PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' RESISTANCE PRACTICES TO REFLECTION

MAZOR COHEN IRIT[1]

ABSTRACT. Educational preparation programs emphasize the importance of reflection in order to learn and promote preservice students' teaching. In the current research, five first year pre-service students who participated in a collective reflective discourse, in a small group in one of the educational colleges in Israel, expressed solid resistance to reflection. The aim of the research was to expose these resistance practices.

The research question is: What resistance practices to reflection are used by primary school pre-service teachers (PST) at the beginning of the first preparation year?

The research findings showed that the pre-service teachers (PST) used the following resistance practices in order to express their resistance to reflection: discursive practices of negative sentences, using examples from their previous experience to reflection as useless and accusing the pedagogical instructor; behavioral practices of their discourse manner and types of laughter.

This article will start with a literature review on: reflection in teachers' education, and pre-service teachers' resistance practices. Next, there will be a description of the collective reflective discourse in a small group, followed by qualitative content analysis and findings. Finally, conclusions will be added and discussed.

Key words: *reflection; resistance practices; pre-service teachers.*

---

[1] *David Yellin College of Education, Israel, doctoral student Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, mazoririt33@gmail.com*

1. Introduction

Personal individual reflection in education focuses primarily on problems and difficulties (Dewey, 1933). During the training process, pre-service teachers (PST) are encouraged to reflect on their learning from their experiences in school teaching (Le Cornu & Ewing, 2008; McClure, 2005). In addition, there is a recognition of the importance of **C**ollective **R**eflective **L**earning (CRL) for the development of their teaching (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Anderson, 2006; Le Cornu & Ewing, 2008; Schechter & Michalsky, 2014).

CRL emphasizes PST' learning from their own teaching (Schechter & Michalsky, 2014). However, the PST' reflection is mostly done in the traditional way of subjective individual reflection in writing, or in discourse with a mentor and pedagogical instructor (PI). On rare occasions, the discourse occurs with a mentor and peer(s), followed by a written personal reflection of learning by teaching (Schön, 1987; Dewey, 1933; Le Cornu & Ewing, 2008; Birenbaum, 2013). However, in practice, the personal reflections are not necessarily connected to the CRL.

This current research has used CRL discourse to expose PST' resistance practices to reflection. PST' resistance practices to reflection in a discourse on reflection has not been researched yet. Researchers (including the researcher in the current study) believe in the effectiveness of reflection tools and processes as a way to promote teaching of PST and would like to encourage PST to use them at the beginning of their preparation period as self-regulated learners in their teaching (Michalsky & Schechter, 2013; Kohen & Kramarski, 2012, 2018; Perry & Rahim, 2011).

The purpose of the study is: to identify and expose PST' resistance practices to reflection. The research question is: What resistance practices to reflection are used by primary school pre-service teachers (PST) at the beginning of the first preparation year? Five out of eight first year PST expressed solid resistance to reflection and presented resistance practices in a CRL discourse on reflection, in a small group in an educational college in Israel that participated in the research.

The qualitative content analysis research findings indicated that these PST used the following resistance practices in order to express their resistance to reflection: discursive practices of negative sentences,

using examples from their previous experience to the reflection as useless and accusing the pedagogical instructor; behavioral practices of their discourse manner and types of laughter.

In the following chapters, a literature review on reflection in teachers' education and PST' resistance practices will be presented. Then, the CRL discourse method, in a small group, followed by qualitative content analysis findings will be described. Finally, conclusions will be added and discussed.

2. Literature review

Personal reflection is recognized in educational programs so teachers and especially PST will learn from their teaching and improve it accordingly. Even though PST' attitudes toward reflection, specifically written reflection remains unclear. However, the power of CRL discourse which is more wide spread nowadays in educational preparation programs has not been used as leverage to promote personal reflective writing in teaching practice in order to promote it. Specifically, according to the literature review made for the purpose of this research, no research has yet been conducted exposing PST' resistance practices toward reflection by CRL discourse.

2.1. Reflection in teachers' education

"Reflection" is a retrospective introspection process of "turning back" (in Latin), a retrospective look at actions, occurrences, or events that have occurred in the past. It is also an experience of deliberate internal observation that enables the description, analysis, and evaluation of thoughts, assumptions, beliefs, feelings, theories, and actions to be expressed and exposed consciously. It includes options to refer simultaneously to the future, the present and the past, and it is based on self-awareness, openness and willingness to internalize new insights (McClure, 2005).

Reflective learning, through free and associative reflection, or through structured reflection in light of questions, or through chronological recollection, is an important stage in learning to become independent learners. The structured learning reflection is a major tool to stimulate

thinking about the past and to enable the construction of comprehensions and insights in light of past experience. It can be done through speech, writing, or creative activity that allows a person to reconstruct and reveal hidden information that includes descriptions, thoughts, and feelings that learners were not aware of. Reflective learning promotes professional development in teaching and in the course of teacher training, what is known as thought patterns, assumptions, theories and facts are revealed in a different way, reexamined, transformed, and constantly reorganized (Schön, 1987; Schön & Rein, 1994).

Personal reflection is acceptable in teaching, in an individual manner. The reflections are focused mostly on problems and difficulties (Dewey, 1933, 1938; Rodgers, 2014). Only recently, the importance attributed to collective reflective learning (CRL) has increased as well as learning from both problems and success in teaching, and in teacher education preparation (Schechter & Michalsky, 2014).

Teachers are increasingly encouraged to support reflection as a shared experience of learning. (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Anderson. 2006; Le Cornu & Ewing, 2008; Jaeger, 2013). CRL in teaching is important in the development of PST' teaching to promote self-regulation of their learning on teaching, instead of focusing only on teaching (Le Cornu & Ewing, 2008). In this process, the cognitive development of information about their experiences promotes their awareness. It enhances the collection of information, the production and metacognitive reorganization of professional knowledge and finally, the necessary changes in their behavior (Ellis & Davidi, 2005). The collaborative learning by peer discourse creates an emotional impact reflected in the relationship of collegial learning rather than a relationship of hierarchical learning (Anderson, 2006; Le Cornu & Ewing, 2008).

A few researchers have attributed to PST' negative attitudes and resistance to reflection even though, according to the literature review for the purpose of this research, PST' attitudes toward written reflection are unclear and barely known (Jaeger, 2013; Cardullo et al., 2017). In one research, Cardullo et al. (2017) noted the PST' resistance to written reflection was due to poor content knowledge in the relevant subject-matter domains. However, the researchers did not explain the reasons for the PST' resistance to reflect in the different domains (science, mathematics, literature, linguistics) (Cardullo et al., 2017).

Another research that focused on promotion of PST' SRL, Kohen & Kramarski (2018) found poor content knowledge and that PST are not self-regulated learners by themselves. They concluded that these PST presented poor metacognitive pedagogies and showed poor teaching centred student learning because they lack the skills needed to promote their students as self-regulated learners, including lack of metacognitive processes such as reflection. Previous research findings which primarily concentrated on PST' professional development as self-regulated learners and on their metacognitive teaching processes also did not focus on exposing their attitudes toward reflection (Zimmerman, 2008; Zimmerman & Schunk, 2011; Kohen & Kramarski, 2012, 2018; Michalsky & Schechter, 2013; Perry & Rahim, 2011).

While the literature review exposes researchers' and educators' positive attitudes toward reflection as the most significant processes to promote teaching and improve teaching quality, the PST' attitudes were left unrevealed. The next chapter will focus on PST' resistance practices, since the PST in the current research used them to express their resistance to reflection.

2.2. Pre-Service Teachers (PST) resistance practices

Foucault (1976, 1984) argues that resistance is a result of power. The mechanisms of power found in society replicate the existing state and create power struggles of which resistance is an integral part. These replications exist in deeper layers and become stronger throughout history. Foucault (1982, 1984) mentioned that relations of power exist when people direct the behavior of others and have control of their actions. In these relations, one person restricts the possible actions of another person/s and structures his/their field of action. Relations of power can be identified in any kind of relationship, including between teacher and student, since power is everywhere and can exist only as a plurality of resistances in each special case: possible, necessary, improbable, spontaneous, wild, solitary, concerted, rampant, violent, irreconcilable resistances or willingness to agree, self-serving or sacrificial (Foucault 1982).

Resistance has multiple explanations that cross social layers and communities, since relations of power are distributed throughout a variety of situations and circumstances. Foucault (1982) asserts that the emphasis needs to be focused less on the power itself and more on the analysis of the way in which it is exercised (Foucault 1982). Derived from Foucault's approach, Korbut (2018) concluded that it is required to focus on the ordinary manifestations of resistance, to focus on the particular forms in which the power relations can occur as a daily phenomenon, including in what circumstances and through what specific means such forms and instances of resistance are practiced. He suggests a practical way to seek and analyze specific forms of academic resistance by asking two questions that rarely arise while academic resistance is carried out: "Who/what is resisting?" and "Whom/what is being resisted?"

Watson (2006) shows that when observing a given situation where there are students and teachers, we attribute to the teacher and the student certain ways of acting as an integral element of their institutional and social position (Watson, 2006, in Korbut, 2018). Korbut (2018) argues that the labels "teacher" and "student" are not as obvious as they seem. When the student is "resisting" the teacher, he may actually be resisting the very situation, in which his knowledge is being assessed, or resisting the attribution of specific knowledge to him, or resisting the temporary procedures governing the class's work, etc. For the student, the teacher does not lead the interaction, he is only relevant to him as the person who assesses his answers, asks questions on the exam, or gives a lecture. Guided by this point of view, the study is set to explore the statement that: "the preservice teacher is "resisting" the pedagogical instructor".

Specifically, Korbut (2018) added that both the student and teacher are the result of resistance, in local interactions, during which each acquire a specific form as student and teacher, not what brings it about. By resisting, the student becomes a student and helps the teacher to become a teacher. Following Korbut's (2018) clarification it can be concluded that academic resistance is one way to be a student. However, the resemblance between different practices of academic resistance is the reason they have to be investigated case by case by the same research methods (Korbut, 2018).

Korbut (2018) concluded that academic resistance is not only resistance to institutional university practices, but also resistance within the boundaries of these practices. In addition, he argues that we cannot define academic resistance, but we can discover it in principle that can be exposed in several forms, connected to specific practical contexts which make it possible to order one's arguments and actions according to resistance as an interference that must be overcome. The principle of the resistance in the relationship can be discovered from the students' positions, teachers' positions and education when exposing how it is practiced, what effects it has, and what its conditions are. It is a research of revealing the practices of resistance. To this end, the study of resistance requires careful analysis of the positions of all participants in an educational situation, of how they understand and arrange their actions (Korbut, 2018).

Korbut (2018) summarizes that academic resistance is manifested in educational situations in different ways and in different contexts without clear connection. The resistance can take the form of continuous and open acts of protest, or a single phrase or gesture. While the experience of studying ordinary educational situations (giving lectures, conducting seminars, etc.), the participants themselves express a lack of understanding of why such uninteresting events should be. They perceive the specific educational reality as not independent and disconnected, but it has something that is always added to its methodological definition.

Korbut's (2018) main idea is that it is important to study the academic resistance from the point of view of educational practices at the university that are not derived from the desires and intentions of teachers, students, and administrators, but exist as a space of their mutual agreements and interactions. The reflection requirements during the preparation programs are types of active learning in their minds, thoughts and feelings as an internal process. In this context, student resistance can be defined as students' negative behavioral responses to active learning, is frequently mentioned and least researched as barriers to instructors' use of active learning (Borrego, Froyd, & Hall, 2010; Finelli et al., 2014; Froyd et al., 2013; Henderson & Dancy, 2009). Students demonstrate resistance to active learning in various ways: not participating and not engaging in-class activity, disturbing other students, executing the required tasks with minimal effort, complaining, or giving lower course evaluations (Kearney, Plax, & Burroughs, 1991; Seidel & Tanner, 2013; Weimer, 2013).

Another reference to resistance can be found in the research literature in the field of organization consulting as a resistance to change. Ansoff (1990) defines resistance to change as an attempt to influence the process of change by delaying or slowing down the beginning of it, or by blocking and interrupting its application. In addition, Piderit (2000) defines resistance to change as forces that are applied in an organization on workers that express reservation to changes suggested by the management. Furthermore, he adds another definition, seeing resistance to change as a response to anxiety and frustration as a result of change.

Resistance to change can be sorted into different categories according to physical resources, people and tasks. In parallel, the reasons for resistance and the public demonstrations of it may vary according to the type of resistance. The reasons for resistance can be associated to the different types, even though this association is not unambiguous (Goodson, Moore & Hargreaves, 2006; Eilam & Shamir, 2005; Floyd & Lane, 2000; Kruken, 2003; Kearney & Hyle, 2003). Furthermore, reasons for resistance to change that are tied to tasks may be ideological. Therefore, a situation can occur where individuals are asked to perform tasks while they do not agree with the idea of change or with the tasks that serve this idea (Fullan 2001; Sarson 1996).

Signs of resistance to change appear publicly or they can be hidden, depending on the context in the specific organization, depending on the extent to which the members of the organization accept the change and depending on the sanctions involved in not responding to this change (Ashrat, 2018). Resistance practices to change that are taken by members of the organization to express their resistance include: argument, defiance, challenge (Argaman. 2009; Argyris, 1957). In addition, demonstrations of resistance can be expressed in different possible behaviors, including paranoid behavior and obsessive-compulsive behavior (Baum, 2002).

Paranoid behavior includes: over awareness, caution, search for hidden signs and meanings, efforts to create alliances to defend against expected dangers, guarding of autonomy and even minimizing exchange of information with strangers in order to prevent them from having control and more. Obsessive-compulsive behavior includes: breaking large ideas down in too many parts, avoiding seeing the big picture, focusing on small details and more. (Baum, 2002).

Specifically, several features of resistance to change can be found in an educational context. The first, which is prominent in research literature, is that the teachers who are supposed to implement the process of change in educational institutes are the very ones who resist change. Sarson (1996) claims that teachers are intellectually and personally over conformist people and therefore they resist new ideas and the need for change. Lortie (1975) maintains a similar claim and adds that people who are attracted to teaching tend to favor the status-quo and therefore they may support the current state and not oppose it. According to her, the resistance of a single teacher depends on the opinion of the other teachers. As colleagues support the change, so will the individual teacher. Another feature of the resistance to change lies in the character of the teaching profession. According to Fullan (2001), teaching demands day-to-day current and immediate action, however, change demands a long process and the ability to look to the future. According to him, even a subtle change may take between three to five years and during this time period, asking the teachers to shift from short term view to long term view may cause resistance.

Another feature of the teaching profession is that it is an isolated one that does not allow the people practicing it hardly any meaningful interactions with their colleagues (Fullan, 2001; Lortie, 1975; Ben-Peretz & Schonmann, 2000). This is problematic because cooperation is important for the process of adapting to a new situation. More so, there is a need to exchange information and create new teaching materials. The single teacher is alone in this process and that is a cause of resistance to change. Furthermore, cooperation is needed in order to recreate a consensus regarding the relationships and beliefs that guide the group. Even when the system does allow interaction, there is need to be careful of forced collegiality between the teachers by the management at a fixed time and place. Since these alleged collegial relationships are technocratic and meant to implement the change and not intended for teachers development and growth, so their preset results may cause resistance (Hargreaves, 1994).

Another result of the teacher's isolation can be that the management's ideas don't even enter into the classroom. In these cases, changes and innovations in teaching methods or in new learning plans, or in conducting new environment organization of the classrooms do not occur in a meaningful

manner. That is because the teacher is the decision maker in his/her classroom and decides autonomously on the teaching material, the organization of the class and on the acceptance, adjustment or rejection of any change (Fullan, 2001). Therefore, as long as the implementation of change in the classes is not examined and evaluated more often, while leaving the teacher in his isolation, it is very likely that changes will not occur. Researchers claim that teachers have to put up with an "overload of innovation" - have to deal with many changes that are episodical, fragmented, different and clashing (Fullan, 2001). The teacher has to perform many different tasks in parallel, altogether causing a resistance.

Practices of resistance to change which are unique in the teaching profession are language practices. That is because language, mainly speech is a key tool in teaching and speech and especially writing are vital tools in learning. Argaman & Alexander (2013) are researching words as symbols that carry meaning like power relations and solidarity, social groups, ideologies or fields of interest (Hodga & Kress, 1988). These words and phrases seem to have influenced the social forces in the organization during the process of change. Pragmatically speaking, their words are expressions of their resistance and can be linked to the circumstances in the context in which they were stated and to the usage of language by the individual as a way to explain the reality in which he/she acts and to establish it.

In Argaman & Alexander's (2013) research, the teachers expressed complaints and anger at the process of change in the school. These expressions gradually took a form of resistance. The researchers found and analyzed ten words and phrases that express resistance to change in a small group of nine teachers. The researchers classified the words in to two groups. The first group (4 words) had words that inherently expressed resistance at different levels. The second group (6 words) had words that did not inherently express resistance; they only expressed resistance in context with other words.

The researchers inferred that "resistant" words are not necessarily the only ones that express the resistance to change. Some words can express a subtler, yet important, resistance. The researchers explain that

the "resistant" words are used to discuss matters that the teachers don't feel a need to hide, while the less "resistant' ones are used in situations where the teachers feel uncomfortable discussing their resistance or even feel threatened. The researchers found that in most cases, the reason for change was ideological and came from disagreement with the idea of change and the ways in which it was implemented. In a small number of cases, the reason for resistance was ego-status and very rarely the reason was anxiety. In addition, slang words were used to express resistance of two kinds: to express insult in terms of meaning or insult in terms of definition. The researchers state that these words require further research (Argaman & Alexander, 2013).

In another study, Ashrat (2018) presents an investigation and evaluation of an experimental program of self-learning made possible in her college. She describes, as head of the college, the fears and resistance of lecturers and students regarding replacing old images with new ones, giving up authority for cooperation and generally abandoning the old for the new.

In conclusion, resistance is a result of power relations constructed in a relationship, in different organizations with groups and changes within the relationships. The resistance is revealed through usage of different practices, mainly: practices of resistance to change, practices of paranoid behavior, obsessive-compulsive behavior and mainly in the teaching profession by linguistic practices. These practices of resistance can be found in teaching within the a-symmetric relationship between teachers and students. The same goes for pedagogical instructors and student teachers. In the few studies in this field, one of them cited in this article dealt with linguistic practices in the training process. There is room for more research regarding practices of resistance within pre-service teachers. More so, there is a need to research the resistance of pre-service teachers to performing reflections and writing them and the practices that they use in the process. Particularly, while this resistance appears in spite of the fact that the researchers' and the educators' opinion is very positive about "doing" reflection as a positive effect of metacognitive processes on advancing teaching and improving teaching quality in order to promote students' learning performance.

3. Problem Statement

The literature review in this article exposed researchers' and educators' positive thinking about the contribution reflection has on learning from teaching, its usefulness in promoting teaching and increasing teaching quality. On the contrary, the PST' attitudes toward reflection are unclear and blurred. Practically, when the researcher in the role of the pedagogical instructor (PI) guided PST during the first year in the preparation period she encountered huge resistance to reflection. In view of this negative attitude to reflection among PST, it is important to expose the resistance practices of those PST who resist reflection. Exposing them might help to recognize and decrease the PST' resistance to reflection and might even allow them to adapt positive attitudes toward reflection instead.

4. Research Methodology

4.1. Research Question

The research question is: What resistance practices to reflection are used by primary school pre-service teachers (PST) at the beginning of the first preparation year?

4.2. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to identify and expose PST' resistance practices to reflection.

4.3. Research Paradigm

The research paradigm is a qualitative-constructivist research paradigm which assumes interpretive-interactive epistemology (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). This paradigm is based on the social construction of reality, an intimate relationship between the researcher and the participants, what is studied, and the contexts that shape the inquiry (Creswell, 2015). In this research, it seemed the most suitable paradigm to explore PST' resistance practices to reflection in a CRL discourse, constructed in the social relations context of a PST' group with a PI.

4.4. Data Analysis

Discourse categorical content analysis has been conducted in order to reveal the latest knowledge of the research subjects (Creswell, 2012, 2015; Shkedi, 2011) by **content analysis** of common themes (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). To this end, developments and changes in the PST' resistance to reflection writing practices during the CRL discourse audio recording was analysed by **content analysis** of common themes in order to reveal their resistance towards written reflection in the discourse at the beginning of the first preparation year. However, since the researcher in this study is also the PI in the research, she will refer to herself from the researcher point of view as a PI (her role in the discourse) during the stage of data analysis.

4.5. Research Tool

CRL discourse occurs when a group of learners share and reflect their behaviors in a systematic procedure that previously led to the performance outcomes. (Schön, 1983; Ellis & Davidi, 2005; Schechter, Sykes & Rosenfeld, 2008; Perry& Rahim, 2011). Through a reflective process of the action after an event, the participants intentionally reflect on specific aspects of their experiences and on the effects of their actions in their environments (Schön, 1983; Jaeger, 2013). In this research, an audio recorded CRL discourse session of 43:38 minutes has been used in order to explore the PST' resistance practices to reflection.

The PI began the session with a set of questions about reflection: "What is a reflection for you? What do you mean when you say "reflection" in an academic study? What do you mean when you say "reflection" attributed to your instruction?" In order to answer these questions seriously the PST had five minutes for metacognitive thinking and to write their answers on strips of paper. Afterward, the CRL discourse about reflection between the participants started with the guidance of the PI.

4.6. Research population

The population was eight PST teaching in the same primary school classes, studying in the special education track, in their first preparation year, in one of the educational colleges in Israel. Five of them

who displayed resistance practices to the reflection participated in the current research. The PST were guided by the same PI who was also the researcher, in a CRL discourse, at the beginning of the academic year 2017. In order to preserve privacy and anonymity, all participants have been assigned a pseudonym.

5. Findings

Five PST resistance practices that were revealed were not explicitly overt from the beginning of the CRL discourse. The voices of three PST were heard loudly and clearly. First, the resistance practices were discovered by clues in their overt behavior and spoken practices. Then, as the discourse progressed their resistance practices were detected by the PI' guidance until they expressed their resistance to reflection by using explicit resistance practices.

The PST expressed their resistance practices to reflection, on two levels: the explicit level and the implicit level. However, changes in their attitude, increase and reduction of their resistance practices use can be seen in the transformation between the two levels. In the following analysis of the data issues and changes, the resistance practices will be presented according to the two levels of explicit and implicit resistance practices used in the discourse: behavioral and linguistic resistance practices of surreptitious laughter and small talk at the beginning of the CRL discourse; behavioral and linguistic resistance practices of explicit shared laughter and honest discourse on reflection and their resistance to it.

*5.1.Phase 1- B*ehavioral and linguistic resistance practices of surreptitious laughter and small talk

The first phase was characterized by using resistance practices at the explicit level. The PST shared at the beginning of the CRL discourse session, their former knowledge on reflection, its purpose, emphasizing the reflection contribution according to their past experiences.

According to the pedagogical instructor's question at the beginning of the session on reflection (See "research tool", pp.10-11), the following discourse took place:

> **Omer:** *"Learning from failures and successes. ... You are passing through all the things that you did and you learn from your failures, from your successes to the proceeding Learning."*
> **PI:** *"How many reflections did you write till now?"*
> **Omer:** *"In my life?"*
> **PI:** *"In teaching, in life"*
> **Omer:** *"I don't have a number."*
> **PI:** *"Many, Few, Zero, two?"*
> **Omer:** *"A lot."*
> **PI:** *"What did you learn from them?"*
> **Omer:** *"There are (reflections) that I learned from them and there are (reflections) that I didn't learn from them **anything**."*
> [...] **PI:** *"Can you share with us what did you learn (from them)? For example: What was a reflection that was meaningful for you?"*
> **Omer:** *"There wasn't **any** (reflection) that was significant as far as I remember."*

At the beginning of the discourse the word "no" was mentioned eleven times. At the explicit level of the discourse, Omer attributed her past experience in writing reflection by using the words: *"not"*, *"any"* and "*anything*". By using these words, she expressed and shared that in keeping with her past experience in doing reflection they are mostly unhelpful. First, she said that reflection helps you learn from your failures and successes, information she knows already and probably answers in this way because she thinks it is the answer the PI expected to hear. Then, when the PI asked for elaboration and an explanation of her words, she said that some of them are useful and some are not. Then, she said that there wasn't even one that she can remember as meaningful for her. The gradual negative words in her answers emphasizes that the reflections in the past seem to be barely useful if at all.

With the PI' guided questions the PST expose two kinds of resistance in linguistic practices: first, using negative sentences while referring to "doing" reflection and second, attributing their resistance to reflection consistent with their past experience. They emphasized that the reflection wasn't useful and had not helped them in the past. It can be seen that the linguistic resistance practices are presented in their word content, their vocabulary of negative words and grammatical negative sentences.

It seems that initially the PST' answers were given in order to please the PI as can be seen in Omers' words admitting that reflection helped her learn from failures and from successes. When she needed to give more honest answers about whether reflection was meaningful for her, she couldn't find any and gradually as a result, her resistance was exposed from the implicit level to the explicit level of the discourse. These answers strengthen the idea that PST, based on their previous knowledge and mostly on their past experiences, perceived the reflections as not useful, even though at the beginning their resistance to reflection is hidden.

The findings presented above, point to a gradual process in the discourse seen at the explicit level by the PI' guiding questions. In contrast, at the implicit level, at the beginning of the session, the discourse was characterized by small talk and unclear surreptitious laughter seen as idiosyncratic half jokes shared only by the PST, excluding the PI. While at the explicit level, when the PI asked questions they tried to give answers they assumed she expected to hear as can be seen later in Moses' words:" *I don't know. It's (these are) things that you are looking at (on them)"* and "*I'm trying to get into your head".*

In addition, most of the PST' laughter during this phase at the beginning of the discourse was surreptitious laughter at the implicit level. The PST' surreptitious laughter strengthens their resistance to the reflection and expresses their embarrassment. In fact, at the beginning of the discourse, there are situations whereby the PST laugh twice in less than half a minute in response to the PST' reaction attributed to other PST comments about reflection and sometimes to the PI reactions.

> "*In light of the words of one pre-service teacher, the **PI** says:*
> "*Okay. So, first of all, is it focused on my teaching?"*
> (*She says in a tone of a question).* [...]
> **Tom:** "*and to share. As if that is to say, this is the difference. Here it is (the reflection) something that have left for you and there it isn't ".* [...]
> **PI:** "*And the question is also where do I take it? Whether I..."*
> **Moses:** "*Is this is a reflection in teaching?"*
> (*Another pre-service teacher talks in the background.* **Laughter** *and **incomprehensible talking** are heard at the same time.)*
> **Minute 06:53** [...]

Moses: *"That's exactly what I'm going to say. I don't think there is a difference between a reflection in teaching and any other reflection that you do on a day-to-day basis. Only it's just you are here and you are a student and you need to do a reflection for you, as if this is to say to show you (the PI)."*
*(All the PST are **laughing**.) **Minute 06:59***
(*free translation ** the bold words highlighted by the researcher)

There are differences between types of laughing and contexts of talking during the discourse. At the beginning of the discourse, at the explicit level, the PST answered the questions in order to reveal and share their former knowledge about reflection, while a little resistance was exposed and their past reflection had little or no meaning in the content of their words. However, the implicit level tells another story. While in the beginning, laughter was a companion at the implicit level, with small-talk between the PST that are both incomprehensible and take place in the background between two PST as mumbling and whispers, they actually intended not to be heard by the PI.

This practice of small-talk accompanied with surreptitious laughter are used as resistance practices that cover the PST' resistance and negative attitude content to reflection. The PST presented behavioral resistance practices in addition to the linguistic practice ones, by the way they are talking (whispering and mumbling) and by their surreptitious laughter from the PI as if they are keeping a secret or half-joke from her.

5.2. Phase 2- Behavioral and linguistic resistance practices of explicit shared laughter and honest discourse on reflection

The second phase is characterized by explicit resistance discourse on reflection. At this phase, as the discourse progressed the linguistic resistance practices become clearly open. Linguistic practices of direct and honestly shared PST' thoughts of rejecting the reflection, criticizing the PI and her requirements aroused strong feelings. In addition, the behavioral resistance practices developed from surreptitious laughter to shared and loud laughter.

This phase in the discourse started by **Moses'** words at the end of the first phase:

> The **PI** asked: "Why is a written reflection required during the preparation period?"
> **Moses** answered: "So that at the end of the year we can look at the improvement process. I don't know. It's things that you are looking at ".[...] "It is not clear. I do not know. This is what came to my mind. I'm trying to get into your head".

In the first discourse phase, Moses' answer expressed the fact that the PST tried to give answers they thought the PI expected to hear. Moses answered the PI's question on the purpose of reflection in the preparation period that will show the improvement in teaching as a process at the end of the year. When he couldn't figure out the things the PI was thinking about, he admitted that he tried to get in to her head while answering her questions about reflection, exposing a way of thinking found among PST and admit that he couldn't get inside her mind and gave the answer that he thought she expected to hear.

However, the punch words that mark the beginning of the second phase are: *"…We need to do a reflection for you, as if this is to say to show you"*. Moses stressed that the reflection is addressed to the PI and useful for her so she knows what they are doing, to evaluate their teaching. Moses' words are continued by increasing and accelerating the resistance toward reflection addressed to the PI by other PST linguistic resistance practices too, as the CRL discourse continued.

> **Omer:** *"So, as if this is to say, I say that someone who saw it from the outside should say his opinion (on your teaching) and then you take it on yourself."*

In the first phase at the implicit level, Omer expressed that no reflection was useful to her as far as she remembers, i.e. according to her previous experience. In the second phase at the explicit level, she presented her resistance to reflection. She remarked that the most important way to improve teaching is from outside feedback as the most meaningful way in which PST can learn about their teaching from others.

After, she had expressed her other attitude toward reflection as less important or even meaningless with the PI's guiding questions in the first phase, **Omer** presented her attitude toward reflection in the second phase as follows:

> *"Yes and it is something that... you think about it. As if this is to say I agree that (someone professional) has to be with you and analyze. I do not agree that (when) you write down the points this is the thing that you are learning from (about your teaching)."*

Omer's resistance to reflection appeared more strongly when writing reflection, once she responded to Edens' positive attitude toward writing reflection and acknowledging its advantages. In particular, her reaction to Edens' response that it helped her learn about her teaching. Omers' reaction is that the reflection takes place when thinking, which truly means it's a metacognitive process, but she stressed once more the importance of outside feedback as a significant way to learn about your teaching, more than writing down reflection. The reflection writing as she perceives it, is learning about your teaching by writing down improvement points when teaching by yourself. Her word content is used as a linguistic resistance practice rejecting the importance of doing reflection introduced by the PI by strengthening the feedback of others. Once again and more firmly while pointing to more effective alternatives, she stresses the futility of writing reflection. Her attitude to writing reflection in addition to Moses' view that the reflection is addressed to the PI, exposes the practice of resistance to reflection and to the PI demands, more strongly.

In addition, more PST express resistance practices toward reflective writing as can be seen in **Marry's** words:

> *"Yes. But when you write it to someone else, it's not exactly a personal reflection."* [...]*"To write half a sentence is not OK. To write more than half a sentence is OK."* Marry emphasized that when you are writing to someone else except yourself, it is not personal anymore. Specifically, according to her words in this context, it strengthens the accusation practices that when you are writing it to the PI, the sharing makes the reflection non-personal for her.

Marry's words strengthen Moses' words that the reflection is intended for the PI, to show her "your teaching" and in addition to Omer's words that optimal learning about teaching comes from another kind of outside feedback. All this supports the idea that there isn't really an advantage in writing a reflection to yourself, since first it is a thinking process and second you can't actually see what points need improvement in your teaching when you are the teacher. In addition, a third reason expressed in Marry's linguistic resistance practice of accusation was that when you write it to someone else, as she intended it for the PI, it became impersonal and had to be written according to the PI' requirements not in half sentences, but with lots of detail and elaboration. So, in addition to strengthening the linguistic accusation practice a complaint is added.

As the discourse progressed, the PI added questions about the necessity and the need to refer to feelings and emotions in oral or written reflection, since the PST' answers referred only to thoughts. **Moses** responded to her question as follows*: "It depends on who I do it for. If I do it for myself I don't have to write what I feel about it, since I know what I feel."* When the discourse continues he goes on and said in a whisper: *"I don't … I don't get along with writing reflection. I can't do a written reflection."* As a response to his words, the PI told him that now he needs to do reflection and he answers: *"I'm not going to do it. If I was writing (a reflection now) and after a year read the reflection that I wrote I would have known that I had lied."* Later on in the discourse he said clearly: *"I have a resistance to the writing."*

On the explicit level, Moses' resistance to write reflection is very clear and radical. He rejected talking and writing about feelings and emotions to his words, since he knows what he is feeling. He resisted writing reflection even though it is part of the requirements and instructions of the PI and it appears that he still thought that the reflection is addressed to the PI. It seemed at this stage even rude, particularly when he continued and treated what he intends to write as a lie only because he had to do it according to the requirements, or because he still thought that this is a tool with which the PI will evaluate his teaching and improvement in teaching. However, at this stage in the discourse he at last admitted explicitly that he has a resistance to writing a reflection.

In fact, the accusation practice became more severe when **Omer** said: *"No, because you need this. When you know that you have to write it's like a task. You don't quite really exactly… write your reflection".* These sentences show, more accurately, their complaint to the PI in assigning them such a task that is no longer personal, for themselves. In addition, when the PI asked them to remember other reflections that they had to write in other courses **Moses** said: *"We received (tasks) to write five reflections and all of them only in your course."* They see the reflection as a task that does not help them and they even said later in the discourse, as expressed in Moses' accusing words that she is the only one that gives them this task.

In addition, as the discourse precedes this phase, more changes were detected as PST' explicitly shared laughter and open discourse about reflection resistance taking place and along with the linguistic resistance practices, behavioral resistance practices were aroused. The PST' laughter become more common and was expressed as open, explicit behavior in response to clear, sharp and overt resistance articulated in words. It revealed the resistance when Moses honestly said that the written reflection is addressed only for the good of the PI herself.

It is important to emphasize the extent that the word "no" had in the PST' sentences at this phase of the explicit, dramatic, radical resistance second phase CRL resistance discourse. In total, this phase showed that 79 times out of 115 times the word "no" is mentioned in PST' words, at the explicit level, openly expressing their negative attitude toward reflection and exposing at the implicit level, their resistance to writing it. The findings at this phase point to sentences that have changed gradually from mumbling, small-talk and surreptitious laughter at the implicit level, initially, to clearer talking and direct sentences when the discourse proceeded. Then, the sentences changed dramatically to a resistance discourse in which "no" words and a negative attitude are presented in the PST' sentences. This phase characterizes PST clarity in resistance linguistic practices specifically. They oppose writing as a reflection that does not help them, but can be more useful orally or more effective as outside feedback by a professional person to learn and promote their teaching.

Furthermore, acknowledging their previous experience is developed at the explicit level in the second discourse phase. In this phase, the PST recognition of their past experience by clearly mentioning their roles as teachers' guide commander or teacher in the army and as a guide or national service assistant with children in school and in children's homes in the kibbutz. For example, according to her experience in the army, **Omer** said:

> *"When I was a platoon commander* [...] *my class commanders, they learned "neto" from my feedback* [...] *at the end they had a very small part that they had to write down. I don't think that alone they could grasp that and as a platoon commander of my class commanders they couldn't get to the same point like those coming from the outside. I don't think that you can get to it alone."*

Omer related her past experience that in her role as a platoon commander she had to evaluate each one of her class commanders teaching content in a feedback conversation. She emphasized that they learned more when she evaluated their teaching as a professional person in the role of their platoon commander from the outside than from their own reflection. She even stressed that she does not think they were able to even recognize and evaluate their teaching on the same points that she evaluated them. According to her words, they actually learned from her and had to write a very small part on their own.

Later, she gave a particular example of one class commander that evaluated her lesson teaching as 70, while she, the platoon commander evaluated the same lesson teaching as 97.

> *"That's why I say that as if this is to say ("Keilou") that learning is much more external. As if this is that the person may have had a good whole lesson and the last ten minutes the students lost their concentration so what she will remember is the last ten minutes, but it might be that the lesson as if this is to say ("Keilou") had been excellent according to her teaching."*

She gave this example in order to demonstrate the huge gap between the two points of view, the one of the platoon commander as very good teaching (97) compared to the one of the class commanders' point of view and evaluation of her teaching as less than average teaching (70).

By giving examples from her past experience and equalizing her role in the army to the PI' role as a resistance linguistic content practice that reveals her resistance to reflection. In addition, from Omer's example it seems that at the implicit level their attitude and the fact they chose to share their previous past experience as a teacher or guide strengthens their resistance. Since, they unintentionally elevated their role status, in this way the elevation presents their resistance when they equalized their position role to that of the PI' role. In this way, they increased their resistance in accepting her attitude and her point of view as a professional specialist in her role at the explicit level, while they continued with the resistance practice of accusing the PI at the implicit level as she is perceived as challenging them in tasks, even though she insists that these tasks are for their own good from a positive and promoting point of view and for teaching.

The PST' reaction to the repetition of the reflection as useless decreased the status of the reflection, increased the negative attitude against it and blocked their ability to see the reflection's advantages. On the contrary, in addition they even stressed the importance of outside feedback and conversation as more useful than self-writing reflection. However, even then they pointed at them as useful on rare occasions.

On the basis of data, it can be concluded that the proceeding resistance discourse during most of the session is characterized by explicit expression of resistance by clear words followed by loud and shared laughter. The modality of the laughter and talking aroused from the latent expression of mumbling and surreptitious laughter at the beginning of the session gave way to an opportunity to begin the explicit, honest discourse of reflection. It is an opportunity to express and show reflection between the students and the PI and her demands by accusations, complaints, and active resistance practices. Even so, the PST created with their shared laughing together and their resistance discourse content a collective identity resisting reflection and particularly towards the PI. Actually, they accused her of reflections they had to do that were intended for her, for her own good. This accusation created embarrassment, because the common opinion about reflection, specifically a written one, exposed not only one pre-service student's attitude, but most of the PST' attitude towards it. The laughter that occurred immediately afterward created solidarity and a collective identity of active resistance expressed verbally in the accusation and complaints addressed against the PI.

Stemming from this interpretation, it seems to be that the shared laughter was the turning point, after Moses' words that the reflection was intended for the good of the PI. But rather that his words expressed a kind of mutual support, an accusation by all the PST sticking together, and the formation of a common resistance identity that opposes the PI and the reflection she requires, especially writing reflection.

The gap between the implicit and the explicit level changed here. Since, the resistance discourse become overt, the laughter that was heard at this phase was shared laughter and the resistance discourse practices concentrated on the PI' requirements and the reflection became evident, so the accusation of the PI was strengthened at the implicit level by disobedience to her authority by their claim to the futility of the reflection according to their past experience by elevating their status as a teacher commander in the army or as a guide in the kibbutz.

Finally, the explicit behavioral resistance practices of loud laughter and the explicit linguistic resistance practice toward reflection at this phase of most of the PST can be understood as exposing their formation of a collective identity against reflection and against the PI. The practices identified and used by the PST to construct this collective resistance shared identity at this phase are: direct explicit resistance discourse to reflection and toward the PI and her requirements; shared collective laughter, negative sentences using "no" words; attributing their professional past experience in the role of teacher or guide in other frameworks while increasing their professional status in comparison to the PI' role.

6. Discussion

Researchers have proposed several reasonable reasons for resistance to active learning, including: this kind of learning might demand more work, cause anxiety among students about their ability to perform in the new instructional environment, establish expectations that students are not prepared to fulfill, or be a mismatch with students' preferred ways of being taught (Åkerlind & Trevitt, 1999; Alpert, 1991; Keeley, Shemberg, Cowell, & Zinnbauer, 1995; Weimer, 2013).

The CRL discourse on reflection in the current study required an active learning on reflection that exposed resistance to reflection. In the discourse according to Foucault (1982, 1984), perception relation of power took place. Foucault (1982), argues that power relations are distributed throughout a variety of situations and circumstances, but he asserts that the emphasis needs to focus less on the power itself and has to focus more on the analysis of the way in which the resistance as an outcome of power is exercised (Foucault, 1982). Derived from Foucault's approach, Korbut (2018) concluded that it is required to focus on the ordinary manifestations of resistance, to focus on the particular forms in which the power relations can occur as a daily phenomenon, including in what circumstances and through what specific means such forms and instances of resistance are shaped as resistance practices (Korbut, 2018).

From the "How" question in Foucault and Korbut's attributions to resistance, the current research focused on exposing the resistance practices in which the PST expressed their resistance to reflection in the CRL discourse on reflection. The PST in the current research used discursive and behavioral resistance practices in the CRL discourse in two phases of discursive practices. This included negative sentences, giving examples of their previous experience to the reflection as useless, accusing the pedagogical instructor, and behavioral practices of their discourse manner and types of laughter.

One explanation of the existence of these discursive and behavioral resistance practices can be the known phenomena among first year PST during the preparation program as they are in in-between positions and their identity at this stage of entering teaching is fragile (Kupferberg & Gilat, 2005). While the teacher "I" identity is just beginning to form at this stage in preparation, the transfer from their own status as guide or qualified or partly qualified teacher in the army, to the little or no status of the pre-service teacher is very powerful at this stage. This stage according to the literature review is characterized by fear, low self-esteem, low self-efficacy and low SRL processes, especially low metacognitive processes, in this transformation are the cause of a fragile status (Kupferberg & Gilat, 2005).

Flavell (1979) defined metacognition as a person's knowledge about the cognitive processes necessary for understanding and learning. Metacognition, a "cognition about cognition" is described as second order

cognitions including: thoughts about thoughts, knowledge about knowledge or reflections about actions (Kohen & Kramarski, 2012, 2018). The metacognition process of reflection about action requires deep reflection involved with the practical, and applied insight into future educational processes requires a certain level of awareness that is enhanced through post reflection, reflection-in-action, and reflection-on-action. Reflection-on-action which is most frequently in use in education is carried out after the lesson, includes references to classroom implementation, and contains conclusions and recommendations for the future (Schön, 1987; Jaeger, 2013).

The metacognitive processes required for reflection seem to be unaware of the PST beginners and hard to apply. It seems that for these reasons, the inability to be in the position of in- between roles emotionally and to develop deep reflection based on awareness and reflection post, in- action and on-action metacognitive processes, the PST use the above discursive and behavioral resistance practices based on an emotional state of embarrassment and insecurity.

Since, metacognition is connected to meta-emotion that deals with how a person feels about the experience of a particular emotion (Efklides, 2011; Winne, 2017), from the beginning of the discourse, their fragile status exposed them to embarrassment and resistance. The laughing and small-talk practices of whispering and mumbling were signs of their inner and implicit resistance probably due to the bigger phenomenon of being a pre-service teacher student in the first year of preparation in the first phase of induction to the preparation period.

The second phase is characterized by the stronger resistance discourse even though the PST try to equalize their status to that of the PI status through the practice of laughter and talking at the explicit level. They elevate their status by positioning themselves in their roles in the army and some other positions in places where they were guides or teachers as equal to the PI, based on their past experience and previous knowledge for the same reasons. They equalized their status to the PI's one, since at this stage in the preparation program they felt uncertain and their self-efficacy was low so they tried to increase it by equaling their status and role to the PI and they felt unable to be self-regulated learners. In addition, they expressed their resistance and elevated their position

by giving examples from their previous experience in roles as teachers or guides in order to show the uselessness of the reflection process and of writing a reflection for them.

Specifically, as academic resistance practices usage, Korbut (2018) suggests that the principle can be discovered according to resistance as interference in the relationship to resistance from the students' positions, teachers' positions and education. This is research on the practice of resistance and this kind of study according to him requires careful analysis of the positions of all participants in an educational situation, of how they understand and arrange their actions (Korbut, 2018). The current study can be seen as an answer to this challenge, to discover the academic resistance in the context of this particular case situation of PI and PST' discourse on reflection. To find the principles of resistance as an interference from the standpoint of preservice teachers, the PI and educating, mostly as learners of their teaching and improving their teaching and principles of the resistance itself as it is practiced and what effect it has, and what its conditions are.

Learners who rate high in using metacognitive strategies backed up with considerations about how, when and why to use these strategies, are learners who are self-regulated in their approach to their own learning and teaching (Schraw, 1998). Thus, a learner needs to be taught explicitly how to activate metacognitive processes and to be given opportunities to practice those processes of construction of metacognitive knowledge (Mevarech & Kramarski, 2014), both for teachers as learners and as they are teachers for their students (Kramarski & Michalsky, 2009; Perry et al., 2006; Randi, 2004; Vrieling et al., 2012).

The CRL discourse on reflection helped to profoundly and honestly understand the PST' point of view about their in-between status as teacher-learner in order to become a self- regulated learning teacher who learns from his teaching to improve it and in practice to continually develop his teaching. In this context, the PI's role is very important as a creator who enables, them to grow by developing a discourse learning environment, while he/she is sensitive and initiates a discourse on reflection. In addition, at this stage of in-between-roles it is important that the PI is able to recognize the resistance practices and to expose them, is aware of and acknowledges the PST' previous knowledge and

their past perceptions in order to understand the origins of their resistance. It's very important to relate to their resistance expressed by these practices and to understand it when teaching subjects, issues, strategies and practices as part of the teachers' professional preparation.

REFERENCES

Anderson, B. (2006). Using the online course to promote self-regulated learning strategies in pre- service teachers. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 5(2), 155-177.

Åkerlind, G.S. & Trevitt, A.C. (1999). Enhancing self-directed learning through educational technology: When students resist the change. *Innovations in Education and Training International, 36*(2), 96–105.

Alpert, B. (1991). Students' resistance in the classroom. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 22*(4), 350–366.

Ansoff, I.H. (1990). *Implementing strategic management.* London: Prentice Hall International.

Argaman, E. (2009). Arguing within an institutional hierarchy: How argumentative talk and interlocutors' embodied practices preserve a superior-subordinate relationship. *Discourse Studies. 11* (5), 515-541.

Argaman, E. & Alexander, G. (2013). Teachers' resistance to language change-words and phrases. In B. Alpert & S. Shlasky (Eds.), *A close look at the school and the classroom: Ethnographic studies on education* (pp. 505-533). Tel-Aviv: Mofet Institution. (Hebrew)

Argyris, C. (1957). *Personality and organization.* New York: Harper & Brothers.

Ashrat, Z. (2018). Resistance characteristics to changes in teaching and learning. In D. Pritzker (Ed.). *To experience and feel – shared independent learning in academia* (pp. 177-202). Tel-Aviv: Mofet Institution. (Hebrew)

Baum, H.S. (2002). Why school system resist reform: A psychoanalytic perspective. *Human Relations. 55*(2), 173-198.

Ben-Peretz, M. & Schonmann, S. (2000). *Behind closed doors: Teachers and the role of the teachers' lounge*. Albany: State University of New York Press. (Translated to Hebrew, 2013. Tel-Aviv: Mofet Institution, 2005. (Hebrew)

Birenbaum, M. (2013). Conditions that support formative assessment: Assessment for learning (afl) in teacher preparation programs. *Bimat Diun, 51*, 6-12. (Commissioned paper) (Hebrew)

Borrego, M., Froyd, J.E. & Hall, T.S. (2010). Diffusion of engineering education innovations: A survey of awareness and adoption rates in U.S. engineering departments. *Journal of Engineering Education, 99*(3), 185–207.

Cardullo, V., Finley, S., Burton, M., & Tripp, O.L. (2017). Attitudes, perceptions, and knowledge – academic language and academic vocabulary of pre-service teachers. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, *17(9),* 21-35.

Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Merrill Education.

Creswell, J.W. (2015). *30 Essential skills for the qualitative researcher*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. California: Sage.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier Books, Macmillan Publishing Co.

Eilam, G. & Shamir, B. (2005). Organizational change and self-concept threats. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 41*(4), 399-421.

Ellis, S., & Davidi, I. (2005). After-event reviews: Drawing lessons from successful and failed experiences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(5), 857-871.

Efklides, A. (2011). Interactions of metacognition with motivation and affect in self-regulated learning: The MASRL model. *Educational Psychologist, 46* (1), 6– 25.

Finelli, C.J., Daly, S.R. & Richardson, K.M. (2014). Bridging the research to-practice gap: Designing an institutional change plan using local evidence. *Journal of Engineering Education, 103*(2), 331–361.

Flavell, J.H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist, 34*, 906-911.

Floyd, S. W. & Lane, P.J. (2000). Strategizing throughout the organization: Managing role conflict in strategic renewal. *The Academy of Management Review, 25(1)*, 154-177.

Foucault, M. (1976). T*he will to truth: Beyond knowledge, power and sexuality*. (Translated to Hebrew in 1996)

Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry, 8(4),* 777-795.

Foucault, P.M. (1984). *The will to truth: Beyond knowledge, power and sexuality-*Second part. (Translated to Hebrew in 2007)

Froyd, J., Borrego, M., Cutler, S., Henderson, C. & Prince, M. (2013). Estimates of use of research-based instructional strategies in core electrical or computer engineering courses. *IEEE Transactions on Education, 56*(1), 393–399.

Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change* (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College.

Goodson, I., Moore, S. & Hargreaves, A. (2006). Teacher nostalgia and the sustainability of reform: The generation and degeneration of teachers' missions, memory and meaning. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 42*(1), 42-61.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age.* London: Cassell.

Henderson, C. & Dancy, M. H. (2009). The impact of physics education research on the teaching of introductory quantitative physics in the United States. *Physical Review Special Topics: Physics Education Research, 5*(2), 020107.

Hodga, R., & Kress, G. (1988). *Social semiotics.* Ithaca: Cornell UP.

Jaeger, E.L. (2013). Teacher reflection: Supports, barriers, and results. *Issues in Teacher Education, 22(1),* 89-104.

Kramarski, B. & Michalsky, T. (2009). Investigating preservice teachers' professional growth in self-regulated learning environments. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*(1), 161-175.

Kearney, P., Plax, T.G. & Burroughs, N.F. (1991). An attributional analysis of college students' resistance decisions. *Communication Education, 40*(4), 325–342.

Kearney, K.S. & Hyle, A.E. (2003). The grief cycle and educational change: The Kubler-Ross contribution. *Planning and Changing, 34,* 32-57.

Keeley, S.M., Shemberg, K.M., Cowell, B.S. & Zinnbauer, B.J. (1995). Coping with student resistance to critical thinking: What the psychotherapy literature can tell us. *College Teaching, 43*(4), 140–145.

Kohen, Z. & Kramarski, B. (2012). Developing self-regulation by using reflective support in a video-digital microteaching environment. *Journal for Education Research International 3,* doi: 10.1155/2012/105246.

Kohen, Z. & Kramarski, B. (2018). Promoting mathematics teachers' pedagogical metacognition: a theoretical-practical model and case study. In Y.J. Dori, Z.R. Mevarech, & D.R. Baker (Eds.), *Cognition, metacognition, and culture in stem education: Learning, teaching and assessment* (pp. 279-305). Springer.

Korbut, A.M. (2018). Academic resistance in the university- conceptualizing the phenomenon. *Russian Education & Society, 60*(1), 1–13. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/10609393.2018.1436290

Kruken, G. (2003). Mission impossible? Institutional barriers to the diffusion of the 'third academic mission' at German universities. *International Journal of Technology Management, 25*(1-2), 18-33.

Kupferberg, I. & Gilat, I. (2005). Emotion and coping in pre-service teachers' narrative. In I. Kupferberg, & E. Olstein (Eds.), *Discourse in education: Researching educational events*. (pp. 49-76). Tel-Aviv: Mofet Institution, 2005. (Hebrew)

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

Le Cornu, R. & Ewing, R. (2008). Reconceptualizing professional experiences in preservice teacher education: Reconstructing the past to embrace the future. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(7), 799-812.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). *School-teacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

McClure, P. (2005). *Reflection on practice: making practiced-based learning work. A resource commissioned by the making practice based learning work project*. An educational development project funded through FDTL Phase 4 Project Number 174/02 and produced by staff from the University of Ulster, 1-22.

Mevarech, Z.R. & Kramarski, B. (2014). *Critical maths for innovative societies: The role of metacognitive pedagogies.* Paris: OECD publisher. DOI: 10.1787/9789264223561-en.

Michalsky, T. & Schechter, C. (2013). Pre-service teachers' self-regulated learning: integrating learning from problems and learning from successes. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 30*(1), 60-73.

Perry, N.E. & Rahim, A. (2011). Studying self-regulated learning in classrooms. In B.J.

Zimmerman & D.H. Schunk (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation of Learning and Performance* (pp.122-136). New York: Routledge.

Perry, N. E., Phillips, L. & Hutchinson, L. (2006). Mentoring student teachers to support self-regulated learning. *The Elementary School Journal, 106,* 237- 254.

Piderit, S.K. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitudes toward an organizational change. *The Academy of Management Review, 25*(4), 783-794.

Rodgers, C. (2014). *Doing Dewey*. Occasional Paper Series, (32). Retrieved from: http://educate.bankstreet.edu/occasionalpaper-series/vol2014/iss32/8

Randi, J. (2004). Teachers as self-regulated learners. *Teachers College Record, 106,* 1825-1853.

Sarson, S.B. (1996). *Revisiting the culture of the school and the problem of change.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.

Schön, D.A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Schön, D.A. & Rein, M. (1994). *Frame reflection: Toward the resolution of intractable policy controversies.* New York, Basic Books.

Schechter, C., & Michalsky, T. (2014). Juggling our mindsets: Learning from success as a complementary instructional framework in teacher education. *Teachers College Record, 116*(2)*,* 1-48.

Schechter, C., Sykes, I., & Rosenfeld, J. (2008). Learning from success as leverage for school learning: Lessons from a national program in Israel. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 11(3)*, 301-318.

Schraw, G. (1998). Promoting general metacognitive awareness. *Instructional Science, 26*, 113-125.

Seidel, S.B., & Tanner, K.D. (2013). What if students revolt? — Considering student resistance: Origins, options, and opportunities for investigation. *CBE—Life Sciences Education, 12*(4), 586–595.

Shkedi, A. (2011). The meaning behind the words*.* In *Methodologies of qualitative research: Theory and practice.* Tel Aviv: Ramot, Tel Aviv University. (Hebrew)

Weimer, M. (2013). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Winne, P.H. (2017). Cognition and metacognition within self-regulated learning. *Handbook of Self-Regulation of Learning and Performance*, *23.* 36-48. doi: https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315697048.ch3

Zimmerman, B.J. (2008). Investigating self-regulation and motivation: historical background, methodological developments, and future prospects. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*(1), 166–183.

Zimmerman, B.J., & D.H. Schunk, D.H. (2011). *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Vrieling, E., Bastiaens, T., & Stijnen, S. (2012). Effects of increased self-regulated learning opportunities on student teachers' motivation and use of metacognitive skills. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 37* (6), 102-117.