

Pedagogical Negotiations and Authentic Intellectual Work: A Phenomenological Examination of High School Teachers' Experiences

**Christopher Andrew Brkich
Elizabeth Yeager Washington
*University of Florida, Gainesville***

This article focuses on the following questions: 1) How do secondary social studies teachers working in schools of color experience pedagogical negotiations when trying to teach students thoughtful, critically informed citizenship and government and school accountability mandates? and 2) How does teaching with lessons grounded in the principles of authentic intellectual work (AIW) affect this negotiation experience? We employed a phenomenological framework as the methodological basis for eliciting two classroom teachers' experiences, both of whom have advanced degrees in social studies education and several years of teaching experience in schools of color and of poverty. The findings show that prior to the incorporation of lessons based on the principles of authentic intellectual work, these teachers' negotiation experiences had strong negatively affective dimensions based on a zero-sum pedagogical conceptualization of curriculum. Following the introduction of lessons based on AIW, these negatively affective dimensions began to recede from their experiences and were replaced by more positive ones. Given that classroom teachers are the ultimate arbiters of curriculum in their classrooms, this research has implications for improving the experiences of secondary social studies teachers working in schools of color.

Key Words: Accountability, Civic education, Pedagogical negotiations, Phenomenology, Students of color, Teacher experiences

Introduction

When we reflect on our fondest classroom memories and on our favorite teachers, the majority of us probably conjure images atypical of our schooling experience. We recall these lessons and the teachers who taught them, because they were exciting, engaging, and relevant both to our experiences and to our interests. In the current era of increased educational accountability and educational conservatism, social studies teachers and teacher educators like ourselves are mired in a conundrum of contradictions.

On the one hand, the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) (1994) charges its members "to help young people develop the ability to make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world" (p. vii). Included in this charge are the promotion of critical thought and preparing schoolchildren to "demonstrate an understanding that different people may describe the same event or situation in diverse ways, citing reasons for the differences in view" (1994, p. 34). Likewise, the recently published principles of good education with

regards to diversity state, “the curriculum should help students understand that knowledge is socially constructed and reflects researchers’ personal experiences as well as the social, political, and economic contexts in which they live and work” (Banks, Cookson, Gay, Hawley, Irvine, Nieto, et al., 2010, p. 70). On the other hand, recent federal and state government legislation (NCLB, 2001; HB 7087E3, 2006) has created conditions demanding students’ performance be measured by standardized tests. This legislation has favored curricular narrowing and the promotion of a singular knowable, teachable, and testable body of social studies knowledge. As such, there exists a conundrum in which teachers are forced to negotiate between their mission of preparing schoolchildren for thoughtful civic engagement and for meeting accountability targets (Grant & Salinas, 2008).

In spite of the seemingly dichotomous nature of this problem, these two demands placed on classroom teachers need not be mutually exclusive. Fred Newmann’s, Bruce King’s, and Dana Carmichael’s (2007) framework for authentic intellectual work (AIW) raises the potential of satisfying the NCSS’ (1994) stated mission, all while meeting government accountability mandates. Having an understanding of how teachers experience teaching within this framework is essential. Without the teachers’ perspective, the AIW framework stands merely as educational theory advanced by academics and fails to account for the realities of the social studies classroom.

In this paper, we provide such an exploration. First, we survey the literature on the history and effects of accountability, the varied purposes of social studies education, and the theory of authentic intellectual work. Following this, we analyze the experiences of two secondary social studies teachers who taught using AIW in schools of color. Finally, we conclude with a discussion of the implications of our research for both secondary social studies teaching and teacher education.

Review of the Literature History of Accountability in Education

The use of standardized testing for the purposes of educational accountability is not new. In his hallmark analysis of the growth of urban schooling, David Tyack (1974) points to businessmen-cum-school board members’ concerns for efficiency in the schooling process. These men charged classroom teachers were responsible for the large number of students retained from one year to the next. Calling them repeaters and laggards (e.g., Ayres, 1913), these administrative progressives (Tyack, 1974) used the newly adapted Army Alpha and Army Beta Intelligence Quotient (IQ) tests to channel students purposively into differentiated educational tracks. This tracking was justified partly on the grounds that it would benefit students by training them for their likely future occupations. Their major justification was that it would reduce the number of laggards and save the expenditures associated thereto (Callahan, 1962; Fass, 1980).

More recently, educational accountability has shown the connections between business concerns with students’ academic success. Regarding the Minimum Competency Testing movement of the 1970s, Daniel Resnick (1980) draws connections between educational testing and shifting conceptions of accountability. Instead of measuring academic success by calculating schools’ laggard ratios, administrators began to measure student success through widespread standardized testing. As funding came increasingly from federal sources, the public demanded proof that its tax dollars were being well-spent. The public blamed teachers for the 1970s decline in real wages, and demanded they be held accountable for their students’ performance as measured by standardized tests (Gallagher, 1979; Linn, 1978).

In the early 1980s, with the election of Ronald Reagan to the presidency, the schools were targeted anew. In 1981, Reagan estab-

lished the National Commission on Excellence in Education to investigate the reasons for a perceived decline in both educational standards and America's international standing. Two years later, on behalf of the Commission, David Gardner published *A Nation at Risk* (1983), representing a scathing indictment of both public schools and teachers. In the document, he demanded increased educational standards and testing as the means by which to measure students' attainment. Almost 20 years later, President George W. Bush proposed the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2001). The President charged that schools had failed to close the achievement gaps between white students and students of color, between students of means and students of poverty, and between speakers of English and speakers of languages other than English. According to proponents, testing alone could measure students' progress objectively and determine whether these gaps were closing. If schools were failing to close these gaps, they would be subject to sanctions (Peterson & West, 2003).

... there exists a conundrum in which teachers are forced to negotiate between their mission of preparing schoolchildren for thoughtful civic engagement and for meeting accountability targets.

Accountability's Deleterious Effects

Though some of the more recent efforts at increasing school-level accountability have had admirable roots, the reliance on standardized measures of achievement to hold schools and teachers accountable for their students' performance has had a number of strongly negative effects on historically underperforming populations. Scholars have argued at length on the inherently inequitable nature of standardized tests, as they tend to be normed on middle-class European Protestant values. Georgia Garcia and P. David Pearson (1994) note that this norming process "leans toward the mainstream culture" (p. 343). Those students, therefore, who fall outside the majority population --- e.g., students of color, students of poverty, speakers of languages other than English, and non-Christians --- tend to perform worse on these tests simply because of the tests' inherent norming biases (Gipps, 1999). A number of field studies buttress this argument (Myers, Kim, & Mandala, 2004; Warren & Jenkins, 2005; Willingham, Pollack, & Lewis, 2002). White students have enjoyed a persistent advantage over their African American and Latino/a American peers in the years 2007-2009 on accountability tests (Florida Department of Education, 2009). As such, one needs to recognize the social injustices associated with accountability testing.

Critics further charge that the focus on accountability testing has resulted in an unduly narrowed curriculum aimed strictly on lower-order skills and test-taking abilities, rather than on the skills necessary for success in life. Linda Darling-Hammond (2000) notes that students of color, and of poverty, are more likely to receive instruction focused solely on passing multiple-choice tests and on "tasks that are profoundly disconnected from the skills they need to learn" (p. 277). John Warren and Krista Jenkins (2005) demonstrate that students who have historically underperformed on standardized tests see their education narrowed

to the point by which considerable portions of the school year are devoted strictly to test preparation, as teachers choose to forsake powerful teaching in favor of ensuring higher pass rates. In an era of increased educational accountability, educational stakeholders are more likely to adopt practices intended to maximize student pass rates, rather than those intended to maximize socially useful learning (Black, 2000; Hamilton, 2003). Though a number of studies have been written regarding the teaching of powerful social studies content in spite of state-mandated measures of achievement (e.g., Gradwell, 2006; Grant, 2010; van Hover, 2006), teachers in schools of color face intense pressure to ensure students' successes on these measures. This pressure invariably results in an instructional climate that contributes to the fragmented student minds resulting from discordant lower-order thinking (Newmann, 1965; Segall, 2003, 2006).

The Purpose of Social Studies Education

Since the early 20th century, educators have recognized the purpose of schooling is to prepare students for civic life, both presently and in the future (Dewey, 1915, 1916). Preparation for citizenship, however, can take on a variety of meanings. Joel Westheimer's and Joseph Kahne's (2004) three models of citizenship --- the personally responsible citizen, the participatory citizen, and the justice-oriented citizen --- are sources of curricular contention. While all would probably agree that social studies teachers need to prepare students for good citizenship, people differ considerably on the issues of participation and justice. Conservative critics of the social studies and of the public schools at large have charged that education for social justice has resulted in the intellectual decline of the United States (e.g., Agresto, 1990; Bloom, 1988; Hirsch, 1987, 1996; Leming, Ellington, & Porter-Magee, 2003). Proponents of more liberal approaches

to education, however, hold that merely teaching students about their voting responsibilities leaves them ill-prepared for community life (Cherryholmes, 1996; Evans, 2004, 2010; Ross & Marker, 2005). As the NCSS (1994) values the promotion of diverse modes of thought on social issues and historical topics, all of which inform students' development as citizens, having an understanding of the values associated with the different approaches to citizenship is crucial.

Diana Hess' (e.g., 2002, 2008, 2009) substantive work on incorporating controversial public issues into the social studies classroom represents perhaps one of the most important aspects of education for informed citizenship. Some researchers have acknowledged the temptation to avoid incorporating controversial public issues into the social studies curriculum altogether for fear of being charged with politically indoctrinating students (Dahlgren, 2009; Dahlgren & Masyada, 2009; D. M. Kelly & Brandes, 2001; T. E. Kelly, 1986). Providing students with opportunities to examine, discuss, debate, and take action on issues such as abortion, fair trade, global warming, and stem cell research is essential in preparing them for civic life, both present and future. Providing students with additional opportunities to learn the skills necessary to evaluate sources of information relating to these controversial topics is of equal importance. The freedom to academically explore such controversial public issues in the classroom is an essential feature of the development of effective citizens (National Council for the Social Studies [NCSS], 2001, 2007).

Authentic Intellectual Work

Authentic intellectual work (AIW) is the instructional theory which Fred Newmann and his associates have developed since the late 1980s (Archbald & Newmann, 1988; Newmann, 2000; Newmann, Bryk, & Nagoka, 2001; Newmann, Marks, & Gamoran, 1996;

Newmann & Wehlage, 1993; Scheurman & Newmann, 1998). It has culminated ultimately in a cohesive and coherent framework (King, Newmann, & Carmichael, 2009; Newmann, et al., 2007; Newmann, King, & Carmichael, 2009). In this framework, AIW consists of having students (1) construct new knowledge (2) through a process of disciplined inquiry (3) which demonstrates value beyond school.

Regarding the first criterion, construction of knowledge, Bruce King, Fred Newmann, and Dana Carmichael (2009) state that “to reach an adequate solution to new problems, the competent adult has to ‘construct’ knowledge because these problems cannot be solved by routine use of information or skills previously learned” (p. 44). Furthermore, “successful construction of knowledge is best learned through a variety of experiences that call for this kind of cognitive work with important content, not by explicitly teaching discrete ‘thinking skills’ ” (p. 44). Thus, having students perform discrete and discontinuous exercises demanding lower-order thinking skills, strictly for the purpose of documenting students’ abilities with these skills, can hardly be characterized as constructing knowledge.

In an era of increased educational accountability, educational stakeholders are more likely to adopt practices intended to maximize student pass rates, rather than those intended to maximize socially useful learning.

On the second criterion, King, Newmann, and Carmichael (2009) note that the process of disciplined inquiry requires students to “(1) use a prior knowledge base, (2) strive for in-depth understanding rather than superficial awareness, and (3) develop and express their ideas and findings through elaborated communication” (p. 44). To investigate according to these principles, students need to acquire a base of facts and vocabularies, which will allow them to demonstrate relationships between key principles of their content area in well-supported fashion. They subsequently must divulge their findings in a sophisticated manner, be it through essay, debate, discussion, or other format.

With respect to the final criterion, value beyond school, King, Newmann, and Carmichael (2009) hold that “meaningful intellectual accomplishments have utilitarian, aesthetic, or personal value,” whereas typical school assignments, such as quizzes or tests “lack meaning or significance beyond the certification of success in school” (p. 45). Though teachers may work to center instruction around students’ interests as John Dewey (1897, 1906, 1915, 1938) recommended, unless the intellectual challenges they provide have meaning beyond certifying school competencies, one cannot characterize the teachers’ or students’ work as authentic.

Within the context of accountability, a number of field studies have shown promise regarding AIW’s potential as an instructional framework for increasing the quality of classroom teaching, student learning, and student performance on accountability measures. In the Center on Organizing and Restructuring Schools (CORS) Field Study (Newmann, et al, 1996), students in an urban environment who were exposed to instruction centered on the principles of authentic intellectual work outperformed their peers in traditional classrooms by an average of 30%. The findings of the Chicago Annenberg Field Study (Newmann, Lopez, & Bryk, 1998) supported these

results, showing a performance margin of 30-50%. While advocates of standardized accountability measures may argue these results are biased, as they are based on teachers' classroom assessments only, the findings of the Chicago Annenberg's Iowa Test of Basic Skills Gains Study (Newmann, et al, 2001) show that students' classroom gains translate to gains on standardized measures of achievement.

A common thread in these field studies is that when considering historically underperforming populations, students exposed to AIW highly rated instruction (Newmann, et al, 2009) perform better than the mean. Given their longstanding history of educational marginalization, the framework for authentic intellectual work raises the possibility of addressing concerns of efficiency, declining student performance, equity, and powerful and meaningful civic education.

Methods

Epistemological Framework

This study is grounded within a framework of subjective transcendentalism. Martin Heidegger (2008) writes "We are ourselves the entities to be analysed. The Being of any such entity is *in each case mine*" (p. 68, emphasis in original). As Daseiende --- Heidegger's term for those who are concerned of their possibilities of Being --- we cannot grammatically separate ourselves from that which we know. While we all experience the world differently, in a fashion which is uniquely ours, the worldhood-of-the-world is still extant. Though, in the remainder of the methods section, we will cite a number of phenomenologists, the manner of phenomenology with which we align in this study is Edmund Husserl's (1964, 1983), the methods of which are best explained by Clark Moustakas (1994). While we acknowledge phenomenology's appropriateness within an interpretivist framework, we elected

to maintain a transcendental lens, which has continued to enjoy popularity (Anthony, 2008; Kim, Anderson, Hall, & Willingham, in press; Lee & Koro-Ljungberg, 2007; McCarthy & Duke, 2007).

Study Co-researcher

When conducting a phenomenological research study, the primary researcher's personal experiences with the phenomenon under investigation typically serve as the major motivating factor in conducting the research. The aim is to gain a greater understanding of the textural and structural features of the phenomenon. Though the primary researcher's experiences with the phenomenon consist an important part of the data corpus (e.g., Estola & Elbaz-Luwisch, 2003), their data alone is insufficient to provide a full view of the phenomenon's horizons, textures, and structures. As Max van Manen (1990) says, "Why do we need to collect the data of other people's experiences? We gather other people's experiences because they allow us to become more experienced ourselves" (p. 62). The first author has experience teaching secondary social studies in schools of poverty and of color, in both the United States and Canada. His struggles to balance teaching his students for the purposes of government and school accountability mandates and of their roles as thoughtful, critically informed citizens, and his exposure to the AIW framework through practitioner-oriented literature, serve as the motivating factor in this research. We sought to expand our understanding of this negotiation experience by soliciting another secondary social studies teacher's story relating to this phenomenon.

Co-researcher selection. Consistent with our epistemological framework and our phenomenological approach, our co-researcher needed to be someone who had experienced this same phenomenon and was likewise "intensely interested in understanding its

nature and meanings” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 107). Though this serves as the sole necessary discriminating criterion when conducting phenomenological research, we employed several additional criteria in selecting our co-researcher. These discriminating criteria were:

- The co-researcher would be teaching full-time at a public school.
- The co-researcher would be teaching at the secondary level.
- The co-researcher would be teaching a social studies subject area.
- The co-researcher would be teaching at a school of color (herein defined as a school, the student population of which is more than 50% of color).
- The co-researcher would either have taught according to the principles of AIW (Newmann, et al., 2007) or do so during the course of the study.

Beyond these additional criteria, which we imposed on our study, all other consideration of co-researcher selection needed not be purposeful. Having an existing professional relationship with a co-researcher who met these discriminating criteria, whom we describe below, we judged ourselves on firm footing to proceed with our inquiry.

Given their longstanding history of educational marginalization, the framework for authentic intellectual work raises the possibility of addressing concerns of efficiency, declining student performance, equity, and powerful and meaningful civic education.

Co-researcher and site description. Our selected co-researcher, John Stall (a pseudonym), is a European American economics teacher at Thomas Jefferson High School (TJHS), also a pseudonym, a school of color in an urban city in the southeastern United States. John is classified by his state as a highly qualified teacher, having graduated with a Master’s Degree in Social Studies Education from the college of education at a Research One university. At the time we conducted this study, John was entering his sixth year of teaching at TJHS. During his ongoing tenure, John had taught a variety of American Government and Economics classes, at both the school’s major program and Advanced Placement levels. John was first introduced to the AIW framework during the pre-service phase of his teacher education. Characterizing this initial understanding as weak, he supplemented his understanding of the AIW framework through the independent reading of some of the salient practitioner-oriented publications on the framework (Newmann, 2000; Newmann & Wehlage, 1993; Scheurman & Newmann, 1998) at the beginning of the study.

Thomas Jefferson High School’s student population is 74% of color, with African American students making up the largest proportion of the school’s total student population (60%). A sizeable minority of TJHS’ student population (43%) is eligible for either free or reduced lunch. Finally, the school recently declined two full letter grades to a “D” in its annual ranking based on the state’s accountability scheme, with less than half of the school’s lowest quartile making improvements in reading. This contrasts TJHS starkly with the city’s predominantly European American (64%) high school in which the African American population is comparably small (20%), the percentage of students on free and reduced lunch is less than half that at TJHS (19%), and its annual ranking has been consistently either a “B” or an “A” over the past 10 years. John’s classes were representa-

tive of the school's demographics, with the majority of his students being African Americans. He reported that a substantial minority of his students, all high school seniors, had yet to pass the state's accountability measure for reading, administered in the 10th grade.

Data Collection

In order to maintain what Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Diane Yendol-Hoppey, Jason Jude Smith, and Sharon Hayes (2009) refer to as (e)pistemological awareness when researching within a phenomenological framework, researchers can collect only certain manners of data, those which speak to the co-researchers' experiences with the phenomenon under investigation. Characterized as a science of perception (Husserl, 1983, pp. 86-89; Merleau-Ponty, 1964), the data these researchers can collect must be restricted to those which communicate co-researchers' perceptions of their experiences. Martin Heidegger (2005) states that because "the speaking is one with the manner of perceiving... only on the basis of possible communication can one succeed at all to make a unitary fact of the matter accessible to several individuals in its unitary character" (p. 21). As such, only those data which have the characteristics of reflective discourse can be considered phenomenological (Heidegger, 2005, 2008).

Though some have interpreted rather widely what constitutes reflective discourse (see, for example, van Manen, 1990 on the uses of art and observation as discourse on lived experience), we hold that only the primary researchers' and co-researchers' words themselves, be they spoken or written, can constitute unfiltered reflective discourse. Were we to have observed John in his classroom, recorded our observations, and used these as a means to characterize his experiences, we would have demonstrated a lack of both (e)pistemological awareness (Koro-Ljungberg, et al, 2009) and epistemological consistency. These characteri-

zations would have been our words of how John experienced the phenomenon under investigation, rather than John's words themselves. We, therefore, restricted our data collection to the long interview, which Clark Moustakas (1994) notes is the most widely accepted form of phenomenological data collection, and to the first author's recorded oral reflections on his experiences, representing a manner of long auto-interviewing.

As part of the process of *ἐποχή*, or phenomenological bracketing, we had the first author individually and orally reflect on his own experiences of teaching in schools of color and of poverty, on the pressures placed on him by both the NCSS' civic mission and government and school accountability mandates, and on his experiences working with authentic intellectual work (Newmann, et al., 2007) (see Appendix A, Reflection Protocol). This was done before we conducted our interviews with John. Ronald Valle, Mark King, and Steen Halling (1989) note that "in order to bracket one's preconceptions and presuppositions, one must first make them explicit --- one must 'lay out' these assumptions so that they appear in as clear a form as possible to oneself" (pp. 10-11). This ensures one is most able to discern the horizons, features, and structures of the phenomenon being investigated. Collecting his preconceptions, presuppositions, and an account of his experiences before interviewing John thus provided greater self-awareness and greater receptivity to John's experiential account. This allowed us to approach John's pedagogical negotiations from a more bracketed perspective.

Following this process, we scheduled a series of four interviews with John over a period of 12 weeks, conducting them in his classroom at the end of the school day. Clark Moustakas (1994) speaks of the importance of holding phenomenological interviews at a location in which co-researchers are most apt to feel comfortable and to respond frankly to the questions posed. Conducting these interviews in his

classroom was convenient, as John did not have to travel. The first interview focused on John's experiences working in a school of color and explored the extent of his experience working with the AIW framework. After this interview, we provided John some seminal practitioner-oriented readings on authentic intellectual work (Newmann, 2000; Newmann & Wehlage, 1993; Scheurman & Newmann, 1998). The second interview focused on John's reactions to, and initial understanding, of these readings. Following this second interview, John began planning a political polling lesson grounded on the principles of AIW. The third and fourth interviews focused on John's experiences of negotiating between teaching for thoughtful, critically informed citizenship and teaching for government and school accountability mandates, as well as on his experiences of planning, delivering, and assessing his polling lesson (see Appendix B, Interview Protocols).

Data Analysis

In order to analyze the data, we employed Clark Moustakas' (1994) Stevick-Colaizzi-Keen method (pp. 121-122). Having already collected rich descriptions of both John's and the first author's experiences of negotiating between teaching for thoughtful, critically informed citizenship and teaching for government and school accountability mandates, and of working within the AIW framework, we transcribed these data verbatim. From these transcripts, we recorded all statements relevant to the research question and phenomenologically reduced the data corpus by eliminating overlapping or repetitive statements. This process is referred to as horizontalization (Moustakas, 1994, pp. 95-96). Horizontalization has the working function of rendering a massive data corpus workable by "strip[ping] away the theories or scientific conceptions and thematizations which overlay the phenomenon one wishes to study ... which prevents [*sic*] one

from seeing the phenomenon in a non-abstracting manner (van Manen, 1990, p. 185).

We then clustered these static meaning units, or horizons, into themes. We used these to construct a textural description of both John's and the first author's negotiation experiences using verbatim examples through a process of synthesizing the horizons and themes (see Table 1). This allowed us to explain in greater detail the pre-reflective feel of their experiences. Subsequently, we generated individual textural and structural description of these experiences which, while accounting for the particularities of John's and the first author's negotiation experiences, permitted us to discern the constituting elements of negotiating between teaching for thoughtful, critically informed citizenship and teaching for government and school accountability mandates (see van Manen, 1990). Finally, we constructed a synthetic textural-structural description of John's and the first author's experiences, which we present in the findings section.

Table 1. Phenomenological Meaning Clusters and Horizons

Concern for Accountability Mandates	Concern for Citizenship	Negotiating Pedagogy and Purpose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher test content fears • Teacher pass rate fears • Administration pass rate pressures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student life concerns • Real world preparation • Economic and political positioning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High demands on teacher • Ongoing internal conflict • AIW as a solution

John's individual textural description. John spoke often of feeling frustrated when teaching his students of color who, attending his Advanced Placement (AP) American Government class as a result of the school's policy of AP open enrollment, lacked some of

the basic knowledge necessary to succeed on the end-of-year College Board examination. He said, for example,

After grading the AP test for the first time, I realized it's really a vocabulary test. They [College Board representatives] say it's not a vocabulary test, but there is this content they have to know. There's jargon, there's theories, and if they don't know these things, they're gonna go down in flames.

John expressed frustration with his school's administrators, who were demanding higher pass rates on the AP examination even though 30% of his students had not yet passed the state's gatekeeping reading assessment. He found this at odds with the open enrolment policy, noting

if the school was gonna cast the net wide, it'd be a shallow cast. We wouldn't necessarily get the big numbers that we were expecting the first few years... but it's become more and more of an issue and a pressure.

Why do we need to collect the data of other people's experiences? We gather other people's experiences because they allow us to become more experienced ourselves.

John also expressed feelings of conflict relating to his pedagogical methods. He felt pressured to tailor his instruction to ensure his students passed the AP exam, but claimed this tailored approach was boring: "It's heavy on classical instruction --- notes, reading --- and, I mean, I've had some success with it, but after three weeks of that, it just feels kind of 'blah'. But, it's the form that I've developed". With that said, he noted a strong sense of enjoyment whenever he could move away from this manner of instruction, stating "I remember how much I'd liked the idea of having a lesson with value beyond the classroom". He also noted feelings of accomplishment when students demonstrated skills of critical media consumption. On this issue, he stated that these instructional moments "always made me look forward to the next period, and made me look forward to the rest of the day".

Worrying about his students' success, both with respect to their status as thoughtful and critically informed citizens, and to their scores on government and school accountability mandates, also constituted an important affective element of his experience. Regarding teaching in a nontraditional fashion, John voiced his concerns:

I could end up making a really watered down lesson, a cheap knockoff version, and it just wouldn't be rigorous. Everyone would sort of applaud [my creativity], but then these kids would be damaged in the sense that they could have learned so much but really didn't.

He expressed worry over examination raters' control over his students' grades, "I'd rather tell the kid 'Here's the safe play [that will score the most points on the test] instead of the risky one [which might have applicability beyond school]." He also, however, expressed worry that his students, once they left school,

would be unable to “get out in the real world” and be unable to function at their jobs if he did not provide instruction which had value beyond school.

John conveyed feelings of great excitement and joy when it looked possible that designing lessons using authentic pedagogy would allow him to teach for both a thoughtful and critically engaged citizenship, and for government and school accountability mandates. Referring to a lesson he had planned based on AIW, John noted, “I just got more excited for planning. You know, I spent probably more time planning for that lesson than I do for the majority of my other lessons”. John also spoke of his excitement at increased student engagement, noting his students of color began to examine the material more deeply as they began to take greater ownership of their learning: “The other thing I thought was interesting is that kids came back and had created their own polling categories ... and I thought that was really, really great”. This ultimately translated into expressions of confidence in his students’ of color ability to succeed on the AP American Government end-of-year examination.

John’s individual structural description.

The descriptive structure of John’s negotiation experience focused on the overall tension between two teaching responsibilities that seemed mutually exclusive but were deemed important, and the negative affective reactions associated with this tension. John felt pressured by his school administration to ensure higher levels of success on his students’ of color AP American Government end-of-year examinations and frustrated by school policies and the academic realities of his classroom that worked against his endeavors in this area.

John initially felt the need to present his content material in as traditional a format as possible, as he felt it might guarantee his students of color would acquire the content they needed to pass their examinations, even though he himself viewed this mode of presentation as being boring and possibly leading to

his burnout. Once he explored the possibility of ensuring his students of color encountered the material necessary for success on their tests while preparing them for thoughtful and critical citizenship through lessons grounded in the AIW framework, however, John’s feelings of frustration, of being pressured, and of boredom gave way to feelings of hope, excitement, and enjoyment.

Findings

Essence of Negotiating Success Pressures

The final stage of our phenomenological analysis, which aims at extracting transcendental meaning of experience and the essence of negotiating between teaching for thoughtful, critically informed citizenship and teaching for government and school accountability mandates, was to integrate and synthesize John’s and the first author’s textural and structural descriptions of their experiences. It is this textural-structural description which we present as our findings. In brief, the essence of this negotiation experience is one of affective and pedagogical tensions that diminish once instruction based on the principles of authentic intellectual work (Newmann, et al, 2007) is introduced into secondary social studies classrooms of color. We will now discuss the major elements of this essence and include relevant examples from our data corpus as illustrating these elements.

Concern for Success on Government and School Accountability Mandates

Educators concerned with their students’ of color possible future outcomes worry over, and feel pressured to, ensure their charges succeed on government and school accountability mandates, be they state exit examinations, school or College Board end-of-course assessments,

or scholastic aptitude batteries. Recognizing that success on these measures can either provide or deny students of color access to higher levels of educational attainment, concerns regarding their basic skills serving as an impediment to their success recurred frequently:

I knew they needed practice in reading comprehension to boost their SAT comprehension results... but they just weren't keen at all. It was kind of a catch-22. They hated to read, because they felt - and because other teachers had told them - they weren't any good at it. And so, they wouldn't read, which wouldn't make them any better at it. And, come SAT time, that was going to hurt them ... and this worried me. A lot. (First author)

Whether the focus was on college entrance examinations such as the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), on College Board examinations for advanced placement classes, or on state accountability measures, concern for students of color who lacked the reading and analytical skills necessary to succeed on these measures was invariant.

A curricular focus resulted on traditional pedagogical methods designed to transmit as much content as possible in a manner similar to that found on the assessments students would face come measurement time. Though recognizing instruction tended toward the mundane and disinteresting, worry that nontraditional instruction would harm students' chances of succeeding prevailed.

Rightly or wrongly, that's just the way it is. In the context of AP, I'm just a little afraid that if I do that [nontraditional instruction and assessment] and it doesn't work, my students' scores will go down, and then their pass rates will go down. And, that doesn't look good. (John)

Because of the weight given to standardized measurements of achievement in terms of determining students' futures in environments in which a sizeably larger percentage of students perform poorly on these measures, worry over pedagogy and success is common.

Being pressured by administrators to ensure high levels of success on accountability mandates and, subsequently, being hamstrung by school policy, led to strong feelings of frustration. This frustration manifested itself in recognition that students of color were not failing these measures, but rather the measures were failing them.

It wasn't that my kids were stupid. No, far from it. One of my students was an accomplished rapper, another worked two jobs just to keep her and her mom afloat, and a third was raising a kid of his own. The tests, the worksheets, the lectures, they didn't let my kids tap what smarts they had in a way they could use them. (First author)

This frustration thus arose as a result of the recognition that John and the first author recognized students' natural intelligences and intellectual strengths, but the standardized measures of achievement failed to measure the students' of color strengths.

Taken as a whole, this concern for the success of students of color on government and school accountability mandates manifested itself in a variety of negatively affective ways. Worry, fear, and frustration all constituted important, albeit unfortunate, dimensions of this concern.

Concern for a Thoughtful, Critically Informed Citizenship

Contrasted with the previously discussed concern is educators' interest in preparing their students of color for the lives and responsibili-

ties they will have as adult citizens. Recognizing that an exclusively traditional academic curricular focus could disadvantage students of color socially, anxiety over potential sociopolitical disempowerment persisted.

They don't tend to be very media literate. It's not that they believe everything, it's just that there is no discernment necessarily when it comes to mainline media. I need to help them be better citizens, or be more aware, so that they don't get hornswaggled by the people in power. (John)

This anxiety also manifested itself as it related to students' of color socioeconomic positioning as a result of an overly academic and insufficiently practical economic education.

Students, and adults, generally speaking, who don't read the "fine print" on loan applications or credit card applications often get caught in the clauses of the contracts, and it screws up their entire credit rating, which can take years to repair. I didn't want this to happen to my students, least of all my African American students. (First author)

As a result of these anxieties, social studies teachers concerned with the development of students' of color as thoughtful, critically informed citizens may venture to the realm of nontraditional instruction, though the previously discussed worries accompany this decision.

These concerns for the success of students of color in the real world, and for their roles as thoughtful, critically informed citizens, constituted an important feature of this negotiation experience. Like concern for students' of color success on government and school accountability mandates, it tended to manifest itself in a negatively affective manner. Anxiety over students' of color social positioning, be it poli-

tical or economic, framed a fair part of this concern.

Negotiating Pedagogy and Purpose

When trying to account for these seemingly juxtaposed and mutually exclusive concerns, and when trying to negotiate between them in the curricular and pedagogical choices of the day-to-day secondary social studies classroom in a school of color, resignation was frequent. Both John and the first author expressed feelings of hopelessness.

You have to build the vocabulary, the terms, the content, the theories, and the analysis all at the same time. But, then to make it relevant? Sometimes, and it's actually a lot of times, what I've heard was, "Don't worry, you'll be able to do it. It'll be fine". But, it's not fine. Sometimes, I feel like I have to choose between teaching tested content and teaching real-life useful content. Is it just "pie in the sky" to say that I can do both? Sometimes, I feel like it's that way. (John)

Being pressured by administrators to ensure high levels of success on accountability mandates and, subsequently, being hamstrung by school policy, led to strong feelings of frustration. This frustration manifested itself in a recognition that students of color were not failing these measures, but rather the measures were failing them.

Trying to negotiate between teaching students for thoughtful, critically informed citizenship and teaching students for government and school accountability mandates presented itself as a struggle of conscience. On the one hand, teaching students for informed citizenship could stave off immediate political and economic disempowerment, but might limit opportunities for social advancement. On the other hand, teaching students for government and school accountability mandates could afford students of color access to higher education, but could result in a lack of political and economic awareness. Regardless, a feeling of defeat accompanied any decision.

Having spent a chunk of time teaching my kids about credit card fine print, I had lingering concerns that because I hadn't been teaching precisely the content outlined in the AP Microeconomics textbook that I was disadvantaging my African American students for their performance on the AP Micro test. But, there was this internal battle with respect to that, because I felt if I hadn't provided them with this credit card experience, I'd be disadvantaging them in terms of their real-life capacities as adults and responsible spenders. And I always felt that no matter the decision I made, I made the wrong one. (First author)

So long as John and the first author viewed teaching for thoughtful, critically informed citizenship and teaching for government and school accountability mandates as juxtaposed and mutually exclusive purposes, a sense of resignation and failure remained.

These feelings of hopelessness and of defeat were reinforced by the belief that negotiating these juxtaposed concerns is necessarily a zero-sum affair. When presented with the possibility of accounting for both of these teaching concerns --- that is, teaching for

thoughtful, critically informed citizenship and teaching for government and school accountability mandates --- through the implementation of curricula designed around the principles of AIW, the negatively affective dimensions of this negotiation experience began to diminish in favor of positive outlooks regarding the success of students of color. Both John and the first author noted increased levels of engagement and academic achievement among those students of color who had been particularly disenfranchised by a traditional curriculum.

I think, for me, one of the most exciting things to see the kids who, in a sort of academic sense weren't the best students by test scores, were the ones who demonstrated the most involvement in the polling lesson I had planned and who had the necessary interpersonal skills, not only to collect five or ten times more respondents than I had required, but to coordinate their groups' efforts in producing workable conclusions from their data. Also, they get that sort of understanding of polling only gotten from actually doing polls, which will help them not only pass those DBQs [document-based questions] on their AP exam, but now they can critically read and analyze poll data in newspapers and on TV. (John)

This excitement eventually led to increased teacher efforts to include more lessons based on the principles of authentic intellectual work into the social studies classroom of color as a means of not having to choose between pedagogical modes in a zero-sum fashion:

I'm starting to look at everything I do. Not necessarily to switch everything that I do, but now I start now to evaluate everything that I do in the classroom under my understanding of au-

thentic pedagogy. For me, there's a joy, an excitement in it. (John)

When teaching for thoughtful, critically informed citizenship and teaching for government and school accountability mandates are no longer seen as juxtaposed and mutually exclusive, feelings of hopelessness and of defeat recede.

Once equipped with a firmer knowledge of the framework for AIW, secondary social studies teachers in schools of color may experience their pedagogical negotiations less as a binary model which invariably have negative affective dimensions, but rather as an additive model, simultaneously teaching for thoughtful, critically informed citizenship and for government and school accountability mandates. Furthermore, the negative affective dimensions associated with the binary model diminished over time in a fashion proportionate to the realization that both modes of success might be met with a single pedagogical approach.

Discussion and Implications for Future Research

Extant research has noted that students of color, particularly African Americans, typically underperform compared to their white peers on standardized measures of achievement (Battle & Coates, 2004; Fass, 1980; Garcia & Pearson, 1994; Linn, 2000; Myers, et al, 2004). Because of this marked and lasting underperformance, high school social studies teachers working in schools of color, particularly in African American settings, have indicated they want to ensure their students' success on such measures, be they government accountability mandates such as the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), or the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Tests (FCAT), or College Board Advanced Placement examinations which schools are using increasingly as a measure of accountability (Warren & Jenkins, 2005). This desire to ensure students' success

in turn leads to instruction tailored exclusively for such purposes, and also demonstrates that students of color --- particularly African Americans --- receive more instruction that focuses on test-taking abilities than that which focuses on genuine learning (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Hamilton, 2003; Hargreaves, Earl, & Schmidt, 2002; Warren & Jenkins, 2005). This mode of instruction conflicts distinctly with an education that would prepare them for the roles they would fill as adults (Dewey, 1915, 1916, 1938; King, et al, 2009; Newmann, et al, 2007), would be relevant (Nuthall, 1999, 2000a, 2000b), and would be both interesting and engaging (Black & Wiliam, 2003; Marks, 2000; Nuthall & Alton-Lee, 1995).

This study is somewhat limited in its scope, as it is limited to the experiences of two social studies teachers who have taught in schools of color. Because of the this limitation, it would be interesting to see if the horizons, features, and structures of their experiences hold to a broader population of social studies teachers working in schools of color. It may be of additional interest to see if these horizons, features, and structures likewise hold for those teachers working in schools populated predominantly by European American students and in schools populated by students of financial means.

Sometimes, I feel like I have to choose between teaching tested content and teaching real-life useful content. Is it just 'pie in the sky' to say that I can do both?

Implications for Social Studies Teacher Education

In order to ensure social studies teacher candidates are of high quality, they have to meet a considerable number of learning and performance demands (National Council for Accreditation and Teacher Educators [NCATE], 2008). These include classroom management, lesson planning, acquiring multiple instructional methods, negotiating instruction for poor readers and English Language Learners, and surviving their practica and internships. Expecting teacher candidates to graduate as experts in the framework for authentic intellectual work without either lengthening their programs or cutting deeply into the established social studies teacher education curriculum is not feasible. This is not to say, however, that teacher educators cannot make manageable changes to their curricula to provide their candidates with a foundation in AIW, upon which they can build later in-service learning.

In a 15-week-long course, methods instructors can provide their teacher candidates with practitioner-oriented literature focusing on AIW (King, et al, 2009; Newmann, 2000; Newmann & Wehlage, 1993; Scheurman & Newmann, 1998). They can dedicate as little as 90 minutes for classroom discussion on the readings - 60 minutes to discuss the readings as required by many National School Reform Faculty (NSRF) protocols (2008) and 30 minutes for brainstorming some immediate applications of the AIW framework to their praxes. This can help their teacher candidates develop a firm initial understanding of the three principles of authentic intellectual work. Finally, methods instructors might require their teacher candidates to demonstrate this understanding in an already-allotted lesson plan and/or microteaching experience, requiring no additional assignments other than those for which the instructors had already planned.

Those instructors conducting in-service training can do so with a minimal time commitment and at low cost on the part of the school district. Recognizing that classroom practitioners have even greater demands on their time as do teacher candidates, providing four one-hour sessions after school, once per week over the course of four weeks, can provide the social studies department at a secondary school with a sufficient introduction to the theory and practice of AIW. Using a model similar to the one used in this study, classroom teachers can collaboratively discuss a recently published article on AIW (King, Newmann, & Carmichael, 2009) in the first meeting. Based on the understandings they gained during this discussion session, they can subsequently work to develop a lesson aligned with the principles of the AIW framework. During the second meeting, they can elicit feedback from their colleagues on how to fine-tune their lesson prior to delivery. In the third meeting, they can discuss at length their experiences in delivering the lessons they had developed. Finally, in the fourth meeting, the classroom teachers can share samples of student work, and make recommendations for future implementation.

As we refined the essence of John's and the first author's experiences of negotiating between teaching students for thoughtful, critically informed citizenship and teaching students for government and school accountability mandates, it seems that given the excitement and enjoyment they spoke of when relating to their experiences with AIW, and the assertions that their students demonstrated high levels of success in both areas warrants greater investigation.



References

Print-based References

- An act relating to education, HB 7087, Engrossed 3, Florida House of Representatives, 2006 Sess. (2006).
- Agresto, J. (1990). The politicization of liberal education. *Academic Questions*, 3, 69-73.
- Archbald, D.A., & Newmann, F.M. (1988). *Beyond standardized testing: Assessing authentic academic achievement in the secondary school* (ERIC No. ED 301 587): National Association of Secondary School Principals, Reston, VA; National Center on Effective Secondary Schools, Madison, WI.
- Ayres, L.P. (1913). *Laggards in our schools*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Banks, J.A., Cookson, P., Gay, G., Hawley, W.D., Irvine, J. J., Nieto, S., et al. (2010). Education and diversity. In W.C. Parker (Ed.), *Social studies today: Research and practice* (pp. 67-76). New York: Routledge.
- Battle, J., & Coates, D.L. (2004). Father-only and mother-only, single-parent family status of black girls and achievement in grade twelve and at two-years post high school. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 73(4), 392-407.
- Black, P. (2000). Research and the development of educational assessment. *Oxford Review of Education*, 26(3/4), 407-419.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2003). 'In praise of educational research': Formative assessment. *British Educational Research Journal*, 29(5), 623-637.
- Bloom, A. (1988). *The closing of the American mind*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Callahan, R.E. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cherryholmes, C.H. (1996). Critical pedagogy and social education. In R.W. Evans & D.W. Saxe (Eds.), *Handbook on teaching social issues* (pp. 75-80). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Dahlgren, R.L. (2009). Fahrenheit 9/11 in the classroom. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 36(1), 25-42.
- Dahlgren, R.L., & Masyada, S. (2009). Ideological dissonance: A comparison of the views of eight conservative students with the recruitment document from a southeastern college of education. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 4(1), 1-11.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). New standards and old inequities: School reform and the education of African American students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 69(4), 263-287.
- Dewey, J. (1897). *My pedagogic creed*. New York: E. L. Kellogg.
- Dewey, J. (1906). *The child and the curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1915). *School and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Estola, E., & Elbaz-Luwisch, F. (2003). Teaching bodies at work. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 35, 697-719.
- Evans, R. W. (2004). The social studies wars revisited. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 31(4), 523-539.
- Evans, R.W. (2010). The social studies wars, now and then. In W.C. Parker (Ed.), *Social studies today: Research and practice* (pp. 25-34). New York: Routledge.
- Fass, P.S. (1980). The IQ: A cultural and historical framework. *American Journal of Education*, 88(4), 431-458.
- Gallagher, J.J. (1979). Minimum competency: The setting of educational standards. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 1(1), 62-67.
- Garcia, G. E., & Pearson, P. D. (1994). Assessment and diversity. *Review of Research in Education*, 20, 337-391.
- Gardner, D.P. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform* (ERIC No. ED 226 006). Washington, DC: National Commission on Excellence in Education.
- Gipps, C.V. (1999). Socio-cultural aspects of assessment. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 355-392.
- Gradwell, J. M. (2006). Teaching in spite of, rather than because of, the test: A case of ambitious history teaching in New York State. In S.G. Grant (Ed.), *Measuring history: Cases of state-level testing across the United States* (pp. 157-176). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Grant, S.G. (2010). High-stakes testing: How are social studies teachers responding? In W. C. Parker (Ed.), *Social studies today: Research and practice* (pp. 43-52). New York: Routledge.
- Grant, S.G., & Salinas, C. (2008). Assessment and accountability in the social studies. In L.S. Levstik & C.A. Tyson (Eds.), *Research in social studies education* (pp. 219-236). New York: Routledge.
- Hamilton, L.S. (2003). Assessment as a policy tool. *Review of Research in Education*, 27, 25-68.
- Hargreaves, A., Earl, L., & Schmidt, M. (2002). Perspectives on alternative assessment reform. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(1), 69-95.

- Heidegger, M. (2005). *Introduction to phenomenological research* (D.O. Dahlstrom, Trans.). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Heidegger, M. (2008). *Being and time* (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics.
- Hess, D.E. (2002). Discussing controversial public issues in secondary social studies classrooms: Learning from skilled teachers. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 30(1), 10-41.
- Hess, D.E. (2008). Controversial issues and democratic discourse. In L.S. Levstik & C.A. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 124-136). New York: Routledge.
- Hess, D.E. (2009). *Controversy in the classroom: The democratic power of discussion*. New York: Routledge.
- Hirsch, E.D., Jr. (1987). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hirsch, E.D., Jr. (1996). *The schools we need and why we don't have them*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Husserl, E. (1964). *The idea of phenomenology* (W. P. Alston & G. Nakhnikian, Trans.). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Husserl, E. (1983). *Ideas pertaining to a pure phenomenology and to a phenomenological philosophy* (F. Kersten, Trans. Vol. 1). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Kelly, D.M., & Brandes, G. M. (2001). Shifting out of "neutral": Beginning teachers' struggles with teaching for social justice. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 26(4), 437-454.
- Kelly, T.E. (1986). Discussing controversial issues: Four perspectives on the teacher's role. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 14(2), 113-138.
- Kim, C.L., Anderson, T.L., Hall, M.E.L., & Willingham, M.M. (in press). Asian and female in the white God's world: A qualitative exploration of discrimination in Christian academia. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*.
- King, M.B., Newmann, F.M., & Carmichael, D.L. (2009). Authentic intellectual work: Common standards for teaching social studies. *Social Education*, 73(1), 43-49.
- Koro-Ljungberg, M., Yendol-Hoppey, D., Smith, J.J., & Hayes, S. B. (2009). (E)pistemological awareness, instantiation of methods, and uninformed methodological ambiguity in qualitative research projects. *Educational Researcher*, 38(9), 687-699.
- Lee, I., & Koro-Ljungberg, M. (2007). A phenomenological study of Korean students' acculturation in middle schools in the USA. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 6, 95-117.
- Leming, J., Ellington, L., & Porter-Magee, K. (2003). *Where did social studies go wrong?* Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Linn, R.L. (1978). Demands, cautions, and suggestions for setting standards. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 15(4), 301-308.
- Linn, R.L. (2000). Assessments and accountability. *Educational Researcher*, 29(2), 4-16.
- Marks, H.M. (2000). Student engagement in instructional activity: Patterns in elementary, middle, and high school years. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(1), 153-184.
- McCarthy, K.W., & Duke, T.S. (2007). The observation, documentation, and shared reflection process: Preparing early childhood teachers to teach in Alaska Native communities. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 28(2), 97-113.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964). The primacy of perception and its philosophical consequences. In J. Wild (Ed.), *The primacy of perception* (pp. 12-42). Evanston, IL: Northwest University Press.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Myers, S.L., Jr., Kim, H., & Mandala, C. (2004). The effect of school poverty on racial gaps in test scores: The case of the Minnesota Basic Standards Tests. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 73(1), 81-98.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (1994). *Expectations of excellence: Curriculum standards for social studies*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2008). *Professional standards for accreditation of schools, colleges, and departments of education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National School Reform Faculty. (2008). *National school reform faculty resource book: Adult learning in the service of student achievement, 2007-2008*. Bloomington, IN: Author.
- Newmann, F.M. (1965). The analysis of public controversy: New focus on social studies. *The School Review*, 73(4), 410-434.
- Newmann, F.M., Bryk, A.S., & Nagoka, J.K. (2001). *Authentic intellectual work and standardized tests: Conflict or coexistence?* Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research.
- Newmann, F.M., King, M.B., & Carmichael, D.L. (2007). *Authentic instruction and assessment: Common standards for rigor and relevance in teaching academic subjects*. Des Moines, IA: Authors.
- Newmann, F.M., King, M.B., & Carmichael, D.L. (2009). *Teaching for authentic intellectual work: Standards and scoring criteria for teachers' tasks, student performance, and instruction*. Minneapolis, MN: The Centre for Authentic Intellectual Work.

- Newmann, F.M., Lopez, G., & Bryk, A.S. (1998). *The quality of intellectual work in Chicago schools: A baseline report*. Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research.
- Newmann, F.M., Marks, H.M., & Gamoran, A. (1996). Authentic pedagogy and student performance. *American Journal of Education*, 104(4), 280-312.
- No Child Left Behind, 20 USC 6301(2001).
- Nuthall, G. (1999). The way students learn: Acquiring knowledge from an integrated science and social studies unit. *The Elementary School Journal*, 99(4), 303-341.
- Nuthall, G. (2000a). The anatomy of memory in the classroom: Understanding how students acquire memory processes from classroom activities in science and social studies units. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(1), 247-304.
- Nuthall, G. (2000b). The role of memory in the acquisition and retention of knowledge in science and social studies units. *Cognition and Instruction*, 18(1), 83-139.
- Nuthall, G., & Alton-Lee, A. (1995). Assessing classroom learning: How students use their knowledge and experiences to answer classroom achievement test questions in science and social studies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(1), 185-223.
- Peterson, P.E., & West, M.R. (Eds.). (2003). *No child left behind?: The politics and practice of school accountability*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Resnick, D.P. (1980). Minimum competency testing historically considered. *Review of Research in Education*, 8(3-29).
- Ross, E.W., & Marker, P.M. (2005). (If social studies is wrong) I don't want to be right. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 33(1), 142-151.
- Ross, E.W., & Marker, P.M. (2009). Guest editors' introduction - Social studies teacher education: Dare we teach for democracy? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 36(1), 3-7.
- Scheurman, G., & Newmann, F.M. (1998). Authentic intellectual work in the social studies: Putting performance before pedagogy. *Social Education*, 62(1), 23-26.
- Segall, A. (2003). Teachers' perceptions of the impact of state-mandated standardized testing: The Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) as a case study of consequences. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 31(3), 287-325.
- Segall, A. (2006). Teaching in the age of accountability: Measuring history or measuring up to it? In S.G. Grant (Ed.), *Measuring history: Cases of state-level testing across the United States* (pp. 105-132). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Tyack, D.B. (1974). *The one best system: A history of urban education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Valle, R.S., King, M., & Halling, S. (1989). An introduction to existential-phenomenological thought in psychology. In R.S. Valle & S. Halling (Eds.), *Existential-phenomenological perspectives in psychology*. New York: Plenum Press.
- van Hover, S.D. (2006). Teaching history in the Old Dominion: The impact of Virginia's accountability reform on seven secondary beginning history teachers. In S.G. Grant (Ed.), *Measuring history: Cases of state-level testing across the United States* (pp. 195-219). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Warren, J.R., & Jenkins, K.N. (2005). High school exit examinations and high school dropout in Texas and Florida, 1971-2000. *Sociology of Education*, 78(2), 122-143.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237-269.
- Willingham, W.W., Pollack, J.M., & Lewis, C. (2002). Grades and test scores: Accounting for observed differences. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 39(1), 1-37.

Web-based References

- Anthony, K. H. (2008). Helping partnerships that facilitate recovery from severe mental illness. *Journal of Psychosocial Nursing and Mental Health Services*, 46(7). Retrieved from <http://www.jpnonline.com/view.asp?rid=29590>
- Florida Department of Education. (2009). *FCAT student performance results: Demographic report*. Retrieved from <https://app1.fldoe.org/FCATDemographics/>
- National Council for the Social Studies. (2001). *Creating effective citizens*. Retrieved from <http://www.socialstudies.org/positions/effectivecitizens>
- National Council for the Social Studies. (2007). *Academic freedom and the social studies teacher*. Retrieved from <http://www.socialstudies.org/positions/academicfreedom/>

Newmann, F. M. (2000). Authentic intellectual work: What and why? *Research and Practice Newsletter*, 8(1). Retrieved from <http://cehd.umn.edu/carei/Reports/Rpractice/Fall2000/newmann.html>

Newmann, F. M., & Wehlage, G. G. (1993). Five standards of authentic instruction. *Educational Leadership*, 50(7), 8-12. Retrieved from http://pdonline.ascd.org/pd_online/diffinstr/el199304_newmann.html

About the Authors

Christopher Andrew Brkich, a doctoral candidate in Social Studies Education at the University of Florida with research interests in authentic intellectual work, the history of education and qualitative research, and evaluation methods. Prior to beginning doctoral work, he taught economics and world history in Québec and Florida. He can be reached at chrisbrkich@proteachprof.com.

Elizabeth Yeager Washington, a Professor of Social Studies Education at the University of Florida with research interests in civic and democratic education, and wise practices in the teaching of the social studies. She directs and teaches graduate courses within the University of Florida's social studies teacher preparation program.

Note: An earlier version of this paper was presented at the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies in Atlanta, GA, on November 12, 2009.

Citation for this Article

Brkich, C. A., & Washington, E. Y. (2011). Pedagogical negotiations and authentic intellectual work: A phenomenological examination of high school teachers' experiences. *Social Studies Research & Practice*, 6(1), 35-57.

Appendix 1

Reflection Protocol

1. What have my experiences been like as a social studies teacher?
2. What have my experiences been working with students of color and of poverty?
3. What were my major concerns for my students?
4. What were my major hopes for my students?
5. What do I view as being the purpose(s) of a social studies education?
6. What do I see standing in the way of achieving this/these purpose(s)?
7. How, if at all, have accountability mandates impacted my practice as a social studies educator?
8. How, if at all, has the framework for Authentic Intellectual Work impacted my practice?
9. What was my best moment as a secondary social studies teacher?
10. What was my worst moment as a secondary social studies teacher?

Appendix 2

Interview Protocols

Interview 1

1. Tell me about your experiences teaching as a secondary social studies teacher.
2. What have your experiences been like working with students of color and of poverty?
3. What are some of the challenges you face working in a school of color?
4. What are some of the things you like the most working at TJHS?
5. Tell me what you know of *Authentic Intellectual Work*, also known as authentic instruction and assessment.
6. Does AIW inform your classroom practice? If so, why and how? If not, why not and how not?

Interview 2

1. Based on the readings (Newmann, 2000; Newmann & Wehlage, 1993; Scheurman & Newmann, 1998), tell me about your present understanding of authentic intellectual work.
2. How do you feel your understanding has changed since our last meeting?
3. In your own words, tell me about Newmann and associates' (2007) conception of authentic intellectual work, *id est*, a) construction of knowledge; b) disciplined inquiry; c) value beyond school (also called connectedness to the world beyond the classroom).
4. Newmann and Wehlage (1993) state that "public and professional discussion of standards for instruction tends to focus on procedural and technical aspects [of teaching], with little attention to more fundamental standards of quality" (¶ 4). In your opinion as a professional educator, what makes for quality instruction? What makes for quality student performance?
5. What benefits do you see to teaching lessons based on the principles of authentic intellectual work? What benefits do you see particularly for your students of color?
6. What drawbacks, difficulties, or obstacles do you see to teaching lessons based on the principles of authentic intellectual work? What particularly for your students of color?
7. What are some opportunities that you see, within your own classroom, for implementing lessons based on the principles of authentic intellectual work?

Interview 3

1. Tell me about the polling exercise you had planned.
2. How did you plan this lesson to fit the three criteria for authentic intellectual work?
3. Tell me about your experiences planning, delivering, and assessing this lesson. What were they like?
4. Tell me about your students' experiences with the lesson. How do you feel they took to it?
5. What did you like the most about this lesson?
6. If you were to do this lesson again, what - if anything - would you change to make it better?
7. Why do you feel it was particularly important for your students of color to have this experience?

Interview 4 (Follow-Up Interview)

1. You had said you were beginning to prepare your students for their AP American Government test. How do you prepare them for this test?
2. Tell me about your students' experiences with the test.
3. How do you feel your polling exercise helped prepare your students for their test?
4. How do you feel the AIW framework and grading criteria can help to prepare your students for their test?
5. You noted that you felt your students of color benefitted from their polling lesson. How particularly do you feel they have benefitted?
6. Finally, what upcoming opportunities do you see in the upcoming weeks to implement lessons based on the AIW framework?