DISCOMFORT AND DISCOVERY: FOSTERING REFLECTIVE HABITS OF MIND IN STUDENT JOURNALS

Greta Vollmer

Ask any English major who intends to become a high school teacher their reasons for doing so, and the teaching of writing typically will not loom large in their answers. A love of literature is the more likely response, a love encouraged by the emphasis on reading and the broad range of literature courses typically offered by English departments. Often the only writing courses they encounter in college are focused on development of their own writing skills; rarely is explicit attention paid to the pedagogy of writing. The fact that our undergraduate students hover mid-way between the high school students they were and the teachers-in-training they will become only adds to the dilemma. Every year as I teach our senior seminar in writing pedagogy, I have sought ways to foster their ability to be reflective practitioners even though they have yet to encounter first-hand the classroom dilemmas of teaching writing. In doing so, I have come to rethink this dilemma, leading me to the conclusion that this in-between position might in fact be the ideal one from which to develop the reflective "habits of mind" that they will carry with them into their practicum experience and beyond.

In recent decades, a surge of research in teacher education and development has emphasized anew the need for teachers to see themselves not as consumers, but as producers of pedagogic knowledge, and for them to take an active role in the evaluation of their own learning (Lytle and Cochran-Smith 84). Teachers' voices, insights and knowledge base have been rendered invisible,

many argue, and must be incorporated not only into research studies but also into professional development efforts and school reform initiatives (Zeichner). Not surprisingly, the majority of this research has focused on practicing teachers or pre-service teachers, individuals who are actively engaged in the day-to-day problem posing–and solving–of the classroom. Many of these studies have documented the difficulties inherent in this focus on reflection: resistance to the process itself, perhaps due to a lack of experience with such reflective practices, or an inability to move beyond the most obvious issues of classroom control and management (Good; Bain et al., "Using Journal Writing"; Spalding and Wilson; Bates et al.). Moreover, research shows that levels of analysis tend to vary widely, with many student teachers having trouble achieving more sophisticated and critical levels of reflection.

The seminar I teach–geared not to practicing or even pre-service teachers but to undergraduates–is part of a state-approved preparation program for English majors who will enter teacher credentialing programs upon graduation. My students are a mixture of traditional and returning college students; what they share is their lack of classroom experience. Typically, they ground their discussions in their own recalled high school experience, their experience as a writer in college, and some occasional tutoring jobs. During our first class meeting, I ask them what it means to them to be a *writing teacher*. "Learning how to correct papers . . . helping students fix their writing . . . [and] teaching students to write essays" figure predominantly in their vision of themselves as future teachers. Such comments are undoubtedly testament to the power of the "apprenticeship of observation" (Grossman 250), forged through years of being students, which helps create the already well-established beliefs about education and classroom practices they bring to the seminar.

Classroom observations are a necessary element of such a course and indeed are mandated by the state; students are asked to find a secondary level classroom in which they can observe 18-20 hours over the course of the semester and, if appropriate, help out

in limited ways (e.g., one-on-one conferencing, small group work, or paper responses). The primary requirement is that they find a classroom in which teachers focus some portion of instructional time on the teaching of writing.[1] While a potentially mundane component of the course, this requirement has nonetheless emerged as a particularly rich and intriguing window into the developing "habits of mind" of undergraduate students as well as a fruitful vantage point from which to challenge the "apprenticeship of observation" that has shaped their thoughts.

Since students arrange their own observation sites, the settings are as varied as their experiences. Some come back to class enthused and inspired, sharing ideas and insights with the group. Nadia, for example, observed a class in which students "wrote a test" for each other on sentence structure, and reported her amazement at the discussion that ensued. The students, she said, were "so wrapped up in the power of writing a test" that they failed to recognize the teaching and learning they were experiencing. Other students return to our class discussions discouraged and troubled by discrepancies between the principles elaborated in seminar and the events observed at their sites. The lack of curricular relevance or low levels of student engagement with assignments are common themes. After observing a lesson on topic sentences, Amy reported to the class: "I don't think they learned anything . . . [they saw it as] just another academic hoop." Commenting on a seemingly endless unit on *Of Mice and Men,* she noted humorously: "I'm an English major who cares very much about being a 'good student,' but quite honestly, by now I would be out of my mind!" Finding a thoughtful way for my students to process these disparate experiences has become one of my ongoing preoccupations in teaching the course.

As a tool for exploring these observations, students keep reflective journals, a critical component of the process. Reflective practice, of course, derives from a long tradition dating back to Dewey, who asserted that "reflective habits of mind must be taught" (9). Dewey stressed the importance of open-mindedness, a willingness to sustain a "state of doubt" which then pushes us to

further inquiry. This stance ultimately gives individuals more control of their experience, he argued, and greater opportunity to grow. A reflective observer, thus, is one who moves beyond first impressions and intuitive responses, one who weighs conflicting claims without resorting to conventional wisdom or unwarranted explanations, one who can move through the initial discomfort of uncertainty to a level of comfort with complexity and ambiguity. The dilemma of transforming these reflective journals into "a tool for learning rather than a simple record of events" (Bain, "Developing Reflection" 171) can be problematic with undergraduates, who have little experience and are positioned as "outsiders" in the classrooms they observe. Because they have little or no control over the classroom experience, it becomes crucial that they analyze their own construction of knowledge through reflective journals. Yet even understanding these constraints, over the course of several semesters I nonetheless found myself increasingly troubled by the unreflective nature of many entries, as evidenced in this typical response to a classroom incident. Elaine wrote:

> *The next class the students will be going over the papers in small groups. Apparently this teacher thinks that this works even though the class moaned when they heard they had to read their papers to their peers. I always wondered why students have this anxiety. This seems to work for this teacher and I'm sure that it helps the writers to improve their papers.*

As was true of many such entries, Elaine identifies an intriguing issue (anxiety and resistance to peer response groups) yet fails to follow up on her own musings. Instead of exploring the possible sources of the students' resistance, she glosses over the contradiction between the teacher's belief in the strategy and the students' apparent anxiety. In the absence of any evidence, she conforms to the authoritative view and dismisses her own question, reverting to the facile conclusion, "I'm sure that it works."

In another journal, Mia offered some thoughts on the difficulties of teaching the essay format:

I think that trying to teach students how to organize essays . . . overwhelms high school writing teachers. Once a student adapts to the structure, everyone is happy. And that's great. But students who go on to higher education must realize that their writing skills must undergo major changes . . . . Of course, this should not be expected in regular high school English classes [with] all different levels. Students who are truly motivated to succeed in college will seek out resources [they need].

As I read entries such as this one, which reflect not only Mia's implicit acceptance of low expectations for "regular" students but also her view that success is reserved for those who demonstrate individual effort and initiative, I was filled with a sense of urgency, knowing that these are "habits of mind" that will be carried into her own classroom if she is not pushed to reflect on them more critically. For this to happen, a deeper level of reflection in their journals seemed essential.

Analysis as a Teaching Tool

Feeling the need to both encourage and document students' growth as reflective observers, I chose to take a more active approach by not only analyzing my students' reflective journals over the course of a semester and looking for evidence of such development, but also engaging my students in the same analysis. Using sample logs from previous semesters, I introduced and exemplified a typology for examining levels of reflection adapted from Valli ("Reflective Teacher Education") in which levels of reflection are identified as technical, deliberative, personal and critical.[2]

Technical reflection focuses on applications of techniques in the classroom with an eye toward problem-solving and action-oriented solutions. It was by far the most common genre of reflection (representing over half of entries initially), as is typical

of student journals of this type (Valli, "Listening" 75). Here Jessica reflects on the purpose and effectiveness of a writing "scaffold" she observed in action:

The students were given a worksheet style questions that asked leading questions [about their papers] and asked them to expand on observations. I have no way of knowing if the students were aware of the structure implied in the questionnaire . . . . Is there a benefit to using this "structure/strategy" if it is not pointed out to the students? Will they make the connection between the form of the questionnaire and the structure of the essay?

In another typical example, Clara focuses on how a teacher successfully engages her class:

Ms. Moore is very creative in her writing assignments, such as these [an outdoor free-write activity]. Most importantly she explains them with enthusiasm and makes her students feel as though they are extremely privileged to get to participate in such a unique and fun assignment. Which, of course, is the whole idea. As we discussed in class, you've got to "sell it."

Deliberative reflection, in contrast, opens up the writer's thinking to a broader range of concerns, as she looks to weigh and compare complex claims and viewpoints. I hoped that students reflecting in this mode would be willing to entertain Dewey's "state of doubt" as they considered the pros and cons of the practices they were observing, moving beyond quick and easy judgments of "I really liked this activity" or "I wouldn't ever do this in a classroom." I also stressed the importance of linking our class discussion and reading in thoughtful ways to observations they made in the classroom setting. In this example of a deliberative reflection, Nick, referring to an article on self-correction as teaching strategy (McBride), weighs the difficulties of encouraging student accountability in the face of their potential lack of motivation or self-discipline. He writes:

One of the hardest challenges the teachers face in the classroom [is] getting students to care as much as teachers do. I try to imagine myself and how I might respond to such a task [self-correction of errors]. From the perspective of a teenager I can see two problems. First, I might choose goals that I know are manageable, hence not challenging myself to become a better writer, but polishing skills I already have a grasp on. Second, I might see this assignment as another b.s. project and write whatever I think the teacher might want to hear from me . . . . I think these perspectives are not far off from how many students perceive their education. I think they enjoy freedom and personal choice but many lack the self-discipline that actually makes learning possible.

In this entry, Nick first uses his reading to ground his thinking; he goes on to weigh the competing perspectives (the teacher's concern with student accountability and ownership of text versus the students' potential lack of self-discipline), considering both the role of the concerned teacher and the more nonchalant teen seeking to avoid a challenge (or perhaps simply to please the teacher). Through his awareness of the tensions highlighted by this strategy, Nick exemplifies the ability to weigh competing claims and stances. As such, he moved significantly beyond a simple technical commentary on the activity.

Personal reflection, the third category, is one in which students seek to make individual connections to their experience. In this mode, students typically examine their developing relationship with the teacher and students in the classroom. While some researchers have found this to be the predominant mode in which student teachers respond in reflective journals (Spalding and Wilson), this was not the case for my students, a fact I attribute to their position as observers rather than student teachers. Since personal reflections require adopting a teacher's stance and considering relationships to students, it is difficult for them to do so given their peripheral status in the classroom. If they did adopt this mode, they tended to reflect more from the vantage point of student than that of teacher-to-be. Nonetheless, this type of

response was occasionally used to "try on" a teacher's voice, as Corinne did in this entry:

The concept that most of her students read at a level far below the norm really shocked me. As a future teacher, one of my main goals is to prepare my students for college. But I wonder, if they start high school that far behind, how can they possibly be ready? I don't want to be pessimistic but can someone really advance that much in that short amount of time? So how do I do it? I know I'll have to start slow . . .

Here Corinne clearly adopts a teacher's voice, speaking in the first person and the present tense as she notes that her goal "is to prepare my students," asking "How do I do it?" and then counseling herself to "start slow." What's missing, of course, is a level of critical reflection; she is not questioning the norms that might establish a student as "remedial," nor is she questioning whether a "slowed down" curriculum is the best response to struggling writers and readers.

Another student, Margaret, blending both personal and deliberative styles, wrote the following entry:

The students wrote stories, which, as in our class discussion, showed an absence of conflict or resolution. The type of story [in which students were asked to create a character that reflected themselves] was clearly expressionist in nature. As for my criticism of [my tutee's] story, I continued this expressionist approach. I told her what I liked . . . asked some questions about the story that had confused me. I found myself questioning my own creative writing process as I tried to offer guidance . . .

Margaret links her observations to the discussions we had in class about genres and paradigms of writing instruction (deliberative), but also finds herself responding as a fellow writer (personal), reflecting on her own practices as a writer.

In Valli's typology, critical reflection (in which the writer considers the social and political implications of schooling and pedagogical practices) represents the most complex level of reflection, often addressing issues of social justice and equity. While initially the least evident in their journals, some students nevertheless moved into this realm on their own initiative, thus providing excellent models for their peers. Sandra, for example, considers a particularly disruptive student and his impact on the classroom. She does so not from the perspective of "What would I do with a kid like that?" but instead makes cogent links between the uses of classroom writing, the marginalization of students through administrative procedures, and the teacher's difficult task of finding an effective response within these parameters:

> *I have discovered just how counter-productive one student can be to the greater learning community. According to Mrs. P, this student is 'begging for expulsion." . . . I understand that my discipline is "writing and not counseling" [citing Valentino, 276], yet these two domains must work together to effectively serve marginalized students . . . . Although I understand the necessity of protocol, the administration's approach makes it incredibly challenging for the teacher.*

Sandra broadens her view to consider the institutional context, and she is able to see that the practices she was observing were embedded in a complex web of factors that weren't readily disentangled. Exploring the tension between her empathy for a troubled yet disruptive student, the teacher's need to maintain a productive learning environment and the lack of institutional resources to address either of these factors took Sandra far beyond the level of her initial discomfort and dismay.

A Guided Reflection Process

Once the typology had been introduced to the class, I asked students in their weekly entries to highlight and identify the type of reflection they were pursuing in a particular entry or section

(see Spalding and Wilson). Logs were shared with partners, who did the same analysis; often it was easier for a partner to spot certain types of reflection than the author him/herself. Not trusting that this was sufficient, I supplemented this simple awareness-raising activity with a number of well-known practices, among them modeling, peer response and scaffolding. Journal entries that delved into some intriguing issue were shared as models for discussion. A guided discussion protocol for questioning provided the following key questions: What issue is raised here? What aspects are you unsure of? What have you seen at other sites that is relevant? Then, in keeping with Dewey's principle of an open mind and a willingness to entertain possibilities, we would consider the following: What else can we ask about this situation (or activity, or piece of writing)? What else would you like to know? What might it mean? (Hole and McEntee 35).

At times we would pursue these as a class. On other occasions, these questions were used to guide peer response to journal entries; students would begin the class with a reflective entry, which would be given to a classmate for written response. The questions and comments posed by the classmate would then serve as a springboard to further writing and reflection. This type of peer questioning led Ariel, for example, to elaborate on the physical setting of her site (an alternative school for "at-risk" students) and note that

> *by having the school next to the [animal] pound, society is telling these students that no one wants them. . . . The outside of the portable is a chain-link fence, almost set up as a jail. By not giving them a positive building, how can they be proud to go there?*

In this manner, we continued to write and share observations over the course of the semester, with reflective logs forming the heart of our classroom meetings.

Writing in reflective journals alone was not sufficient to resolve all of the contradictions and tensions my students

encountered at their sites; they often needed help in negotiating between classroom reading and their observations. Classroom discussions were essential in pushing students to explore the reasons behind particular practices and to consider alternatives without falling into judgmental stances, easily taken by student observers who have never encountered the multiple demands that teachers juggle on a daily basis. One recurring issue throughout the semester was the use of scripted writing curricula, such as the Jane Schaffer method (1995), an approach increasingly being mandated in high school English classrooms. My students' varied responses offered rich material for discussion. Adriane was the most profoundly disturbed by her observations of this method in action. She wrote:

> *Today Mrs. P [the classroom teacher] introduced the Schaffer method, in which she described the Parts of the Essay. One of Mrs. P's goals was to create a common vocabulary; another one, of course, was to get students familiar with the components of an "acceptable" essay. I was a little offset by the fact that she presented the Schaffer Method as if it were the only approach to writing. The English Department [at this school] has adopted a loose interpretation of Schaffer's approach; there is no word count, nor line count, yet there are still restrictions: two lines of Commentary required for each Concrete Detail. Students are being treated as if they do not have the capacity to make determinations for themselves. The instruction they are receiving tells them that there is only one correct way to produce an acceptable essay. They have no freedom to "grope" through another process.*

In another instance, Mrs. P. provided students with a sentence handout offering sentence openers. Adriane observed that

> *the sentence openings (e.g., "for example," "this proves that," "in addition") actually seemed to frustrate the students, rather than help them. The construction of a paragraph felt much more like a*

mathematical equation than an internally generated process. Students struggle to comply with these prompts.

In our class discussion, another student noted that "the comments I've heard while circulating around the room indicate that many of the students see the Schaffer Method as busy work." Kimberly, on the other hand, had a more optimistic perspective on the method:

Nothing surprising or revolutionary was to be found in the [essay] layout. Despite this, from what I've observed of these kids so far, such a plan was necessary for them. Ms. Moore told me that most of them read at the 4th grade level, suggesting that their writing could be expected to be sub par as well. Even though Wiley's article (see Wiley 2000) described many convincing reasons why formulaic writing should be discouraged, it is necessary for this class.

Yet another student, Brian, felt that structured methods such as the Shaffer Method had much to offer to the classes he observed, who were "performing lower than expected." He wrote:

Both classes worked on similar pre-writing activities today. This was designed to help them write an essay tests . . . [This activity] was presented as part of the Jane Schaffer Method of writing an essay. Instead of spending [time] freaking out about what they had to write they could at least have something on paper, which I thought was a useful strategy. I liked how Ms. D reminded the class that the pre-writing activity wasn't something they had to do like a formula, but that it would help, much like a strategy.

His experience, in contrast to Adriane's, was that the classes he observed responded very well to Shaffer's pre-writing activities, as these groups were, in his words, very "task-oriented." Contradicting his expectations, he found that "these students are very verbal about their writing and enjoy talking about their writing to each other and to Ms. Daniels." He went on to quote Wiley in support of his conclusions: "We writing teachers must

recognize that writing contexts vary, and our students, in order to grow and succeed as writers, must gradually develop a repertoire of strategies for identifying and then handling the differences each situation presents" (66).

By contrasting these journal entries and sharing observations in class, we were able to tease out some of the key issues and speculate as to why such methods and curricula seemed to work in some instances and not in others. We discussed the need to find a balance between supporting weaker writers while affording them a sense of authorship and creativity. We considered the issue of low expectations and remedial "recipes." We tried to define the difference between a writing strategy, a crutch and a straitjacket. While the Wiley piece that Brian cited offers an excellent overview of many of these issues, this kind of deliberative reflection does not come from reading alone. My students came to understand the wide range of implementation that the "same" method can have, and more than any single article could, the students' own reflections allowed them to recreate and struggle with the same questions being asked in professional journals and discussions.

The Ongoing Conversation

In teacher education, our primary focus is typically the new teacher in the classroom, and rightly so. Student teaching represents the period during which first attempts at teaching are nurtured and shaped. Nonetheless, the unique nature of the undergraduate experience needs to be recognized and fostered as well. In reality, what first appeared as disadvantages (i.e., the students' lack of experience, their distance from actual teaching, their marginal position as observers) can be exploited to our advantage. Student teachers are often too overwhelmed with planning, grading and classroom management issues to allow themselves to be deeply reflective. Credential programs must juggle an immediate need for teaching skills with a focus on reflective practice. An undergraduate seminar offers a valuable period in which to reflect without the demands of day-to-day

teaching, a "protected space" within which to weigh and ponder the possibilities of writing pedagogy. Furthermore, reflective habits of mind, once established, may be more easily enacted when the demands of teaching become more pressing.

My seminar experience has also shown me that these reflective practitioners we hope to create must be carefully nurtured along the way. A simple "reflective journal," while a useful tool, cannot in and of itself produce deep reflection, just as hours of unfocused free writing, with little guidance or structure, are unlikely to produce growth in student writers (Bates, Ramirez and Drib 90). This confirms the conclusion of Bain, et al. who note that "feedback focusing on the reflective writing processes . . . and [giving] a suggested framework for moving into higher levels of cognitive activity is both more effective and more generalized than feedback focusing on teaching issues raised by the students" ("Developing Reflection" 193). Furthermore, the quality of the classroom experience in terms of writing pedagogy, while certainly not insignificant, was not the essential component it might seem. The students' growth in understanding of writing pedagogy, with its multiple variables and complex decisions, emerged from the wide variety of experiences represented in the class, ranging from the traditional essay-focused AP literature classroom, to the unstructured and individualistic creative writing class, to the "remedial" classroom using packaged curriculum materials.

In retrospect, and looking forward, I see a number of ways in which this guided reflective process can be improved. In addition to asking students to respond in breadth (across many weeks, trying on different modes of response), I will also ask them to respond in depth, focusing on one critical incident and moving through each level of response. Until now, I have asked my students to reflect only their classroom experiences; however, there is much to be gained by reflecting on the process itself and discussing the limits of each type of reflection. One such critique of the reflective hierarchy already evident is the lack of attention to emotion and its role in the developmental process of a

prospective teacher. One student, Katie, wrote poignantly of a moment at which an angry and difficult student (in a "community school" for troubled students) finally let down his guard and opened up to her about the assigned book. She wrote: "I was able to give an ear, a little support and nudge him when he got stuck (. . .) throughout our short session, I saw a remarkable change happen for both of us," a change which she identified as a fledgling moment of trust. It was obviously a significant moment for her, and the emotions it evoked will undoubtedly shape her as a teacher. Other students spoke of moments of embarrassment, of fear, and of the difficulties of processing volatile emotions in a classroom. None of these entries found an easy "category" in the types of reflection posed by Valli.

An observant reader will, at this point, recognize that a key element is missing from this pedagogical equation: the classroom teacher. Indeed, one critique made of Dewey's work on the development of reflective practitioners is of its individualistic nature, and its "general omission of any acknowledgement of the interactive nature of the reflective process" (Cinnamond and Zimpher 58). Valli's typology is firmly cognitive in nature as well. The growth in reflective thought it posits can seem highly individualistic and disconnected from the ways in which knowledge is socially constructed in any given context. The construction of pedagogic knowledge is not as linear as Valli's typology might suggest, but a more complex and socially embedded process.

In my case, the omission of teacher perspectives and a broader dialogue was not an oversight, but instead reflected a real reluctance on my part, albeit one which now seems misguided. Well aware of the demands placed upon secondary English teachers, I was loath to have my students' presence be seen as yet another burden on those teachers generous enough to open their classrooms to us. My students, for their part, felt a similar reluctance to engage teachers with their many questions, for fear of appearing either critical or ignorant. In retrospect, it is clear that fostering of reflection cannot be simply a dialogue, however

fruitful, between the students and the professor. All three perspectives must be present and engaged. In fact, some of the more successful sites demonstrated this fact. As Carla wrote,

At first I thought that asking Anne [the classroom teacher] questions would be an imposition, but she has shown a willingness to explain her teaching philosophy. Hearing Anne's thoughts behind her curriculum choices helps me to have a deeper understanding of what I observe and it makes the observation time more interesting. The next time I observe in a classroom, I will more readily and confidently ask questions that come to my mind.

Which brings me to a question posed by Katie, one of the most enthusiastic and thoughtful students in this particular seminar. Katie was delighted to find herself in the classroom of an excellent, experienced teacher who had carefully crafted a semester-long unit centered on the question, "Why does society turn on its own?" Mrs. Rosemond, Katie wrote, was "attempting to encourage her students to think about more than their immediate issues so that that they can engage critically with society at large." Yet Katie was puzzled by the students' apparent resistance and the superficial responses they offered to Mrs. Rosamond's provocative questions. She wrote in her journal: "How do you get students to think critically about issues when they have such limited life experiences?"

As I continue to teach this seminar, I find myself asking a very similar question to Katie's. How can I help students pursue deeper levels of reflection and process effectively the many permutations of "composition pedagogy" they see in real classrooms? As in Katie's high school classroom, we too address "society at large" through the lens of the classroom, as well as the broader issues of equity and academic access which are embedded in our teaching of academic genres and the development of writing proficiency. I am far from reaching a definitive answer to my question. Observation and participation in classrooms are essential, and research certainly indicates that keeping a journal during service-learning

experiences or student teaching is a significant positive predictor of a change in views of teaching and students (Root, Callahan and Scpanski; Bain et al, "Using Journal Writing"; Nagle). Nonetheless, the purposes, venues and functions of these reflective practices can vary. As noted in the service-learning literature,

> Only at the highest stages of reflective judgment can individuals identify the ill-structured nature of social problems, frame them, resolve them and understand the need to continually readdress the issue as conditions change and new information is developed. Since few college students in traditional programs function beyond . . . mid-levels of analysis, it is vital that instructors provide structured reflection to encourage this growth. (Eyler 522)

My experience has confirmed that guidance into more complex levels of reflection must be thoughtfully scaffolded, particularly in the case of undergraduate students who are not yet "reflective practitioners" in the Deweyan sense of one who, in an action setting, can experiment and then reflect upon actions and their consequences. Ultimately, it was not one individual activity, but a sort of reflective synergy which was created through multiple facets of the course: the classroom observations, open-ended discussions, guided reflective journals, and participation as active writers. All of these can lay the groundwork for future teachers who will be poised to look critically at their own teaching of writing, and, equally important, use writing as the means by which they can do so.

Notes

[1]High school classrooms which fit these criteria have been surprisingly difficult to find. Even teachers who initially reported that they focus on writing often devoted the lion's share of classroom time to the reading and discussion of literature, with writing employed primarily as an assessment measure at the end of a unit or grading period.

²In my adaptation, I omitted the level defined as "reflection in/reflection on" as it is aimed at reflecting upon actual moments of classroom instruction and thus not relevant to my students.

Works Cited

Bain, John D., Colleen Mills, Roy Ballantyne, and Jan Packer. "Using Journal Writing to Enhance Student Teachers' Reflectivity During Field Experience Placements." *Teachers and Teaching: Theory & Practice* 5.1 (1999): 51-73. Print.

Bain, John D., Colleen Mills, Roy Ballantyne, and Jan Packer. "Developing Reflection on Practice Through Journal Writing: Impacts of Variation in the Focus and Level of Feedback." *Teachers and Teaching: Theory & Practice* 8.2 (2002): 171-196. Print

Bates, Alisa, Laurie Ramirez, and Dina Drits. "Connecting University Supervision and Critical Reflection: Mentoring and Modeling." *Teacher Educator* 44.2 (2009): 90-112. Print.

Cinnamond, Jeffrey, and Nancy L. Zimpher. "Reflectivity as a Function of Community." *Encouraging Reflective Practice in Education: An Analysis of Issues and Programs.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1990. 57-72. Print.

Dewey, John. *How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process.* New York: D.C. Heath & Company, 1933. Print.

Eyler, Janet. "Reflection: Linking Service and Learning - Linking Students and Communities." *Journal of Social Issues* 58.3 (2002): 517-534. Print.

Good, J., and P. Whang. "Encouraging Reflection in Pre-service Teachers Through Response Journals." *The Teacher Educator* 3.4 (2002): 254-267. Print.

Grossman, Pamela L. "What Are We Talking about Anyhow? Subject Matter Knowledge of Secondary English Teachers." *Advances in Research on Teaching (Vol.2: Subject Matter Knowledge).* Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1991. 245-264. Print.

McEntee, Grace H., and Simon Hole. "Reflection Is at the Heart of Practice." *Educational Leadership* (1999): 34-37. Print.

Lytle, Susan L., and Marilyn Cochran-Smith. "Learning from Teacher Research: a Working Typology." *Teachers College Record* 92.1 (1990): 83-103. Print.

McBride, Shawni. "Why Are You So Worried about It? Struggles and Solutions Toward Helping Students Improve as Writers." *English Journal* 89.6 (2000): 45-52. Print

Nagle, James F. "Becoming a Reflective Practitioner in the Age of Accountability." *The Educational Forum* 73(2009): 76-86. Print.

Root, Susan, Jane Callahan, and Jungsywan Scpanski. "Service-Learning in Teacher Education: A Consideration of Qualitative and Quantitative Outcomes." *Service Learning: The Essence of the Pedagogy.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, 2002. Print.

Schaffer, Jane. *Teaching the Multi-Paragraph Essay: A Sequential Nine-Week Unit.* San Diego, CA: Jane Schaffer Publications, 1995. Print.

Spalding, Elizabeth, and Angene Wilson. "Demystifying Reflection: a Study of Pedagogical Strategies That Encourage Reflective Journal Writing." *Teachers College Record* 104.7 (2002): 1393-1421. Web. 07 Dec. 2008. <http://www.tcrecord.org>.

Valentino, Marilyn J. "Responding When a Life Depends on It: What to Write in the Margins When Students Self-disclose." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* 23.4 (1996): 274-283. Print.

Valli, Linda. *Reflective Teacher Education: Cases and Critique.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1992. Print.

Valli, Linda. "Listening to Other Voices: A Description of Teacher Reflection in the United States." *Peabody Journal of Education* 72.1 (1997): 67-88. Print.

Wiley, Mark. "The Popularity of Formulaic Writing (And Why We Need to Resist)." *English Journal* 90.1 (2000): 61-67. Print.

Zeichner, Kenneth L. *Reflective Teaching: An Introduction.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1996. Print.