capacity to reflect critically on his or her practice and consistently adjust his or her teaching to ensure students are learning. A new pathway to improved teacher preparation was immanent. What has emerged is a nationally available assessment for new teacher candidates, the edTPA. The edTPA is a performance-based multiple-measures assessment of teaching—built and submitted by the candidates—that addresses planning, instruction, assessment and analyzing teaching. The three tasks (planning, instruction and assessment) represent a cycle of effective teaching (i.e. teaching that is focused on student
The Planning task documents the candidate’s intended teaching, the Instruction task documents the candidate’s enacted teaching, and the Assessment task documents the impact of the candidate’s teaching on student learning. The edTPA process identifies and collects subject-specific evidence of effective teaching from a learning segment of 3–5 lessons from a unit of instruction for one class of students. Candidates submit authentic artifacts from a clinical field experience. Candidates also submit commentaries that provide a rationale to support their instructional practices based on the learning strengths and needs of students. (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 2015). Candidates’ evidence is evaluated and scored within the following five dimensions of learning.

1. **Planning Instruction and Assessment** establishes the instructional and social context for student learning and includes lesson plans, instructional materials and student assignments/assessments. Candidates demonstrate how their plans align with content standards, build upon students’ prior academic learning and life experiences and how instruction is differentiated to address student needs.

2. **Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning** includes one or two unedited video clips for 15–20 minutes from the learning segment and a commentary analyzing how the candidate engages students in learning activities. Candidates also demonstrate subject-specific pedagogical strategies and how they elicit and monitor student responses to develop deep subject matter understandings.

3. **Assessing Student Learning** includes classroom based assessment (evaluation criteria), student work samples, evidence of teacher feedback, and a commentary analyzing patterns of student learning. Candidates summarize the performance of the whole class, analyze the specific strength and needs of three focus students, and explain how their feedback guides student learning.

4. **Analysis of Teaching Effectiveness** is addressed in commentaries within Planning, Instruction and Assessment tasks. In planning candidates justify their plans based on the candidate’s knowledge of diverse students’ learning strengths and needs and principles of research and theory. In Instruction, candidates explain and justify which aspects of the learning segment were effective, and what the candidate would change. Lastly, candidates use their analysis of assessment results to inform next steps for individuals and groups with varied learning needs.

5. **Academic Language Development** is evaluated based on the candidate’s ability to support students’ oral and written use of academic language to deepen subject matter understandings. Candidates explain how students demonstrate academic language using student work samples and/or video recordings of student engagement (AACTE, 2015).

The five dimensions of teaching are evaluated using 15 analytic rubrics on a five point-score scale focused on student learning. The edTPA is transformative for prospective teachers because the process requires candidates to actually demonstrate the knowledge and skills required to help all students learn in real classrooms. However, more importantly edTPA asks candidates to provide a rationale for
instructional decisions and fosters the disposition of critical reflection through written commentaries and evidence of how student learning is supported.

Evaluation of instructional effectiveness is ongoing through analysis and reflection. The three tasks of the edTPA paired with analytic reflection allow the candidate to be mindful of the complexity of teaching. By placing classroom students in the center of planning, instruction and assessment requires a critically reflective stance, one which takes the whole child into consideration with the intention of improving the quality of instruction.

edTPA has been adopted by many teacher preparation programs in the United States to support student learning and is aligned with InTASC standards and NCATE standards as a summative capstone assessment to evaluate readiness to teach by promoting the disposition of critical reflection.
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