

Critical Literacy and the Social Studies Methods Course: How Pre-Service Social Studies Teachers Learn and Teach for Critical Literacy

**Edric C. Johnson, Ph.D.
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater**

Abstract

This study looks at the development of critical literacy for three pre-service teacher participants, relevant support systems, and pedagogies. It considers how pre-service teacher participants construct knowledge on critical literacy within the methods course. The participants started with their own literacy histories in order to begin developing internalization and critical consciousness within the methods and field experience course. Throughout the course, the participants took social action by using some of the critical literacy approaches that were presented as instructional strategies in the methods course. However, the participants were still internalizing two essential components of critical pedagogy in their own teaching: problem posing and dialogue. They acknowledged the value of problem posing and dialogue in their own learning but had some difficulty using these methods in their own teaching. The implications from this study suggest that teacher educators and future teachers take a stance on critical education and push for structural changes in common teaching practices and school curriculum mandates.

Introduction

On the first day of my social studies methods class, I asked my pre-service teachers to think about what literacy instruction meant to the teaching of social studies. For example, what does it mean to teach for critical literacy in the social studies? The students offered the following ideas:

1. Critical literacy is a method to improve reading scores;
2. Critical literacy is being in-depth, and
3. Critical literacy is having the ability to analyze social studies reading for better understanding.

For the second day of class, the students read Barbara Comber's "Critical Literacy: What Is It, and What Does It Look Like in Elementary Classrooms?" and Steven Wolk's "Teaching for Critical Literacy in Social Studies." On the second day of class, when asked, "What does it mean

to teach for critical literacy in the social studies?" the following student statements presented an immediate influence of the two articles:

1. Critical literacy questions race, gender, class, and other social issues represented in the text;
2. Critical literacy is looking at a topic from many different perspectives since any given perspective can have a bias view, and
3. Critical literacy means to challenge what is being read.

Although they had read two articles and were able to produce responses that reflected a more accurate *definition* of critical literacy, many of the pre-service students did not appear to gain an *understanding* of how critical literacy could influence their practices in social studies teaching. For example, in our classroom discussion during the second day of class, pre-service teachers were not able to provide examples of dominant themes that could be examined for biases or introduction of multiple perspectives in a given historical social studies text. Simply by their ability to restate descriptions/definitions of critical literacy from the journal articles, I was not confident that they would actually be able to teach or incorporate critical literacy approaches into their own teaching practices.

While the pre-service teachers started the course with naïve perceptions of critical literacy, observations of subsequent classroom practice revealed teachers with three distinct profiles: a) those without a commitment towards critical literacy; b) those with a commitment towards critical literacy in the university classroom but who did not teach for it in their actual teaching practice, and c) those with a commitment towards critical literacy who displayed some evidence of commitment in their actual teaching practice. This article presents the case studies of three pre-service teachers who showed commitment towards critical literacy in their actual teaching practice. The case studies covered a period of approximately 10 weeks in a middle school (grades 6-8). Several scholars suggest that critical literacy practices promotes better critical thinking in the social studies (Beck & McKeown, 2002; Giroux, 1988; Heafner, 2004; Hennings, 1993; Irvin, Lunstrom, Lynch-Brown, & Shepard, 1995; Lankshear & Knobel, 1997; Massey & Wolk, 2003; Zinn, 2005). Wolk (2003) says that rather than seeing critical literacy as an addition, teachers can select critical literacy knowledge and perspectives from current existing social studies topics. He continues his stance by encouraging K-12 teachers to break away from the textbook and include strategies for critical literacy in the social studies classroom.

Critical Literacy

Concept

The monoculture curriculum presented by several social studies textbooks denies students the opportunity to benefit from the knowledge, perspectives, and understanding to be gained from studying other cultural groups' experiences and attaining the intercultural competency to work with everyone (Ukpokodu, 2003). Instead of the monoculture curriculum, Zinn (2005) offers the following suggestion:

Juxtaposing historical text and content whereby various points of reference are taken into account, students, in particular, and the public, in general, will begin to be able to link the

necessary bodies of knowledge to develop a more critical and comprehensive understanding of reality. If our education systems don't change, schools will continue to produce highly literate individuals who willfully or unwillfully do not see the obvious. (p. 23)

Critical literacy views teaching more as an art than technical training. Thus, critical literacy in the social studies is more than teaching strategies and content knowledge required by curricula and textbooks. Instead, critical literacy is applying the conceptual tools necessary to engage students in a reasoned, well-argued critique of society along with its inequalities and injustices (Kretovics, 1985). Freire (1998) would propose that the teachers and learners are to be thought of as "subjects" rather than "objects." Critical literacy acknowledges that as subjects, we all have our own set of biases, privileges, and non-privileges which may be visible, non-visible, or even purposefully hidden but found in text. Critical literacy becomes active when we are engaged in problem posing and dialogue that seeks multiple perspectives to better reveal the *whole* text. Furthermore, through problem posing and dialogue, we may seek new possibilities that support social justice (Freire, 1970).

Lankshear (1993) describes critical literacy as efforts to discover how everyday ways of reading and writing help create and maintain processes and practices that benefit certain populations. While some critical literacy scholars stress the critique of society, others talk more about our personal involvements and social action with text. Today, Doizer, Johnston, and Rogers (2006) best summarize critical literacy as it pertains to this study:

For us, critical literacy involves understanding the ways in which language and literacy are used to accomplish social ends. Becoming critically literate means developing a sense that literacy is for taking social action, an awareness of how people use literacy for their own ends, and a sense of agency with respect to one's own identity. (p. 18)

Critical Literacy in Teacher Education

Most of the few existing studies examining critical literacy in teacher education focused on the critical literacy development of pre-service teachers in literacy and multicultural education courses (Ball, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 2001; Leland and Harste, 2005). These studies advocate the need for pre-service teachers to critically examine their biases and prejudices; meanwhile, these same educators are examining the inequalities and social injustices, including beliefs and practices that are accepted by the dominant culture. The tacit assumption holds that if pre-service teachers engage in this type of examination, they are more likely to teach for critical literacy in the classroom. While researchers continually stress the need for students to consider critical literacy in their teachings (Luke, 1997; McLaughlin & DeVogd, 2004) of the studies found, none examined critical literacy methods in a social studies methods course and field experience. Therefore, this study reports a look at the experiences of pre-service social studies teachers attempting to incorporate critical literacy in their social studies field experience.

Teachers can develop a philosophy of critical literacy through their experiences in their teacher education program. Ball (2000) conducted a study to examine how the exposure to theoretical readings and practical activities engaged pre-service students in dialogic conversations that impacted their philosophic thoughts on issues of literacy, teaching, and diversity. She frames her work in a course that she taught:

As these teachers begin to move beyond quoting the words of theorists to populate the words of others with their own intentions, when they can appropriate the words and adopt them to their own purposes, then we have evidence that internalization is occurring. (pp. 247-248).

Drawing on Vygotsky's sociocultural perspective on internalization, Ball's (2000) research considered how particular experiences within a social context provide reflection and growth that alters teachers' philosophies concerning literacy and its strategic use. Ball concluded that pre-service teachers must take into account their own literacy experience, their self-perceptions of being critically literate, and their perceptions on how critical literacy can enhance teaching and learning.

Ultimately, it is necessary for pre-service students to learn how to translate their increased awareness of critical literacies into teaching behaviors that meet the needs of a diverse student population. This translation of critical literacy knowledge into practice eventually provides pre-service teachers with the skills necessary to seek diverse perspectives and to recognize cultural bias in their own planning and instruction (Wooldridge, 2001). Therefore, the purpose for this research project is to examine how pre-service teachers attempt to make sense of critical literacy in their field experience practice.

Study Design and Method

Context

This case study examined the pre-service social studies teachers' experiences not only in their social studies methods course but also their concomitant field experiences. The methods course included a variety of relevant topics, readings, activities, and practice lessons (see Appendix A). As a way to teach for critical literacy in the methods course, I modeled various drama methodologies and the use of historical biographies as a way to gain multiple perspectives. As a result, the pre-service teacher participants involved multiple perspectives, historical biographies, and some form of drama in their lesson plans.

A public land grant university in a metropolitan city in Ohio served as the site for the study. This institution used a concurrent social studies field experience model for providing undergraduate pre-service middle grade teachers with field experience in social studies education prior to admission to the Master of Education teacher licensure program. The concurrent model means pre-service elementary/middle teachers had a field experience requirement in social studies education during their enrollment in an elementary/middle social studies methods course. The participants in the study spent between 36-40 hours in social studies classrooms for students ranging from grades 6-8. At the same time, they also spent 30 hours in the methods course that addressed social studies curriculum and instruction in grades 4-9. In this model, the field experience is an integral part of the middle childhood social studies methods, and pre-service middle teachers practiced their social studies lessons in the methods course then in the field placement in the middle school classrooms. This field experience is different from traditional social studies field experiences in that we attempted to provide pre-service teachers with opportunities to observe critical literacy in the social studies lessons in the classrooms as well as attempt to implement critical literacy strategies in the lessons that they taught.

The study methodology was reflective and oriented toward change (Zeichner, 1995) and is similar to teacher research approaches (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Hubbard & Power, 2002). Pre-service teachers watched social studies lessons conducted in the university classrooms and in the middle school setting.

Participants

The methods class participants presented a picture similar to the larger teacher education population. The predominately white, middle-class females enrolled in the methods course and field experience had attended suburban and rural schools typically located in Ohio. Because we placed pre-service teachers primarily in urban settings, most of these teachers encountered student populations that differed significantly from the student populations in the schools they had attended. Although there were eleven participants in the class, the study focused on the three participants, two white females and one Korean American female, who demonstrated skills and dispositions in being critically literate in their teaching.

Britney, Stacie, and Heather grew up in middle-class environments and reflected on how that contributed to their own privilege. All participants were able to critique their school experiences. All participants reflected on their biographies of literacy in social studies learning that influenced their own literacy attitudes and allowed them to question their own perspectives, some of which they previously may have not been aware. For example, Heather writes:

I was taught social studies with lectures, worksheets, and chapter tests, and I found that this was not the best way to learn. These “learning” activities did not incorporate literacy at all. These things can be helpful during the right situations in class, but it is not an ideal way for students to learn and think critically about social studies. Lectures and worksheets primarily do not allow students to think for themselves because the teacher and the book do it for them.

In this reflective discussion and writing activity, early literacy experiences and evolving thoughts on literacy are used to educate and begin the internalization process (Ball, 2000). Ball describes this activity as “a readiness exercise that prepares students to consider new and different perspectives, attitudes, and visions for literacy and its uses” (p. 226). This internalized activity supports their developing commitment as well as establishes the thought or idea that needs to be transformed. In all three cases, the participants can be seen as developing critically literate teachers. It is important to note that I was deliberate in the selection of these three particular students for the study. When one looks at the literature on critical literacy and other methods—and the overwhelming number of studies that focus on what pre-service teachers are unable to do—it was important to provide a counter story, a story of hope for critical literacy in social studies education. I chose to look at what pre-service teachers can do, however feeble their attempts. This trio, with their evident ability and commitment to engage critical literacy, may elaborate more of what is possible for pre-service teachers.

Data Collection

My scheduled observations of pre-service teachers' practices became an opportunity for an ongoing conversation about their school and practice. I also spent time facilitating communication between the university and the schools and met with all staff. This familiarization helped create a visible presence so that building teachers would feel comfortable with my presence as both researcher and as the students' university supervisor.

This study provides a detailed account of the ways in which critical literacy and social studies are connected in an introductory social studies field experience course from the perspectives of the pre-service students and the researcher. Through observations, curriculum documents, and interviews, I examined their questions, practices, opinions, and growth in using critical literacy as a way to improve social studies teaching. To better understand the details of how the data was collected, refer to Appendix B.

Data Analysis

Consistent with the naturalist inquiry framework in qualitative research (Guba & Lincoln, 1985), I inductively approached data analysis. I was especially interested in the critical literacy approaches that pre-service teacher participants attempted to teach in their field experience when given the opportunity and freedom to do so. Therefore, this case study is a primary vehicle for emic inquiry (Guba & Lincoln, 1985). No single item of data was given serious consideration unless it could be triangulated (Guba & Lincoln, 1985). Analyzing this triangulated data (classroom observations, focus group/individual interviews, and curriculum development) through the lens of critical and qualitative research paradigms and theory generated a form of analysis aligned with qualitative research.

One major task when analyzing the three pre-service teacher participants was to make assertions from the data corpus that is from the grounded survey, classroom observations, interview notes, and curriculum documents. In addition, I provided warrants for all the assertions I made by reviewing the data corpus repeatedly to test the validity of the assertions that were generated and seeking disconfirming evidence as well as confirming evidence (Erickson, 1986). In order for the reader to interpret my assertions, I included extensive detail from the cases of the three selected pre-service teachers.

Qualitative research uses several techniques to address threats of internal validity (Guba & Lincoln, 1985). In any research design, the possibility that the relationships shown in the data are, in fact, due to something else that always exists (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000). In this qualitative research study, I addressed threats to internal validity by engaging in expert and peer consultation/debriefing, informal member checks, and triangulating my data analysis. Working from a post-positivist framework, it was not my goal to search for proofs but to demonstrate plausibility (Charmaz, 2000). This research attempts to demonstrate the plausibility of pre-service teacher participants being able to develop into critically literate social studies teachers.

Case studies also call for examination of complexity (Guba & Lincoln, 1985). In addition to careful examination of the multiple layers of meanings of critical literacy for these teachers, I have suggested those complexities as possibilities for further investigation. In my movement through what happened with three participants and what generally happens for pre-service teachers learning to teach social studies from a critically literate perspective, I am ultimately guided by a vision that this can be achieved in a variety of ways, demonstrated by the very

structure of the course and the careful reflective processes used with the pre-service teacher participants. Given the complexity of the three participants' lives and through their individual case studies, the reasonableness of generalizability will depend on the reader finding in the thick description substantial similarities between his or her own contextual understanding and this study. Through the systematic data collection, analysis, and presentation, certain aspects of this research may transfer to support of reflective practice among pre-service teachers in other contexts. The data suggest that the pre-service teacher participants used the methods course as a valuable resource for their field experience teaching.

Findings

Demonstrating Social Action: Which Approaches Do Pre-service Teachers Use?

Among the wide range of approaches in critical literacy, what was the ultimate action of the pre-service teacher participants? A dimension of becoming critically literate is social action (Leland & Harste, 2005). In the methods course, we discussed and practiced several pedagogical approaches in the social studies including multiple perspectives, inquiry, drama, students' knowledge, activism, author or power in text, anti-oppressive education, text with a position, deliberation, text juxtaposition that shows complexity, alternate texts that represent missing voices, creativity, and independent thinking. I wanted to know which approaches (if any) would be common among the three participants and would be examples of social action in the social studies. In examining their practices, I provide a description of the critical literacy practices they actually used in their teaching along with a discussion and analysis of these practices. Finally, I provide an overall analysis of the types of practices the participants had chosen as well as a model of pre-service teachers' critical consciousness development.

Stacie's lesson on Alexander the Great. Stacie wanted to explain the concept of multiple perspectives to her sixth-grade students through act-it-out activities. Her main objective in the lesson was to have students pick out key information from a single text representing Alexander the Great as a hero and also as a villain. Using informational reading strategies previously learned in the classroom, she had some students examine the event of Alexander's conquest from the perspective of the conqueror. With the same text, she had some students examine the event from the perspective of the conquered. The students were instructed to perform act-it-outs and relate key information about both perspectives. At the end of the lesson, Stacie's questions included, "Why is it important to be aware of the two perspectives of Alexander's conquests? How is it possible that one person can represent both sides of a perspective?"

This lesson is an example of developing students' ability to read from a critical stance. "Readers have the power to envision alternative ways of viewing the author's topic, and they exert that power when they read from a critical stance" (McLaughlin & DeVoogd, 2004, p. 53). In the methods course, we discussed how Rosenblatt's (2002) notion that no reading experience is objective and readers are always making choices in their thinking. In this exercise, the students were making choices on how they would think and read about Alexander the Great. Although the lesson planning was guided by her mentor teacher, in Stacie's lesson reflection, she provided the following reflection on her instruction:

In my field experience this quarter, I did an activity on Alexander the Great that I thought was a good representation of how to bring critical literacy into the classroom. The students were asked to look at an event from Alexander's conquest from two perspectives, that of the conqueror and of the conquered. The students then presented each side to the class through a short play as the rest of the class watched each event and perspective. In the end, the students were to write an editorial in which they wrote about their opinion on whether Alexander was a hero or a villain and why they thought that. I thought this was a good lesson using critical literacy because it had the students looking at a source and finding the different viewpoints within it.

This is an example of Stacie's developing ability to understand taking a critical stance, in this case, making choices on how to read a text about Alexander the Great. Each group eventually performed their interpretation of the text.

Heather's lesson on the bombing of Hiroshima. Heather taught a lesson that involved three different readings and perspectives on dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima. The three perspectives included a sixth-grade Japanese student whose family was killed, a writer for a local newspaper, and a Chief of Staff to Roosevelt and Truman. Heather worked within a pedagogy described by Zinn (2005) as "the juxtaposition of historical texts that enables students to see the messiness of viewpoints and to gain a more critical reading of reality" (p. 16). By bringing in the voice of the sixth-grade Japanese student, Heather attempted to grasp a perspective that was rarely seen in social studies textbooks, i.e., the victim, as well as a perspective from a person of the same age group as the students.

In teaching the lesson, Heather divided the class into three groups with each group taking one perspective. Heather developed questions similar to questions that I provided in a previous lesson during a session of the methods course. After reading the text on their respective perspectives, each group had to respond to questions that included:

1. Who is the communicator of the author?
2. What audience is the target of the message?
3. Was the message factual in style, emotive, biased?
4. How justifiable is the purpose of the communication, according to an evaluation in terms of the reader's values?
5. Was it persuasive?

The purpose of these questions was to understand how text positions readers to make meaning a certain way (Luke, 1997). After each group did the reading and prepared question responses, Heather asked each group to discuss the event from their assigned perspective.

Afterward, Heather had the students participate in an informal debate about whether or not the United States should have dropped the bomb. Again, the class was divided into two groups—one group supporting and one not supporting the decision to drop the atomic bomb. It was important for Heather to keep all the perspectives in mind. Heather was the moderator and asked questions like, "How would you have felt if you were the one who dropped the bomb that killed 110,000 people?" and "Aside from dropping the bomb, could there have been an alternative method of ending the war?" When little discussion was occurring, Heather addressed a direct question to a student. In the middle of the debate, she asked, "Do you think the bomb

was racially motivated?” Silence followed the question. This silence might be read as resistance from the class to Heather's lesson. Finally, a student quickly replied, “It had nothing to do with race. America has a lot of power, that’s just the way we are!” This student's reactions actually silenced the class even more. In this discussion, Heather had pushed her students to interrogate the personal involvement that exists when we go to war. Although little discussion followed Heather’s questions, one may interpret her question as an attempt to teach for critical literacy in her lesson. However, silence and a defensive reaction occurred as soon as Heather, who is Korean American, mentioned racial motives in her questioning. Once Heather experienced this resistance/silence, she dropped her question. This experience can be a common occurrence in teacher education for teachers of color as Delpit (1995) reminds us:

1. Many believe accounts of their own experiences are not validated in teacher education programs or in their subsequent teaching lives.
2. Many frequently encounter negative racial attitudes towards themselves.
3. Many often felt isolated from instructors and other students during their teaching training. (pp. 108-122)

Heather was attempting to model critical literacy teaching by pushing students to think not only about the United States but also the conditions of Japanese people. However, as the instructor and researcher, I was concerned about how this situation might decrease Heather’s comfort and increase her isolation within the methods course. I was also troubled with my own actions as the instructor, since I offered little support while she was stuck in this situation.

Heather's lesson on Rosa Parks. In a second lesson, Heather’s goal was to teach her sixth-grade students about Rosa Parks and her important place in American history. In addition, she wanted to promote critical thinking and creativity. The beginning of Heather’s lesson had students thinking about what they would do if they were put into a similar situation to that experienced by Rosa Parks. She set this situation by asking the students, “What would you do if our middle school decided to make it a rule that everyone had to start wearing school uniforms? What would you do about this?” In this discussion, Heather advocated, “If you truly think something is unfair, you should take your stance for better change.” When I asked Heather how her lesson was related to critical literacy, she responded:

My first question to the students encouraged them to think for themselves about what they would do with a rule/law they didn’t agree with. I asked them the uniform question thinking that they would disagree with the mandatory uniform policy, which ended up working out as I had planned. They evaluated an issue and came up with their own opinions about it because it was a topic that they could connect to their own lives. It also initiated a discussion, which is an important part of critical literacy. Involving students in the discussion allowed them to form opinions, hear different perspectives from their classmates, and to think about real issues that are out in society.

During the first part of her lesson, Heather appeared to be making some important connections to common critical literacy approaches which included discussion, activism, and decisions in which students think creatively and think by themselves (Wolk, 2003). After the students had their discussion, she related it to her lesson on Rosa Parks. Following an in-class play reading on Rosa

Parks, there was a class discussion on how one person could make a difference and inspire people to stand up for the Civil Rights movement. What ended up happening throughout the lesson was Heather reinforcing the message to her students, “If you think something is unfair, you should take a stance.” When I asked her why she kept repeating that idea, she said, “I wanted students to focus on the social issue of civil rights and the inequalities that once existed in America.”

Another critical literacy element was that students were asked to select the most important aspect of Rosa Parks' life (as depicted in the play) and reproduce it by creating frozen pictures or tableaux about it. The tableaux activities were facilitated similar to the way I had facilitated them in the methods course. Unlike many pre-service teachers who had thought tableaux or frozen pictures would be ineffective with children, Heather attempted to do this in her actual teaching practice. Heather had asked students to construct frozen pictures of the most significant aspect of Rosa Parks. She was confident that her choice of drama strategy was a good one:

This lesson plan also enabled the students to think creatively during the tableau activity. The tableau involved the students in active learning, and after reading and understanding the play, they were able to “act” out something important they learned about Rosa Parks.

After students performed their frozen pictures, Heather asked the students to give an explanation on why they thought those particular frozen pictures were most significant to them. If one group of students created their tableaux that represented something unfair, Heather would advocate student activism.

This activity is an example of drama where biography and history were connected in a way to make better sense of their lived experiences (Mills, 1959). This overall activity allowed the sixth-grade students to enter history in an active way as well as allow them to think of how and where this activity might fit into their own time (mandatory uniform policies).

I was concerned, however, with Heather's representation of Rosa Parks. When I observed her teaching, she said to her class, “Rosa Parks was just an ordinary person that one day decided to make a difference.” The theatrical play and her follow-up comment were really a misrepresentation of Rosa's actions. Similar to textbooks and other literature, the play depicted Rosa Parks as “all of a sudden” to make a political stand; in contrast, her autobiography documents her long-term political commitment towards social justice. After observing Heather's first-period class, I discussed this issue with her. For the future class periods, she assured me that she would mention Parks as more of an activist.

Britney's lesson on Paul Revere. Britney asked the students, “How would you feel if the British were invading our land? What would you do?” After some quick responses, she asked, “What do you know about Paul Revere?” Many students responded that he warned that the British were coming. She read to the class a poem called “Paul Revere's Ride” by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. After the reading, she stated, “You may think the book is based on a true story, but it's not all true.” Britney read an additional text titled, “The Real Ride” according to Paul Revere's account. She provided the class with additional biographies and timelines about Paul Revere. Through reading and writing exercises, students were asked to role-play the roles of as common people while creating an interpretation of the event. Little dialogue was occurring, and students were appearing to be a bit confused on the assignment expectations. At the end of the lesson, Britney had a reflective writing exercise. She asked the class, “What kind of a person

was Paul Revere?” Students were expected to write and submit a brief description. Students struggled with the lesson because it appeared they rushed through the material. Britney was frustrated and added, “I would have liked to have done more with the timeline, discuss the quotes on Paul Revere’s own journal, and hear the students’ reactions to his biographies and timelines.”

When I asked Britney to describe how her lesson was linked to critical literacy, she replied:

My lesson involved reading and understanding the poem. This required the students to interpret what the poem was saying into words that were more easily comprehensible. By then extending what is learned in the poem to a timeline of actual events and a biography, literacy in theory, practice, and pedagogy are being used because students are interpreting the poem and applying it to the timeline and drawing conclusions from that. They are also delving deeper into the poem by learning about Paul Revere’s life. The students’ homework also practiced this because it required them to look back on everything that was covered in class and to describe Paul Revere as a person (whether he was smart, courageous, brave, cowardly, etc.) and explain why they thought that. When explaining why, they had to refer to what was discussed in class.

Britney’s lesson served to help students to attempt to become historical interpreters. An influential reading from the methods course was McLaughlin and DeVogd’s “Critical literacy as comprehension: Expanding reader response” (2004). Britney’s students were developing a critical stance by the juxtaposition of various texts that helped demonstrate multiple perspectives about Paul Revere.

Discussion of Common Practices

I wanted to know which teaching practices (if any) would be common among the three participants. Many pre-service teacher participants’ lesson formats involved multiple perspectives, historical biographies, and some form of drama. The three approaches they commonly used were directly influenced by their discussions in the social studies methods class. Specifically, they wanted to move away from traditional social studies learning and teaching. All three participants defined traditional social studies as using one textbook, meaning a single perspective and single text, and a person lecturing the content to students. As a reaction to these negative experiences, the participants determinedly avoided reacted by not wanting to do exactly that: They truly wanted their lessons to be engaging and involving more than not just one source or perspective. Again, that was their experience in social studies; their own learning had been a single textbook and lecture approach which students commonly criticized during the discussions in the method course. However, the participants tended to use approaches that ignored the social studies textbook completely. Instead, when planning their lessons, the participants’ conversations stressed the idea of bringing in other sources or perspectives and letting the learners discover on their own. No participant considered using the social studies textbook to question, point out missing voices, etc. Given their social studies learning histories, the methods course activities, and the observations in the field, the participants took sort of an “anti-textbook” stance. I was a bit concerned by this position because when the participants have more experiences in education, we could speculate that they will encounter district curriculum mandates that may require them to use textbooks. Perhaps as the instructor, rather than just critiquing the textbook in the methods

course, I could have used the textbook as a way to create a foundation for multiple perspectives seeking as well as model problem-posing in middle-grade classrooms.

Using Multiple Perspectives for Problem-Posing

One pedagogical tool that Freire (1970) offers is problem-posing education as a pedagogical tool in which you provide information while simultaneously questioning the information. During the methods course, all three participants began to think about how and why multiple perspectives were needed in social studies education. They experienced interactive activities in the methods course, some of which were designed by the instructor, while other activities were designed by the pre-service teachers in the course. They reflected on how and why they would teach for critical literacy.

While the methods course modeled incorporating multiple perspectives, the pre-service teachers and participants struggled to successfully incorporate and transfer the strategy to multiple perspectives in their lessons. There were also some limitations on how the participants taught multiple perspectives. Stacie writes in her final reflection, "The most important thing I think I will take from this class is the idea that there are multiple views to every event and that I must consider that when in the classroom." However, there is a limitation here. Presenting more than one view point is not the same as engaging the student in processing and critiquing more than one point of view. The participant appeared to be unable to get the engagement piece. In many final reflection papers, as well as the lesson that I observed, many perspectives were still viewed from a neutral standpoint and avoided critiquing any person or event. The participants attempted to involve problem-posing in their critical approaches in the field placement. However, participants would present additional material but would often leave their students alone in their interpretations. Sometimes different viewpoints were shared but were rarely contested or discussed about. Basically, there was no planning for processing and critiquing multiple perspectives. The pre-service teachers simply advocate and put in "more" perspectives and resources in the learning environment with limited or no discussion, simply expecting each student to come up with his or her own opinion. However, participants were beginning to problem-pose by providing additional information to achieve multiple perspectives, rarely questioning the perspective assumptions embodied within these perspectives. Thus, the dialogue needed to raise Freire's notion of critical consciousness was very limited. This leads to the second main method the participants engaged, which was dialogue.

Dialogue

When problem-posing, a useful pedagogical tool (Freire, 1970) is to use dialogue, a discussion among people whose intelligence is valued equally. All of the participants wanted dialogue and critical consciousness to occur in their lessons, but attempts to implement dialogue were limited or ineffective due to their lack of preparation or knowledge on how to facilitate a dialogue. From the interviews and reflection papers, the data suggests that the selected participants would strongly recommend effective discussions in all critical social studies classrooms. However, in my observations of their teaching, discussions were ineffective or nonexistent discussions even as the participants stated in their interviews that they were highly valued discussion in the interviews and included them in their lesson plans. Among the three participants, discussion was unplanned, limited, or ineffective. Heather was the only participant

who attempted to run a full discussion-based lesson session. Heather starts one of her discussions on the bombing of Pearl Harbor by saying, "I don't know if you guys want to talk about this or not..." This prompt is not a recommended approach to begin an effective discussion. From another lesson, Heather reflects from on one of her planned discussions:

I wanted to have a discussion of some sort, rather than have the students read and write during the period. I knew that not all the students would know the meaning of Veterans' Day, so I decided to make a short PowerPoint while I discussed some background information briefly.

Heather calls it discussion but she was mainly lecturing on the information with her PowerPoint presentation. Fortunately, the students had some questions, and the "discussion" lesson extended from 20 minutes to the whole period.

All three participants strongly believed that social studies education involves students critiquing society. It is important to note that a critique in a social studies classroom would naturally require a successful discussion to take place. However, if the teacher has trouble with managing a discussion, it becomes a barrier to critique an issue in the classroom. Based on my observations, in order for pre-service teachers to critique society or to teach critical literacy, they need specific training on how to facilitate a discussion. If they do not gain these skills, they resort back to what feels safe: traditional teaching.

Hess (2001) quickly points out those discussion skills need to be taught to all pre-service teachers. Both pre-service and in-service teachers downplay the difficulty of worthwhile discussions, believing that it happens naturally and spontaneously: One needs to simply throw out the topic and watch a wonderful exchange of ideas unfold (Hess, 2001). A dilemma is that in many social studies classrooms, minimal dialogue is taking place. Pre-service students would greatly benefit if taught how to facilitate a discussion and perhaps then be given a more directive assignment such as facilitating a discussion-based activity in their field experience. However, related to their development as critically-literate social studies teachers, this study suggests that the participants indeed develop an awareness of the significance of dialogue in schools. As Heather concluded:

One thing I was surprised by was the way the students were so enthusiastic and eager during discussions. I learned that "Education is dialogue."

All pre-service teachers should discover what Heather did in the course: Dialogue has an important place in the social studies classroom. Much is still left to be learned about the connections between social studies methods classes as sites and approaches that support dialogue and problem-posing.

Implications

Essential critical literacy approaches such as problem-posing and dialogue were supported by the pre-service students and participants. However, the data suggests critical literacy approaches need more attention in the methods course in order for internalization to take place.

The following implications serve teacher education preparation programs as they consider ways to foster a critical perspective of equality, justice, and diversity in social studies methods and field experience courses:

1. As critical teacher educators, it is essential that we teach beyond normative knowledge concerns of “what should be” to also include empirical knowledge, political knowledge, ontological knowledge, and experiential knowledge. Kincheloe (2004) acknowledges this as the “reflective-synthetic knowledge that involves bringing all of our knowledge’s of teaching together, so they can be employed in the critical pedagogical act” (p. 106). The data from this research suggests the need for more critical teacher education that seeks reflective-synthetic knowledge, particularly in the social studies curriculum.
2. Teacher preparation might promote critical literacy for social studies pre-service teachers by requiring lesson plans that are directly related to issues of race, gender, class, sexual orientation, disabilities, etc.
3. Teacher preparation should model and teach what Dillard (1993) calls dialogical teaching, which consists of posing problems followed by critical discussion, encouraging deeper levels of critical thinking and dialogue. (p. 94)

The implications of this study suggests teacher educators and future teachers take a stance on critical education and push for structural changes in common teaching practices and school curriculum mandates. However, Dillard (1993) reminds us that the journey toward critical education is not this is not an easy journey:

It is important to note that critical education toward freedom, with all of its struggles, is not necessarily an enjoyable pursuit. For those who promote teacher education as a practice of freedom, the requisite critical, political, and pedagogical stance often has serious consequences, such as being viewed as a troublemaker or "radical" by colleagues or not being liked by students. (p. 90)

From this critical standpoint, Dillard acknowledges that resistance exists; however, the study suggests that the potential for critical literacy as a transformative teacher preparation pedagogy is called for in today's society.

Intentions for Further Research: Cursory Glance vs. In-Depth

In this research study, the pre-service students discussed and experienced several critical literacy approaches that teachers can use in the classroom. However, in order for critical consciousness among teachers and students to take place, the data suggests that teacher educators need to select and give specific critical approaches more attention in the methods course. Rather than having a cursory glance at several different types of teaching strategies, does a focus on a particular critical literacy approach allow for higher likelihood that pre-service teachers will transfer the methods to their teaching? If I am suggesting a focus on dialogue teaching through dialogue, as the methods course instructor, I must be aware of the complexities of dialogue. Several factors to be considered when modeling and teaching through dialogue in the methods classroom include designing an opening question, differentiating types of discourse,

understanding student beliefs, assumptions, and values, examining assessment practices, selecting powerful texts, and implementing opportunities in the field experience, the role of the teacher, and the role of the students.

There is a need in teacher education to investigate the long-term impact and possible environmental factors supporting teachers in teaching for critical literacy. More data need to be collected over a longer period of time in order to make a definitive linkage between instruction in methods courses and teachers' disposition and ability to employ instructional strategies learned in the methods courses. However, this study provides us hope and allows us to continue to think about what might be possible for a social studies methods/field experience course in teacher education.

References

- Ball, A.F. (2000). Teachers' developing philosophies on literacy and their use in urban schools: A Vygotskian perspective on internal activity and teacher change. In C. Lee & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research: Constructing meaning through collaborative inquiry*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Beck, I.L. & McKeown, M.G. (2002). Questioning the author: Making sense of social studies. *Educational Leadership*, 60(3), 44-47.
- Comber, B. (2001). Critical literacy: What is it, and what does it look like in elementary classrooms? *National Council of Teachers of English*, 6(3), 1-6.
- Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded Theory: Objectivist and Constructivist Methods. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed., pp. 509-536). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1993). *Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Dillard, C.B. (1993). Placing student language, literacy, and culture at the center of teacher education reform. In J. King, E. Hollins, & W. Hayman (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for cultural diversity*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dozier, C., Johnston, P., & Rogers, R. (2006). *Critical literacy critical teaching: Tools for preparing responsive teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 145-152). New York: Macmillan.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2000). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (4th ed.). Madison, WI: McGraw Hill.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.
- Giroux, H. (1988). Writing in the social studies. In *Teachers as intellectual: Towards a critical pedagogy of learning*. Westport, CT.: Bergin and Garvey.
- Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hennings, D.G. (1993). On knowing and reading history. *Journal of Reading*, 36(5), 362-370.
- Hess, D. (2001). Teaching to public controversy in a democracy. In J. J. Patrick & R. S. Leming (Eds.), *Principles and practices of democracy in the education of social studies teachers*. Bloomington: ERIC Clearinghouse.
- Hubbard, R., & Power, B. (2002). *Living the questions: A guide for teacher-researcher*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Irvin, J.L., Lunstrom, J.P., Lynch-Brown, C., & Shepard, M.F. (1995). *Enhancing literacy strategies in social studies*. Washington DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Kincheloe, J.L. (2004). *Critical pedagogy*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Kretovics, J.R. (1985). Critical literacy: Challenging the assumptions of mainstream educational theory. *Journal of Education*, 167(2), 50-62.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The new journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

- Lankshear, C. & Knobel, M. (1997). Critical literacy and active citizenship. In S. Muspratt, A. Luke, & P. Freebody (Eds.), *Constructing critical literacies: Teaching and learning textual practice*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Leland, C.H., & Harste, J.C. (2005). Doing what we want to become: Preparing new urban teachers. *Urban Education*, 40(1), 60-77.
- Luke, A. (1997). Critical literacy and the question of normativity: An introduction. In S. Muspratt, A. Luke, & P. Freebody (Eds.), *Constructing critical literacies: Teaching and learning textual practice*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Massey, D.D., & Heafner, T.L. (2004). Promoting reading comprehension in social studies. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 48(1), 26-40.
- McLaughlin, M., & DeVogd, G. (2004). Critical literacy as comprehension: Expanding reading response. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 48(1), 52-62.
- Mills, C.W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rosenblatt, L.M. (2002, December). A pragmatist theoretical looks at research: Implications and questions calling for answers. Paper presented at the 52nd annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Miami, FL.
- Ukpokodu, O. (2003). The challenges of teaching a social studies methods course from a transformative and social reconstructionist framework. *The Social Studies* (March-April), 75-80.
- Wolk, S. (2003). Teaching for critical literacy in social studies. *The Social Studies* (May/June), 101-106.
- Wooldridge, N. (2001). Tensions and ambiguities in critical literacy. In B. Comber & A. Simpson (Eds.), *Negotiating critical literacies in classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Zeichner, K. (1995). Reflections of a teacher educator working for social change. In Russell & F. Korthagen (Eds.), *Teachers who teach teachers: Reflections on teacher education*. London: Falmer Press.
- Zinn, H. (2005). *Howard Zinn: On democratic education*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Appendix A

Brief Overview of Method Course Sessions

Session One

The class shared their own personal experiences as social studies learners. Some of the discussion questions included: Why do you think content coverage is so important for most teachers? Describe an outstanding social studies learning experience and/or teacher. Pre-service teacher completed the following writing prompt: What do you know or think you know about critical literacy?

Session Two

I provided an overview lecture on critical literacy and critical literacy in the social studies classroom. I then discussed using current events in the classroom and led a discussion about life after Hurricane Katrina. I had asked how supportive structures developed in the homeless group in New Orleans. To what extent were they supportive? What services were available for the homeless? How effective were they? How do Hollywood and the media portray homeless people and their situations?

I led the discussion by studying drama with Eve Bunting's children's book *Fly Away Home*. This particular drama lesson did not directly go into the issue in New Orleans, but it prepared students to think about poverty and the hidden prejudices/oppression that come with it. In this lesson, students were to gain a better understanding of poverty by examining how a boy and his father survived on little income.

Afterwards, I shared the results of session one's writing prompt: What do you know or think you know about critical literacy with students?

Session Three

The students read *Searching for substantial knowledge in social studies* by J.J. White. The essential question in the article was how do textbooks pretend to be objective? In this reading, White claims that social studies texts have a point of view and cannot be objective and texts have only one point of view but need multiple points of view.

We conducted a social studies textbook analysis on how the Holocaust is represented. The main objective was to critique who was represented in the text and who was not.

Using the White article, I wrote, "Children need to acquire the story of our past from an ever increasing cast of characters." We had a discussion, and students participated in a role-play activity about the Holocaust that supported White's statement.

Session Four

A second reading by Lankshear and Knobel was done in class and explored how certain constructions of reality can be created by text. Included was a brief article asking for aid for the

starving people in Africa. After reading this article, pre-service teachers were asked to explore the following questions (p. 112):

1. What version of events/reality is foregrounded here?
2. Whose version is this? From whose perspective is it constructed?
3. What other (possible) versions are excluded?
4. Whose/what interests are served by this representation?
5. By what means—lexical, syntactic, etc.—does this text construct (its) reality?
6. How does this position the reader?

Britney and Kerri facilitated a discussion on the assigned readings and conducted a drama activity. The activity asked the class to create stories of three *Titanic* passengers (the names were real names of passengers) followed with checking their stories with “factual” biographies that were found on the Internet. The activity involved members from the first and second class and the staff. The creative narratives and survival in the narratives were associated with class status.

Session Five

Heather facilitated a discussion on the assigned readings and conducted a class activity. Heather taught a lesson in the methods course for which she brought in three different readings/perspectives on the dropping of the atomic bomb at Hiroshima. The three perspectives included a sixth-grade Japanese student whose family was killed, a writer for a local newspaper, and a Chief of Staff to Roosevelt and Truman. In teaching the lesson, the class was divided into three groups with each group taking one perspective. After reading the text on their assigned perspective, each group had to respond to questions that included:

1. Who is the communicator of the author?
2. What audience is the target of the message?
3. Was the message factual in style, emotive, and bias?
4. How justifiable is the purpose of the communication, according to an evaluation in terms of the reader's values?
5. Was it persuasive?

After each group completed the reading and question responses, Heather asked students to discuss the perspective for which they were assigned. Afterward, Heather had the students participate in an informal debate about whether the United States should have dropped the bomb or not. The class was divided again into two groups—one group supporting and one not supporting the decision to drop the atomic bomb. Heather moderated the discussion.

I had asked students, “What is critical literacy?” Reflecting from the observation logs they conducted, they were asked if they saw critical literacy in their field placement or not.

Session Six

Barb, Erica, and Lisa facilitated a discussion on the assigned readings and conducted a class activity. The first activity required each person to read a different character in Paul Fleischman's *Bull Run*. Each person was asked to read a biography from the story. The class was

split into two groups. Each group was asked to create or come up with a theatrical skit that involved all of the characters.

Erica gave a book talk on Eve Bunting's *Smoky Nights* and asked if teachers should teach it or not. The story is about the riots in Los Angeles in 1992. Erica read parts of the story to the class and had stressed that "You can't just read *Smoky Nights* and leave it. Instead, you would also want to explore why the riots happened." The class had a discussion about using controversial books in the classroom. Later, I facilitated a discussion and summary around the McLaughlin and DeVoogd article and conducted a drama/children's literature activity.

Session Seven

Stacie facilitated a discussion on the assigned readings and conducted a class activity. This activity was focused on collecting and performing an oral story from a Japanese woman named Gumi. After reading Gumi's biography, Stacie asked the class, "What should the interview focus on?" After some brainstorming, the class decided to focus the interview on how Gumi's father's military service affected her learning experiences in school. When the topic was established, Stacie conducted some interview skill-building exercises before developing actual questions. Some of the questions in the interview included:

1. Can you talk about the father's view on the military in Japan and World War II?
2. Did your school and father ever conflict?
3. Can you share an episode?
4. What are the teacher's views about the military, and can you discuss their opinions?

In Gumi's oral telling, she described her life as a student in Japan. A major conflict was that her father supported the military; meanwhile, her teachers were anti-military and had purposefully left nationalism out of the curriculum. Gumi told the class that teachers were somewhat prejudice of her because of her father. She went on to say, "In the fifth grade, one of my teachers was leaving the school permanently. The teacher had written a goodbye letter for everyone but me. The teacher specifically told me it was because my father was in the military. I was so upset. I would often learn more about my father's views over the dinner table." In the next activity, students were divided into two groups and asked to create a performance focused on this conflict. Both groups had listened to the same oral telling of the event, then created and performed that event into four scenes.

Session Eight

Using drama skills such as tableaux and improvisation, two different groups created a performance based on Gumi's telling. Afterwards, the groups shared their performances with each other. A reflective discussion occurred afterwards addressing the similarities and differences of the two performances.

A discussion took place on how well the pre-service teachers prepared for their lessons. Many of them had taught lessons already. Discussion question: Could you tell me what influenced your decision-making when designing your lesson plans in the field experience?

Session Nine

Pre-service teachers were asked to distribute one or two of their lesson plans and explain these to the methods class. They were asked to be prepared to discuss their experience in teaching the lesson as well as defend their choices with sound ethical and pedagogical justifications. Each presentation addressed the lesson sessions they conducted at their field experience school.

Session Ten: Finals Week

Pre-service teachers were asked to construct a final portfolio. Some of the requirements throughout the academic quarter were required as part of the final portfolio.

Appendix B

Pre-service Teacher Observation

I observed the participants teach one social studies lesson in the methods course. The lesson taught in the methods courses required students to incorporate the assigned readings for that day. In addition, I observed the pre-service teacher participants teaching at least one social studies lesson in their assigned field experience. Throughout the entire course in the autumn quarter, I took observation notes as pre-service teachers were engaged in conversations and activities around critical literacy in the methods course. I collected detailed field notes at all these observations.

Curriculum Portfolio

I collected the curriculum portfolio from the three pre-service teacher participants for analysis. The portfolio consists of field experience observation logs, student-written lesson plans, self-evaluations of lessons, and written reflections (Appendix A).

The curriculum portfolio can be thought of as document collection from the three selected pre-service teacher participants. These documents were used as data within this study. I draw on several other sources for additional curriculum data.

Reflection Exit Cards

Each week, students were asked to hand in a written reflection about the class session of the methods course. They were asked to reflect on the work done in the methods course (e.g. record an insight you had, something you learned, something that caught your interest). These data were used in the study.

Field Logs

In their field experience, pre-service students were asked to write up classroom observations. In those lessons, they examined the literacy practices in the classroom. Each week, they submitted a copy of their field logs. At least two logs from two different social studies lessons observed were submitted each week.

Lesson Plans and Self-Evaluation

Pre-service teacher participants designed social studies lesson plans, implemented them for a small group of children or class, and completed an extended self-evaluation one week after each lesson. The self-evaluation asked the following questions:

1. How effective was the preparation process with your mentor teacher (e.g., division of material, consensus/initial disagreement?)
2. Did you present all information clearly?
3. What were the variables that contributed to the students' effective/ineffective work?
4. Were your objectives clear in your leadership?

5. Were your transitions smooth?
6. Did you ask appropriate and open-ended questions?
7. What were some of the emotions you experienced as a leader during the session and what generated them (discuss both positive and negative feelings)
8. How was your social studies lesson linked to literacy in theory, practice, and/or pedagogy?
9. What did you learn from the activity, and what would you do differently if you could do it again with the same type of group?

Literacy and Social Studies Reflection Paper

In a five-page reflection paper, pre-service teachers reflected on their own progress, incorporating field experience and previous reflections, the readings, and other learning experiences they had during the class regarding literacy connections in the social studies. The main questions/guidelines for the reflection paper were as follows:

1. What have you learned in the field experience and class?
2. Have your attitudes about literacy in social studies been changed or reinforced? How?
3. Do you intend to incorporate critical literacy and balanced literacy into your own social studies teachings? Why? How?

Focus Group and Individual Interviews

I facilitated two focus group interviews. Both focus group interviews involved the three participants and took place after regular class sessions. In addition, I conducted individual interviews with the three pre-service teacher participants. Individual interviews were conducted after the three pre-service teachers completed their portfolio conference/grading to avoid a conflict of interest or the feeling of pressure to perform. The format for the individual and focus group conversations were open-ended. Typical questions/topics included the following:

1. Tell me what you know about critical literacy thus far?
2. Tell me the ways in which critical literacy can be connected to the social studies?
3. Do you remember an occasion when critical literacy skills were involved in your own social studies learning experience? Tell me about your social studies class.
4. How are your classroom observations done for class helping you to think about connections between critical literacy and social studies learning? Give an example of this.
5. Could you tell me what influenced your decision making when designing your lesson plans in the field experience?
6. When planning your social studies lesson, could you give a more detailed description of what happened in your planning?
7. What do you think contributed to your students' understanding in the lessons you taught?
8. How were your social studies lessons linked to critical literacy in theory, practice, and/or pedagogy?
9. What did you learn from connecting critical literacy to your social studies instruction?

10. What would you do differently if you could teach the same group of students again?
11. What would you do differently if you could teach a different group of students?

With the permission of the participants, these interviews were audio taped. Participants were informed that they were free to stop the recorder at any time. The recorder was placed on the center of the table for visibility. Transcriptions of these interviews provided data for in-depth review, follow-up, and analysis.

Focus Group Interview #1

For the first focus group interview, the pre-service teacher participants were learning about critical literacy in the social studies and starting to make observations in their field experience classroom. The primary purpose of this discussion was to define critical literacy and explore how they see critical literacy in their field experiences or not. All three selected participants spoke in the interview, and the interviews were tape recorded and transcribed.

Focus Group Interview #2

By the time of the second focus group interview, all three pre-service teacher participants had taught one or two social studies lessons in their field experience. During their participation in this focus group, the pre-service teachers were more focused on the outside factors that determined the outcome of their lesson(s) development design. The primary purpose of this discussion was to look at pre-service teachers' perception of their methods course in relation to their lesson planning in the field experience. Again, all three selected participants spoke in the interview and the interviews were tape recorded and transcribed.

Individual Interviews

Individual interviews were also conducted with the three pre-service teacher participants. The purpose was to learn more about the pre-service teacher participants' backgrounds, clarify their definition of critical literacy in the social studies classroom, and discuss how they went about lesson planning and implementation in their field experience. Also, the individual interview focused on how they would teach the lesson differently if they were not under the guidance of a mentor teacher.

Researcher Journal Entries

Throughout the project, I kept a researcher journal on my thoughts, feelings, observations, and theoretical notes. Also, in my research journal were my lesson plans and post-session notes including thoughts about my changing understanding of how the pre-service teachers were influenced in their abilities to teach for critical literacy.

Finally, it considers how critical approaches to teaching and learning literacy and social studies might be united to promote and support the development of critical thinking skills necessary for today's students to successfully address issues in an increasingly complex and interconnected global society. In order to move toward a critical literacy perspective, teachers will have to rethink their usual textbook practices and search for alternative resources (Wolk, 2003). This study adopted mixed methods. The study participants consisted of Social Studies teachers working in Bursa, which is a large-scale province of Turkey, in the 2014-2015 school year. According to the study findings, while terror was the most controversial issue, faith in creation was the least controversial issue. According to critical literacy, teaching a foreign language can favor the development of a critical awareness of how meanings and identities are more. This paper investigates the importance of critical literacy for English language teaching. Made in a period of great social and political unrest, fuelled by frequent clashes between Asian immigrants and the white the characters' identities. As a result, distinctions often taken for granted such as colonizer and colonized, or right and left, are blurred, suggesting that our identities are always already products of temporary and provisional alliances, entangled in to set standards for an ethical representation of racial and cultural difference.