NATHAN D. BRUBAKER

11. CULTIVATING DEMOCRATICALLY-MINDED TEACHERS

A Pedagogical Journey

In this chapter, I examine how my interactions with graduate-level pre-service teacher candidates in an elective course on teaching for critical thinking helped shape my pedagogy of teacher education concerning diversity and democratic citizenship. Specifically, I deconstruct a class discussion in which a particularly outspoken student, as the facilitator of the session, encouraged participants to critically question their assumptions about classroom discourse, civil rights teaching, and diverse perspectives about the topic of freedom. In analysing specific examples of discourse from class, I illuminate the complexities of learning to teach through dialogical pedagogies that simultaneously construct and are constructed by diversity content. From highlighting the multiple challenges to authority embedded in our interactions, I provide insights into the pedagogical journey I experienced, involving the following questions: Of what value was a classroom community of inquiry to furthering students' development as teachers? What should I have done differently to help students more effectively transition from the role of student to facilitator? What were some developmental dynamics of learning about and through a participatory and (allegedly) non-indoctrinating approach? Such insights are important for constructing pedagogical practices congruent with democratic aims and preparing teachers who are democratically-minded and embrace diversity.

TEACHING DEMOCRATICALLY

In a recent volume on teacher educators' professional learning (Williams & Hayler, 2015), I described my journey of becoming a democratic teacher educator—of transforming my pedagogical practice from transmission to dialogue—as the central defining transition of my professional career. My quest to learn the skills and knowledge necessary for making students' interests central to my teaching has proven pivotal—since first developing an interest in teaching adults as an undergraduate teacher education student—to my identity as a teacher educator. Courageously countering authoritarian assumptions in teaching has represented, to me, an essential means of helping future teachers construct alternatives to conventional practices—to fashion pedagogical identities congruent with democratic aims and create possibilities for enacting powerful and transformative experiences

J. Kitchen et al. (Eds.), Self-Study and Diversity II, 173–191.

for learners. While the tendency towards unilateral experiences in which students are silenced—where teachers presumably are all-knowing experts and students know nothing—remains prevalent, the potential to challenge such circumstances endures. As a teacher educator, I have learned to be increasingly comfortable blazing new pedagogical terrain instead of being stifled by the pedagogical solitude associated with teaching democratically (Brubaker, 2015b).

As Kahne and Westheimer (2003) have acknowledged, many citizens in our contemporary world are often disengaged from politics. Many are passive and apathetic when it comes to major issues that affect their lives. If democracy is to be effective at improving society, people need to exert power over issues that affect their lived realities. Otherwise, we risk experiencing what Ambrose (2005) has called democratic erosion, which occurs when citizens and policymakers are insufficiently diligent about maintaining widespread, deliberative participation in social matters. According to Ambrose (2005), a nation can strengthen its democratic fiber or allow its democracy to erode; strengthening democracy requires diligent maintenance by political leaders and citizens alike. In this respect, teachers and teacher educators possess particular responsibility for strengthening democracy by cultivating in future generations the propensity to participate in democratic life. As Brookfield (2010) contends, learning democracy can only happen in the doing of democracy. As such, educational settings must embody not just the rhetoric of democracy, but its actual practice (Apple, 2011). In Palmer's (2011) view, the relational dynamics of classrooms have a more lasting impact on students than any information they acquire for tests. The pedagogical imperative is therefore clear: teachers and teacher educators must carefully attend not just to what they teach, but how they teach it, with particular attention to how their practices are implicated with broader democratic aims across social contexts.

As a teacher educator, I have devoted myself to constructing a pedagogy of teacher education to which diversity and democratic citizenship are not just topics of study, but ways of life to be embraced and embodied. For me, doing so has meant contributing to a cause that is deeply intertwined with broader quests for social justice and democracy throughout the world. How teachers and teacher educators conduct themselves in classrooms, invariably, has implications beyond classroom walls. I therefore seek to exhibit congruence (both implicitly and otherwise) between my actions and beliefs in ways that support my vision of the kind of world I seek to inhabit. In my efforts to actualize such aims, I draw inspiration from such Civil Rights icons as Martin Luther King, Jr. (Carson, 1998) and John Lewis (Lewis, 1998, 2012) who—in leading peaceful protests fifty years ago in pursuit of racial justice, equity, and the right to vote—exemplified such efforts. As they led marchers across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama (USA), only to be brutally beaten by state police, they exuded extraordinary courage, conviction, and strength of character consistent with their commitments to embodying respect and dignity. Such action, on behalf of building a better world, provides an animating metaphor for cultivating democratically-minded teachers who embrace diversity. In this chapter, I

describe one component of my journey to enact this vision with prospective teachers and contribute to broader efforts to create more democratic schools and societies.

DIALOGICAL PEDAGOGY

Dialogical, deliberative pedagogy provides the moral and conceptual anchor for cultivating democracy in teacher education settings (Boyle-Baise, 2003). To Brookfield (2010), dialogue involves engaging in constant and meaningful communication with each other. It also involves higher-order thinking and a deep and abiding appreciation for complexity, uncertainty, and multiple perspectives (Ambrose, 2005). Whereas ideological extremism involves tenacious, dogmatic adherence to single views, dialogue requires more nuanced consideration and interpretation of multidimensional issues in ways that promote deeper, on-going exploration and examination. As Noddings (2013) has acknowledged, values are not simply handed down in such environments, but are cooperatively constructed through shared participation. The opportunity to exercise independent judgment in constructing such values is of paramount importance. As Bode (1950) has argued, students of all backgrounds attend school; it is inconceivable they should all emerge with the same conclusions. To indoctrinate students would defeat the very purpose of democracy. By embodying democratic values through dialogue, teachers and teacher educators are more likely to advance deliberative thinking, undermine absolutist thought, and promote more substantive engagement with the full breadth of complexity in life.

Cultivating a classroom "community of inquiry" (CI)—in which participants are encouraged to build on one another's ideas and assist each other in providing reasons, drawing inferences, and identifying each other's assumptions (Lipman, 2003)—is considered a particularly effective cross-disciplinary approach to helping students think for themselves, come to their own conclusions about matters of importance to their lives, and enact a dialogical pedagogy (Lipman, 1988, 2003; Lipman, Sharp, & Oscanyan, 1980). As the basis of Philosophy for Children (P4C)—an internationally recognized program for fostering critical thinking across disciplines through dialogical teaching—this community approach represents the best available model for actualizing Dewey's vision of democratic teaching (Cam, 2008; Johnson, 1995; Kennedy, 1995). Surprisingly little empirical research, however, has been conducted on CI in teacher education contexts. CI has been theorized as fundamentally egalitarian (Cassidy et al., 2008), democratic (Sharp, 1993), and as involving different conceptions of community (Farr Darling, 2001). Yet, limited insight has been generated concerning the role of teacher education coursework in helping prospective teachers learn to foster dialogical classrooms. The purpose of this study was to use a particular teacher education student's efforts to transition from student to facilitator in CI to help illuminate my own pedagogical journey as a teacher educator committed to cultivating democratically-minded teachers who embraced diversity in their teaching.

METHODOLOGY

I conducted the study at a large comprehensive state university in a rural area in the Southeastern U.S. The study took place in the graduate course, *Teaching for Critical Thinking*, which I offered as an elective at Southeast State University (a pseudonym to protect the confidentiality of my research participants) in the summer 2010 term due to student request. Of the ten students enrolled, I had previously taught each of them as undergraduates in the class, *Diversity in Elementary Education*, across different sections of the course over three semesters. All students identified as female, of whom one was of African-American ancestry and all others of European-American descent, ranging in age from 21-23 in the first term of their graduate year as part of a five-year M.A.T. program for teaching children in grades PK-6. Nine of the ten students provided their consent to participate in the research as it was approved by the university's institutional ethics process. I identified as of European-American ancestry, in my mid-thirties, and as a third-year member of the teacher education faculty.

In the course, *Diversity in Elementary Education*, I used a critically-reflective and discussion-based approach to help introduce students to diversity concepts (e.g., race and ethnicity, social class, and pedagogical diversity) and help them reflect more deeply on individual and shared assumptions concerning the intersection of class topics with their personal experiences. In the course described in this study, *Teaching for Critical Thinking*, I extended students' previous study of diversity by situating it more deeply within the broader methodological framework of the classroom community of inquiry (Brubaker, 2012a; Lipman, 2003; Sharp, 1993). As what I considered to be the best currently-available means of teaching for critical thinking across disciplines using a dialogical and non-indoctrinating approach, I used novels and discussion plans from the P4C curriculum (e.g., Lipman, 1983; Lipman & Sharp, 1985) to promote the pedagogical focus of the course, while integrating theoretical and practical texts from the organization, *Rethinking Schools,* as well as from other sources, to highlight diversity content. Overall, to help deepen students' understanding of teaching for critical thinking, I selected texts intended to focus their attention simultaneously on diversity content and the procedural dimensions of philosophical inquiry through which we collectively engaged with such content.

As a self-study of my own practice as a beginning teacher educator, I sought to subject my practices to public critique as a means of both reinterpreting and reframing my experience (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). Doing so was important for grappling with the difficulties and dilemmas embedded in my teaching, constructing knowledge of relevance to teachers and teacher educators more broadly (LaBoskey, 2004), and realizing the many benefits associated with studying one's own practice, including the opportunity to assess the congruence of my practices and beliefs (Berry, 2004; Loughran, 2004; Schulte, 2009) and improve my credibility as a teacher educator (Hamilton & Pinnegar, 2000). As part of a larger research project,

I audio recorded and selectively transcribed all activities associated with the course throughout the term while also maintaining a personal journal and using students' written assignments as data. I analyzed relevant transcripts from the 14 class sessions (150 minutes each) and 15 meetings with students outside of class, as well as a variety of teacher- and student-generated course documents like e-mails, reflective papers, and critical incident questionnaires (Brookfield, 1995).

To analyse the data, I used a range of grounded theory methods (Birks & Mills, 2012; Glaser & Strauss, 1999; Strauss & Corbin, 1998) including constant comparison, theoretical saturation, and memos. I used the computer software program, QSR Nvivo 9.0, to facilitate the process of constant comparison, which involved an iterative and inductive method of analysing the data line-by-line, proceeding at least three times through the full data set. Theoretical saturation involved arriving at conceptually abstract categories until no new codes could be clearly articulated or integrated. Writing memos consisted of maintaining a detailed record of the decision-making processes that informed all of my research activities, including changes in my research direction and my rationale for such changes. In all, I identified 7 main categories (e.g., Colette's facilitation) and 33 subcategories (e.g., seeking answers, seeking clarification, specific requests) of relevance to this study, involving 168 total references in the data, which I have summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Categories and subcategories

Main categories	*Total references*	*Total subcategories*	*Largest subcategory*	*References in subcategory*
Colette's facilitation	34	5	Specific requests	12
Practice of T4CT	33	6	Participation patterns	10
Personal outlook on class	29	4	Personal agitation	11
Outlook on authority	28	4	Internalized authority	9
Colette's contributions to class	22	5	Colette's successes	8
Outlook on philosophy	14	3	Added content	6
Conceptions of freedom	8	6	Freedom as strength of the entire community	2
7	168	33	7 of 33 subcategories	58

Upon completing such analysis, I selected a single discussion to comprise the central focus of the study. This discussion occurred in the tenth session and was

led by a particularly outspoken student (Colette—all names used are pseudonyms). It consisted of ninety minutes of classroom talk (28 typed pages). I selected this particular discussion because of its relevance to civil rights teaching, its relevance to my own pedagogical journey, and because it best exemplified my efforts to help students facilitate discussion through cultivating CI. Colette's circumstances, overall, also comprised a sort of negative case—a situation that was contrary to what was expected (Birks & Mills, 2012)—in that she was responsible for helping to organize the course (without her initiative, I would not have offered it as an elective); she actively negotiated her obligations for the class when presented the opportunity to design an individualized grading contract (Brubaker, 2010, 2015a); she was the only student to accept my proposed option of facilitating a discussion in class as one of her negotiated requirements; I had the most interaction with her of any other student in the class; her struggles and successes in learning to lead class discussion were most readily evident in the data; and in our twelfth class session, in the ensuing week, she assumed a leadership role in precipitating a critical moment concerning religion and gender that shaped our class deliberations in rather dramatic fashion (Brubaker, 2014).

PEDAGOGICAL AIMS

As the teacher of the course, I presented to students at various points throughout the semester insight into my pedagogical aims in an effort to help shape their learning about teaching for critical thinking. In both writing and in class, I shared my view that teachers, to effectively teach for critical thinking, needed to embody particular attributes. Such attributes included accepting that knowledge was subject to change—that theories were inherently tentative and changed depending on evidence; encouraging the asking of questions, even ones that challenged our own beliefs; seeking out and having empathy for alternative viewpoints as a means of seeing the world from a variety of perspectives; and tolerating ambiguity, on the basis that seldom was there just one right answer (Wright, 2002). I explained how philosophically contestable questions comprised the best sources of meaningful discussion (Haynes & Murris, 2011), and that a philosophical concept would be expected to have many different answers and perspectives. In this respect, I considered teaching for critical thinking at its best when approached as an act of doing philosophy instead of just learning about it. As I described in class, doing so meant incorporating multiple actions into our repertoire as teachers, of which the following were examples:

1. Starting with students' questions and with what they found interesting.
2. Being flexible in responding to what students found of interest.
3. Being able to anticipate the path the inquiry could take.
4. Having materials available to help take the discussion deeper.
5. Having different types of questions in mind to help extend students' thinking.
6. Being able to respond flexibly based on where the discussion went.

7. Making sure that, as the teacher, one did not just take over the discussion.
8. Making efforts to bring in additional perspectives.
9. Having a philosophical ear, to be able to discern the philosophical substance of the different perspectives expressed.
10. Following the inquiry where it led.

In aspiring to have students in class both experience CI and become more aware of what they would need to do as teachers to help make it possible, I regularly emphasized my view that discussion-based teaching was a complex undertaking. As teachers, I explained how:

> It's not just, 'oh we feel good and that stands for fun.' A discussion is a highly orchestrated, highly planned, highly skilled activity…and to pull off a meaningful discussion takes a lot of preparation, a lot of expertise, and a lot of skill to be able to make that happen.

Actually leading discussions with children that would maximize their collective engagement, I shared, required anticipating a range of actions they could take as teachers. To help facilitate students' thinking about what moves they would anticipate making as teachers, I regularly asked them questions, both in individual meetings and in class, like the following:

> Would you ask people for their reasons? Do you ask them to give specific examples? Will you ask them about what they're assuming? If someone says x, then what are you going to say in response? If they say y, then what would you say differently?

In my view, there were many different layers and dimensions to learning to teach for critical thinking—it was not a straightforward process they could anticipate quickly mastering. Helping students learn to make the fundamental transition "from banking-style teaching to facilitator-esque teaching" was nevertheless what I considered to be the central purpose of the course. In making such a transition, I believed they would be more likely to teach in ways that helped children realize Lipman's (2003) conception of critical thinking: making good judgments that are reliant on criteria, sensitive to context, and self-correcting.

PARALLEL AGITATION

Collette was particularly enthusiastic about the pedagogical aims I espoused concerning teaching for critical thinking. She was an active participant in class discussions and was committed to voluntarily leading her peers for part of a session as a means of demonstrating her capacity to cultivate critical thought in class. The tenth session of the semester was her allocated day to assume a leadership role and implement her plan. Little did I realize the event would nearly be cancelled before it commenced—coming at a time of parallel agitation between myself and Colette.

Personally, my concerns about the course had been mounting. I had previously taught a similar course with undergraduate students at a different university, but not with graduate students, and not with ones I had already taught. While I considered the existing relationships within the class an invaluable resource for maximizing what we could realistically accomplish, I was becoming increasingly disillusioned by my narrowing perception of what ultimately seemed realistic.

My personal agitation reached its pinnacle on the day before Colette's session. In my journal, I recorded in rather spectacular fashion that I was "pretty confident all hell was going to break loose and the world was…going to come to an end," in that I had essentially "given up on the spirit of the course" and declared "the whole thing a complete failure." My dialogical and inquiry-based approach, it seemed, embodied "a very advanced form of teaching" which was "incredibly far away from the entire transmission [model]" (Freire, 1996)—too far, perhaps, to realistically help novices learn to teach for critical thinking, particularly how I had envisioned it as consistent with CI and P4C. Perceiving a need for a more "gradual weaning away" from transmission-based teaching than I had implemented to date, I considered students' chances of realizing pedagogical transformation in the course—perhaps ever—not only unlikely, but potentially no longer worth further pursuing.

Colette's agitation likewise peaked the day before her looming deadline to lead class—further fuelling my own angst. I recognized Colette brought much to the group. In my journal at the beginning of the semester, I expressed confidence that she would be a "driving influence" in the class. I looked forward to her "driving, penetrating, probing questions" and to her "brilliant points" and "brilliant counterarguments" as "a good questioner." Nevertheless, the immediate circumstances proved frustrating as Colette exhibited, to me, unexpected desperation to finalize her plan for class. As I recorded in my journal:

> I was pissed with Colette for leaving her…project to the last minute and then panicking, as though she had no idea [her day to lead class] was coming, and putting it all on my own lap, and for not being able to take the leap from student to teacher and realize how her participation needs to change and be transformed and shift.

As I shared with Colette in my office the day before her session, "I know that you're very gifted in terms of coming in and orchestrating things in a discussion and being an active participant, but…now you're on…the other side of being a teacher." I expected her to have been more thoroughly prepared. We had communicated about her plan through e-mail, but only minimally, and without more time, there was little more we could do to further develop her intentions. From her perspective, she was concerned her "initial plan of leading class [would] be…wrong" since she had "never done anything like this before." She said: "I just don't know what to do. [I've] never done anything like [it] before…[with so many] moving components that I don't know about." She expressed feeling "confused" and "out of sorts about what to do" since she had "never really facilitated a discussion before." In our parallel

agitation—with me having privately declared the class a complete failure and her concluding she had no idea how to proceed—we faced a crisis. It proved a critical turning point in our quest to advance the pedagogical cause of the course to which we were both committed.

CONTEXT OF THE DISCUSSION

Two class sessions earlier, I had shared with students Episode 6, "Bridge to Freedom," of the documentary, *Eyes on the Prize* (Crossley & DeVinney, 1987), concerning the historic civil rights march from Selma to Montgomery (Alabama, USA) in 1965. I had already assigned students an article to read on civil rights teaching (Lyman, 2001) containing insights into the civil rights demonstrators' march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge and its relevance to elementary teaching. The video footage from *Eyes on the Prize* of the violent police response to peaceful demonstrators attempting to cross the bridge is graphic and confronting; students found it shocking. None of them had likely witnessed such extended footage of this particular event—Bloody Sunday—which helped give rise to key voting rights legislation in the era. Following the film, consistent with CI as recommended for elementary classrooms (Whalley, 1993), I invited students to construct questions concerning aspects of the documentary they considered particularly interesting, puzzling, or confusing. We constructed a list of eleven questions: two about stereotypes, five concerning the feelings and motivations of figures in the actual events of the time, two involving the broader historical context, and two about the concept of freedom. We selected the question, "what is freedom?" for future class discussion.

As Colette and I further discussed ideas for her session, we recognized that, due to scheduling anomalies, we had not yet discussed our selected question as a class. Colette therefore decided to incorporate it into her plan for the following day. For opening the session, Colette intended to use a chapter I had assigned for everyone to read, "When Talk Breaks Down" (Reed, 1983), to highlight common problems in classroom talk (e.g., oversimplification, forestalling disagreement, avoiding the question, arguing from moral purity, jumping on the bandwagon, etc.). She wanted to clarify with others the meaning and relevance of each of the ten problems described in the text, then assign problems to each member of the class so they could focus on detecting whether or not their assigned problems were evident in our discussion. For the second part of her session, Colette and I agreed to co-facilitate a class discussion concerning freedom using a philosophical discussion plan from P4C curricular materials designed for intermediate-level (grade 3–4) elementary students (Lipman & Gazzard, 1988, p. 235). The particular discussion plan required participants to respond to particular scenarios (e.g., 'we are free if no one tells us how to live,' 'we are free if we think we're free,' 'we are free only when everyone is free')—each representing different philosophical perspectives—by agreeing or disagreeing, explaining why, then inviting others' comments. To close, Colette intended to revisit the first part of the session and lead the class in collectively

identifying, unpacking and debriefing the different types of problems that surfaced in our discussion, and evaluate their relevance for elementary teaching. Arriving at such a plan proved helpful for alleviating our agitation, at least for the time being. From the ensuing session, three themes emerged for the study concerning Colette's transition from student to facilitator in CI of particular relevance to my own pedagogical journey as a teacher educator: uncovering others' views, managing diverse perspectives, and countering conventional teaching. Below, I elaborate on each of these themes.

UNCOVERING OTHERS' VIEWS

Uncovering others' views represented a dimension of Colette's transition from student to facilitator that was particularly prominent throughout her session. In planning for class discussion, it quickly became evident that fostering sustained dialogue required a different type of responsiveness to those involved than she was accustomed to demonstrating in more teacher-directed contexts. The challenge of uncovering others' views rather than relying on her own—through employing strategies like anticipating what people might say, posing questions, and using discussion plans—helped illuminate the complexity of cultivating CI. In facilitating our session, Colette made use of a variety of prompts to elicit input from those in class and help shape our collective discourse. The prompt she implemented most frequently involved providing opportunities for students to offer perspectives and openly express themselves in the presence of others. The following questions were typical of this approach:

> Does anyone else have anything they want to add?
> Does anyone else have anything based on what [she] was saying about the analogy?
> Does anyone have any questions about that?

In posing such questions, Colette continually tried to involve as many students as possible in shaping the direction of our deliberations. She created space for multiple voices to be heard concerning the topics being discussed, inviting students to voluntarily contribute perspectives and build on others' ideas while also providing opportunities to open new lines of inquiry.

Beyond eliciting input to help broaden the base of participation in class and ensure it was not dominated by just a few individuals, Colette contributed questions concerning the quality of students' participation. One such prompt was to seek clarification of the ideas already expressed, of which the following questions were examples:

> So no one's free?
> Is anyone else confused?

So you agree?

In posing such questions, Colette encouraged students to exhibit awareness and understanding of each other's contributions, while clarifying their thinking and promoting shared understanding to help advance the collective discourse.

Colette also employed questions involving specific requests of particular individuals. Her contributions in this regard were largely concerned with evoking agreement and disagreement about particular views expressed, while seeking individuals' assessment of the matters being discussed. The following types of questions exemplified this strategy:

So would you…say that's an effective analogy?
Do you…feel like everything we brought up was valid?
Does anyone disagree with Dr. Brubaker on this one?
Is arguing always necessarily a bad thing?

In posing such requests, Colette presented participants opportunities to make explicit their reasoning and judgments. Identifying similarities and differences of viewpoints within the group created possibilities for taking the discussion in diverse directions. Her questions were not concerned with forcing convergence on predetermined answers and conclusions, but of encouraging those present to reveal their views as a means of expanding the discussion.

Effectively promoting critical thinking involves employing a range of inquiry tools to actively build on others' ideas and follow the inquiry where it leads (Gregory, 2007; Jackson, 2001; Splitter & Sharp, 1995). Uncovering others' views is a necessary start for making explicit participants' thinking and generating diverse understandings of topics being examined. Colette's contributions as a facilitator of CI helped ensure each member's contributions were valued for fashioning a collaborative context. Doing so presented possibilities for creating a more participatory and student-centered classroom, where developing participants' thinking was privileged over reproducing predetermined answers. Employing a wider range of open-ended prompts may have increased the emphasis on intellectual rigor, reasoned judgment, and skilled inquiry within a context of shared responsibility for shaping the discussion agenda. Nevertheless, her actions presented a path to communicating openly, cultivating informed conclusions, and working towards a more complex understanding of the issues being discussed—important steps towards fostering philosophical inquiry and dialogue.

MANAGING DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES

Managing diverse perspectives, as a consequence of uncovering others' views, represented a second challenge of transitioning from student to facilitator in CI. As Lipman (1988) has described, a central tension in facilitating CI is one of actively

encouraging inquiry and discussion while guarding against unwitting indoctrination. Being pedagogically strong (exerting procedural direction) yet philosophically self-effacing (focusing on developing participants' views instead of advocating for one's own) constitutes a delicate balance. Handling this tension is a key responsibility of CI facilitators. The complexity of doing so was evident in Colette's session when managing participants' diverse perspectives concerning the topic of freedom. The perspectives expressed in class included views that freedom:

1. Was the absence of restriction—one was free when others were not;
2. Constituted an absence of threat—one was free when there was no malicious intent to take away one's freedom;
3. Derived from adhering to rules, since laws were made not to confine people, but to protect them from harm;
4. Derived from complete autonomy and isolation, without the possibility of impacting others (like living alone on an island);
5. Derived from the strength of the entire community.

Of all the perspectives expressed in class, it was our exchange concerning the last—the view that freedom derived from the strength of the entire community—that most clearly illustrated the challenge of distinguishing inquiry and indoctrination in facilitating philosophical discourse. I introduced this perspective to our discussion when I shared that "it could be relevant to think of freedom as a collective." I elaborated:

> [If] there's a weakness in [the] community…and the community collectively has not stepped up to remedy that weakness, then [according to such a perspective, we are] not free…unless, as a community, we are strong enough to protect, preserve, advocate for, and nurture everyone. And if we haven't done that, [then we] need to assume responsibility and say, [we're] a part of this community, [we] failed because someone had been failed so therefore [we've] lost at least part of [our] freedom.

Colette was quick to challenge this perspective, asserting that those who employed dogs and fire hoses against civil rights demonstrators, as documented in *Eyes on the Prize*, could be argued to have, "as a collective community," simply been defending "their right to segregation." I clarified that such a view seemed like an incomplete application of the community concept: "It's not the full community with all the diverse people living in it. It's the white community against the other communities." We then had the following exchange:

> Colette: The [white people] were acting as a community because the fire department and all the police were working together. It was a whole group of people who were protecting their community…It was a collective group of people beyond the individual.

Me: …Is it ever inclusive of everyone though?
Colette: So you're asking, 'is there a way that everyone in the whole world would be free?'
Me: Does that sense of community include [the demonstrators] as well?
Colette: No…I think [the white people] didn't even consider [the black people] a part of their community. It was like two separate worlds. If black people were a part of their community, they would have treated them differently since they would have been a part of their community.

Colette's circular conclusion aside, identifying who was actually facilitating this portion of the discussion presents a source of both allure and alarm. In one respect, the distinction between participant and facilitator seemed to have vanished, with us both simultaneously challenging each other's perspectives in ways that pushed more deeply into the topic at hand. In another respect, we seemed all too eager to advocate for our particular perspectives in ways that invited a seeming logger-heads, as though vying for the argumentative upper hand. Who was redirecting the discourse to incorporate those who had remained silent—perhaps colluding with each other to avoid discussing racism (Segall & Garrett, 2013)? Was the whole discussion perhaps just a nuanced exercise in affirming a culture of niceness, validating each other as good whites (Phillip & Benin, 2014)—resisting any conscious acknowledgment of race (Garrett & Segall, 2013)? Whether tackling legitimate differences of perspective concerning the reality of racism as a central theme in the American story, or tangling over secondary subplots (Ayers, 2004), our efforts to both assert individual views and advance collective inquiry helped highlight the complexity of managing diverse perspectives in facilitating philosophical dialogue.

COUNTERING CONVENTIONAL TEACHING

Countering conventional teaching represented a third dimension of transitioning from student to facilitator in CI. From Colette's written reflections, it was evident that she considered teaching for critical thinking a significant departure from the educational reality to which she had long been accustomed. Regarding the climate in our class in particular, she expressed how I, as teacher educator, had "made it very clear that our opinions are respected and wanted," but that such was not the case in most of her other classes, including those devoted to helping her become a teacher. She lamented how many teacher educators "made it very clear that they are in charge and…make all the final decisions." Most of them, in her view, informed students of "all…these great things to do to…[be] student-centered" in their future teaching, but at the end of the day were ultimately training prospective teachers such as herself "to just…give them the answer." She concluded, emphatically: "[W]e've all learned that however long we've been in school that the teacher is always in charge. The teacher

always has the final say. The teacher always wins." Such teaching, in Colette's mind, was incongruent with critical thinking. It had to be countered to promote a more discussion-based alternative that affirmed the intellectual capacity of all learners—including future teachers.

As Bode (1950) has argued, education as a process of systematic indoctrination is the only kind of education with which the course of civilization has made us thoroughly familiar. Transmission-based teaching has long been criticized as oppressive (Freire, 1996), disempowering (Shor, 1992), and functional for perpetuating social inequities (Kim, 2011), yet it remains widely prevalent. Despite the seemingly insurmountable odds of realizing pedagogical transformation anytime soon, Colette expressed satisfaction with what she had managed to learn from facilitating her session in class. Even in light of her initial agitation, she considered the experience an overwhelming success on the basis that she had "learned the value of well-placed questions and comments, and how they can direct a conversation into new waters, and stimulate students to think about issues in new ways." She acknowledged, "It is much easier to just prepare a lesson, stand in front of a classroom and lecture." But, she concluded, "[T]eaching students how to think critically is a much more beneficial way to teach." Nearly five months later, while meeting with Colette to discuss her experience in class, she elaborated on such benefits in the context of children's diverse circumstances:

> [As] teachers, we need to have the ability and the capacity to look at things from every angle, so when a kid comes in and says something is going on at home or like says that their parents didn't feed them last night, we don't automatically go up in arms and think the parents are abusing the child, but we can [instead] look at [the circumstances] from the parents' perspective and be like, well maybe a family member died or maybe they just lost their job or [maybe] there [are] other reasons…

That conventional teaching, in Colette's view, did little to promote thinking from such perspectives presented her with a source of despair, but also hope. As a teacher, it would not be easy countering the context of authoritarian practices, yet it was within her capacity to develop her own practice. As a self-proclaimed lifelong learner, she concluded: "The research has just begun." Her journey towards purposefully shaping her pedagogy was underway.

ENACTING A DEMOCRATIC PEDAGOGY OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Colette's experiences in learning to facilitate CI provide a useful means of illuminating my own pedagogical journey as a teacher educator. As I have previously asserted, enacting a democratic pedagogy of teacher education (Loughran, 2007) is "clearly situated in opposition to the prevailing tides of educational practice" (Brubaker, 2012c, p. 16). Few teacher educators and teacher candidates have been equipped from firsthand experiences in schools to partake in deliberative decision-making

concerning issues affecting their lives. The challenges of helping future teachers learn to teach in an inquiry-based fashion are significant (Parker & Hess, 2001), particularly within the current educational climate of high-stakes accountability and standardization (Brown, 2010). With support, guidance, and modeling, it is indeed possible to make a difference (Crawford, 1999; Haynes & Murris, 2011) in helping teacher education candidates learn practices that emphasize inquiry over indoctrination and foster reflective teaching (Lipman, 1988; Pardales & Girod, 2006). A range of possibilities and pitfalls are nevertheless associated with pedagogical transformation in contemporary times. Below, I consider some complexities of such an enterprise as they were evident in this study.

As Zeichner, Payne, and Brayko (2015, p. 123) have recently argued, "The way in which…teacher education is usually structured is fundamentally undemocratic." Practices that indoctrinate students do more to perpetuate such a reality than reconstruct it. When CI is used to help students come to their own conclusions, think for themselves, and exercise independent judgment over issues affecting their lives, it presents an authentic alternative to authoritarian education. As Lipman (2008) has written of P4C:

> It is not about prescribing any one philosophy to children but about encouraging them to develop their own philosophy, their own way of thinking about the world. It is about giving the youngest minds the opportunity to express ideas with confidence and in an environment where they feel safe to do so. (p. 166)

While many teachers and teacher educators lay claim to democratic commitments, fewer actually enact pedagogies consistent with such aims. In my own practice, as illustrated in this study, I demonstrated congruence between my actions and beliefs to the extent that I modeled for future teachers—while helping them learn to embody for themselves—the very tenets of CI comprising the content of the course. In providing a safe environment for building students' confidence in embracing new methods, I embodied democratic values in practice, not just in rhetoric. Doing so was neither value-neutral nor an act of imposing values, but a means of valuing diversity and democratic citizenship as ways of life.

Cultivating democratically-minded teachers who embrace diversity is fundamentally an act of negotiating authority. Whether through grading (Brubaker, 2010), curriculum (Brubaker, 2012b), or inquiry (Brubaker, 2012a), teaching youth—and teachers of youth—to be more democratic when the prevailing patterns of authority in both classrooms and the broader educational community tend toward the extremes of authority relations is complex. As a teacher educator, I could have employed more explicit methods to teach about the purposes and processes of discussion. Doing so may have provided more continuity with the broader manifestations of authority with which students were already deeply familiar. Relying less on student initiative and demonstrating deeper responsiveness to the challenges involved in my own past experiences learning to lead discussion—at points in my career where I had more experience than the students in my care—may have

helped me set my sights on smaller steps towards more readily attainable outcomes. Nevertheless, building the authority of community (Benne, 1970) involves helping students become autonomous members of the profession capable of transforming teaching practice. Aspiring towards a realistic amount of transformation is a delicate endeavor requiring democratic negotiation.

Regarding the developmental dynamics of learning about and through a participatory approach, I wonder: must teachers first master transmission-based teaching before they can take the leap from students to facilitators? Can they realistically learn to teach for critical thinking when, by virtue of their experiences in schools and life, they are not yet comfortably versed with either teaching *or* critical thinking? Perhaps it is less a matter of learning new methods than it is ridding ourselves of the ones we already know; less a matter of despairing over the difficulties of intervening in contemporary trends than taking a lead in inspiring new tendencies. The prospective teacher featured in this study was well positioned, by the end of the course, to exude courage, conviction, and strength of character in countering conventional teaching and creating classrooms consistent with democratic aims. It is a task that cannot be done alone, yet one that cannot always afford to wait for others. Democracy in education maintains a fragile existence, but educators must initiate action to ensure it lives more robustly (Davis, 2003). As John Lewis—whose skull was fractured by police in 1965 when peacefully demonstrating for respect and dignity in Selma—has concluded: "The true work of social transformation starts within. It begins inside your own heart and mind" (Lewis, 2012, pp. 14–15). Were more teacher educators to find it from within to shape their pedagogy in the direction of democracy, perhaps teacher candidates would do so more readily themselves?

REFERENCES

Ambrose, D. (2005). Aspiration growth, talent development, and self-fulfillment in a context of democratic erosion. *Roeper Review, 28*(1), 11–19.

Apple, M. (2011). Democratic education in neoliberal and neoconservative times. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 21*(1), 21–31.

Ayers, B. (2004). *Teaching the personal and the political: Essays on hope and justice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Benne, K. D. (1970). Authority in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 40*(3), 385–410.

Berry, A. (2004). Self study in teaching about teaching. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 1295–1332). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Birks, M., & Mills, J. (2012). *Grounded theory: A practical guide*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Bode, B. H. (1950). *Democracy as a way of life*. New York, NY: The MacMillan Company.

Boyle-Baise, M. (2003). Doing democracy in social studies methods. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 31*(1), 51–71.

Brookfield, S. D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, S. D. (2010). Leading democratically. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 128*, 5–13.

Brown, C. P. (2010). Children of reform: The impact of high-stakes education reform on preservice teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(5), 477–491.

Brubaker, N. D. (2010). Negotiating authority by designing individualized grading contracts. *Studying Teacher Education, 6*, 257–267.

Brubaker, N. D. (2012a). Negotiating authority through cultivating a classroom community of inquiry. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 28*, 240–250.

Brubaker, N. D. (2012b). Negotiating authority through jointly constructing the course curriculum. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *18*, 159–180.

Brubaker, N. D. (2014). Gendered discourse in the Evangelical South: Fashioning a conservatively critical pedagogy of teacher education. In M. Taylor & L. Coia (Eds.), *Gender, feminism, and queer theory in the self-study of teacher education practices* (pp. 111–125). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Brubaker, N. D. (2015a). Critical moments in negotiating authority: Grading, accountability and teacher education. *Teaching Education, 26*(2), 222–246.

Brubaker, N. D. (2015b). On becoming a democratic teacher educator. In J. Williams & M. Hayler (Eds.), *Professional learning through transitions and transformations: Teacher educators' journeys of becoming*. Switzerland: Springer.

Cam, P. (2008). Dewey, Lipman, and the tradition of reflective education. In M. Taylor, H. Schreier, & P. Ghiraldelli (Eds.), *Pragmatism, education, and children: International philosophical perspectives* (pp. 163–181). New York, NY: Rodopi.

Carson, C. (Ed.). (1998). *The autobiography of Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York, NY: Grand Central Publishing.

Cassidy, C., Christie, D., Coutts, N., Dunn, J., Sinclair, C., Skinner, D., & Wilson, A. (2008). Building communities of educational enquiry. *Oxford Review of Education, 34*(2), 217–235.

Crawford, B. A. (1999). Is it realistic to expect a preservice teacher to create an inquiry-based classroom? *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 10*(3), 175–194.

Crossley, C., & DeVinney, J. A. (Writers). (1987). Eyes on the prize: America's Civil Rights Movement 1954–1985. In M. Ambrosino, A. Bassett, C. Crossley, J. A. DeVinney, J. Else, H. Hampton, M. Samels, & J. Vecchione (Producer). Alexandria, VA: PBS.

Davis, O. L. (2003). Does democracy in education still live? *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 19*(1), 1–4.

Farr Darling, L. (2001). When conceptions collide: Constructing a community of inquiry for teacher education in British Columbia. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 27*(1), 7–21.

Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans., New Revised 20th Anniversary ed.). New York, NY: Continuum.

Garrett, H. J., & Segall, A. (2013). (Re)considerations of ignorance and resistance in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 64*(4), 294–304.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1999). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Gregory, M. (2007). A framework for facilitating classroom dialogue. *Teaching Philosophy, 30*(1), 59–84.

Hamilton, M. L., & Pinnegar, S. (2000). On the threshold of a new century: Trustworthiness, integrity, and self-study in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(3), 234–240.

Haynes, J., & Murris, K. (2011). The provocation of an epistemological shift in teacher education through Philosophy with Children. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 45*(2), 285–303.

Jackson, T. E. (2001). The art and craft of 'gently socratic' inquiry. In A. L. Costa (Ed.), *Developing minds: A resource book for teaching thinking* (3rd ed., pp. 459–465). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Johnson, T. W. (1995). Philosophy for children: Implementing Dewey's vision. In *Discipleship or pilgrimage? The educator's quest for philosophy* (pp. 115–133). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Kahne, J., & Westheimer, J. (2003). Teaching democracy: What schools need to do. *Phi Delta Kappan, 85*(1), 34–40, 57–61, 63–66.

Kennedy, D. (1995). Philosophy for children and school reform: Dewey, Lipman, and the community of inquiry. In J. P. Portelli & R. F. Reed (Eds.), *Children, philosophy, and democracy* (pp. 159–177). Calgary, Alberta, Canada: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.

Kim, Y. (2011). The case against teaching as delivery of the curriculum. *Phi Delta Kappan, 92*(7), 54–56.
LaBoskey, V. K. (2004). The methodology of self-study and its theoretical underpinnings. In J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 817–869). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Lewis, J. (1998). *Walking with wind: A memoir of the movement*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace and Company.
Lewis, J. (2012). *Across that bridge: Life lessons and a vision for change*. New York, NY: Hyperion.
Lipman, M. (1983). *Lisa*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children.
Lipman, M. (1988). *Philosophy goes to school*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
Lipman, M. (2003). *Thinking in education* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
Lipman, M. (2008). *A life teaching thinking*. Montclair, NJ: Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children.
Lipman, M., & Gazzard, A. (1988). *Getting our thoughts together: Instructional manual to accompany Elfie*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children.
Lipman, M., & Sharp, A. M. (1985). *Ethical inquiry: Instructional manual to accompany Lisa* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
Lipman, M., Sharp, A. M., & Oscanyan, F. S. (1980). *Philosophy in the classroom* (2nd ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
Loughran, J. (2004). A history and context of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices. In J. J. Loughran, M. L. Hamilton, V. K. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 7–39). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Loughran, J. (2007). Enacting a pedagogy of teacher education. In T. Russell & J. Loughran (Eds.), *Enacting a pedagogy of teacher education: Values, relationships and practices* (pp. 1–15). New York, NY: Routledge.
Lyman, K. (2001). From snarling dogs to bloody sunday: Teaching past the platitudes of the civil rights movement. In W. Bigelow, B. Harvey, S. Karp, & L. Miller (Eds.), *Rethinking our classrooms, Vol. 2: Teaching for equity and justice* (pp. 119–124). Williston, VT: Rethinking Schools.
Noddings, N. (2013). *Education and democracy in the 21st century*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
Palmer, P. J. (2011). *Healing the heart of democracy: The courage to create a politics worthy of the human spirit*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Pardales, M. J., & Girod, M. (2006). Community of inquiry: Its past and present future. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 38*(3), 299–309.
Parker, W. C., & Hess, D. (2001). Teaching with and for discussion. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 17*(3), 273–289.
Phillip, T. M., & Benin, S. Y. (2014). Programs of teacher education as mediators of White teacher identity. *Teaching Education, 25*(1), 1–23.
Pinnegar, S., & Hamilton, M. L. (2009). *Self-study of practice as a genre of qualitative research: Theory, methodology, and practice*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
Reed, R. F. (1983). *Talking with children*. Denver, CO: Arden Press, Inc.
Schulte, A. K. (2009). *Seeking integrity in teacher education: Transforming student teachers, transforming my self*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
Segall, A., & Garrett, H. J. (2013). White teachers talking race. *Teaching Education, 24*(3), 265–291.
Sharp, A. M. (1993). The community of inquiry: Education for democracy. In M. Lipman (Ed.), *Thinking children and education* (pp. 337–345). Dubuque, IO: Kendall Hunt.
Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Splitter, L. J., & Sharp, A. M. (1995). *Teaching for better thinking: The classroom community of inquiry*. Melbourne: ACER.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Whalley, M. J. (1993). The practice of philosophy in the elementary school classroom. In M. Lipman (Ed.), *Thinking children and education* (pp. 491–494). Dubuque, IO: Kendall/Hunt.

Williams, J., & Hayler, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Professional learning through transitions and transformations: Teacher educators' journeys of becoming*. Switzerland: Springer.

Wright, I. (2002). *Is that right? Critical thinking and the social world of the young learner*. Toronto, Ontario: Pippin Publishing.

Zeichner, K., Payne, K. A., & Brayko, K. (2015). Democratizing teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 66*(2), 122–135.

Nathan D. Brubaker
Faculty of Education
Monash University