
Democracy & Education

Teacher Learning and the Difficulties of Moving Civic Education Forward.

A Response to *Beyond the Invisible Barriers of the Classroom: iEngage and Civic Praxis*

Avner Segall (Michigan State University)

Abstract

In “Beyond the Invisible Barriers of the Classroom: iEngage and Civic Praxis,” the authors reported on the experiences teachers encountered during a weeklong Youth Engage Civic Institute Camp and the degree to which what teachers learned in the camp was able to move their thinking and practice toward a more critical, justice-oriented approach to civic education. The authors’ analysis thus “considers the ideological shifts the counselors [teachers] made and the likelihood that they will teach beyond the formal classroom as they return to more traditional environments” (Magill et al., 2020, p. 2). In that, the authors were interested not only in what teachers learned at the camp and how it impacted their thinking about civic education but, also, in issues of contextual transfer: whether the teachers were inclined to make the learning gained at the camp material in their future teaching in classrooms back home. This response both questions the ability of a weeklong professional development to change teachers’ civic imagination as well as the ability of studies using traditional qualitative frameworks to get at the complex psychic processes involved in attempts to shift teachers’ understanding about practice. Specifically, the piece focuses on concepts borrowed from psychoanalytic theories in education to explore the manner in which learning also always involves not learning and the processes of ignorance and resistance teachers might be using to both embrace and reject change at the same time.

This article is in response to

Magill, K. R., Davis Smith, V., Blevins, B., LeCompte, K. N. (2020). Beyond the Invisible Barriers of the Classroom: iEngage and Civic Praxis. *Democracy and Education*, 28(1), Article 1.

Available at: <https://democracyeducationjournal.org/home/vol28/iss1/1>

IN “BEYOND THE Invisible Barriers of the Classroom: iEngage and Civic Praxis,” Magill et al. (2020) reported on the experiences teachers encountered during a weeklong Youth Engage Civic Institute Camp and the degree to which what teachers learned in the camp was able to move their thinking and practice toward a more critical, justice-oriented approach to civic education. Both the premise and promise of the piece—and of the Youth Engage Civic Institute Camp it describes—are no doubt important and necessary. Civic education in K–12 classrooms, as well described in the piece’s literature review, too often is—and has

been so for many years—mired in curricular standards that result in dry, rote learning about the operation of government and the formal roles and responsibilities of a “citizen” rather than giving life

AVNER SEGALL is professor of teacher education at Michigan State University. His research integrates a wide range of critical theories and focuses on how particular versions and visions of citizenship, education, teaching, and learning are made possible both in formal and informal educational settings.

and body to what it means to be an active, critical citizen in (and of) a democracy. Indeed, one could argue that the current state of civic education is, by and large, a manifestation of a civic ideology and of a curricular and pedagogical stance that does more to stifle critical, thoughtful, active citizenship than to encourage it. Learning how a bill becomes law or how the electoral college is constructed or discussing the list and history of the amendments are surely important but most often do little to encourage students to go into the world and make the necessary changes to foster a society that is more equitable, democratic, and just, regardless of on which side of the political aisle they stand. Such learning also does little to engender civic courage that leads to formulating and taking a civic stance and then enacting it, as members of real communities, toward a better common good.

When teachers and students embark on civic advocacy or activism, Peterson (2019) wrote, “they are more likely to develop the knowledge and skills needed to effectively oppose injustice” (p. 3). More likely indeed, as the general sense in the field proposes. Yet, as this paper illustrates, that desired result is not necessarily guaranteed. In his book *What Kind of Citizen? Educating Our Children for the Common Good*, Westheimer (2015) advocated for critical civic awareness through action (see also Dewey, 1963) and suggested that mere knowledge, that which is learned in classrooms and is abstracted from action, does not lead to civic participation. In fact, he argued, “often it worked the other way around: Participation led to the quest for knowledge” (p. 90). True, but, again, as the case portrayed in this paper highlights, the act of civic participation itself doesn’t always result in new ways of knowing, at least not ones that are enduring and can transverse epistemological and contextual boundaries.

This idea of transformation, where civic action leads to new, critical civic understandings, is at the heart of Magill et al.’s (2020) paper. In it, they report data from a longitudinal qualitative study about teachers’ experiences at the weeklong summer camp that focuses on active, community civic engagement and its impact on expanding teachers’ understanding toward justice-oriented civic action in their own classrooms. The authors were interested in “how the introduction of various forms for civic engagement shifted counselors’ thinking about what qualifies as knowledgeable, engaged, active, and transformational citizenship . . . [and] consider what changes to civic understandings and dispositions, if any, resulted from counselor participation in Youth Engage” (p. 4). Specifically, the authors focused on the ways in which seeing the possibilities the camp offers teachers for active community engagement with students attending the camp might shift teachers’ thinking about what is possible in “regular” civics classrooms back home. The authors’ analysis thus “considers the ideological shifts the counselors [teachers] made and the likelihood that they will teach beyond the formal classroom as they return to more traditional environments” (p. 2). In that, the authors were interested not only in what teachers learned at the camp and how it impacted their thinking about civic education but, also, in issues of contextual transfer: whether the teachers were inclined to make the learning gained at the camp material in their future teaching in classrooms back home.

The assumption—of the counselors and the researchers—was that “through participation in more active civic learning, camper civic ideology and practice would move [teachers and students] from a personally responsible notion of citizenship (e.g., dropping off food to a food drive) to more participatory (e.g., organizing a food drive) and justice-oriented acts (e.g., working to understand why people are hungry in the first place)” (Magill, et al., 2020, p. 3). In that, and elsewhere, the authors used the very helpful (and by now much popularized) civic education heuristic introduced by Westheimer and Kahne (2004) as both an orientation for the study and as a means to analyze its results. Like most heuristics, it is meant both as an organizing framework to think with, about, and through civic education and as a scale to evaluate it, with justice-oriented citizenship considered the most desired goal.

The invocation of this particular heuristic in the context of this study, however, raises a variety of concerns: First, there is little data to support the claim that, despite the intent of the camp, teachers (as well as students, from the description of activities) ever reached the third level of justice-oriented citizenry, at least as defined by Westheimer and Kahne (2004). We are told that both teachers and students mostly fluctuated between the first two levels of the heuristic “personally responsible” and “participatory.” More than that, the invocation of the heuristic with regard to the summer camp also raises broader questions as to what might move students and teachers toward this third level of justice-oriented citizenship. The assumption underlying the study is that being involved in community-based citizenship will, by definition, lead to this level. Such an assumption is not unique to this study but pervades across the educational landscape, underlying rationales for service-learning projects and study abroad, among others. Simply being immersed in community action or traveling to other places, however, may do little to produce a critically oriented citizen or shift our understanding about ourselves and the world. Indeed, in many cases, the very perspectives targeted for change by such endeavors simply get reified (Boyle-Baise, 1998; Kortegast & Boisfontaine, 2015; Kortegast & Leilani Kupo, 2017; Paige et al., 2002; Pompa, 2002; Stewart & Webster, 2010; Vande Berg, 2007; Vande Berg et al., 2012).

Getting one’s students outside of the classroom and into the community is, by and large, a positive move for a variety of reasons. But as this study has shown, one cannot expect that move itself to do the trick. Sometimes a “move” is no more than a move, with little educational movement resulting from it. It is clear from the paper that teachers appreciated the need to enact civics in communities and recognized its benefits. Less evidence, however, is provided as to whether these activities in fact transformed those communities or what teachers understood to be important and transformative in such activities. Nor is there sufficient evidence that teachers’ thinking on these matters as teachers was transformed, at least not in robust and meaningful epistemological or pedagogical ways. As Magill et al. (2020) noted, “we found that many of the ideological barriers limiting counselors from engaging in more critical approaches remained intact after their experiences” (p. 5).

Part of the impetus for the study offered in this paper, Magill et al. (2020) noted, is heeding the call by Giroux (2004) and others for additional research to more fully “understand how teacher ideologies are produced, negotiated, and modified in pedagogical practice and how critical identities, interpretations, and agency are discarded or maintained.” (Magill et al., 2020, p. 3). In this piece, the authors stay true to that call regarding the need to develop and enhance teachers’ critical identities and, as researchers, to document and report one such attempt. But the emphasis in the call by Giroux and others is not necessarily on the development of teachers’ critical sensibilities—an idea critical pedagogues have importantly been advancing for decades—but on researchers gaining an understanding as to *how* those critical sensibilities are maintained or discarded. In emphasizing the *how*, what the call proposes is not necessarily an evaluation of what or how teachers teach but a particular stance for research that strives to get at the very process by which critical understandings of and by teachers are adopted and/or rejected. This, to be sure, is a more complex process than reporting on what teachers did or did not do. It is a process that calls for examining structural, discursive, and contextual constraints put upon teachers as well as the ones they self-impose in light of those constraints or in response to them, some of which are well documented in this paper. But the call to researchers noted also closely connects the *how* question to that of the *why*. That is, the manner in which teachers’ critical identities are discarded or formed is inextricably related to the more complex—and often hidden, even suppressed—ways in which the presence or disappearance of criticality is made possible. That *why* attempts to connect what teachers *choose* to do and not do, say or not say, with the assumptions they have about teaching and learning, with their epistemological and ontological commitments, affiliations, and desires and, mostly, to examine the above as it plays out in teachers’ inclinations and refusals to learn. After all, as Carr & Thésée (2017), among others, have reminded us, teachers—all of us—do not arrive at pedagogical encounters as *tabula rasa*. The ideologies, discourses, perspectives, and experiences underlying teachers’ stance in the world help structure their attachments and beliefs. They are central not only to who teachers are but to the kind of knowledge and knowing they choose to take up or refuse and to what they select to make of it in classrooms. It is these issues, I believe, and the ways in which they are both addressed and ignored in this piece, that make it so intriguing and, thus, serve as the basis for my response.

Holding on to One’s Assumptions: The Trouble with Shifting Teachers’ Educational Imagination

Magill et al. (2020) reported that despite teachers’ initial statements about their commitment to social justice, despite the two-day professional development they received prior to the arrival of students, and despite feeling emboldened while working with students on active citizenship issues for the duration of the camp, only minimal movement in teachers’ thinking toward teaching justice-oriented citizenship was noted. The question, then, returning to the call by Giroux (2004) and others, is *why*. Why didn’t teachers make the desired shift? On this issue, the paper

provides very little other than the notion, well-articulated by teachers in this study, of curricular constraints and lack of administrative support in the K–12 settings. While this is no doubt a very real factor in limiting teachers’ educational imagination, that “reality,” as Segall (2003) has suggested, is often partly constructed and self-imposed by teachers to justify their own hesitations to experiment and branch out—a form of rationalizing the limits of their pedagogical world by externalizing or projecting it on others outside the classroom.

The idea that, for whatever reason, that which works in a summer camp cannot work in a classroom is questionable at other levels as well. Though the authors rightfully suggest that confining civic education to “traditional” learning in classrooms is problematic, what constitutes the problem is not necessarily where it is enacted but how it is enacted and to what ends. There are many ways in which in-classroom teaching and learning could help students move toward justice-oriented citizenship without having to leave the classroom. Assuming that such transformations can only, or mostly, happen outside the classroom creates the very conditions that allow—even invite—teachers to suggest that what was learned outside the classroom cannot be readily adopted in it. This is a discourse that surrenders to an existing culture of practice rather than challenging it through one’s commitment to new critical ideas—the very premise of this study.

One might also suggest other reasons as to why teachers in this study did not make the shift to critically oriented citizenship. One such reason pertains to time. That is, that a weeklong camp, as wonderful and pedagogically focused as it may be, cannot be expected to meaningfully change one’s views of the world—whether the one we live in or that of teaching and learning. One can also assume that, much like most professional development sessions in schools, professional development outside of school might, by its very nature, be insufficient in generating lasting transformative understandings among teachers (e.g., Ermeling & Yarbo, 2016; Hardy, 2010; Webster-Wright, 2009). Yet these reasons and others of their kind, often recited in educational discourses, do little to explore the deeper and more complex processes that could be underlying this phenomenon. Indeed, such answers may not only hide more than they reveal; the very preoccupation with them serves as a shield from digging deeper and finding the causes of one’s inability or refusal to shift one’s epistemological and pedagogical positions.

Several approaches could lead us toward “digging deeper,” including poststructural theory (e.g., Derrida, 1997; Foucault, 1972, 1977, 1980) and critical discourse analysis (e.g., Fairclough, 2010; Gee, 1999), among others. Each could provide interesting, and hopefully revealing, understandings as to the manner in which patterns of power, knowledge, and discourse could have exposed issues underlying teachers’ statements in this study in relation to a—real or perceived—mandate to engage in education reform. In the remainder of my response, however, I turn instead to concepts from psychoanalytic theories in education (e.g., Bibby, 2010; Britzman, 1998, 2006, 2009; Garrett, 2017; Pitt, 1998) that may help shed a different light on the results portrayed in this study and what might have led to them. Doing so is not meant as criticism of

this paper—after all, psychoanalytic theories were not a lens the authors applied—but, rather, as an attempt to speak to broader educational issues in relation to how we tend to think and report about teacher learning or the lack thereof. In that, I am particularly interested in highlighting a variety of processes that too often remain unspoken yet could be at the core of how teachers encounter learning—whether in the context of a summer camp or elsewhere—and the degree to which such encounters produce new, lasting understandings about ourselves and our role as educators of others.

Defending the Self in Encounters with Learning

It is unreasonable to expect that learning resulting from professional development intended to change one's thinking and practice would be easy or straightforward. After all, teachers have had many years of an apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975) as students in "traditional" civics classroom. They have also had much invested in them during teacher preparation, and they themselves have their own personally held ideological, curricular, and pedagogical investments in their current teaching practices that make shifting one's educational imagination difficult. Obviously, teachers learn new things all the time and grow and develop as a result. The more congruency there is between the new knowledge presented to teaches or the new experiences they encounter and what teachers already believe and do, the easier the shift to new educational practices. Conversely, the greater the dissonance between what teachers are expected to do with what they already believe and do, the less we are to expect for that desired educational change to materialize. This is because, as psychoanalytic theories remind us, while we welcome new information that resonates with our existing beliefs, we tend to defend ourselves against knowledge that might trouble what we already know, want to know, and feel comfortable with.

Every encounter with learning, especially that which challenges our deeply held conceptions and commitments, inevitably involves elements of both learning and not learning. We tend to accept and adopt knowledge that aligns with our existing views of the world and reject those that trouble them. The latter, psychoanalytic theories suggest, is used to "defend the self." It is a process through which new information that invites us to question our firmly held beliefs is contested and/or rejected. It is a way to maintain our existing set of beliefs that undergird who we are and who we want to become.

Two processes underlying the process of "defending the self" against troubling knowledge are what psychoanalytic theories identify as "ignorance" and "resistance." I will address each in turn, beginning with ignorance. The most ubiquitous public (and educational) use of ignorance refers to a lack of knowledge about something, a missing piece that if we only provided learners, that lack, that hole in knowing, would be remedied and one's knowledge of the topic would be more complete. We find an element of this notion in this study, when the authors suggest that "teachers may also believe that they do not have the content knowledge . . . to teach in these more active, transformational, or nontraditional ways" (p. 3). Ignorance, however, is approached quite differently

through psychoanalytic theories. Here, ignorance is not considered simply a lack of knowledge but a desire to ignore. Considered not a noun but a verb, ignorance is not passive but active. Ignorance is not something that can be fixed by more information—it is a way of ignoring that which we do not want to see and, thus, have to implicate ourselves in. It is a mechanism through which we choose to not validate the existence of something, so we do not need to address it or justify why we didn't. As Felman (1982) explained,

ignorance is not simply opposed to knowledge: it is itself a radical condition, an integral part of the very structure of knowledge . . . [It] is tied up with repression, with the imperative to forget—the imperative to exclude from consciousness, to not admit to knowledge. Ignorance, in other words, is not a passive state of absence—a simple lack of information: it is an active dynamic of negation, an active refusal of information. (pp. 25–26)

Ignorance is not considered here simply as a lack of knowing but as a strategy of avoidance. When a teacher ignores an incident in the classroom, it is most often not because they didn't see it (lack of knowledge) but because they have made an active decision to ignore it, probably not wanting to address its implications in the midst of doing something they deem more important. But teachers also actively ignore other things as well, including directives from administrators and top-down curricular changes. This is not because they somehow missed those memos but because they chose to not pay attention to them. Ignoring, in these cases, is often easier than having to go through the process of implementing policies in which teachers have little faith or investment. Teachers do the same at professional development sessions they find irrelevant or ones that ask of them to embark on educational practices they deem unattainable, unproductive, too ambitious, or endangering their understandings and beliefs.

Similar to ignorance, resistance too can be considered in a variety of ways in educational contexts. For critical pedagogues (Freire, 1970/2006; Giroux, 1983; McLaren, 1989), resistance is a political and pedagogical tool that challenges unequal relations of power and "takes the notion of emancipation as its guiding interest" (Giroux, 2001, p. 246). Here, resistance entails conscious action against hegemonic ideologies and their ramifications both within and beyond the classroom (Garrett & Segall, 2013). From the perspective of psychoanalytic theory, however, resistance has quite a different meaning. Rather than opposing societal oppression as a public act, resistance here is an internal and private process that works to oppose that which our own sensibilities find oppressive, operating as an integral part of the process of defending the self. This form of resistance, Pitt (1998) explained, begins "with a resounding 'no' in the face of new and difficult knowledge, [but] this 'no' conceals a much more ambivalent story of implication in the very knowledge that one is at pains to refuse." (p. 536). It is, Pitt added, a response to a discomfiting learning situation where the learner finds themselves implicated despite their will. While resistance may be manifested overtly, it is, more often than not, only reflected implicitly and, thus, usually unnoticed by others.

Rereading the Data through Psychoanalytic Theories

If one goes back to the study reported in “Beyond the Invisible Barriers of the Classroom: iEngage and Civic Praxis,” one could, as the teacher participants do, justify the lack of movement toward a critically oriented civic approach in the external constraints put upon them in schools—e.g., curricular restrictions and lack of administrative support. But when we look at teachers’ overall statements more carefully, we might see elements of ignorance and resistance through the utterances teachers make, by those they avoid making, and, mostly perhaps, as one relates the two—a process I explore in the remainder of this section.

Two caveats, however, before doing so. The first is that my attempt is not intended to necessarily invalidate or contradict the analyses provided by Magill et al. (2020); they did a fine job in supporting those analyses with evidence. Instead, my attempt is meant to provide a different form of analysis that, by correlating utterances and silences through the lens of psychoanalytic theories, might speak to broader educational issues the authors, using their particular conceptual lenses, did not. The second caveat pertains to the data used in my analysis. While the authors of the paper had access to a complete set of participant data with which to conduct their analysis, the only data I have at my disposal as respondent are the limited data provided within this paper. That is, the claims I will be making are based only on my reading of the data shared, not on the data not included in the original paper.

A foray into applying psychoanalytic theories to this study might begin with a conundrum: As Magill et al. (2020) noted, the teachers participating in the summer camp all reported an affiliation to community-based, critical forms of citizenship in their application materials. Why, then, one might ask, would they ignore or resist the very thing they believe in and desire? A possible answer may be that, just like when we purchase an object we have long wanted, regret may seep in right away, often in the shop itself: Did I really want this? What am I going to do with it once I get home? What will I need to move around to be able to place this new item appropriately? Perhaps I made a mistake in buying it. Maybe I didn’t need it after all. Buyers’ remorse doesn’t only occur when we shop. It may—and often does—manifest itself just as much in learning and may take a similar pattern, regardless of how much we initially thought we wanted to learn it. While education doesn’t allow us to return learning, we can instead reject it outright by applying the processes of ignorance and resistance. Most often, however, these processes percolate slowly, whereby resistance and ignorance occur less at the immediate contact with new knowledge and, rather, in the processing of such knowledge and in realizing the ramifications for practice of endorsing it. Ignorance and resistance, then, may be less an outright rejection of knowledge than a response to processing it. It is a manner in which we express our hesitations, allowing us a “way out” that satisfies the social codes of the context in which that new knowledge was received and a means by which to not address that which our teachers hoped we will embrace.

We find these patterns in the ways teachers in this study described what they learned and the changes they may make to

their teaching once back in their classrooms. For example, I found it illuminating when, in response to the researchers’ questions about what teachers learned in the camp and how this learning might invite them to enact more justice-oriented civic education, teachers responded by mostly avoiding the issue. Rather than speak about their own epistemological or pedagogical development as teachers—what they learned and how that learning impacted their *own* understanding about the purposes, processes, and desired outcomes of justice-oriented citizenship—we find participants mostly avoiding the topic by talking about everything but. This may be because when one submits to such a question, one is inevitably implicated by one’s response. Avoiding here appears safer than engaging, especially if one is concerned that responding might reveal one’s actual thoughts on the matter.

Rather than speak to whether and how the camp developed their own thinking on civics education, we find teachers avoiding the topic by externalizing it, speaking about student learning instead. For example, we find David avoiding the main research question about teacher learning by changing the subject to students. A similar pattern is evident in Susan’s response, when she noted that “it was great to see [campers] challenge societal norms by looking at the causes instead of just spreading awareness . . . We need more people investigating WHY things are unjust in our world in order to change the cyclical cycles” (Magill et al., 2020, p. 6). Rather than speak to teachers’ learning, Susan too referred to student learning. Even when she used the notion that “more people” are needed to make the world more just, teachers didn’t seem to be mentioned in that broader term. And though David and Susan both embraced the idea of community-based action, civic action in the service of communities is intended not only to learn about those being served but to learn anew about the self who is serving. The question left unanswered, however: What did Susan and David learn about themselves as teachers and as human beings? How, if at all, did that learning impact teachers’ pedagogical and curricular understandings?

While not fully avoiding the researchers’ question about her development as a teacher, Jennifer chose to avoid speaking about her intellectual growth and addresses skills she learned instead, skirting the issue all together: “I learned a great deal about classroom management and different models of informal education” (Magill et al., 2020, p. 6). To conclude her response, she immediately shifted to talking about her love of kids and her enjoyment of enabling the learning of others: “I genuinely loved getting to know the kids and having the opportunity to help them learn about citizenship” (Magill et al., 2020, p. 6). Once again, we see the tactics of avoidance in operation, whereby the issue asked about is not fully ignored but its implications are actively resisted.

Two of the other teachers cited in the paper did in fact address a question of what they will be doing differently when they return to their own classroom. Yet even here, the language used is indicative of the tentativeness of the projection they make. John suggested that “I will try to incorporate a project that involves civics and service” (Magill et al., 2020, p. 6). Kathy proposed that “I can implement the iCivics games in my class . . . [and] I can also implement the citizen essential questions and chart of what

citizens know, see, and do” (Magill et al., 2020, p. 6). Note that neither John nor Kathy were certain that they would be doing any of what they proposed. John used the tentative “I will try to” rather than the simple “I will,” and Kathy proposed that “I can implement” rather than “I will implement.” What the two teachers may have been doing here is, in effect, responding to the question by not committing to the responses they provide. They appear to have wanted to shift their practices in alignment with the teachings of the camp but to have been uncertain as to whether they actually would, implicitly highlighting the inner struggle taking place as to what might happen once the camp was over and the reality of their classrooms again began to sink in.

Like the teachers discussed, Whitney and Abby too chose to avoid providing any specifics about their own development as critical teachers. Instead, they spoke about how supported they felt while learning and how energized they felt by it. Whitney noted that “I felt like I had so much support from all the [Youth Engage] staff,” and Abby mentioned that “the atmosphere I was around was so energetic and full of life . . . I also felt a part of a small family and learned so much from everyone” (Magill et al., 2020, p. 6). It is indeed encouraging to learn that Abby learned “so much,” though we are still in the dark as to what that learning might have been or what it entailed.

What we notice in those examples is a clear form of teachers avoiding the subject. Whether this form of avoidance actually incorporated processes such as ignorance and resistance is unclear, but the outcomes are nonetheless similar, manifest in a variety of mechanisms teacher participants deployed in order to not have to reveal what they did in fact learn. My point in addressing this is not to suggest that these teachers did not learn much—I am sure they did! Rather, it is to suggest that engaging in educational reform, especially toward social justice, is not straightforward and that, as educators, we cannot expect an immediate and transparent input-output process of revelation, of teachers “seeing the light.” This process is complex, often engaging contradictory notions about practice and the role of the teacher in making the change possible. It also means that, as researchers, we understand that complexity and the inner struggle teachers may be going through and center rather than avoid that struggle in our studies—in the theoretical frames we use, in the questions we ask participants, and in the analyses we conduct thereafter.

Conclusion

Though intending to provide teachers a more advanced vision for civic education, teachers may have considered the camp as a place to practice a new form of citizenship that leads to challenging social structure underlying inequality but left with their own curricular and pedagogical imagination about critical civics education in classrooms mostly intact. Teachers’ statements throughout indicate that while they may have temporarily adopted the discourses of the camp, those discourses were not sufficiently internalized, made their own, and were thus unable to speak to, with, and about them in responses to the researchers’ questions.

Simply adding new layers of knowledge and pedagogy to teachers existing understandings may not be sufficient to engender

the kind of shift in their thinking the camp was hoping for. To get teachers to make such a shift, it is not enough to provide teachers with an alternative framework and then have them enact it. What is needed—in professional development as well as in the questions researchers pose to participants about it—is an exploration of the perspectives, assumptions, and desires of teachers, as well as their anxieties, fears, and hesitations of what owning such theories might mean both *for* and *in* their own practice. Without that, to play on the title of Britzman’s (1991) book, *Practice Makes Practice*, practice itself may not necessarily make perfect; it can, instead, simply reproduce more of the very same practice we hoped would change.

References

- Bibby, T. (2010). *Education—An impossible profession? Psychoanalytic explorations of learning and classrooms*. Routledge.
- Boyle-Baise, M. (1998). Community service learning for multicultural education: An exploratory study with pre-service teachers. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 31(2), 52–60.
- Britzman, D. (1991) *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. State University of New York Press.
- Britzman, D. P. (1998). *Lost subjects, contested objects: Toward a psychoanalytic inquiry of learning*. State University of New York Press.
- Britzman, D. P. (2006). *Novel education: Psychoanalytic studies of learning and not learning*. Peter Lang.
- Britzman, D. P. (2009). *The very thought of education: Psychoanalysis and the impossible professions*. State University of New York Press.
- Carr, P. R., & Thésée, G. (2017). Seeking democracy inside, and outside, of education: Re-conceptualizing perceptions and experiences related to democracy and education. *Democracy & Education*, 25(2). Retrieved from <https://democracyeducationjournal.org/home/vol25/iss2/4/>
- Derrida, J. (1997). *Of grammatology*. John Hopkins University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1963). *Experience and education*. McMillan Publishing Co.
- Ermeling, B. A., & Yarbo, J. (2016). Expanding instructional horizons: A case study of teacher team-outside expert partnership. *Teachers Colleges Record*, 118(2), 1–48.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Routledge.
- Felman, S. (1982). Psychoanalysis and education: Teaching terminable and interminable. *Yale French Studies*, 63, 21–44.
- Foucault, M. (1972) *The archeology of knowledge*. Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977* (C. Gordon, ed. and trans.). Pantheon Books.
- Freire, P. (2006). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum. (Original work published 1970)
- Garrett, H. J. (2017). *Learning to be in the world with others: Difficult knowledge and social studies education*. Peter Lang.
- Garrett, H. J., & Segall, A. (2013). (Re)consideration of ignorance and resistance in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 20(10), 1–11.
- Gee, J. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A. (1983). Theories of reproduction and resistance in the new sociology of education: A critical analysis. *Harvard Education Review*, 53 (3), 257–293.
- Giroux, H. A. (2001). *Theory and resistance in education: Towards a pedagogy for the opposition revised and expanded edition*. Greenwood.

- Giroux, H. A. (2004). Cultural studies, public pedagogy, and the responsibility of intellectuals. *Communication and critical/cultural studies*, 1(1), 59–79.
- Hardy, I. (2010). Critiquing teacher professional development: teacher learning within the field of teachers' work. *Critical Studies in Education*, 51(1), 71–84.
- Kortegast, C. A. & Boisfontaine, M. T. (2015). Beyond "it was good": Students' post-study abroad practices in negotiating meaning. *Journal of College Student Development*, 56, 812–828.
- Kortegast, C., & Leilani Kupo, V. (2017). Deconstructing underlying practices of short-term study abroad: Exploring issues of consumerism, postcolonialism, cultural tourism, and commodification of experience. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 8(1), 149–172.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. University of Chicago Press.
- Magill, K. R., Davis Smith, V., Blevins, B., LeCompte, K. N. (2020). Beyond the invisible barriers of the classroom: iEngage and civic praxis. *Democracy & Education*, 28(1), Article 1. Retrieved from <https://democracyeducationjournal.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1483&context=home>
- McLaren, P. (1989). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. Longman.
- Paige, R. M., Cohen, A. D., Kappler, B., Chi, J.C., & Lassegard, J. P. (2002). *Maximizing study abroad: A program professionals' guide to strategies for language and culture learning and use*. Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.
- Peterson, B. A. (2019). Educating for social justice: A case for teaching civil disobedience in preparing students to be effective activists. A response to "Justice citizens, active citizenship, and critical pedagogy: Reinvigorating citizenship education." *Democracy & Education*, 27(2). Retrieved from <https://democracyeducationjournal.org/home/vol27/iss2/7/>
- Pitt, A. J. (1998). Qualifying resistance: Some comments on methodological dilemmas. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(4), 535–553.
- Pompa, L. (2002). Service-learning as crucible: Reflections on immersion, context, power, and transformation. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9(1), 67–76.
- Segall, A. (2003). The impact of state-mandated testing according to social studies teachers: The Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) as a case study of consequences. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 31(3), 287–325.
- Stewart, T., & Webster, N. (2010). *Problematizing service learning: Critical reflections for development and action*. Information Age.
- Vande Berg, M. (2007). Intervening in the learning of U.S. students abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3–4), 392–399.
- Vande Berg, M., Paige, R. M., & Lou, K. H. (2012). *Student learning abroad: What our students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it*. Stylus.
- Webster-Wright, A. (2009). Reframing professional development through understanding authentic professional learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(2), 702–739.
- Westheimer, J. (2015). *What kind of citizen? Educating our children for the common good*. Teachers College Press.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237–269.